U.S. Congress

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FOURTH SESSION OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

OF

THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA

VOLUME LXIV—PART 1

DECEMBER 4 TO DECEMBER 28, 1922

(Pages 1-1044)



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1922



Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS FOURTH SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1922.*

The first Monday in December being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the fourth session of the Sixty-seventh Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol at 12 o'clock meridian.

The VICE PRESIDENT (CALVIN COOLIDGE, of Massachusetts) called the Senate to order.

PRAYER.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our God, as we come together for this opening session we pray Thee for Thy blessing and guidance. We thank Thee for all the way Thou hast been leading us, for every mercy vouchsafed, and for Thy grace in time of need and of perplexity. We humbly beseech Thee that these days following may be freighted with Thy goodness and that great good may result therefrom. We ask in Jesus Christ's name. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour having arrived for the opening of the session of Congress, the Secretary will call the roll for the ascertainment of a quorum.

The reading clerk (John C. Crockett) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	George	McKellar	Robinson
Bayard	Gooding	McLean	Sheppard
Brandegee	Hale	McNary	Shortridge
Brookhart	Harris	Myers	Smoot
Broussard	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Heflin	New	Sterling
Capper	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Sutherland
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Ladd	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	Lodge	Ransdell	Watson
Fletcher	McCumber	Reed, Pa.	Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent on business of the Senate, attending the funeral of the late Representative JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS.

The list of Senators by States is as follows:

Alabama.—Oscar W. Underwood and J. Thomas Heflin.
Arizona.—Henry F. Ashurst and Ralph H. Cameron.
Arkansas.—Joseph T. Robinson and Thaddeus H. Caraway.
California.—Hiram W. Johnson and Samuel M. Shortridge.
Colorado.—Lawrence C. Phipps and Samuel D. Nicholson.
Connecticut.—Frank B. Brandegee and George P. McLean.
Delaware.—L. Heisler Ball and Thomas F. Bayard.
Florida.—Duncan U. Fletcher and Park Trammell.
Georgia.—William J. Harris and Walter F. George.
Idaho.—William E. Borah and Frank R. Gooding.
Illinois.—Medill McCormick and William B. McKinley.
Indiana.—James E. Watson and Harry S. New.
Iowa.—Albert B. Cummins and Smith W. Brookhart.
Kansas.—Charles Curtis and Arthur Capper.
Kentucky.—A. Owsley Stanley and Richard P. Ernst.
Louisiana.—Joseph E. Ransdell and Edwin S. Broussard.
Maine.—Bert M. Fernald and Frederick Hale.
Maryland.—Joseph I. France and Ovington E. Weller.
Massachusetts.—Henry Cabot Lodge and David I. Walsh.
Michigan.—Charles E. Townsend.
Minnesota.—Knute Nelson and Frank B. Kellogg.
Mississippi.—John Sharp Williams and Pat Harrison.
Missouri.—James A. Reed and Selden P. Spencer.
Montana.—Henry L. Myers and Thomas J. Walsh.
Nebraska.—Gilbert M. Hitchcock and George W. Norris.
Nevada.—Key Pittman and Tasker L. Oddie.
New Hampshire.—George H. Moses and Henry W. Keyes.
New Jersey.—Joseph S. Frelinghuysen and Walter E. Edge.
New Mexico.—Andrieus A. Jones and Holm O. Bursum.
New York.—James W. Wadsworth, jr., and William M. Calder.
North Carolina.—F. M. Simmons and Lee S. Overman.
North Dakota.—Porter J. McCumber and Edwin F. Ladd.
Ohio.—Atlee Pomerene and Frank B. Willis.
Oklahoma.—Robert L. Owen and J. W. Harreld.
Oregon.—Charles L. McNary and Robert N. Stanfield.
Pennsylvania.—George Wharton Pepper and David A. Reed.
Rhode Island.—LeBaron B. Colt and Peter G. Gerry.
South Carolina.—Ellison D. Smith and Nathaniel B. Dial.
South Dakota.—Thomas Sterling and Peter Norbeck.
Tennessee.—John K. Shields and Kenneth McKellar.
Texas.—Charles A. Culberson and Morris Sheppard.
Utah.—Reed Smoot and William H. King.
Vermont.—William P. Dillingham and Carroll S. Page.
Virginia.—Claude A. Swanson and Carter Glass.
Washington.—Wesley L. Jones and Miles Poindexter.
West Virginia.—Howard Sutherland and Davis Elkins.
Wisconsin.—Robert M. La Follette and Irvine L. Lenroot.
Wyoming.—Francis E. Warren and John B. Kendrick.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 371), which was read by the Assistant Secretary (Henry M. Rose), considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled, and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 372), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. LODGE and Mr. UNDERWOOD the committee on the part of the Senate.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 373), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian until otherwise ordered.

Mr. LODGE. In order that the committee just appointed may have an opportunity to notify the President and to carry out the order of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

426404

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 4, 1922.*

This being the day fixed by the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the House of Representatives of the Sixty-seventh Congress met in its Hall at 12 o'clock noon for its fourth session, and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, judge of all men, and unto whom all hearts are open, make Thy presence evident in the labor of this day and throughout this session. We believe that there is a guidance for each of us, and by thoughtful reflection and lowly listening we shall know the way. O may everything be lifted to the high level of unfailing devotion to the country that has called us. In the strain of toil, and it will come; in the fret of care, and it will disturb; in the maze of exactions, and they will entangle. O may courage be strong, vision clear, and all hearts kept pure. Enable us always to understand that happiness and well-being are the blessings which belong to a free people and reach back to the life and service of Him who glorified the virtue of self-sacrifice. Amen.

ROLL CALL BY STATES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll of Members by States for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk called the roll by States, when the following Members answered to their names:

ALABAMA.

John McDuffie.
John R. Tyson.
Henry B. Steagall.
Lamar Jeffers.
William B. Bowling.
William B. Oliver.
Lilius B. Rainey.
Edward B. Almon.
George Huddleston.
William B. Bankhead.

ARIZONA.

Carl Hayden.

ARKANSAS.

William J. Driver.
William A. Oldfield.
John N. Tillman.
Hence M. Jacoway.
Tilman B. Parks.

CALIFORNIA.

Clarence F. Lea.
John E. Raker.
Charles F. Curry.
Julius Kahn.
James H. MacLafferty.
Henry E. Barbour.
Arthur M. Free.
Walter F. Lineberger.
Philip D. Swing.

COLORADO.

William N. Vaile.
Charles B. Timberlake.
Guy U. Hardy.
Edward T. Taylor.

CONNECTICUT.

E. Hart Fenn.
John Q. Tilson.
James P. Glynn.

DELAWARE.

Caleb R. Layton.

FLORIDA.

John H. Smithwick.
William J. Sears.

GEORGIA.

William C. Wright.
William D. Upshaw.
Gordon Lee.
Thomas M. Bell.
Carl Vinson.
William C. Lankford.
William W. Larsen.

IDAHO.

Burton L. French.
Addison T. Smith.

ILLINOIS.

Charles E. Fuller.
Joseph G. Cannon.
Guy L. Shaw.
Loren E. Wheeler.
Edwin B. Brooks.
Edward E. Denison.
Richard Yates.

INDIANA.

Oscar R. Luhring.
Oscar E. Bland.
John S. Benham.
Everett Sanders.
Richard N. Elliott.
Merrill Moores.
Albert H. Vestal.
William R. Wood.
Louis W. Fairfield.
Andrew J. Hickey.

IOWA.

William F. Kopp.
Harry E. Hull.
Burton E. Sweet.
Gilbert N. Haugen.
Cyrenus Cole.
Cassius C. Dowell.
Horace M. Towner.
William R. Green.
L. J. Dickinson.
William D. Boies.

KANSAS.

Edward C. Little.
Philip P. Campbell.
Homer Hoch.
James G. Strong.
Hays B. White.
J. N. Tincher.
Richard E. Bird.

KENTUCKY.

Alben W. Barkley.
David H. Kincheloe.
Robert Y. Thomas, jr.
Charles F. Ogden.
Arthur B. Rouse.
Ralph Gilbert.
William J. Fields.
John M. Robsion.

LOUISIANA.

James O'Connor.
H. Garland Dupré.
Whitmell P. Martin.
John N. Sandlin.
Riley J. Wilson.
George K. Favrot.
Ladislas Lazaro.
James B. Aswell.

MAINE.

Carroll L. Beedy.
Wallace H. White, jr.
John E. Nelson.
Ira G. Hersey.

MARYLAND.

Albert A. Blakeney.
John Philip Hill.
J. Charles Linthicum.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Allen T. Treadway.
Frederick H. Gillett.
Samuel E. Winslow.
John Jacob Rogers.
A. Piatt Andrew.
Frederick W. Dallinger.
Charles L. Underhill.
George Holden Tinkham.
Louis A. Frothingham.
William S. Greene.

MICHIGAN.

Earl C. Michener.
John C. Ketcham.
Carl E. Mapes.
Patrick H. Kelley.
Louis C. Cramton.
James C. McLaughlin.
Roy O. Woodruff.
Frank D. Scott.
W. Frank James.
Vincent M. Brennan.

MINNESOTA.

Sydney Anderson.
Frank Clague.
Oscar E. Keller.
Walter H. Newton.
Oscar J. Larson.
Halvor Steenerson.

MISSISSIPPI.

John E. Rankin.
Bill G. Lowrey.
Benjamin G. Humphreys.
Ross A. Collins.
Paul B. Johnson.
Percy E. Quin.
James W. Collier.

MISSOURI.

Henry F. Lawrence.
Charles L. Faust.
Edgar C. Ellis.
William O. Atkeson.
Roscoe C. Patterson.
Sidney C. Roach.
Theodore W. Hukriede.
Harry B. Hawes.
Marion E. Rhodes.
Edw. D. Hays.
Samuel A. Shelton.

MONTANA.

Washington J. McCormick.
Carl W. Riddick.

NEBRASKA.

R. H. Thorpe.
Albert W. Jefferis.
Robert E. Evans.
Melvin O. McLaughlin.
William E. Andrews.
A. R. Humphrey.

NEVADA.

Samuel E. Arentz.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edward H. Wason.

NEW JERSEY.

Isaac Bacharach.
T. Frank Appleby.
Amos H. Radcliffe.
Richard Wayne Parker.
Frederick R. Lehlbach.

NEW MEXICO.

Nestor Montoya.

NEW YORK.

Frederick C. Hicks.
John Kissel.
Ardolph L. Kline.
Meyer London.
Thomas J. Ryan.
Frank Crowther.
Bertrand H. Snell.
Luther W. Mott.
Walter W. Magee.
Archie D. Sanders.
Clarence MacGregor.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Hallett S. Ward.
Edward W. Pou.
Charles M. Stedman.
Homer L. Lyon.
Alfred L. Bulwinkle.
Zebulon Weaver.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Olger B. Burtness.
James H. Sinclair.

OHIO.

Nicholas Longworth.
A. E. B. Stephens.
Roy G. Fitzgerald.
John L. Cable.
Charles J. Thompson.
Charles C. Kearns.
Simeon D. Fess.
William W. Chalmers.
Israel M. Foster.
Edwin D. Ricketts.
John C. Speaks.
James T. Begg.
C. Ellis Moore.
Joseph H. Himes.
W. M. Morgan.
Frank Murphy.
John G. Cooper.
Miner G. Norton.
Harry C. Gahn.
Theodore E. Burton.

OKLAHOMA.

Alice M. Robertson.
Charles D. Carter.
J. C. Pringey.
F. B. Swank.
L. M. Gensman.

OREGON.

Willis C. Hawley.
Nicholas J. Sinnott.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William S. Vare.
George S. Graham.
George P. Darrow.
Henry W. Watson.
William W. Griest.
Fred B. Gernerd.
I. Clinton Kline.
John M. Rose.
Adam M. Wyant.
Samuel A. Kendall.
Henry W. Temple.
Milton W. Shreve.
Nathan L. Strong.
Stephen G. Porter.
M. Clyde Kelly.
John M. Morin.
Guy E. Campbell.
Thomas S. Crago.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

W. Turner Logan.
James F. Byrnes.
Fred H. Dominick.
John J. McSwain.
William F. Stevenson.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles A. Christopherson. William Williamson.

TENNESSEE.

B. Carroll Reece. Clarence W. Turner.
J. Will Taylor. Lon A. Scott.
Wynne F. Clouse. Finis J. Garrett.
Ewin L. Davis. Hubert F. Fisher.

TEXAS.

Eugene Black. James P. Buchanan.
John C. Box. Tom Connally.
Morgan G. Sanders. Fritz G. Lanham.
Sam Rayburn. Harry M. Wurzbach.
Hatton W. Sumners. John N. Garner.
Rufus Hardy. C. B. Hudspeth.
Clay Stone Briggs. Thomas L. Blanton.
Daniel E. Garrett. Marvin Jones.
Joseph J. Mansfield.

UTAH.

Don B. Colton. Elmer O. Leatherwood.

VERMONT.

Frank L. Greene. Porter H. Dale.

VIRGINIA.

Schuyler Otis Bland. Thomas W. Harrison.
Andrew J. Montague. R. Walton Moore.
J. M. Hooker.

WASHINGTON.

John F. Miller. John W. Summers.
Lindley H. Hadley. J. Stanley Webster.
Albert Johnson.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Leonard S. Echols.

WISCONSIN.

Edward Voigt. Joseph D. Beck.
John M. Nelson. David G. Classon.
John C. Kleczka. James A. Frear.
Florian Lampert. Adolphus P. Nelson.

WYOMING.

Frank W. Mondell.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 458.

Resolved, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House is assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. MONDELL, Mr. LONGWORTH, and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee.

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 459.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives has appeared, and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 460.

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be 12 o'clock meridian.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Also, Senate Resolution 372:

Resolved, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

And that in compliance with the foregoing resolution the Vice President had appointed members of said committee Mr. LODGE and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

REQUEST TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the charges filed with the Judiciary Committee by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KELLER] against the Attorney General and the Attorney General's answer thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Michigan also include that they be printed in parallel columns?

Mr. WOODRUFF. I did not do that, but I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In eight-point type.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I will also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the statement made by the Attorney General.

Mr. WOODRUFF. That is included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to both requests.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects to both requests.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. When the gentleman speaks of the statement of the Attorney General, does he refer to an interview?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Printed in this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Objection has been made.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Objection has been made. I call for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EVERY HOME A SENTRY BOX.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, under leave to print given me by the House I desire respectfully to submit some suggestions as to a proper policy for our people and our Government as they were recently outlined by me in a letter to the Hon. Louis A. Coolidge, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in his capacity as one of the incorporators of the new organization known as Sentinels of the Republic. In this letter I have endeavored to make clear in succinct form my earnest convictions concerning what I regard as, perhaps, the most important general political issue confronting the American people to-day and one upon which the future character of our Government and social order depends.

The letter follows:

I am sorry I shall not be table to get to Boston to-morrow to attend the mass meeting at Symphony Hall conducted by the newly organized Sentinels of the Republic to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Adams. But I hope the best of success will crown this first public demonstration of the new society whose slogan is, "Every citizen a sentinel; every home a sentry box."

That last phrase tells the whole story. "Every home a sentry box." The genius of the English-speaking civilization from earliest days has ever made the hearthstone both the foundation and the shrine of its social order. Civic liberty was born at the fireside, was reared and made strong by experience in local self-government, and forever renewed itself in successive generations of men and women who did not expect the Nation's government to do for them what they ought to do for themselves at home.

This American experiment in civics was originally meant to be a popular government, deriving its just powers from the consent of the "governed," proceeding from the countless hearthstones of the land to Washington, and not descending from Washington upon the hearthstones. The sturdy old idea of a sturdy old generation was that that was the best government that governed least and still maintained a healthy social order. Faithful to that policy, free government in America waxed and prospered for many years.

But nowadays a misguided public interest is persistently uprooting the local self-government that has bred strong men and women

for the conduct of national affairs, is centralizing the government in well-nigh innumerable bureaus and commissions at Washington, and through one device and another of paternalism is seducing the ancient spirit of independence and self-reliance among our people, gradually bringing them to be dependent upon the will and favor of politicians in the National Capital and implanting in them an ever-growing sense of irresponsibility and ease that can in the end but breed a generation of parasites and helpless dependents with whom no so-called free government could either actually govern or be free.

"Every home a sentry box." It is time to rouse the multitude to an understanding of the danger that confronts them and their children and their children's children. These paternalistic devices now being introduced to a people whose forebears would have indignantly repelled the attempt to pauperize them are but the vain inventions of political doctors who are desperately struggling to dose into a few more flickers of life the decaying civic institutions and social order of lands across the sea. They are desperate Old World attempts to keep an outraged multitude quiet yet a little while longer. They are Old World remedies brought over here to cure a country that isn't sick.

"Every home a sentry box." Let us highly resolve to restore the old balance of power between the States and the Federal Government in every respect consistent with national integrity and safety. Let us restore to the fullest practical measure the old spirit and policy of local self-government among our people. Let us bend our energies as far as may be upon the idea of developing the strength of the Nation through the nursery of the home and the home community. The Government at Washington can never be any stronger than the homes it comes out of. Let us maintain all the government we can at home, where we can keep our eyes on it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. To-day is suspension day and the Unanimous Consent Calendar is in order. The Clerk will report the first bill on the calendar.

LAC DU FLAMBEAU BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWAS, WISCONSIN.

The first bill on the calendar was the bill (H. R. 6428) for the enrollment and allotment of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewas in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill be read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within 90 days after the approval of this act the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to add to the existing rolls of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Chippewa Indians the names of all persons legally entitled to enrollment born prior to the approval of this act, including the issue of members of the band heretofore enrolled or who may be enrolled hereunder, such roll to constitute the final roll of the Lac du Flambeau Band. In the preparation of this roll the said Secretary shall be assisted by a committee of members of the said band duly appointed at a general council of the Lac du Flambeau Band called for that purpose. Immediately after the approval of the roll the Secretary of the Interior shall cause allotments of land within the Lac du Flambeau Indian Reservation to be made to the members of the band whose names appear on said additional roll (exclusive of the merchantable timber on such land) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty of September 30, 1854 (10 Stat. L., p. 1109), and acts of Congress applicable to allotting lands to members of an Indian tribe: *Provided*, That if there is not sufficient unappropriated land on the reservation to give each member the full acreage to which he or she is entitled, the Secretary of the Interior may prorate the lands as nearly as practicable among the members so enrolled. The patents for the allotments made hereunder shall issue to the allottees as early as practicable after the merchantable timber thereon has been removed and the right is hereby reserved to the United States to cut and market the merchantable timber on the lands so allotted, the proceeds to be disposed of as herein provided. When the merchantable timber has been cut from the lands so allotted the title to such timber as remains on said lands shall thereupon pass to the respective allottees: *Provided further*, That the land allotted or reserved hereunder shall be subject to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country until otherwise provided by Congress.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized to sell at the current market value in the year which the timber is cut or logged, the merchantable timber on the lands allotted under the provisions of this act under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, the net proceeds derived therefrom, together with any undistributed proceeds derived from the sale of timber heretofore cut and sold from such lands, shall be distributed per capita and paid to the members of the band enrolled under the provisions of this act where such members are or may hereafter be adjudged by the Secretary of the Interior to be competent to manage their own affairs and care for their own business; and in cases where members have not been adjudged competent by the Secretary of the Interior, their shares shall be deposited to their individual credit as individual Indian moneys are now deposited and paid to them or used for their benefit under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That of the amount now on deposit derived from the sale of tribal timber, at least $50,000 shall be distributed among the members enrolled under the provisions of this act as early as practicable after the approval of the roll as herein provided.

SEC. 3. That there be set aside for the village of Lac du Flambeau, lots 3 and 4 of section 8, and lots 3 and 4 of section 5, township 40 north, range 5 east; for the Indian village lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of section 1, and lots 1, 5, 6, and 7 of section 2, and lots 1, 2, and 3 of section 12, township 40 north, range 5 east, and for the school and agency farm approximately 200 acres of unappropriated land, and sections 6 and 7, township 40 north, range 5 east.

The following committee amendments were read.

Strike out all of section 3 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof a new section to be known as section 3 and to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That there be reserved from allotment or other disposition the following lands: For the village of Lac du Flambeau, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter and lots 3 and 4 of section 5, and lots 3 and 4 of section 8, township 40 north, range 5 east; for the Indian village, lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of section 1, lots 1 and 7 of section 2, and lots 1, 2, and 3 of section 12, township 40 north, range 4 east; and for the school and agency farm, the unappropriated land in sections 6 and 7, township 40 north, range 5 east; that in the east half of section 31 and that in the west half of section 32, township 41 north, range 5 east."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question or two about this legislation. This appears to be a bill for the final allotment of land to this band of Chippewa Indians, there having been an allotment made to a certain portion of them in the past. It also provides for the enrollment of Indians, some of whom have been born since the rolls were closed. Are there any others to be added to the rolls except the newly born?

Mr. ROACH. No; this completes the roll.

Mr. CARTER. Are there other Indians to be enrolled except those born since the last roll was closed?

Mr. ROACH. The principal number of Indians to be added are the newly born since the former allotment was made. There are a number that were not included in the former allotment that will be included in this, but only a few.

Mr. CARTER. Were those enrolled before and not allotted, or were they never enrolled?

Mr. ROACH. I am not able to answer that question. On the first page of the report it says:

It appears from the evidence considered by your committee that in the year 1903 approximately 45,000 acres of the reservation of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewas was allotted to some 900 Indians in number on this reservation; that there remained approximately 24,500 acres of this reservation which has been unallotted, and that some 450 Indians would be benefited by the enactment of this legislation. These 450 Indians for the most part are Indians who have been born since the allotment above referred to. It is proposed by this bill to allot this remaining 24,500 acres of unallotted land to these new-born Indians.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that it says "for the most part," but I want to know what is meant by "the most part." Can the gentleman tell the House how many of these Indians who are to be reenrolled were living at the time of the last enrollment?

Mr. ROACH. I will state it in another way. Practically all of the 450 are new-born since the former enrollment was made.

Mr. CARTER. But there were some living at the time the former enrollment was made and not enrolled?

Mr. ROACH. A few, but I am not able to state the exact number. I made inquiry of the commissioner during the hearings, but do not now recall the number. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin can give the number.

Mr. CARTER. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin tell us why they were not enrolled?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I can answer by saying that the exact number might be difficult to state. The department itself would be unable to do that, and in the report they say that approximately 450 will be the number, most of whom have been born since the last allotment. They believe that 450 is about as near the number as can be ascertained, and that that is the number among whom the 24,500 acres allotable is to be allotted.

I will read a letter that I received November 3. As the gentleman knows, this bill has been up once or twice, and the question has been raised, Is the Interior Department and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs definitely committed to this legislation and is there any reason why the legislation should not be passed? For the information of the committee and in direct answer to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma, I would like to insert a letter which I received on November 3 from Commissioner Burke in reference to this particular bill. The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, November 3, 1922.

Hon. A. P. NELSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: Your letter of October 30, in relation to the passage of H. R. 6428 (67th Cong., 2d sess.), a bill for the enrollment and allotment of the Lac du Flambeau Indians, has been received.

I note what you say with reference to the consideration of the bill coming under the Unanimous Consent Calendar shortly after the convening of Congress.

I wish to advise you that the measure to which you refer has twice been favorably reported upon by the department and has the unqualified approval of this office in the event of the minor amendment in section 3 thereof, which has been referred to in the reports mentioned. Copies of the reports referred to are inclosed.

Our office is heartily in favor of allotting all the available tribal lands at Lac du Flambeau Reservation to the members of the band who are now living and entitled to allotments. Our records show that there are approximately 24,580 acres available for allotment purposes and that there are approximately 450 members of the band who have not

received allotments. It will be seen that the allotment of the entire acreage to the unallotted members would give them about 54 acres each.

I am not aware of anything I could say at this time which would more clearly and definitely indicate our approval of the measure under consideration.

Cordially yours, CHAS. H. BURKE, *Commissioner.*

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman know whether there is any treaty with reference to the allotment of these lands to these particular Indians?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Only the general treaty of September 30, 1854.

Mr. CARTER. Has there ever been any treaty with reference to the final closing of the roll of this band of Indians?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. I would not make a definite answer because I wish to be correct, but my best information in going over the matter with Commissioner Burke, and particularly Assistant Commissioner Meritt, is that there was nothing in the consideration of this bill as far as treaties are concerned with the rights of the Indians that could be questioned.

Mr. CARTER. Here is the difficulty I am trying to avoid. If you have a treaty with the Indians providing for the closing of the rolls at a certain time and the rolls were closed at that time, then if you undertake to add other names to the roll you probably would involve the Government in a suit for recovery by these Indians already on the roll.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Does not the gentleman think that the commissioner, with his usual thorough and careful consideration of all subjects, has taken all these matters into consideration with reference to this legislation, especially in view of his three letters of approval? The commissioner makes the reply that he does in response to my direct question, which I have already stated. This matter has also been in the regular council, and has been approved there by a majority of the Indians.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that I have very great confidence in the ability, the understanding, and the integrity of the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and I am sure, if he has given a favorable report upon the bill, he has considered all of these questions. However, the report of the committee does not print any statement upon the bill from the commissioner or the Secretary of the Interior, and that is why I ask the question. We have had similar cases where we have closed the rolls of tribes by a treaty. Afterwards we would reopen those rolls by statute, and in every instance the Indians have come back on the Government. They have been sent to the Court of Claims and they have recovered.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Speaker, the assistant commissioner, Mr. Meritt, appeared before the subcommittee handling this legislation, of which I was the chairman. He stated that the purpose of the legislation was to close up the affairs of this tribe. I assume from his statement that the purpose of the legislation being to "close up the affairs of the Lac du Flambeau Tribe," that heretofore it had not been closed up. Else he would not have made that statement.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROACH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Does the gentleman understand by this legislation that it actually closes the rolls and that there will be no further distribution?

Mr. ROACH. This legislation will close the rolls. The question was asked as to whether there had been a former closing of the rolls, and I assumed from the statement of the assistant commissioner, to which I have just referred, that the former allotment had not closed the rolls.

Mr. SNELL. How much money is there in the Treasury at the present time that is available for this distribution? I notice this bill provides for distributing $50,000.

Mr. ROACH. This money to be distributed is from the sale of timber to be sold.

Mr. SNELL. I notice the provision in line 20, page 3—

that of the amount now on deposit derived from the sale of tribal timber at least $50,000 shall be distributed—

And so forth. There is some money in the Treasury at the present time?

Mr. ROACH. Twenty-four thousand five hundred and eighty-eight dollars in the Treasury at the present time.

Mr. SNELL. Do I understand there is only $24,588 on deposit at the present time?

Mr. ROACH. Twenty-four thousand five hundred and eighty-eight dollars.

Mr. SNELL. How can you distribute $50,000 out of $24,500?

Mr. ROACH. From the sale of this timber. This bill provides for the sale of certain timber by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SNELL. But the bill provides for a distribution of $50,000 out of the money now on deposit.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken. There are 24,500 acres of land yet to be distributed and allotted.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin tell me how much money there is on hand?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Approximately $50,000 on deposit at the present time.

Mr. SNELL. How long has that money been there?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. I would not be able to say the exact time, but, no doubt, it has been received from the sale of timber.

Mr. SNELL. As the gentleman understands this legislation, it actually closes up this whole transaction and we wipe it off the slate?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Yes. I have gone over the matter very thoroughly with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the bureau is just as anxious as it can be to have the whole matter settled and finally disposed of. It has been hanging fire for a long while, and the only reasonable way to do it is to get it settled as the department desires, as it has indicated that it should be done.

Mr. CARTER. This is probably what has happened with reference to the money in the Treasury. The timber is being sold now, is it not?

Mr. ROACH. This bill authorizes the sale of the timber.

Mr. CARTER. What the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] is trying to get at is how it is you have a statement in the report of only $24,000 in the Treasury.

Mr. SNELL. That is an error.

Mr. CARTER. And yet you have $50,000 provided for in the bill.

Mr. ROACH. I do not think it is a mistake.

Mr. SNELL. You can not distribute $50,000 out of $24,000.

Mr. ROACH. This authorizes the sale of timber, and that, together with the money on deposit, would make up the amount.

Mr. CARTER. Perhaps some other sales have been made since then, and that money has been accumulating since the information came to the committee. Some reservations are made here. Three reservations seem to be made—one for the village of Lac du Flambeau, one for the Indian village, and another for the school and agency farm. How much is reserved in those three reservations?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Approximately 40 acres. That is for school purposes.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that, because in the bill there are two quarters of a quarter section, which would be 40 acres each, which would make 80 acres.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Forty acres are reserved distinctly for village purposes.

Mr. CARTER. Three hundred and twenty acres seem to be reserved in the east half of section 31.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Yes; but if the gentleman will notice there are reservations for several purposes, such as village and school and agency farm.

Mr. CARTER. I understand. Just what is the proper definition of "merchantable timber"? Can the gentleman tell us?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Anything that will sell on the market.

Mr. CARTER. That does not mean dead and down timber; it means anything that can be sold to a sawmill?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this do with these Indians; take them out from under the jurisdiction of the Government so as to cease paying for them?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. No; it does not take them from the jurisdiction of the Government. This does not change the status quo at all. This land is to be allotted so as to give him a place to live on. Certainly the purpose of the department, as far as possible, is to make these Indians self-supporting wherever they can do so, and if they can get a small piece of land where they can build a home, why, that will tend in that direction.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And in the meantime cutting all the timber from the land, denuding it and selling it, and there is $50,000 to be distributed among the members enrolled under the provisions of this act.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. And it is for the best interests of the Indians and the department that the merchantable timber shall be sold.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield? I think it is important that we know about the money. It has been stated that there was $50,000, whereas it distinctly states on page 2 of the report that the amount on deposit in the Treasury is

only $24,988. Now, line 21, page 3, of the bill contains the provision for distributing $50,000 of the money now on deposit. I think the amount should be absolutely known before we allow this legislation to go through. You can not distribute $50,000 out of $24,000.

Mr. ROACH. Where is that?

Mr. SNELL. Page 3, line 20. "*Provided*, That of the amount now on deposit derived from the sale of tribal timber at least $50,000 shall be distributed."

Mr. ROACH. There are certain timber contracts. This timber is sold under contract and annual payments are now being made to the trust fund. Now, I do not believe that the money derived from the sale of that timber is included in this $24,988. It is the sum to be derived from the sale of timber, and from what money is already on hand the distribution of the $50,000 is to be made. This is a general statement of the affairs of the Lac du Flambeau Indians, of their financial condition, property held, and so forth.

Mr. CARTER. I notice in line 15, page 2, provision is made as follows:

> The patents for the allotments made hereunder shall issue to the allottees as early as practicable after the merchantable timber thereon has been removed, and the right is hereby reserved to the United States to cut and market the merchantable timber on the land so allotted, the proceeds to be disposed of as herein provided. When the merchantable timber has been cut from the land so allotted the title to such timber as remains on said land shall thereupon pass to the respective allottees.

It says that allotment shall be made in conformity with the provisions of the treaty of September 30, 1854. Now, can the gentleman tell me when this land is allotted to the Indians whether they will have the right of alienation or not?

Mr. ROACH. Pardon me, but I was talking to a gentleman and did not hear your question.

Mr. CARTER. When this land is allotted to the Indians there does not seem to be any restrictions as to sale, and so forth, placed in this bill. Now, will the Indians be permitted to alienate? Can the gentleman tell us that?

Mr. ROACH. No, I could not; but I do not think they would.

Mr. CARTER. That is a very important thing. Unless there is some restriction as to sale, taxation, and incumbrance placed by the law these people might be left homeless within a very short time.

Mr. ROACH. I am of the opinion that the general law relating to the Indian tribes takes care of that, and that only competent Indians can alienate after they have received patents in fee.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. The gentleman appreciates the fact that these little details possibly ought to be clearly set forth, but I want to assure him of this fact, that with a bill of this kind it is very difficult to state in full all of these technical details. I want to say to the gentleman, however, that it does seem to me that with the commissioner of the bureau and with the assistant commissioner of the bureau having gone over these matters thoroughly and having made two separate favorable reports in which they approve the bill unqualifiedly, there should be no objection to its passage.

Mr. CARTER. Doubtless they have. As I say, I have a very high regard for the commissioner, but I might disagree with him as to whether these Indians should be permitted to alienate. That is a very important matter.

Mr. ROACH. I will say this to the gentleman, that there has already been allotted to this same tribe of Indians 45,756 acres, and I presume that this allotment among these 450 Indians will be upon the same basis and on the same terms as the allotments of their ancestors, those who have previously been allotted. There should not be any difference between this allotment and the former allotments in this particular tribe.

Mr. CARTER. Under the former allotments, made under the treaty, were restricted Indians permitted to alienate their lands?

Mr. ROACH. I presume that inasmuch as their affairs are still administered by the Committee on Indian Affairs they are not permitted to alienate their land.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no; it would still be necessary to administer the tribal affairs even though these restrictions were not removed.

Mr. ROACH. The gentleman will understand that it would be only fair that these 450 should be allotted in the same manner.

Mr. CARTER. I recall a similar mistake being made with another band of the Chippewas, known as the White Earth Band, and a great many of those Indians lost their entire property because there was placed in the bill a permission to permit a mixed-blood Indian to alienate his title. The roll did not distinguish the pure bloods from the mixed bloods. There being no other determining factor, the Indian would go into court and swear that he was a mixed blood, and it entailed no end of litigation and a considerable loss of property to the Indians in that particular section of country.

Mr. ROACH. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and is more familiar with this matter than I am. It is my impression that the Indians to be allotted under this provision will not be permitted by the Secretary of the Interior to alienate their lands and that the general law would prohibit them from doing so.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] recalls that this whole Chippewa matter is very much mixed up; particularly the Red Earth and the White Earth Bands have their affairs mixed up.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. It is the most complicated Indian problem I know of; the only thing that is more complicated is the Federal Government itself. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROACH. But there is nothing particularly complicated about this legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROACH. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What proportion of these Indians have been declared to be competent to manage their own affairs?

Mr. ROACH. As I recall the statement of the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Meritt, made before our committee, it has been some time since the hearings were held; he stated that the larger number of these 450 are minors. I do not remember now the exact number. I have the exact data, however, in my office.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. A. P. NELSON] give us the proportion in that number?

Mr. A. P. NELSON. I could not give that information.

Mr. SNELL. I think the provision should be amended on page 3, lines 20 and 21, so that the distribution proposed shall also include the money to be derived from the sale of timber.

Mr. ROACH. I will have no objection to that, but I have not the necessary information before me.

Mr. SNELL. If you have not the money now on hand, you certainly could not distribute it.

Mr. ARENTZ. On page 3, line 20, I suggest after the word "deposit" that the words "and hereafter" be inserted, so that it will read, "that of the amount now on deposit and hereafter derived from the sale of tribal timber," and so forth.

Mr. ROACH. I have no objection to that if it will satisfy the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Reserving still further the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill as to a provision in section 2. I think an amendment should be inserted at about line 4, providing that the Indian council that is now in existence in this band might have the right to act, along with the Secretary of the Interior, in the sale of this merchantable timber. It seems to me that this band should have its tribal council acting with the Commissioner in the sale of timber. I should like to offer an amendment of that kind and I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. ROACH. Well, I will accept such an amendment on that point if the gentleman desires to offer it.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, is this bill up for consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Then I object.

Mr. ROACH. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice and retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. I have no objection.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF THE BUDGET.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, which is summarized in the following statement:

Budget summary.

[Exclusive of postal revenues and postal expenditures paid from postal revenues.]

	Estimated, 1924.	Estimated, 1923.	Actual, 1922.
Total receipts	$3,361,812,359	$3,429,862,959	$4,109,104,150.94
Total expenditures (including reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts)	3,180,843,234	3,703,801,671	3,795,302,499.84
Excess of expenditures		273,938,712	
Excess of receipts	180,969,125		313,801,651.10

In the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, transmitted to Congress December 5, 1921, the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1922 were $3,943,453,663, and the estimated expenditures $3,967,922,366, thus forecasting an apparent excess of expenditures over receipts of $24,468,703. At the close of business on June 30, 1922, it was found that the actual receipts for the fiscal year 1922 were $4,109,104,150.94 and the actual expenditures $3,795,302,499.84, making an excess of receipts over expenditures of $313,801,651.10. That we closed the fiscal year 1922 with a surplus of $313,801,651.10 instead of an estimated deficit of $24,468,703 was due in no small measure to the fact that at the beginning of the fiscal year 1922 a system of financial control was established in the executive branch of the Government under the Budget system. Immediately upon the commencement of the fiscal year 1922 Executive pressure for the closest economies was brought to bear upon the business organization of the Government. For the first time in the history of this country coordination was established in the routine business of the Government and the departments and establishments thus brought together in a common effort for economy.

While the estimate of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923 as made at the time of the presentation of the Budget in December, 1921, indicated that the receipts would be $3,338,182,750 and the expenditures $3,505,754,727, a revision of the prospective receipts and expenditures made on July 1, 1922, the commencement of the fiscal year, indicated that the receipts would be $3,073,825,311 and the expenditures $3,771,258,542. That revised estimate indicated an excess of expenditures over receipts of $697,433,231.

As a result, however, of the operations of the first five months of the current fiscal year, a revised estimate of receipts has now been made showing a total of $3,429,862,959. The considerable increase over the July estimate is due to the stimulation in the collection of ordinary receipts aided by an increase in the customs revenues. On the other hand, due to continued pressure for economies and a revision of the expenditure program based on five months of actual operation, it is now estimated that the expenditures for the fiscal year 1923 will be $3,703,801,671. These revised figures indicate an apparent prospective deficit of $273,938,712. I am hopeful, however, that the conditions on which this estimate is predicated will change for the better in the ensuing months of the fiscal year and that the close of the year will show a balanced account.

It is well to mention that of the total estimated expenditures of $3,703,801,671 for the fiscal year 1923, approximately $2,000,000,000 will be expended in the payment of pensions, payments to or on behalf of World War veterans, interest on the public debt, and for the reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts.

This estimate of expenditures during the fiscal year 1923 includes the amount of the difference between the cash receipts from sales of war savings stamps, series of 1918, and their face value, which series becomes due January 1, 1923. This amount of approximately $125,000,000 represents discount accruals covering a period of five years, and while not an expenditure properly chargeable against the ordinary receipts of 1923 must be met this fiscal year, and therefore has been included in this year's estimated expenditures.

We now come to the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. It is estimated that the total ordinary receipts from all sources, excluding the Postal Service, will be $3,361,812,359. This is $747,291,791.94 less than the actual receipts for 1922 and $68,050,600 less than the estimated receipts for 1923. The items which make up this estimated total for 1924 are compared with similar items for the two preceding years, as follows:

Receipts.

Source.	1924	1923	1922
Internal-revenue receipts	$2,425,000,000	$2,400,000,000	$3,213,253,250.79
Customs receipts	425,000,000	450,000,000	356,443,387.18
Miscellaneous receipts:			
Interest, premium, and discount	252,863,263	237,800,455	57,460,287.03
Sale of Government properties	35,404,410	95,839,125	116,267,787.96
Public domain receipts	16,149,650	16,214,000	16,334,905.64
Franchise tax, Federal reserve banks	10,000,000	10,000,000	50,974,465.64
Profits on coinage, bullion deposits, etc	10,000,000	17,000,000	21,600,921.07
Fees, fines, and forfeitures	33,000,642	31,295,357	32,539,330.35
Repayments of foreign loans and other investments	89,175,000	58,643,000	120,658,729.93
District of Columbia receipts	15,506,500	16,363,415	15,235,016.44
Panama Canal receipts	14,224,000	13,924,000	11,747,092.47
Trust fund receipts	65,319,170	61,196,522	57,939,581.32
Other sources	20,169,713	21,506,485	29,589,693.22
Total miscellaneous receipts	511,812,359	579,862,959	539,407,509.97
Total receipts, all sources	3,361,812,359	3,429,862,959	4,109,104,150.94

The estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year 1924 is $3,180,843,234. This is the amount which it is estimated will be withdrawn from the Treasury during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. This estimate of cash withdrawal is to be distinguished from the estimate of appropriations contained in the Budget, since withdrawals during the fiscal year will be made from appropriations heretofore made as well as from appropriations recommended in this Budget. Furthermore, a portion of the money to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1924 will not be withdrawn from the Treasury until after the close of that fiscal year.

These expenditures may be divided into two general classes, those which partake of the nature of fixed charges and are not generally subject to administrative control, and those which are subject to administrative control.

Included within the first class are pensions, payments to or on behalf of World War veterans, interest on the public debt, and the reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from the ordinary receipts of the Government. These items, together with certain other, but smaller, items not generally subject to administrative control, represent about two-thirds of the estimated expenditures, leaving approximately $1,000,000,000 subject to administrative control.

The foregoing does not include expenditures for the Postal Service and the Post Office Department payable from postal revenues. Such expenditures for the fiscal year 1922 were $545,666,582.28, a deficiency of $64,346,234.52, payable from ordinary receipts, being included in the ordinary expenditures for 1922 hereinbefore mentioned. The estimated expenditures from postal revenues during 1923 are $559,996,841.69, an estimated deficiency of $31,502,570.76 being included in the estimated ordinary expenditures for 1923. The estimated expenditures from postal revenues for 1924 are $584,653,151.50, and it is estimated that through proper readjustments there will be a surplus of postal revenues over expenditures amounting to $952,439.56 for that year.

That we approach the commencement of the fiscal year 1924 with an estimated surplus for that year of $180,969,125 is certainly most encouraging. While I am hopeful that there will be no deficit in the current fiscal year, 1923, if such a deficit does occur this surplus for 1924 will give a margin to take care of it.

Successful management of the public debt in the transactions involving large refunding operations is essential to the public credit and closely related to successful Budget operations. The Treasury Department has been carrying out a program of orderly funding and gradual liquidation of the public debt. On June 30, 1922, the gross public debt was $22,963,381,708.31, as compared with $23,977,450,552.54 on June 30, 1921, showing a reduction of $1,014,068,844.23 during the fiscal year 1922. This reduction was accomplished through the following means: First, in the amount of $422,694,600, through the cumulative sinking fund and other public debt expenditures payable from certain specific receipts; second, in the amount of $277,572,593.13, through the reduction in the net balance in the general fund of the Treasury; and third, in the amount of $313,801,-

651.10, through the surplus of ordinary receipts over expenditures for the year.

On April 30, 1921, the short-term outstanding debt maturing before June 30, 1923, was more than $7,500,000,000, which through the reductions referred to and refunding operations was reduced to about $4,500,000,000 on June 30, 1922, and up to November 15, 1922, this amount had been further reduced to approximately $3,000,000,000. These refunding operations have involved the issue on October 16, 1922, of approximately $750,000,000 long-term bonds and the issue of Treasury notes aggregating $2,743,334,000 maturing as follows: $701,897,700 during 1924, $936,727,700 during 1925, and $1,104,708,600 during 1926. These refunding operations are carried on for the purpose of changing the maturity date of public debt obligations and thus to avoid the necessity for meeting obligations of many billions of dollars at one time. The resulting distribution of maturities does not indicate a reduction in the total of such obligations.

We now come to the estimates of appropriations for 1924, amounting to $3,078,940,331.49. This is $195,298,359.14 less than the appropriations already made for the current fiscal year, 1923. Early in July I called together in open meeting for the third time the executives constituting the business establishment of the Government and at that time further emphasized the need of more rigid economy in the expenditure of public funds. I stated that the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1924 would not permit so liberal appropriations for that year as had been made for the current fiscal year, 1923. The preparation of the estimates of appropriations as they appear in the Budget was controlled by this policy. While it may be possible to make a small reduction in an item here and there, any material reduction will necessitate a change in the administrative policy upon which estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 are based. I am giving below a comparative statement of the estimates of appropriations for 1924 and appropriations for 1923.

Comparative statement of estimates of appropriations for 1924 and appropriations for 1923.

	Estimates of appropriations, 1924.	Appropriations, 1923.
Legislative establishment	$14,418,912.60	$14,504,164.95
Executive office	382,850.00	396,595.00
Special repairs, Executive Mansion	25,000.00	
Independent offices:		
Civil Service Commission	877,295.00	907,911.00
Employees' Compensation Commission	2,432,740.00	2,660,306.00
Federal Board for Vocational Education	6,427,000.00	5,932,000.00
Federal Trade Commission	955,000.00	955,600.00
General Accounting Office	3,361,163.00	3,922,418.00
Housing Corporation	870,450.00	1,056,425.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	4,514,590.00	5,361,462.00
Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation	59,413,500.00	160,459,000.00
State, War, and Navy Department Buildings	1,707,230.00	3,771,950.00
Tariff Commission	700,000.00	345,000.00
United States Veterans' Bureau	440,313,000.00	422,077,328.45
Other independent offices	1,874,780.74	2,287,884.00
Department of Agriculture	81,251,613.00	62,412,036.00
Department of Commerce	19,715,535.00	20,618,496.20
Department of the Interior	316,207,762.06	227,514,157.10
Department of Justice	18,754,056.00	18,631,205.00
Department of Labor	6,203,556.00	7,499,133.11
Navy Department	296,934,025.00	298,324,265.25
Post Office Department, payable from the Treasury		14,600.00
State Department	15,058,237.79	11,095,200.66
Treasury Department	148,888,802.28	160,627,265.44
War Department, including Panama Canal	326,517,300.28	346,894,385.87
District of Columbia	25,043,973.00	25,990,050.80
Ordinary	1,783,849,381.60	1,844,149,890.83
Reduction in principal of the public debt:		
Sinking fund	298,872,000.00	285,838,800.00
Purchase of Liberty bonds from foreign repayments	31,225,000.00	31,250,000.00
Redemption of bonds and notes from estate taxes	5,000,000.00	5,000,000.00
Redemption of securities from Federal reserve bank franchise tax receipts	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
Principal of the public debt	345,097,000.00	330,088,800.00
Interest on the public debt	950,000,000.00	[1] 1,100,000,000.00
Total payable from the Treasury	3,078,940,331.60	3,274,238,690.83
Post Office Department and Postal Service, payable from postal revenues	599,160,191.39	864,534,766.50
Total, including Post Office Department and Postal Service	3,669,103,522.19	3,978,763,457.33

[1] Including $125,000,000 discount accruals of war savings stamps, series of 1918, due Jan. 1, 1923.

Statement No. 8 of the Budget gives a functional classification of the estimates for the fiscal year 1924, which will be found interesting and informative, showing as it does the approximate amounts devoted to important Government activities and interests. This classification has four general divisions—general functions, military functions, civil functions, and a grouping of the non-functional appropriations.

It will be found that a total of $103,070,886 is carried for general functions, which include the legislative, judicial, executive, and the general administrative operations of the Government which can not be allocated to specific civil functions.

The sum of $1,256,715,939 is provided for military functions, which include military pensions, retirement pay, annuities and World War allowances, and national defense.

The amount recommended for national defense is divided into two classes: Army, $256,552,887; Navy, $289,880,993.

The amount recommended for the maintenance and operation of the Army will provide for a Regular Army of 12,000 officers and 125,000 enlisted men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, which is the force now authorized by Congress; will provide for the training of 15,000 reserve officers for a period of 15 days and for 150 for a period of three months, as against a total of only 5,000 for 15 days during the current fiscal year; will provide for the attendance of 38,000 men at civilian military training camps as against 27,000 during this current fiscal year; and will enable the Militia Bureau to increase the strength of the National Guard from 160,000 officers and men—the strength on June 30, 1922—to 215,000 officers and men. While no increase in the number of students enrolled at Reserve Officers' Training Corps units at schools and colleges—now totaling 96,000 students in 225 institutions—is provided, the funds recommended, however, will enable a larger number of these students to be given both basic and advanced courses of instruction.

The funds recommended will provide for all essentials connected with the upkeep of all military posts, camps, and stations, the Army transport service, the coast defenses of the United States, Panama and insular possessions, and other military activities, and, in addition, allow $3,166,767 for new construction at military posts and $750,000 toward the replacement of worn-out portions of the Alaska cable. For the Air Service the amount recommended is $12,871,500, which is $23,500 less than the 1923 appropriation, and will permit this service to operate efficiently in accordance with existing policy. For the United States Military Academy at West Point $2,066,428 is recommended, an increase of $6,799 over 1923.

The amount recommended for the Navy will provide for the present enlisted personnel of 86,000 men; will maintain all present ships in commission; will increase the steaming radius of capital ships from 13,080 miles to 16,200 miles, and other ships proportionately; will provide training for 2,000 officers and 7,000 men in the Naval Reserve; and will make provision for continuing all new ship construction in privately owned yards, except for reduction in speed of construction on three light cruisers; for suspending the construction of four auxiliaries in navy yards and reducing the speed of construction on two fleet submarines.

The amount provided in the Budget for military pensions and allowances includes $253,000,000 for pensions, $434,584,050 for World War allowances, and $20,389,289 for retirement pay.

The amount recommended for civil functions totals $953,599,096. Under this general function $14,587,167 is allowed for foreign relations and protection of American interests abroad; $18,553,686 for general law enforcement, which includes activities having to do with the enforcement of general laws and the administration and enforcement of special acts like the national prohibition act, the narcotic act, and the investigation and prosecution of war-contract frauds; $7,199,000 for the control of currency and banking; $12,584,305 for the administration of Indian affairs; $17,582,018 for the administration of public domain, which includes those activities of the Government having to do with the care and utilization of public lands and the care and utilization of national forests; $11,991,909 for the promotion and regulation of commerce and industry, which includes the activities of the Tariff Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Patent Office, and those activities of the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce having to do with the promotion and regulation of commerce and industry; $79,491,905 for the promotion, regulation, and operation of marine transportation, which includes $50,411,500 for the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation; $4,514,900 for the promotion and regulation of land transportation; $590,171,942 for the Postal Service and land telegraph and telegraphic communication, which includes $590,166,192 for the Postal Service; $24,876,799 for the promotion and regulation of

agriculture; $1,244,090 for the promotion and regulation of fisheries; $4,718,030 for the promotion of labor interests; $3,871,210 for immigration and naturalization; $15,877,339 for promotion of public health; $10,151,060 for promotion of public education; $10,619,456 for science and research; $29,563,110 for local government, including the District of Columbia; and $228,050 for civil relief.

For public works, under civil functions, $96,197,030 is carried, which includes $41,764,550 for rivers and harbors proper and items of similar character; $31,480,000 for roads; $6,889,105 for Panama Canal; $4,750,000 for Reclamation Service; $2,200,000 for railroads in Alaska; $5,728,950 for hospital construction and facilities for war patients, and $3,384,425 for other public improvements and Government plant additions.

Under nonfunctional appropriations is carried a total of $1,355,720,602, which includes $36,187,059 for refunds, losses, contingencies, and miscellaneous; $345,097,000 for public-debt retirements payable from ordinary receipts; $950,000,000 for interest on the public debt, and $24,436,543 for disbursement of trust funds.

It seems appropriate here to consider the course of the retrenchment policy of the Government since the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the year in which the armistice was signed. Exclusive of expenditures made in the reduction of the public debt, the total expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, were $6,403,343,841.21. The expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, including $422,281,500 on account of reduction of the public debt payable from ordinary receipts, under the new cumulative sinking fund, were $5,538,209,189.30. This was further reduced for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, to $3,795,302,499.84. As I have previously stated, the estimated expenditures for 1923 are $3,703,801,671, while the Budget for 1924 estimates the expenditures at $3,180,843,234 for that year. These figures show a most satisfactory reduction in the expenditure of public moneys since 1919.

Can there be a reasonable expectation for further considerable reduction in governmental expenditures in the near future? This question is no doubt upon the lips of many. The burden of taxation caused by the World War has borne heavily upon us all, and it has been the earnest desire of the Government to reduce this burden to the minimum consistent with a proper functioning of the Federal services. We have seen, however, that approximately two-thirds of the taxes collected go to pay certain fixed charges, over the expenditure of which there can be exercised little or no administrative control. The interest on the public debt, the chief of the fixed charges, must be paid. This will be $950,000,000 for the fiscal year 1924, constituting nearly one-third of the total expenditures of the Government. Among these are also certain permanent and indefinite appropriations for various purposes and certain large annual appropriations sanctioned by law and by public opinion.

After deducting these items there is left, as has been shown, approximately only $1,000,000,000, out of which these normal operating expenses of the Government must be paid. It is against this group of expenditures that the retrenchment policy of the Government has been directed. Never before in our financial history has there been such close scrutiny on the part of both the Executive and the Congress of every item which contemplates expenditures for the support of the Government. Not only have the departments themselves set up agencies of control both in the preparation of their estimates and over their expenditures but the pressure of the Executive has been directed toward effecting economies in these ordinary governmental operations.

A reduction in expenditures would undoubtedly result from a reorganization of the departments and establishments upon a more scientific basis, but we can not look to this alone to effect such a material reduction in cost of Government operation as would justify the expression of hope for a considerable lessening of expenditures in the years to come.

There is, however, another field of Government operation—a rapidly broadening field of Government expenditure—which may be discussed with profit to us all. I refer to expenditures which are being made from appropriations for Federal aid in lines of research, improvement, and development which, while having no direct connection with the operations of the business of government, have grown to become a recognized part of its activities. It is not easy, therefore, to divorce from our minds the fact that considerable of the moneys appropriated for the Government are spent for those things which do not pertain to the normal functions or operations of the business of government. There is question as to how far the Government should participate in these extraneous activities, and I am frank to say that an answer to the question as to whether we can look forward to any further material reduction in the expenditures of the Government in future years depends largely upon whether or not there will be a curtailment or expansion of these activities, which have already added greatly to the annual drafts upon the Treasury of the United States. These extraneous activities have flowed from the laws enacted pursuant to popular demand, and I take this occasion to refer to them for the purpose of showing that the taxation which necessarily results in providing funds to meet them is a necessary incident to the fulfillment of the popular demand.

In the efforts which have been directed to reducing public expenditures I have been much concerned in apparent increasing State, county, and municipal indebtedness, and I am fearful lest this condition may be in part attributable to the expenditures made by the Government pursuant to its Federal aid laws, as many of these laws require State contributions as a prerequisite to the extension of the Federal aid. Certainly an expression by the Government that it is willing to bear a proportionate part of the cost of certain aid work is an incentive to the States to contribute their share, and it is only natural that this should lead to the increasing State, county, and municipal indebtedness.

In adapting its procedure to the needs of the new Budget system, I fully realize the far-reaching changes which Congress made in its organization. While the Budget bill was pending the House, in anticipation of its final enactment, changed its rules in order to centralize authority and responsibility over appropriation measures; and, further, when the President last year transmitted the Budget, prepared according to the form and contents of the old Book of Estimates, and an alternative budget, prepared according to a logical grouping of governmental services, the House forthwith adopted the alternative budget and changed the form of the appropriation bills to conform to the chapters of such alternative budget. This was a change of far-reaching importance. Following the action of the House, the Senate reorganized its committee system for the consideration of appropriation bills, centralizing authority and responsibility in its Committee on Appropriations.

The President has received from Congress during this formative period of the Budget system the most hearty cooperation at all times. Many conferences with the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate were necessary in order to establish the form of the Budget. We were working in virgin soil, establishing new methods of financial procedure. I am glad to say that no important step has been taken by the Executive, even though the matter involved might be of purely executive concern, without first discussing the matter with your Appropriations Committees, and I desire to express my appreciation of the helpful spirit always evidenced by them whenever we had occasion to come together for the mutual consideration of questions of budgetary principle or procedure. I may say without fear of exaggeration that we have been during the past two years colaborers in the greatest reform in our financial history.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 4, 1922.*

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, your Committee appointed on behalf of the House to join with a like committee of the Senate to notify the President that the Congress has assembled, with a quorum of the two Houses present and ready to receive any message he might be pleased to transmit, performed that duty, and beg leave to report that the President informed us that he would communicate with the Congress in person at a date to be hereafter fixed, in the near future, some time this week.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from further consideration of Senate bill 3275, agree to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, including amendment of the title, and pass the bill as amended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to suspend the rules, discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of Senate bill 3275, agree to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, including amendment of the title, and pass the bill as amended in the form the Clerk will report.

Mr. FULLER. When the Clerk reads, will the substitute be read in lieu of the original bill?

The SPEAKER. It will.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Army nurses, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or whose name is now on the pension roll as a Civil War veteran, and every person who served 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $72 a month.

SEC. 2. That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who has heretofore been or may hereafter be granted a pension for service in the Civil War, such widow having been married to such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1915, or who if married after said date shall have lived and cohabited with the soldier, sailor, or marine for at least two years and continuing until his death, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month, and an additional pension of $6 a month for each child of the officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability: *Provided further*, That the additional pension herein granted to the widow on account of the child or children of the husband by a former wife shall be paid to her only for such period of her widowhood as she has been, or shall be, charged with the maintenance of such child or children; for any period during which she has not been, or she shall not be, so charged, it shall be granted and paid to the guardian of such child or children: *Provided further*, That a widow or guardian to whom increase of pension has been, or shall hereafter be, granted on account of minor children shall not be deprived thereof by reason of their being maintained in whole or in part at the expense of a State or the public in any educational institution, or in any institution organized for the care of soldiers' orphans: *Provided further*, That the rate of pension for the widow of any person who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the War of 1812, or for 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be $50 a month.

SEC. 3. That the rate of pension for the former widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or who, having so served for less than 90 days, was discharged for a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, such widow having married the officer or enlisted man prior to June 27, 1915, or if after such date shall have lived and cohabited with such soldier, sailor, or marine for a period of at least two years and continuing until his death, and having remarried, either once or more than once after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce for any cause other than infidelity on the part of the wife, shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month: *Provided*, That in case of any widow whose name has been dropped from the pension roll because of her remarriage, if the pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, she shall not be entitled to renewal of pension under this act until the pension to such child or children terminates, unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her, and upon the renewal of pension to such widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease.

SEC. 4. That the benefits of this act shall be extended to and shall comprehend and include each and severally the classes of persons enumerated in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of section 4693, Revised Statutes of the United States, who served during the Civil War, and also any person who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, or the acts of January 29, 1887, March 3, 1891, and February 17, 1897, on account of service during the Civil War and the war with Mexico, and the widows and minor children of such persons: *Provided*, That service under this section shall be proven in the manner and form specified in section 2, act of March 4, 1917, and the act of September 1, 1922.

SEC. 5. That all Army nurses of the Civil War who have been, or who may hereafter be, allowed a pension under existing laws shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month.

SEC. 6. That all persons now on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the forearm or any part of the bones of the leg below the tuberosity of the tibia, shall receive a pension at the rate of $80 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or at any point above the elbow or a leg at or at any point above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is an ankylosis of either the elbow or knee or shoulder or hip joint, shall receive a pension at the rate of $85 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or shall have lost one hand or one foot and in addition thereto shall have lost a portion of the other hand or foot, or shall have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of both of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of $100 a month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms or both legs or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of both of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of $125 a month; and it is hereby directed that the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be reviewed without application on the part of the pensioner all cases wherein there is an excision or resection of any part of the bones of an arm or leg, shoulder or hip, or any of the joints, or an ankylosis of any of said joints, and shall place the name of the pensioner on the roll at the rates herein provided.

SEC. 7. That in the adjudication of claims for widows' pensions marriage of the parties and the legality thereof may be established by any competent testimony, and in the absence of direct proof of a ceremonial marriage, satisfactory evidence that the parties lived together as husband and wife and were so recognized by their neighbors and acquaintances until the death of the husband may be held to constitute sufficient proof of marriage; and cohabitation continuously for seven years or more may be accepted in lieu of proof that no impediment existed to the marriage of the parties. A widow, otherwise entitled to pension under this act, may not be barred from being granted such pension for the reason that she failed to live and cohabit with the "soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person continuously from the date of the marriage to the date of his death," unless it be shown that she willfully deserted such "soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person," without good cause; and all provisions of law requiring such continuous cohabitation in any case are hereby repealed, except as provided in section 2 of this act.

SEC. 8. That the pension or increase of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rates herein provided on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law, but who may be entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the mailing of a check in payment of a pension to the address of a pensioner shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the date of the check, and shall be payable to his estate.

SEC. 9. That nothing in this act contained shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as "The Army and Navy medal of honor roll," as provided in the act of April 27, 1916, but any increase herein provided for shall be in addition thereto; and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

SEC. 10. That no claim agent or attorney or other person shall be recognized in the adjudication of claims under this act, except in claims for original pension, and in such cases no more than the sum of $10 shall be allowed for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any such claim, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of a pension allowed or due to such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding $500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 11. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FESS). Is a second demanded? If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill as read.

The question was taken, and two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CAREY SEGREGATION NO. 11, COLORADO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3195) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11, and to issue patent therefor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, this bill is very simple on the face of it, but it may in many ways change the policy of the Government as expressed in former irrigation legislation. I think it would be well for the sponsor of the bill to make a complete explanation of the effect of it, and what it is intended to do.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this Carey irrigation project is a case where a number of farmers have gotten together and combined to irrigate a tract of land, and thereby to obtain title under the Carey Act. In these cases sometimes it costs a little and sometimes it costs more. In this case about 225 families have spent about $20 an acre already in this development. They have developed enough water to make about 1 acre-foot of water. It requires really about an acre-foot and a half of water to irrigate the property. They have spent more money than it ordinarily takes to reclaim a piece of land. They have gone their limit and spent $20 an acre, or a total of about $400,000 on this project. Enough water has been developed to irrigate about half of it, or about half enough water to irrigate all of it. Under the Carey Irrigation Act the State has the administering of it. The Governor of Colorado and the State land board have asked that the Department of the Interior grant a patent to the State of Colorado so that it can deal with these farmers as a whole instead of individually.

In this way the people will put a bond issue on the land and will spend about $400,000 more in developing more water. This land is out in the foothills and of no value to anybody anywhere without the water on it. They have dammed up some dry streams and have made reservoirs where water runs only during the flood season. In this way they conserve the water and use it in the irrigation season to cultivate the ground. As I say, about 225 families have put in about $20 an acre, and they are developing a project which when completed will house and feed and support a great number of people.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Under the law before the Federal authorities can patent to the State under the Carey Act they must be satisfied that enough water has been developed to fully reclaim the land. In this case it has been impossible to present proof of full and complete irrigation satisfactory to the Federal authorities, but there is as complete irrigation as can be had, unless these people shall have such title to their land or the State shall have such title to their land as will enable them to secure funds for the further development of their enterprise. That is the situation as I understand it.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. All that this bill does is to authorize the Federal Government to issue the patent under conditions which do not quite meet the requirements of the Carey Act as to full and complete irrigation. It is also true that as a matter of fact these settlers could have acquired this land under the homestead act without any payment whatever or without any requirement of irrigation; but they went upon the land because they desired to have it irrigated, and they desired to utilize the provisions of the Carey Act for that purpose. That is still their purpose and their desire. Unless what is proposed is done, it will leave these people with an insufficient water supply, no possibility of securing more, and in danger of losing all they have expended.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. And it will tie up the Carey project forever.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. The Carey project could not be fully worked out, because of the fact that the Federal authorities can not issue the patent to the State, there not being full and complete water rights assured.

Mr. SNELL. Has the Federal Government any claim against this land except its original ownership of public land, which is of no value without irrigation?

Mr. MONDELL. No; the Carey Act is an act under which the State applies to the Federal Government to have a certain area of land set aside for settlement and development under irrigation, and under the Carey Act the Federal Government issues a patent, not to the settler but to the State, in order that the State may also enforce its requirement with regard to settlement and development. The Federal authorities in this case are not justified in issuing a patent to the State, because while good faith has been shown and great effort has been made and much land has been irrigated, there has not been enough water conserved to fully and completely irrigate the land during the entire irrigation season. Nothing would be gained by refusing to issue a patent. These people would be there without any title to their land and the Government would not be benefited in any way.

Mr. SNELL. Do these people live on the land at the present time?

Mr. MONDELL. The major portion of them do.

Mr. SNELL. How many acres are there in this project?

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. About 24,000 acres.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand, there are 225 families.

Mr. MONDELL. There are 225 families, not all of whom are living on the land at this time because, I assume, under the State law the settlers are not required actually to go upon the land until the water has been supplied for the irrigation of the land. Of course, under the State law they must go upon their land and they must reside upon it before they can obtain patents from the State. But by granting this patent to the State, the State authorities or the settlers will be in a position to secure the additional funds that are necessary to enable them to build additional reservoirs.

Mr. SNELL. Is there anything in this legislation that will afford a precedent under which other irrigation projects can ask for special legislation?

Mr. MONDELL. We have had special legislation for several irrigation projects under the Carey Act. For instance, in my State a certain Carey Act project was in much the same situation that this project is in. The farmers went on in good faith, spent a good deal of money, and it turned out that there was not a sufficient amount of water for the complete and satisfactory irrigation of all the land. In that case the settlers were willing to go on with the irrigation of the land, delivering the water they already had.

Mr. SNELL. Then this is not the first time that this has been done?

Mr. MONDELL. No; it is occasionally necessary to legislate where it is impossible under the circumstances to supply all the water that under the law must be supplied in order to justify the Federal Government in issuing patents.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The money so far expended has been supplied by the present owners?

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Absolutely.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And the remaining part of the money to develop the land will be secured by the issuance of bonds or securities to raise the money?

Mr. MONDELL. As the settlers or State may determine to do, but the settlers must furnish the money.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Federal Government does not furnish any money under this legislation?

Mr. MONDELL. No.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of an objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if I understand the matter, application was made to the Government under the Carey Act to set apart this 24,000 acres with the understanding that patents would issue whenever there was sufficient water to reclaim the land under the irrigation project.

Mr. VAILE. The patents were to issue when the land is fully irrigated and reclaimed and occupied.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I left out the occupancy.

Mr. VAILE. They have expended half a million dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. The consideration the Government received for setting apart the 24,000 acres of land was that there should be sufficient water furnished to fully reclaim the land and put it in a condition for occupancy as regular farming land.

Mr. VAILE. The inducement which led the Government to that policy was to get actual settlers on the land and develop farms.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but how many settlers are there on this 24,000 acres?

Mr. VAILE. About 200 families. Others are ready to come in when they get additional water.

Mr. BLANTON. Two hundred families on 24,000 acres.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. This will enable more families to come in and settle on the land.

Mr. BLANTON. When the Government parts with its title to the land by the issuance of a patent it does not know whether or not the purpose for which the Carey Act provided for segregation is going to be carried out.

Mr. VAILE. It has to rely on the State for that. In the arid-land States the State has the machinery for seeing that the settler does go on the land.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. And in good faith develop the land. That was the purpose of the Carey Act.

Mr. BLANTON. The settlers do not have to go on the land until the water is provided.

Mr. VAILE. Under the State law, no, because there is no way to irrigate this arid land.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think it a good policy on the part of the Government to part with the title of 24,000 acres until all these requirements are made?

Mr. VAILE. Well, the alternative would be that you would not get the additional farmers. The State is the trustee for the Government, and will see that the provisions are fully carried out.

Mr. BLANTON. Why can not the State do that before the patent is issued?

Mr. VAILE. How can it be done by one who has no title? The title is the prerequisite to raising the money. You must have the title in order to give security.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. The State board of land commissioners, when the Interior Department gives the patent, will deal with the settlers and make them come in and consent to the bond issue and build a new dam costing $232,000 and about $90,000 for a new canal. The State of Colorado, the State land board, will administer that and see that nobody gets the grant until they put up the money.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not a case where the irrigation fund has been furnished by the Government?

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. CRAMTON. The real purpose of this is to put the land in condition so that further money can be borrowed upon it. Can the gentleman state whether there is an assurance that there will be such a further loan as will permit the people who have put in already $400,000 to complete the project. Or, on

the other hand, is it simply putting the title out of the Federal Government into the hands of the State of Colorado, so that there may be some squeezing-out process and this land, with $400,000 improvement, will go into other hands?

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Oh, no.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would be glad to have the gentleman make a statement as to what will happen.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. The people of this whole community are in favor of the project, because it means a great deal to get a bunch of ground in the hands of irrigation farmers instead of dry-land farmers. This land could all have been homesteaded; people could have lived on it a few days a week for seven months of two years and obtain title to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. The Carey Act was to take care of certain conditions and laid down certain conditions that have to be met, and you are asking to have those set aside. I am now asking one definite question, but not as to these other matters the gentleman speaks of. Is there a definite funding proposition in view by the people who have already put in the $400,000, or is this a bill that is going to let some other people get hold of the land?

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman's mind can rest at ease in respect to that. The State has a considerable sum of money in its school fund, part of which could be loaned on the land. It is not for the purpose of squeezing anybody out who is already in, not at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is sure that with this authority the people who have gone thus far will be able to get a further loan?

Mr. VAILE. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAMTON. And complete their project?

Mr. VAILE. That is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would say to the gentleman that personally I feel reluctant about seeing the provisions of the Carey Act set aside. This case seems to be a desirable case. I hope it will not be taken as a precedent so that at any time in the future gentlemen in the West who desire it may think they can come here and have the patent given regardless of whether the provisions of the Carey Act have been complied with or not.

Mr. VAILE. We hope there will not be many cases, but here is a case where nearly half a million dollars has just been already expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to accept work already performed and the proof submitted under Carey segregation No. 11, State of Colorado, and to issue patent to the State of Colorado for lands embraced therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. VAILE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2531) to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object. The District has already a day given to it, and I think this should be taken up on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

SALE OF MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11040) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object, unless the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON] desires to be heard on the bill.

Mr. NORTON. I would like to be heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I reserve the right to object.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, a bill was passed several years ago authorizing the sale of the marine hospital in Cleveland, but at that time the bill provided that only $400,000 of the amount obtained could be used for the construction of a new hospital. The Government, and especially the Surgeon General and the people who have to do with hospitals in this city, are very anxious to use the entire amount of money received from the sale of this hospital for the construction of a new hospital. That is the entire purpose of the bill. It is to remove the objection upon the part of the Government. While this hospital is being used, all of the Government officials say that it is not fit for use. Some six or eight different railroad tracks cross it—I think eight. Smoke is coming into it at all times. The property cost originally only $12,000. We are not asking for the appropriation of a single cent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. At the time this bill was passed several years ago authorizing the sale of the hospital buildings, were not conditions such that it would cost much more then to construct a hospital than it would now?

Mr. NORTON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. It would cost a good deal more now than it would then—probably double the amount.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought that was only about three years ago.

Mr. NORTON. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. But the original act did provide that only $400,000 of the proceeds could be used.

Mr. NORTON. Four hundred thousand dollars should be, yes; and the balance go into the Treasury.

Mr. BLANTON. If that money is turned back into the Treasury it becomes money that is available for all uses.

Mr. NORTON. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. That is money that can be used for every purpose, and if we now provide that it can be expended for this hospital, in a sense it is appropriating money out of the Treasury.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think that land can be bought and a hospital erected in Cleveland for $400,000? Why, they are building a private bank now in that city that costs $12,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there a Government hospital there already?

Mr. NORTON. This is the only one there.

Mr. BLANTON. And what is the closest one to Cleveland other than this?

Mr. NORTON. There is not a Government hospital near there. Everybody on the Lakes, every interest, has petitioned for this. The Government itself insists that it is absolutely required. This bill was introduced at the suggestion of the Surgeon General. He was the one who asked me to bring the matter up. It is for Government purposes. It is impossible to build a hospital in that section for $400,000.

Mr. BLANTON. How much is involved; that is, how much over $400,000 will they receive?

Mr. NORTON. I have no idea what they will receive. The property is to be sold by the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely the gentleman has an idea of what is in contemplation.

Mr. NORTON. I think the property ought to sell for a million dollars or more. I hope it will.

Mr. BLANTON. This bill, then, would authorize the expenditure of two and a half times as much as was contemplated at first.

Mr. NORTON. When the bill was first talked of; but land can not be secured for any such money, and it is impossible to build a local hospital for that much money.

Mr. BLANTON. Will this hospital be used by the disabled veterans of the late war?

Mr. NORTON. That is what it is used for now.

Mr. BLANTON. And it will be used for them?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; as well as for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of the act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio, approved July 26, 1916, be amended by striking out after the word "therefor" the words "within a limit of cost of $400,000, and the balance of the proceeds of the sale shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and insert in lieu thereof the following words, "and the Secretary of the Treasury shall with the proceeds procure, by purchase, a site in or convenient to said city of Cleveland, Ohio, and erect thereon a suitable building for use as a United States marine hospital and other Government hospital purposes, the same to be in accordance with the designs to be prepared by the Supervising Architect to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the cost of the site and construction of the new building shall not exceed the sum realized from the sale of the present building and site.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "site," insert: "*Provided further*, That after the sale of the present property it shall remain in the custody and control of the United States until after the completion of the proposed new hospital plant."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS OR MEDAL.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing the award of the distinguished service cross or distinguished service medal provided for in the act of July 9, 1918, to Army officers brevetted for gallantry during the war with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not press the objection, for I feel there is merit in the bill—I desire to ask why it is that this action has been deferred so long if it is important, as I assume it to be. The last time this went to the Senate, according to the report, was in 1902. Now 20 years have gone by and this measure is now brought before the House. Why has it been waiting 20 years?

Mr. SNELL. There does not seem to be anybody here who understands the provisions of the bill, and it seems to me it had better go over without prejudice.

Mr. HICKS. Is there any member of the Committee on Military Affairs here who can answer any question in regard to this bill? The question I just propounded I will now again propound, as I see the chairman of the committee has just come in. According to the report, the matter was taken up in the Senate in 1902, and yet 20 years have gone by, and I am wondering why it is taken up now.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. I will.

Mr. SEARS. I would like to suggest that many have died in 20 years. I know I have been trying to get medals for those brave——

Mr. HICKS. Senators or soldiers have died?

Mr. SEARS. Generals and private soldiers, too.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered by the committee at the time I had gone away for a rest under the advice of my doctors, so that I am not familiar with the situation regarding the matter. I would ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to go over without prejudice until the next Unanimous Consent Calendar day, when it can come up for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

REGULATING SALE OF MILK, ETC., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7746) to regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and certain milk products, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I expect to—this seems to me very important legislation; and there is to be a District day soon, and it seems to me these regulatory matters should come up in the normal way and have full and free discussion on the floor of the House and not be passed under unanimous consent on such an important matter as this. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

TEACHERS' SALARIES AND SCHOOL REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10300) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a bill which I expect to support when the proper time comes, but I do not believe it should be taken up at this time, and as there are no members of the committee here——

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand that there are a number of vacancies now of teachers in the District of Columbia and that these vacancies have existed for two years and it is impossible to get enough teachers for the District of Columbia, and I quite agree with the gentleman that this is a bill that is very important——

Mr. SNELL. Too important legislation to be considered in this manner.

Mr. BLANTON. It should not be passed until it can be taken up in an orderly way and carefully considered—say, to-day, after we get through with the calendar, and we will be through in about 30 minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I do not believe it should be taken up to-day. We certainly should have the chairman explain the provisions of the bill. I expect to support it, but I believe it should be considered in an orderly way and the provisions fully explained to the House.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is seriously defective and ought to be amended in many particulars. It does not take care of those who ought to be taken care of and takes care of some who ought not to be taken care of. This bill ought to come up in such a way as to give it proper consideration. I intend to support the bill if properly amended, but I think it is objectionable in its present form.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent that the milk bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

PREVENTION OF VENEREAL DISEASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11021) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

SILVER SERVICE OF THE CRUISER "BROOKLYN."

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12648) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. KLINE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee on Naval Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3990), and that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3990), and that that bill be considered in the House in lieu of the House bill of similar import. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is the Senate bill identical with the House bill?

Mr. KLINE of New York. They are both the same.

Mr. HICKS. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House has unanimously indorsed this proposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3990) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for preservation and exhibition in such museum, the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery of such silver service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KLINE of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House bill, similar to the Senate bill, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COLLECTION OF STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. May we have that bill reported, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the control and with it the expense of operation of the office known as the Bureau of Customs Statistics under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Treasury, now located in the customhouse, city of New York, State of New York, including all officers, clerks, and other employees of that bureau, official records, papers, mechanical and office equipment, furniture, and supplies now in use, be, and the same hereby is, transferred from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, if by him deemed advisable, to consolidate the said Bureau of Customs Statistics with the Division of Statistics of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce into one office, located in either Washington or New York, or partly in either place, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce; that the statistical bureau hereby authorized to be located in New York under the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Commerce continue to occupy the premises in the New York customhouse which are now occupied by the Bureau of Customs Statistics, and that additional space as needed be assigned in the same building for its use by the Secretary of the Treasury upon request of the Secretary of Commerce. Seventy-five per cent of the unexpended appropriations or allotments from appropriations available for the maintenance and expense of operation of the said Bureau of Customs Statistics are, from the time when this act takes effect, deducted from the appropriation of the Department of the Treasury for collecting revenue from customs and transferred to the appropriation for the Department of Commerce, to be available from the time of such transfer, for expenditure in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, for personal services, rental or purchase of mechanical tabulating, duplicating, and other office machinery, devices, furniture, and supplies, including their exchange or repair; subsistence, traveling, and transportation expenses of employees for official purposes; telegraph, telephone, and all other contingent expenses not specifically included in the foregoing.

SEC. 2. That the Department of Commerce will furnish monthly to the collectors at the several ports a tabulation in detail showing the quantities and values of the merchandise imported and exported from their respective districts, and will furnish the Treasury Department upon request such special reports as may be necessary from time to time.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect and be in force on the 1st day of July, 1922.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold my objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let us have the amendments to the bill reported.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think if the gentleman fully understood about the bill he would not interpose any objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I thought the bill was such that it should be considered at another time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. The bill shows that there is in the Treasury Department a bureau known as the Bureau of Customs Statistics. This bureau consists of a group of men who work in New York and gather these customs statistics together and collate them and pass them over to the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Commerce gets out these monthly reports, with which the gentleman is familiar, giving the statistics of our imports and exports.

Now, the present system involves not only a certain amount of duplication of work, but it also delays the work so that at the present time we are getting the reports of customhouse exports and imports but slowly. The September report is the last report we have received. This will do away with the duplication and enable the work to be done more expeditiously, and on the whole I think it will save money.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman investigated whether or not it will avoid duplication?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It necessarily will avoid duplication, because it puts it all under one department instead of first being collected by one department and then passed over to another.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is not the customs branch of the Treasury Department a better bureau to gather these statistics than some outside department? Should it not be left in the hands of the customs officials?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. The same force now doing the work in the customs department will be located at the same place and do the same work, and when they complete it it will be finished in the form that the Department of Commerce wants it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have not read this bill, and have only heard it read from the desk; but as I understood it, it establishes certain offices and authorizes certain traveling expenses.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no. There will be no new employees whatever. This bill meets with the unanimous approval of both Democrats and Republicans of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BLANTON. But this report is printed weekly, is it not?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is furnished by the Department of Commerce afterwards. The main report is the large volume which comes to you each month, containing the reports of the exports and imports.

Mr. BLANTON. Is that still to be printed at the Government Printing Office, or will it be printed in New York?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It always has been printed at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BLANTON. But when this bill passes where will it be printed?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Here in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. BLANTON. Then they will have to send all the data down from New York to Washington?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The work is to be done promptly and sent to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HAWLEY. At present the reports are sent from the New York office to the Treasury Department here, and then sent to the Department of Commerce, and the accounts are compiled and the material printed. There is delay in sending this material first to the Treasury Department and then to the Department of Commerce, and the business interests of the country are complaining that the information does not reach them as promptly as it should.

This will eliminate that delay and will furnish more immediately the information for which this money is expended to those who may find it useful.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Is it not true that this tabulation, prepared by the Department of Commerce, proceeds upon the finality of the liquidation by the Treasury officials, and that this record that is made up and handed over to the Department of Commerce will be handled by the same people, and that it will expedite it to have the management of the statistical work absolutely under the control of one department?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct. That is the purpose of it, simply to expedite the work.

Mr. HAWLEY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that the work is all being done by the Department of Commerce now; that is, the real work in connection with the tabulation.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The final work is all done by the Department of Commerce. They get their reports from these parties who are working in New York and send them into the Treasury, and after the information gets to the Treasury it is turned over to the Department of Commerce and they make up the final tabulation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I can not see where you will expedite matters by simply shifting responsibility, then.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The department officials, both of the Treasury and of the Department of Commerce, agree that it

will expedite the work, that time will be saved, and both departments are in favor of it. The point of it seems to be that if the Department of Commerce has charge of it right from the start they will get it out at first in the form in which they want it, and will not have to retabulate it and go over it again. There will be a saving of time and also a saving of expense, and it is claimed by the Treasury that unless this is done they will require a larger appropriation for the work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will an amendment to section 1 be first in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendment to section 1 is first in order. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, strike out "75 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof the word "all."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I will say that this is made necessary by reason of the fact that the passage of the bill has been delayed so long. Originally it was expected that the bill would go into force on the 1st day of July, 1922, as provided in the last section, but now it is not to go into force until the 1st day of January, 1923, and what little there will be left of this appropriation ought all to be turned over.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If you are going to cut down expenses, what is the use of expending all of the unexpended balance? It seems to me that if this is going to be an economy measure, you ought to be able to reduce the appropriation in some way.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The reason I say it will cut down expenses is that unless this bill is enacted they will have to make a larger appropriation than is now being made.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then there will be another deficiency bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is hoped that by the passage of this bill we will save the necessity of anything of that kind.

Mr. JONES of Texas. On the face of the bill, then, there is no assurance of economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 21, after the word "available" insert the words "for the current fiscal year."

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that is the intention anyway.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 13, strike out the words and figures "July, 1922" and insert in lieu thereof "January, 1923."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GREEN of Iowa, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FULTON COUNTY, GA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12174) to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield to me about 10 minutes?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, to-day's Washington Post contains a dispatch which I would like to have the Clerk read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be read in the gentleman's time.

Mr. LONDON. Reserving the right to object, to what does it relate?

Mr. KAHN. It relates to the coming to Washington of M. Clemenceau.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PITTSBURGH, PA., December 3 (en route with Clemenceau to Baltimore—By the Associated Press).—Georges Clemenceau sought to-day to clarify his position on the League of Nations as he sped east to Baltimore from St. Louis, where yesterday he delivered the fifth of his addresses in an effort to arouse sentiment for the return of the United States to participation in European affairs.

Concerned, because some newspapers he saw interpret his St. Louis speech as a plea to America to enter the League of Nations, he declared he had not intended to advocate such a step.

It was well known, at least in France, he told correspondents, that he was not an advocate of the league, and he said he would not urge the United States to enter it.

However, he declared, the league has done some good, as he said in his St. Louis address, and he would much prefer to see the United States enter it than not to come into European affairs at all. He indicated that what he really would prefer above all else, however, was an agreement of the United States and Great Britain to guarantee France against aggression.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the last part of this article is particularly interesting to the people of this country. When I was in Europe in 1919 M. Tardieu and other leaders of the French people were especially desirous of having the United States go into a special agreement with France so that if Germany should begin any attack on France the United States and England, through their agreement with France, would immediately come to the rescue of that country. I told those gentlemen that in my opinion the United States would never enter into such an agreement; that it had not entered into an agreement for offensive and defensive alliance with any foreign country since the adoption of our Constitution in 1789. Then these gentlemen began to explain how France had 38,000,000 people, while Germany, according to their figures, had 68,000,000 people. In case England and the United States both withdrew, France would be peculiarly open to attack on the part of Germany.

I told them very frankly that the French people were placing themselves in this peculiar situation. According to them the population of France at that time was only 38,000,000 people, while the population of Germany was 68,000,000 people. I called to their attention the fact that in 1870, when the war between France and Germany was fought, each country had about 40,000,000 people. I called to their attention that while traveling through France we saw very few children. On the other hand, while traveling through the occupied territory of Germany we had to caution our chauffeur repeatedly to refrain from running over the large numbers of German children which crowded the thoroughfares on every hand. Now Germany is away ahead of France on account of the increase of population. I said to them that the women of America will have a great deal to say regarding this matter. They are now voters in the United States. They have a voice in the Government, and if you intend to get an agreement of that kind enacted the woman will naturally say, "Why should I send my boy to defend the boundaries of France when the French mother does not raise any boys to defend that boundary?" I said under these circumstances you will have a very big question in the United States to determine. That, Mr. Speaker, is the situation. The American mothers raise their children and are willing to allow them to go to the defense of their country in case their country gets into trouble. But as for forming an alliance with France to send our boys to protect the boundaries of France because she gets into trouble with Germany or any other country, I doubt whether the American mothers will be willing to agree to any proposition of that kind.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman says that he told the French leaders in 1919 that America would never go into any agreement with any nation——

Mr. KAHN. No; I said we had never gone into one since the adoption of the Constitution, and personally I did not think they would go into any such agreement.

Mr. SEARS. But since then we have gone into the four-power pact and have advocated the association of nations.

Mr. KAHN. We have not gone into a four-power pact in such a way that we would immediately be called upon to send our troops to the defense of any other nation.

Mr. SEARS. What about the association of nations if we had gone into that?

Mr. KAHN. I never was for going into the association of nations, and therefore it is a question I have never seriously thought about.

Mr. SEARS. I want to congratulate my friend on his frankness.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of an objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to convey, by quitclaim, to the county of Fulton, in the State of Georgia, for use as a public road, and for no other purpose, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all that strip of land, 5 feet in width, off the northerly and northeasterly sides, along the McDonough Road frontage of United States penitentiary farm No. 1, in said county, between the easterly line of Sawtell Avenue and the westerly line of Forrest Road: *Provided, however*, That the county of Fulton shall not have the right to sell or convey the said premises, nor to use the same for any other purpose whatever than as herein provided; and in the event the premises shall cease to be used for a public road and cease to be cared for and maintained as are other public roads in said county, the right, title, and interest hereby authorized to be conveyed shall therefore immediately revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That the conveyance herein authorized shall not take effect until and unless a strip of land 5 feet wide is dedicated by the property owners on the opposite side of McDonough Road: *Provided further*, That the county of Fulton shall bear the cost of replacing the existing curb in front of the residence of the warden along said McDonough Road as widened.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "therefore" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thereupon."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do that, Mr. Speaker, to correct what seems to be an obvious error.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "not," strike out the words "take effect" and insert in lieu thereof the words "be made."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the reason I offer that is that this is to authorize the conveyance of a strip of land, 50 feet wide, for the purpose of widening a street. The way the bill is drawn the Government gives it and immediately makes the conveyance, and if they fail to convey the other 5 feet the conveyance is void. By making the change the Attorney General will not make the conveyance until the other side performs their duty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SANDERS of Indiana a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 461, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 461.

Resolved, That in the consideration of House Resolution 425 the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths to witnesses, and to sit during sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to what does it refer?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This resolution has the unanimous indorsement of the entire committee, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it for general purposes or for a specific case?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It is for the investigation under Resolution 425, which the gentleman perhaps will remember, relating to the impeachment charges against the Attorney General made on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MAHLON PITNEY.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4025) to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the Judicial Code, section 260, as amended by the act of February 25, 1919, chapter 29, section 6, be, and they are hereby, extended and made applicable to Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in consequence of his physical disability, notwithstanding he has not attained the age of 70 years as required by the aforesaid provisions: *Provided, however*, That the said Mahlon Pitney shall resign the said office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States within two months after the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 20 minutes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, under existing law a Justice of the Supreme Court who has served 10 years and has reached the age of 70 years may retire, or under another law he may resign, retaining his pay during the remainder of his life. Mr. Pitney, according to the statements that have been made to us, has reached a condition where he can not in the future be of any service to the country because of his physical condition. A number of certificates from very prominent doctors are on file in the Senate Judiciary Committee and we have copies of them in the House Judiciary Committee. They were inserted in the RECORD in the Senate. There is no doubt but that he is entirely incapacitated, without any hope of permanent recovery, and in view of the fact that so much work is pending in the Supreme Court and that only seven active members are now upon that bench it is important that something be done so that the President may be able to fill his place as soon as possible.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How long is it since Mr. Pitney served on the Supreme Court bench?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do not think he has been away from his duties for more than just a few months.

Mr. BLANTON. It has been only since the summer vacation, has it not?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That he has been under disability?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And his age is what?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. His age is not quite 70. It lacks a few months of that age, perhaps six or seven months. However, he has served for more than 10 years.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any reason to believe that he will not be any better than he is now?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no chance of his recovery, according to the statements of the doctors.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, may I say in answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas that it is perfectly apparent from the letters written by several experts, recently inserted in the RECORD in the Senate, that there is no possibility that Justice Pitney will ever be in a condition, either physically or mentally, to properly discharge the duties of the office that he now holds.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is perfectly evident.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. He has served over 10 years?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to voice a protest against the future extension of such a precedent. It is a rare privilege and next to our highest honor to be a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. The position carries with it many privileges besides the salary. Only a few officers enjoy the privilege under the law to be able, when reaching the age of 70, after 10 years of service, to retire on the salary of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court for life. Until recent months the Members of the House who have attended the sessions of the Supreme Court have seen Mr. Justice Pitney upon the bench, and they have heard him deliver opinions. Only during a few months has he been under this disability, and I think we might well wait the four years more for him to reach the retiring age and in that way prevent the further extension of this precedent. The time may come when it may be followed very frequently.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, we have already established the precedent in the instance of Mr. Justice Moody, who had not served as long as has Justice Pitney.

Mr. BLANTON. And he was how old?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He had not reached the age of retirement.

Mr. BLANTON. The same argument that I was making applies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not entering the argument, but endeavoring to show that this is not a precedent.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, Mr. Moody had been a Member of this House for a long time. Members were very familiar with his work in the House. He became very helpless while he was on the bench. Therefore, retirement was given him accordingly.

Mr. BLANTON. The statement by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] merely emphasizes the argument that I am making, because it shows how easy, after we once establish a precedent, it is to follow it.

There could be instances where this would be repeated over and over again, and while I do not think it will affect action on the bill, yet I want to voice my protest against extending the precedent, and for one I expect to vote against this bill.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a statement I made. I learn that Mr. Justice Pitney is only about 66 years old. The party who gave me the statement as to his age said, as I understood him, that the judge only lacked a few months of being 70 years old. I find that is incorrect; but that should not prevent relief, as there is no question that he is permanently disabled and that the Supreme Court needs relief.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet there are various instances of men all over the country who are over 65 years of age who are conducting very large business affairs?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And because he is 66 years of age and suffering from present disability he may be better.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Has Justice Pitney served 10 years—the required time?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes; he has served 10 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that in the opinion of the Chair two-thirds——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House again divided, and there were—ayes 79, noes 1.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent—

On request of Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. DUNBAR was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of serious illness.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

Mr. LONDON was granted leave of absence for one day on account of important business.

Mr. MCFADDEN was granted leave of absence for six days on account of important business.

Mr. PARK of Georgia was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of important business and sickness in his family.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent—

Mr. STEENERSON was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Winnie L. Martin, Sixty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon (H. R. 9452, omnibus H. R. 10025).

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 5, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

714. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of French Broad River, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

715. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Raritan River, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

716. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from The Adjutant General of the Army submitting report of documents received and distributed during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

717. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting recommendation for the passage of legislation to increase the pay of headquarters messengers in the Philippine Islands from the appropriation for "Pay of the Army, 1923," increased pay for foreign service authorized by the Army appropriation act of April 27, 1914, not to exceed the sum of $800; to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs.

718. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting recommendation for the passage of legislation which will provide that during the fiscal year 1923 the cost of subsistence allowances for enlisted men of the Regular Army on duty with the National Guard shall be chargeable to the appropriation for "Subsistence of the Army," notwithstanding the provisions of section 67 of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended by the acts of June 4, 1920, and September 22, 1922; to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs.

719. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting report for the period July 1, 1921, to June 30, 1922, inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent fund employees of the House and their respective compensation, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; the amounts drawn from the Treasury; the stationery accounts; and unexpended balances for the year ended June 30, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 474); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

720. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting list of reports to be made to Congress by public officers during the Sixty-seventh Congress (H. Doc. No. 475); to the Committee on Accounts and ordered to be printed.

721. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of that government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

722. A letter from the president of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting statement of expenditures made from the appropriation for contingent expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

723. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the annual report of the operations of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

724. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a contract made the 19th day of June, 1922, with the Pacific & Arctic Railway & Navigation Co. for carrying the mails on its railroad on route No. 113739, between Skagway and White Pass, Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

725. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a contract made on the 15th day of May, 1922, with the Alaskan Engineering Commission for carrying the mails on the Government railroad in Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

726. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting copy of a contract made the 8th day of June, 1922, with the Copper River & Northwestern Railway Co. for carrying the mails on route No. 113737, between Cordova and Kennecott, Alaska; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

727. A letter from the secretary of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting statement showing expenses for travel of officials and employees of the Civil Service Commission from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

728. A letter from the Chief of United States Bureau of Efficiency, transmitting a report showing the publications issued by that bureau during the fiscal year 1921; to the Committee on Printing.

729. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Navy Department traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

730. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement showing the exchanges of labor-saving devices for the Navy Department, the naval service, and the United States Marine Corps during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

731. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement of expenditures under the contingent appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

732. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting statement showing the aggregate number of publications issued during the fiscal year 1922 and the cost of the same; to the Committee on Printing.

733. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting report showing the number of persons employed by the commission who received increased compensation for the months of July, August, September, and October, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

734. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the travel expenses of all officials and employees who have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

735. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement of labor-saving devices exchanged in part payment for new machines during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

736. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting statement showing the employment under appropriation for the valuation of carriers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

737. A letter from the superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds, transmitting statement relative to travel from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia on official business during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

738. A letter from the superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds, transmitting statement regarding purchases of typewriting machines and exchanges made in part payment therefor by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

739. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting statement showing the number of officers or employees of the Library of Congress who traveled on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

740. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting report giving the aggregate number of publications issued by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year 1921–22, the cost of paper used, the cost of printing, the cost of preparation, and the number distributed; to the Committee on Printing.

741. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report covering the disposal of surplus property in the possession of the War Department within the United States during the period from November 19, 1921, to November 15, 1922, inclusive; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

742. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of publications issued by the Treasury Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

743. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting statement of typewriters exchanged in part payment for new typewriters during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

744. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a report of Government publications issued during the fiscal year ended June 3, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

745. A letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting statement of travel on official business for the Smithsonian branches during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

746. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Secretary of the Treasury on expenses of loans through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

747. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report with respect to the cumulative sinking fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 476); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

748. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting separate report of purchases made during the fiscal year 1922 for account of the 5 per cent bond purchase fund up to July 2, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 477); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

749. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statements of expenditures under said acts to November 30, 1922, in the purchase of obligations of foreign Governments and in the purchase of United States bonds for retirement from repayments by foreign Governments on account of the principal of their obligations purchased by the United States (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

750. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 2, 1922, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and the nature of the claims; to the Committee on Claims.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12940) granting a pension to Sophia Hubbard; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12941) granting a pension to John H. Boyd; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13125) to amend sections 3, 4, 6, 9, 12, and 15 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRENNAN: A bill (H. R. 13126) to amend Article IV of the war risk insurance act by adding to section 408 thereof, as added by section 27 of the act creating the Veterans' Bureau, approved on August 9, 1921, a new proviso; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 13127) to define intoxicating liquor within the meaning of the national prohibition act, as supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 13128) authorizing an appropriation for the construction of a road within the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNAN: A bill (H. R. 13129) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Detroit, Mich., to be used as a station of the Detroit post office; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13130) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Detroit, Mich., to be used by the United States Government departments and offices; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 13131) to amend section 107 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as heretofore amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRINGEY: A bill (H. R. 13132) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bristow, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13133) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Fort Wayne, Ind., and also for the sale of the present post-office building and its site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13134) to amend the retirement laws affecting certain grades of Army officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13135) to grant the consent of Congress for the special commission constituted by an act of the Legislature of Massachusetts to construct a bridge across the Merrimack River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 13136) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. WOODS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13137) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Roanoke, Va., as may be necessary for the location of a new building or

for the enlargement of the present post office and Federal office and court building in said city, to cause said present building to be enlarged or a new building erected, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13138) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the city of Radford, Va., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in the said city, and also to construct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13139) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a railroad bridge across Pearl River, at approximately 1¼ miles north of Georgetown, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13140) to amend section 90 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARBOUR: A bill (H. R. 13141) granting a pension to James E. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13142) granting a pension to Thomas G. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13143) granting a pension to Celestia Barnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 13144) granting a pension to Ruth E. Vann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13145) granting a pension to Sarah A. Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 13146) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sherrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13147) granting a pension to Keziah A. Balch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13148) granting an increase of pension to Watt F. Fultz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13149) granting a pension to Julia Murphy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 13150) for the relief of Blattmann & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13151) granting a pension to Mary F. Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13152) granting a pension to Hiram M. Graves; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13153) granting a pension to Alexander B. Swearingen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13154) granting a pension to Charles W. Van Devender; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13155) for the relief of Webster Flanagan; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6499. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the American Medical Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring a slight modification of the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6500. Also (by request), petition of Rear Admiral George W. Baird (retired), of Washington, D. C., protesting against the erection of a statue on any public property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Library.

6501. Also (by request), petition of the Safe River Committee, of New Orleans, La., relative to the flood control law of 1917; to the Committee on Flood Control.

6502. Also (by request), petition of Greater Boston Chapter of the Military Order of the World War, regarding the excessive reduction of the Regular Army of the United States of America; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6503. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Resolutions adopted by the Greater Boston Chapter of the Military Order of the World War in favor of legislation which will maintain an Army of 13,000 officers and 150,000 enlisted men, and also that the personnel of the Navy be raised to the number of officers and enlisted men necessary to establish and maintain the ratio determined upon by the Washington conference of 5-5-3; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6504. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Inter-Lake Yachting Association, Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 10531; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6505. Also, petition of C. V. Vickrey, Esq., Near East Relief, New York, N. Y., regarding the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6506. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of New York City, by Frank P. Walsh, requesting the release of Miss Mary MacSwiney, now in prison in Mountjoy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6507. Also, petition of citizens of New York City, relative to the brutal murder and torture of Irish men and Irish women, whose only offense is their belief in their country's right to be a sovereign, independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6508. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of the Republican Club, twenty-third assembly district of New Lork, indorsing the ship subsidy bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

6509. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of citizens of New York City, requesting the release of Miss Mary MacSwiney, in Mountjoy Prison, Dublin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6510. Also, petition of citizens of the city of New York, relating to the brutal murder and torture of Irish men and Irish women, whose only offense is their belief in their country's right to be a sovereign, independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6511. By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Mrs. C. M. Banger, of Battle Creek, Mich., urging further action on the part of our Government in order that the freedom of Armenia and the liberation of the Greeks from the rule of the Turks may be secured at an early date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6512. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of the Community Club of Ada, Minn., favoring establishment of guaranteed prices on leading farm products, adequate reduction of freight rates on farm products, and adequate farm credits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6513. Also, petition of the Woman's Club of Mahnomen, Minn., in support of any action the Government may take to free the Christian nations from Turkish rule, signed by Mrs. Otto Isaacson and 60 members of the club; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, we bless Thee, that Thou art, and art the rewarder of all those who diligently seek Thee, and that as a father pitieth his children Thou dost pity them that trust in Thee. We invoke Thy presence this morning, asking Thee to be in every thought and act, and so glorify Thy name in and through us that the highest interests may be subserved, and we may honor Thee continually. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore (ALBERT B. CUMMINS, a Senator from the State of Iowa) took the chair.

WILLIAM E. BORAH, a Senator from the State of Idaho, LEBARON B. COLT, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, JOSEPH I. FRANCE, a Senator from the State of Maryland, CARTER GLASS, a Senator from the State of Virginia, HIRAM W. JOHNSON, a Senator from the State of California, and JOHN K. SHIELDS, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, appeared in their seats to-day.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. UNDERWOOD appeared and

Mr. LODGE said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by the Senate to notify the President that Congress is in session have performed the duty which was imposed upon them, and desire to report that they informed the President, and the President stated that he expects at an early day to address the Houses of Congress in regard to the state of the Union.

THE JOURNAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

On request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled and that the House was ready for business.

The message also announced that a committee of three were appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with the committee on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and to notify him that a quorum of the two Houses had assembled and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he might be pleased to make, and that Mr. MONDELL, Mr. LONGWORTH, and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee were appointed members of the committee on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed without amendment Senate bills of the following titles:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor;

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire.

The message also announced that the House had passed Senate bills of the following titles, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows; and

S. 3295. An act to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916; and

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two communications from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitted, pursuant to law, which, with the accompanying papers, were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

An account of all property, including stationery, belonging to the United States in the possession of the Secretary of the Senate on December 4, 1922 (S. Doc. No. 268); and

A statement of receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (S. Doc. No. 267).

JUDGMENTS OF COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. —).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 2, 1922, the amount thereof, the parties in whose favor rendered, and a brief synopsis of the nature of the claims, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report giving the aggregate number of publications issued by the Library of Congress proper during the fiscal year 1921–22, the cost of paper used, the cost of printing and of preparation, and the number distributed, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail what officers or employees of the Library of Congress have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1922, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the superintendent of the Library Building and grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement relative to travel from Washington to points outside the District in connection with official business during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a report from the superintendent of the Library Building and grounds, transmitting, pursuant to law, data relative to purchases of typewriting machines and exchanges made in part payment therefor by the Library of Congress during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORTS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

1. A statement showing travel expenses of officers and employees on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia.

2. A report showing employees of the commission receiving increased compensation for the four months ending October, 1922.

3. A report showing the number of typewriters and other machines exchanged, with the cost thereof.

4. A report showing employees under the appropriation for the valuation of carriers and also showing the expenditure of moneys appropriated for the fiscal years 1913 to 1922, inclusive.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the cumulative sinking fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, relative to the Victory Liberty loan act, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the following reports, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

1. A report of purchases made during the fiscal year 1922 for account of the 5 per cent bond purchase fund, and up to July 2, 1922, when the fund expired (S. Doc. —).

2. A report of expenditures under the first and second Liberty bond acts to November 30, 1922, in the purchase of obligations of foreign Governments and in the purchase of United States bonds for retirement from repayment by foreign Governments on account of the number of their obligations purchased by the United States (S. Doc. —).

3. A report with respect to the cumulative sinking fund for the retirement of the various issues of Liberty bonds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (S. Doc. —).

4. A report of approved expenditures under the first and second Liberty bond acts on account of expenses of loans through the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (S. Doc. —).

REPORT OF TAX SIMPLIFICATION BOARD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the report submitted, pursuant to law, of the Tax Simplification Board of the Treasury Department, relative to the operations and activities of the board, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the travel from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia performed by officers and employees (other than special agents, inspectors, and employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed statement of the manner in which the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, 1922," has been expended, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report of all typewriters, computing, addressing, and duplicating machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1922 in part payment for new machines, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the cost of maintenance, operation, and repair of all motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats owned by the department and operated outside of the city of Washington during the fiscal year 1922, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report showing the names of all persons employed, their designations, and rates of pay in the Bureau of Animal Industry for the suppression of contagious, infectious, or communicable diseases of domestic animals during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of "the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase," under the appropriation "Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, 1922," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing the payment to officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments of sums allotted to the Bureau of Chemistry during the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of contributions on account of cooperative work with the Forest Service and the amount refunded to depositors on account of excess deposits, national forests fund, for the fiscal year 1922, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the condition and character of any papers not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the executive departments and the amount of proceeds from the sale of such papers deemed useless, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROTECTION OF LIFE IN THE NEAR EAST.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from a number of prominent citizens of the State of New York relating to the situation in Asia Minor. It is in the nature somewhat of a petition. It is not long. I ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Our Secretary of State in Boston on October 30th stated that the United States will have no diplomatic relations with Mexico while Mexico fails to respect property rights, but he expressed no unwillingness to have friendly relations with Turkey.

The Secretary of State said, "We do, however, maintain one clear principle of international intercourse—that international obligations shall be met and that there shall be no confiscation or repudiation."

Let us hope this nation will not pursue a policy where commercial interests triumph over the true spirit of humanitarianism so dear to every American nor refrain from declaring as unequivocally for human rights at home and abroad as it has for property rights, nor fail to make clear that it will withhold diplomatic relations from nations which permit wholesale slaughter of racial, political, or religious minorities within their borders.

History abundantly proves that Turkish promises and guarantees are worthless when affecting minorities under their rule.

It is anticipated that further massacres by Turks will occur in Constantinople and Thrace, from which countries all non-Moslems are now fleeing with loss of their property in order to save their lives.

If international intercourse is withheld in order to protect property rights, how much more incumbent upon us is it to hold human life sacred for the defenseless.

The sentiment of this country will never sanction a policy which holds property rights more sacred than human rights.

America owes it to herself to call upon the Government at Washington to broaden its present policy of protection of commercial rights and property rights so as to include the protection of the most sacred rights of all—human liberty and human life.

His Grace, the Most Reverend Archbishop Patric Joseph Hays, St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City; Bishop Charles H. Brent of Diocese of Buffalo; Hon. William Graves Sharp, of Ohio, former United States Ambassador to France (deceased); Dr. John Grier Hibben, president Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; Right Reverend Thomas J. Shahan, Rector, The Catholic University of America, Washington; Dr. John H. MacCracken, president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.; E. H. Outerbridge, former president New York Chamber of Commerce; Hon. Rowland B. Mahany, former counselor Department of Labor, Washington; Rabbis Joseph Silverman and Stephen S. Wise, New York City; Dr. and Mrs. Arthur Stein; Mr. Melville E. Stone, Mr. Wm. Fellowes Morgan, former president Merchants Association of New York; Hon. Henry J. Allen, Governor of Kansas; Mr. Edwin F. Gay, editor of New York Evening Post; Mr. Samuel Gompers, president American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Hon. James W. Gerard, former United States Ambassador to Germany; Mrs. Frank A. Vanderlip, chairman New York State League of Women Voters; Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, Columbia University, New York City; Mr. Hamilton Holt of the "Independent"; Mr. Charles H. Kirby; Dr. Charles S. MacFarland, general secretary Federal Council of Churches of America; Mr. Gray Silver, director American Farm Federation Bureau, Washington, D. C.; Mr. John G. Agar; Mr. R. Fulton Cutting; Mr. Wm. M. Chadbourne; Bishop James H. Darlington of the Diocese of Harrisburg, Pa.; Mr. George Gordon Battle; Mrs. James Loes Laidlaw; Mrs. Hamilton Holt, Connecticut; Mr. George Foster Peabody, vice-chairman Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Miss Mabel Choate; Mrs. R. J. Caldwell; Mrs. Wm. Graves Sharp, Elyria, Ohio; Mr. William Jay Schieffelin, president of Citizens' Union; Rev. William P. Merrill, Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City; Rev. Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn; Rev. Dr. William W. Scudder, secretary American Board for Foreign Missions; Dr. Stanley White, secretary Board of Foreign Missions of Presbyterian Church in United States of America; Rev. Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York City; Rev. Ernest M. Stires, St. Thomas's Church, New York City; Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York; Mr. Herbert S. Houston, editor "Our World"; Mr. Alfred R. Kimball and Rev. Worth M. Tippy, Federal Council of Churches of America; Rev. John M. Moore, Marcey Avenue Baptist Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Herbert F. Laflamme, secretary New York Federation of Churches; Rev. William I. Chamberlain, corresponding secretary the Board of Foreign Missions; Mr. Henry A. Atkinson, general secretary of Church Peace Union, Boston, Mass.; Senator Everett Colby, of New Jersey, and Mr. T. C. Desmond; Rev. William H. Morgan, First Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md.; Mr. George R. Montgomery, director Armenia America Society; Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Mr. R. J. Caldwell, president of R. J. Caldwell Co. (Inc.).

ADMISSION OF ARMENIAN AND GREEK REFUGEES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from Bishop Hugh L. Burleson, of the Episcopal Diocese of South Dakota, relating to legislation concerning the admission of Armenian and Greek refugees to the United States. The letter is short, and I should like to have it read and referred to the Committee on Immigration with the accompanying papers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read the letter as requested.

The letter was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., November 27, 1922.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am deeply interested in the matter of providing admission into this country for Greek and Armenian refugees who are coming to responsible relatives. I understand that they are now denied admission because the annual immigration quotas for Greeks and Turks are exhausted.

It would seem to me a wise policy for Congress to make possible the admission of a limited number in excess of the quotas coming to families who will guarantee that they shall not become public charges. It would be the most practical and human way to provide for at least a portion of these destitute and suffering people.

I trust you will feel able to use your influence to bring this about.

Faithfully yours,

HUGH L. BURLESON.

Mr. STERLING. I submit in connection with the letter a resolution adopted by the department of Christian Social Service of the Episcopal Church, which I ask may be inserted in the RECORD without reading, together with the names of the signers.

There being no objection, the resolution, with the accompanying names, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

A resolution concerning emergency immigration legislation to relieve Near East refugees.

Whereas at Ellis Island many Greek and Armenian refugees from Constantinople and Asia Minor coming to relatives in America are being denied admission because the annual immigration quotas for Greece and Turkey (to which they belong) are exhausted; and

Whereas American Greeks and Armenians desire to bring to safety in America their relatives now suffering privations after evacuating Smyrna, Constantinople, and Thrace, but can not do so because the quotas for the year have been exhausted; and

Whereas the enactment of restrictive immigration legislation can be made compatible with the traditional American policy of offering asylum in emergency to victims of religious and political persecutions: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the department of Christian Social Service of the Episcopal Church urge the administration to take necessary action to prevent the exclusion of these refugees from Asia Minor and Thrace now at our ports of entry, and to make possible the admission of a limited number of such refugees in excess of quota coming to families who shall guarantee that they shall not become public charges; and that the social service department of the Episcopal Church inform its constituency of this action and ask the secretaries that if they approve they take it up with their representatives in Congress.

DECEMBER 1, 1922.

Additional signatures received at the office of the department of Christian Social Service indorsing the resolution sent to you November 27, 1922, regarding the admission to the United States of the Greek and Armenian refugees from Asia Minor and Thrace.

Paul Matthews, bishop of the diocese of New Jersey; C. P. Anderson, bishop of the diocese of Chicago; Boyd Vincent, bishop of the diocese of southern Ohio; Philip M. Rhinelander, bishop of the diocese of Pennsylvania; A. S. Lloyd, bishop suffragan of the diocese of New York; Ethelbert Talbot, bishop of the diocese of Bethlehem; William A. Leonard, bishop of the diocese of Ohio; Thomas J. Garland, bishop suffragan of the diocese of Pennsylvania; Hugh L. Burleson, bishop of the diocese of South Dakota; Charles E. Woodcock, bishop of the diocese of Kentucky; James R. Winchester, bishop of the diocese of Arkansas; Frederick F. Johnson, bishop coadjutor of the diocese of Missouri; Joseph M. Francis, bishop of the diocese of Indianapolis; G. G. Bennett, bishop of the diocese of Duluth; Harry T. Moore, bishop coadjutor of the diocese of Dallas; R. H. Mize, bishop of the diocese of Salina; Fred Ingles, bishop coadjutor of the diocese of Colorado; Sidney C. Partridge, bishop of the diocese of West Missouri; John N. McCormick, bishop of the diocese of western Michigan; J. Poyntz Tyler, bishop of the diocese of North Dakota; G. Ashton Oldham, bishop coadjutor of the diocese of Albany; Herbert H. H. Fox, bishop suffragan of the diocese of Montana; Rev. Charles L. Street, chairman of the social service department of the diocese of Chicago; Rev. Raimundo de Ovies, chairman of the social service commission of the diocese of Texas; Rev. Floyd S. Kenyon, chairman of the social service department of the diocese of Connecticut; Mr. Clinton Rogers Woodruff, chairman of the social service department of the diocese of Pennsylvania; Rev. Churchill J. Gibson, chairman of the social service commission of the diocese of southwestern Virginia; Very Rev. E. B. Woodruff, chairman of the social service department of the diocese of South Dakota; Rev. Holmes Whitmore, chairman of the social service commission of the diocese of Milwaukee; Rev. N. R. H. Moor, chairman of the social service commission of the diocese of Ohio; Rev. Henry H. Daniels, chairman of the social service commission of the diocese of Wyoming; Rev. Percival C. Bailey, chairman of the social service department of the diocese of Marquette; Rev. Arthur C. Peabody, New Bedford, Mass.; Rev. G. I. Hiller, Lakeland, Fla.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial of members of the Farmers' Union of Nuckolls County, Nelson, Nebr., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution of Eggleston Post, No. 244, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wichita, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation granting a 1 cent per mile railroad fare to Civil War veterans attending national encampments, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Bourbon County Rural Carriers' Association, of Uniontown, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation granting to rural carriers an allowance of $2.50 per mile a month for the upkeep of equipment, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LADD presented resolutions adopted by the Federated Shop Crafts of Devils Lake, Grand Forks, and Minot, all in the State of North Dakota, favoring prompt action by the Federal Government to remedy faulty condition of railroad operating equipment, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Mrs. George Beagle and 5 others, of Werner; Sam P. Sjeislee and 9 others, of Braddock; A. W. Johnson and 11 others, of Gwinner; Gottlich Krieger and 11 others, of Manfred; Arthur H. Olson and 67 others, of Osnabrock; A. C. Wild and 52 others, of Egeland; William Claughton and 17 others, of Hensel; Charles McGawey and Ole Sather and 41 others, of Bismarck; Philip Kavey and 9 others, of Glen Ullen; Martin R. Svor and Ole Hersel and 18 others, of Tioga; 36 citizens of Sargent County; 70 citizens of Nelson County; James A. Reinke and 50 others, of Hankinson; Gustaf Job and 35 others, of Linton; S. E. Brown and 25 others, of Wolford; Mrs. Anton Anderson and 15 others, of Lunds Valley; Mrs. Robert Thoslaw and 39 others, of Overly; Mrs. Theresa Merritt and 22 others, of Maxbass; Mrs. S. B. Irwin and 21 others, of Hillsboro; and Mrs. J. Boe and 29 others, of Turtle Lake, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. NICHOLSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2792) for the relief of John L. Livingston, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 932) thereon.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) expressing the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives that Members failing of reelection should not participate in the enactment of legislation which the people at the polls had sought to repudiate, submitted by Mr. CARAWAY November 22, 1922, reported it with an amendment in the nature of a joint resolution, and submitted a report (No. 933) thereon.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 253) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and providing for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote, was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 4089) granting an increase of pension to William Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4090) granting a pension to Charles P. H. Poppe; and

A bill (S. 4091) granting a pension to Isaac G. Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 4092) providing for the admission into the United States of certain refugees from near eastern countries; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4093) to provide seamen on American vessels with a continuous discharge book, to provide for improved efficiency and discipline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4094) granting an increase of pension to William Elliott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4095) to enlarge the public building at Bismarck, N. Dak. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4096) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4097) granting a pension to Fanny Meyer Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4098) granting a pension to Eliza Dunn Minard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4099) granting an increase of pension to Phebe S. Riley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a joint resolution, for which I ask immediate consideration. It has not been customary to refer such joint resolutions to a committee.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 251), providing for the filling of two vacancies that will occur on January 14, 1923, and March 1, 1923, respectively, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the two vacancies that will occur as herein specified in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the reappointment

of Henry White, of the city of Washington, whose term will expire January 14, 1923, and of John B. Henderson, of the city of Washington, whose term will expire March 1, 1923.

The Senate by unanimous consent proceeded to consider the joint resolution as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question? Under existing law how are these appointments made?

Mr. LODGE. They are made by the Congress.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFUGEES FROM THRACE AND ASIA MINOR.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to be read at length and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 252) to permit the admission of certain refugees from Thrace and Asia Minor was read the first time by its title and the second time at length and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

Whereas the recent war between Greece and Turkey has resulted in the expulsion from Asia Minor and Thrace of more than a million Armenians, Greeks, and Syrians;

Whereas these refugees can not obtain proper food, shelter, or protection in the places to which they have been forced to flee, and devastation, starvation, and persecution await them if they attempt to return to their former homes; and

Whereas numerous relatives and friends in the United States have offered homes, protection, and employment for many of these refugees if they can be admitted into this country: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subdivision:

"(e) Refugees from Thrace or Asia Minor may be admitted, if otherwise admissible, notwithstanding the limitation upon the number of aliens admissible in the same month or fiscal year."

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. BORAH submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SARAH ORR.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 374), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Sarah Orr the sum of $372.94 for services as clerk from October 3, 1922, to November 21, 1922, rendered the Hon. Rebecca Latimer Felton, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] be excused from further service on the Committee on Naval Affairs and assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations; that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] be assigned to service on the Committee on Commerce; that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] be assigned to service on the Committee on Naval Affairs; that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] be assigned to service on the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, the Committee on Military Affairs, and the Committee on Manufactures.

STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, which were read.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. FLETCHER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BURSUM, Mr. MCCUMBER, and Mr. WALSH of Montana conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were each read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that when the consideration of the calendar is proceeded with, it be limited to unobjected bills. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, why should the calendar be taken up in that way?

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me, I desire to suggest that the calendar was taken up just a week or two before the final adjournment of the session which ended in September last. It was considered on a Saturday, I think, while the Senator from Alabama was absent. Some one hundred and fifty-odd bills were then disposed of, and the bills remaining on the calendar only embrace about five pages.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not going to object at this time to the request of the Senator from Kansas, but I merely desire to state that there are a number of bills on the calendar which, though really controversial, now that there is no other business pending before the Senate, I think, should have an opportunity to be considered.

Mr. CURTIS. The reason why I have asked for the unanimous-consent order is because no Senator has notified us that he was ready to have taken up on the calendar any bill as to which there was a contest; and I thought that during the day if any Senator was interested in a bill of that character he could notify the Senate and the bill could then, probably, be taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas, and it is agreed to. The Secretary will proceed with the call of the calendar under the unanimous-consent order.

The bill (S. 214) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as first in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1467) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Being objected to, the bill will go over.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold hearings here or elsewhere and to employ a stenographer to report the same was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair observes that the resolution has been reported with amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 491) to provide, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

WALTER RUNKE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1829) for the relief of Walter Runke, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "his," to strike out "defense" and insert "defenses"; in the same line, after the word "his," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "trial" and to insert "trials"; in line 10, after the article "the," to strike out "month of March, 1918, his alleged offense

having been committed in performance of his official duties and he having been acquitted," and in lieu thereof to insert "months of September, 1916, and March, 1918, his alleged offenses having been committed in the performance of his official duties, the charge against him in the first trial having been dismissed after a severance and after acquittal of his late co-defendants, and he having been acquitted in the second trial," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That not to exceed $4,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse Walter Runke, of Flagstaff, Ariz., formerly superintendent of the Western Navajo Indian Agency, Ariz., for actual and necessary expenses incurred by him from personal funds in connection with his defenses upon his trials in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona during the months of September, 1916, and March, 1918, his alleged offenses having been committed in the performance of his official duties, the charge against him in the first trial having been dismissed after a severance and after acquittal of his late co-defendants, and he having been acquitted in the second trial.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF LOANS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 7) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia, approved February 4, 1913," be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. That no such person, firm, voluntary association, joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation shall charge or receive, either directly or indirectly, or by means of any collateral or contemporaneous arrangement, a greater rate of interest upon any loan made by him or it than 2 per cent per month on the actual amount of the loan, and this charge shall cover all fees, expenses, demands, and services of every character, including notarial and recording fees and charges, except upon the foreclosure of the security. The foregoing interest shall not be deducted from the principal of loan when same is made. Every such person, firm, voluntary association, joint-stock company, incorporated society, or corporation conducting such business shall furnish the borrower a written, typewritten, or printed statement at the time the loan is made, showing, in English, in clear and distinct terms, the amount of the loan, the date when loaned and when due, the person to whom the loan is made, the name of the lender, the amount of interest charged, and the lender shall give the borrower a plain and complete receipt for all payments made on account of the loan at the time such payments are made. No such loan greater than $200 shall, except pawnbrokers' loans, be made to any one person: *Provided*, That any person contracting, directly or indirectly, for or receiving a greater rate of interest than that fixed in this act shall forfeit all interest so contracted for or received; and in addition thereto shall forfeit to the borrower a sum of money, to be deducted from the amount due for principal, equal to one-fourth of the principal sum: *And provided further*, That any person in the employ of the Government who shall loan money in violation of the provisions of this act shall forfeit his office or position and be removed from the same."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study this bill, but I have been informed that it authorizes the collection of as much as 2 per cent interest per month on certain classes of loans. I inquire of the sponsor for this bill whether that information is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that the author of the bill is not present.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.

The bill (S. 2391) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, that bill can not be disposed of, I presume, under the unanimous-consent order. Therefore I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The bill (S. 2228) to amend certain sections of the Judicial Code relating to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a long bill, and I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he desires to have it considered this morning.

Mr. NELSON. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] has an amendment which he desires to propose to the bill. That Senator not being present, I think the bill had better go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator from Tennessee had made a statement to that effect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I would like to ask if this is a bill which provides for the appointment of referees for the Court of Claims?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; it is the bill which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, of course if there is any reason for the bill going over, I have no objection; but I wish to say that in the days when the Court of Claims merely tried cases growing out of the Civil War, which had arisen many years back and many of which had been thrashed out, it did not take so much of the time of the court or involve excessive labor to dispose of the cases pending there.

I think, however, the time has come when the Congress and the executive branch of the Government should realize that there are over $2,000,000,000 worth of claims against the United States Government pending in the Court of Claims and that the business of that court can not be attended to properly and the rights of the Government protected unless we give the court facilities to transact its business. It is impossible for the five judges of that court, under the present conditions and with the facilities now afforded them, to keep up with their work. It is an excellent court and is doing a splendid work; it is rarely that its decisions are reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States; but it must be provided with the proper facilities. It desires the power proposed to be given by this bill to appoint referees to consider matters and to present findings of fact in order that there may be exceptions made to the findings of the referees, the cases expedited, and the real issue brought to the court.

Unless there is some good reason why this bill should be passed over, this being the short session of Congress and there being no business pressing at this time, I think the present an excellent opportunity to act upon this measure and provide facilities which will expedite the business of the court. I trust the bill may be considered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should be very glad to have the bill considered. I wish to state to the Senator that the bill, which was reported at a previous session of Congress, provided, among other things, for an increase in the salary of one of the officials of the court, namely, the clerk of the court. He was only receiving $3,500 and the bill proposed to increase the compensation to $5,000. On that account the Senator from Utah made strenuous opposition to the bill. At the last regular session, however, the Appropriations Committee allowed the clerk of the court a salary of $5,000 a year as was provided in the bill, and that is the law to-day. The other provisions of the bill relate mainly to appointment of commissioners or referees, as the Senator calls them, to assist the court by taking testimony and submitting findings.

The Senator is entirely right in saying that a great mass of cases has accumulated, especially war claims, within the last year or so, and the court is excessively crowded with business. As Senators know, no jury serve in the Court of Claims, and there is a need that testimony may be taken by referees. The bill ought to pass, and I should be very glad to have it taken up now. Heretofore there has been no opposition to the bill in any shape or manner except, as I recall, the opposition to increasing the salary of the clerk of the court.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And that has already been accomplished by a provision of the appropriation bill?

Mr. NELSON. That question has been settled by the action of the Appropriations Committee in appropriating $5,000 to cover the salary of the clerk of the court, and therefore the pending bill in that particular will simply be a reenactment of the existing law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill, but as the Senator from Minnesota will probably remember, when the bill was under consideration on a previous occasion the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] gave notice that he desired to offer an amendment. That is the only reason why I suggest that it should go over, the Senator from Tennessee not being present at this time.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to say further to the Senator from Alabama that the Senator from Tennessee desired to offer an amendment to open the door to a class of war claims which were excluded by an amendment to the law adopted some years ago, and I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] cooperated with him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should be very glad to support the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I believe as to those cases the door ought to be opened, but I am unwilling to consent that this bill shall go over when I know that outside of the rights of the Government which should be protected, there are many people who have legitimate war claims which are entitled to trial. This bill merely provides for the appointment by the court of referees or commissioners, who will not receive any pay unless they do the work, and if they do the work, I think, in the end, the expense will be charged against the litigants, to one side or the other. The bill is to enable the court to transact its business.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I merely desire to state that the Senator from Tennessee is very much interested in an amendment that he has heretofore proposed to this bill; and on another occasion he requested me, if the bill came up for consideration, either to present his amendment or to ask that the consideration of the bill be deferred until he could be present and offer it himself.

I ask, therefore, that the bill go over for the present, unless the Senator from Alabama insists upon taking it up now. If he does, I shall get the amendment and offer it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, Senators are entitled to have it go over on objection, and, of course, I do not want to interfere with what the Senator from Tennessee desires; but I am very much afraid that if we do not take up this bill on the calendar very shortly it will not pass this Congress, and if that should happen it would deprive a lot of people of their rights.

Mr. ROBINSON. I share the view of the Senator from Alabama. The bill may go over for the present. I will procure the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, and the bill may be called up later during the day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator asks that it go over without prejudice, so that it can be taken up later?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Alabama that, as I understand the amendment that the Senator from Tennessee proposes, it is to reopen the door for the old cotton claims that were excluded by the Crawford amendment that we passed some years ago.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what it is.

Mr. NELSON. And that has occasioned the delay.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I see no reason why we should not have a vote on that proposition. It would not take very long. It would not be necessary to debate it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1920.

The bill (H. R. 8331) to amend the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PITTMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

The bill (S. 1452) providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pending a request for consideration of the bill, I desire to state an amendment to which I am informed the author of the bill has no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is already an amendment pending.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I am only stating the amendment which I intend to propose. I shall offer to amend the bill by inserting, at an appropriate place, the following language:

> Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as subjecting any land acquired, held, or used by the United States for military purposes to any of the provisions of this act.

I am informed that the sponsor of the bill has no objection to that amendment.

Mr. NEW. As the author of the bill, Mr. President, I will say that that is true.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I dislike to object to the immediate consideration of the bill; but there is one provision in it to which I am opposed, and that is the provision for a Federal license. Is the Senator from Indiana wedded to that provision of the bill?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the whole carrying out of the purposes of this bill depends absolutely upon that feature of it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am going to ask that the bill may go over without prejudice, because I want to prepare an amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

Mr. CARAWAY. I withhold the request for a minute if the Senator wants to say something to me about it.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, what has been said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] concerning the urgency for the consideration of the bill under discussion a moment ago applies with equal force and aptitude to this bill. It is very apparent that unless it is considered now, before certain other matters of major importance are brought up, it will not be considered at all at this session and will die. It has been on the calendar exactly one year to-day, and I think it ought to be considered on its merits.

Of course, I am not in any way interfering with the right of any Senator to object. That is all right; but if objection is made at this time, I wish to give notice that when the call of the calendar shall have been made I shall move that the bill be taken up for consideration.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, just one moment. I have no desire to delay the consideration of the bill. I desire to offer an amendment to it, and I have not had an opportunity to prepare it. If the bill might go over for an hour I should not object to returning to it and considering it. I want an opportunity to offer an amendment.

Mr. NEW. Why, certainly, Mr. President. With that understanding the bill may be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the bill is temporarily passed over, subject to the right of the Senator from Indiana to call it up at a later time in this session.

TRANSPORTATION OF MILITARY SUPPLIES.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) authorizing the payment of the cost of transportation for certain supplies purchased by the Military Establishment was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That hereafter when supplies for the Military Establishment are accepted by the United States at factory or other point of origin and are shipped to destination at the expense of the United States, the cost of such transportation may be paid from the appropriation from which the supplies are purchased.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing transportation for dependents of Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2718) to provide for leasing of the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La., was announced as next in order.

Mr. CALDER. Let that be passed over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2589) to amend section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 67) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1539) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1861) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Capt. David McD. Shearer for compensation for the adoption and use and acquisition by the United States Government of his patented inventions, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SUPPLY CORPS OF THE NAVY.

The bill (S. 2390) to redistribute the number of officers in the several grades of the Supply Corps of the Navy, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph in the act of August 29, 1916, which reads as follows: "One-half pay directors with the rank of rear admiral to 4 pay directors with the rank of captain, to 8 pay inspectors with the rank of commander, to 87½ in the grades below pay inspectors," be amended to read as follows: "One-half pay directors with the rank of rear admiral to 6 pay directors with the rank of captain, to 12 pay inspectors with the rank of commander, to 81½ in the grades below pay inspector: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1923, no vacancies as pay directors with the rank of captain, and pay inspectors with the rank of commander, shall be filled until the numbers have been reduced to those authorized by the act of August 29, 1916."

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah asks for information concerning the bill. This is a bill to increase the number of higher officers in the Pay Corps of the Navy, and at the same time to reduce the number of lower officers. It is a bill that has been reported favorably by the Naval Affairs Committee on several occasions, and unanimously reported. It was introduced originally at the request of the Secretary of the Navy when Mr. Daniels was Secretary of the Navy. It has since been introduced at the request of the present Secretary of the Navy. The reason for it, as given by the Secretary of the Navy in his letter to the committee, is that they have not a sufficient number of officers of the grade of commander in the Navy to perform the services allotted.

I ask to have the report read.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not care about it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Very well; the Senator understands the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, this is a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. It is quite an important matter, and I do not think it could be disposed of by unanimous consent; so I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 14) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2992) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish certain information for historical purposes to the adjutants general of the several States and the District of Columbia, and making an appropriation therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, what is the calendar number of that bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is Order of Business No. 510.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not on the printed calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that on April 5, 1922, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] asked that the bill be returned to the Senate, and entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was passed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3254) to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States through Federal and State cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of rural homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1343) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PAY OF THE ARMY, ETC.

The bill (S. 3326) to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this bill, with a House number, long since passed the Congress and has become a law. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1345) to amend an act entitled "Interstate commerce act," approved February 28, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1346) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, including the safety-appliance acts and the act providing for the valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission, approved March 1, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2921) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DETAIL OF RETIRED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN.

The bill (S. 2371) to further amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effective provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, be, and is hereby, further amended as follows:

That the second sentence of section 40b of said act approved June 3, 1916, as contained in section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"In time of peace retired officers, retired warrant officers, or retired enlisted men shall not be detailed under the provisions of this section without their consent."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920.

COOPERATIVE ORGANIZATIONS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CORNWELL CO., SAGINAW, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 449) for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich., was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that go over, unless there is some explanation made of it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Has the Senator from North Carolina read the report?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I have not. I merely wanted to have some explanation of the bill. I said I would object unless somebody would explain it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The report shows very clearly just what the facts are. This defendant in a case brought against it was a codefendant with one of the packing companies, as I remember. Their case was tried and decided against the Government. This case, which was simply the case of dealers who had taken off shipments along the line on through traffic, was decided by the original case. The codefendant was not found guilty, and it is recommended that this be allowed. These people were not responsible. They were acting in accordance with a custom which had obtained for a great many years, and it was not their fault that they were not complying with the order which was affirmed later by the court in reference to the original packing company, not the Saginaw company.

Mr. OVERMAN. What was the crime charged?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Getting carload rates on less-than-carload lots. They were allowed to stop off on the road to sell their goods, and had been doing it. That was a violation of the statute. If the Senator would read the evidence in reference to this matter, he would find that this company should not be held under any construction that could be placed upon the law.

Mr. OVERMAN. Very well.

The bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich., successor to the Saginaw Beef Co., the sum of $8,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, being the amount of money collected from the Saginaw Beef Co. by fine imposed by District Judge Sessions, at Grand Rapids, Mich., on August 28, 1914.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REMOVALS FROM THE BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) authorizing the appointment of a committee to report the facts and reasons relative to the removal by order of the President of responsible officials of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing was announced as next in order.

Mr. STERLING. I think the resolution should be indefinitely postponed. There has been an adverse report pending here against it, together with the following resolution. Adverse reports were made upon both, and I ask that they be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Arkansas here.

Mr. LODGE. He is here.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not think he cares to have it retained on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota moves that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGED DEMOTIONS AND DISCHARGES.

The resolution (S. Res. 271) requesting the President to inform Congress as to alleged demotion, dropping, and discharge of honorably discharged sailors and soldiers from the service since March 4, 1921, was announced as next in order.

Mr. STERLING. I ask that the same action be taken with regard to this resolution. I move that it be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

SALARIES OF SCHOOL-TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 3136) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 8, line 19, after the words "present salary," to strike out the word "including" and to insert the words "which present salary shall include."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, to strike out section 16, as follows:

SEC. 16. That the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, is hereby authorized to fix and prescribe the salaries, other than those herein specified to be paid all employees in the community center department, the night schools, the vacation schools, the Americanization schools, and such other activities as may hereafter be authorized, from lump-sum appropriations.

And to insert in lieu:

SEC. 16. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to conduct as a part of the public-school system a community center department, a department of school attendance and work permits, night schools, vacation schools, Americanization schools, and other activities, under and within appropriations made by Congress, and, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to fix and prescribe the salaries, other than those herein specified, to be paid to the employees of the said activities.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish the Senator from Kansas would explain why that section is in this bill, a bill increasing the salaries of the school-teachers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They ought to be increased.

Mr. SMOOT. This section has nothing at all to do with salary increases.

Section 16 provides:

That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to conduct as a part of the public-school system a community center department, a department of school attendance and work permits, night schools, vacation schools, Americanization schools, and other activities, under and within appropriations made by Congress, and, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to fix and prescribe the salaries, other than those herein specified, to be paid to the employees of the said activities.

Mr. CAPPER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the section creates no new activities in the schools of Washington. It simply authorizes a continuation of work that is already being carried on here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And within the appropriations made.

Mr. CAPPER. Within the appropriations made by Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there is no necessity for it.

Mr. CAPPER. It makes provision as to what the salaries shall be in those departments.

Mr. SMOOT. And it is desired that provision be made so that the Board of Education can pay them any salary they want.

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all. If the Senator will examine the bill he will find that it undertakes to classify those departments of the schools.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if we are going into all these activities on the part of the schools, which, if authorized, are authorized under a law with which I am not familiar, I think I shall have to object to the consideration of the bill. I have no objection whatever to the other part, which fixes the salaries of the school-teachers in the District of Columbia. I have no objection whatever to that part of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. This does not introduce a new department in the school system here; it does not create a new position; it does not in any way increase the cost of the school system as it now exists.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there is no necessity for it; it is absolutely unnecessary; and I think that part ought to go out of the bill.

Mr. CAPPER. The committee considered it very carefully and were of the opinion that it ought to stay in.

Mr. SMOOT. I am taking the word of the Senator that it does not create a new activity in the schools; that all the activities are already provided for under the law. The salaries are to be paid out of the appropriations provided, and therefore it seems to me it would be perfectly useless, and there is no necessity for it at all. I can not tell from the mere reading of it exactly how far it goes or what is going to be the cost.

Mr. CAPPER. The entire school program has been carried on without any permanent school organization measure. This undertakes to set up a school program and give some authority under law, and give the teaching force and the various agencies connected with it a place in the school system, which they have not had heretofore.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it is a change in law, and is an attempt to create this new system. There has been quite a dispute in the Senate as to the community center department and a dispute in Congress as to whether the appropriations should be made for it. In fact, the last appropriation asked for the community center department was refused by Congress after the expenditure of the $25,000 which had been authorized the year before. But the bill does not stop at that. It includes the department of school attendance and work permits, vocational schools, Americanization schools, and other activities. In other words, it grants power to the school board to undertake any kind of activity that they see fit. There is apparently no limit to it at all.

Mr. CAPPER. The department of school attendance and work permits was created about three months ago in a measure which combined the two activities. The pending bill simply gives it its proper place in the school system of the city of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it is now made compulsory from this time forward.

Mr. CAPPER. We have had it for years.

Mr. SMOOT. Not all the activities covered by this provision.

Mr. CAPPER. As I said, it does not introduce a new agency of any kind.

Mr. SMOOT. Take the question of Americanization schools. We may be called upon to appropriate $150,000 for that purpose in the District of Columbia if this provision becomes a law. The Senator can not tell how much it would be. Does the Senator say we have those schools now in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes; we have Americanization schools.

Mr. SMOOT. That is under the law as previously enacted, but not as a part of the school system of the District nor under the school board of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER. It is in full operation and has been for years. This provision simply undertakes to give it a place in the school system.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator to allow the bill to go over for a day, and I will find out from some source in the District what they are doing about it and what it really means.

Mr. CAPPER. That is entirely satisfactory, but I will say to the Senator that I regard this as a very important measure.

We are losing in the city of Washington many of the best teachers we have.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will agree to eliminate section 16, I am perfectly willing the bill should pass at this time. I would have no objection to it then at all.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kansas whether this is not merely a matter of raising salaries for the different teachers?

Mr. CAPPER. That is the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand it will cost the Government $250,000 in increased salaries for the District of Columbia. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. CAPPER. I will accept the Senator's suggestion, and consent to the elimination of section 16.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I am perfectly willing, if that section is eliminated, that the bill shall pass.

Mr. CAPPER. That will be satisfactory to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee inserting section 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out section 16 of the bill, in the following words:

SEC. 16. That the board of education, on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools, is hereby authorized to fix and prescribe the salaries, other than those herein specified to be paid all employees in the community center department, the night schools, the vacation schools, the Americanization schools, and such other activities as may hereafter be authorized, from lump-sum appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 10, after the word "fund," to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, no teacher, officer, or other employee of the board of education whose salary is fixed by this act shall receive any additional increase of compensation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, while we are talking about increasing the salaries of teachers and getting better efficiency in the schools of the District of Columbia, some effort ought to be made to furnish better light in the school buildings of the District. I am told that on dark days it is almost impossible for the children to see. I hope the Committee on the District of Columbia will look into that proposition and give the children better light in the schoolrooms.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLLECTION OF TAXES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 3565) relating to the collection of taxes in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The provisions of the bill have been incorporated practically in the District of Columbia appropriation bill and are now the law. I therefore move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 3384) authorizing an appropriation to meet proportionate expenses of providing a drainage system for Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the Newlands reclamation project of the Reclamation Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 171) to extend the provisions of the act of May 11, 1912, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill go over until I can look into it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) rejecting bids for the acquisition of Muscle Shoals was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ANTILYNCHING BILL.

The bill (H. R. 13) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the bill had better go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF COTTON FUTURES ACT.

The bill (S. 385) to amend section 5 of the United States cotton futures act, approved August 11, 1916, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed. I think all the provisions contained in it are covered in the next bill on the calendar, which is really a substitute for the bill just reached.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from South Carolina if the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is agreeable to an indefinite postponement of the bill? As I understand, the Senator from Louisiana is opposed to the next bill on the calendar but is in favor of this one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Both bills were introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL].

Mr. DIAL. I understand that the Senator from Louisiana is opposed to both bills.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator is sure of that, I have no objection to the bill being indefinitely postponed.

Mr. DIAL. Oh, yes; I know he is willing that it be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, to indefinitely postpone the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill (S. 3146) to amend section 5 of the United States cotton futures act was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. DIAL. With regard to the bill just passed over, I wish to say that I intend to ask at an early date that it be made the unfinished business of the Senate. The principle involved in the bill is worth more to the people of my section and the people of the United States generally than any other remedial legislation we could enact. I hope in the near future we shall have an opportunity to vote on the bill.

RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.

The resolution (S. Res. 330) authorizing a special committee to report to the Senate the results of its investigation concerning the financial interests of Senators in matters affected by the pending tariff bill was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is not the resolution out of date?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it go under Rule IX.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does my colleague [Mr. CALDER] have any objection to its going to Rule IX, or to its indefinite postponement? It is quite meaningless now.

Mr. CALDER. I move that the resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 843) for the relief of Augusta Reiter was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] desires to be present when this bill is considered, and in his absence I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3858) to define butter and to provide a standard therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. STERLING. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 335) directing the Federal Reserve Board to require the Federal reserve banks of Atlanta, Dallas, St. Louis, and Kansas City to report to the Senate the rates of interest charged by them on loans and discounts in 1920 and 1921, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

The bill (H. R. 211) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and May 1, 1920, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES MAILS.

The bill (S. 3962) to prohibit the sending of threatening letters through the mails, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, to strike out "whether or not the sender of such letter, pamphlet, card, writing, or other written or printed matter makes any demand for money, property, or other consideration"; and on page 2, line 5, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000"; and in line 6 to strike out the word "five" and insert "two," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That every letter, pamphlet, card, writing, or other written or printed matter threatening bodily harm or injury to the person or property of the person addressed, or of any member of his household, is hereby declared to be nonmailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier. Any person who knowingly deposits or causes to be deposited for mailing or delivery any such letter, pamphlet, card, writing, or other written or printed matter shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA CLAUDE HOWARD.

The bill (S. 1883) granting a pension to Anna Claude Howard was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna Claude Howard, widow of Thomas Benton Howard, late rear admiral, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEO BALSAM.

The bill (H. R. 6251) for the relief of Leo Balsam was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Leo Balsam, of Plattsburg, N. Y., the sum of $1,282.50, in full compensation for repair at contract price of 950 pairs of shoes destroyed by fire when the gymnasium at Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., was destroyed on November 28, 1917.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask is the Government responsible in a case of that kind? This bill covers a claim for the destruction of certain shoes in a Government barracks.

Mr. CAPPER. On page 4 of the report there is found the following statement in a letter from the Judge Advocate General:

As to the 950 pairs of shoes which it is stated were actually completed on November 28, 1917, it is the opinion of this office that the bailee is entitled to payment therefor.

The pending bill covers only the 950 pairs of shoes, so I think there can be no question that the claimant is entitled to be reimbursed as provided in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

THOMAS B. SMITH.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8264) for the relief of Thomas B. Smith. It proposes to pay to Thomas B. Smith, of Cheriton, Va., $185.66, to reimburse him for expenses incurred by him from April 20 to June 6, 1917, for travel performed by him while an ensign with the United States Naval Reserve Force attached to the Seventh Squadron, United States Navy.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANT OF LANDS TO OGDEN, UTAH.

The bill (S. 3598) granting certain lands to the city of Ogden, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water supply system of said city, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, line 2, after the word "That," to insert "upon the payment of $1.25 per acre," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the payment of $1.25 per acre there is hereby granted to the city of Ogden, Utah, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patent to said grantee for certain public lands in Utah for the protection of the watershed furnishing the water for said city, the lands being described as follows:

Northwest quarter and southeast quarter section 2; all section 12; northeast quarter and east half southeast quarter section 14; north half northwest quarter and east half section 24; township 5 north, range 1 west, Salt Lake meridian.

East half and east half west half and northwest quarter northwest quarter section 10; all section 14; north half northwest quarter and southwest quarter northwest quarter and lot 5, section 24; southeast quarter east half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter section 26; township 6 north, range 1 west, Salt Lake meridian.

East half east half section 5; all section 4; southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 8; all section 10; east half southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 12; north half section 15; northwest quarter northeast quarter, east half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 22; north half section 26; southeast quarter section 34; township 7 north, range 1 west, Salt Lake meridian.

Northwest quarter and southeast quarter section 22; all section 26; north half and southwest quarter section 28; east half section 32; all section 34; northwest quarter and east half section 36; township 8 north, range 1 west, Salt Lake meridian.

All section 6; west half northwest quarter, and northwest quarter northeast quarter section 18; township 5 north, range 1 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Northeast quarter section 8; west half, northwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southeast quarter section 12; east half southwest quarter section 14; southwest quarter section 18; north half section 24; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4; southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter section 30; township 7 north, range 1 east, Salt Lake meridian.

All section 2; northwest quarter northwest quarter and southwest quarter section 4; township 5 north, range 2 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Northwest quarter, east half east half, southwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 12; south half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 14; northwest quarter, east half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter section 24; township 6 north, range 2 east, Salt Lake meridian.

North half, northeast quarter southeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 4; west half, northwest quarter northeast quarter section 12; northwest quarter northeast quarter, south half north half, southeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 14; north half section 20; west half west half, northeast quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter northeast quarter section 22; all section 26; north half, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 28; lots 1 and 2, east half northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter and northeast quarter southeast quarter section 30; east half and east half northwest quarter section 34; township 7 north, range 2 east, Salt Lake meridian.

West half and southeast quarter section 34; township 8 north, range 2 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 12, section 6; south half northwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 4; north half north half southwest quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, south half section 8; west half, north half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter section 10; all section 12; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter, northeast quarter northeast quarter, south half northeast quarter, east half southeast quarter section 14; all section 18; west half, west half southeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, northeast quarter section 20; west half west half, southeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter, north half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 22; north half north half, southeast quarter northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter section 24; northwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter, south half southeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 28; all section 30; township 6 north, range 3 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Southeast quarter northwest quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter section 1; north half north half, southwest quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter section 8; west half, west half east half, northeast quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 12; all section 14; northwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 18; north half north half, southwest quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter section 20; all section 24; all section 26; northeast quarter section 28; west half, north half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 30; west half northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 34; township 7 north, range 3 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Northwest quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter section 4; all section 6; all section 8; north half northwest quarter, southwest quarter northwest quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 10; west half east half, northeast quarter northeast quarter section 18; west half, west half southeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 30; north half north half section 28, township 6 north, range 4 east, Salt Lake meridian.

Southwest quarter northwest quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter section 1; lots 3 and 4 section 4; lot 1, south half north half, southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 5; lots 4 and 5, south half northeast quarter, south half southeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 6; northeast quarter section 7; west half southwest quarter, northwest quarter section 8; southwest quarter northeast quarter section 10; south half north half section 11; northeast quarter northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, southwest quarter section 12; north half, south half of south half, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 14; all section 18; northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, southeast quarter northeast quarter, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 20; north half, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 22; northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter, west half southeast quarter section 24; northwest quarter, north half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, north half southwest quarter, southwest quarter southwest quarter section 26; northeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, northeast quarter, south half section 28; all section 30; north half, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 34, township 7 north, range 4 east, Salt Lake meridian.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any lands which, at the date of the issuance of patent, shall be covered by a valid existing bona fide right or claim initiated under the laws of the United States: *Provided*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found on the lands so granted and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove

the same: *Provided further*, That said city shall not have the right to sell or convey the land herein granted, or any part thereof, or to devote the same to any other purpose than as hereinbefore described; and if the said land shall not be used for such municipal purpose the same, or such parts thereof not so used, shall revert to the United States. The conditions and reservations herein provided for shall be expressed in the patent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUBE ALLEN.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3595) to reimburse Rube Allen for losses and damages sustained by him through the negligent dipping of tick-infested cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$7,344.49" and to insert "$6,445.04," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,445.04 to Rube Allen for loss and damage sustained by him through the negligence of the veterinary inspectors employed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, in their failure to properly dip 120 head of Texas cattle that were shipped from Fort Worth stockyards in April, 1919, by Fred Nation to Kansas, where they infested the native Kansas cattle with the Texas fever tick. Said sum to be paid to the above-named party in full for all loss and damage sustained by him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM MALONE.

The bill (H. R. 1463) for the relief of William Malone was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to William Malone $75, being the cost of an abstract of title sent to the Commissioner of the General Land Office in August, 1916, and lost by some employee of that office.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEROY FISHER.

The bill (H. R. 1862) for the relief of Leroy Fisher was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Leroy Fisher $1,500 for expenses incurred as a result of injuries sustained through being hit by an auto truck, the property of the United States Post Office Department and driven recklessly by an employee of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORTS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS.

The bill (H. R. 8996) to amend paragraph 440, section 5211, act June 3, 1864, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to strike out "paragraph 440 of section 5211 of the act of June 3, 1864, as amended, 1877, be" and to insert "section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, be further"; and on line 7, before the word "Every," to strike out "440" and to insert "Sec. 5211"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5211. Every association shall make to the Comptroller of the Currency not less than three reports during each year, according to the form which may be prescribed by him, verified by the oath or affirmation of the president or cashier of such association, and attested by the signature of at least three of the directors. Each such report shall exhibit, in detail and under appropriate heads, the resources and liabilities of the association at the close of business on any past day by him specified, and shall be transmitted to the comptroller within five days after the receipt of a request or requisition therefor from him, and in the same form in which it is made to the comptroller shall be published in a newspaper published in the place where such association is established, or if there is no newspaper in the place, then in the one published nearest thereto in the same county, at the expense of the association; and such proof of publication shall be furnished as may be required by the comptroller. The comptroller shall also have power to call for special reports from any particular association whenever in his judgment the same are necessary in order to a full and complete knowledge of its condition."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there appears to be no report accompanying this bill.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the bill merely reduces the number of annual reports which are required of national banks from five to three.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought, but I was about to ask a question in order to ascertain whether the bill had any other purpose.

Mr. McLEAN. That is all the bill proposes to do. The comptroller may require as many special reports as he sees fit.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

BRADLEY SYKES.

The bill (H. R. 540) for the relief of Bradley Sykes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay $1,727 to Bradley Sykes for injuries sustained as the result of being struck by a Government-owned automobile in Chicago on June 28, 1920.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM R. BRADLEY.

The bill (S. 3791) for the relief of William R. Bradley, former acting collector of internal revenue for South Carolina, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to credit the account of William R. Bradley, former acting collector of internal revenue for South Carolina, with the sum of $100, that amount now being charged against him for the loss of one special stamp book of the value of $100.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTERMINATION OF BEAN BEETLES IN NEW MEXICO.

The bill (S. 3995) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exterminate bean beetles in the State of New Mexico, and authorizing expenditures therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ROBERT EDGAR ZEIGLER.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 107) for the relief of Robert Edgar Zeigler. It proposes to reimburse Capt. Robert Edgar Zeigler in the sum of $725 for personal property stolen from him while his household goods were in Government custody at United States Army General Hospital No. 20, Whipple Barracks, Ariz.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, that is a bill which should pass, and I hope the Senator from Utah will allow it to be considered.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not see that there is any liability on the part of the Government involved in this case.

Mr. LODGE. The claim involves only $725.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The liability on the part of the Government is practically acknowledged. The report of the Secretary of War states that while the War Department has no authority to pay it the claim ought to be paid.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not see that in the report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There is a long report covering several pages. The claimant had a receipt for the goods which he placed in the custody of the department, and there is not any question about the blame being on the quartermaster for not properly keeping the goods. Nor is there any question about their value nor about their having been stolen. I hope, therefore, the Senator from Utah will not object to the consideration and passage of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not insist upon the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is there not some question, may I ask the Senator from Michigan, in reference to the amount involved? In one statement on page 5 of the report it appears apparently that the total value of the property was $585.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 2 of the report Secretary Weeks states:

3. The War Department does not interpose any objections to a favorable consideration of the pending bill other than to state that, based upon the information of record in regard to the claim, the reimbursement proposed is excessive.

I do not think that the Government of the United States——

Mr. LODGE. Do not let us ruin the Government of the United States by paying $725.

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of ruining anything; it is a question of right.

Mr. LODGE. I also think it is a question of right.

Mr. FLETCHER. On page 9 of the report there is a statement which shows apparently that $725 was the original cost of the property.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Exactly, and it was worth more than that at the time it was stolen. The sum of $725 is what the goods cost abroad before they were shipped here; that amount represents the foreign price that was paid. The fact is they were worth more than that by appraisement, but there was only claimed the exact cost of the goods abroad.

Mr. SMOOT. The Government, then, runs all the risk of property being stolen when it is put in a Government storehouse.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the quartermaster had done his duty at that time the officers would have been assigned to quarters when they went there, but Mr. Zeigler had to put his goods in the custody of the quartermaster, who gave a receipt for them, Mr. Zeigler being assigned to service on the border when he might just as well have been assigned to quarters. The story of this chaplain is a long one; but it seems to me one which is entitled to belief, and it did impress the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. It appears by the report that the goods were bought in 1915, and here we find, in 1922, a claim that they were worth more after seven years of use than they were when they were originally bought.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But they were not used. In 1919, when Mr. Zeigler secured a receipt for the storage of the goods, they were not in use, and they have not been in his possession since, for they were stolen.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not see how these articles could increase in value by age; for instance, portières, an electric iron, an electric radiator, two pairs of feather pillows, one lady's coat, carved wood, and lacquer trays, and so forth. It looks to me as if the committee have been too liberal in making the allowance as to the value of the property. On page 5, as I have stated, it seems to be listed at $585, although $725 is proposed to be paid by the bill.

I move, Mr. President, to amend the bill by striking out "$725" and in lieu thereof inserting "$585."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt, and will again put the question.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE M'COLGAN.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, considered the bill (S. 1600) for the relief of Annie McColgan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$7,500" and to insert "$5,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Annie McColgan, of Philadelphia, Pa., widow of Peter McColgan, who, while a civilian employee of the Ordnance Department, United States Army, in the discharge of his duties, and without fault or negligence, was killed by the explosion of fuses at the Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa., on February 5, 1903, the sum of $5,000, being the sum recommended to be paid her by the board of officers appointed to investigate said explosion by the commanding officer at Frankford Arsenal on February 6, 1903.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHIE CAFFREY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, considered the bill (S. 1511) for the relief of Sophie Caffrey, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment in line 11, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$5,000" and to insert "$2,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sophie Caffrey, of Haverstraw, N. Y., dependent mother of Henry Sloat, who, while a civilian employee of the Navy, in the discharge of his duties and without his fault or negligence, was killed by the explosion of a shell charge at the United States naval magazine on Iona Island, in the Hudson River, N. Y., on December 5, 1906, the sum of $2,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I am, of course, anxious that the bill shall be passed, but I merely wish to point out to the Senate the inconsistency between the bill now pending and the one which has just been passed. In this case the Committee on Claims have recommended $2,000, while in the bill which has just been passed they allowed $5,000, although the two cases are on all fours.

Mr. SMOOT. In one case the payment is to the wife and in the other case to a dependent mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NEW JERSEY SHIPBUILDING & DREDGING CO.

The bill (S. 3515) for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$205,028.28" and insert "$152,278.28," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $152,278.28 to the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J., in full settlement to reimburse said owner of drill boat *No. 3* for loss sustained as a result of total destruction of said drill boat *No. 3* through collision with the U. S. S. *Lykens*, in Hell Gate, off Halletts Point, New York Harbor, on September 1, 1921.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice that in the report signed by the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Theodore Roosevelt, it is stated:

The finding of the naval board of investigation placing the responsibility for the collision on the U. S. S. *Lykens* is approved by the department, and while the claim of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co. for reimbursement for losses sustained is large, the records in the department fully sustain it. The item of $53,750 for loss of profits is one that has required most careful consideration. Strictly speaking, it is not a claim for demurrage. It arose because the wreck of the drill boat prevented the contractor from prosecuting its work under the contract with the War Department. It is not based on the loss of the boat or its earning capacity, but on the loss of the earnings of the entire dredging plant, for the period it was required to remain idle due to the wreck.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator will find that that sum was stricken from the bill.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will permit me, it is to meet that objection that this amendment is proposed. The amendment takes out of the bill all consideration of the earnings of the company from the time of the wreck until the expiration of their contract; and the amount fixed in the bill is the amount of damages actually sustained, as proven by their statements of cost and proved value of the property destroyed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, this is a bill involving a very large sum. I scarcely think we ought to pass on it without a chance to examine some of the details of the matter. The report is rather voluminous, and it would take some little time to read it; but it seems to me that if these people have a claim, if a vessel of the United States caused damage to them, they have their remedy. They ought to have brought suit and had this question passed upon by the court.

In these admiralty cases the courts have jurisdiction to consider the negligence of both sides and to apportion the loss; and it may be that if the matter had been thrashed out in the courts a very different amount than that specified in this bill would have been arrived at. It seems to me it is a mistake to legislate in this way.

Mr. DIAL. Let the bill go over.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask that the bill go over. This matter was carefully inquired into by a commission appointed by the Secretary of the Navy.

The Navy Department, in fact, recommended the appropriation of the whole sum. The committee, in their judgment, have stricken out the profit this company would have made if they had been operating the ship.

It appears that the Government entered into a contract to have certain dredging done in the East River, at Hell Gate, and that a vessel going through the Gate collided with the vessel owned by this contractor and sank it. The Navy Department admit that it was their fault. There is no question about it. They have carefully examined into all the facts. The Committee on Claims have examined all the facts sub-

mitted by the Navy Department. The case is on all fours with hundreds we pass here. There is no other course to pursue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a request that the bill go over?

Mr. DIAL. Let it go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE STATION, HOFFMANS ISLAND, N. Y.

The bill (S. 3923) for the relief of the State of New York, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the State of New York the sum of $55,917.68, being the amount expended by the said State of New York for the construction of a delousing station on Hoffmans Island, New York Harbor, which was thereafter transferred to the Public Health Service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRADE PERCENTAGES OF ENLISTED MEN.

The bill (S. 4037) to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have no objection to that bill, but I did not know that it was on the calendar. I have on my desk a letter which deals with some proposition, and I am not sure but that it may be involved in this measure; so I should like to have the bill go over until to-morrow. I will look at the letter in the meantime, and I am satisfied that I shall be ready to have the bill taken up to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. This completes the call of the calendar.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

Mr. NEW and Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, while the calendar was being called I understood that the bill that I referred to at that time was passed over without prejudice, by which I understand that it would come back on the calendar now that it is finished. It is Senate bill 2228 and was passed over so that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] might offer his amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognized the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama evidently misunderstood. I was about to say that under the understanding announced by the Chair at the time Senate bill 1452 was passed over by agreement, I think it would come up for consideration at this time. It was announced that it would be passed over until the reading of the calendar had been completed.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. SHIELDS. I should like to inquire what was done with the bill that was called up by the Senator from Alabama?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama misunderstood. The Chair recognized the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that if that bill is called up I shall object to its consideration to-day.

Mr. SHIELDS. When the bill was reached on the calendar some time ago, it was passed over on account of my absence from the Chamber. I am perfectly willing to have it taken up if the Senator wishes to take it up right now.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I shall object to its consideration to-day.

Mr. SHIELDS. In other words, I want it understood that I am not delaying the passage of the bill. Really, I am anxious to take it up on account of an amendment I desire to offer to it.

Mr. NEW. I have no possible objection to the consideration of the bill to which the Senator from Tennessee refers; but I think he is under a misapprehension, and that Senate bill 1452 is the one that is now before the Senate, under the agreement announced by the Chair when it was passed on the call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate bill 1452 is before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the reason why I made the statement I did was because of the fact that the chairman of the committee having the bill in charge was not present; and not only that, but I do not want it considered to-day either. Therefore, I shall object to Senate bill 2228 when it comes up, if it comes up again.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1452) for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them.

The READING CLERK. The pending amendment was offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], to add at the end of section 15:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any person from complying with the provisions of the laws of the several States for hunting or shooting migratory birds.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, that is the same amendment as proposed by myself. It is the amendment introduced by me and ordered favorably reported by the Military Affairs Committee, and I ask that that amendment be agreed to. Will the Senator from Indiana accept it?

Mr. NEW. In so far as I can agree to it, I do so gladly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I do not understand the parliamentary situation of that bill. Has the bill been taken up?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was taken up and temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SHIELDS. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Did I understand that objection was made to the consideration of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection was made by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NEW. Then I feel that I must move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1452.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I desire to look into that bill. We have had so many of these regulations—regulating everything that a man does on his farm or anywhere else in the country in relation to game birds and those that are not game birds—that I think we have gone about far enough. The country is tired of legislation in favor of a few sportsmen. I think that matter ought to be seriously considered.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, in order that we may have a full expression of the sentiment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Hale	McLean	Robinson
Brookhart	Harris	McNary	Sheppard
Broussard	Johnson	Myers	Shields
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Kellogg	New	Spencer
Caraway	Kendrick	Nicholson	Sterling
Curtis	Keyes	Norbeck	Townsend
Dial	Ladd	Norris	Trammell
Dillingham	La Follette	Overman	Underwood
Ernst	Lenroot	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Lodge	Pepper	Warren
George	McCumber	Phipps	
Glass	McKellar	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana to resume the consideration of Senate bill 1452, providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I have here a number of amendments which I want to offer after consultation with various Senators who have been interested in this bill. All the amendments were printed on September 11 and laid upon the desks of Senators. I would like to offer them serially.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana offers the amendments which he sends to the desk, and they will be stated in their order.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the word "person," insert the words "except as hereinafter provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 6, at the end of section 2, strike out the period and insert a colon and the words:

Provided, That such license shall not be required to be procured by any person or by any member of his immediate family for the purpose of hunting, pursuing, shooting, capturing, or killing any such migratory bird on any farm land owned by such person and occupied by him as his place of permanent abode.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 13, at the end of section 3, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to exempt any person from complying with the provisions of laws of the several States for hunting or shooting migratory birds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 7, line 10, strike out the words "fish, wild animal, or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "migratory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 7, line 22, strike out the words "fish, wild animal, or wild" and insert in lieu thereof the word "migratory."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. Add, after section 15, page 9, line 4, a new section, to be entitled "Sec. 15-A," to read as follows:

SEC. 15-A. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to call an annual conference for the consideration of matters relating to the conservation and increase of migratory birds, for which conference invitations shall be extended to the official game service of each State and to others interested, and at which the Department of Agriculture shall be represented.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. In section 11, page 6, line 19, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided further, That all areas acquired under this act shall be subject to the laws of the State in which such areas are located, if such laws are not inconsistent with the provisions of the migratory bird treaty act, this act, or regulations adopted pursuant to the provisions of this act, or provide additional protection for migratory birds, their nests or eggs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 8, line 7, before the word "purpose," insert the word "unlawful."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 13, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "which rules and regulations shall be made a part of such license."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 8, line 1, after the word "reserved," insert the words "where so set apart or reserved."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, line 1, after the word "any," insert the words "rule or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. In section 16, page 9, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "on its passage and approval" and substitute therefor the words "when duly enacted."

The amendment was agreed to.

The READING CLERK. Amend section 16, page 9, line 7, by striking out the words and figures "16th day of August, 1922," and inserting in lieu thereof the words and figures "1st day of February, 1923."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. That completes the list of amendments I have to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and still open to amendment.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, no one now knows what this bill provides. The Senator from Indiana called up the bill and then proceeded to offer a dozen or 15 amendments. None of them were explained, and not a Senator on the floor, not even the Senator from Indiana, could tell exactly what their effect would be. The bill is radically wrong. There is absolutely no defense for one provision in it.

Everyone who wants this particular bill passed will tell you that the licensing provision is the most important section in it. Yet the licensing provision has nothing to do with restricting the number of people who might, under this bill, become qualified to hunt. It does not give the commission any more power to regulate the conduct of the licensed hunter than the unlicensed hunter, but it is intended to promote a professional hunters' club, composed of men who will go to the trouble to get licenses; but any workingman, any farmer, who perhaps one day in the year wants to hunt and goes out to shoot game will discover that a Federal law requires him to go and get a Federal license before he may hunt. If there were some provision attached to the procuring of licenses, or some obligation resting upon the licensee which did not rest upon other people, there might be some people to urge that there should be a license fee.

I know, and everybody who stops to think knows, that a number of people finding a little time on their hands might hunt; but there is a very strong aversion upon the part of most people to taking out a Federal license to exercise a right they have felt was theirs by right of American citizenship. The result is that the intention is to exclude from the privilege of hunting a very large number of the American people and give an exclusive right to those people who pride themselves upon being hunters, who have their shooting clubs, and who will take out the licenses and go out and hunt. Under this bill they will be the only ones who will hunt. That is the purpose of the bill. The Senator from Indiana says that is the heart of the bill. It is the heart of it because it is expected to make game more plentiful for those people, and to exclude everybody else from hunting. A few people have written me about the bill.

I wish now to offer a motion to strike out, on page 2, line 1, the words "without first having procured the license herein provided," and if that amendment shall prevail, then amendments to sections 3, 4, and 5 will be offered in succession.

What I want to say about it is rather a reiteration. There is no excuse whatever for laying this additional burden upon the American people who sometimes exercise the American right of hunting, unless it is expected that it will limit the number of those who will hunt. In other words, unless it shall operate as the proponents of the measure hope it will—and I believe it will—to exclude a very large number of American citizens from exercising the right to hunt, it will have no application at all.

It is true that the license fee which is to be paid is to be used for leasing or buying certain hunting preserves and building within them cabins and things of that kind for the use of hunters; but that is only an afterthought. That will never be done. There is no expectation of its being done. The hope and the belief, which I think are well grounded, are that the majority of people are not going to take out Federal licenses, because the majority of people are thoroughly out of patience with Federal regulation. It has gotten so that you can not do anything without a Federal license. There is hardly a single act of citizenship which a man may now exercise except as a licensee. The American people are thoroughly tired of this everlasting thrusting of the Federal Government into every detail of their lives; and of all, this is the most idiotic exercise of Federal authority.

It is bad enough that the Secretary of Agriculture should say to the people living in my State, or any other State of this Union, "You shall hunt only within certain prescribed periods." I know, and most people who have had any experience with the regulations know, that the regulations in some States absolutely forbid any effective hunting. They make it possible to hunt migratory game in some States with some pleasure, but in most States, and my own State is one of them, they so prescribe the seasons that the open season is the period when the migratory birds are not there.

The closed seasons are those seasons when hunting could be indulged in. That was bad enough. It met the hearty condemnation of every American citizen everywhere except the professional reformers and the professional hunters, but this is intended to extend it just that much further to include a license fee. Not content with prescribing times and places where they might hunt, it is now proposed to say, "You have to go to your postmaster and take out a license, and then if you permit anybody else to pick up your license and go out with a gun, then you forfeit it and are subject to many other pains and penalties."

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that there is enough of American spirit left in the Senate to defeat this sort of legislation. I realize there is less of it here than any place else on earth. Right here in the Senate there is less desire to protect the American people in their constitutional rights than anywhere else where an equal number of men are associated. It has gotten so that instead of trying to obey and uphold the Constitution and protect the rights of American citizens, the Senate devotes its entire energies to devising means whereby the Government may invade the rights of the people and make life less pleasant. This is another one of the things that has absolutely no excuse whatever for being thrust upon the people. I hope there is spirit enough left in the Senate to defeat the legislation.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if anyone had read the bill as it is amended and had listened to what has just been said by the Senator from Arkansas they must have realized that he totally misapprehends the purpose and the effect of the bill. It not only does not do what he seems to fear it does, but it is the one promise we have against the happening of just exactly what he seems to fear.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator from Kansas wait just a moment?

Mr. CURTIS. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NEW. I yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the fact that the bill is now the unfinished business and there is some objection on the other side of the Chamber that Senators have not had a chance to read the various amendments, and, as the Senator thinks the amendments do cover the point raised by the Senator from Arkansas, would it not be well to let us have an executive session and let the bill go over until to-morrow? It is the unfinished business and can be taken up to-morrow after morning business is closed.

Mr. NEW. That is just what I was going to suggest.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that is a very good suggestion. I was just about to make it myself. We do not know what is in the bill.

Mr. NEW. That is the suggestion I was going to make of my own motion, so we are agreed on one point at any rate. If the bill goes over as the unfinished business the amendments can be printed and it then comes up, as I understand it, at the close of the morning hour to-morrow. With that understanding I am willing that it shall go over.

But I wish to add a word before I resume my seat. It is true that a Federal license is to be issued under the provisions of the bill. The cost of that license would be $1. It must be taken out by every man who wants to shoot migratory birds. The measure is meant to be supplemental to the migratory birds treaty which was entered into between the Government of the United States and the Canadian Government and which is now in force. Ever cent of the dollar that is to be paid for a license would go for the benefit of the poor man who has not the means of belonging to a club. We can not stop the shooting indulged in by the man who belongs to a club, but the man who belongs to a club can prevent anybody other than a member of the club from coming on that property. Not only that but they will do it, and if necessary will do it at the point of a gun. I have seen men shot for coming on private hunting grounds.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. It surely is not the contention of the Senator from Indiana that I could take out a license under the terms of this measure and hunt on his land whether he was willing for me to do so or not?

Mr. NEW. Certainly not. The Senator could not go on private preserves——

Mr. CARAWAY. I could not do it under the terms of this bill.

Mr. NEW. Certainly not; but those are lands that have already been taken over by the clubs. There are still in the country certain marsh areas of not inconsiderable size that have not been taken over by the clubs, but every acre of which will be taken by them unless some measure of this kind is enacted into law to prevent it.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is there anything in the bill to prevent a club from taking over such lands?

Mr. NEW. Only the provision that the Government is empowered to take up the land, and if the Government does so the club man can not.

Mr. CARAWAY. And the private individual could not do it without the provisions of this measure?

Mr. NEW. Certainly they could.

Mr. CARAWAY. A private individual could take up Government lands?

Mr. NEW. No; but the private individual could buy the land and establish clubs. The object of the bill is to permit the Government to take these lands that are still unoccupied and maintain them as public shooting grounds upon which the Senator can go as well as I.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; it would not be me.

Mr. NEW. Evidently not.

Mr. CARAWAY. It would be the Senator from Indiana. The license has nothing to do with that. The license undertakes to prevent a man from hunting anywhere, except the very generous offer a moment ago for the exclusive use of the owner and his family. That would not even permit a man to hunt on such lands.

Mr. NEW. Certainly any man holding a license could hunt on any of the grounds that may be taken over under the operation of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. The measure does not give the Government any power it does not now have. The license is the only feature in the bill that is intended to exclude certain people from hunting.

Mr. NEW. No; it is not. It is the only feature of the bill which will establish the grounds upon which any man without the means to enjoy club membership may go hunting.

Mr. President, certainly further discussion of the points of difference between the Senator from Arkansas and myself is not going to expedite anything, so with the understanding that the bill goes over as the unfinished business and will be printed with the amendments I have nothing further to say at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying Budget statements, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, which is summarized in the following statement:

Budget summary.

[Exclusive of postal revenues and postal expenditures paid from postal revenues.]

	Estimated, 1924.	Estimated, 1923.	Actual, 1922.
Total receipts	$3,361,812,359	$3,429,862,959	$4,109,104,150.94
Total expenditures (including reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts)	3,180,843,234	3,703,801,671	3,795,302,499.84
Excess of expenditures		273,938,712	
Excess of receipts	180,969,125		313,801,651.10

In the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, transmitted to Congress December 5, 1921, the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1922 were $3,943,453,663, and the estimated expenditures $3,967,922,366, thus forecasting an apparent excess of expenditures over receipts of $24,468,703. At the close of business on June 30, 1922, it was found that the actual receipts for the fiscal year 1922 were $4,109,104,150.94 and the actual expenditures $3,795,302,499.84, making an excess of receipts over expenditures of $313,801,651.10. That we closed the fiscal year 1922 with a surplus of $313,801,651.10 instead of an estimated deficit of $24,468,703 was due in no small measure to the fact that at the beginning of the fiscal year 1922 a system of financial control was established in the executive branch of the Government under the Budget system. Immediately upon the commencement of the fiscal year 1922 Executive pressure for the closest economies was brought to bear upon the business organization of the Government. For the first time in the history of this country coordination was established in the routine business of the Government and the departments and establishments thus brought together in a common effort for economy.

While the estimate of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923 as made at the time of the presentation of the Budget in December, 1921, indicated that the receipts would be $3,338,182,750 and the expenditures $3,505,754,727, a revision of the prospective receipts and expenditures made on July 1, 1922, the commencement of the fiscal year, indicated that the receipts would be $3,073,825,311 and the expenditures $3,771,258,542. That revised estimate indicated an excess of expenditures over receipts of $697,433,231.

As a result, however, of the operations of the first five months of the current fiscal year, a revised estimate of receipts has now been made showing a total of $3,429,862,959. The considerable increase over the July estimate is due to the stimulation in the collection of ordinary receipts aided by an increase in the customs revenues. On the other hand, due to continued pressure for economies and a revision of the expenditure program based on five months of actual operation, it is now estimated that the expenditures for the fiscal year 1923 will be $3,703,801,671. These revised figures indicate an apparent prospective deficit of $273,938,712. I am hopeful, however, that the conditions on which this estimate is predicated will change for the better in the ensuing months of the fiscal year and that the close of the year will show a balanced account.

It is well to mention that of the total estimated expenditures of $3,703,801,671 for the fiscal year 1923, approximately $2,000,000,000 will be expended in the payment of pensions, payments to or on behalf of World War veterans, interest on the public debt, and for the reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from ordinary receipts.

This estimate of expenditures during the fiscal year 1923 includes the amount of the difference between the cash receipts from sales of war savings stamps, series of 1918, and their face value, which series becomes due January 1, 1923. This amount of approximately $125,000,000 represents discount accruals covering a period of five years, and while not an expenditure properly chargeable against the ordinary receipts of 1923 must be met this fiscal year, and therefore has been included in this year's estimated expenditures.

We now come to the Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. It is estimated that the total ordinary receipts from all sources, excluding the Postal Service, will be $3,361,812,359. This is $747,291,791.94 less than the actual receipts for 1922 and $68,050,600 less than the estimated receipts for 1923. The items which make up this estimated total for 1924 are compared with similar items for the two preceding years, as follows:

Receipts.

Source.	1924	1923	1922
Internal-revenue receipts	$2,425,000,000	$2,400,000,000	$3,213,253,253.79
Customs receipts	425,000,000	450,000,000	356,443,387.18
Miscellaneous receipts:			
Interest, premium, and discount	272,865,283	237,800,455	57,400,287.03
Sale of Government properties	35,404,410	96,850,125	116,287,787.86
Public domain receipts	16,149,650	16,214,600	16,334,595.64
Franchise tax, Federal reserve banks	10,000,000	10,000,000	59,974,495.64
Profits on coinage, bullion deposits, etc	10,000,000	17,000,000	21,603,921.07
Fees, fines, and forfeitures	35,000,642	31,295,267	32,539,339.35
Repayments of foreign loans and other investments	50,175,000	58,645,000	120,658,720.93
District of Columbia receipts	15,500,500	16,363,415	15,235,016.44
Panama Canal receipts	14,224,000	13,924,000	11,747,092.47
Trust fund receipts	65,319,170	61,195,522	57,900,581.32
Other sources	20,169,715	21,500,485	29,589,693.22
Total miscellaneous receipts	511,812,359	579,862,959	539,407,503.97
Total receipts, all sources	3,361,812,359	3,429,862,959	4,109,104,150.94

The estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year 1924 is $3,180,843,234. This is the amount which it is estimated will be withdrawn from the Treasury during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. This estimate of cash withdrawal is to be distinguished from the estimate of appropriations contained in the Budget, since withdrawals during the fiscal year will be made from appropriations heretofore made as well as from appropriations recommended in this Budget. Furthermore, a portion of the money to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1924 will not be withdrawn from the Treasury until after the close of that fiscal year.

These expenditures may be divided into two general classes, those which partake of the nature of fixed charges and are not generally subject to administrative control, and those which are subject to administrative control.

Included within the first class are pensions, payments to or on behalf of World War veterans, interest on the public debt, and the reduction of the public debt required by law to be made from the ordinary receipts of the Government. These items, together with certain other, but smaller, items not generally subject to administrative control, represent about two-thirds of the estimated expenditures, leaving approximately $1,000,000,000 subject to administrative control.

The foregoing does not include expenditures for the Postal Service and the Post Office Department payable from postal revenues. Such expenditures for the fiscal year 1922 were $545,666,532.28, a deficiency of $64,346,234.52, payable from ordinary receipts, being included in the ordinary expenditures for 1922 hereinbefore mentioned. The estimated expenditures from postal revenues during 1923 are $559,996,841.60, an estimated deficiency of $31,502,570.76 being included in the estimated ordinary expenditures for 1923. The estimated expenditures from postal revenues for 1924 are $584,653,151.50, and it is estimated that through proper readjustments there will be a surplus of postal revenues over expenditures amounting to $952,430.56 for that year.

That we approach the commencement of the fiscal year 1924 with an estimated surplus for that year of $180,969,125 is certainly most encouraging. While I am hopeful that there will be no deficit in the current fiscal year, 1923, if such a deficit does occur this surplus for 1924 will give a margin to take care of it.

Successful management of the public debt in the transactions involving large refunding operations is essential to the public credit and closely related to successful Budget operations. The Treasury Department has been carrying out a program of orderly funding and gradual liquidation of the public debt. On June 30, 1922, the gross public debt was $22,963,381,708.31, as compared with $23,977,450,552.54 on June 30, 1921, showing a reduction of $1,014,068,844.23 during the fiscal year 1922. This reduction was accomplished through the following means: First, in the amount of $422,694,600, through the cumulative sinking fund and other public debt expenditures payable from certain specific receipts; second, in the amount of $277,572,503.13, through the reduction in the net balance in the general fund of the Treasury; and third, in the amount of $313,801,651.10, through the surplus of ordinary receipts over expenditures for the year.

On April 30, 1921, the short-term outstanding debt maturing before June 30, 1923, was more than $7,500,000,000, which through the reductions referred to and refunding operations was reduced to about $4,500,000,000 on June 30, 1922, and up to November 15, 1922, this amount had been further reduced to approximately $3,000,000,000. These refunding operations have involved the issue on October 16, 1922, of approximately $750,000,000 long-term bonds and the issue of Treasury notes aggregating $2,743,334,000 maturing as follows: $701,897,700 during 1924, $936,727,700 during 1925, and $1,104,708,600 during 1926. These refunding operations are carried on for the purpose of changing the maturity date of public debt obligations and thus to avoid the necessity for meeting obligations of many billions of dollars at one time. The resulting distribution of maturities does not indicate a reduction in the total of such obligations.

We now come to the estimates of appropriations for 1924, amounting to $3,078,940,331.60. This is $195,298,359.14 less than the appropriations already made for the current fiscal year, 1923. Early in July I called together in open meeting for the third time the executives constituting the business establishment of the Government and at that time further emphasized the need of more rigid economy in the expenditure of public funds. I stated that the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1924 would not permit so liberal appropriations for that year as had been made for the current fiscal year, 1923. The preparation of the estimates of appropriations as they appear in the Budget was controlled by this policy. While it may be possible to make a small reduction in an item here and there, any material reduction will necessitate a change in the administrative policy upon which estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 are based. I am giving below a comparative statement of the estimates of appropriations for 1924 and appropriations for 1923.

Comparative statement of estimates of appropriations for 1924 and appropriations for 1923.

	Estimates of appropriations, 1924.	Appropriations, 1923.
Legislative establishment	$14,418,912.60	$14,504,164.95
Executive office	382,850.00	300,595.00
Special repairs, Executive Mansion	25,000.00	
Independent offices:		
Civil Service Commission	877,295.00	807,911.00
Employees' Compensation Commission	2,432,740.00	2,660,305.00
Federal Board for Vocational Education	6,427,000.00	5,932,000.00
Federal Trade Commission	955,000.00	955,600.00
General Accounting Office	3,361,163.00	3,922,418.00
Housing Corporation	870,450.00	1,056,425.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	4,514,500.00	5,301,402.00
Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation	50,411,500.00	100,459,000.00
State, War, and Navy Department Buildings	1,707,230.00	3,771,950.00
Tariff Commission	700,000.00	845,000.00
United States Veterans' Bureau	440,313,000.00	422,077,323.45
Other independent offices	1,874,790.74	2,287,884.00
Department of Agriculture	81,251,613.00	62,412,036.00
Department of Commerce	19,715,535.00	20,618,495.20
Department of the Interior	316,207,752.00	227,514,157.10
Department of Justice	18,751,056.00	18,631,205.00
Department of Labor	6,203,556.00	7,490,188.11
Navy Department	286,934,025.00	286,324,265.25
Post Office Department, payable from the Treasury		14,600.00
State Department	15,058,237.79	11,095,200.66
Treasury Department	148,888,892.28	160,627,265.44
War Department, including Panama Canal	238,517,300.28	246,894,386.87
District of Columbia	25,043,973.00	25,990,050.80
Ordinary	1,793,843,331.60	1,844,149,930.85
Reduction in principal of the public debt:		
Sinking fund	236,872,000.00	283,838,800.00
Purchase of Liberty bonds from foreign repayments	31,225,000.00	31,250,000.00

Comparative statement of estimates of appropriations for 1924 and appropriations for 1923—Continued.

	Estimates of appropriations, 1924.	Appropriations, 1923.
Reduction in principal of the public debt—Continued.		
Redemption of bonds and notes from estate taxes	$5,000,000.00	$5,000,000.00
Redemption of securities from Federal reserve bank franchise tax receipts	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00
Principal of the public debt	345,097,000.00	330,088,800.00
Interest on the public debt	950,000,000.00	[1] 1,100,000,000.00
Total payable from the Treasury	3,078,940,331.69	3,274,238,690.83
Post Office Department and Postal Service, payable from postal revenues	590,166,191.50	564,524,766.50
Total, including Post Office Department and Postal Service	3,669,106,523.19	3,838,763,457.33

[1] Including $125,000,000 discount accruals of war savings stamps, series of 1918, due Jan. 1, 1923.

Statement No. 8 of the Budget gives a functional classification of the estimates for the fiscal year 1924, which will be found interesting and informative, showing as it does the approximate amounts devoted to important Government activities and interests. This classification has four general divisions—general functions, military functions, civil functions, and a grouping of the nonfunctional appropriations.

It will be found that a total of $103,070,886 is carried for general functions, which include the legislative, judicial, executive, and the general administrative operations of the Government which can not be allocated to specific civil functions.

The sum of $1,256,715,939 is provided for military functions, which include military pensions, retirement pay, annuities and World War allowances, and national defense.

The amount recommended for national defense is divided into two classes: Army, $256,552,887; Navy, $289,880,993.

The amount recommended for the maintenance and operation of the Army will provide for a Regular Army of 12,000 officers and 125,000 enlisted men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts, which is the force now authorized by Congress; will provide for the training of 15,000 reserve officers for a period of 15 days and for 150 for a period of three months, as against a total of only 5,000 for 15 days during the current fiscal year; will provide for the attendance of 38,000 men at civilian military training camps as against 27,000 during this current fiscal year; and will enable the Militia Bureau to increase the strength of the National Guard from 160,000 officers and men—the strength on June 30, 1922—to 215,000 officers and men. While no increase in the number of students enrolled at Reserve Officers' Training Corps units at schools and colleges—now totaling 96,000 students in 225 institutions—is provided, the funds recommended, however, will enable a larger number of these students to be given both basic and advanced courses of instruction.

The funds recommended will provide for all essentials connected with the upkeep of all military posts, camps, and stations, the Army transport service, the coast defenses of the United States, Panama and insular possessions, and other military activities, and, in addition, allow $3,166,767 for new construction at military posts and $750,000 toward the replacement of worn-out portions of the Alaska cable. For the Air Service the amount recommended is $12,871,500, which is $23,500 less than the 1923 appropriation, and will permit this service to operate efficiently in accordance with existing policy. For the United States Military Academy at West Point $2,066,428 is recommended, an increase of $6,799 over 1923.

The amount recommended for the Navy will provide for the present enlisted personnel of 86,000 men; will maintain all present ships in commission; will increase the steaming radius of capital ships from 13,080 miles to 16,200 miles, and other ships proportionately; will provide training for 2,000 officers and 7,000 men in the Naval Reserve; and will make provision for continuing all new ship construction in privately owned yards, except for reduction in speed of construction on three light cruisers; for suspending the construction of four auxiliaries in navy yards and reducing the speed of construction on two fleet submarines.

The amount provided in the Budget for military pensions and allowances includes $253,000,000 for pensions, $434,584,050 for World War allowances, and $20,389,289 for retirement pay.

The amount recommended for civil functions totals $953,599,096. Under this general function $14,587,167 is allowed for foreign relations and protection of American interests abroad; $18,553,686 for general law enforcement, which includes activities having to do with the enforcement of general laws and the administration and enforcement of special acts like the national prohibition act, the narcotic act, and the investigation and prosecution of war-contract frauds; $7,199,000 for the control of currency and banking; $12,584,305 for the administration of Indian affairs; $17,582,018 for the administration of public domain, which includes those activities of the Government having to do with the care and utilization of public lands and the care and utilization of national forests; $11,391,909 for the promotion and regulation of commerce and industry, which includes the activities of the Tariff Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Patent Office, and those activities of the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce having to do with the promotion and regulation of commerce and industry; $79,491,995 for the promotion, regulation, and operation of marine transportation, which includes $50,411,500 for the Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation; $4,514,900 for the promotion and regulation of land transportation; $590,171,942 for the Postal Service and land telegraph and telegraphic communication, which includes $590,166,192 for the Postal Service; $24,876,799 for the promotion and regulation of agriculture; $1,244,090 for the promotion and regulation of fisheries; $4,718,030 for the promotion of labor interests; $3,871,210 for immigration and naturalization; $15,877,339 for promotion of public health; $10,151,060 for promotion of public education; $10,619,456 for science and research; $29,563,110 for local government, including the District of Columbia; and $228,050 for civil relief.

For public works, under civil functions, $96,197,030 is carried, which includes $41,764,550 for rivers and harbors proper and items of similar character; $31,480,000 for roads; $6,889,105 for Panama Canal; $4,750,000 for Reclamation Service; $2,200,000 for railroads in Alaska; $5,728,950 for hospital construction and facilities for war patients, and $3,384,425 for other public improvements and Government plant additions.

Under nonfunctional appropriations is carried a total of $1,355,720,602, which includes $36,187,059 for refunds, losses, contingencies, and miscellaneous; $345,097,000 for public-debt retirements payable from ordinary receipts; $950,000,000 for interest on the public debt, and $24,436,543 for disbursement of trust funds.

It seems appropriate here to consider the course of the retrenchment policy of the Government since the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the year in which the armistice was signed. Exclusive of expenditures made in the reduction of the public debt, the total expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, were $6,403,343,841.21. The expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, including $422,281,500 on account of reduction of the public debt payable from ordinary receipts, under the new cumulative sinking fund, were $5,538,209,189.30. This was further reduced for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, to $3,795,302,499.84. As I have previously stated, the estimated expenditures for 1923 are $3,703,801,671, while the Budget for 1924 estimates the expenditures at $3,180,843,234 for that year. These figures show a most satisfactory reduction in the expenditure of public moneys since 1919.

Can there be a reasonable expectation for further considerable reduction in governmental expenditures in the near future? This question is no doubt upon the lips of many. The burden of taxation caused by the World War has borne heavily upon us all, and it has been the earnest desire of the Government to reduce this burden to the minimum consistent with a proper functioning of the Federal services. We have seen, however, that approximately two-thirds of the taxes collected go to pay certain fixed charges, over the expenditure of which there can be exercised little or no administrative control. The interest on the public debt, the chief of the fixed charges, must be paid. This will be $950,000,000 for the fiscal year 1924, constituting nearly one-third of the total expenditures of the Government. Among these are also certain permanent and indefinite appropriations for various purposes and certain large annual appropriations sanctioned by law and by public opinion.

After deducting these items there is left, as has been shown, approximately only $1,000,000,000, out of which these normal operating expenses of the Government must be paid. It is against this group of expenditures that the retrenchment policy of the Government has been directed. Never before in our financial history has there been such close scrutiny on the part of both the Executive and the Congress of every item which contemplates expenditures for the support of the Government. Not only have the departments themselves set up agencies of control both in the preparation of their estimates and over their expenditures but the pressure of the Executive has been directed toward effecting economies in these ordinary governmental operations.

A reduction in expenditures would undoubtedly result from a reorganization of the departments and establishments upon a more scientific basis, but we can not look to this alone to effect

such a material reduction in cost of Government operation as would justify the expression of hope for a considerable lessening of expenditures in the years to come.

There is, however, another field of Government operation—a rapidly broadening field of Government expenditure—which may be discussed with profit to us all. I refer to expenditures which are being made from appropriations for Federal aid in lines of research, improvement, and development which, while having no direct connection with the operations of the business of government, have grown to become a recognized part of its activities. It is not easy, therefore, to divorce from our minds the fact that considerable of the moneys appropriated for the Government are spent for those things which do not pertain to the normal functions or operations of the business of government. There is question as to how far the Government should participate in these extraneous activities, and I am frank to say that an answer to the question as to whether we can look forward to any further material reduction in the expenditures of the Government in future years depends largely upon whether or not there will be a curtailment or expansion of these activities, which have already added greatly to the annual drafts upon the Treasury of the United States. These extraneous activities have flowed from the laws enacted pursuant to popular demand, and I take this occasion to refer to them for the purpose of showing that the taxation which necessarily results in providing funds to meet them is a necessary incident to the fulfillment of the popular demand.

In the efforts which have been directed to reducing public expenditures I have been much concerned in apparent increasing State, county, and municipal indebtedness, and I am fearful lest this condition may be in part attributable to the expenditures made by the Government pursuant to its Federal aid laws, as many of these laws require State contributions as a prerequisite to the extension of the Federal aid. Certainly an expression by the Government that it is willing to bear a proportionate part of the cost of certain aid work is an incentive to the States to contribute their share, and it is only natural that this should lead to the increasing State, county, and municipal indebtedness.

In adapting its procedure to the needs of the new Budget system, I fully realize the far-reaching changes which Congress made in its organization. While the Budget bill was pending the House, in anticipation of its final enactment, changed its rules in order to centralize authority and responsibility over appropriation measures; and, further, when the President last year transmitted the Budget, prepared according to the form and contents of the old Book of Estimates, and an alternative budget, prepared according to a logical grouping of governmental services, the House forthwith adopted the alternative budget and changed the form of the appropriation bills to conform to the chapters of such alternative budget. This was a change of far-reaching importance. Following the action of the House, the Senate reorganized its committee system for the consideration of appropriation bills, centralizing authority and responsibility in its Committee on Appropriations.

The President has received from Congress during this formative period of the Budget system the most hearty cooperation at all times. Many conferences with the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate were necessary in order to establish the form of the Budget. We were working in virgin soil, establishing new methods of financial procedure. I am glad to say that no important step has been taken by the Executive, even though the matter involved might be of purely executive concern, without first discussing the matter with your Appropriations Committees, and I desire to express my appreciation of the helpful spirit always evidenced by them whenever we had occasion to come together for the mutual consideration of questions of budgetary principle or procedure. I may say without fear of exaggeration that we have been during the past two years colaborers in the greatest reform in our financial history.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 4, 1922.*

REPORT OF THE GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I submit herewith the eighth annual report of the committee for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the presentation by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics of a national aeronautical policy at the conclusion of its report. The constructive recommendations therein contained for the advancement of aeronautics deserve the thoughtful consideration of all Members of the Congress.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PORTO RICO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 38 of the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 951), entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of each of 26 franchises granted by the Public Service Commission of Porto Rico. The copies of the franchises inclosed are described in the accompanying letter from the Secretary of War transmitting them to me.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

IMPROVEMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

[NOTE.—Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with paragraph 5, section 2, of the Army appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, I transmit the sixth annual report of the Council of National Defense for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 6, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 5, 1922.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Pierce Butler, of Minnesota, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice William R. Day, resigned.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

GENERAL OFFICERS.

To be major general.

Brig. Gen. William Lassiter, from December 30, 1922, vice Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, who is to be retired from active service December 29, 1922.

To be brigadier general.

Col. Edwin Barnch Winans, Cavalry, vice Brig. Gen. William Lassiter, nominated for appointment as major general.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Charles J. Alden to be postmaster at Globe, Ariz., in place of W. T. Wright, resigned.

ARKANSAS.

James W. Oglesby, jr., to be postmaster at Gravette, Ark., in place of E. W. Cato. Incumbent's commission expired May 2, 1921.

COLORADO.

David P. Saunders to be postmaster at Brush, Colo., in place of C. F. McMullen. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

FLORIDA.

Thomas H. Milton to be postmaster at Trenton, Fla., in place of T. H. Milton. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Forrest E. Peterson to be postmaster at Depue, Ill., in place of M. E. Althoff. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Bert C. Lind to be postmaster at Sanborn, Ind., in place of B. C. Lind. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

Milton G. Irwin to be postmaster at Merrill, Iowa, in place of Florence Lucey. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Harry J. Perrin to be postmaster at Monroe, Iowa, in place of H. J. Perrin. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Charles S. Walling to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, Iowa, in place of H. S. Rosecrans, resigned.

Frank J. Shearer to be postmaster at Prairie City, Iowa, in place of A. H. Brous. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Anna N. Dixon to be postmaster at Rock Valley, Iowa, in place of C. A. N. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Charles O. Bollinger to be postmaster at Iola, Kans., in place of A. H. Hecox. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Gilbert E. Goodson to be postmaster at La Cygne, Kans., in place of A. B. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Elmer Alban to be postmaster at Westphalia, Kans., in place of W. T. S. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Charles A. Bickford to be postmaster at Hellier, Ky., in place of Perry Anderson, resigned.

MAINE.

John C. Arnold to be postmaster at Augusta, Me., in place of F. W. Plaisted. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Cleo A. Russell to be postmaster at Bethel, Me., in place of G. L. Thurston. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

MARYLAND.

Elwood C. Orrell to be postmaster at Greensboro, Md., in place of Wesley Jarrell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Xavier A. Delisle to be postmaster at Lowell, Mass., in place of J. F. Meehan, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Fred W. Holmes to be postmaster at Milford, Mich., in place of C. E. Lovejoy. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Edna M. Park to be postmaster at Alden, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Byron L. Page to be postmaster at Clifford, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Ida L. Sherman to be postmaster at Pullman, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Fred Lutz to be postmaster at Warren, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Charles W. Patsold to be postmaster at Cambridge, Minn., in place of L. M. Peterson, removed.

Herman E. Kent to be postmaster at Sanborn, Minn., in place of H. E. Kent. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MISSOURI.

James O. Erwin to be postmaster at Mokane, Mo., in place of R. E. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Alfred O. Lowman to be postmaster at Smithville, Mo., in place of C. C. Kindred. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MONTANA.

Roy W. Broman to be postmaster at Ismay, Mont., in place of M. B. Bacon. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Russel B. Henchman to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, N. H., in place of R. B. Henchman. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Carlton E. Sparhawk to be postmaster at Walpole, N. H., in place of R. G. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

Sadie E. Johnson to be postmaster at Fort Hancock, N. J., in place of D. J. Murphy, resigned.

Arity L. Hope to be postmaster at Raritan, N. J., in place of William Slattery. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Harry P. Maxson to be postmaster at Adams Center, N. Y., in place of F. G. Burt. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Maud E. Butterfield to be postmaster at New Berlin, N. Y., in place of R. F. Talbot. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Helena Swackhamer to be postmaster at Schenevus, N. Y., in place of L. B. Bennett, resigned.

Howard F. Fleming to be postmaster at Gardiner, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Dexter S. Slack to be postmaster at Speculator, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Wiley B. Knowles to be postmaster at Wallace, N. C., in place of L. B. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lunda V. Owen to be postmaster at Winton, N. C., in place of C. F. Mitchell, resigned.

OKLAHOMA.

Albert H. Keil to be postmaster at Halleyville, Okla., in place of W. I. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Effie J. Malone to be postmaster at Harrah, Okla., in place of W. T. Malone, deceased.

William H. McKinley to be postmaster at Pondcreek, Okla., in place of W. T. Vest, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry Bourns to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Pa., in place of Henry Bourns. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Fred E. Lukens to be postmaster at Macungie, Pa., in place of C. E. Desch. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

William H. Lowry to be postmaster at Ligonier, Pa., in place of A. U. Ashcom. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

John W. Biddle to be postmaster at Millville, Pa., in place of J. S. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Charles B. Illig to be postmaster at Womelsdorf, Pa., in place of W. A. Christman. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

RHODE ISLAND.

Arthur L. Taylor to be postmaster at Phenix, R. I., in place of Charles Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Gunnell M. Gorder to be postmaster at Frederick, S. Dak., in place of S. E. Olsen. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

Alice M. Lane to be postmaster at Hecla, S. Dak., in place of Harry Donovan. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TEXAS.

John B. Reneau to be postmaster at Munday, Tex., in place of J. M. Diggs. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

Samuel G. Allen to be postmaster at Front Royal, Va., in place of S. B. Downing. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Harvey P. McCary to be postmaster at Esmont, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

WYOMING.

Ora Sonners to be postmaster at Cody, Wyo., in place of R. J. McGinnis. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 5, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whose all-searching eye is upon us, we are grateful that Thy blessings are so freely bestowed. There is no price set upon the promise of to-day or the hope of to-morrow. The supply of the Father's care is boundless for us and for all mankind. In all our ways may there be unity, harmony, and conformity to Thy holy will. Upon us to-day do Thou bestow Thy blessing, which is the essence of the highest and the finest in the universe, namely, the presence of Thy Spirit. In our national life may evil elements be subdued and the good elements made more perfect for citizenship. Bless all citizens with robust intelligence and with a healthy patriotic spirit, so shall they be led to reaffirm and reassert righteous law, authority, and the Constitution of the Republic. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for, say, five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we had expected to be able to take up the first of the appropriation bills this morning, but circumstances over which we have no control makes that impossible; and in that event we had thought of taking up a contested-election case from the seventh Virginia district, but it is impossible in the time allowed to give due and proper notice of that matter to the parties interested, so that that measure will not be taken up to-day. In this situation it was suggested that we take up under a rule granted some time ago the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5823) known as the migratory bird bill, but those interested in that legislation have concluded that it was perhaps not wise to bring it up this morning.

That leaves us, Mr. Speaker, without any business which I think we could properly bring up to-day, and under those circumstances I think it will be necessary for the House to adjourn.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. The gentleman from Wyoming might state what the circumstances are that would prevent the consideration of a conservative measure like the game refuge bill.

Mr. MONDELL. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to having that bill considered to-day. I am trying to meet the views of those who I understood were interested in the measure. I am perfectly willing to take the bill up. I think this is just as good a time to have it laid on the table, or the enacting clause stricken out, as any other.

Mr. ANTHONY. I will say to the gentleman that I think quite a lot of the Members of the House would be willing to go to the mat with the gentleman on that proposition and see whether you will be able to do that. We are willing to try it. I do not believe the gentleman has the power to do it, even if he is the leader of the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, so far as the gentleman from Wyoming is concerned, he is perfectly willing to have that brought up to-day.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wyoming if he would mind telling us why he does that?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion to adjourn.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that motion.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have an extension until Monday next of the time in which I may file my speech on the merchant marine bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend until Monday next the time allowed him for the extension of his remarks on the merchant marine bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the merchant marine bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD his remarks on the merchant marine bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the present bill, commonly known as the administration's ship subsidy bill, and denominated in the act as the "merchant marine act, 1922," certainly carries out the policy of the Republican Party in the development, maintenance, and fostering of monopolies. In this act the steamship companies are preferred in every provision of the bill. They are preferred, and so expressed in the bill, as to sale of vessels, exemption as to both income and property tax as vessel owners, compensation to shipowners, and loans. Heretofore the majority party in Congress favored the special interests by opening the doors of the Treasury to the railroads under the Esch-Cummins railroad bill. The steamship companies, under the present act, receive a bonus from the Government more liberal, in many respects, if possible, than that heretofore awarded the railroads under the Esch-Cummins bill. In order, however, that they may both enjoy together the fruits of the bonus and compensation system, heretofore applied in name only to ex-service men, the present bill creates a joint board, an interrelations board under the joint control of the Shipping Board and the Railroad Commission. The Shipping Board and the Railroad Commission exercise unlimited authority in the control and operation of the great arteries of trade, by both water and land, in the United States and upon the high seas. They fix the rates, regulate the control, and govern with arbitrary power all the facilities of commerce. Let us now proceed with an analysis and consideration of the provisions of the present bill.

The first power conferred on the board under the act authorizes and directs an immediate disposition of all vessels belonging to the United States Government, composing that remnant of the American-owned merchant marine, and the immediate transfer of such vessels to the steamship companies.

Under section 1 the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable, all the vessels referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board, viz:

Any vessel either constructed or in the process of construction belonging to the United States.

The significance of this law is the departure of the last vessel of the American-owned merchant marine from the ports of the American people to the ports of the steamship companies. Any vessel may be sold without advertisement, without com-

petitive sale, privately and to any "person," which under the bill signifies a corporation or association, and at any price agreeable to the board—

Sub. (b) SECTION 1. Any sale under this section shall be made at such prices and on such terms and conditions, including the use or disposition of the vessel by the purchaser, as the board may prescribe.

Such, in brief, is a part of the arbitrary power conferred on the Shipping Board. The only proviso in this instance governing the sale of such vessels and which, indeed, is very violent I must confess, is that the purchaser has only 15 years in which to pay the purchase price, together with 4 per cent per annum which likewise shall be deferred for a period of 15 years.

You will discern also a marked discrimination in the disposition of such vessels. The bill specifically provides that the board shall not for a period of two years after the enactment of the merchant marine act, 1922, sell such vessels to persons other than those who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested in such lines. What lines are referred to and who are the "persons" named in the bill?

The "persons" are the steamship companies and the lines are steamship lines owned and controlled by steamship companies.

The domestic communities primarily interested in such lines are defined in section 2 of the bill, as follows:

Shall be understood to mean the geographical divisions of the coasts of the United States known as the North Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific, and the territorial regions and zones naturally tributary to such coastal divisions.

The board is directed in the development of its sales policy to continue as far as practicable all existing steamship lines and regular services and to endeavor in every way to bring about the permanent establishment of such routes and lines, to maintain the services, and to retain such lines and routes.

LOAN FUND.

Under the bill there is established in the Treasury a revolving fund to be known as the "United States Shipping Board construction fund." There shall be covered into the loan fund all moneys which at the time of the enactment of the merchant marine act, 1922, are in the fund created by this section—section 5 amends section 11, act 1920, to so read—as in force before its amendment by such act; and the board may set aside and cover into the fund all receipts of the board, except appropriations made by law and profits of the board from the operations of the vessels; the total amount of money covered into the loan shall not exceed $125,000,000. The board may use the loan fund to such extent as it deems necessary for making loans to aid "persons" (1) in the construction by them of vessels of the best and most efficient type, equipped with the most efficient and the most economical machinery and commercial appliances, or (2) in the equipping by them of vessels already built with such machinery and commercial appliances. No loan shall be made for a longer period of time than 15 years. The interest on said loans shall not be less than 2 per cent per annum.

INCOME TAX AND PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTIONS TO OWNERS OF VESSELS.

The owner of a vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more registered, or enrolled and licensed, under the laws of the United States shall, for the taxable year 1921 and for each of the eight taxable years following, be allowed as a reduction in computing net income, in addition to other deductions allowed by law, an amount which bears the same ratio to his net income during the taxable year attributable to the operations of such vessel as his gross income attributable to the foreign operations of such vessel bears to his entire gross income attributable to the operations of such vessel. Tax deductions shall be allowed the owner as follows:

(1) The amount invested by the taxpayer, after the beginning of the taxable year for which the deduction is claimed and prior to the time fixed by law for filing the return, in the building in private shipyards in the United States of new vessels of a kind approved by the board, to be registered, or enrolled and licensed, under the laws of the United States; and (2) the amount set aside by the taxpayer after the beginning of the taxable year for which the deduction is claimed and prior to the time fixed by law for filing the return, in a trust fund for investment in the building in private shipyards in the United States of new vessels of the type and kind approved by the board, to be registered, or enrolled and licensed, under the laws of the United States. If the owner of the vessel uses it in whole or in part for the transportation of his own property his gross income attributable to the operations of the vessel in transporting such property shall be considered to be such amount as is determined by the board and certified by it to the commissioner as representing the fair value of the service performed by the vessel in transporting such property.

In the case of the sale during the taxable year 1921 or any of the eight taxable years following of a vessel launched prior to January 1, 1914, which was at the time of the enactment of the merchant marine act, 1922, registered, enrolled, or licensed under the laws of the United States, and which was at no time thereafter up to the time of the sale under a foreign registry or flag, the taxable gain derived from the sale shall be allowed as a deduction in computing the net income to the owner. All credits on income tax allowed the owner of vessels under this act may be originally claimed by him in his return by simply attaching thereto a copy of the certificate of the Shipping Board.

GOVERNMENT COMPENSATION TO OWNERS OF VESSELS AS INCOME.

The board is authorized and directed, on behalf of the United States, to enter into a contract with any "person" who is the owner of a vessel for the payment of compensation in respect to such vessel. The board shall not refuse to enter into a contract for compensation to such person on the ground that he is not qualified unless such refusal is specifically authorized by an affirmative vote of not less than five members of the board. Such contract shall be made for a period not exceeding 10 years, and the payment of compensation shall be made at regular intervals, at least every six months. Whenever the board deems it necessary to do so the rate of compensation may be increased, provided the increase be not more than double the amount being paid. The rules and regulations governing the amount of compensation are set forth in section 404 of the bill.

IMMIGRATION.

Section 301 provides that at least one-half of the total number of immigrants to the United States shall be transported by such vessels and steamship lines as designated in the bill. And to guarantee same the Commissioner General of Immigration is directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as will carry into effect such provision. There is no greater menace to-day to American institutions, to American ideals, than the open-door policy in respect to foreign immigration. The indiscriminate importation of foreign immigrants into the United States would overrun our country with undesirables, criminal aliens, anarchists, communists, and reds—the sure breeders of discontent, lawlessness, and riot. It has ever been the policy of steamship companies to engage in the traffic of transporting immigrants to the United States. It has ever been the pronounced policy of the big manufacturing interests of this country to encourage, to foster, and to promote such immigration, their purpose being to obtain cheap labor and to break down the honest wage of the American laboring man. The present immigration laws are far too lax and the enforcement thereof is not as strict and effective as it should be.

Under the present bill you rather encourage the importation of aliens and hold out to the favored steamship lines a guaranty that they shall engage in the traffic with profit to themselves, and you back up your guaranty with such rules and regulations as to compel at least 50 per cent of the immigrants to take passage on such vessels. Special cable of recent date, published in the press, carries announcement that Europe desires and expects the United States to so amend, revise, and alter its present immigration laws as to admit 1,100,000 refugees into the United States. In accordance with the plan of Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, a tremendous mass of the civil population in Constantinople, Anatolia, and western Thrace will forcibly be ejected. The majority of this vast horde are Greeks, destitute and homeless. We are told that Greece does not want them, and assigns as a reason therefor the lack of territorial domain. Other European nations assume the same attitude. The final decision of European nations as to the final disposition of this vast number of undesirables is that they shall be dumped into the United States. M. Venizelos hastened to inform the European national conference that the United States will be expected to provide the necessary funds, equip and charter ships, furnish food and clothing, and upon reaching their destination house and support them until they become self-sustaining. We are informed also that Great Britain is willing to charter vessels to the United States for the purpose of transporting these unfortunates, and that an immediate appeal will be made by those European nations mostly affected by and in closest contact with such immigrants to the United States, and that we shall be expected to respond with alacrity. The first cost to the United States of this project, according to the highest-salaried experts, says Doctor Nansen, "will be only $50,000,000."

Under the bill now being considered by Congress, should the plan of Doctor Nansen, M. Venizelos, and others be carried out one-half of these immigrants, or 550,000, must be carried on such vessels as are named in the bill, for which the owners would receive as their share of the initial cost for passenger

service $25,000,000, and this in addition to the regular compensation for shipowners provided in the bill. As a member of the House Immigration Committee I am somewhat familiar with immigration problems. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, there were admitted to the United States 309,556 immigrants. Of these the largest number from particular races are, viz: Jews, 53,524; Italians, 41,154. Of the total number of immigrants for the period named there would have been required under the proposed bill to travel on such vessels 154,778, or 12,898 per month. It will be seen, therefore, that it will be greatly to the interest of the steamship companies to encourage immigration. These companies, together with the manufacturing interests, constitute the two most powerful factors in the United States whose efforts have been devoted to breaking down restrictive immigration laws. Indeed, we are informed by Winthrop L. Martin, vice president American Steamship Owners' Association, in a recent article, that the "most important of all is the section giving to American ships one-half of the immigrant traffic to this country." The proposed bill may be correctly summarized as follows:

1. Immediate sale of the present Government-owned merchant marine to steamship companies, hereafter to be called "American merchant marine."

2. Credit terms of sale of the merchant marine to steamship companies, term 15 years, interest 4 per cent, deferred 15 years.

3. Loans by the United States Government of $125,000,000 to the shipowners at 2 per cent interest; term of loan, 15 years.

4. Income-tax exemptions to owners of vessels.

5. Compensation to be paid by the Government to the owners of such vessels.

6. Compel 50 per cent of all immigrants to travel on such vessels.

7. Certain tax exemptions on such vessels.

8. Increase of compensation to the owners of such vessels.

Under the bill the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel, the United Fruit Co., and other great shipping corporations would not only be provided with free ships for transportation of their products but they would be paid compensation for such transportation.

It would be unjust and discriminatory—

Says the mouthpiece of the American Steamship Owners' Association, Mr. Winthrop L. Martin—

to deny the compensation provided for freighters to the ships owned by the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel, and other industrial corporations. However, ships of these great fleets will receive compensation.

It appears from the bill and the facts that the President of the United States, the Republican majority of the House committee, the Republican majority of the Senate committee, the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel, the American Steamship Owners' Association, and the Shipping Board have all fallen upon the same plan to float the American flag upon the high seas over the vessels of the steamship companies, and all in the name of "American merchant marine." Not only have they fallen upon the same plan but they appear to be working together in perfect accord, harmony, and brotherly love. I have incorporated into my remarks, Mr. Speaker, almost the identical language of many sections of the bill. The passage of this measure defeats, for the present at least, every hope and every dream of an efficient, American-owned merchant marine, and removes from the hands of the Government such a fleet and places it into the hands of steamship companies.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question. Is it the program to take up an appropriation bill on Thursday, and what appropriation bill, can the gentleman tell us, will it be?

Mr. MONDELL. We hope to take up the Treasury appropriation bill.

Mr. WINGO. That will be the first?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; that will be the first. To-morrow will be Calendar Wednesday, and the call rests with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I understand they intend to bring up first their Coast Guard bill.

Mr. WINGO. Can the gentleman tell us what will be the second appropriation bill?

Mr. MONDELL. The bill for the Departments of State and Justice will probably be the next one.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that when we start with the appropriation bills I think they should have the right of way exclusively until they are disposed of, so long as there is an appropriation bill before the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman state for the information of the House whether he has any intention of striking the enacting clause out of the Coast Guard bill or not?

Mr. MONDELL. Any Member of the House would have the right to do that if he were recognized for that purpose.

Mr. ANTHONY. I just wanted to see what was the policy of the leadership.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. I think perhaps I ought to make a statement in regard to this migratory bird bill, since I had something to do with it. I had made arrangements to bring in a rule this morning, but I got into communication with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in the course of which he told me that it was not convenient for him to take it up to-day. I have communicated with others interested in the bill, but I was unable to confer with gentlemen who might be opposed to it, so I thought it was not right to present the resolution at the present time inasmuch as I was unable to get into communication with gentlemen who are opposed to it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman from New York indicate when we shall have an opportunity to go to the mat on that bill with those who are opposed to it?

Mr. SNELL. I do not feel any responsibility in regard to it, and I am willing to take it up at the first opportunity.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman mind disclosing who it is that opposes the bill?

Mr. SNELL. There are several people opposed to the bill. There is no question about that.

SETTLEMENT OF EUROPEAN DEBTS TO THE UNITED STATES—LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by publishing a very brief statement by Mr. G. W. Duvall, of Cheraw, S. C., one of the leading financiers of that State, on the question of the collection of the foreign debt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A PLAN LOOKING TO THE SETTLEMENT OF EUROPEAN DEBTS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(Proposed by G. W. Duvall, of Cheraw, S. C.)

At present the general opinion seems to be that no stable conditions will obtain in Europe until these debts and reparations are arranged in some permanent form, and as it is generally accepted that the individuals and companies in these countries are in much better financial condition than the Governments, the following plan looking to this settlement is presented:

As to the debts due by the various nations to the United States of America.

Each nation to issue bonds payable to the United States for the amount of its indebtedness. These bonds to bear interest at 4½ per cent per annum and to be amortized at 1½ per cent additional, making 5½ per cent per annum, so that in 35 years 7 months and 6 days they will be paid in full. There being an agreement that only a small proportion, say 10 per cent, of this 5½ per cent be withdrawn each year, the balance being used to make up the capital stock of a trust company to be called "The Trust Company of the United States of America." This trust company to then lend to the individuals, companies, and corporations in each country the balance of the interest each year during the life of the bonds, withdrawing each year the interest on money so loaned in addition to the 10 per cent above mentioned.

To show in a few words how this would work out, suppose we take the debt due by Great Britain to the United States for example. They owe us approximately $4,750,000,000. The interest on this is $261,250,000 per annum, at 5½ per cent. They would pay us the first year 10 per cent of this, or $26,125,000, leaving $235,125,000 to be loaned in Great Britain. Figuring that the trust company loaned this $235,125,000 at 4½ per cent, we would collect the end of the second year $36,705,625; that is to say, $26,125,000 from the Government and $10,580,625 from the individuals and companies, each year increasing $10,580,625 until the end of 35 years 7 months and 6 days, in which year we would collect $381,764,525. At the end of this period these bonds would have been paid in full by the Kingdom of Great Britain, and the trust company would have invested in Great Britain the sum of $8,370,450,000. This amount could then be gradually liquidated, thereby clearing the indebtedness of Great Britain to the United States of America. The debts of each of the other foreign governments could be handled in like manner.

This would give a definite financial program, and in addition to stabilizing the currency of the various governments would vastly increase the trade of the United States of America.

So much for these debts. Now as to reparations.

The indemnity to be paid by Germany should be fixed at a figure of, say, $20,000,000,000. Bonds to be issued to the various nations in proportion to their valid claims. The interest on these bonds to be invested in Germany in the same manner as indicated above, and the

distribution of interest to each country to be in the proportion its share bears to the whole.

Should all of the above be carried through, Europe would have in process of definite settlement practically all matters that now cause so much uneasiness and could settle down to a definite and forward-looking program.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

AMENDMENT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE ACT.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to withhold his point for a moment. I desire to call up a bill from the Speaker's desk. I do not think there is any objection to it. I ask to do this in view of the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that he wishes to call up appropriation bills hereafter.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withhold his point of no quorum?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] if the bill he refers to is the one that he had up the other day?

Mr. FISH. Yes. It is all straightened out now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will withhold the point.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take from the Speaker's table House bill 8062, and to concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report by title, and moves to concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill H. R. 8062, amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$50" and insert "$20."

Page 1, line 8, after "reasonable," insert "and if the disabled person is blind, legless, or armless and is in constant need of a nurse or attendant, such additional sum shall be paid, but not exceeding $50 per month, as the director may deem reasonable."

Mr. SWEET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SWEET. Just for a question. That now applies only to those who are blind, does it?

Mr. FISH. No; it applies to the blind, legless, or armless, and not to the otherwise totally disabled.

Mr. DOWELL. Not otherwise totally disabled?

Mr. FISH. It applies to those three classes.

Mr. SWEET. It is broad enough, is it not, to include all those who are permanently totally disabled?

Mr. FISH. No; that was stricken out by amendment in the Senate.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we can not hear what is going on.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. We should like to hear it.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman propound his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WINSLOW. I should like to ask the Speaker if it is according to custom to have bills of this kind referred to the committee from which they came originally, before being considered again on the floor of the House?

The SPEAKER. No; this can be called up as a matter of right. It is a House bill with Senate amendments, called up from the Speaker's table.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from New York yield for a question?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Under this bill as it is amended, where a soldier is either blind, legless, or armless, he is still allowed $50 a month for a nurse, is he?

Mr. FISH. He gets $50. He received only $20 before. He now receives $50 for a nurse or attendant.

Mr. BLANTON. He now receives $50 in spite of the fact that the amendment strikes out $50 and inserts $20?

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman will read the bill carefully he will see that the first amendment does not apply to that. The wording is so involved that it might give that impression to the gentleman, but if he will read it carefully he will see that it still allows a man who is blind, legless, or armless $50 a month for a nurse.

Mr. DOWELL. Why should not a disabled soldier who is not blind but who is totally helpless be entitled to the $50 per month also?

Mr. FISH. I quite agree with the gentleman, and that was the provision in the original bill, but it was amended in the Senate so as to strike out those classifications to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman believe that if this bill is sent to conference there is the possibility of securing that $50 for the otherwise helpless soldier?

Mr. FISH. No; I have reason to think you could not get it.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, it is the gentleman's belief that unless this amendment is accepted the bill will be defeated entirely?

Mr. FISH. It is. I agree with the purpose of the gentleman and will be glad to cooperate with him to secure these amendments in other bills, but it can not be done in this bill.

Mr. DOWELL. It occurs to me that helpless soldiers ought to be entitled to enough to take care of them.

Mr. FISH. There is a big distinction. A man who is helpless in bed does not need an attendant, because he is in the hospital. A man who is blind or legless does need an attendant, whether he lives at home or in a hospital. There is that distinction. Of course, I would have preferred the original bill; but, rather than delay any longer furnishing necessary relief to the blinded, legless, and armless veterans, I hope this bill will prevail.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The question being taken, the Senate amendments were concurred in.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 6, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD and print the so-called "slacker lists," I desire to call attention to a letter from The Adjutant General's office, dated December 1.

It is my intention to insert these lists on the 5th day of each month until all of the names are printed. No good soldier will be injured by the publication of his name in these lists; but on the contrary, if his military record is one to be proud of, the publication will only serve to call attention to that record. If by mistake the names of good soldiers have not been eliminated from the record, it will be my pleasure and duty to insert in the RECORD the facts in each individual case and to see that the facts are brought to the attention of the Secretary of War, who is as anxious as any soldier of the late war with Germany to have the records correct. Mistakes ought to be corrected while the men are living and while there is evidence to substantiate any valid claim as to service.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, December 1, 1922.

Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have the honor to transmit herewith for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, 1922, lists of alleged draft deserters, which lists were released by the War Department for publication between September 5 and November 4, 1922, both dates inclusive. A copy of the statement to be printed at the head of the lists is also inclosed herewith.

There is also transmitted herewith, for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a list of the names of registrants which have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the RECORD, the reasons for such removals being set forth in the second paragraph of the statement which is to precede the lists in the RECORD.

Very respectfully,
ROBERT C. DAVIS,
The Adjutant General.

The following names have been removed from the lists of alleged draft deserters heretofore published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since the publication of such names:

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CRAIGHEAD, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

52 Ezra Boon Robinson, Bay, Ark. (Ezra Robinson, Jonesboro, Ark.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF ATLANTA, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1299 Jesse Wilhite, 10 Mangum, Atlanta, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 17, CITY OF CHICAGO, STATE OF ILLINOIS.

2654 Desmond H. Blondell, 6432 Kenwood Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF SOUTH BEND, STATE OF INDIANA.

775 Peter Lippert, 1015 Lawrence Street, South Bend, Ind.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 7, BOSTON, MASS.

4268 Emil Coirivean (Emil A. Corrivean), 189 Penbroke Street, Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 10, SOUTH BOSTON, MASS.

2101 Adam Mitchell, 5 Thomas Park, South Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHEBOYGAN, STATE OF MICHIGAN.

624 Thos. Casey (Thomas Casey), Mackinaw City, Mich.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

1412 Jefferson Benner, 23 West Fifteenth Street, Minneapolis, Minn. (Manila, P. I.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 6, NEWARK, N. J.

963 Albert Bennett, 116 Fairmount Avenue, Newark, N. J.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, SALEM COUNTY, N. J.

5120 Samuel Simms (Samuel Simmus), Pedricktown and Salem Road, Pennsgrove, N. J.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, WAYNE COUNTY, N. Y.

43 Peter DeSeyn (Peter DeSyn), Marion, N. Y.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DURHAM, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

2148 Daniel C. (D. C., Cravin) Howard, West Durham, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE CITY OF TULSA, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

4571 Charles Harrison Monreau (Chas. Harrison Monreau, Moureau), Fourth and Cincinnati, Tulsa, Okla.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MONROE, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

1071 Franklin Edison Wolfe, Mount View Hotel, Buskkill, Pa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 48, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

1766 Otto Heits, 119 South Fifty-second Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

1265 Rob't A. Jenkes (Robert A. Jewkes), 59 Holden Street, Providence, R. I.

LOCAL BOARD, DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF MEMPHIS, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2231 Albert Oates, 905 Almost (Almast), Memphis, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FISHER, STATE OF TEXAS.

449 Ben Enoch Stone (Storie) (Benjamin Enoch Stone), McCaulley, Tex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MITCHELL, STATE OF TEXAS.

434 Edmund Baumann (Edmond Bauman), Loraine, Tex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, STATE OF TEXAS.

851 Joe Diaz (Jose Diaz, Joe Dias), 600 East Commerce Street, San Antonio, Tex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MARINETTE, STATE OF WISCONSIN.

1359 Max Wm. Matt Ewald, 1602 Oak Street, Marinette, Wis. (231 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF MARATHON, STATE OF WISCONSIN.

186 Joseph W. Kamenick, Marathon, Wis.

The men whose names appear below, and who were under the jurisdiction of the local boards named, were, according to the public draft records, classified and reported by the draft authorities as deserters from the military service of the United States. The lists in which these names were originally included have been given at least one month's publicity.

The name of any man who, since the publication of the lists, has been found to have actually rendered service in either our own forces or in those of the Allies during the period between May 18, 1917, and November 11, 1918, is not included; nor is that of any man who, though he rendered no service during the period mentioned, has, since the publication of his name, been found to have been erroneously inducted or to have been erroneously certified as a deserter, nor that of any man who is known to be no longer living.

Every reasonable effort has been made by the War Department to eliminate from these lists names which, for any of the aforementioned reasons, should not appear thereon. Should it develop, however, that certain of the names listed below should, for any of these reasons, likewise be removed, notice to that effect will be published in each such case in a later issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COVINGTON, STATE OF ALABAMA.

1877 Thomas Ausby, Falco, Ala.
154 Otis Ballard, Montgomery County, Ala. (Andalusia, Ala.).
1461 Willie (William) Blocker, Falco, Ala.
1197 Will Bray, Andalusia, Ala.
1834 Lewis Brown, Falco, Ala.
186 Will Brown, Lockart, Ala.
1283 Homer Bascomb Carr, Florala, Ala.
1144 Mark Cawthon (Cauthon, Cauthorn), Lockhart, Ala.
398 Jesse Clayton (Clarton), Andalusia, Ala. (care J. A. Prestwood, Andalusia, Ala.).
840 Cefus (Cephus) Cochran, Florala, Ala.
1374 General Crooms (Croomes), Lockhart, Ala.
281 W. E. Crosby (E. Crosby), Lockhart, Ala. (care F. C. I. R. R. Co., Bayview, Ensley, Ala.).
127 Jack Crapp (Cropp), Florala, Ala.
38a Bellington Roan (Ryan) Davidson, R–A, Andalusia, Ala. (Rt. No. 1, Falco Avenue, Andalusia, Ala.).
2661 Ed Dennis (E. D. Dennis), Worth Cateon, Andalusia, Ala.
87 Eddy (Eddie) Howdy Beery DuBose Eddie Howard Berry Dubuis), R. C. (Et. C.), Andalusia, Ala.
2690 James Duncan, Florala, Ala.
1394 Arthur England, 41 Washington, Selma, Ala.
2709 Poney Foster, Lockhart, Ala.
1921 Houston Freeman, Lockhart, Ala.
2468 Curtis Fulmore, Lockhart, Ala.
247 Willie George, Castleberry, Ala.
1368 Elsie Gibbons, River Falls, Ala.
2198 Arthur (Authur) Giddens, Opp, Ala. (Benham, Ky.).
1608 Alford Hagans, Florala, Ala.
689 Carey (Cary) Harrison (Harrison Cary (Gary)), Opp, Ala.
1472 John Henry Holloway, Falco, Ala.
787 Guss (Gus) Holmes, Lockhart, Ala.
70 Homer Howard, Lockhart, Ala.
282a Benry Stephens, Jackson, Route E, Andalusia, Ala.
648 Charlie Jackson, Opp, Ala.
1117 Sam Jackson, River Falls, Ala.
645 Paul James, Falco, Ala. (Gadsden, Ala.).
2963 Edd Johnson, Red Level, Ala.
210 Frank Johnson, Florala, Ala.
2306 Eugene Jones, River Falls, Ala.
3016 George Jones, Florala, Ala.
3044 Lullie Jones, Florala, Ala.
2689 Willie C. Jones, Route A, Opp, Ala.
1986 Pink Jordan, Florala, Ala.
1079 Genie Kendrick (Hendrick), Florala, Ala.
2178 George Kendrick, Florala, Ala.
2460 Ben Tilman (Tillman), Kirkling, Route E, Andalusia, Ala.
1266 Tom Knith (Knight), Lockhart, Ala.
311 Addie Lee, Bainbridge, Ga. (Lockhart, Ala.).
2114 Tom Lee, Lockhart, Ala.
1644 Isaiah (Isaih) Lett, Andalusia, Ala.
1621 Robert McBryd (R. McBryde, Robert McBride), Florala, Ala. (Camp Hugh, Northport, Ala.).
1299 Lillie (Lilie) McFarlin, Florala, Ala.
1028 Oliver Melton, Greenville, Ala.
2268 George Merritt, Andalusia, Ala.
1705 Early Eugene Miller (Eugene Miller), Falco, Ala.
567 Will Oliver, Old Mill Janitor, Andalusia, Ala.
2673 John Pierce, Florala, Ala.
751 Oscar Potter, Lockhart, Ala.
2510 John Powell, Falco, Ala.
364 Thos. Price (Price Thomas), Andaluia, Ala.
2075 Fayette Pruett (Pruitt), Lockhart, Ala.
2182 Columbus Robertson, Florala, Ala.
2651 James Rogers, Lockhart, Ala. (701 East Main Street, Troy, Ala.).
402 James Rogers, Lockhart, Ala. (care Ida Rogers, Goshen, Ala.).
124 Joe (Loe, Joseph) Scott, Poley, Ala.
2836 William Daniel Sharp, route A, Florala, Ala.
585 John Wesley Sims (J. W. Sims, John W. Sims), Falco, Ala.
1881 Prince Sims, Poley, Ala.
1630 Benjamin Smith, McKenzie, Ala.
2048 Eddie Crawford Smith, Lockhart, Ala.
1543 Son Snell, Lockhart, Ala.
2359 Will Spearman, Florala, Ala.
2952 T. J. Still, Florala, Ala.
1323 Hosea Still (O. Z. Still), Lockhart, Ala.
1029 Ed Thomas, Florala, Ala
1770 Oscar Thomas, Lockhart, Ala.
1009 Essie Thompson, River Falls, Ala.
1749 Oliver Town, Lockhart, Ala.
1688 George Trawick (Travick), Lockhart, Ala. (Pensacola, Fla.).
256 Cliff Walters, Red Level, Ala. (Greenville, Ala.).
2918 Charlie (Charley) Osborn West, Andalusia, Ala.
44 John Henry Wilder, Andalusia, Ala.
731 Tom Wines, Andalusia, Ala.
1867 Gregg Whitmore, Florala, Ala.
1512 Jesse Wishop (Wisshop), Florala, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DALLAS, STATE OF ALABAMA.

932 Lee Armstrong, R. F. D., Selma, Ala.
1404 David Atwood, Orrville, Ala.
1203 James Bailey, Jeff Davis Avenue, Selma, Ala.
2227 Hardy Baldwin, Alberta, Ala.
2943 George Battle, Orrville, Ala.
980 Will Beasley, Perham Street, Selma, Ala.
2805 Edd Bennett, Selma, Ala.
1740 Edward Bennett, 1408 Washington Street, Selma, Ala.
545 Joe Bennett, Orrville, Ala.
911 Coras Berry, Orrville, Ala.
1613 Aberdine Bowers, Selma, Ala.
1197 Eugene Boyington, Selma, Ala. ("Raybell Manufacturing Co.").
1965 Morris Boykin, Selma, Ala. ("Dr. Harber's Quarter").
231 Albert Brooks, 908 (905) Griffin Avenue, Selma, Ala.
496 Dave Brooks, 1226 Bell Street, Selma, Ala.
2206 William Brown, Orrville, Ala.
772 Will Butler, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
890 Rozelle Byrd, 2702 Medley Avenue, Selma, Ala.
2591 Walter Campbell, Tyler, Ala.
2810 Andrew Carter, Berlin, Ala.
2049 George Carter, R. F. D. 6, Selma, Ala.
1995 Grim Cobbs, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
2579 Isaac Cole, near Selma, Ala. (R. F. D., Selma, Ala.).
2426 Alex Coleman, 821 Howard Quarter, Selma, Ala.
1509 Henry Coleman, Burnsville, Ala.
2294 James Cole, Tilden, Ala.
1463 David Cook, Lapsley Street, Selma, Ala.
92 Green Cowan, Pleasant Hill, Ala.
2884 Harvey Cowan, Berlin, Ala.
1343 Joe Craig, Safford, Ala.
523 Herbert Crumpton, Minter, Ala.
896 John Dailey, Orrville, Ala.
2665 Jim Daniel, Marion Junction, Ala.
1152 Thomas Davis, 1614 Minners Avenue, Selma, Ala.
2178 Jerry Dockery, Selma, Ala.
313 Albert Drakes, Salem (Selma), Ala.
144 William Cozy Dudley, 209 St. Avie (Ann) Street, Selma, Ala.
1794 Jake Dunham, Orrville, Ala.
2743 Will Evans, Orrville, Ala.
1518 Will Ford, Plantersville, Ala.
840 Jeff Foster, Pleasant Hill, Ala.
2201 Philipe Frazier, R. F. D. No. 1, box 52, Selma, Ala.
2409 Joseph Gardner, Safford, Ala.
541 Will Gardner, Minter, Ala.
548a Wm. Henry Gilmer (Gilmer), Massillon, Ala. (Merryvill, Tenn.).
93 Harrison Gipson, Plantersville, Ala.
486 Thornton Goldsby, Burnsville, Ala.
2415 Jack Goodwin, 1128 Morgans Alley, Selma, Ala.
960 Mathews Lee Gorham, Selma, Ala.
2841 John Henry Green, R. F. D. No. 2, box 62, Marion Junction, Ala. (box 56, Selma, Ala.).
1723 Joe Hall, Selma, Ala.
1781 Lewis Hall, R. F. D. No. 2, box 61, Marion Junction, Ala.
2105 Charley Hardy, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
1168 Dallas Harrells, Orrville, Ala.
1600 Andrew Harris, Linden, Ala.
1104 Jerry Harris, R. F. D. No. 1, King's Landing, Ala. (Selma, Ala.).
2323 Johnnie Harris, Selma, Ala.
1842 Richard Harris, 1217 Selma Avenue, Selma, Ala. (1217 Selma, Ala.).
139 Josh Hatcher, Orrville, Ala.

624 Sam Hatcher, Hazen, Ala.
618 James Hinikin, Eleanor, Ala.
503 Jesse Holmes, 504 Gary Street, Selma, Ala.
893 Jim Calhoun Horton, Burnsville, Ala.
2612 Willis Homes (Willie House), Orrville, Ala.
1748 Jesse Hunter, Orrville, Ala.
2853 West Hunter, Minter, Ala.
697 William Houston (Huston), Selma, Ala. (Selma Avenue, Selma, Ala.).
2301 Ransom Ingram, R. F. D., Selma, Ala. (Davis Dr. Co.).
1472 Oscar Irwin, R. F. D. No. 2, Box 11, Selma, Ala.
2161 Tom Irwin, Elders, Ala.
517 Ed. Lee Jackson, Selma, Ala.
1008 George Johnson (Jackson), 714 Green Street, Selma, Ala.
864 Tom Jackson, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
1412 Arthur Johnson, Lapsecy Street, Selma, Ala.
298 Arthur Johnson, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
2523 Dan Johnson, Marion Junction, Ala.
2211 Jake Johnson, Bialock, Ala.
2322 Lovel (Lovey) Johnson, King's Landing, Ala.
2424 Bill Jones, Eleanor, Ala.
1527 Eugene Jones, 1421 Jeff Davis Avenue, Selma, Ala.
1091 Mose Jones, Burnsville, Ala.
2357 Neal Jones, Orrville, Ala.
1895 Ben King, Selma, Ala.
2330 Robert King, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
839 Shep King, R. F. D. No. 4, Selma, Ala.
2107 Joseph Lacy, Marion Junction, Ala.
1900 Jim Lane, Browns, Ala.
1735 Isom Lawson, Ellis, Ala.
826 George Lewis, Selma, Ala.
2313a Jerry Samuel Holman Lewis, Selma, Ala.
518 Willie McCain, Burnsville, Ala.
1813 Isiah McCall, 700 Lawrence Street, Selma, Ala.
2407 Chas. McDougal, R. F. D. No. 2, Procter Station, Ala.
402 York McIlwain, 811 Small Street, Selma, Ala.
1448 Willie McNeal, Orrville, Ala.
243 James McNeal, Berlin, Ala.
2121 Johnnie McPerson, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
2359 Isaiah Martin, Berlin, Ala.
2083 James Martin, Berlin, Ala.
1609 Charles Maryett, 2502 Water Avenue, Selma, Ala.
583 Thomas Earl Mason, Harrell, Ala.
2238 Ike Mayberry, R. F. D., Procters Station, Ala.
950 Frank Miller, 1225 Landerdale Street, Selma, Ala.
1433 Will Minter, Calien Place Street, Selma, Ala.
73 Harrison Mitchell, Pinebelt, Ala.
2596 Henry Mitchell, Burnsville, Ala.
1299 Albert Moore, Post Office, Browns, Ala.
1729 Huntley Moorer, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
1281 Robt. Moore, 214 Griffin Street, Selma, Ala.
819 Roland Moses (Moore) Stroggans, 47 West Dallas Avenue, Selma, Ala. (47 West Water Avenue, Selma, Ala.).
1767 James Mooer (Moorer), Minter, Ala.
1058 John Morgan, Berlin, Ala.
488 Lemuel Morrison, D. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
2939a John Owens, Selma, Ala.
2734 John Henry Pace, 1120 Voeglin Street, Selma, Ala.
877 Thomas Peoples, Selma, Ala.
1356 Alfred Perry, Plantersville, Ala.
660 Evigan Pettway, Massillon, Ala.
97 Sam Ramsey, Burnsville, Ala.
2670 Charlie Rayfield (Rayford), Orrville, Ala.
2786 James Redding, Selma, Ala.
975 Corliale Robinson, Selma, Ala.
173 Dave Roberson, Orrville, Ala.
685 Will Robinson, Orrville, Ala.
889 John Rogers, Burnsville, Ala.
2072 Thomas Rogers, R. F. D. No. 2, Berlin, Ala.
2100 Emmet Allen Rowlett, 502 St. Phillip Street, Selma, Ala. (Emmit Allen Rawlett, 2955 Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.).
1190 Earnest St. Clair, Orville, Ala.
15 Walter Sharp, 221 Lameme Street, Selma, Ala.
1588 Henry Skiner, R. F. D. No. 2, Minter, Ala.
840 Albert Smith, Orrville, Ala.
2560 George Smith, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
8 James Makie (Mackie) Smith, 801 Baker's Alley (801 Baker Avenue), Selma, Ala.
2857 John Smith, R. F. D., Uniontown, Ala.
1981 John Smith, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
2333 Nathan Smith, Berlin, Ala.
1667 Clinton Soil, Orrville, Ala.
2829 Ezekiel Solomon, Bialock, Ala. (Browns, Ala.).
2236 David Stubbs, Orville.
2069 Charlie Sturdevant, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
1827 Arthur Taylor, 1402 Jeff Davis Street, Selma, Ala.
1678 Calvin Taylor, 146 LeRoy Street, Selma, Ala.
2619 George Taylor, 1123 Morgans Alley, Selma, Ala.
2039 Joe Taylor, Water Street, Selma, Ala.
375 Jim Thomas, Browns, Ala.
179 Willie Thomas, Orrville, Ala.
2797 Nehemiah Thrash, Kings Landing, Ala.
3 Otto Thurman, Pinebelt, Ala.
989 Charlie Underwood, Pleasant Hill, Ala.
1851 Morris Underwood, R. F. D. No. 1, Selma, Ala.
1236 Harry Vaughan, R. F. D. No. 2, Selma, Ala.
2888 Henry Lucius Wade, 304 Hardy Street, Selma, Ala.
1977 John Henry Walter, Selma, Ala.
99 Calvin Watkins, Southern Railway Co., Selma, Ala.
294 Lionell Weil, Selma, Ala.
490 Sandy White, Orrville, Ala.
2356 Fred Williams, 1319 Church Street, Selma, Ala.
1688 George Williams, Burnsville, Ala.
1056 Henry Williams, Masselin, Ala.
1434 James Williams, Beloit, Ala.
2732 Joe Williams, Eleanor, Ala.
335 Walter Williams, 2613 Pearlbam Avenue, Selma, Ala.
2189 Linsey Young, 13 Seventh Street, Selma, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ETOWAH, STATE OF ALABAMA.

331 Will Ambron (Ambrow), (Consolidated Furnace Quarters), Gadsden, Ala.
3737 Eligc Anthony, Cleveland Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
4576 Lee Herschel (H.) Bennett, Attalla, Attalla, Ala.
1278 Willie (Willis) Berry, Sycamore Flat, Gadsden, Ala.
2496 Joe Davis Billingsley, Attalla, Ala.
1795 Lonnie Birchfield (Berchfield), Foundry Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1042 Moten Boykin (Boyken), 2304½ Tenth Alley north, Birmingham, Ala. (L. & N. Section, Alabama City, Ala.).
3644 Ansel (Hansell) Bradford, 327 South Sixth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
897 George Brown, 817 Jones (James Street), Gadsden, Ala.
5908 Cager Bryant, L. & N. Railroad Co., Gallant, Ala.
2467 Carlton Bryant, 255 South Third Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3042 John Henry (H.) Bush, Attalla, Ala.
335 Walter James Marion (M.) Cahela (W. J. M. Cahela), route No. 6, Boaz, Ala.
1436 Homer Calloway, North Tenth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2286 Chester Campbell, Alabama City, Ala.
3447 Farlow Campbell, 325 Wall Street, Gadsden, Ala.
4383 Will Cargo, 626 Bay Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1666 Henry Carmichael, 715 Kyle Avenue, Gadsden, Ala. (Linden, Ala.).
2871 George Oscar Carr, 1024 First Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
2343 Willie Carter, Alabama City, Ala.
2050 James Chapman, Attalla, Ala.
4348 Robert Clark (Clarke), Attalla, Ala.
253 Frank Coats, Gadsden, Ala.
1163 Nathaniel Floyd (F.) Cobb, 702 Kyle, Gadsden, Ala.
2783 Ned Cobb, Alabama City, Ala.
2864 Wilbur (Wilber) Cody, Broad H., Gadsden, Ala.
1189 Tony (Toney) Coleman, 524 North Ninth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2842 Lazarus Copeland, Alabama Co. Furnace Quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
3149 Robert Craig (Craigg), Avenue E, Gadsden, Ala.
943 Jesse (Jess) Croft, 634 Birmingham, Gadsden, Ala.
3651 Milton Crooke (Crook), L. & N. Section House, Alabama City, Ala.
1629 Frank Cunningham, 301 Tuscaloosa Street, Gadsden, Ala.
4007 Son Daniel, 416 North Eleventh Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2451 Kelley Davis, 817 Bay Street, Gadsden, Ala.
757 Lewis Davis, 309 Third Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3141 Lewis Davis, Attalla, Ala.
1106 Luke Nixon Day, Attalla, Ala.
1326 Miles Jason (J.) Deboard, White Street, Alabama City, Ala.
4178 George Dixon (Dickson), Locust Street, Gadsden, Ala.
376 Joe Leearmer Dellard (Dillard) (Joe L. A. Dillard), R. F. D. No. 2, Alabama City, Ala.
3246 Rufus (Ruth) Drakes, Cleveland Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
4282 Edd (Ed.) Duncan, Attalla, Ala.
2599 Ezical (Egical) Edwards, 920 Kyles Alley, Gadsden, Ala.
4067 Robert W. Edwards (Robert Edwards), Altoona, Ala.
3281 Abe Flannigan (Flannagan, Flamagon, Flaningan), 216 Steel Plant Ed., Gadsden, Ala.
1 Beauregard (Beauregaurd) Flemming, 424 Keeling Alley, Gadsden, Ala.
1397 Lena Florence, 822 St. Johns, Gadsden, Ala.
608 Raymoon (Raymond) Forsythe, Attalla, Ala.
3580 Conrad James Fraleigh, 433 Fourth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1188 Joe Garrett, 60 Jones, Gadsden, Ala.
3715 Lee Dise Gray (Gary), Central Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.
1469 William Gates, Keener, Ala.
3461 Willie Gee, 445 North Tenth, Gadsden, Ala.
3941 James Gilliland, route 1, Attalla, Ala.
4447 Vergil (Virgil) Glenn, R. F. D. No. 1, Glencoe, Ala.
1311 John Goggins, 1012 Jacksonville, Gadsden, Ala.
2040 Leroy Goree, Gallant, Ala., care L. & N. R. R. Co.
434 Ed Grace, Alabama City, Ala.
3936 Walter Welsh (W.) Grace, near Chestnut and Third, Gadsden, Ala.
448 Johnnie Grant, Third Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3972 Chas. (Charles) Green, Alabama City, Ala.
472 Richard Green, Attalla, Ala.
1526 Elmore Griffin (Griffith), Attalla, Ala. (Gadsden, Ala.).
683 Jessie Griggs, 310 Forest, Alabama City, Ala.
2563 Jonn Hammoc (Hamoc), 228 Chestnut, Gadsden, Ala.
3133 Hirmond Hammond, R. F. D. No. 1, Alabama City, Ala.
310 John Madison (M.) Harvey (Hawey, Haney), Alabama City, Ala.
2235 John Wesley Hardy, Attalla, Ala. (705 Twelfth Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.).
2574 James Harry, North Gadsden, Gadsden, Ala.
4495 James Hayes, 1336 (1136) Fourth Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
3967 Marion Lee Haynie, Alabama City, Ala.
2861 Ozzie (Ozie, Ozyie) Henderson, 1081 (508) Tracy Street, Gadsden, Ala.
234 Ars (A.) Hill, Fourth Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
6 Edd Hodge (Ed Hodges), 917 (1917) Avenue E, Gadsden, Ala.
2033 James Howard, 228 Chestnut Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1078 Elbert Hunter, steel plant quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
3333 John Hutchinson, 719 Bay Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1324 Eugene Jackson, 2008 Steel Plant, Alabama City, Ala.
3387 Eugene Jackson, Gadsden, Ala.
952 Joe Jackson, Fourth Street, Anniston, Ala.
3167 Robert James, Railroad Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.
658 Charlie (Charley) Jarvis, R. F. D. No. 2, Gadsden, Ala.
3956 Will Jefferson, Attalla, Ala.
2953 Cecil Jemison, South Sixth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
641 Isac (Isaac) Jemison, Attalla, Ala.
2098 Frank Ransin (Ransier) Johnson, corner Fourth and Locust Streets, Gadsden, Ala.
2787 Henry (Harvey) Johnson, 412 Locust, Gadsden, Ala.
861 John Henry (H.) Johnson, R. F. D. No. 2, Gadsden, Ala.
3337 Joseph Johnson, Gallant, Ala., care L. & N. R. R. Co., B. M. Division.
2406 Albert Raymond (R.) Jones, Attalla, Ala.
863 Ed Jones, Attalla, Ala.
8836 George Jones, 167 Church Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2140 Will Jones, 516 Lamar Avenue, Gadsden, Ala.
4246 William Elbert (W. E.) Jones, Gadsden, Ala.
614 Adam Kelly (Kelley), Alabama City, Ala.
1090 Jake Kelley (Kelly), Alabama City, Ala.
1126 Walter King, 700 Kyle Avenue (North Fifth Street), Gadsden, Ala.
2726 Burl Knox, Furnace Quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
677 William Large, Route 1, Attalla, Ala.
609 Richard Lawson, Quarters, Alabama City, Ala.
2057 Tom Lewis, 496 S. P. Quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
449 Ward Lewis (Lewis Ward), 1127 Tuscadoosa, Gadsden, Ala.
4093 Will McBee, Foundry Street, Gadsden, Ala.

2881 John Henry (H.) McClendon, 648 Birmingham Street, Gadsden, Ala.
92 Ben McKeldry (McElderry), Broad Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1532 Green McElrach, Steel Quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
991 John McKinney, Duncans Alley, Gadsden, Ala.
344 Otis McKinney, Jacksonville Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2039 Dock (Doc) McNeil, Thirteenth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1914 Lee James (J.) Malby, 23 Sixth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3700 Leamon (Leomon) Manell, West Gadsden, Ala.
2780 Joe Martin, Alabama City, Ala.
2691 Joseph Martin, 627 Walnut, Gadsden, Ala.
3880 Ben Megginson, Alabama City, Ala.
1149 Ben Middleton, 404 South First, Gadsden, Ala. (900 Taft Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.).
2301 Harvey Mitchell, Black Creek, Gadsden, Ala.
2531 Eddie Montgomery, 624 Brothers Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3969 George Montgomery, 518 North Ninth, Gadsden, Ala.
2670 Arthur Moore, 4448 Kyle, Gadsden, Ala.
774 Clarence (Claude, Clarence W.) William Moore, 401 North Tenth, Gadsden, Ala.
855 Clements (Clement) Moore, 717 Steel Plant Quarters, Gadsden, Ala.
534 Jonas Moore, Attalla, Ala.
2347 William Moore, Attalla, Ala.
2345 Low Murph, East Gadsden, Gadsden, Ala.
76 Willie Nelson, 443 North Tenth, Gadsden, Ala.
3398 Ben Newberry, 1530 Cansler Avenue, Gadsden, Ala. (1825 East Twenty-eighth Street, Cleveland, Ohio).
3323 L. C. O'Kelley (Kelly), 122 Third Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1184 Roy Owens, East Gadsden, Gadsden, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ETOWAH, STATE OF ALABAMA.

1143 Allen Parker, Church Street, Gadsden, Ala. (Steel Plant Quarters Church, Gadsden, Ala.).
407 Arion Parker, 315 Church, Gadsden, Ala.
179 J. P. Pearson (Pearsons), 534 Fountain, Gadsden, Ala.
1857 Frank Perry, 225 Chestnut, Gadsden, Ala.
1260 Charlie Phillips, Gallant, Ala., care L. & N. R. R. Co., B. M. Div.
3927 Willie Osker (Oscar) Pierce (Price), 1509 Alabama, Gadsden, Ala.
1345 Hular (Huly) Pool, Keelands Alley, Gadsden, Ala.
2430 John Porter, 397 North Fifth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1267 Alexander Powell, 833 St. John, Gadsden, Ala.
3631 Charley Prater (Chas. (Charlie) Prater), East Gadsden, Ala.
768 John Prince, Alabama City, Ala.
4544 Will Quinney, Gadsden, Ala.
4289 James Rauls, Sixth Street and Railroad North, Gadsden, Ala.
538 Oscar Reed, 821 Bay, Gadsden, Ala.
2943 William Marvin (Wm. M., William M.) Robertson, 17 White, Alabama City, Ala. (H. W. John Manville Co., Alabama City, Ala.).
3019 Alfred Johnson (J., Aftn James) Robinson, 521 Foundry, Gadsden, Ala.
3279 Lucius Rodgers, Attalla, Ala.
2420 Lon Russell, Alabama City, Ala.
2895 Robert Scott, Church Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1704 Robert Shinault, Attalla, Ala.
1905 Willie (Will) Shorter, Alabama City, Ala.
1986 Fillmore (Filmore) Sims, 1009 Tuscaloosa, Gadsden, Ala.
1646 Tommy (Tommie) Slide, Birmingham, Gadsden, Ala.
2887 Arthur Smith, 327 South Sixth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
342 Campbell R. Smith, Alabama City, Ala.
3263 Leonard Smith, 327 South Sixth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
2135 Robert Smith, Black Creek, Alabama City, Ala.
346 William Marvin (Wm. M.) Smith, 415 Seventh, West Gadsden, Ala. (care Little Joe Barber Shop, Pratt City, Ala.).
1779 John Spencer, 819 Gardner, Gadsden, Ala.
4485 Ike Square, care L. & N. R. R. Co., Gallant, Ala.
4089 Louis (Louie, Loui) Stephens) (Loie Stephen), Steel Plant Quarters, Gadsden, Ala. (Alabama City, Ala.).
2589 Solomon Stewart (Solomon Steward), 948 Avenue E, Gadsden, Ala.
4250 Howard Stocks, 328 Fourth Street, Gadsden, Ala.
4456 Cleveland Story, Route 1, Attalla, Ala.
305 Robert J. Stridie (Stredic), Attalla, Ala.
2489 Robert Sullivan, Gadsden, Ala.
2632 Jim Swing, Attalla, Ala.
4200 Joel Jesse Tatum, 541 Foundry Street, Gadsden, Ala.
1786 Curtis Mack Taylor (Curtis Taylor), 315 Church Street, Alabama City, Ala. (care H. L. Harris, deputy sheriff, Wakefield, Va.).
1503 Alexander Thomas, 17 Norris, Gadsden, Ala.
2575 Dallas Thomas, Steel Plant, Alabama City, Ala.
1877 Will Thomas, 1012 Tuscaloosa, Gadsden, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ETOWAH, STATE OF ALABAMA.

3479 Stephen Tramell (Trammel), Third and Chestnut, Gadsden, Ala.
4394 Charlie Turner, 947 Avenue G, Gadsden, Ala.
732 Walter Turner, 918 Gardner, Gadsden, Ala.
1447 Can Vanderbilt (Dan Vanderbilt), Keener, Ala.
1207 Dossie Vester, Attalla, Ala.
3090 Leamon Wadkins, route 4, Gadsden, Ala.
1462 Will Ward, Attalla, Ala.
2862 George Ware, Attalla, Ala.
4496 Jim W. Ware (Jim Ware), care W. T. Cox, East Gadsden, Ala.
319 Alfonzo (Alphonzo) Washington, Attalla, Ala.
4337 William Clementine Warren (William Warren, William C. Warren), 22 Hix Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.
4367 John Washington, Attalla, Ala.
3859 Warren Watkins, Church Street, Alabama City, Ala.
2779 Lawrence Wattier (Laurance Watier, Wattier), Attalla, Ala.
1742 William Watts, care L. & N. R. R. Co., Gallant, Ala.
1291 Ernest C. Whisenant (Whisenaut, Earnest C. Whisemont), Attalla, Ala.
1365 Minson White, 656 Lister Lane, Gadsden, Ala.
1245 Willis Wilcher, Lookout Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.
11 Lovejoy (Lovejay) Wiley, Walnut, Gadsden, Ala.
268 Calloway Williams, steel quarters, Alabama City, Ala. (S. P. Qtrs, Alabama City, Ala.).
4421 Ed Williams, 407 Bay Street, Gadsden, Ala.
3582 Jim Williams, Attalla, Ala.
2350 Lother Williams, Attalla, Ala.
3611 John Willis, 911 Avenue E, Gadsden, Ala.
343 Richard M. (R. M.) Willis), Hotelle, Alabama City, Ala.
1441 Joshua Wilson, Altoona, Ala.
1134 Tom Wilson, Gadsden, Ala.
1095 Weldon Wilson, Alabama City, Ala.
840 James Marcus (M.) Wood, 64 Kyle, Alabama City, Ala.
1951 Jesse William Wooden, Kyle Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.
2912 James Wooten, Alabama City, Ala.
3407 Dave William Wren (Dave Wren, Dave W. Wren, Dave Wilson Wren), Alabama City, Ala. (Jenkins, Ky.).
176 Willis Wright, 1121 Jacksonville, Gadsden, Ala.
3804 Dave Young, back of plant, Alabama City, Ala.
4135 Elgie Lige Young (Elige Young), 1063 Kyle Avenue, Alabama City, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF ALABAMA.

1411 Sam G. Adams, Phil Campbell, Ala.
371 Joseph Albert Baker (J. A. Baker), Phil Campbell, Ala.
233 Robert Edgar Barksedale (Barksdale), Vina, Ala.
228 James N. Boyd, Russellville, Ala.
1501 Sim Byrd, Russellville, Ala.
1646 Lewis Clarke (Clark), Route No. 3, Russellville, Ala.
553 Willie Clark, Phil Campbell, Ala.
29 Burnard (Bernard) Lile Funderburk, Hodges, Ala.
1380 Willie Graham, Russellville, Ala.
1700 Richard Brooks Greenkill (Greenahill), Russellville, Ala. (care Auxford Mines).
822 Ben Henderson, Russellville, Ala.
970 William Henderson, Russellville, Ala.
44 Oscar Jones, Ruleville, Miss.
454 Emmett (Emmitt) King, Russellville, Ala.
1246 Anderson McNair, Russellville, Ala.
147 Alonzo Maddox, Russellville, Ala.
614 Charles (Charley) Moore, Route No. 3, Russellville, Ala.
1227 Walter Roberson, Russellville, Ala.
988 Ernest Sheppard, Route No. 3, Russellville, Ala.
1021 James Smith, Russellville, Ala.
866 William M. Smith (Wm. Meburn Smith, W. M. Smith), Phil Campbell, Ala.
674 Fernand (Fernando) Taylor, Russellville, Ala.
11 Robert Percy Tyler, Russellville, Ala.
684a Jim Upton, Hodges, Ala.
1303 Columbus O'Hara (O'Haro) Wells, Russellville, Ala.
53 Walter Williams, Phil Campbell, Ala.
533 Robert Henry Woodson, Route No. 3, Russellville, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HENRY, STATE OF ALABAMA.

720 John Tomas Brown, R. F. D., Headland, Ala.
491 James Martin Cain, R. F. D., Columbia, Ala.
1316 Jessie (Jesse) Cain, R. F. D., Ashford, Ala.
569 Fred Carter, Headland, Ala.
81 Wilbert Carter, R. F. D. No. 1, Abbeville, Ala.
1000 Wm. Henry Clark, Headland, Ala. (Route No. 7, Dothan, Ala.).
168 Forest Corbitt, Abbeville, Ala.
451 William Culver, Abbeville, Ala.
239 Joe Henry Falson, Headland, Ala.
246 James Glover (Glever), Abbeville, Ala.
486 James Grace, Haleburg, Ala.
1208 Lois Grimes, Headland, Ala.
1395 Malachi (Malichi) Irwin, Shorterville, Ala.
1281 Eddie Johnson, R. F. D., Abbeville, Ala.
1358 George Jordan, Abbeville, Ala.
1487 Charly (Charles) Key, Abbeville, Ala.
129 Telles Kirkland, Newville, Ala.
656 James Martin, Newville, Ala.
251 Dennis Pierce, Headland, Ala.
4 Joe Reynolds, Shorterville, Ala.
11 Tom Searcy, Route No. 5, Headland, Ala.
1529 Will Smith, Abbeville, Ala.
827 Doc (Dock) Washington, Abbeville, Ala.
282 Henry Williams, Headland, Ala.
195 James Williams, Route No. 5, Abbeville, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF MOBILE, STATE OF ALABAMA.

2508 Lonza Alexander, Joachim Street, Mobile, Ala.
2281 Nelson Allen (Nelsm Allan), Mobile, Ala.
284 Charles Anderson, 265 South Lawrence, Mobile, Ala.
141 Floyd Arnold, 254 Texas, Mobile, Ala.
61 Alfred Auston, 457 Selma, Mobile, Ala.
312 Dennis Bell, 302 South Franklin, Mobile, Ala.
869 Lawrence Bell, 807 South Franklin, Mobile, Ala.
2427 Willie Bell, 161 Manassas, Mobile, Ala.
815 Edgar Benton, 157 Adam, Mobile, Ala.
705 Alfred Bell Bixter (Bexter, Albert Bell Bixter), 806 Delaware, Mobile, Ala.
393 Charles J. Bowen (Charles Leander Bowen), Mobile, Ala.
2181 Ollie Boyd, Mobile, Ala.
31 Johnson Brockie (Brookie Johnson), 710 South Bayou, Mobile, Ala.
601 William (Willie) Brown, 257 Canal, Mobile, Ala.
1966 William A. (Augustus) Brown, 54 North Jackson, Mobile, Ala.
1684 Harry Brunemeyer (Brune Meyer), 58 Water, Mobile, Ala.
1491 Ed Campbell, 729 St. Emanuel, Mobile, Ala.
526 Percy Carter, 222 Davis, Mobile, Ala.
51 Oscar Chaney, 255 Lipscomb, Mobile, Ala.
1919 Mervin J. (Joseph) Cocklin (Conklin), 932 South Warren, Mobile, Ala.
1022 Sam (Samuel) Coleman, 110 Poe, Mobile, Ala.
2336 Ernest Sledge Conlan, Semerick and Brussels, Mobile, Ala.
841 Eddie Cossey, 162 North Royal, Mobile, Ala.
160 Benjamin Richard Coskey, Mobile, Ala.
542 Andrew J. (Jackson) Davis, 559 North Claiborne, Mobile, Ala.
597 George Davis, 660 North Jackson, Mobile, Ala.
2396 John Davis, 108 Earl, Mobile, Ala.
2111 Richard Davis, Madison between Royal and St. Emanuel, Mobile, Ala.
659 John Dugannetto (Duganetto), 459 St. Emanuel, Mobile, Ala.
1280 Robert Echols, 261 Lipscomb, Mobile, Ala.
1652 Andrew Evans, 924 South Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
1543 Hardy Franklin, 110 South Commerce, Mobile, Ala.
2542 Scott Garrett, Pleasant Avenue near Virginia, Mobile, Ala.
2378 Andrew Golden (Goldin), 101 South Water, Mobile, Ala.
636 Edward Govern, 304 South Royal, Mobile, Ala.
966 Albert Grady, 110 Selma, Mobile, Ala.
2246 David Harris, 15 North Jackson (14 North Jackson), Mobile, Ala.

1312 John Harris, 106 Commerce, Mobile, Ala. (Slidell, La.).
2067 Frank Hayes, 309 Silver (309 Eslava), Mobile, Ala.
627 Willie Hill, 305 Montgomery, Mobile, Ala.
754 Joseph Horton, 2635 Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
2013 George Hudson, Mobile, Ala. (Virginia Power Co., Sewall, W. Va.).
1316 Natharie (Nathiere) Hunter, 308 Cedar, Mobile, Ala.
1926 Sanford Irby (Irbey), 353 Bloodgood, Mobile, Ala.
902 George Jackson (Jakobson), fruit steamer *Fort Gaines*, Mobile to Belize B. H
2122 James Jackson, 159 Church, Mobile, Ala.
1671 Benjamin Johnson, 259 South Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
367 John Johnson, 156 Lawrence, Mobile, Ala. (222 Pacific, Stamford, Conn.).
907 Samuel Johnson, M. & O. R. R., Mobile, Ala.
2384 Cortney (Cotney) Jones, 455 Texas, Mobile, Ala.
1180 Frank Jordan, 505 South Wilkinson, Mobile, Ala.
501 Bert Kimmear (Kinnear), S. W. Palinetto and Royal, Mobile, Ala.
585 Ragner (Ragnar) Knudson, 3 Conti, Mobile, Ala.
189 Leslie Eugene Lancashire, 210 Marine, Mobile, Ala.
23 Aubrey (Aubry) McCoskey (McCaskell), 159 Manassas, Mobile, Ala.
804 Palmer McMellon (McMillan), 257 Adams, Mobile, Ala.
181 Richard McNiel (McNeil), 150 Washington, Mobile, Ala.
2605 Ruff Mack, 308 South Cedar, Mobile, Ala.
1752 William Martin, 208 Bloodgood, Mobile, Ala.
742 Ed. Mencer (Mercer), 255 Bloodgood, Mobile, Ala.
609 John L. Milburn, Cawthon Hotel, Mobile, Ala.
39 Mose Montgomery, Southern Railway freight yard, car-section house, Mobile, Ala.
1129 Robert Morris (Morrie, March), 155 St. Louis, Mobile, Ala.
426 Jimmie Moseley, Deleware Street, Mobile, Ala.
1477 George Oliver, 613 North Jackson, Mobile, Ala.
346 Richard Perry, 10 Mallon's Alley (605 North Claiborne), Mobile, Ala.
1623 Taylor Perry, 261 Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
33 Harry Plenty, 811 St. Emanuel, Mobile, Ala.
1762 Henry Powell, 308 South Cedar, Mobile, Ala.
1971 Hadden (Haddon) Robbinson, 1605 Jackson, Mobile, Ala.
1837 Carl Rosmussen (Rasmussen), Mobile, Ala.
1866 Walter Smith, Three Mile Creek, Mobile, Ala.
1716 Daniel Richardson, 304 Elmira, Mobile, Ala.
1304 Willie Roboron, "E" Conception and Bloodgood, Mobile, Ala.
1507 Arthur Rivers, 459 Monroe (458 Monroe), Mobile, Ala.
753 George Scott, 602 New Jersey, Mobile, Ala.
1963 Harold (Harrald) Scott, 813 South Conception, Mobile, Ala.
218 John Scroggins, 261 Lipscomb, Mobile, Ala.
1779 James Sigamoor, 607 South Wilkinson (713 Conception), Mobile, Ala.
961 Elser Singleton, S. E. Washington and New Jersey, Mobile, Ala.
320 Eddie Smith, 211 Bloodgood, Mobile, Ala.
2341 John Spates, 601 North Conception, Mobile, Ala.
832 George Steward (Stewart), 61 Elmira, Mobile, Ala.
52 Albert Suttles, 210 Texas, Mobile, Ala.
1782 Peter Theodoropulis (Theodoropulas, Theodoropulos), 55 Government, Mobile, Ala.
508 John Thomas, 601 North Jackson (107 North Conception), Mobile, Ala.
253 Moses Thomas, 608 North Franklin, Mobile, Ala.
92 Lafayette Thornton, 101 Selma, Mobile, Ala.
559 Charles Walker, 263 South Hamilton, Mobile, Ala.
1725 John Wesley, 16 Selma, Mobile, Ala.
2501 Sam Williams, 453 St. Joseph's, Mobile, Ala.
1378 Willie Williams, 411 Canal, Mobile, Ala.
1054 Tommie Wilson, 2675 Hamilton, Mobile, Ala. (care Department of Justice, Norfolk, Va.).
1546 Willie Wilson, 259 North Conception, Mobile, Ala.
338 Henry Witherspoon, Delaware and Conception, Mobile, Ala. (Mobile, Ala.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, STATE OF ALABAMA.

1478 John Henry Adams, box 71, Wise, Pa. (Montgomery County, Ala.).
979 George Arnold, R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
177 George Arrington, Sellers, Ala.
977 John Bailey, Sellers, Ala.
1210 Richard Bishop (alias Bishop Vickers), Sprague, Ala.
1568 Philip Brist, R. F. D. No. 2, Montgomery, Ala.
882 Elmore Brown, R. F. D. No. 4, Montgomery, Ala.
207 Will (Wiel) Caffey, Gray, Ala.
887 John Daniels (Daniel), Sprague, Ala.
671 Frank Davis, Mathews, Ala.
165 Jim Davis (Daviss), Mathews, Ala.
1588 F. M. DeBardlaben (Frederick Mann De Barlahere, Frederic Mann DeHarthabeu), R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
750 Will (Wil) Dickey, Sellers, Ala.
635 Eugene Dozier, Myrtle, Ala.
1639 Jerry Downing, Mathews, Ala.
1501 Toy Lee Dubose, Pine Level, Ala.
857 Wilson Duncan, Montgomery, Ala.
1789 Bessie Eubanks (Eubank), R. F. D. No. 5, Montgomery, Ala.
1718 Tom Farris, Barachias, Ala.
1359 Thomas Feagin (Fagin), Hails, Ala.
1062 Wm. Fielder, Scotia, Ala.
1428 Will Fishpatrick, Sledge, Ala.
279 Louis Flowers, R. F. D. No. 2, Montgomery, Ala.
1522 Eric Gordan (Gardon), R. F. D. No. 2, Montgomery, Ala.
155 Frank Gray, Snowdown, Ala.
1755 Charles Hall, R. F. D. No. 1, Ramer, Ala.
1619 John Harris, R. F. D. No. 1, Montgomery, Ala.
638 Will Harris, near Montgomery, Ala.
118 Dan Harvey, Snowdown, Ala.
1260 Eldridge Hearst, Snowdown, Ala.
1691 William (Wilbur) Hicks, Hardaway, Ala.
1367 Alexander Hooks, R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
440 David Hurst, R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
530 Henerson (Henderson) Jackson, Ada, Ala.
955 Sam Jackson, R. F. D. No. 4, Montgomery, Ala.
1117 Leslie Johnson, Myrtle, Ala. (710 Union Street, Montgomery, Ala.).
1366 Twas Johnson, Sprague Junction, Montgomery, Ala.
531 Ed Jones, Snowdown, Ala.
1154 Sam Jones, R. F. D. No. 1, Letohatchee, Ala.
746 Tom Jones, Hielliaro Street, Montgomery, Ala.
120 George Jordan, Hails, Ala.
292 Wm. Kelly, R. F. D. No. 2, Montgomery, Ala.
1817 Sole Kerlin (Kerbin), Snowdown, Ala.
581 John T. Lawson (John Thomas Lawson, J. T. Lawson), R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
916 Judge Lewis, R. F. D. No. 5, Montgomery, Ala.
589 Will (Wiel) Lewis, Hope Hull, Ala.
96 Willie Lewis, Hope Hull, Ala.
515 John Lindsey (Lindsay), R. F. D. No. 4, Montgomery, Ala.
810 Trust McNeal, Montgomery, Ala.
1146 Jas. (James) T. Brooks McNeil, Pine Level, Ala.
1150 Wm. (Willie) Mitchell, Route No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
1436 Sandy Perry, Mathews, Ala.
1293 Charlie Poole (Charlie Poole, jr.), Route No. 2, Ramer, Ala.
456 Mathis (Mathew) Powell, 947 Washington Ferry Road, Montgomery, Ala.
1249 Dink Poole, jr., R. F. D. No. 2, Ramer, Ala.
1299 Major Rawlinson, R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
248 Sam Sanders, London Station, Ala.
1441 Willie (Wilie) Sanders, Mount Meigs, Ala.
1745 Robert Sherman, Ramer, Ala.
943 Willie Sumpter, R. F. D. No. 1, box 36, Montgomery, Ala.
908 Jessie Taylore, Hope Hull, Ala.
1627 Jessie Townsend, R. F. D. No. 3, Montgomery, Ala.
1214 Judge Walker, Mount Meigs, Ala.
850 Jule Washington, Hails, Ala.
1546 Sam (Samuel) Washington, Tharin, Ala.
1115 Sam Williams, 453 St. Joseph Street, Mobile Ala. (Sam Willimons, Pike Road, Ala.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PICKENS, STATE OF ALABAMA.

792 Foster (Fouster) Bell, Carrollton, Ala.
1591 Manly (Manley) Berry, Gordo, Ala.
939 John Weldon (Wilbourn) Boyd, Reform, Ala.
676 Melvin Boyd, Reform, Ala.
1745 Henry Brown, Delma, Ala.
1093 Richard Chappie (Dick Chappie, Richard Chappell), Ethelsville, Ala.
1136 Will Clayborn (Clayton), Reform, Ala.
152 Tom Connor (Conner), Carrollton, Ala.
470 Willie Connor (Conmor, Conner), Cochran, Ala. (Tuscaloosa, Ala.).
1812 Henderson Cook, Route No. 1, Aliceville, Ala.
1546a J. C. Crawford, Aliceville, Ala.
704 Charlie Cunningham, Aliceville, Ala.
1175 Isom Dobbins, Millport, Ala.
66 Chas. (Charlie) Hun Dorsby, Reform, Ala.
1905 Charles Edwards, Vienna, Ala.
660 Charlie Fulgham, Pickens County, Carrollton, Ala.
1438 Henry Fulgham (Fulgrum), Stafford, Ala. (Ethelsville, Ala.).
1563 Curtis Gardner, Reform, Ala.
817 Jimmie Garner, Reform, Ala.
844 William Gathright (Gathwright), Carrollton, Route 1, Ala.
1278 Buck Giles, Carrollton, Route 3, Ala.
1709 Walter Gilyard, Reform, Ala.
1180 Walter Glenn, Ethelsville, Ala.
1098 Albert Grace, Reform, Ala.
752 George Green, Reform, Ala.
818 Marion Guyton, R. F. D. No. 1, Millport, Ala.
1228 Champ Harris, R. F. D. No. 3, Carrollton, Ala.
1019 Jessie (Jesse) Henderson, Aliceville, Ala.
1218 Andy Henry, Columbus, Miss.
1064 Henry Hinton, Pickensville, Ala.
1016 Dock Hood, Aliceville, Ala.
1930 Gray Horton, Carrollton, Ala.
1913 Joe Howard, Coal Fire, Ala.
805 Lee James (James Lee), Reform, Ala.
824 Rich Jones, Aliceville, Ala.
943 Murph Knox, Carrollton, Ala.
1305 John Lamar, Reform, Ala.
68 Rufus Lang, Ethelsville, Ala.
1198 Charlie Lark, Reform, Ala.
611 George Larry, Carrollton, Ala.
1312 Mack (Mark) Luke, Coal Fire, Ala.
1069 Bruster McGee, Reform, Ala.
1394 Wash McGee, Reform, Ala.
1634 Will Mack, Carrollton, Ala.
570 Earnest Parker, Route No. 1, Prairie Point, Miss.
1951 Will Pate, Reform, Ala.
987 Earley Pumphrey (Pemphry), Gordo, Ala.
667 Dan Partis, Carrollton, Ala. (Tuscaloosa, Ala.).
772 Albert Robertson, Route No. 1, Reform, Ala.
995 Willis (Willie) Spain, Route No. 1, Reform, Ala.
96 Marshall Stringfellow (Marshal Strigfellow), Carrollton, Ala.
323 or 325 Robert Strode, Coal Fire, Ala.
1182 Nora Sikes (Norah Sykes, Nora Sykes), Reform, Ala.
880 Emmet Taylor, Prairie Point, Miss.
865 George Tillman, Reform, Ala.
812 Andrew Tines, Carrollton, Ala.
610 Juley Watts, Millport, Ala.
1298 Will Watts, Aliceville, Ala.
657 Cleveland Whitfield, Carrollton, Ala.
1092 David (Davis) Williams, Dancy, Ala.
1447 Jeams Williams, Aliceville, Ala.
322 John Williams, Coal Fire, Ala.
1941 Johnnie (Johnie) Williams, Lothrope, Ala.
1234 Sam Williams, R. F. D. No. 2, Ethelsville, Ala.
1978 John Wilson, Gordo, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ASHLEY, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

534 Robert Williams, Wilmot, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CRAWFORD, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

885 Archie Coggs, Yale Hotel, Okmulgee, Okla. (Catcher, Ark.).
632 Walter Kenney, Alma, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CRITTENDEN, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

398 Phenis (Phoenix, Phenix) Adams, Clarkedale, Ark.
75 Burke Allen, Seyppel, Ark.
2810 Charles Allen, Marion, Ark.
91 Jim Allen, Hulbert, Ark.
1473 Henry Anderson, Marion, Ark.
1591 Walter Anderson, Crawfordsville (Clarkedale), Ark.

2199 Charlie (Charley) Arnold, Marion, Ark.
2053 Will Arnold, Earl, Ark.
2153 Edgar (Sidward) Badger, Waverly, Ark.
1811 Albert Banks, Menesha, Ark.
737 Subious Banks (Locious (Lucuich) Burks), Mounds (Hughes), Ark.
1685 Greer (Green) Barber, Edmondson, Ark.
450 Earnest Barnes, Jeanette, Ark.
307 John Bassett, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2583 John Bastick, Seyppel, Ark.
2262 Louis Beasley, Waverly, Ark.
1325 Philip (Phillip) Bell, Marion, Ark.
11 Sam Bell, 316 North Front, Memphis, Tenn. (Hulbert, Ark.).
1329 Green Betts, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2246 Willie Bishop, Waverly, Ark.
659 Chatley (Charley) Black, Crawfordsville, Ark.
82 Will Blanch, Marion, Ark. (care of R. L. Cheshare, Memphis, Tenn., 1118 Peabody).
2402 James Blanchie, Chatfield (Bruins), Ark.
2945 Andrew Bogan, Crawfordsville, Ark.
1140 Don (Dan) Bolden (Boldon), Marion, Ark.
2921 James Bolden (Balden), Pinckney, Ark.
1953 Carter Boles, Earl, Ark.
2732 Willis Bolton (Bolten), Cloar, Ark.
1903 Mat Boner, Marion, Ark.
2613 Edgar Bonner, Jericho, Ark.
83 Jim (James) Boyd, Lambethville, Ark.
157 Ike Bracer, Kanema (Simsboro), Ark.
2113 Ely Braxton (Baxter), Seyppel, Ark.
353 Will Bridgeman, Chatfield, Ark.
218 Henry Brown (Bowen), Mounds, Ark.
3209 Robert Brown, Crawfordsville, Ark.
1640 Will Brown, Hulbert, Ark.
2910 Will Brown, Simsboro, Ark.
2549 William Brown, Seyppel, Ark.
1826 Jezebell Bryant, West Memphis, Ark.
588 Eddie Buffington, Earl, Ark.
23 Oscar (Osker) Burns, Hulbert, Ark.
259 Emmett Burrow, Waverly, Ark.
6 James Butchie, Briers, Miss. (Crawfordsville, Ark.).
1055 Bennie Bussey, Ripley, Tenn.
1513 Jerry Caldwell, Simsboro, Ark.
2020 Isreal (Isriel) Calhoune (Cahoune), Lambethville, Ark.
1430 Ples Callahan, Hulbert, Ark.
1603 Butler (Buttler) Carr, Earl, Ark.
2572 Robert Carson, 84 North Second, Memphis, Tenn.
1303 Jessie (Jessiu) Chambers, Seyppel, Ark.
27 Ned Chatman (Chalman), Bruins, Ark.
2673 Johnie Childress, Seyppel, Ark.
2928 Charley Childs, Earl, Ark.
108 Ben Clark, Earl, Ark.
1904 Henry Clayton, Earl, Ark.
999 Albert Cobb, Chatfield, Ark. (Artisia, Miss.).
741 Henry Coleman, Earl, Ark.
2803 Fred Collier (Cotton), Crawfordsville, Ark.
537 Will Collins, Hulbert, Ark.
2440 Mose Colwell (Collwell), Wyanoka, Ark.
2941 Sam Conley (Coneley), Brandywine, Ark. (St. Thomas, Ark.).
1525 William Cooley (Coley), Earl, Ark.
1728 Clarence Cooper, Ebony, Ark.
2152 Ben Cowons (Cowans, Bennie Cowans), Crawfordsville, Ark.
2648 Ed Crittenden, Neuhardt, Ark.
938 Johnie (Johnnie) Crook, Grannuti, Ark. (Jeannette, Ark.).
2984 John Crowder, Clarkedale, Ark.
1664 Jeff Crum (Cunn), Simsboro, Ark.
1287 John Dabney, Vincent, Ark.
1260 Alex Danson (Elick Denson, Alex Denson), West Memphis, Ark.
2355 Marcus Darrington (Marcus D. Darrington), Edmundson, Ark.
2952 Joe Dawd (Dowd), Stacy, Ark.
1385 Frank Davidson, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2757 Alf Davis, Seyppel, Ark.
111 Frank Davis, Hubert, Ark. (care Mason & Huger Co., Nashville, Tenn.).
803 Ila Davis, Turrell, Ark.
237 John Henry Davis, Edmondson, Ark.
2985 Johnie (Johnnie) Davis, Hulbert, Ark.
2291 Lee Davis, Seyppel, Ark.
979 Tom Davis, Proctor, Ark.
2016 Will Davis, Marion, Ark. (Vincent, Ark.).
1460 Will Davis, Marion, Ark.
2302 Willie Davis (Dowd), Seyppel, Ark.
3055 William Davis, Chatfield, Ark.
1335 Coleman Dill, Earl, Ark.
262 Albert Dorsey, Lansing, Ark.
837 Sampson (Samson) Dowd, Crawfordsville, Ark.
896 Dock Drain, Marion, Ark.
907 Monroe Duckworth, Ebony, Ark.
293 Will Dunneghee (Willie Dunighee), Earl, Ark.
475 John Durks (Durkes), Chatfield, Ark.
2193 Frank Durren (Durrem), Crawfordsville, Ark.
442 John Henry Edwards, Marion, Ark.
752 Alonzo (Alonza) Eliby, Simsboro, Ark. (Forrest City, Ark.).
24 Lloyd Estes (Estell), Box 77, Ebony, Ark.
3217 Louis Evans, Edmondson, Ark.
2760 Checuk (Chuck) Evet, Mounds, Ark.
1034 Jack Farp, Earl, Ark.
933 Joe Fields, Pinckney, Ark.
2345 Ernest Ford, Edmondson, Ark.
2104 Theodore Ford, Ebony, Ark.
329 Frank Foster, Earl, Ark.
34 James Foster, Tyronza, Ark.
1964 John L. Sullivan Fox (John Sullivan Fox), Edmondson, Ark.
1204 Lebeirt (Lebirt) Franklin, Marion, Ark.
387 John Friend, Crawfordsville, Ark.
21 Charles (Charlie) Fulton, Turrell, Ark.
3166 John Fulton, Twist, Ark.
1284 Earnest (Ernest) Gaines, Jeannette, Ark.
2420 John Gaither, Mounds, Ark.
875 Hughey Gamble, Edmondson, Ark.
278 John Garland, Turrell, Ark.
1029 James Garrett, Earl, Ark.
1210 John Garrett, Earl, Ark.
1897 Walter Garry (Garrey), Neuhardt, Ark.
3077 Joe Gibson, Marion, Ark.
666 Johnie (Johnnie) Gibson (Johnie Giban), Turrell, Ark. (Heafer, Ark.).
1469 Robert Gibson, Neuhardt, Ark.
2593 Myer Gill, Lancen P. O., Catenenar, Ark. (Lansing, Ark.).
3108 Oliver L. Gilmore, Earl, Ark. (Sullivan, Ind.).
3039 Jeff Glover, Marion, Ark.
477 Miles Goldstein, Neuhardt, Ark.
542 Ben Gooden, Menesha, Ark.
2129 Clarence Goodlow, Pinckney, Ark.
2733 Frank Gray, Chatfield, Ark.
723 Will Gray, Proctor, Ark.
3260 Tony Green (Tony Green, jr.), Pinckney, Ark.
1939 Nora Greenby (Grundy), Clarkedale, Ark.
2371 Fred Griffin, Clarkedale, Ark.
3185 William Guess, Earl, Ark.
1550 Alfred Hall, Earl, Ark.
2522 Cart Hamilton (Hamelton), Crittenden, Ark.
1832 Mary Hanford, Simsboro, Ark.
1253 Scentell Hardman, Earl, Ark.
2980 Jessie Harley (Hurley), Seyppel, Ark.
191 Hudie Harrington, Earl, Ark.
1621 Edd Harris (Hardis), Marion, Ark.
2165 Fred Harris, Proctor, Ark.
437 Robert Harris, Marion, Ark.
429 Will Hart, Ebony, Ark.
1971 Cleo Hatchett, Lambethville, Ark.
406 Will Hatchett (Hattchett), Earl, Ark.
289 North Hayes, Lambethville, Ark.
3177 Eddie Haynes, Crawfordsville, Ark.
226 Luster Hellem (Hallem), Earl, Ark.
2370 Odie Henderson, Marion, Ark.
2284 Hugh Hense (Hence), Kanema, Ark. (Simsboro, Ark.).
788 Osiah (Isaiah) Henson, Mounds, Ark.
2413 Frank Herron, Mounds, Ark.
1806 Columbus Hickman, Pinckney, Ark.
88 Robert Hibler (Hibbler), Earl, Ark. (care of Dupont Eng. Co., Jacksonville, Tenn.).
2514 Cleveland Hill, Crawfordsville, Ark.
936 Ernest Jesse (Jessie) Hill, Waverly, Ark.
1449 Henry Hill, Marion, Ark. (Crawfordsville, Ark.).
2677 Alfred (Albert) Hobson, Chatfield, Ark.
3292 Tom Hobson (Hobsan), Marion, Ark.
1756 Nathaniel Hodge, Turrell, Ark.
2788 Walter (Waller) Hodges, Marion, Ark.
584 Lewis Holingshead (Hollingshead), Kanema, Ark. (Simsboro, Ark.).
32 Morgan Hollowell (Halwell, Hallowell), Jeannette, Ark. (Earl, Ark.).
522 James Honer (Horner), Mason, Tenn.
532 Walter Hood, Marion, Ark.
2143 Albert Hopson, Chatfield, Ark. (Osceola, Ark.).
2634 Albert Horton (Hardy), Twist, Ark.
30 Charlie Horton, Box 17, Crittenden, Ark.
25 Will Houston (Huston), Earl, Ark.
1529 Charley Howard, Earl, Ark.
2521 Jerry Howard, Earl, Ark.
2164 Tom Howell, Marion, Ark.
1860 Lury Hudman, Pinckney, Ark.
2601 Jimmie Hudson, 1130 Grand Ma, Monroe, La. (Bridge Junction, Ark.).
204 Will Hudson, Crawford, Ark. (Parkin, Cross County, Ark.).
656 Walter Huff, Marion, Ark.
2263 Harry Huggins, Waverly, Ark.
47 Ed Hughes, Bridge Junction, Ark.
560 Joe Hughes, Simsboro, Ark.
148 Prince Johnson Hughes, Chatfield, Ark.
2625 Allen Huinor (Huinon), Edmondson, Ark. (Marked Tree, Ark.).
496 Clayburn (Clayborn) Hulbert, Seyppel, Ark.
1687 Charles (Charley) C. Hunter (Charley Hunter), Earl, Ark.
1595 Joe Ingram, Proctor, Ark.
2993 Will Ingram, Edmondson, Ark.
757 Ed Jackson (Ed. Johnson), Turrell, Ark.
2073 James Jackson, Hulbert, Ark.
859 Joe Jackson, Jericho, Ark.
1615 John Jackson, Crawfordsville, Ark. (Hulbert, Ark.).
674 John Jackson, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2281 Monroe Jackson, Waverly, Ark.
1129 Anthony Jake, Marion, Ark.
2120 John Jameson (Jamerson, Neuhardt, Ark.; Jamison, Osceola, Ark.), Menhardt, Ark.
1848 Mack Jenkins, Hulbert, Ark.
1877 Auther (Arthur) Johnson, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2234 Clinton Johnson, Hulbert, Ark.
4 Henry Johnson, Hulbert, Ark.
2550 James Johnson, Earl, Ark.
2703 Ladrers (Landers, Landus) Johnson, Edmondson, Ark.
2156 Leroy Johnson, Hulbert, Ark.
340 Milton Johnson, Bridge Junction, Ark.
2019 Percie (Peirce) Johnson, Ebony, Ark.
2728 Robert Johnson, Seyppel, Ark.
2905 Sammie (Samie) Johnson, Clarksdale, Ark.
2541 D. Jones, Vincent, Ark.
3231 Everett Elijah Jones (James), Seyppel, Ark.
2304 Frank Jones, Pinckney, Ark.
68 Fred Jones, Bauxippi, Ark.
822 Maurice (Morris) Jones, Earl, Ark.
1723 Nathaniel Jones, Neuhardt, Ark.
1365 Otto Jones, Stacy, Ark.
2397 Will Jones, Hulbert, Ark.
126 Charlie (Charley) Kelley, Marion, Ark.
739 Wilson Kellogg (Kolloge), Crawfordsville, Ark.
2774 Eugene Kelly, Crawfordsville, Ark.
1781 Walter Kemp, Proctor, Ark.
3180 Joseph (Jasper) Kidd, jr., Simsboro, Ark.
1373 Monroe Kilpatrick, Marion, Ark.
1881 Johnson Kimbrough (Kinbrough), Earl, Ark.
2126 Simon King, Proctor, Ark.
271 Dave Knight, Edmondson, Ark.
3233 Price Kyle, Neuhardt, Ark.

1777 Tom Land, Crittenden County, Ark. (T. J. Land, 268 Winchester, Memphis, Tenn.).
2312 Preston Landers (Sanders), Earl, Ark.
1978 Will Lanokin (Will Lampkin), Hulbert, Ark.
663 James Larkins (Larkin), Twist, Ark.
658 Robert Larry, Marion, Ark.
1080 Buddie Leath (Leach), Jeannette, Ark.
805 Son (Sam) Lee, Earl, Ark.
911 Lee Lemons (Lemon), Marion, Ark.
2544 Allen Lesby (Lisby), Marion, Ark.
19 Charles (Charley) Lewis, Ebony, Ark.
3243 Will Lewis, West Memphis, Ark.
1637 Joe Lindsay, Crawfordsville, Ark.
363 Garland Lopp (Lepp) (Gastond Lott), Proctor, Ark.
2115 Phillip Louis (Lewis), Chatfield, Ark.
432 Will Lucas, Proctor, Ark.
152 Charlie Byron Lung (Chas. Bryan Lung), Tyronzia, Ark.
2556 Millago Lymon (Millige Lynor, Lynore), Jericho, Ark.
2977 Prince McAllister (McAlister), Crawfordsville, Ark.
2419 Nathan McCarr (McGear, McGeer), Bruins, Ark.
190 Benjamin (Benjamine) McClain, Mounds, Ark. (Indianola, Miss.).
1454 Gilbert McGhee (Gilbert McGee), Hulbert, Ark.
1956 Robert William McGhee (McGee), Pinckney, Ark.
2275 George McInnis (McInus), Seyppel, Ark.
3144 Charlie (Charles) McNee, Jericho, Ark.
2894 Tom Mables (Maples), Turrell, Ark.
3125 Willie Mabry (Mabrey, Will Marley, Marlin), Buins, Ark. (Crawfordsville, Ark.).
702 Louis Mahony (Lewis Matheny, Matheney), Kanema, Ark. (Simsboro, Ark.).
1507 Don (Dan) Malone, Marion, Ark.
20 Frank Malone, Lambethville, Ark.
3237 Albert Manning (Maninguay, Mannining), Proctor, Ark.
2161 McKinney (McKinley) Marshall, Bridge Junction, Ark.
376 Will Marshall, Chatfield, Ark.
145 Chatan (Chatman) Martin, Marion, Ark.
1378 James Mathews (Mathis, Matthews, Jim Matthews), Turrell, Ark. (Wilson, Ark.).
1984 Will Matthews (Willie Mathews, Will Mathews), Earl, Ark.
2237 King Mays (Hays, Mayes), Marion, Ark.
1729 James Meeks, Marion, Ark.
1570 Pleas Miller, Turrell, Ark.
1433 Willie Miller, Edmondston, Ark.
64 Jonah Mitchell, Edmondson, Ark.
1879 Bennie Moore, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2138 Hosea (Hosie) Moore, Waverly, Ark.
2216 Pete Moore, Proctor, Ark.
2850 Will Morley (Marley), Crawfordsville, Ark., (care of L. B. Pearse, Benoit, Miss.).
2965 Walter Morris (Morras), Crawfordsville, Ark. (Route No. 1, Jacksonville, Ark.).
3021 Otis Morrison, Edmondson, Ark.
2285 Earnest (Ernest) Mosley, Jackson, Miss.
582 Clenard Mumsion (Munson), Proctor, Ark.
2748 Luther Milton Murrow, Bridge Junction, Ark.
Joe Myers (Meyer), Crawfordsville, Ark.
2806 Son Nates (Kates), Marion, Ark.
3257 Henry Neal, Simsboro, Ark. (Hughes, Ark.).
3004 Henry Newman, Marion, Ark.
679 James Newton, Proctor, Ark.
612 Lon Nicholas (Nicholes, Nichols), Ebony, Ark.
133a Patzy O'Conner (O'Coner), Gilmore, Ark.
579 Dock (Doc) Oliver, Proctor, Ark.
2036 Jim Owens, Vincent, Ark. (Norfolk, Va.).
639 Luther Owens, Marion, Ark.
1486 Lee Palmer, Earl, Ark.
2010 Will Pardes (Parden), Seyppel, Ark.
1275 Arthur Parrot (Parrett), Edmondson, Ark.
827 Willie Parry (Will Perry), Lambethville, Ark.
3293 John Patterson, Waverly, Ark.
2851 Sam Paxter, Proctor, Ark.
2009 Joe Paxter (Paxton), Clarkedale, Ark.
2257 Robert L. Pennington, Earl, Ark.
2538 William Perkins, Lambethville, Ark.
1384 Nathan Person, Waverly, Ark.
2160 Sam Pertel (Partee), Lansing, Ark.
2140 Olive (Alvin) Phelps, Earl, Ark.
2974 Will Phillips, Marion, Ark.
2329 Arthur Pierce (Price), Coldwater, Miss.
1311 Elijah Potterson (Patterson, Eliga Paterson), Marion, Ark.
1222 Sep (Swep) Pounds, Earl, Ark.
3287 Andrew Powell, Earl, Ark.
681 Cedell Pratt, Mounds, Ark.
2580 Luscious (Luscuis, Lucious) Presco, Proctor, Ark. (Palestine, Ark.).
2719 John Price, Clarkedale, Ark.
58 Robert Lee Price (Robert Price), New Earl, Ark.
638 Faynie Proctor (Fonzir, Frynie Proctoe), Chatfield, Ark.
1980 John Pykins (Pepkins, Johnie Pepkins), Lambethville, Ark. (Olive Branch, Miss.).
2715 Jonny (Johnny) Richards, Jericho, Ark.
1077 Henry Riley, Clarkedale, Ark.
1096 Roy Roberts, Kanema, Ark. (Simsboro, Ark.).
1423 Abe Robinson, Hulbert, Ark.
29 Dan Robinson, Eaner, Ark. (Earl, Ark.).
1419 Aaron (Aron) Rosby, Wyanoka, Ark. (Philipp, Miss.).
2149 Howard Curtis Ross, Hulbert, Ark.
2128 David Rowell (Rowel), Crawfordsville, Ark.
2938 Will Rufus, Gavin, Ark. (Marion, Ark.).
1179 Lincoln Sanders, Grassy Lake, Ark.
2631 Robert Sanders, Hulbert, Ark.
2961 Rome Sanders, jr. (Rome Sanders), Stacy, Ark.
2563 Haywood Sanford, Marion, Ark.
1959 Eddie Scott, Seyppel, Ark.
1720 Gilbert Scott, Turrell, Ark.
2213 John Scott, Chatfield, Ark.
178 Chalmers Self, Neuhardt, Ark.
3141 Andrew Shaw (Show), Stacy, Ark.
565 General Shaw, Pinckney, Ark.
2374 Henry Shaw, Pinckney, Ark.
1441 Hezekiah Shelby (Shelly), Earl, Ark. (Twist, Ark.).
1901 Andrew Shuford, Clarkedale, Ark.
2463 Calvin Shumprint (Shrimprint), Neuhardt, Ark.
2754 Charley Simms (Sims, Charles Sims), Seyppel, Ark.
2137 Frank Sims, Proctor, Ark.
273 Lee Sims, Earl, Ark.
786 Ollie Simms (Sims), 416 Clinton, Huntsville, Ala.
397 Allen Smith, Proctor, Ark.
2077 Clifford Earl (Earle) Smith, Ebony, Ark. (Marion, Ark.).
447 Ed Smith, Seyppel, Ark.
1495 Fred Smith, Hulbert, Ark.
2778 Jessie Smith, Stacy, Ark.
1181 Oliver (Ollie) Smith, Kanema (Simsboro), Ark. (Earl, Ark.).
2943 Robert Smith, Waverly, Ark.
2457 Sylvester Smith, Crittenden, Ark.
465 Walter Smith, Neuhardt, Ark.
2244 Willie Smith, Crawfordsville, Ark. (Chatfield, Ark.).
2798 Joe Spencer, Hulbert, Ark.
3151 Eli (E. S.) Stevenson, Vincent, Ark.
2891 Curtis Stovall, Gilmore, Ark.
1761 Lucions Stovall, Turrell, Ark.
2473 Charlie (Charles) Strong, Heth, Ark.
1623 Jim Summonds (Simmonds), Proctor, Ark.
1840 John Summonds (Simmonds), Proctor, Ark.
313 Hasson Sumpkin (Hassen Sumpkins), Proctor, Ark.
2148 Eugene Swain (Swoin), Clarkedale, Ark.
840 William Sykes (Sypes, Will Sypes), Crawfordsville, Ark.
813 Nedham (Neland, Neelam) Tate, Crittenden, Ark.
983 Earle (Earl) Taylor, Bridge Junction, Ark.
1697 General Taylor, Hulbert, Ark.
2315 James Taylor, Chatfield, Ark.
3272 John H. (Hy) Taylor, Earl, Ark.
3143 William Taylor, Earl, Ark.
316 William Tells (Tello, Tell), Mounds, Ark.
35 John Tempton, Lansing, Ark.
2078 Ben Thomas, Hulbert, Ark.
1246 Elbert Thomas (Elbert T. Thomas), Waverly, Ark.
636 John Thomas, Crawfordsville, Ark.
1280 John Thomas (Thanios), Turrell, Ark.
1786 Sam Thomas, West Memphis, Ark.
869 Ashley Thompson, Marion, Ark.
1864 Datius (Datis, Dastis) Thompson, Proctor, Ark.
1338 Donous (Darious) Thompson, Bruins, Ark.
535 Eugene Thompson, Gilmore, Ark.
3267 Oliver Thompson, Clinton, Ark.
2577 Will Titus, Stacy, Ark.
2632 William Townsend (Townsand), Vincent, Ark.
2660 Charley Trotter (Trotted), Kanema, Ark. (Hughes, Ark.).
463 Will Tucker, Waverly, Ark.
294 Odell Turner, Vincent, Ark. (Parkin, Ark.).
2599 Saul Vine (Vince), Lansing, Ark.
1186 Robert Walker, Clarkedale, Ark.
2401 Virge Walker, Simsboro, Ark.
1836 George Washington, Earl, Ark.
2497½ George Washington, Marion, Ark.
1810 James Washington, Crawfordsville, Ark.
2621 Winfield Washington, Proctor, Ark.
548 Turner Watson, Wyanoke, Ark. (Phillips, Miss.).
15 Isah (Isaiah) Webb, Clarkedale, Ark.
914 Jeff Wells (Walls), Proctor, Ark.
1190 Robert Lee West, Bridge Junction, Ark.
1138 Bailey White, Earl, Ark.
722 Franzy (Fonzy) White, Neuhardt, Ark.
2336 John White, Jericho, Ark.
817 Dan Whitehead, Hulbert, Ark.
531 Allen Whittington, Edmondson, Ark.
246 Morgan Wilkerson, Pinckney, Ark.
923 Elijah (Eliza, Eliga) Wilkins, Menesha, Ark.
1609 Alex Williams, Crawfordsville, Ark.
475 Arthur Williams, Crittenden, Ark.
2709 Calvin Williams, Marion, Ark.
1888 Charley Williams, Seyppel, Ark. (Earl, Ark.).
3092 Conie (Cario, Cairo) Williams, Marion, Ark.
467 Dennis Williams (Wade), Bauxite, Ark. (Wyanoke, Ark.).
2293 Ed Williams, Hulbert, Ark.
743 Ed (Edd, Eddie) Williams, Marion, Ark.
1464 James Williams, Marion, Ark. (Earl, Ark.).
2831 John Williams, Pinckney, Ark.
1614 King Williams, Edmondson, Ark.
1645 Leonard (Lenard) Williams, Vincent, Ark.
2566 Robert (Tobert) Williams, Lambethville, Ark.
2181 Will Williams, Lambethville, Ark.
1775 Sam Wills, Vincent, Ark.
661 Ed Wilson, Earl, Ark.
951 Henry Wilson, Marion, Ark.
1268 Mose Wilson, Pinckney, Ark. (Brinkley, Ark.).
1476 Pleas Wilson, Bruins, Ark.
2846 Monnie Winston, Waverly, Ark.
135 Pete Witherspoon, Marion, Ark.
2195 Frank Woodard, Mounds, Ark.
1638 Aukton Wortham, Edmondson, Ark.
852 Albert Wright, Proctor, Ark.
874 John Wright, Earl, Ark.
2367 Henry Young, Jericho, Ark.
105 John Young, Crawfordsville, Ark.
3061 Sam Young, McClure, Ark.
510 Emmett (Emmitt) Meacham, Earle, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HOWARD, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

528 Charlie (Charles) Ewing, Lufkin, Tex. (Dierks Lbr. and Coal Co., Dierks, Ark., Mansfield, La.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

673 Harvey Mitchell, 405 South Cherry St., Pine Bluff, Ark. (510 Pullen, Pine Bluff, Ark.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LEE, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

2021 George Wilson, R. F. D. No. 3, Marianna, Ark. (Marianna, Ark.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LOGAN, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

754a Thomas (Thos.) G. Scott, Booneville, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MONROE, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

465 Richard Campbell, Duncan, Ark. (Clarendon, Ark., care of G. B. Lambert Co., Elaine, Ark).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF OUACHITA, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

1472 Addison Lee, Camden, Ark. (Odie B. Lee, Millville, Ark., Millville, Ark.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ST. FRANCIS, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

1191 Tyree Jones Crossian (Tyree Crossian), Forrest City, Ark.
81 James Cunningham, Heth, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WOODRUFF, STATE OF ARKANSAS.

660 Andrew J. Young (Andrew Jackson Young, A. J. Young), Cotton Plant, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

5689 Dwight Moody (M.) Anderson, 228 Embarcadera Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Dwight Anderson, 228 the Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif., 228 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.)
3114 Clinton Edward (Edw.) Cason, Y. M. C. A., East Street, San Francisco, Calif., 1318 McDonald Avenue, Richmond, Calif., 545 O Street, Fresno, Calif.).
305 John O. Chambers, 74 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4100a Neil Leo (N. L., Neil L.) DeVore, 228 Embarcadero Street, San Francisco, Calif. (228 East, San Francisco, Calif.).
1773a Thomas Edward Hickey (T. E., Thomas E., Thomas E. Hackey), 115 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4980 Earl Marion (M.) Hitt (Earl M. Hett), 153 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4188a John H. (J. H.) Kincaid, 228 Embarcadero Street, San Francisco, Calif. (228 East, San Francisco, Calif.).
4907a Claude Massengill, 714 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Weed, Calif.).
3357 Charles (Chas.) Peterson, 753 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2961a Maurice R. (Maurice P.) Smith, 190 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Ina, Ill.).
5203 Roy Staufft, 9 Mission Street, care of Annie Johnson, San Francisco, Calif.
2647a Fred A. (F. A.) Sturdivant, United States marshal's custody, San Francisco, Calif.
923 Joe Cambra (Joe Cambar), San Leandro, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF BERKELEY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

88 John F. (John Francis, J. F.) Shippie, 2217 Fulton Street, Berkeley, Calif. (1011 Fifty-third Street, Oakland, Calif.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2733a Joseph (Jose) Batros, Rodeo, Calif.
1052 Harry Lee Burns, box 37, Port Richmond, Calif.
992 Tony Burallo (Burello), 456 D Street, Richmond, Calif.
1335 Edward William Clark, 218 Barrett Street, Richmond, Calif.
183 Timothy Collins, 50 Washington Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
1216 Harney A. Cook (Harvey Allen Cook, H. A. Cook), Hercules, Calif.
955 John Garcia Cunha, R. F. D. 480 (490), Richmond, Calif.
2088 Albert Frank Dallies (Dalleis), Hercules, Calif.
3513a Albert Deering (Doering), Wenk Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
714 Andreas Garcis (Andres Garcia), 456 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (456 Third Street, Richmond, Calif.).
402 Grover A. Gartley (Grover Arthur Gartley), Pinole, Calif.
305 William J. Griffin, 40 Cottage Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
1515 Victor Hagstrom (Haystrom), 536 Pullman Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
2783 Albert Robert Juillerat (Juillerat), 141 South Fifth Street, Richmond, Calif.
2336 Jeremiah Kelleher, 100 Ohio Street, Richmond, Calif.
102 Quidi Eustol (Guido Kustel), 1 Richmond Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
480 Victor Largo, Pinola, Calif.
2731 Jack LaRue, Hercules, Calif.
1284 Cristolbal Lavin (Christobal Lavin, Cristoval Lavin), San Pablo Quarry, Richmond, Calif.
400 Stephen Leahy, Oleum, Calif.
950 Patrick Lyons, 12 Standard Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
2074 Peter Martin McDonough, 40 Cottage Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
2144 James Molinari (Molinan), 16–18 Mancilla (Mancella) Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
956 William T. Muhlenfeld (William Thomas Muhlenfield, jr.), San Pablo Dam, Calif.
1028 William James Overton, 314 Ninth Street, Richmond, Calif.
1902 Walter Felix Parks, 1706 Macdonald (McDonald) Street (Avenue), Richmond, Calif.
2109 John Ranta, 420 Ninth Street, Richmond, Calif.
1292 Lewis G. Reid (Lewis Garnet Reid), Pinole, Calif.
841 Isedro Tauji (Isidro Tauja), Pinole, Calif.
899 John Joseph Wall, 315 Nevin Avenue, Richmond, Calif.
2229 Harry Welsh, Pinole, Calif.
916½ Herbert Wilson, Hercules, Calif.
2697 Lee Zou (You), Tormey, Calif.
1969 John Madsen (Madson), Hercules, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF FRESNO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1905 Homer Clarence Allan (Allen), Oilfield, Calif.
380 Mark Banchero, Firebaugh, Calif.
70 Elvia Brannon, Sentinel, Mo.
2085 Robt. Pawliton Bolen (Robert Pawhiton Bolen, R. Boeln), Firebaugh, Calif.
93 Victor W. Brown, Fresno, Calif. (box 571, Oakdale, Calif.).
2796 Dante (Danta) Casini, Firebaugh, Calif.
2180 Agapito (Agapite) Carrillo, general delivery, Coalinga, Calif.
1962 Antonio Castillo (Antonia Costello), Laton, Calif.
2442 James Daly, Camp 3 B. B., care of Southern Pacific Co., Ingle, Calif.
25 Arthur Hubert Dreiser, San Joaquin, Calif. (A. H. Driser, care of Spreckles Ranch No. 11, Greenfield, Calif.).
1913 Gee Duck, Coalinga, Calif. (care of C. A. Fox, Taft, Calif.).
643 James Patrick Enright, San Joaquin, Calif.
1062 Moises Leon Escajeda, San Joaquin, Calif.
2549 Virda Gaw, Route 1, Cookeville, Tenn. (Cleveland, Okla.).
2040 Leo Giannoni, Firebaugh, Calif.
3490 Lee Bock Gin, 185 F Street, Coalinga, Calif.
2174 Luis Gonzales (Gonzalez), Firebaugh, Calif.
1011 Samuel Gould, general delivery, Coalinga, Calif.
2275 Lorenz Gregory (Gregory Lorenz, Lawrence Gregory), Firebaugh, Calif.
3583 Jose Gutterez, Curinizio, Mexico (care of extra gang, Southern Pacific Co., S. J. V. Division, Kingsburg, Calif.).
2744 Boskick R. Hall, general delivery, Coalinga, Calif. (Bostwick R. Hall, Oilfields, Calif.).
1142 Hubert Harry Hathway (Hathaway, H. H. Hathaway).
3239 Frank Imlig, 663 Clay, San Francisco, Calif. (Pleasant Valley, Fram Co., Coalinga, Calif.).
2689 Frank Jennings, R. R. H., box 151A, Fresno, Calif.
2844 Ruan Jugio (Rodrigeo Jugio, Lugio Rodriges, Lusio Ruan, Lusio Rodriges), Mondota, Calif.
2746½ Antony Kraling, care of Pan American Co., Taft, Calif. (132 East "C" Street, Coaling, Calif.).
2384 John Leahy, American 30, Coalinga, Calif.
1027 Stanislaus Levusky (Stinis F. Levusky), Firebaugh, Calif.
864 Frank Lewis, Caruthers, Calif.
4123 Fred Calvin Love, Route A, box 169, Laton, Calif. (Fred Love, Modesto, Calif.).
1028 Dong Yook Low, Kakrgabe, Canton, China (Kern Trading & Oil Co., Coalingo, Calif.).
2559 Manuel Martinez, Chihuahua, Mexico (care of M. G. Rose, Lulare, Calif.; Southern Pacific Co., Huron, Calif.).
439 Francisco Masquez (Marquez), Fowler, Calif.
1703 John Michel, care of M. B. Thornton, C. C., R. D., N. R., Calgary, Alberta, Canada (Laton, Calif.).
2758 Festy Murphy, Oilfields, Calif.
889 Joseph Oliveas, Fowler, Calif.
959 Fay Pickford, Oaks Apartments, C. Ct., Coalinga, Calif.
558 James Plummer, 540 Bates Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (San Joaquin Valley Farm Lands Co., San Joaquin, Calif.).
2745 Linza H. Pope, 547 Washington, Coalinga, Calif.
3226 Joe Poaquin Preira, Hanford, Calif.
408 Archie Puckett, Firebaugh, Calif.
3555 Frank Reilly (Riley), 330 Fifth Street, Firebaugh, Calif. (330 Fifth Street, Oakland, Calif.).
2035 Manuel Rodrigues, San Joaquin, Calif.
891 Margarito Salaz (Salos), Kerman, Calif.
2127 Estevan Selvestre (Silvestra), Kingsburg, Calif.
696 John Bernard Stearnes, San Francisco, Calif. (J. B. Stearns, Coalinga, Calif.; care of Burnett Sanitarium, Fresno, Calif.).
404 Charlie Henry Taylor, Band Fifth, Coalinga, Calif.
3261 Cornelius Vessies, Oilfields, Calif.
2422 Albert Edmond Voight (Voigt, Albert Edmund Voigt), Marion, Kingsburg, Calif.
2548 Otto West, 621 Stafford Street, Fresno, Calif.
1431 Luther H. Wigginton (Luther Homer Wigginton), Route A, box 137, Kerman, Calif.
1355 Chong (Chang) Kam Yoke, 274 E. E., Coalinga, Calif.
231½ Franklin John Ziebell (Franklin J. Ziebell), general delivery, Fresno, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF FRESNO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2825 Jose Acosta, Calwa, Calif.
3445 Albert Smith Albusch (Allrisch, Albisch), Navalencia, Calif. (1217 Bay, Eureka, Calif.).
3430 Rob't (Robert) Lloyd Allen, Hume, Calif.
3064 Eurigne Arroyo (Enrique (Enriquo) Arryo), route B, Sanger, Calif.
2626 Bisente Brisbanco (Bisente Bisbanco), Sanger, Calif.
3098 Geo. W. Brown (George William Brown), Watts Valley, Calif.
2286 Wm. Brylka, general delivery, Globe, Ariz. (William Brylka, Huntington Lake, Calif.).
3254 John Henry Clark, Hume, Calif.
3228 Raymond Louis Elder, Huntington Lake, Calif.
101 Leo Espinoss, route B, Sanger, Calif.
701 Dat Fat, route B, Box 257, Sanger, Calif.
2744 Thomas Fitzgerald, Huntington Lake, Calif.
1325 John Getin, Fresno, Calif.
547 Rob't Taylor (Robert Taler) Huddleston, Box 174, route B, Fresno, Calif.
2645 Stanley Jerome (Stanley Jerome E., Jerome Stanley), Huntington Lake, Calif.
3436 Walter E. Jotter, 2137 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, Calif.
3436 Walter E. Jotter, 2137 Berkeley Way, Berkeley, Calif. (Walter Elvesmann Jotter (Walter Ehresmoan Jottear), Ockenden, Calif.).
3280 Chas. Kalawawa (Charles Kalanawa, Chas. Kalauawa), Honolulu, Hawaii.
360 James B. McKey, star route, Sanger, Calif.
3065 John Marlar, Squaw Valley, Calif.
3308 Willie Marrow, Squaw Valley.
239 Antonia Perez, Huntington Lake, Calif.
2343 Edw. Rob't Peters (Edward Robert Peters, E. R. Peters), Big Creek, Fresno, Calif. (Bib Creek, Calif.).
1405 Joe Flores Posos (Basos), route B, box 270, Sanger, Calif.
3138 Chu Ah Quy (Quy), Del Rey, Calif.
3038 Apeneo (Apreno) Rodriques, Del Rey, Calif.
527 Mehar Sinch Sigera (Mehar Singh Sigera), route A, box 75, Reedley, Calif.
2721 Jesus Snniga, route B, box 270, Sanger, Calif. (Jesus Surgne, Singir, Calif.).
962 James F. Thompson, Huntington Lake, Calif.
214 Amos Leolen Turner, Big Creek, Calif.
1569 Fred Geo. Webber (Fred George Webber), Auberry, Calif.
3166½ Eddie Whyte, Selma, Cal.
1748 Henry A. Zeblan, Tracy, Calif. (28 School Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF FRESNO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1086 Dominick Bioletto (Dominch Beoletto), G and Fresno Streets, Cosmopolita Hotel, Fresno, Calif. (Dominck Beoletto (Dominick Beoletto), G and Fresno Streets, Fresno, Calif.).
79 William Bowman, 647 J Street, Fresno, Calif.
2419 Tom Boy, 917 G Street, Fresno, Calif.
1900 Henry Calico, 056 M Street, Fresno, Calif.
2403 Edw. Cancio, 1019 B Street, Fresno, Calif. (San Diego, Calif.).
3703 Wilbur Chester Coffman, 715 M Street, Fresno, Calif.
1256 Ng Ga Chew, 1019 G Street, Fresno, Calif.
3019 Too Yuen Cheng (Chong), 1013 (1073) China Alley, Fresno, Calif.
704 Arthur E. Colton (Arthur Edward Colton), 1819 Cross Street, Luis Obispo, Calif.
1148 Geo. Henry Davis, Paul Meyer, Kern Street, Fresno, Calif.
979 William J. Doherty, caboose between Fresno and Bakersfield, Calif.

2421 Geo. A. Dreger (George Arthur Dreger), 912 Van Ness Building, Fresno, Calif. (general delivery, Taft, Calif.).
3608 Patrick Egan, 1019 J Street, Fresno, Calif.
3125 Robert Francis Ellis, 2723 Tulane Street, Fresno, Calif.
1549 John Eskesen, Sequio Hotel, Fresno, Calif. (Equitable Hotel, Fresno, Calif.).
3475 Louis (Louie) Fagundes, 1515 Kern Street, Fresno, Calif.
3384 David Alex (Alexander) Foley, 950 M Street, Fresno, Calif.
212 Ellis Franklin Gay, Grand Hotel, Fresno, Calif.
353 Archibald W. (White) Gibson, Collins Hotel, Fresno, Calif.
923a Walter F. (Fred) Granger, 1425 Branch Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
1225 John Hadjeian, 1841 Tulane (Tulare) Street, Fresno, Calif.
2312 Walter L. Hanson (Walter Lawrence Hansen), 1315 J Street, Fresno, Calif.
2390 Jackson M. Howard (Jack M. Howard, Jackson Merritt Howard), care H. Therwaldsen, Fresno, Calif.
3256 Emil T. Johanson (Emile Thilander Johanson), 2342 Kern Street, Fresno, Calif.
3387 Peter Klassen, Fresno, Calif.
637 Fred'k Lang, general delivery, Fresno, Calif.
2934 Geo. A. Lee (George Arthur Lee), 1529 Kern Street, Fresno, Calif.
104 Jack Kinsey Loman (Jack Kinsey Le Minon), 843 I Street, Fresno, Calif.
944 Edwin C. Lively (Edwin Clarence, Edwin Clarence Lively), Mechanic Hotel, H Street, Fresno, Calif.
3216 Tom Lopez, 1923 Mary Street, Fresno, Calif.
2382 Look Lum, 1523 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
1000 Tom Loon Lum, 1013 China Alley, Fresno, Calif.
3466 Everett Marker, Hotel Collins, H Street, Fresno, Calif.
3161 Clyde M. Masten (C. M. Master, Masten), corner G and Fresno Streets, Fresno, Calif.).
569 John Maxwell, 1524 Kern Street, Fresno, Calif.
1328 Juan Y. Mendez, 905 C Street, Fresno, Calif.
1934 Frank N. Miller (F. Miller), 2612 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
2451 Archie Ray Mitchell (A. R. Mitchell), 162 Diana Street, Fresno, Calif.
3569 Theung (Thung) Mong, 927 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif. (927 G Street, Fresno, Calif.).
2401 Florencio Nidal, 923 Santa Fe Street, Fresno, Calif.
1664 Edw. Pina, 1009 F street, Fresno, Calif.
561 Norman Pinkston; Fresno, Calif.
1443 Phillip Price, Kerman, Calif.
3701 Thomas Shea, general delivery, Stockton, Calif.
1171 James Smith; general delivery, Butte, Mont.
2711 Cornelius Sullivan, 1129 I Street, Fresno, Calif.
1172 Raymond Weible, 742 H Street, Fresno, Calif.
1899 Loy Wong, 1523 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
2514 Wing Wong (Wong Wing), 1013 China Alley, Fresno, Calif.
1777 Edw. J. Woods (Edward James Woods), Hotel Colliers, Fresno, Calif.
1441 King Young, 1043 G Street, Fresno, Calif.
1454 Alfred Clinton Eason (Alfred), Flagstaff, Ariz.
1480 Thomas Useiton, Sun Set Rooms, Mariposa Street, Fresno, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF IMPERIAL, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2926 David Abraham, Hotel Barbra Monte, El Centro, Calif., care of D. S. Stein Co., 46 Davis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
121 Savino Aguilar (Oguilae), Imperial irrigation district, Ellentio, Calif.
96 Joe Aguilera (Augelaro), Calexico, Calif.
2179 Eulogio Alboro, Brawley, Calif.
732 Manuel Alveras (Alvares, Alvarez), Calipatria, Calif.
280 Glendon Burdette (Berdet) Amidon (Anidon), East Eighth Street, Thelma, Calif. (Hotel Imperial, Calif.).
5570 Martin A. Anderson, 247 Imperial Street, Calexico, Calif.
3915 Geo. J. Arata, Brawley, Calif. (27 Excelsior Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
1941 Guadalup Ariza (Guadaloupe Arraiza, Guadalye Araiza), Second Street, Calexico, Calif.
4812 Firmin (Firmin) Arrouge, R. R. A., box 148, Calexico, Calif.
1096 Anastacio (Anstacio) Arreola, Durmid, Calif.
1946 Nicolas Avina (Abina), Calipatria, Calif.
626 Guadaloupe Awradono (Guadalonye Anedondo, Guadalupe Arredondo), Calexico, Calif.
2150 Abdul Aziz, Brawley, Calif.
5816 Leo Ball, Calexico, Calif.
713 Isabelle Ballinosa (Isabel Ballinas), Brawley, Calif.
2540 Innocenco Baptiste (Yoncenelo Bautista), Calexico, Calif.
701 John T. Bergner (John Bergner), Petaluma, Calif.
1548 Salomon Billarino (Salamon Villarino, Willarnic), Fifth Street, Calexico, Calif.
1523 Jacinto Binera (Rivera, Jacinto Binara, Bivera), R. F. D. A, Holtville, Calif.
1426 Thos. P. Brady, Calexico, Calif.
200 Clarence R. Branscom (Branscomb, Clarence Ralph Branscom), general delivery, Imperial, Calif.
3794 Aubrey Brooks, Calexico, Calif.
5325 Frank P. Brown, Calexico, Calif.
1956 Leon Brown, Calipatria, Calif.
2004 Ed. Thos. Bryant, Brawley, Calif. (Everett, Wash.).
2815 Vito (Vido) Burgess, Audrade, Calif.
118 W. W. H. Burnette, box 295, El Centro, Calif. (W. W. Burnett, general delivery, Los Angeles, Calif.).
3758 Felix Burton, 517 Imperial Street, Calexico, Calif.
920 Fredodosio Crbajoe (Feodosio Carbajoe, Carvajoe), Colorado Siding, Calif.
1149 Geo. W. Carr, Niland, Calif.
409 James (James H.) Casey, 1936 North Twenty-sixth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1950 Pedro Cervantes (Cervantis), Holtville, Calif.
1231 Roberto Chaseros (Caseros, Casherso), Calexico, Calif.
5313 Alexander Childs, Imperial, Calif. (703 East Washington Street, Phoenix, Ariz.).
1415 Bautisto (Bantisto) Chutnicut, Warner Hot Springs, El Centro, Calif.
1403 Sidney A. Clay (S. A. Clay), care of Union Oil Co., El Centro, Calif.
1426 Jesus Cloiv (Calen, Calin), Fourth Street, Calexico, Calif.
1597 Henery H. Cochran (H. H. Cochran), Calexico, Calif.
2052 Anachito Codo (Anaclito Cado), Brawley, Calif.
5761 Wm. Corbin, Calipatria, Calif.
2007 Bruno Corrillo, Brawley, Calif.
1338 Tiburcio Corrona (Corona), First and Rockwood Streets, Calexico, Calif.
2165 Saturnino Cormona (Carmona), Palm Hotel, Calexico, Calif.
2069 John Conlan, Brawley, Calif. (412 Congress Avenue, Detroit, Mich.).
1101 John Edgar Crane, 803 Paulin Avenue, Calexico, Calif. (general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.).
1854 Harry Cunningham, Calexico, Calif.
5852 Herbert Cummings, El Centro, Calif.
5836 Gene Daly, Overland Hotel, Calexico, Calif.
5349 Frank Dorres (Dorre), general delivery, Imperial, Calif.
2579 Cushman Kellog (Cushman K.) Davis, Water Company Corral, Imperial, Calif.
910 Jack Davis, Star Route, Box 40, El Centro, Calif.
3460 Leroy Davis, P. O. Box 75, Bostonia, Calif.
4106 Oddie (Addie) Davis, Caller, Ill.
4922 Roy Davis (Davies), general delivery, Imperial, Calif.
5631 Shirley A. Deakins, 645½ Main Street, El Centro, Calif. (Lincoln Hotel, Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1108 John Prescott Delmar, 303 Commercial, El Centro, Calif. (general delivery, Los Angeles, Calif.).
72 Domengo De Pianti, Calexico, Calif.
720 Fulgencio Depos (Lepos), Calexico, Calif. (Fulgencire Leneer, Holtville, Calif.).
4946 Clifton W. Dillingham, Midenal Avenue, Calexico, Calif. (Clifton William Dillingham, Imperial Avenue, Calexico, Calif.).
3130 Robert G. (Roger G.) Douglas (Douglass), general delivery, Calexico, Calif.
4574 John H. Duffy (Duffey), 719 Octavia Street, New Orleans, La.
5257 Robt. D. Dutcher, First and Paulin Streets, Calexico, Calif.
2035 Clyde Edwards, Seeley, Calif.
2088 Francisco Eparaza (Eparza, Esparza), Imperial, Calif.
480 Emeterio Espinoza, Holtville, Calif.
2168 Marcelino Espinoza (Mosselino Espinosa), Brawley, Calif.
321 Refugio Espinosa, Calipatria, Calif.
1510 Jose Esquibel, Tortuga, Calif.
1875 Alejo Estreda (Estrada), King Ranch, Calexico, Calif.
4039 John Albert Fagnan, Star Route, El Centro, Calif.
1380 Juan (Juan) Figueroa, R. F. D. A., Holtville, Calif.
2357 Francisco Filomeno (F. Filomeno), 245 First Street, Calexico, Calif.
1934 Everett M. Fischer, Calipatria, Calif.
520 James Wm. Fletcher, Calipatria, Calif.
1810 Miguel Flores, Los Palmos, Calexico, Calif.
4694 Collie Houston (Callie Huston) Fort, 307 East Main Street, El Centro, Calif.
126 Louis Fraser, Patholes, Calif.
2426 Eiji Fukesako, P. O. Box 486, Brawley, Calif.
328 Floyd Fults, general delivery, El Centro, Calif.
945 Jay W. Furrey, Pierce, Ariz.
2558 Seishichi Furvmoto (Selhibu Furomoto), Calexico, Calif.
1742 Joaquin Gallardo, El Centro, Calif.
3890 Oscar F. (Oscar T.) Ganiard (Oscar Ganiard), 625 Imperial Street, Calexico, Calif.
1243 Ruiz (Cruz) Garcia, 123 Walnut Street, El Paso, Tex. (El Centro, Calif.).
1342 Clement Gensa (Gneso, Gnesa), Box 94, Nippel, Wash.
4029 Raymond Albert Gilbert, El Centro, Calif.
1323 Chas. (Chase) Glendon, El Centro, Calif.
4425 Clint Leonard (Lenard) Goacher, Holtville, Calif.
1730 Genaro Gomez, Imperial, Calif.
303 Anselmo Gonzales (Gonzales, Gonsalez), 101 Ranch Street, Brawley, Calif.
301 Ramon B. Gonzales (Gonzalez), Third Street, Calexico, Calif.
2712 Mile (Milo) Heaton Grammell, Calexico, Calif. (Nogales, Ariz.).
1298 Chas. Souncellor Granor (Councellor Cranor), Calipatria, Calif.
3513 Chas. Ernest (Earnest) Gray, 122 Indiana Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.
2333 Felix Guereca, Brawley, Calif.
1591 Juan Haro, Second Street, Calexico, Calif.
3729 Harry Guernsey, Imperial, Calif.
4344 Oliver K. Hamilton, Austin, Tex. (Brawley, Calif.).
1060 Walter J. Harsch, Pueblo, Colo.
2834 Albert Wm. Hansen, Heber, Calif., Lindsay, Calif.
1724 Ralph Benj. Hayes (Ralph Hays), R. F. D., Calexico, Calif.
3315 Samuel Haywood, Imperial, Calif.
2200 Earl Morgan Herber, Heber, Calif. (box 1039, Chico, Calif.).
2023 Ezequiel Hernandez, Calipatria, Calif.
1356 Isidiro (Isidro) Hernandez, Colorado Siding, Calif.
2073 Pedro Hernandes, Andrade, Calif.
2274 Chiei Hija (Higi, Higa), post-office box 564, Brawley, Calif.
4449 Walter Hilderbrant (Hilderbrand, Hildebrand), care of camp 1 A, Big Creek, Calif. (303 Second Street, Calexico, Calif.).
2593 Juan Hinojosa (Hingoza), Leon Guanajuato, Mexico (Brawley, Calif.).
5920 Ray (Raymond) L. Hoffman, Brawley, Calif.
3939 Sidney G. Hoffman (Sidney S. Hofman), Niland, Calif.
354 Allen Holmes, Brawley, Calif.
3964 Fred Horman, Brawley, Calif.
4839 Steve Hudson, Calexico, Calif. (Fourth Hotel, 128 North Fourth Street, El Centro, Calif.).
816 A. R. (A. T.) Hughes, Holtville, Calif.
4471 Prince T. (Theodore) Hutcherson (Prince Hutcherson), Calexico, Calif.
702 John Isaacson, Brawley, Calif. (1781 Fifteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
28 Simon Jacobo (Jacobs), Calexico, Calif.
152 Elmer Jure, Imperial, Calif.
3887 Leo N. Jeffers (Leo M. Jeffries), Cheyenne, Wyo. (Westwood, care of L. B. Co., Placer, Auburn, Calif.).
1921 F. H. Johnson, general delivery, Calexico, Calif.
4875 Steve Johnson, general delivery, Calexico, Calif.
5792 Tom Johnson, Calexico, Calif.
1511 Frank Clinton Jones, Brawley, Calif.
1713 Shutaro Katshira (Katahira, Shitoro Katahiro), Calexico, Calif.
751 Thomas Joseph Keegan, Calexico, Calif.
4660 Henry O. Kelly (Kelley), Deming, N. Mex. (Calexico, Calif.).
1997 James Walter Kelly (Kelley), 1101 West Ninth Street, corner Imperial Avenue, Imperial, Calif.
951 Alfred Kimball, Hotel Ramona, El Centro, Calif.
2275 Kotaro Kinchi (Kotaso Kiuchi), post-office box 413, Brawley, Calif.
5805 Harry King, Calexico, Calif.

1008 Theodosia Kinonits (Kinonus), Holtville, Calif.
2013 Kenjero Koboyashi (Koboyashai, Kentaro Kohayashi, Kobayashi), route A, box 159, Calexico, Calif.
1371 Yoshizo Kodayashi (Kobayashi, Kobayaski), Ibaraki, Japan (Brawley, Calif.).
2227 Yasushai Koja (Yashushi Koga), box 807, Brawley, Calif.
2093 Zeuchichi Kuno (Kanno, Kauno), Heber, Calif.
1276 Antono (Antonio) Lachugo, Brawley, Calif.
2861 Tomas D. (Thomas, T. D.) Larrazabel, 400 First Street, Calexico, Calif.
420 Francisco Laseno (Lorano, Loras, Losano), Calipatria, Calif.
1374 Henry Layman (Laymen), Brawley, Calif.
2497 John Milton Lear, Holtville, Calif.
1007 Harvey (Harney) Lewis, Seventh and Emerson Streets, Calexico, Calif. (care of Bristol Bay Packing Co., Bristol Bay, Alaska).
1377 Juan Lieres, Calexico, Calif.
1448 Aploinio Linodn (Lincoln, Apolonio Licon, Apolonis Lecon), Mericali Befa, Mexico (Calexico, Calif.).
3405 Russell Longbreak (Longbrake), Brawley, Calif. (Benton Ridge, Ohio).
74 John Henry Lovveas (Lovieas), Lemon Grove, Calif.
5486 John McClusky (McCloskey, McCluskey), 1082 Fifty-seventh Street, Oakland, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
4167 Roy L. McCurdy, P. O. Box 324, Imperial, Calif.
27 W. H. McGoldrick (W. H. McGoldrick, jr.), Weist, Calif.
5575 Clifton R. (Clifton Ray) McPhee, Bard, Calif. (care of Imperial Irrigation District, Calexico, Calif.).
33 Elum Mackey, Bard, Calif.
4356 Robt. J. Maher, general delivery, Calexico, Calif.
5569 John Edw. Malone, Oglesby, Ill. (Calipatria, Calif.).
3962 Robert W. Manley, First Street, Calexico, Calif.
1930 Leo T. Maroney, Tiffin, Ohio.
4268 Arthur T. Martin, Calexico, Calif.
4429 Ed Martin, Calexico, Calif.
1227 Ralph James Martin, Salton, Calif. (Niland, Calif.).
2460 Ramon Martinez (Meartinez), Yuma, Aaris.
2722 Jas. Chas. Maser, 185 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Conn.
3680 Roy (Ray) John Mason, South Sixth Street, El Centro, Calif. (El Centro, Calif.).
1398 Clarence L. Massengale, Holtville, Calif.
2040 Dolores Mason, Brawley, Calif.
2151 Isidro Mason, Wiest, Calif.
1085 Jose Mason, Weist, Calif.
1281 Faustino Melendez (Milendez), Calipatria, Calif.
4234 Allison J. Metcalf, Seventh Street, Imperial, Calif. (Allison Jefferson Metcalf, Seventh and Imperial Streets, Imperial, Calif.).
4326 Edw. Miller (Ed Miller), P. O. Box 308, Heber, Calif.
4217 James D. Miller, Second Street, Calexico, Calif. (El Centro, Calif.; Apalachicola, Fla.).
5306 Ray (Ramond, Raymond) Oscar Miller, Bard, Calif. (Box 56, Yuma, Ariz.).
3800 Harvey (Harry) Mills, Melloland, Calif.
4994 Albert S. (Scott) Montgomery, Park View Apartments, El Centro, Calif.
2086 Andrew Herman Morris, general delivery, Brawley, Calif.
605 Shimey Nishi Mura (Simisey (Shiniy) Nishimura), Calexico, Calif.
5266 John Murphy, 345 Imperial Street, Calexico, Calif. (Imperial, Calif.).
1347 Chas. Myers, Main Street, Imperial, Calif.
761 Salvador Myia, general delivery, Calexico, Calif.
1705 Sosuke Nakosone (Nakasone), R. F. D. No. 1, box 18, Brawley, Calif.
1847 Oslo Neilsen, Los Angeles, Calif. (Brawley, Calif.).
3966 Chas. Nelson, La Crosse, Wis. (Pratt, Kans.).
2601 Jack Nudson, Imperial, Calif. (Honaker House, Imperial, Calif.; general delivery, Fresno, Calif.).
1423 Joseph Odojo (Jaco Lojue), Calexico, Calif.
2965 Stephen O'Mara (O'Meara), R. F. D. No. 2, Imperial, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
5121 Frank Orleans, Cadiz, Oco, Neg. (Imperial, Calif.).
976 Ernest Osborn, Brawley, Calif.
5025 John Hamilton O'Toole, 219 Hice Street (219 Hill Street), San Antonio, Tex.
2189 Frank Oyos, Wiest, Calif.
1014 Leo F. Pallais (Dr. Leo Pallaic), Los Angeles Hotel, Calexico, Calif.
5617 Robbie P. Parker, R. F. D. No. 1, Brawley, Calif. (Robie Preston Rolie P.) Parker, Placentia, Calif.).
5592 Antonio Parra (Parro), Bard, Calif.
635 Hewitt Edwards (Hewett Edward) Parriah, Heber, Calif. (105 Fifth Street, Pedro, Calif.).
5923 Jens Geo. Pederson (Pedersen), Calipatria, Calif.
1608 Julian Pena, Tortuja, Mexico (Niland, Calif.).
1409 Leslie Roy Perkins, Heber, Calif.
2609 Melvin (Malvin) A. Phillips, Brawley, Calif.
5249 Forrest (Forest) Pittman, Calipatria, Calif.
1225 J. Francisco Preciado (Fraera Francisco Precado; Procodo), 1700 Third Street, Calexico, Calif.
2213 Antonio Prieto, Calipatria, Calif.
695 Fernim, Ininteyo (Inmtexo, Ininteyo), Calipatria, Calif.
2306 Casemiro Ramires, Audrade, Calif.
2445 Mariano E. Ramos, 239 Second Street, Calexico, Calif.
42 Nicholas (Nicolas) Ramos, Calexico, Calif.
2175 Luther Doldgar (Dolger, Doldger) Raphael, Silsbee, Calif.
4714 Mark D. (B. Regan) Reagan, Calexico, Calif.
1098 Chas. Geo. (Chas. G.) Richards, Calexico, Calif. (Yuma, Ariz.).
3618 Wm. Richard (Rickard, Reckard, Rechard), Imperial and Ninth Streets, Imperial, Calif.
2886 or 2886½ Leon Ridgway, Calexico, Calif. (504 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
4439 Webb Wentz Riley, East Eighth Street, Imperial, Calif. (Whitesboro, Tex.).
3171 John Roberts, Calipatria, Calif.
3269 Wm. Floyd Roberts, Holtville, Calif. (454 West Fourth Street, Romona, Calif.).
3851 Bernett Ernest (Bernet Earnest) Robinson, Calipatria, Calif.
5780 Wm. Roche, St. Mary Street, Tucson, Ariz.
722 Alejandro (Alajasndro) Rodriguez, El Centro, Calif.
2438 Manuel Romero, 2 miles north of Calexico, Calif.
1937 James Rorens, El Centro, Calif.
5111 Harry Rosenstein, Calexico, Calif.
1465 John Rutman, Calexico, Calif.
1492 Sixto Sall, Brawley, Calif.
534 Feliciano Salonga, Box 57, Calexico, Calif.
1134 Manuel Santos, 3 miles east of Calexico, Calif.
5225 Wm. Scanlin (Scanlan), Brawley, Calif.
3016 Roy W. Scott, Monterey Hotel, Calexico, Calif. (1035 East Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
5197 Thos. S. Scott, 245 Grand Avenue, Springfield, Ill. (Brawley, Calif.).
2410 Pedro Sebringa (Sebunga, Sebtunya), Box 333, Brawley, Calif.
4240 Edw. H. Shayer (Hacker), 319 Densadero (Devisadero) Street, San Francisco, Calif.
683 Hal Andrew Sheek, Second Street, Calexico, Calif.
5181 Frank Shindledower, Thirteenth Avenue, Phoenix, Ariz. (1364 Walnut Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
2254 Arthur Floyd Shuter, Holtville, Calif.
956 Sinechi Skishido (Shinichi Shishido, Shichhia), R. R. A. Box 204, Calexico, Calif.
4628 Dennis Slayan (Slyan), Second Street, Calexico, Calif. (1024 Third Street, San Diego, Calif.).
1985 Chas. Wm. Smith, General Delivery, Brawley, Calif.
1519 Wm. Spencer, 307 East Main Street, El Centro, Calif.
4979 Myron Sprague, Creston, Iowa (Preston, Iowa; Brawley, Calif.).
82 Joseph (Joe) Stanley, Franklin Rooms, El Centro, Calif.
2250 Earnest (Ernest) M. Stark, Calexico, Calif. (care Hotel Sydney, Yakima, Wash.).
4528 Willis (Willie) Lester Stone, Holtville, Calif. (Wills Point, Tex.).
2618 Roy Geo. Stull, Calexico, Calif.
5535 or 5525 James Taylor, Chino, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
5076 Walter Taylor, R. F. D. No. 2, Imperial, Calif.
2658 Nola Bolmes (Volmes, Valnee) Thompson, Calipatria, Calif.
5241 Claude (Claud) Tilley, Wiest, Calif. (Dodd, Tex.).
1968 Paul L. Tortillo (Portillo), First Street, Calexico, Calif.
1771 Joseph A. Trotta, Third Street, Calexico, Calif. (Second Street, Calexico, Calif.)
4017 Roy Walsh (R. Alex Walsh), Brawley, Calif.
4327 John Rufus Warren, Miami, Ariz. (Brawley, Calif.).
1117 Gesario Wasques (Cesario Vasques (Vasques), Cesario Vesgres), Calipatria, Calif.
2825 George Weatherby, Calipatria, Calif.
5604 John Walter Welch, Holtville, Calif.
1180 Chas. W. Werner, Virginia Hotel, Calexico, Calif.
4196 Jack Westfall (West Fall), 1084 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Heber, Calif.).
5555 Ollie White, Calipatria, Calif. (Imperial, Calif.).
1288 Homer Whiting, Springfield, Tenn.
771 Wm. Riley (William R.) Whitworth, 411 Third Street, Calexico, Calif.
5527 Lasco Wiginton, 766 Commercial Street, El Centro, Calif.
5880 Antone Wilbur (Wilber), Ruse Ranch, Calexico, Calif.
793 Albert S. Wilkerson, Brawley, Calif.
2628 Chas. F. Williams, Brawley, Calif.
3944 Lloyd Williams, Calipatria, Calif.
4961 Louis Williams, Brawley, Calif.
4622 Thos. A. Williams, Brawley, Calif.
2823 Wm. Dowl Willis, Holtville, Calif.
4443 Robt. Wilson (Willson), Calexico, Calif.
1807 John Verburg, route B, box 60–C, Holtville, Calif.
516 Manuel Vironnelle, Brawley, Calif.
1817 Blain Darrell, R. F. D. No. 1, El Centro, Calif.
1261 James Garney, Imperial Avenue, Calexico, Calif.
1543 Henry Grady Hudgins, Brawley, Calif.
5919 James B. (James V.) Lacuran, route A, Hemet, Calif. Holtville, Calif.).
1976 Elmer Carlton Pusey, general delivery, San Diego, Calif. (Washington rooms, El Centro, Calif.).
965 Clyde Edward Tilden, El Centro, Calif.
3833 Robert (Robt.) T. Washington, Silsbee, Calif.
1238 Earl Palmer Woods, 184 East Anaheim Street, Long Beach, Calif. (1804 East Anaheim Street, Long Beach, Calif.; Brawley, Calif.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF KERN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1302 Mathew M. Adam, Randsburg, Calif. (Mathew Earl Adam, San Bernardino, Calif.).
891 Jose Aguirre, general delivery, Bakersfield, Calif.
1755 Marcus Allala (Marces Allala), Saltdale, Calif.
1700 Reyes Andrade (Reyers Andeade), Tehachapi, Calif.
390 Bernandene Arboleg (Bernardino Araboles, Bernardino Arabales) Juanice, Mexico (Isbell Const. Co., Woody, Calif.).
3369 Brigidio Arellano (Brijido Arellano), Delano, Calif.
3252 Pedro Banders, Zalanca, Mexico (Kern County Land Co., Shafter, Calif.).
360a Carlo Barges (Carlos Barges), Bakersfield, Calif.
559 Leland George Bashford (Leland Bashford), Cosmant Hotel, Bakersfield, Calif.
1444 Coronado Beandry (Coronado Beandery, Coronado Beandry, Coronado Beaudry), 15 North Beandry Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. (general delivery, Salt Lake, Utah).
898 Jose Belasque (Jose Belasques), Edison, Calif.
363 Edimo Boles (Erminio Belis, Erminio Bello), Tehachapi, Calif.
1973 Moces E. Bond (Moses Emory Bond, Moses Emery Bond), bin 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (Casper, Wyo.).
1885 Joseph C. Bradhort (Joseph Chas. Bradhart, Joseph Charles Bradhort), 619 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
632 Juan Callardo (Juan Gallardo, Yuan Gallardo), R. F. D. No. 6, Bakersfield, Calif.
1644 Santos Carleton (Santos Carlan), 701 Fremont Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1715 Edwin D. Casey (Edwin David Casey), 1619 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
2117 Grogendes Castello (Gragedes Castello, Gragdes Castello), Santa Rosalia, Chic, Mexico (care of John D. March, Johannesburg, Calif.).
363 Casimiea Gassia (Casimica Gassin, Casimies Cassia), Bakersfield, Calif.).
886 Arthur Cederblade, Wasco, Calif.
2110 Ramon Chaves (Ramon Charay), R. F. D. No. 6, Bakersfield, Calif.
957 Edgar Clark (Edward Clark), St. Ann Rooms, Bakersfield, Calif.
41 Richard Coggs, 1814 N Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1986 John Connell (John Quirk Cannell, John Quirk Connell), Isabella, Calif.
2462 Pragedes Corrtes (Prasedis Cortes, Pragedes Corrtes), Tehachapi, Calif.

2732 Francisco Costillo (Manuel Castillo), Farnosa, Calif.
2092 Louis Couch, 1110 Sonora Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
47 Gorivio Dalgado (Torivio Delgada, Gorilio Delgado), American Hotel, Bakersfield, Calif.
1154 Felix Deelera (Felix DeLira), Zacateca, Mexico (care of S. P. Co., Lerdo County, Calif.).
1923 Jóse Del Rio (Jose del Rio), Tehachapi, Calif.
3306 Guiseppe Derverso (Guiseppe Deverso, G. Deverso), Rosamond, Calif.
700 John Dobth, Crucero, Calif. (?)
2315 Tooney Duck (Toong Duck), 711 Baker Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1824 Thomas D. Duncan (Thomas James Durcan), Keene, Calif.
1933 Pearl H. Edwards, 701 H Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
923 Frederick K. Elwood (Frederick Paul Ellwood), 712 Kentucky Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1138 Jerry Flahive, Oil Center, Calif.
1199 Miguel Felix, general delivery, Bakersfield, Calif.
899 Francisco Forres (Franseco Tores, Francisco Feres), Tehachapi, Calif.
1645 Suchero Fuger (Seichiro Fugii), Colony Precinct, Wasco, Calif.
2571 Tubencio Gamino (Tuberrcio Gamino), Conners Station, Kern County, Calif.
1578 Emelio Gazaldson (Emelio Gavaldon), Chihuahua Chi, Mexico (Johannesburg, Calif.).
879 Francisco Garcia, Muroc, Calif.
2634 Faustino Garcia (Fuetino Garcia), Famosa, Calif.
2522 Pedro Gracia, Tehachapi, Calif.
2818 Jose Garibay (Jose Garivay, Tose Garibay), general delivery, Bakersfield, Calif.
65 Frank Geren (Frank Gerens), 1002 Monterey, East Bakersfield, Calif.
510 Jose Gonsales, Guadalajara, Mexico (Jose Gonzales, jr., Isbell Construction Co., Woody, Calif.; Guadalajara, Mexico).
1785 Damasco Gonzales (Damaco Gonzales, Damaso Gonzalez), R. F. D. Bakersfield, Calif.
1717 Dionirio Gonzalez (Dionisio Gonzalez, Diomerio Gonzalez), R. F. D. No. 6, Bakersfield, Calif.
2716 Francesco Gonzalas (Francisco Gonzales, Francesco Gonzalez), Tehachapi, Calif.
1695 Francisco Grihalvg (Francisco Grihalva), Bakersfield, Calif.
2918 Jesus Guerrero, Shafter, Calif.
2839 Pantetes Hagiconstas, 1726 L Street, Bakersfield, Calif. (Pantelis Hagiconstas, East Youngstown, Ohio).
2444 Clemen Hall, 2202 Q Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1690 Peter Hazen, R. F. D. No. 4, Bakersfield, Calif.
2507 Charles Heinz, Lebec, Calif.
2694 Antonio Hernandez, Mojave, Calif.
1074 Ignacio Hernandez (Tanacio Hernandez, Ygnacio Hernandez), R. F. D. No. 6, Bakersfield, Calif.
288 John Hernandez (John Hennardas), American Hotel, Bakersfield, Calif.
1508 Charles Hoffman, R. F. D. No. 4, East Bakersfield, Calif.
3 Charles K. Johnson (Charles Kunle Johnson), general delivery, Taft, Calif.
977 Darby Kelly, Russ Hotel, Bakersfield, Calif.
2768 Willard L. Kofahl, box 788, Marivopa, Calif. (Willard Lacy Kofahl, R. F. D. No. 5, box 69, Bakersfield, Calif.).
3012 Warren Lamson (Warren Lanison), Famosa, Calif.
79 Oscar Latimer, 130 East Grove Street, Bakersfield, Calif. (15 Rosedale, Johnstown, Pa.).
1387 Chris Larsen, North Sacramento, Calif.
2357 Orin Lay (Chong Lee), 1218 China Alley Butchershop, Bakersfield, Calif.
1409 Benjamin Levy (Benjamin Leavy), Famosa, Calif.
1844 George Lewis, Twenty-first and Chester Streets, Bakersfield, Calif.
3457 Victor Leyva, Brown, Calif.
2366 Ferdinand Loher (Ferdinand Laher), Tehachapi, Calif.
2489 Francisco Losano (Fransico Lasano), R. F. D. No. 6, box 167, Bakersfield, Calif.
3443a John L. Lukens (J. L. Lukens, John Lewis Lukens), 1508 K Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
2904 Wm. McDonley (William McDonley), R. F. D. No. 4, Bakersfield, Calif.
3261 Harland W. Major (Harlan W. Major), 1102 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1777 Gasper D. Malcold (Gaspard Dundee Malcola), box 265, route 2, Los Angeles, Calif.
1617 Bernardo Marges, Kenne, Calif.
1145 Walter W. Martin, McFarland, Calif.
1633 Charles H. Martindale (Charles Henry Martindale, Chas. Henry Martindale), Eighteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
2535 Ignacio J. Martinez (Ignacio Jose Martinez, J. Ignacio Martinez), The Princeton, Bakersfield, Calif.
1020 Jose Martinez (Tose Martinez), Buttonwillow, Calif.
1236 Ygnacio Martinez (Tguacio Martinez), Bakersfield, Calif.
1922 Mayarita Marquez (Margarita Marquez), section 23, Keene, Calif.
1285 Ferdinand Peter Maurer (Ferdinand P. Mauer), 465 Lake Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
3027 Frank Meade, Wasco, Calif.
1435 Vincent Melenderez (Vicente Melenderz), R. F. D. No. 4, Kern, Mesa, East Bakersfield, Calif.
2046 Ralph Theodore Moore (Ralph T. Moore), McFarland, Calif.
1164 Frank A. Morris, general delivery, Los Angeles, Calif. (Frank A. Morriss, Tehachapi, Calif.).
3100 Wm. E. Morris (William E. Morris), 1250 George Street, Plainfield, N. J.
699 Charles Murphy, 713½ Sumner Street, East Bakersfield, Calif. (Chas. Murphy, Evanston, Wyo.).
2231 Francisco Myecos (Francisco Myescus M., Francisco Myescas M.), Ninth Street and Onion, Bakersfield, Calif.
2347 Tom Napier, 1017 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1389 Juan Olivas, Tehachapi Cattle Co., Bakersfield, Calif. (Wera Alahajl, Mexico).
1925 Nedom A. Paul, Lebec, Calif.
171 Elias Peres (Elias Peres, Elias Pires), Tehachapi, Calif.
2789 William Elbert Phillips (William E. Phillips), 325 Humboldt Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
2633 George S. Pickering, Oildale, Calif. (George Spencer Pickering, Powe Mo.).
277 Othenal W. Pickett (O. Pickett), McFarland, Calif.
1684 Jose Ramirez, S. Pac. Reservation, Bakersfield, Calif.
1073 Esegnio Ramas (Esigno Ramos, Esignio Ramos), Lakeside Ranch, Bakersfield, Calif.
2850 Francisco Ramos, Manaco Hotel, Bakersfield, Calif.
2662 Felix Rimeriz (Felis Rimeiriz, Felis Rimeirs), Mojave, Calif.
2743 Harry Robinson (Harry Robison), Cherryvale, Kans.
1433 Frances Rogers (Francis Rogers), Tehachape, Calif.
1517 Jose Salgado, Johannesburg, Calif. (Planindicuare, Mich., Mexico).
3228 Arvil Salo (Arvid Salo), 1240 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
1300a Francisco Sandoval, care of Alfornza Sandoval, Placer Creek, Calif. (60 miles from Bakersfield).
2336 Jose Sandoval, Zacatica, Mexico.
1619 Martimer Peter Shea, Standard Oil Co., Bakersfield, Calif.
2597 Feliz Sierra (Felis Sierra), Tyon Ranch, near Bakersfield.
1860 Henry M. Simons (Henry Monroe Simms, Henry Monroe Semms), care of Thompson Bros., Delano, Calif.
3351 Orando Smith (Orlando Smith), 216½ West Orange, Monrovia, Calif.
2925 Nicholas Souralez, R. F. D. No. 6, Box 176, Bakersfield, Calif.
1964 William Thomas, Kenne, Calif.
2192 Felix Tonora (Feliz Torrora, Feliz Tonora), 605 Kern, Bakersfield, Calif.
534 Joaquin Tyro (Joaquin Tryo, Joaquin Trijo), R. F. D. No. 6, Bakersfield, Calif.
523 Manuel Ueribe (Manuel Uribe, Manuel Urive), Metropic Hotel, East Bakersfield, Calif.
1769 Augustin Valdez, Tehachapi, Calif.
785 Juan Valencia (Juan Valenas), Tehachapi, Calif.
783 Enos Vasquez, 1607 South Bakersfield, Calif.
1131 Jose Valquez (Jose Vasgerez, Jose Vasquez), Saltdale, Calif.
635 Jesse E. Walker (Jesse Earl Walker), 1312 Nineteenth Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
3403 Albert J. Williams (Albert John Williams), general delivery, Taft, Calif.
2999 Louie Wing, Mojave, Calif.
566 Jesse Woodard, Isabella, Calif.
2241 Charles Young (Charlie Young), 1418 N Street, Bakersfield, Calif.
830 Christian Jenson, Tehachapi, Calif. (Christian Jensen, Deeth, Nev.).
3277 John Bucker Keith, 1629 California Avenue, Bakersfield, Calif.
53 Lester W. Paine, Union Oil Co., Bakersfield, Calif. (Union Refinery, Bakersfield, Calif.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF LASSEN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1067a James (James M.) Rasmussen, 1938 Sixty-second Avenue, Oakland Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 11, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

247 Harold W. (Wendell) Aiken, 1135 (1323) South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
2035 Clifford A. (M.) Anderson, 1019 West Eleventh, Los Angeles, Calif.
3392 Chas. Auken (Aiken), 508 East Twelfth, Los Angeles, Calif.
2178 Sandie Jas. Banks, 1217 Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. (1751 West Seventh, Oakland, Calif.).
2342 Chang Bing, 1026 Wall, Los Angeles, Calif.
2044 Geo. H. Brown, 1217 Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
1614 Phillip Brown, 1319 East Twelfth, Los Angeles, Calif.
3006 Samuel R. Burgess, 933 South Olive, Los Angeles, Calif. (Samuel E (Earl) Burgess, 1417 North Topeka, Wichita, Kans.)
3892 Rufus Cameron, 931 Naomi, Los Angeles, Calif.
4297 Sam Cole, 1260 Georgia, Los Angeles, Calif.
1754 Rob't (Robert) Craig, 914 Long Beach, Los Angeles, Calif.
1772 Lun Doon, 1420 South Flower, Los Angeles, Calif.
1701 Chas. F. (Franklin) Douglas, 1353 South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
2694 Allan (Allen) V. Fortier, 915 Birch, Los Angeles, Calif.
2757 Ray H. (Herbert) Gale, 940 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
3860 Barry Gardner (Gordner), 1821 South Oak, Los Angeles, Calif.
448 Elvia C. (Charles) Grant, 1223 Wall, Los Angeles, Calif.
3373 Harold B. Guillos, 919 Albany, Los Angeles, Calif.
2934 Fred Hansen, 1414 South Hope, Los Angeles, Calif.
906 Oren S. (Sherman) Holcomb, 1117 Santee, Los Angeles, Calif.
3455 Boyde (Boyd) Jerome, 308 West Fourteenth, Los Angeles, Calif.
2533 Benj. R. Kratser (Benj. Roy Kratzer, Ben R. Kratzer), 1471 Griffith, Los Angeles, Calif.
670 Morrell Learning (Morrell Leaming, M. Leaming), 509 East Pico, Los Angeles, Calif.
2461 Chester Lee, 939 San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
4266 Jack W. Lewis, 1260 Georgia, Los Angeles, Calif.
127 Henry Llevan, 826½ Wall, Los Angeles, Calif.
2115 John A. (Aloysius) McCarthy, 812 West Tenth, Los Angeles, Calif.
2812 John McDonald, 1055 South Hope, Los Angeles, Calif.
1874 David R. McLain (David Roy McClain), 1359 South Union, Los Angeles, Calif.
4024 James J. Marchman (James Jonie Marshman, jr.), 1118 East Tenth, Los Angeles, Calif.
143 Chas. (Charlie) Martin, 1368 South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
1047a Roy S. (Samuel) Marvin (Ray Samuel Marvin), 817 Pedro (San Pedro), Los Angeles, Calif.
1758 Benj. F. Moore (Benjamin Franklin (Frank) Moore), 121 West Fifteenth, Los Angeles, Calif.
92 Frank Nelson, 548 East Pico, Los Angeles, Calif. (1612 Woodland, Toledo, Ohio).
4128 Rufus Nevels (Rufus F. Nevels), Los Angeles, Calif. (not permanent).
1285a Henry C. (Clay) Nicholson, 956 Hope, Los Angeles, Calif.
3366 John Packer, 937 Naomi, Los Angeles, Calif.
2364 John Perales (Perales), 1223 South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
2720 Jas. G. Riley (James Gay Riley), 1101 Santee, Los Angeles, Calif.
2063 Jas. C. Rivers (James Clayton Rivers), 904 Wall, Los Angeles, Calif.
3947 Harry Skales (Henry Skates), 836 Birch, Los Angeles, Calif.
2078 Jack P. (Patrick) Smith, 932½ South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
2219 Wm. L. Smith (William Lawrence Smith), 1226 Georgia, Los Angeles, Calif.
3136 Lawrence L. Soare (Lawrence Littleton Soare), 916 (944) Francisco, Los Angeles, Calif.
4010 Burt Starr, 934 Hemlock, Los Angeles, Calif.
2a Edw. (Edward) Stewart, 914 Hemlock, Los Angeles, Calif.

185 Frederick Strong, 1723 South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
591 Leonard P. Swift (Leonard F. Swift), 118 East Fifteenth, Los Angeles, Calif.
3385 Anthony Szmulksztys, 1416 South Los Angeles (1416 O Street), Los Angeles, Calif.
216 James Thomas, 1205½ Central, Los Angeles, Calif. (1307 Andrew, Houston, Tex.).
2345 Jos. W. Todd, 1317 De Long (526 California), Los Angeles, Calif.
1583 Merrill Tucker, 1615 Redwood, Los Angeles, Calif.
567 James A. Wallace, 1349 De Long, Los Angeles, Calif. (Fresno, Calif.).
2152 Horace White, 1546 East Fourteenth (1546 East Fifteenth), Los Angeles, Calif.
499 Chas. Cecil (Chas. C.) Eades, 120 West Ninth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 16, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1570 Hong Woon Song (Wong Hong Soon), 343 Marchesault Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
5495 George Smith, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 17, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

5056 Patrick Abril, 323 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
8262 Jack I. (Ira) Angus, 1253 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
5074 Frederick August Baker, 702½ East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
779 Ralph E. Barker, 107 South Rampart Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
4381 Percy Bilk, 236 East Second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
3499 Paul H. Brauer, 527 San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
2055 Jno. M. Brookbank, 403 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
5741 Fred C. (Fred Camillo) Cahal, 567 Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
7073 Clifford S. (Solomon) Chamberlain, L. A. Rooming, Main and Second, Los Angeles, Calif.
4458 Wm. (William) Christ, 1336 Industrial Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
4465 Joseph Clark, 515 Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
7108 Arthur Carl Clarke, 211½ East Fifth, Los Angeles, Calif.
2775 Virgil Corea (Coree), 411 Central, Los Angeles, Calif.
2697 Lorrain (Lorraine) Crow, 248 East Second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
667 Jas. L. Davis, 934 West Sixth Street, Bartel Apts., Los Angeles, Calif.
4448 Sidney DeMars, 521 San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
6142 Wm. (William) Deneen, Second and San Pedro Streets, Los Angeles, Calif.
2170 Orlin Lloyd Diller, R. F. D. 6, box 57, Los Angeles, Calif.
7528 Daniel Dockery, Joplin, Mo. (Daniel (D.) David Dockery, 409 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
5388 Geo. Earlie (George Earlie), 527 San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
3123 Wm. Emerson, 423 Crocker, Los Angeles, Calif.
1052 Wm. (William Erler), 248 East Second, Los Angeles, Calif.
4802 H. C. Ford, 262½ South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
2125 Edward Gibson, Zamora, Calif. (527 Stanford, Los Angeles, Calif.).
6147 Nelson Gouker, 660 South Stanford, Los Angeles, Calif.
6768 Frank W. Graham, 531 San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
5859 Frank Guttery, First & Wilmington, Los Angeles, Calif.
3107 Birk Guyton, 434 East Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2736 Wm. Jos. Hagarty (William Joseph Hagerty), 124½ East Second, Los Angeles, Calif.
3759 Rd. (E. D.) Hamilton, 553½ Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
6790 Wm. (William) Hinchie, 347 South Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.
2954 Wm. L. (William L.) Hollingsworth, 907 East Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
7378 Earl D. Horton, General Delivery, Fresno, Calif. (516 West Eighth, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1661 Dilbert Hughson, King Hotel, Willimington & First, Los Angeles, Calif.
3332 Joe Hull, 347 North Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.
8050 Modesto Ignacio, 247 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
7968 Martin Jensen, 226½ East First, Los Angeles, Calif. (1718 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
790 Phillip (Philip) B. Jones, 310 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
4783 Phil P. Kelly, care of Larson Co., Westwood, Calif. (312½ West First, Los Angeles, Calif.
7106 Edw. Kluvein (Edward Kleevein, Kleewein), 834½ East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
4219 Edw. (Edward) Kraft, 508 Stanford, Los Angeles, Calif.
3866 Fred Kraft, 508 Stanford Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
1083 Frank Landgreen, 437½ South Hill, Los Angeles, Calif.
8088 Frank E. Lee, 318 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
6153 W. A. (William Arthur) Logan, 510½ East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2566 Jack Lonegran (Lonergan), 128 East First Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
8255 Jon. (John) B. McAssery, 115 East Third Street, City, Calif.
243½ Wm. James (William James, William J.) McMillan, Palace Hotel between 384 Olive, Los Angeles, Calif.
3165 Wm. Maryou, 262 South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
4131 Fidencio Mendoza, 259 East Sixth, Los Angeles, Calif.
8125 Rob't M. Millikin (Robt. M. Millikin), Hotel Hayward, Los Angeles, Calif.
367 Bernard Montoya, 325 East Second, Los Angeles, Calif.
2483 Wm. J. Moran (William Joseph Moran, William J. Moran), 409 East Fifth, Los Angeles, Calif.
7891 Harry Morrison, 312 East Second, Los Angeles, Calif.
5052 Geo. Neshyima (George Nishyima), 323 East First, Los Angeles, Calif.
7008 Ralph Lawrence Newton, 2329 San Pablo Avenue, Oakland, Calif. (623 East Twenty-second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; 720 South Maple Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.).
5080 Walfrid Olson, 656½ South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
8274 Louis Patrick, 128½ Wilmington, Los Angeles, Calif.
4459 Chas. Jno. Pearle (Charles John Pearce), King Edward Hotel, 119 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
5802 Richard Floyd Pierson, 536 South Hope, Los Angeles, Calif.
3878 Wilbur David Pitgreen (Wilbur David Pilgreen), 40 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
7539 Chas. L. Preble (Charles L. Preble, Chas. L. Preble), 236 South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
1032 Lee Rhodes, 632 Crocker, Los Angeles, Calif.
3478 Lee Riddle, 144 South Main, Los Angeles, Calif.
3412 Clarence W. Riley, 210 South Fremont, Los Angeles, Calif.
4414 Reuben Benj. Rodriques (Reuben Benjamin Rodriques), 513 North Westmoreland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. (425 West Second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
5919 Jas. Rollins (James Rollins, James R. Rollins), 560 Gladys Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
4771 Eddie F. Sisson, 553½ Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
4326 Geo. Smith (George Smith), 304 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
6900 Louis Snyder (Louis Snyder), 403 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
3149 Henry Spahn, 226½ East First, Los Angeles, Calif.
7996 David D. Stead, 403 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2603 Frank Lindsay Stevenson (Frank Lindsey Stevenson), 409 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
7063 Andrew Taylor, 411½ Central Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
3917 Boyd Ealson Taylor (Boyd Ealsten Taylor, Boyd E. Taylor), 230½ South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1876 Wm. Thomas (William Thomas), 248 East Second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
142 Joe Trujillo (Joe Trujielo), 614 Stanford Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
6807 Gay Upson, 525 (535) San Julian, Los Angeles, Calif.
8189 Milan J. Welch (Milan J. Welsh), 611 East Fifth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
46½ Sidney E. Welch, La Alinet, Calif.
2008 W. D. White, Main Street, near Third, care of Volunteers of America, Los Angeles, Calif.
1597 Jas. M. Wilcox (Joseph M. Wilcox), general delivery, Des Moines, Iowa (410 Crocker, Los Angeles, Calif.).
5307 Rastus E. Wright, 623 Crocker Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1225 John Wynn (John J. Wynn), 567 Central, Los Angeles, Calif.
2589 Carlos C. Kohler, 1220 Shatto Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
5372 Mike J. O'Neil, 116 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 18, CITY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

547 Juan Aguilar, 17 San Fernando Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1626 Hunarto (Hanarto) Caravalar, 1156 St. John Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1390 Marjeses Caronel East Side Jail, Seregosa, Mexico City, Mexico (Marjisos Caronel, East Side Jail, Los Angeles, Calif.).
2851 Daniel Daley, 2131 Mozart Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
697 Charles Darling, 627 North Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2087 Alfonzo Ecobar, East Side Jail, Guanajuato, Mexico (Alphonsa (Alfonso) Escobar, East Side Jail, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1299 Geo. Gladstone, 1015 Alhambra Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
702 Michael Grady, 1765½ North Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
715 Frank Wm. Grice, 1508 North Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2247 Ernest Rolland Harris (Harnes), 1760 North Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1464 Jesus Herara (Herrara), Ferne Place, Pdct. 76, Los Angeles, Calif.
2753 Charley McSwine (McSwain), 4800 Hunnington Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
99 Milo Maximiano (Maximiano Nila, Maximiani), 1456 Nand Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
63 Oliver H. E. Pendley (Oliver Harry Eugene Pendley), Herman P. O., Los Angeles, Calif.
2011 Alphonso R. Racicot (Alphonso Raphael Racicot), 535 South Workman Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
2108 Francisco Raimires (Ramires), 600 San Fernando Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
113 Emigdio (Emiggio Ramirez), 1439 Nand Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
676a Leon Arthur Schultz, Los Angeles, Calif.
1375a Steve Vidock (Videck), 1539 St. John Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
926a Mack Whitehead, General Delivery, Los Angeles, Calif.
1714 Almond Leo Zwiener, 1510 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

821 Louis Aguirre, R. F. D. No. 1, Whittier, Calif.
13 Raymond Aguirre, R. F. D. No. 1, Whittier, Calif.
127 Frederick Wm. Bramann, R. F. D. No. 2, Los Angeles, Calif.
3497 Tino Castro (T. Castro), 3633 Santa Fe Avenue, Redondo, Calif.
3500 Roy James Downey, Gardena, Calif.
2570 Howard Fisher, Hynes, Calif.
3229 Harry Franklyn Gomm, 808 Arcadia, Los Angeles, Calif.
1811 Harry N. Hamilton (Harry Newton Hamilton, H. N. Hamilton), Porterville, Calif. (Compton, R. F. D. No. 2, Calif.).
2356 Robert Gale Kay, 134 Lynwood Road.
3866 Leslie Aaron Kirk, Poplar Street, Monterey Park, Calif. (Poplar Street (Monterey Park), Montabello, Calif.
2868 Charles McCabe, Compton, Calif.
4148 Frank Martin McGee, 503½ Greenleaf Avenue, Whittier, Calif.
2238 Verne Thomas Moore, Flower Street, Bellflower, Calif.
3190 Philip Mordi, Hynes, Calif.
3061 Andrew Nault, 141 South Newlin, Whittier, Calif. (La Habra, Calif.).
1283 Francis O. Nelson, R. F. D. No. 2, Box 220, Los Angeles, Calif. (Francis Nelson, post office box 484, Eureka, Calif.).
3073½ William C. O'Connor (William O'Conner), Douglas, Ariz.
498 Willis C. Paulson, Norwalk, Calif.
740 Jessie Reyes, Route No. 6, Box 260, Los Angeles, Calif.
4210 George H. Rhodes (George Henry Rhodes), 2541 East 26, Vernon, Calif.
1071 Antonio (Antonia) Robles, Laguna Bell, Calif.
1492 George W. Rogers (George Wilson Rogers, G. W. Rogers), Hawthorne, Calif.
1534 Patrick Donald Sampson (P. D. Sampson), Bloomfield Avenue, Artesia, Calif. (Newhall, Calif.).
4068 Damacio (Damacie) Sanchez, care of Sherer Camp, R. F. D. No. 2, Whittier, Calif. (Damacie Danchez, R. F. D. No. 2, Sherer Camp, Whittier, Calif.).
2257 Albert R. Tapia (Alberto R. Tapia), R. F. D. No. 2, Whittier, Calif.
1003 Benigno Telles, R. F. D. No. 2, Box 26, Whittier, Calif.

575 Pete Verdugo, R. F. D. No. 2, Whittier, Calif.
948 Charles A. West, Liberty Street, Watts, Calif.
3225 Bert J. L. Willoughby (Bert L. L. Willoughby), Compton, Calif.
3292 Frank Alvarado, 218 North Hollenbeck Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
135 Edwin N. Bowman, 4005 Michigan Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MENDOCINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2205 Guiseppe Alberto (Guisppe Alberto), Fort Bragg, Calif.
268 Fred Beck, Fort Bragg, Calif.
274 John Benton, Westport, Calif.
2172 Steve Bujikowski, Spyrock, Calif.
1921 Winnie Boggs, Manchester, Calif.
2179 Michael Coughlin, Fort Bragg, Calif.
1315 James Moss Doyle, Franklin Street, Fort Bragg, Calif.
1548 D. H. Eberhart, Fort Bragg, Calif.
1207 Oscar W. Erickson (Oscar Wiljam Erickson), Camp 11, Elk, Calif.
2127 James Edward Farley, Hopland, Calif.
2154 Frank Joseph Farrell, Glen Blair, Calif.
2144 John Forti (John Forte, John Fort, Tort), 418 Mason Street, Ukiah, Calif.
1789 Thomas B. Hill (Thomas Benjamin Hill), Caspar, Calif.
265 Roy Hull, Caspar, Calif.
1048 Simon A. Jacobson (Simon Andrew Jacobson, Fort Bragg, Calif.), Caspar, Calif.
1835 Sam Kalve, Fort Bragg, Calif.
2083 Fred D. Leake (Fred Dent Leake, Diut), Irmulco, Calif.
1349 Matti Ossian Linnala (Matte, Mattie O. Linnala, Box 193, Fort Bragg, Calif.), Fort Bragg, Calif.
765 Franklin J. McDonald (Franklin Joseph McDonnell, Mendi), Willits, Calif.
1914 Grover McLeod, Ukiah, Calif.
1296 Joseph Miller, Fort Bragg, Calif.
1412 Robert Nelson, Fort Bragg, Calif.
398 Robert Niel, Westport, Calif.
2290 Herman Nohf, Fort Bragg, Calif.
1272 Antonio D. Oliveria (Antonio D'Oliveria), Northspur, Calif.
842 Dong On (Harry), (Dong On), Sherwood, Calif.
217 Henry Parker (Harry Parker, Harry), Fort Bragg, Calif.
1953 Elis Salmen (Salinen) (Elis Salinen), Fort Bragg, Calif.
1497 Settino Sbrogia (Settino Sbragia, Sbragia Settino), Fort Bragg, Calif.
1022 Piacentini Sialdini (Piacentino, Piacentino Sialdini, Piaccentini Sialviani, Gialdini), Fort Bragg, Calif.
1774 John Simmons, Fort Bragg, Calif.
2326 John Smith, Caspar, Calif.
1314 Roy Smith, Cummings, Calif.
3473 Olof B. Nylander (Uylander, Olof Briger Nylander, O. B. Nylander), Caspar, Calif.
339 Phillip Vogel, Fort Bragg, Calif.
92 Raleigh J. Ward (Raleigh James Ward), Covelo, Calif.
2090 Klaus O. Westerlund (Klaus Oscar Westerlund), Willits, Calif.
1833 Edward M. Wolfe (Edward Michael Wolfe), Ukiah, Calif.
1484 Lester Oswell Russell (Lester O. Russell, Sherwood, Calif), Ukiah, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MERCED, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1184 Francisco Aguierre, Livingston, Calif.
482a Domeigo Baffano, general delivery (care of Wallis & Clyne), Los Banos, Calif.
497 Ralph Bicknell, Livingston, Calif.
786 Angelo Bojorgus (Bojorgues), Los Banos, Calif.
2611 James Francis (F.) Brady, Portland, Oreg. (general delivery San Francisco, Calif.).
2513 George Osias (O.) Brothers, Hartford, Conn.
496 Francisco Vieira Cord (Francico Vieiro Codozo, Francisco V. Cordoze), Ward ranch, Cressy, Calif.
1921 Harry Leroy (L.) Covell, Livingston, Calif.
57 Antonio Dilorio (Diborio, Diloris), Newmon, Calif.
212 John Dionda (J. Dianda), Los Banos, Calif.
578 Joe Dixon, Los Banos, Calif.
929 Bartholomew (B.) Donnelly (Donnolly), Gustine, Calif.
82 Bob (B.) Evans, Los Banos, Calif.
1603 Lucio Cervantes (Fervantes, Cervinte, Pervantes), Atwater, Calif.
1062 Robert Thimtly (T.) France, Newman, Calif.
822 Lem (Sam) Gar, Los Banos, Calif.
2567 Francisco (Francesco) Casalnuevo (Gasalnuevo, Casalnuovo), Gustine, Calif.
364 Marco Georgi (Giorgi), Merced, Calif.
32 Agostine V. Gomes (Agostinho Vieria Gomos), Newman, Calif.
799 Charles (Charley, Charlie) Howell, Cressey, Calif.
414 James Jos. (Joe) Ingerson, Atwater, Calif.
133 John Ireland, 775 Corbett Avenue, San Francisco (Merced Falls), Calif.
1159 John Edwin (E.) Jewell, Merced, Calif.
835 Carl Martin (M.) Johnson (Martin Johnson), Delhi, Calif.
2341 Jose Joley (Soley), Los Banos, Calif.
1144 Thomas Jones, Ingomar, Calif.
231 Thomas Harrison (H., T. H.) Jones, Los Banos, Calif.
668 Gee Kee, Gustin, Calif.
2353 Walter Laughlin, Bellevue ranch, Mercer, Calif.
475 Antonio Lovoglio (Laveglio, Lavaglio), Merced, Calif.
830 Frank Victor (V.) Mattos (F. V. Nattos), Los Banos, Calif.
1855 Jay Robert (R.) Monroe, Central Hotel, Merced, Calif.
264 John Anthony (A.) Moriarty, Dos Palos, Calif.
342 Anadeto Cortez (Ortez), Athlone, Calif.
739 Vincenzo Padula, Los Banos, Calif.
1979 Pietro Pardi, Los Banos, Calif.
345 Felix Rozio (Kozio), Merced, Calif.
277 Domenico (Dominico) Spina, Los Banos, Calif.
88 Luther Arthur (A.) Walton, route No. 3, box 103, Turlock, Calif.
1239 Vincent Ward, Le Grand, Calif.
566 Earl Wheadon, Livingston, Calif.
177 Charles (Charlie, Charles) Henry (H.) Williams, Merced, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF OAKLAND, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

768 Newman S. Thompson, 1440 Eleventh Street, Oakland, Calif.
2090 John Hynes, 2321 Filbert Street, Oakland, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

615 Francis Aguilera, Arlington, Calif. (Francisco Anguliera, County Hospital, Los Angeles, Calif.)
291 Jose Arrayos, East Twelfth, Riverside, Calif.
609 Civilo Arrendondo (Cirilo Arrendondo), care of Stafford Ex. Gang, San Bernardino, Calif.
1080 Matias Ayala (Azala, Azalla), Tibbets Street, Riverside, Calif.
508 Luis (Lais) Ayala (Ayallo), 113 East Arlington Avenue, Riverside, Calif.
1420 John Cantarini, 639 Eighth, Riverside, Calif.
848 Gregorio Esparso (Esparro, Espares), Riverside, Calif.
695 Trenidia Gonsales (F. Gonsalez, Gonsaloz), Fourteenth, Riverside, Calif.
867 Guadaloupe Gurfanto (Guadalupe Guifanie, Gurfanto), Arlington, Calif.
1093 Francisco Evinandes (Fracesco Ernandes, Francisco Hermandez), Market, Riverside, Calif.
1926 Dearh (Deark) B. Joing, P. O. box 207, Highgrove, Calif.
525 Estanislado (Estanislodo) Luna, Col. Boulevard and Howard Street, Corona, Calif.
254 Leo Eldean McCrary, 531 Orange Street, Riverside, Calif, Las Plumas, Calif.
1431 Maurice Francis (F.) McElliott, 360 Eucalyptus Avenue, Riverside, Calif.
97 C. Mauriquez, Mountain View, Calif. (Mauriquez (C. Maruequez, Candeleria Vela Mountain View Avenue, Riverside, Calif.)
550 Antonio Mijella (Mejilla, Mijilla, Mylla), Chase Ranch, Corona, Calif.
1956 William Webster Nickle, box 178, Route A, Corona, Calif. (William W. Nickle, Holyoke, Colo.)
1046 Guadalupe Pachardo, Chase Ranch, Corona, Calif.
283 Joe W. Pena, R. F. D. 4, Arlington, Calif.
412 John Periz (Juan (John) Perez), Indiana, Riverside, Calif.
1153 Fred Rodriguez, Evans, Riverside, Calif.
1573 Sam Rubino (Rubino Salvatore, Sam Rukino), Opal, Riverside, Calif.
1919 George W. (G. W.) Smith, 1089 Orange, Riverside, Calif.
555 Joaquin Solorzano (Solarzano), Samuel, Riverside, Calif.
737 Pedro Urilias (Pedro L., Pedro L. Wilias), 212 Main, Corona, Calif.
551 Juan Vasquez (Tuan Vasquez, Juan Vasquez), Golden State Hotel, 8, Riverside, Calif.
1284 Juan Gracia Vill, 117 Merrill, Corona, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1216 Theodore (Thedore) Albanez, Redlands, Calif. (330 Latin Street, Calexico, Calif.).
233 Domuseno Alcaido, Blythe, Calif.
1443 Leon Avila (Alila, Avile), route No. 1, West Riverside, Calif.
1752 William Ballard, Blythe, Calif.
1464 Pearl (Peal) D. Boggers (Boggurs), Blythe, Calif.
1286 William J. Britton, Blythe, Calif.
1305 Albert Butres, Banning, Calif.
1411 William Callison, Nuevo, Calif.
1285 Jake Comstock, Blythe, Calif.
1801 Frank Corrillo, Murrieta, Calif.
1453 Encrias Damindas, Blythe, Calif.
1271 Vittore Dresti, Tamecula, Calif.
1917 Tom Eddy, Fertilla, Calif.
1395 Atansio Epnosia, route No. 1, Crestmore, West Riverside, Calif.
762 Conception Estrado, Blythe, Calif.
490 Jackie Gilbert Evans, Ethanac, Calif.
1646 William S. (Steward, Stewart) Foster, 341½ South Spring, Los Angeles, Calif. (Thermal, Calif.).
719 Benj. E. Garcia (Benjiman E. Garcia), Corona, Calif.
852 Calvin Godbee, Cocahella, Calif.
1956 Alberto Gonzales (Gonzalez), Blythe, Calif.
892 Martin Gonzales (Gonzalez), Mexico (Prado, Calif.).
1066 Ramon Gonzales, Blythe, Calif.
555 Jas. H. (Harrison) Green, route No. 1, Ethanac, Calif. (502 South Main Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1444 Silas Hamilton, Blythe, Calif.
1933 Chas A. (Albert) Jones, Winchester, Calif. (125 East Fourth, Los Angeles Calif.).
298 Frank Jones, Truman, Ark. (Temecula, Calif.).
1630 Emil L. Kisker, Wineville, Calif.
277 Eugene T. (Thomas) McKelligan (E. McKelligan), 1171 West Thirty-seventh Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.
1771 Frank E. (Estrada) Martinez, Coachella, Calif.
1777 Joe D. G. Martinez, Pedley, Calif.
202 Sam A. (Augustine) Martinez, Perris, Calif.
1057 Manuel Minduago (Manuel Minduaga), Winchester, Calif.
1596 John W. (William) Mitchell, Hemet, Calif.
1660 Jose (Joe) Noriega, Blythe, Calif.
89 Arthuro M. Ortiz, Indio, Calif.
1391 Edward Osuna, Perris, Calif.
1058 John Parnassas, Alberhill, Calif. (754 Town, Los Angeles, Calif.).
735 Manuel Rameriz (Ramirez, Ramires), Palm Springs, Calif.
1063 Jose Maria Reiirs, Blythe, Calif.
1748 Harrison D. Richards, Blythe, Calif.
1327 Henry Richards, route No. 1, Ethanac, Calif. (general delivery, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1781 Sarafin Rios, Prado, Calif.
1203 Geronimo Rodrigues, Blythe, Calif.
1808 Joe Ruiz, 130 B. B., Puenc't, Calif.
1073 George Rujanio, route No. 1, camp West Riverside, Calif.
1022 Raphael (Rafael) Sepeda, Wineville, Calif.
673 Geo. Washington Smith, Blythe, Calif.
1086 Leandro Trujillo, Redlands, Calif.
1253 James Unicio, Thermal, Calif.
1244 Jose Vasquez, Elsinore, Calif. (Riverside Portland Cement Co., Riverside, Calif.).
1816 Jose Vasques, Blythe, Calif.
1775 Henry Williams, Seventh Avenue South, Seattle, Wash. (Beaumont, Calif.).
489 Jacob Walter Williams, Hemet, Calif.
333 Alex Ybarra, route No. 1, Corona, Calif.
1418 Alfredo Campos, Temeculia, Calif. (El Paso, Tex.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2290 Lester Crawford, Mayhews, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF SACRAMENTO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1344 LeRoy (Leo Roy, Leo Ray) Armstrong, 626 H Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2384 Chang (Chong) Babe, 1228 N Street, Sacramento, Calif.
70 Eddie Belmont, 1012 Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3100 Elmer Bersie, 1007½ Fourth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3074 George Boyd, 922 Second Street, Sacramento, Calif. (Geo. Boyd, care of Alvin Eggbert, Grafton, Calif.)
2408 Irving Washington Boyer, 707 Ninth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1926 Alfred Brauns, Sacramento, Calif.
2065 William Britton, 1309 Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1830 Harold Hayes (Hays) Brown, Glenville, W. Va.
3139 Wilfred Chester Carson, 620 H Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3939 Joe Cassi, 120 I Street, Sacramento, Calif. (Joe Casci, Eureka, Calif.)
194 Charles Cavanaugh, 1006½ Second Street, Sacramento, Calif.
447 Albert (A.) Kay Chan, 701½ Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
525 Noah Childers, 301½ J Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3254 Wong Chun (Chan), 410 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2294 William Herman Condroy (Condray), 1016½ Fifth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3450 Richard M. (Moorland) Courtney, general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.
1273 Benjamin Crowder (Cowden, Benjamin W. Cowden, box No. 82, Riverside Road, Sacramento, Calif.
1266 Richard Daly, 819 I Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2588 Sam Tony Delsona, Union Hotel, Sacramento, Calif.
1525 Thomas Elza Dodd, 1317 Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2256 Lin (Lim) Dong, 314 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3978 Homer Chas. Falwell (H. C. Falwell, Horace Chas. Falavell), 1011½ Fifth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1143 Isadore E. Fesler, general delivery, Sacramento, Calif. (Isadore Eugene Fesler, Hamilton City, Calif.)
1553 John Henry Fiegr, 1017 Tenth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1741 Fong Foo, 908½ Third Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3665 Fong Fin (Tin) Foo, 917 Third Street, Sacramento, Calif.
790 Ngau Foo, 213½ Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3273 Thomas Patrick (P.) Green, 906½ Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1134 Carl Wilber Groves, Front and P Streets, Sacramento, Calif.
1784 William Albert Gruber (Greeher), St. Clair rooming house (transient), Sacramento, Calif.
469 Carl Columbus Hamilton, 406 M Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1899 Arthur Hammon (Hannon), city wharf, Sacramento, Calif.
2684 Fong King Hans, 824 Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3050 Robert Harris, 210 Sutter Avenue, Sacramento, Calif.
1722 Edward Hazenton, 716 Seventh Street, Sacramento, Calif.
551 Glen W. Hefkin (Glenn William Hefkin), Homewood, Kans.
735 Miguel Hernandez, Sacramento, Calif.
2941 Jew Wah Hing, 919½ Third Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2963 Lee Hong, 316 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif. (P. O. box 288, Colusa, Calif.).
2051 Francis K. (Keoholani) Hopkins, Second and N Streets, Sacramento, Calif.
1306 John Barasbua (Barsnbus) Hughes), 504½ K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3310a Lewis Hector Hulburt, 110 West Thirty-seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (Lewis Hector Hurlburt, Hotel Regis, K 10–11, 204 First National Bank Building, Oakland, Calif.)
193 Frank Thomas Jackson, 203½ J Street, Sacramento, Calif. (care of Cooks and Waiters' Union, Sacramento, Calif.).
3848 Alvin Johnson, S. P. Depot, Sacramento, Calif.
1310a Faun King, 510½ J Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3214 Henry (Henrey) Landrum (Lamdrum), 720 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3205 Joseph H. Laughlin (Harry Laughlin), St. George Hotel, Sacramento, Calif.
586 Lin (Lim) Len, 314 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3983 Edward Lewis, 916 Second Street, Sacramento, Calif. (Edward M. Lewis, general delivery, Oakland, Calif.)
2785 John Adolph Lingrist (Sigrist, Ligrist), 620 H Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3680 Joseph Logan, 128½ K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2390 Hugh McDonald, Great Western Power Co. (transitory), Sacramento, Calif.
3175 Tom Francis McDonald (Tom McDonald), 613 N Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2168 John McNally, general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.
2636 James Edward Malley, 708½ K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1394 Frank Monroe Mason, 904 Q Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3107 William J. (William Joseph) Mead, 1308 Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
8 Edward Mero, 904 Q Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3662 Sisto Gasper Mirandes (Sisto Gaspar Miranda, Sisto Gaspar Mirandes), 1005½ Second Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1822 Charlie J. Mitchum (Charlie Jess Mitcham, Charley Chas. Mitcham), general delivery, Petaluma, Calif. (3404 Y Street, Sacramento, Calif.).
2688 Joseph Francis Mondoza (Joseph Francis Mendova, Joseph Francis Medonca), 506 (506½) J Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2418 Alfred Munk, 516½ Seventh Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2696 Levi James Nagle, 910½ Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1573 Fong Ming On, 324½ I Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1503 Yee On, 921 Fourth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
713a Arthur Peterson, general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.
959 Theodore Edward (Theo. Ed.) Picasso, 1110 Fourth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2318 Chan Poy, 221½ Eye Street (917 Third Street), Sacramento, Calif.
3901 Wong Sam, 907½ Third Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1630 John Santiago, 1007½ Fourth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3726 Vincent Savorie (Vincent Harvey Savore, Vincent Harry Savoie, Vincent Harry Savore), Sacramento, Calif.
2822 Jerry Scanlon, 1110 Second Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3277 Fong Seck, 915 Fourth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2940 Kustian Simlenas (Kristian Simlenas, Kristian Simlenes), 328½ K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2661 Dewa Singh, 1117 Second Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3711 Chas. Ralph Smith, 328½ K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3120 Lou Dong Soo (Low Leong Soo, Low Long Soo), 904½ Third Street (920 Third Street), Sacramento, Calif.
1291 Walter Robert Spencer, 800 J Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2382 William Steele, Twelfth Street Bridge, Sacramento, Calif. (future address: Brush Creek P. O., Plumas County, Calif.).
3498 Bob Stepp, 511 M Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3891 Roy John (Roy James) Thompson, 628 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2314 Harry Underwood, 1018½ Seventh Street, Sacramento, Calif. (general delivery, Portland, Oreg.).
1653 Thomas M. (Thos. M.) Vaughan, City Wharf, Fort Sutter boat, California Transportation Co.
1408 Lin Uun (Lin Vun), 314 I Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3543 Herbert Weichman, 912½ Sixth Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2982 Robert J. Weir (Robert John Weir), 620 H Street, Sacramento, Calif. (74 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1272 Edward Wilson, 530 M Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1492 Yee Wing, 909 Third Street, Sacramento, Calif.
2607 Mah Ah You, 300 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3377 Sam Yuen, 314 Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
1670 Fong Wing Yok (Fong Ming Yak), 312½ Eye Street, Sacramento, Calif.
3555 Lau Tong (Lam Tong), 314 I Street, Sacramento, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2079½ Benjamin Harrison (Harrisin) Anderson, 205 First Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
2524 Joe Belles, First Street, Chino, Calif.
79 Mike Bouma, box 405, Chino, Calif.
1687 Thos. Roy Cadden, 391 D Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
2049 David Chaves, S 12, Chino, Calif.
2075 Otis C. Clement, Rialto, Calif. (Otis Clement, care of T. G. Thompson, R. F. D. No. 2, El Centro, Calif.).
2941 Michael Coyle, Co. Hospital, San Bernardino, Calif.
426 Andrew Daneri, 124 Sterling Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
1828 Frank Charley Dennis, R. F. D. A, Chino, Calif.
278 Enrique Garcia, Guasti, Calif.
2913 Lorencia Garcia, Third and Mount Vernon Avenue, San Bernardino, Calif.
3713 Charles Gordon, 14 Thirty-sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1389 Manuel Grajeda, Chino, Calif.
316 Lee Hung Hoe, 337 D Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
468 Frederick (Frederic) Hull, Fontana, Calif.
1036 Joe Jiminez, Lytle Creek, Calif.
3647 John Johnson, 260 First Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
438 Godfrey Theodore Keene, Second Avenue, Upland, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
71 Lloyd Lantz, Cajon, Calif.
3434 John E. Leonard, Harvey House, San Bernardino, Calif.
1824 Florentine Lira, Declez, Calif.
3293 James Lyons, E Street, San Bernardino, Calif. (875 Braddock Avenue, Braddock, Pa.).
2327 Charles Martin, Fontana, Calif.
1698 Morgan Martin, Fontana, Calif.
208 Emilio Mendoza, Alta Loma, Calif. (San Marcial, N. Mex.).
190 John Montanye, R. F. D. No. 1, Chico, Calif.
2118 Joseph Morgan (Jos. Morgan), no address given.
281 Jesus (Joses, Josus) Moreno, R. F. D. A, Chico, Calif.
2963 Tony Napoleone, 723 Third Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
2433 Murvin Oscar (M. O.) Oliver, Date Street, Rialto, Calif.
1490 Dari Cari Pierce, Fontana, Calif.
241 Peter Piasere (Pelisero), Guasti, Calif.
2377 Manuel Quintana, First and C Streets, Chino, Calif.
2003 Albert Rouland (Rowland (s)), Third and Mount Vernon, San Bernardino, Calif.
1120 Daniel Sinaus, Third Street, Chino, Calif.
2617½ Frank Stephens, 133 West Twenty-first Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1608 Elmer Thomas, 767 Third Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
233 Jose Villa, First Street, Chino, Calif.
1652 Chas. Goldie (Goldy) West, 608 Third Street, San Bernardino, Calif.
347a Robert James Young, West Seventeenth Street, Upland, Calif.
2700 Presiliano Archuleta, 750 Penn, San Bernardino, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1022 Joe Bishop, Parker, Ariz.
1039 John Bittick (Bitlick), 1115 Front, Needles, Calif.
1407 Victor Carson, Barstow, Calif.
122 George Aaron Cole, 807 Y Street (Fourth Street), Needles, Calif.
48 Esiques Cortes (Ezequras Cortes), Needles, Calif.
1394 Fred S. Cunningham, Bagdad, Calif.
161 Frank Elliott (Elliot), Denver, Colo.
638 Toney (Tony) Frankina, 800 Gearney Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Monarch Hotel, Needles, Calif.).
1090 Mike Martin Gonyon, Lodi, Calif.
284 Juan J. Gutieras, Needles, Calif.
1571 John Hall, San Bernardino County, Lucerne Valley, Calif.
1656 Charley W. Logan, Hesperia, Calif.
18 Christian E. Meyer, Fenner, Calif.
1081 Alving (Alvin) F. Muehlfeld, Daggett, Calif.
58 Pasqual Muniss (Munis, Murris), Needles, Calif.
946 Edward (Edmond) Harry Price, 710 A. & P., Needles, Calif.
93 Jose Rameres (Ramires), Siam, Calif. (Jesus Maria, N. Mex.).
399 Stanley Raymond Suit, Trona, Calif.
91 Bert (Burt) Michael Reynolds, 721 Central Avenue, Home Apartments, Los Angeles, Calif.
248 Roy Joseph Russell, Amboy, Calif. (Provo, Utah).
1459 Benjamin Scott, Needles, Calif.
9 George Siemens, Llano, Calif.
257 Rafael O. Villa, Cima, Calif.
1026 John L. Walters, Bagdad, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

740a Louis Garcia, Courtland House, Seventh and G–4 (Fourth and G), San Diego, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

8706a Leopola (Leopolao) Abelardo, 392 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3188 Jose Acrena (Aguna), China Basin Yard, San Francisco, Calif.
2375 John K. (Kamaka) Akaka, 246 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
778 Louis S. (Stevenson) Alfieri (Alfiri), 80 Ninth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5166 Arthur W. (William) Anderson (A. W. Anderson), 92 Seventh Streeet, San Francisco, Calif.
1720a Sverre Anderson, 222 The Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif.
1374 Charles S. (Steffens) Applegate, 205 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5596a Benj. Austin, United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif. (2021 Blake Street, Berkeley, Calif.).
2630 Parfirio (Porfirio) Ayala, China Basin Yards, San Francisco, Calif.
3841 Anthony Bade, 187 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3493 Anthony (H.) Barovich, 995 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2145a Reuben Becker, 153 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Hercules Powder Co., Pinole, Calif.).
404 William John Bennett, 259 Seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1773b Christinio Bernardino (Christino Bernandino, Barnardino), general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
5589 Oscar Bevry (Bevery), 585 Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4891 Thos. H. (Henry) Blundell, 957 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3461a George Bowman, United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
3207a James (J. H.) Boyd, 493 Bryant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
167 Raymond Boyer, 331 Pennysbrama Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2591 Jacob Brand, 273 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2458 Frederick (Fritz) Brandt, 344 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2489 Patrick Brennan, 525 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3674a Arnold H. Bressler (Arnold Hendrik Bresler, A. H. Bresler), 197 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3265 Wayne Bronson, 241 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (St. Charles Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.).
4112a Percy Brown, United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
2463a William Brown, 252 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2073 Jack C. (Cecil, Ceil, J. C.) Bruggy, 176 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (567 West One hundred and forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.).
5391 John A. Lee Brun (John Alfred Lebrun, John A. LeBrun), 149 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif (508 Columbia Street East, New Westminster, British Columbia, Canada.
2378 Clyde Buchanon (Buchanan), 936 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2141 Peter E. (Emil) Buland, 187 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1859 James Burke, 667 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8829 Nicolous Burkers (Nicolaas Johannes Berkers, Nicolaus J. Berkers, N. J. Berkers), 120 The Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif.
2160 Samuel (Adelbert) Butler, 672 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3606 George P. Callicoote (George Patrick Callicotte, Callicoote), 55 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1558 Harry O. Carroll, 957 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1130 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
5031 Frederick Castro, 850 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3300 Frederick Cherry, 662 Clementina Street, San Francisco, Calif (383 Ninth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
2943 Louis Cleary, 28 Essex Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1852 Otto Cohn, 939 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif (Green Park Barracks, Westminister, British Columbia).
3850 Jess Collins, 165 Eleventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4267 Raymond Colton, 819 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5408 John F. Condon (John Francis Condon, John Condon), 80 Nineteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3769 John Constantinon, 303 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5193 Merrit (Merritt) W. Cook, 1018 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2452 Thomas B. (Bernard) Corcoran, 397 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2675 Meka Cordos (Cords, Mike Cords), 995 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
604 Charles J. Corlin (Carlin), Lang Hotel, Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
701 Howard Cornwell, 417 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1568b Barney Costello (Castello), General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
730 William Cowett, 221 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5411 Arthur J. Cox, 153 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5334 Harry Crawford, 935 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1851 Thomas Crawford, 190 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3226 Cornelius K. Crocci (Cornelius Kiefer Croco), 939 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
490 Batt Crowley, 829 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3225 John J. Curtin (John James Curtin, J. J. Curtin), 260 Connecticut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
706 Richard Dale, 205 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2887 Bernard Daly (Bernard L. Daly, B. L. Daly, Bernard Daley), 158 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Cinema Ex. 6154 Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
685 Walter Daves, (William Davis, Davies), 227 Connecticut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3942 Claude E. Davis, 452 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2686 George DeLaCruz, 253 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1255a Pablo S. Dela (Delo) Rosa, 60 Shipley Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3644a Carlos M. Del Campo, Del Mar Hotel, Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3133 Joseph Dennis, 1222 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2410a Raymond Diaz, 395 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1973c Robert Dickerson, 493 Bryant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5002 Charles Dickson, 548 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3693 James Dimulias, 137 Clementina Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2635 Charles H. Dix (Charles Henry Dix), 172 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2029 Juma Dodd, 233 or 234 Langton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3948 John Dodd (John Wesley Dodd, J. W. Dodd), 197 (Albany Hotel) Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2210 Alfred Dosie, 789 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2463 John J. Durcan (John Jos. Duncan, Durcan), 1082 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8713 George E. Duree (George Emmett Duree), 114 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4835 Michael G. Dutrivich (Michael George Dutrivick, Dutrivich), 825 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2705 Wilbur (Wilber) Edmunds, 175 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1045, Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
3915 Allan K. Ernest (Alan Kenward Ernest, Alan K. Ernest), 939 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
316b Wilbert Evans, 226 6th Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3080 Richard Falk, 146 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5131 Patrick Fallon, 345 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4839 Fred H. Falls (Fred Hinze Falls), General Delivery, San Francisco,
30 Fabian M. Feldhousing (Fabian Mattees Feldhouseing), Winchester Hotel, Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1898 John Ferguson, 90 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.
68 John Peter Ffione, 80 Ninth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4707 John Fitzpatrick, 252 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2098 Charles Flynn, 574 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3854 Jerry Flynn, 287 Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif.
180 Henry M. Ford (Mason Henry Ford), St. Raphael Hotel, San Francisco, Calif. (General Delivery, Fresno, Calif.).
4669 William G. Forsen (William Gustav Forsen), 47 Chesley Street, San Francisco, Calif.
282 John Foster, 1147 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1700 Ernest E. Fourner, 74 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
671 Frank E. Friedel (Frank Edgar Friedel), 143 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3913 Louis Frietsch (Frieeth), General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
1487b Carmen B. Fuentis (Fuentes), custody Department of Justice, San Francisco, Calif.
2911b Jesus Galeana (Galiano), San Francisco, Calif.
1412a Charles T. Calloway (Gallway, Charles F. Gallwey), United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
2493 Pete Garcia, 926 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2876 John M. Garman, 74 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (John M. Gorman, 236 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.)
1889 Edward Gilham, 109 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4822 John Girad (Girard), 338 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1652 Samuel Gleaves, 114 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5691 Lawrence Glenn (Lawrence Edward Glenn, Lawrence E. Gleinn, Glenn), 141 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2096 Harry Goetz, general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
4496 George Gordon, Hotel Delta, San Francisco, Calif.
4449 Harry Gray, 143 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5215a Cruz Gonzales-Gonsales, general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
3029 Andrew Greig, 271 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (539 Carolina Street, Vallejo, Calif.)
3360a John Gressman (Gressmann), the Embarcadero Y. M. C. A., San Francisco, Calif.
4398 Frank Griffin, 112 Seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif. (512a Thirteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.)
926 Carl Gruening, 781 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2812 Ramon Gutierriz (Gutierres, Gutierrey), China (China) Basin Yard.
2324 Bernard (Bernhard) Hansen (Bernard Jeutef Hansen), 38 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1481 Thomas W. Hardisty (Thomas Wilson Hardisty, T. W. Hardisty), 115 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2353 Frank G. Hare (Frank George Hare), 214 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4791 Patrick Harrington, 205 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4760a Charles E. Hedges, 286 Second Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3183 Charles Hennings, 208 Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif.
708 Dennis Chas. Herlihy, 11 Shipley Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Dennis C. Herlihy, general delivery, Camp Lewis, Wash.)
5665 Walton J. Hillis (Walton John Hillis), Army and Navy Y. M. C. A., San Francisco, Calif.
1516a George B. Holmes (George Bishop Holmes), 108 Seventeenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5053b George W. Howard (George Walter Howard), Atlas Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
2492 Fred J. Howell (Fred John Howell), 911 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3556 Gus Hubbenette, 456 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (337 Guerrero Street, San Francisco, Calif.)
2963 Edward H. Hunger (Edward Henry Hunger), 51 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2359 Frank J. Hunter, 254 Embarcadero Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Care A. Muller, Sacto Transportation Co., Sacto, Calif.)
3821a Richard Hunter (R. Hunter), 141 Fifteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5082 George Hutchison, 684 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif. (George W. Hutchinson, International Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.; Hutchison, 781 Sixth Street, Oakland, Calif.)
723 Christian Ibsen, steamer *Matsonia*, Pier 30, San Francisco, Calif.
4057 Kaslem (Kabm, Kabin) Islam, 447 Ninth Street, San Francisco; Calif.
5414 Walter James (Walter M. James), 715 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1681 Raymond Jeffery, 221 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1718a Warner Johansen, 221 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5301 Ernest Johnson, 253 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
96 John P. Johnson (John Phillip (Philip) Johnson), 744 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2909 William Johnson (Johnston), 1018 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
233 Ralph Jones, 126 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3518 Patrick F. Joyce (Patrick Francis Joyce), 464 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif.
171 John Phillip Keefar (John Philip Keefer), 427 Ninth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3483 James B. Keenan, 425 Ninth Street (725 Ninth Street), San Francisco, Calif.
1814 Michael D. Kehoe (Michael David Kehoe), 604 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4681 Durward T. Ketterer (Durward Theo Ketterer, Durward T. Ketterer), 1045 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

679 Walter E. Kinski, 231 Missouri Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Walter Edward Kinski, 231 Mission Street.)
3038 Roman Kiviatkowsky (Roman Kwiatowsky, R.), 309 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3677 William Klelan, 1259 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2132 William Klemm, 149 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1675 Nick Konskonlas (Kouskoulas), 45 Hayworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5475 Ivan Krotov, 597 Utah Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1404 Edward Lacy, 789 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4816a George T. Larsen (George Theodore Larsen), 120 Embarcadero Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3623 Albert Lato, 165 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3153b Gustavo Lazano (Gustave Lozani, Gustevo Lozano), general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
1458 William Learney (Leamey), 48 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2852 Demetrios (Demetre) Leon, 321 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5187 Joseph Leonard, 557 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
560 William B. Leower (Locowr, Locover), (William Bernard Loewer, Leower), Clements Hotel, 271, San Francisco, Calif.
33 Bruce Leslie, 252 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3762 Athanasios Lipais, 636a Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
2230a William Lockland (William L. Laughlin, W. M. Laughlin), general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
41a Morton R. Long (Morton Raymond Long), Dewey Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
1972c Fanatino Lorenzand (Faustino Lorenzana), 677a Minna Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1050 Joseph A. Lorenzona (Joe Arthur Lorenzana, Lorenzona), 1288 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
348 Ithanassians Lynperopoulos (Ithanassious Lynperopouloxes, S. K. Lynperopoulos), 259 South Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
2741a Frank McCarthy (McCarty), 756 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2300 Maurice McCarthy, 464 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2017 Roy McCrary (Roy Crary), 146 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
283 Peter M. McGeveny (Peter Marwin McGeveny, Peter M. McGivney, Peter Merwin McGivisy), 1015 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
629a John J. McGuire (John James McGuire), 115 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4818a James McLain, Keystone Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
2201 James J. McNamee (James Joseph McNamee, Jos. J. McNamee), 94 Seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2040 John McNamara, 69 Kissling Street, San Francisco, Calif.
184 Joseph P. McVey, 1227 Seventeenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3657 William Mackel, 456 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2881a Gustave Maggio, United States Depot of Justice, San Francisco, Calif. (903 Clinton Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1649 Mathias Maki (Matheas Make), 1011 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4110 Mathew Mantell (Matthew J. Mantell), 211 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4856a George Markus (G. Markus), 82 Perry Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5374a Delfino Martinez, general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
1691 Daniel Mattie (Daniel Patrick Mattie, Daniel P. Mattie), 782 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1697 John F. Meade (John Francis Meade), 227 Ninth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3575 John R. Meski (Meskes), 276 Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3694 James T. Murray, 548 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3813 Fred Musson (Murson), 175 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2165a Clarence E. Myers, 284 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3125 Thomas Moffett (Moffitt), 140 South Park Street, San Francisco.
3079a Louis (Lowas) Molongt (Loyis Meiulonget), Cooks and Waiters' Union, San Francisco, Calif.
4003a Jack F. Monahon (Jack Francis Monahon, Jack F. Monahan), Perry Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4043 Patrick Monahan, 236 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1667 Mertyn Moon, 750 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1555 Thomas Moore, 40 Seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4147 Walter J. Moore (W. J. Moore), 819 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
58 Arthur J. Morgan (Arthur James Morgan), Denver House, Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2504 John W. Morrow (John William Morrow), 221 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2294a Allen Naipo, care of Hawaiian Steamship Co., San Francisco, Calif.
1594a Frank Nopoli, General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
2014a Peter R. Nunez, San Quentin Prison, San Francisco, Calif. (Peter Robert Nunes, General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.)
1972b John Nurm (John A. Nurn, Nurm, John Alexander Nurm), 348 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3066 Ed O'Brien (Edward), 934 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
176 Terance O'Brien, 187 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2725 Robert O. O'Donnell (Robert Owen O'Donnell), 487 Tehama Street, San Francisco, Calif.
122 Oscar W. Ogren (Oscar Wm. Ogren), 404 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.
130 Dennis O'Keefe, 1570 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3442a Oscar Olson (Olsen), 234 Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif.
1768a Frank Orasco (Francisco), General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
4983 Peter O'Toole, 138 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1850 James W. Packer (James William Packer), 1288 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3577 Robert Palmer, 224 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3282 Theodore Pappadotas, 41a Juniper Street, San Francisco, Calif. Pappadatos, T., 52 Langton Street).
261 Verner Para (Paro), 684 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5258a Tony Paresi, Mont (Mint) Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
2248 George D. Pavelias, 205 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3860 John Peris, 82 Ritch (Rich) Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5647 William Perry, 149 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
629 Robert Peters, 672 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1799 Vernon H. Price (Vernon Hardy Price, Vernon Price), 659 Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1678 Kalani Pun, 246 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2637 Martin A. Ramez (Ramiez), 830 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4076 James Ramirez, 753 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1900 Louis Rasmussen, 292 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
253 Arthur C. Remers (Arthur Charles Remus), 725 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8798 William H. Reynolds, 55 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
64a John Rice, 515a Natoma Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1819a John Richards, 650 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (328 Townsend Street, Townsend Street Rooming House, San Francisco, Calif.)
3142 Thomas Robinson, 74 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4189 Caleo Roe, 76 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2663a Fred Romano, Navy Yard Hotel, Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2295b Victor Romarato, Northeast Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
5245a William H. Ross, United States Marshal's Office, San Francisco, Calif.
4909 Gordon Russell, 190 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
266a Vinencio San Juan (Vivenico, V.), General Delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
1779 Richard Saunders, 602 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4692 Hirn D. Schays (Hum David (Davis) Schays), 441 Minna Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5393 Bruno Schmack (Schnack), Rex Hotel, 236 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2327 William Schmid (William Fred Schmid, William F. Schmid, W. F. Schmid), 181 Jessie (Jesse) Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1956 Clifford P. Schroeder (Clifford Peter Schroeder), 55 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
282a Antony (Anthony) Schutrop, 37 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3616a Mel C. Searle (M. C. Searle), 146 Stewart Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2223 Louis Seiminoff, 128 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2327a Henry Seilios (Selles, Selleas, Teilles), Hotel Senata, corner Sixth and Folsom Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
2446 George B. Sharp, general delivery, Oakland, Calif. (George Barton Sharp, Henry Hotel, Sixth and Mission Streets, San Francisco, Calif.)
1615 James A. Sheldon, steamer *Pyramid*, San Francisco, Calif.
90 Cris (Chris) Sheridan, 1150 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5096 John W. Shortridge, China Basin Yard, San Francisco, Calif.
3708 Frank P. Shumaker (Frank Ray Shumaker), 44 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3061 Benjamin H. Shutes (Benjamin Harrison Shutes, Benjamin Shutes), 149 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4 William Sinclair, 205 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1877 Joseph Skroponich (Skrapovich, Skropanich, Skropaniah), 210 Brannan (Brennen) Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5243 Frank Smith (Frank H. Smith), 85 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2638a Joseph Smith, 417 Sheldon Building, San Francisco, Calif.
4640 Sid S. Smith, 153 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1461 Ernest Souza, 281 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3268 Clarence Spurgeon (Clarence E. Spurgeon, C. E. Spurgeon), 1146 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2178a William D. Stafford (William David Stafford), general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.
4098 Samuel L. Stanley (Samuel Luther Stanley), 895 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5294 Herman Steior (Stein), 328 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3754 Frank H. Stevenson (Frank Hoey Stevenson), 1045 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1534 Henry Stilmikoff (Stilinikoff, Nandr Stahmakoff), 115 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
299 David George Stokes, 971 Mission Street (3452 Sixteenth Street), San Francisco, Calif.
4850a Wallace Surear (Surnear), United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif. (First and Broadway, Oakland, Calif.).
1504 Robert Swanson, 114 Stillman Street, San Francisco, Calif.
958 Bryan Sweeney (Bryon Sweeny, Bryan Sweeny), 66 Perry Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3480 Dalton Sweeney (Dalton F. Sweeney), 55 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5610 Edward Sweeney, 234 Iowa Street, San Francisco, Calif.
348 John H. Tansey (John Henry Tansey), 190 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
324a John Teply, United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif. (Redwood City Jail, San Francisco, Calif.).
4053 Harry Thompson, 213 Sterling Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5274 Irvin S. Thyle, 55 Fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
879 Lonnie Thomas Todd (Lonnie T. Todd), 172 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2464 John E. Tompkins (John Earl Tompkins), custody United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
181 Thorwald (Thorvald) Philip Tostenson, 870 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4079 Dan E. Tuninsker (Dan Edward Tuninsker), 597 Utah Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4755 Richard Uberio, 114 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1419 Leo E. Vail (Leo Ernest Vail, Leo Vail), 1288 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
67 Frank Valentine, 452 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3631a Petris G. Van Dewoort (Petrus Geo. Van der Voort, P. G. d Voort), 36 The Embarcardero, San Francisco, Calif.
2944a Demetrio Velan, room 311, Post Office Building, San Francisco, Calif.
3762 John Vierra, United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
5046 Andreas Volbos (Voilos, Volos), 377 Third Street (345 Third Street, New Athens Hotel), San Francisco, Calif.
1771 George E. Waite, 1146 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5200 John C. Wake (John Edward Wake, J. E. Wake), 146 Stewart Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2506 William Walker, 895 Mission Street, Lick Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
4956 James Walsh, 187 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.

1529a George Waltson (George W. Waltson), 1213 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5412 Peter J. Weber (P. J. Weber), 2224 Mariposa Street, San Francisco, Calif.
438 August Wesenberg, 731 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3447a Henry West, general delivery, San Francisco, Calif. (Disciplinary Barracks, Alcatraz Island, Calif.).
4764a David White (David Joseph White, D. J. White), 228 Embarcadero, San Francisco, Calif.
674 John P. White (John Patrick White, John White), 156 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
672 William H. William (William Harrison Williams, W. Harrison Williams), Hotel Atlanta, Seventh and Mission Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
1641 Panagiotas Willis (Panogiotis Willas, Panagiotis Willis, Ganagiotis Nillas), 791 Folsom Street.
5003a Matia F. Winns (Winans), United States marshal's office, San Francisco, Calif.
1333 Lynn R. Wood (Lynn Raymond Wood), 338 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
18 William H. Woods (William Howard Woods), corner Howard and Sixth Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
2460 David C. Woolliscroft (David Charles Woolliscroft), 574 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (box 662, Imperial, Calif.).
4326 Herbert W. Wright (Herbert Washington Wright), 193 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3193 Reuben J. Wulff (Reuben Joseph Wulff), 781 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5074 James R. Wyatt (James Roy Wyatt), Morton Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
5123 A. Young, 34 Sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Sergeant Quartermaster Department, Drummond, N. J.).
1470a Harry Young (Harry R. Young), 172 East Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

605 William Berthold (Bertholl), San Francisco Hospital, San Francisco, Calif.
753 Geo. B. (George Evert) Blain, San Francisco Hospital.
1209 Vincent Bonnici, 1200 Keith, corner Fairfax, San Francisco, Calif.
720 Manuel (Manuels) Borg, 1206 Fairfax Avenue, South San Francisco, Calif.
731 John J. (Joseph) Brady, 2580 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1949 Jos. (Joseph) Camillert, 1730 La Salle Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
169 Jos. (Joseph) Camelarri (Camilleri), 1781 Oakdale Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5424 Patrick Duffy, 900 Potrero Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
975 Emil (Eric G.) Erickson, 1076 Carolina Street, San Bruno, Calif.
1552 Frank (Felix) Falcom (Falcon), 2316 Twenty-third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2002 Furgisant (Furguzant), 940 Arkansas Street, San Francisco, Calif.
635 Anglo (Angelo) Galen (Galea), 1104 Phelps Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1902 Hakita (Nikito, Nikita) Giaska (Gickin), 17 Boyd Street, San Francisco (623 Thirteenth Street, Oakland), Calif.
1404 Wm. Godfrey, 2222 Twenty-third Street (1066 Kansas Street), San Francisco, Calif.
665 Tone (Toni) Grech, 1247 Fairfax Avenue, South San Francisco, Calif.
2065 Peter Haley, 314 Twenty-second Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1147 Cornelius T. Hollahan (Hallohan), 952 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1110 Maurice Hallihan (Hallahan), 952 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.
603 Polimikis (Polinikis) Lalagianis, 1265 Gilman Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
180 Oscar Mattson, 1200 Utah Street, San Francisco, Calif.
997 Edw. (Edward) Lussi, Johnson's Dairy, Leland Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1062 Chas. (Charles) Mosheili, 997 Arkansas Street, San Francisco, Calif.
830½ John Mosbeill, 836 Arkansas Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1103 Michael Murphy, 952 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.
906 Olegario Poard, 10 Lucy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
475 Alex (Alek, Anek) Popoff, 842 Wisconsin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1836 John P. (F.) Powers, 673 Texas Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1262 Chas. (Charles) Rafalo, 1206 Fairfax Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2044 Constantine (Constantino) Scribberas (Sciberras), 1298 Fairfax Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
702 Dinardo Sceverio, 512½ Railroad Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
359 Eugene Sullivan, 917 Illinois Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1115 Salvador (Salvatore) Sammutt (Sammut), 1284 Fairfax Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
922 Henry W. (Wilken) Wieboldt, 2678 Twenty-first Street (care of steamer *Apache*, pier No. 5), San Francisco, Calif.
561 Daniel J. Guiney, 20 Latona Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1577 John Guiney, 20 Latona Street, San Francisco, Calif.
338 Michael Guiney, 20 Latona Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1850 Cornelius Daniel Sullivan, 952 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

563 Edwin Adams, 3030 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2390 Geotfried C. Brobell (Gottfried Christopher Brobil, Brobell, Brobid), 12 Godeus Street (12 Godeno Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2253 Thomas Carey, 173 Highland Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1328 Eugene A. Carr (Eugene Augustine Carr), 143 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif. (82 St. Marys Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
2613 Jas. Connor, 131 Park Street, San Francisco, Calif. (0581 East Fourteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.).
2507 Jos. Constantione (Costantinio, Costantino), 50 Manchester Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2744 Emanuele Cardinali (Cardinale), 320 Precita Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1287 John D. (John T.) Donoho, 135 Rey Street, San Francisco, Calif.
711 Michael Donohoe, 21 Powers Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2982 James Douglas, 2255 San Jose Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2487 Thomas Fallon, 603 London Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3102a Gus Fay, 318 Madison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
16 David S. Gorman (David Stephen Gorman), 480 Madrid Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1257 Chester Horgan, Silver Heights, San Francisco, Calif.
597 Edward Kittler, 97 Coleridge Street, San Francisco, Calif.
479 Michael Kormendy, 4315 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2553a Herman Lundbald (Lundblad), 399 Courtland Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
678 Alexander McCabe, 79 Norden Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2203 Fimis (Finnis, Fimis Gillmore) McCann (F. G. McCann), 322 Raymond Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (P. O. box 343, Riverbank, Calif.).
2138 John Edw. (John E.) O'Connor, 1535 Hampshire Street, San Francisco, Calif. (127 Valley Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
2954 Robert Henry Platt, 21 Brook Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2773 Walter Puhff, 68 Rey Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
277 Geobatto (Giobatto) Rocco, 52 Santa Marriana (Santa Marina), San Francisco, Calif.
2412 William David Ryan, 216 Curtis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
950b Herman Schwing (H. Schuring), 3900 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1326a Michael Smith, 127 Edenburgh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1407 Frank Tognetti, 4789 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 10, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

3813 Eugene Francis Ahern, 610 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
1042a Gettfried (Gottfried, Gottli) Anderson, 1466 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
3152 Chas. Cuthbert M. H. Baldwin (Charles Cuthbert Marley Hunter Baldwin, C. C. M. H. Baldwin), 1358 Post, San Francisco, Calif.
3633 Albert Weiss Banks, 1377 Folsom, San Francisco, Calif.
4066 Max Bass, 1215 Buchanan, San Francisco, Calif.
3483 Fred Bauman, 1030 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
139 Ralph Phillip (Philip) Beckneli, Oregon Hotel, 1912 Fillmore, San Francisco, Calif.
3540 Benj. (Benjamin) Bender, 1663 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
2554 Dale Byron Bost, 1150 Ellis (438 O'Farrell), San Francisco, Calif.
834 Thomas Joseph Boyd, 1550 Fillmore, San Francisco, Calif.
122 Courtland Edw. (Cortland, Edward) Brown, 1350 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif. (Los Angeles, Calif.).
1338 John Burkhard (Burkhardt), 1356 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2294 Carl Hilding Carlson (Carl Helding Carleson), 937 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
780 Korsten Christiansen (Karsten Christensen, Karsten Kristensen), 1310 Buchanan, San Francisco, Calif.
404a Geo. (George) I. Clements, 937 Webster, San Francisco, Calif.
1531a Alberto Corella (Covella), 2670 Bush, San Francisco, Calif.
2719 Patrick Joseph Corrigan, 1356 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
369 Chas. Mort Davis, jr. (Charles M. Davis), 1745 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
3488 Alfred DeMartini (Demartini, De Martini), 1956 Turk, San Francisco, Calif.
471 Jas. (James) Wm. Donovan, 811 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
3168 Raymond Donovan, 81 Blake, San Francisco, Calif.
531 Girsh. Dubiowsky, 1336 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
1711 Ray Edwards, 606 (1826) Post, San Francisco, Calif.
3680 Wm. (William) Emerson, 1859 Post, San Francisco, Calif.
801 Stephen Esandi, 480 Pine, San Francisco, Calif.
1714 Patrick Joseph Feeney, 1177 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
1568 Boris Feingold (Faingold), 646 Redwood, San Francisco, Calif.
982 Borris Feingold (Boris Fiengold), 646 Redwood, San Francisco, Calif.
127 Albert Ching Fong (Albert C. Fong), 1051 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
4167 Henry Forgelle, 1705 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
1497 John J. Friedman, 1523 Laguna, San Francisco, Calif.
822 Dick E. Goff, 1531 Steiner, San Francisco, Calif.
2699 Oscar Goldman (Geldman), 1201 Gough, San Francisco, Calif.
3848 Jaeuls Manser Greene (James Mansir Greene), 851 Van Ness, San Francisco, Calif.
2071 Harold Flood Harlan, 1511 Scott, San Francisco, Calif.
384 Ralph Rall Harnish, 722 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
4217 Rudolph (Rudolf) Henke, 1300 Post, San Francisco, Calif.
708 Geo. Jackson, 16 Willmot, San Francisco, Calif.
161 James Jackson, 1920 Fillmore, San Francisco, Calif.
3439a Chas. (Charles) R. Jameson, 2028 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
3974 Frank Joseph Johnson, 1519 Eddy, San Francisco, Calif.
3796 Fritz Oscar Johnson (Fritz Oskar Johansen, Fritz Oscar Johansen), 2406 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
3833 Orville Johnson, 1759 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
30 Rubin Kaplan, 1236 Webster, San Francisco, Calif.
2849 Samuel Karelin, 1010 Webster, San Francisco, Calif.
2019 Peisach Freid Kein (Peisach Freidkin), 1207 Buchanan, San Francisco, Calif.
3191 John Joseph Kelleher, 1114 Divisadero, San Francisco, Calif.
3496 Chas. Ploff (Plaff) Keller (Charles Plaff Keller), 6020 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
4204 Raymond Edw. (Edward) Kelly, 1661 Octavia, San Francisco, Calif.
1664 Lawrence Francis Killilea (Killilea), 1394 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
633 Constantin Kim (Constaine Kin, Kostia Kin), 1026 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
3552 Chas. (Charles) Knight (Charles M. Knight), Yates Annex, Fillmore & Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
3539 Henry Komomna (Komomua), 1549 Octavia, San Francisco, Calif.
1371 Tony C. Lake, 1124 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
774 Antonio M. Lopez, 1482 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
165a Arthur McCary, 635 Franklin, San Francisco, Calif.
1871 Joel Marks, 1502 Laguna, San Francisco, Calif.
878 Tom F. Martin, 1021 Van Ness, San Francisco, Calif.
3571a John Martinez, 1613½ Baker, San Francisco, Calif.

481 Fredk. (Frederick) Menz, 2016 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif. (Salt Lake City, Utah).
723 Fred C. Merke (Fred I. Merke), 1109 Turk, San Francisco, Calif.
1501 Howard Miller, 1752 Bush, San Francisco, Calif.
756 Wm. A. Morton, 1744 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
3765 Manshichoro Mauramatsu (Maushichiro Mauramatsu, Manshikos Mauramatsu), 1773 Post, San Francisco, Calif.
1018 Christopher J. (Joseph) Murtag, 828 Central, San Francisco, Calif.
2096a Geo. Muyata (Mujata, Muijata), 1669 Post, San Francisco, Calif.
1825 Robt. (Robert) Nelson, 1380 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
2752 Wm. Ralph Newhill (Rolph Newbill), 1374 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
1250 Donald A. Norton, 1165 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
4090 James Patrick Oates, 2577½ Post, San Francisco, Calif.
2988 Isidro Presnoza Orias (Isidro Presnoza Oriar), Hotel Normandie, San Francisco, Calif.
1300 Daniel O'Sullivan, 1728 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
3172 Eugene Pohlman, 2055 Bush, San Francisco, Calif.
2494a Ernest Porter, San Quentin Prison, Calif. (711 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.).
3603 Ben Warren Portlock, 2893 Pine, San Francisco, Calif.
2613 Roy Joseph Ramirez, 1345 Gough, San Francisco, Calif.
2459 Paul J. Rapp, 1227 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
3691 John Redmond, 633 Van Ness, San Francisco, Calif.
2176a Wm. Richardson, Pine Street, near Fillmore, San Francisco, Calif.
1139 Lloyd James Rodgers, 1690 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
3672 Mark Roshlin (Mark Rochline), 1256 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
4097 Michael Joseph Rowe, 1394 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.
1259 Samuel Rudopher (Rudofker, Rudolfker), 1130 Turk, San Francisco, Calif.
2276 Willie Russell, 640 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
2871 Wm. Clyde Ryder, 1772 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
141 Nachman Shabsin, 1027 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
1440 Boris Siarin, 1207 Buchanan, San Francisco, Calif.
177a Chas. Louis Smalley (Smally), 1556 Devisadero, San Francisco, Calif.
3909 Alvin Smith, 16 Wilmot, San Francisco, Calif.
3132 Edwin Solberg, 959 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
1490 Clarence Sorey, 1105 Laguna, San Francisco, Calif.
2608a Sanaye Takehita (Takishita, Takeshita), San Quentin, Calif. (1611 Laguna, San Francisco, Calif.).
460 Stephen Edgar Taylor, 1734 Steiner, San Francisco, Calif.
2047a Ted Turner, 1281 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
4088a Cronley Van Gorden, 927 Webster, San Francisco, Calif.
2131 Edw. (Edward) Van Simpson, 941 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
3074 Wong Wai, 1268 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
2160 Albert Walker, Hotel Fillmore, San Francisco, Calif.
467 Wesley Clyde Weber, Geary & Fillmore, Hotel Gates, San Francisco, Calif.
1883 Carlas (Carlos) L. Weems, 1457 Geary, San Francisco, Calif.
2042 Otto Weissner (Meissner), 722 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
952 Wm. White, 1287 O'Farrell, San Francisco, Calif.
3377 Arthur Williams (Howell Arthur Williams), 1024 Franklin, San Francisco, Calif.
1380 Limars Wishniack, 1310 Golden Gate, San Francisco, Calif.
3825 Joseph Henry Woolridge (John Henry Woolridge), 1657 Gough, San Francisco, Calif.
270 Cornelis Zwan, 1722 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
40 Thomas Edward Speer (T. E. Speer), 1822 McAllister, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF SAN JOSE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2456 Constanzo (Costanzo) Allio, 119 North Market Street, San Jose, Calif.
415 Antonino Balliungu, 479 North Ninth Street, San Jose, Calif.
1120 Dominick Berti (D. Berti), 435 Vine Street, San Jose, Calif.
1272 Vito Borrero, 636 North Twenty-second Street, San Jose, Calif.
603 David Boyarsky (Biyarsky), 156 Santa Teresa Street, San Jose, Calif.
2479 Louie Bruskin (Druskin), Nevada Rooming House, Second and Fountain Street, San Jose, Calif.
1527 Livert V. Chenoweth (Livert Voltaire (L. V.) Chenowethts), King and Whitton, San Jose, Calif.
2685 Paul P. (Paul Peter) Christen, 355 South Sixth Street, San Jose, Calif.
642 Walter R. Clark, San Jose, Calif. (Walter Roymand Clark (Walter Clark, W. R. Clark), 126 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.).
2392 Peter Condite, 174 North Third Street, San Jose, Calif.
1501 Chris Nickolas (Nicholas) Crilletich, 577 South Sixth, San Jose, Calif.
2217½a Arthur B. (Arthur Burgess) Cummings, 417 North Seventh Street, San Jose, Calif.
577 Leong Duck, 33 Cleveland Street, San Jose, Calif.
13 Joe Fiallo, 839 Whitten Avenue, San Jose, Calif.
970 Howard George, Main Street, O'Connell Falls, Wis.
279 Charles Phil. (Charles Phillip, C. Phil.) Goodman, 220 North Thirteenth Street, San Jose, Calif.
1547½a Lee Griffin, 195 West San Fernando Street, San Jose, Calif.
1027 Fred Hocks, Montgomery Hotel, San Jose, Calif.
447 John V. Hill, 296 Delmar Avenue, San Jose, Calif.
1050 Ah Hong, 438 North Seventh Street, San Jose, Calif.
2671 Ng Kan Hong, 19 Cleveland Avenue, San Jose, Calif.
1574 Lee Loy (Loy Lee), Chinatown, San Jose, Calif. (Chinatown).
1055 Yee Lie, 164 Taylor Street, San Jose, Calif.
1630½a Bletcher M. (Bletchey M., B. M.) Lundy, 502 North Seventeenth Street, San Jose, Calif.
2200½ Albert Luthold, 885 North Fourteenth Street, San Jose, Calif.
807½ Charles A. (C. A.) McDonald, 162 Locust Street, San Jose, Calif.
2774 Ralph E. (Ralph Elbert, R. E.) Mack, 418 South Fourth Street, San Jose, Calif.
216½ Jos. T. (Joseph Thomas) Marie, Aiea Plaietatin, Honolulu, H. T. (Jos. T. Maria, Aiea Plantation, Honolulu, H. T.).
1222 Giovanio B. (Giovanni Battista, Gio Catter, Giovastio Battista) Mussia, 338 St. Augustine Street, San Jose, Calif.
2530½ Manuel Muinos, San Jose, Calif. (general delivery, San Jose, Calif.).
44 John Philapil, 480 Keyes Street, San Jose, Calif.
1051 Frank (Franz) Rickenback, 9 North Market Street, San Jose, Calif.
2034½ Jose Rivera, 707–29 Sixteenth Street, San Jose, Calif. (707 Twenty-ninth Street, San Jose, Calif.).
2850 How Tuck Shew, 450 North Seventh Street, San Jose, Calif.
206 Wong Bok Sing, 350 South First Street, San Jose, Calif.
2409 John Smith, 285 North Fourth Street, San Jose, Calif.
2254 Henry T. Tanaka (Tanakaa), 632 North Sixth Street, San Jose, Calif.
4358½a Ross Burton (Ross B.) Thom, San Jose, Calif. (1050 Comox Street, Vancouver, B. C.; American consul, Vancouver, B. C.).
1945 William (Wm.) Todd, 28 Vine Street, San Jose, Calif.
1205½ Robert Valenzuela, 322 East Julian Street, San Jose, Calif. (Balaklala Mine, Coran, Calif.).
1861 Charles E. (Chas. Eugene, C. E.) Waterbury, 87 East San Fernando Street, San Jose, Calif.
2777 Joseph Welsh, 165 South Ninth Street, San Jose, Calif.
490 Edward (Edw.) Harris Williams, Nevada Rooming House, San Jose, Calif.
1954 John James (J. J.) Wilson, 204 West Santa Clara Street, San Jose, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2412 Edw. H. (Edwin Hugh, E. H.) Ballinger, Redwood City, Calif.
493 Jas. Bertram (James Chester Bertren, James Christopher Bertrend), College Street, Hillsborough, Calif.
2015 Edward Bolger, Capitol Hotel, South San Francisco, Calif.
3253 Baryolomeo (Bartolomeo) Bonlo, El Camino Real, Redwood City, Calif.
438 Geo. Brackie, Ridgefield, Wash.
1841 Wm. Henry (H.) Breen, Beresford, Calif.
3323 Ben A. Burkland (Ven Alfred Burkland), Belmont, San Mateo, Calif.
121a Aquileno Cabanilla (Aquilino Cabanilla), Peninsula Hotel, San Mateo, Calif.
3517 Giovanni Cersa, Daly City, Calif.
3105 Frank (F.) Coleman, Redwood City, Calif.
17 Eugene Comeford (Comerford), Colma, Calif.
3085 Alfredo Dreginini (Dregenni), Grand Avenue, South San Francisco, Calif.
3520 M. Durat (Duart, Manuel Duarte), Millbrae, Calif.
1218 Benito Fernandez, Palo Alto, Calif.
3012 Frances Ferris (Ferrari, Francesco Ferraris, Frances Ferarrio), Baden Avenue, South San Francisco, Calif.
2122 Low Gow (Low Gou), care of R. J. Wilson, Burlingame, Calif.
3448 Cyprian Victor Herrera, St. Patricks Seminary, Menlo Park, Calif.
1373 Hom Him (Hon Hin), Pump Station, near D Street, San Mateo, Calif.
3321 Archibald Crosbie Hailiday, Palo Alto, Calif.
2479 Noel Edgar King, Burlingame, Calif.
318 Frank Lane, South San Francisco, Calif.
3248 Emilio Lenelonl (Lenclonl), 211 North D, San Mateo, Calif.
338 Law Kong Leong, 39 Griffith Avenue, San Mateo, Calif.
3193 Hom Lone (Hon Yone), West Santa Inez Avenue, San Mateo, Calif.
56 Frank Marion (Manion), New Heidelberg Avenue, San Boen Road, South San Francisco, Calif.
716 Beenie D. (Bennie) Moore, South San Francisco, Calif.
1657 Michael (Martin) Morley, South San Francisco, Calif.
2264 Patrick O'Boy, South San Francisco, Calif.
2397 Manuel D. Oliveira (Manuels de Oliveira Junis, Manuel De Olivela), Woodside, Calif.
1225 Theodoros G. Pappagrosgas (Poppngrosgas, T. G. Pappagiosgos, Pappagiosgas), Belmont, Calif.
2350 Edwin Theodore Petersen (Peterson, Edw. T. Peterson), Portola, Calif.
1534 Dang Quong, Medway Road, San Mateo, Calif.
2547 Chinn Sue (Chinn (Chim) Seu), 410 Main Street, Vallejo, Calif.
2651 Antone (Anton, Toni) Trento, 29 North G Street, San Mateo, Calif.
1168 Lee Van (Yam), 400 First Avenue, San Mateo, Calif.
1962 Thomas A. Williamson, Belmont, San Mateo, Calif.
5668 Wing Wong, Menlo Park, Calif.
2290 Wee (We) Lee Yee, Menlo Park, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

24 George Aki, 583 School Street, Honolulu, Hawaiian Islands (2218 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1740 William Francis Browne (Brown), 3371 Twenty-first Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2219 William Carson, 1140 Guerrero Street, San Francisco, Calif.
322 Edward En Shue Chow (En Shue Chow), 2528 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1291 Jimmy Chow, 2528 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2575 Thomas Colligan, 370 Lexington Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
739 Jesse Earl (E., J. E.) Filling, 167 Fair Oaks Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2541 John Fisher, 204 San Jose Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2586 William Fonseca (Fonesca), 2495 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2528 Jang Fook, 2654 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
242 Louis G. Genestra (Louis Genestra), 2776 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2797 Frank Gulliksoa (Gulliksen), 2393 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1479 Henry Fred (F.) Hons, jr., 85 Bartlett Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3072 George Howeth, 2424 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3014 Wilber Jenkins, 2284 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1398 Michael Kelly, 907 Dolores Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2693 Charles Anthony (A.) Kilgariff, 3308 Twentieth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1659 Louis Knoff, 2100 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif.
889 Mikola (Nikola) Kovacic, 3170 Twenty-fifth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2171 Dennis Lucey, 907 Dolores, San Francisco, Calif.
933a John Leslie McGowan, 2258b Bryant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1780 Peter J. Maguire, 625a Shotwell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1389 Rupert (R., Robert) Matthews, 114 Liberty Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1841 Robert Michaels, 2780 Twenty-sixth Street, San Francisco, Calif.

594 James Arthur (Jas. A.) Moore, 2432 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1875 Amerigo Louis (L.) Morganti, 3320 Nineteenth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1883 Bartholomew O'Brien, 173 Twenty-seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1862 Edward O'Brien, 173 Twenty-seventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2714 Bartholomew O'Conner, 757 Capp Street, San Francisco, Calif.
51 Lester Albert (A.) Rice, 731 Capp Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1175 Alvin Jacob (J.) Rupkey, 759 Capp Street, San Francisco, Calif.
968a John Smith, 1347 Alabama Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1828 Julius S. Soloway, 3662 Twentieth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1319 Walter Ernest (E.) Spellman, 1130 Guerrero Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1850 John Cornelius (C.) Steinen, 218 Bartlett Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1994 Jan Gum Wo, 2654 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 9, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2810 Frank Kavesh, 684 Hayes Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 12, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

5388 Frank Adams, 1226 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3803 Rob't J. D. Alburg (Robert J. D. Alburg, Robert J. D. Albury), 1045 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4804 Wm. Alull (William Alule), 1544 Polk Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2212a Franklino (Franquilino or Franqulino) Amar, 440 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3392 Niclas (Nichas) Argiriades, 465 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif. (488 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1260 Hignio Avilo (Avila), 1165 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
3935 Harry A. (Harry Albert, H. A.) Baker, 1225 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1801a Juan C. Batiste (Juan Bautista, Juan A. Batste), 33 Jones Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2815 John Bettencourt, 908 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3927 Pasquale Bitouti (Bitonti), 1555 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Dunsmuir, Calif.).
2984a Herman H. L. Brinkhans (Herman Hugo L. Brinkhaus, Herman H. L. Brinkhaus), 1008 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1409 Gus D. (Gus Donald, G. S.) Bruneman, 248 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4446 Harry C. (Harry Clark) Cater, 1353 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4360 Rafael (Raf.) Corren, Piccadilly Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
2173 James Bernard Cortney (James Bernard McCourtney, James B. McCourtney), 387 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4015 Samuel Davidson, 335 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif. (560 Polk Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
2873 Geo. Dernos (George Demos (or Demas), George Dernos), 440 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4350 Frank Dikos (Detos or Ditos, Dakos), Hotel Garland, San Francisco, Calif.
2972 John Moore Dixon (Dixen or Dixin), 421 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3691 Thos. R. (Thomas Rodgers, Thomas R.) Donahue, 1736 Polk Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1743a Victor Duena, Hotel Orman, San Francisco, Calif.
165a John August Eneman, 828 Ennis Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (828 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
4740 Geo. W. (George W.) Ferrin, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif
3431 Walter W. (W. W.) Franklin, 632 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif. (525 J Street, San Diego, Calif.; general delivery, City).
3928 Frank L. (Frank Leslie, Frank) Fifield, Beresford Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
119 Anthony Foster, Larne Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
4769 Richard H. Freeman, 415 O'Farell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3100 Baldwin Gray, 220 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3931 Teriso C. Gulle, 725 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2260 Rogue (Rouge) Gusman (Rogne or Rogue Guzmain), 1359 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5091 Geo. A. Hagg (George August Hogg, George Hagg, George A. Hagg), 1148 Elevenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1148 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
4705 Arthur Hansen, 335 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2515 Benj. (Benjamin) Harrison, 220 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3503 Alfred B. Hobson (Alfred Bridge Hodson, Alf. B. Hodson), 415 Jones Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5184 David I. Horning, 1091 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
202a Samuel Iokia, 664 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2276 Albert Kalani, Hotel Crawford, Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1490 Harry John Kime (H. J. Kime), 965 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3294 Joseph Krivitsky, 1406 Buchanan Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Krieitskey or Krieitzkey, 765 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1767 Livi Leannoana (leaumoana, Leaunoana), 443-53 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
429a Frank N. Lehman, 1515 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
165b Frank LeRoy (Le Roy), 1224 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1642 John Leslie Lewis (John L. or J. L.), 1736 Polk Street, San Francisco, Calif. (general delivery, Hopkinsville, Ky.).
4289 Edw. John Lipphowski (Edward John Lipphowski), 18 Salmon Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4460 John McColum, 1553½ Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1692 Edwin M. McInerney (Edw. Washington), Perkins Hotel, Portland, Oreg. (522 Hyde Street).
4735 Leo V. McInerny (Leo Vilallio), 522 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1589 Enocinco (Enocinso) Manahan, 225 Fourth Avenue (1255 Polk Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2100 Bill P. Markontsas (Markoutsas), 245 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1099a Peter Clyde Martin, 1442 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
2410 Haswell V. (Vasserot or Vasserat) Merle, 1612 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4723 John Meyer, 220 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4836 Geo. Wm. Micsalso (George William Micsanko, George W. Micanko), 245 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2176 Albert Nessimades (Nessim Ades), 866 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
490 Albert Parr, 335 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1592 Arthur Power, 550 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
825 James Dempsey (James Dempey) Prosser, 364 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2218 Sholom (Sholon) (S.) Racoff, 560 Polk Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2376 Edw. Lee (Edward Lee, E. L.) Read, 606 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5146 Joseph Rivas, 37 Barnard Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2583 Lowell O. (Oscar) Robb, 660 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4995 Gabriel Rodriguez, 1122A, Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2811 Suchet Singh, Y. M. C. A., San Francisco, Calif. (220 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
3804 Wm B. (William B., W. B.) Stensel, 235 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3004 Wm. J. Stropper (William John Stofer, W. J. Stofer, William J. Stoper), 621 Taylor Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3385 Edgar W. (Edgar Willard or E. W.) Thompson, 465 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3545 Erskine H. Todd, 1418 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2916 Wm. Twikile (William Turkele, Wm. Turkile), 1101 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4632 Clarence Watson, 1196 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
59 Rogers (Roger) Williams, Polk and Market, San Francisco, Calif.
4581 Leonard W. (L. W.) Wilson, 637 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5467 Elgin S. (Stowell) Yankee, 740 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2204 Gaston Yean, 1561 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 13, CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

4018 F. Edward Adams, Madison Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
2135 Wun Ast, 825 Sacramento, San Francisco, Calif.
9047 Juan Afior, transport *Sherman*.
7645 Pasqual Agombrado (Pasqual Agonbrado, Pasqual Azonbrado), 848 Kearney Street (848 Kearny Street), San Francisco, Calif.
5991 Steve Alcarez, 29 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2182 Albert Allen, 381 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
2531a Andy Allen, San Francisco, Calif. (general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.).
2617 Wm. A. Althouse (Wm. Allen Althouse), 447 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6448a Albert Anderson, Sailors' Union, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4455 Rubin Anderson, 141 Eddy, San Francisco, Calif.
6008 Edward B. Andrade (Edward Babio Andrade), 1819 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
768 Anker M. Andressen (Anker M. Andreassen), steamer *Yale*, San Francisco, Calif.
2834 Raffaelle Andreotti, 440 B Chestnut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3276 Milani Angeli (Milani Angelo), 1182 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6071 Kei Aoki (Keii Aoki, Keo Aoki), 521 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4716 Eugenio D. Aquimo (Eugenio Dorono Aquimo), 142 West Sixty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (Eugenio Dorona Aquimo, 331 Franklin Street, Buffalo, N. Y.).
2648 Edward Arlington (Ed Arlington), 209 Francisco Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2861 Mario Armanini (Mario Armanino, Nario Armanini), 1419 Kearney Street (1419 Kearny Street), San Francisco, Calif.
3071 Daniel W. Arsenawa (Daniel W. Arsenau), Luxembourg Hotel, 905 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5611a Sutira Atiniga, 1208 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
679 George Baciocio (George Baciocco), 1340 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
9630 Ong Yee Bak (Ong Yue Bak), 850 Washington, San Francisco, Calif.
694a John Baker, steamship *Bochum*, San Francisco, Calif.
6501 Demetera Balderama (D. Balderama, Demetrio Badderama, Badderama), transport *Thomas*, San Francisco, Calif.
5879 Pietro Barbarino (Peter Barbarino), 474 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
5127 Frank N. Barracks (Frank Norman Barracks), 151 Ellis, San Francisco, Calif.
6447a Pecilio S. Barrican (Cecilio Stanislaw Barrican), 691 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
6659 Abic (Abdka) Belkacein (Abkic Belkacein, Belkacen, Abkic Belkacein), 740 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
8588 Ong Sue Bell (Oug Sue Bell), 831 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1037 Goffredo Bellouchi (Goffredo Bellouchi), 869 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
2243 Stiffano Benasco (Stefano Benasco, Steffano Benasco), 1923 Mason, San Francisco, Calif.
1414 Henry Benecken, steamer *Crockett*, Wharf 17, San Francisco, Calif.
5501 Garret A. Berm (Gerret A. Berm, G. A. Berm), 112 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2712 Ng Ngero Bero (Ng Ngew Bew), 864 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6516 Domenico Bertollocini (Domenico Berlotoccini), 408 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3613 Leo Berube, 60 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6922 Leonard Betsinger, 280 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1562 Richard G. Bicknell (R. G. Bicknell), 58 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1986 Walter G. R. Bischol (Walter Geo. Rudolph Bischof, W. G. R. Bischof), 640 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2192 Hector Black (Hector Block), 1334 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
802 Lester G. P. Blum, 417 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2357 Stephen Bomes (Stephen Bonus, S. Bonus), 841 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
982 Wm. Boadell (Wm. Bondell), 64 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
2407 Santiago Bonilla, Steamer *Waker*, Pier 1, San Francisco, Calif.
1881 Bunnie H. Booher (Bunnie Harlan Booker), Herberts Bachelor Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.

3176 Alberto Bortolazzo (Alberto Bortolozzo), 530 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
1838 Alexander Boscovitch (Aleksander Boscovitch, A. Boskovitch), 132 East, San Francisco, Calif.
625 Louie Bow, 617 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5344 Wm. Bowman, transport *Thomas*, San Francisco, Calif.
5a Charles Bradley, Westwood, Calif.
1988 Louis C. Brady (Louis Charles Brady, Louis Brady), steamship *Ventura*, San Francisco, Calif.
4199 Russell H. Brandus (Russell H. Brandes), steamer *Constance*, Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif. (care of Deer Island Lumber Co., Deer Island Oreg.).
2660 Van T. Briggs, 172 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1180 Arthur Brown, 111 Taylor Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4048 Henry E. Brown (Henry Earl Brown), Arrowhead Hot Springs, Arrowhead Court, San Francisco, Calif. (Arrowhead Springs Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.).
690 Jesse Brown, 527 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
8610 Edward Browning (E. Browning), care of Pacific Steamship Co., steamer *Harvard*, San Francisco, Calif.
4842 Lee Fong Bon (Lee Yong Bon), 928 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6462 Charles Bowers, 34 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2542 Tour Buck (Tom Buck), 808 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (O'Farrell & Taylor, San Francisco, Calif.).
1852 Arnesto Burnello (Arneto Brunello, Arnesto Brunello), 757 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6671 Rasmus A. J. Bush (Rasmus A. J. Busk), Seventeenth Avenue, between M and N Streets, Sunset District, San Francisco, Calif.
7631 Luis B. Cadegant (Luis Billapuertoi Cadegant, Luis Bellapuirty Cadegant), 848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5919 Fred Call, 56 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9915 Ettore Cameratti (Ettore Camarate, Ettore Comarati), 34 Julin, San Francisco, Calif.
4320 Paul Camoroto (Paul Camaratz, Paul Camorwata (Camonvata)), 924 Orchard Street, San Jose, Calif.
1296 Santiago Canda (Santiago Conda, Santiago Canda), steamer *Fort Sutter*, pier 4, San Francisco, Calif.
1476a Louis Ward Canfield (Ward Lewis Canfield, W. L. Canfield), 1019 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1079 Wm. H. Canfield (Wm. N. Canfield), City Prison, San Francisco, Calif.
1170 Pedro Canida, 848 Kearny, San Francisco, Calif.
2495 Domingo (Domigno) Canipi, (Domingo Campi, Domigno Campi), 629 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6344 Peter P. Carbomagup (Peter Paul Carlomagno, Peter Paul Carlormagni), 658 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1697 Guiseppe Cardinale (Guiseppe Cardinali), 369 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
8617 Guiseppe Carota, 735 Montgomery, San Francisco, Calif. (Martinez, Calif.).
4938 Wm. Carter, Pullman House, Grant Ave., San Francisco, Calif. (Las Vegas, Nev.).
2573a Paul Cass, S. S. *Venezula*, San Francisco, Calif.
7938 Antonio Castro, 58 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif. (1031 Clay Street).
4636 Trindad (Trinidad) Castro, county jail No. 1, San Francisco, Calif.
6988 Dodolfo Cavallero (Rodolfo Cavallero, Cavallero Redolfo), 381 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
1320 Ernesto Cerchi (Ernesto Crchi), 15–17 Boone Place, San Francisco, Calif. (1517 Brown Place).
1234 Louis Chacon, S. S. *Newport*, San Francisco, Calif.
7556 King Chan (Chan King), 744 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5395 Tai Chan, 847 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6362 Wah Hip Chan, 729 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif. (775 Clay Street).
1664 Lee Chang (Lee Chung, Lee Chong), 56 Waverly Street, San Francisco, Calif. (56 Waverly Place).
7105 Yee Chee, 1116 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8941 Ein Cheun (Ein Cheum), 825 Washington, San Francisco, Calif.
7672 Chee Chew (Chee Chee, Chu Chee), 843 Clay, San Francisco, Calif.
8244 Kam Foo Chew, 843 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5979 Ong Wing Chew, % Quong Yick Wing, 952 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5666 Yee Chew, 823 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8436 Young Chew (Yuong Chew), 845 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7594 Bill Chin, 38 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
4043 Jack Chin, 972 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5009 Chan Yai Chong (Chun Yai Chong), 408 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3562 or 3652 Lee Chong (Lee Chew), 61 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
6667 Wong Chong, 828 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
9670 Wong Chong, 406 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7466 Yok Leong Chong (Yok Leonog Cheong, Cheong Yoke Leong), 735 Washington, San Francisco, Calif.
7102 Loo Wah Choo, 1129 Dupont (1129 Grant Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.
5731 Arthunas Christopher (Arthunas Christopher, Christopher Artunas), 160 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6281 Lee Chuck (Chuck Lee), 804 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6610 Jun Chun (Chum), 823 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6797 Wong Kim Chun, 912 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2755 Lee Chung, 734 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8797 Lee Hon Chung (Lee Hoon Chung, Lu Hoon Chung), 960 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8922 Tom Bing Chung, 1015 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5892 Wong Chung, 424 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (802 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
7078a Lee Clark, general delivery (750 Pacific Street), San Francisco, Calif.
6769 Charles C. Cohen (Charles Chester Cohen), Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association, 42 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7106 Kenneth Coinor (Corner), Empire Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
8742 Joseph Combombatto (Joseph Colombatto, Joe Colombatto, Joseph Cobomlatto, Joseph Cobombatto), 750 Valley Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Rodeo, Calif.).
745 Guiseyipe Conous (Guiseppe Conous, Geuseyipe Conous), 50 Varenass Place (50 Varennesa Place), San Francisco, Calif.
4089 Willie Oscar Cooper (Willie O. Cooper), 381 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif. (1937 Sacramento Street).
736 Salomone G. Cestango (Salomone Giovanni Estanzo, Salomone Giovanni Costanzo), Rome Hotel, Sansome and Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
5781 Gregorio C. Coyne, 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2876 Frank W. Crane (Frank Wm. Crane, F. W. Crane), Raton, N. Mex.
8474 Martin Crogiat (Martin Corgiat), 641 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
4409 Chang Wing Dum (Chan Wing Daun, Chang Wing Daur), 944½ Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6437 Lawrence Danielson (Lawrence Donielson), steamer Apache, Pacific Street Dock, San Francisco, Calif.
4535 Dan Davidovich, 688 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
575 Alfred Joseph Deana (Alfred Joseph Deane, A. J. Deam), 208 Westmoreland Road, Woolworth, England.
4765 Hom Toy Deg, 815 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
943 Hew Dehon (Jew Dehon), 846 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
990 Sebastian Delacerna (Sebastian Delacerne), 1055 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7200a Earl De Moss, Santa Barbara, Calif.
7257 Manuel A. DeSimos (Manuel Silveira De Simos, Manuel Silverio de Simos), 37 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6234 Louis Devincinzi (Louis De Vicenzi, Louis Devincenzi), 400 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
3643 Luin Dick (Lun Dick), 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5115 John D. W. Dickerson (Jno. Don Wallace Dickerson, Donald Dickerson), Astoria Hotel, Bush and Grant Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
3392 Anthony Dietra, 37 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5570 Chin Din, 864 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8736 Chin Hoy Din, 858 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1713 Pietro Dogliano (Pietro Dogliani), 426 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
9509 Chn Dong, 843 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6943 Yeo Fung Doeey (Yeo Fung Dooey), 835 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1087a Charles Duarte, 834 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif. (719 King Street, Seattle, Wash.).
4650 Wong Duck, 243 Joice Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5729 Tauslino P. (Fauslino P., Faustono P., Faustino P.) Dumpit, transport *Thomas*, San Francisco, Calif.
1158 Wee (Yee Wee) Dun, 816 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
947a Earling Earlingsen (Erling Ehlingsen, Erling Ellingsen), Union Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (58 Clay Street).
3279 Henry Herbert Edwards, 66 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9783 Luste Martin Elasco, 774 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8561 Martin Emerin, 151 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9537 Geo. E. (Geo. Edward) Endy, 600 Twentieth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7444 Arthur H. (Arthur Henry) Ervin, steamer *Prentiss*, San Francisco, Calif. (E. J. Dodge Steamship Co.).
6457a Arcadia (Arcadio, A.) Escobia, transport *Logan*, San Francisco, Calif.
4243 Carl Espling, 245 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5567 Joaquin H. (Joaquin Hernandez) Estiche, Castro Hall, Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6817 John Faglia (Foglia), 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9205 Frank G. Famely, 15 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1489 Ettore Farmi (Ettoro Tanni), 136 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3427 Jacob Fenner, 569 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1900 Antonio Ferari (Ferrari), 1549 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5438 Rolandelli Ferdonando (Ferdenandi, Fernando), 20, alley between Kearny and Roma Place, San Francisco, Calif.
6244 Crisanto Fernandes (Crisanto Fernando), S. S. *Thomas*, San Francisco, Calif.
291 John J. (John) Ferrari (Torreri), 369 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
4104 Santino Ferrera (Ferrea), 847 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8724 Geo. W. (George Washington) Ferrin, 83 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7824 John Flarres (Flores), S. S. *Newport*, San Francisco, Calif.
4396 Chan Foe (Chin Foi), 864 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8273 Hom Fon, 824 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8870 Chin Gee Fong (Fing), 802 Clay Street (263 San Carlos Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.
760 Chong Fong (Fong Chong), 825 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3435 Gee Fong, 1268 Seventh Street (4 Spofford Alley), San Francisco, Calif.
9052 Gee Fong, 935 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9325 Lee Fong, 907 Clay Street (902 Clay Street), San Francisco, Calif.
3052 Chong Foo, 2 Nottingham Place, San Francisco, Calif.
7959 Gee Foo, 37 Spofford Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1119a Lem Foo, 30 Rose Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
6085 Low Foo, 932 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7682 Soo Hoo Foo, 920 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8037 Chung Fook, 858 Washington Street (859 Washington Street), San Francisco, Calif.
3121 Dung Fook, 942 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2836 Gee Fook, 831 Sacramento (831 Sacto Street), San Francisco, Calif.
5297 Joe Fook, 742½ Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif., % Go Yui Kee Co., Armona, Calif.
3858 Lum Fook, 825 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Okla. City, Okla.).
2193 Young Quong Fook, 804 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4533 Mok Wah Foon, 24 Waverly Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3055 Max Forester (Foerster), 640 Kearny Street (640 Kearney Street), San Francisco, Calif.
5602 Felice Fotor (Fotoro, Fortoro), 7 Marvin Place, San Francisco, Calif.
6465 Dante Francesconi, 402 Broadway Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4983 Constantine Freeland (C. Freiland), S. S. *Idaho*, San Francisco, Calif., % Sailors Union.

4218 Ernest Frickle, Pier 17, Stmr. *F. A. Killourn*, San Francisco, Calif.
6564 Jung Fun, 32 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
5907 Wong Fung, 808 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3566 Yee Fung, 822 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8540 Francisco Gaita (Francesco Garto, Gaeta Francisco), 864 Vallejo (846 Vallejo Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2341 Geo. P. Gardiner (George Putnam Gardiner, G. P. Gardiner), 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4124 James R. Garland, 640 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5079 Kwong (Kung) Aye Gee, 841 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
879 On Sing Gee (Gee On Sing), 22 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3230 Willie Gee, 874 Sacramento Street (874 Sacto Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2158 Wong Wo Gee, 126 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
429 Gee Yee (Yee Gee), 861 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2363 Gurta Georgakopolos, Georgakopios (Gurt Georgakupulos, Georgakopolos), 524 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
151 Charles Gerhart, 549 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5827 Ombrosia G. Gialoune (Ombosia Gory Glamone, Ombrosia Goray Gialone), 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9229 Emilio Giannini, 100 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
833 Bertram Gibbons, Hotel Menton, 387 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3838 Fong Gim, 921 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3396 Lim Wah Gim, 851 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5582 Pen (Pon) Fong Gim, 748 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2271 Yee Gim, 868 (869) Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8603 Mariano Giminez (Gimenez) (Marino Giminez), 1113 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1937 Hong Bark (Back) Gin, 824 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6499 Wong Chew Gin, 4 Spofford Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
8321 Balestiena Giovani (Balestow Javanni, 18 Ohio Place; Balestera Giovoni, Balestien Giovanni, 18 Ohio Bace), San Francisco, Calif.
6424 Alexander Girard, 224 Columbus Avenue (Alexandria Girard, 244 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7987 Angelo Giretti (Girotti), 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
282 Gum Wah Gong, 532 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3473 Yum (Yee, Yun) Gong, 124 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
2625 Francisco Gonzales (Gonsalez), 310 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (Franciso Gonzalez, Alaska Packing Co.).
2730 Leo Gonzales (Gonzalez), 609 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3890 Wong Gooey, 37 Waverly Pl., San Francisco, Calif.
8150 Gee Goon, 27 Spofford Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
9357 Ug (Ng) Goon, 31 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
5270 John Gorham, 155 Clara Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1718 Gee Gin (Lee Gen) Gow, 873 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6820 Hamilton Gray, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8802 Thomas H. Gray, 1859 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9067 Lee Yet (Gee Yet) Guey, 1050 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7766 Bjorn Gulbranson (Gulbransen), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2458 Sin Gum, 1002 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7805 Chin Gung, 13 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
6216 Jacob Guralski, 120 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7392 Ralph P. Hadson (Ralph Pollisur Hudson, R. P. Hudson), St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
5461 Richard Hamm, Sailors Union, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1308 Oscar Hansen (Hanson, 668 Clay Street), 229 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2195 Richard Harris, Wiltshire Hotel, 340 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6014 John M. Harson (John Nir Harrn, John Mu Harnn, John M. Harsen), 1416 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3899 Frank Hart, 1 Napise Hotel (Napire), San Francisco, Calif.
7845 Harry Hart, 254 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2811 Mason C. Hart (Mason Carroll Hart), % Charles Dillon, Maine Street, Hartford, Conn.
5898a Samuel Joseph Haskins, 214 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8346 Donato Hatiti (Donati Hatiti, Donato Satili), 1019 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8344 Otto Hauenstein (Hauenstien, Hauenstin), 34 Turk Street, Francisco, Calif.
4836 Theodore H. Hayden (Theodore Harry Haden, Theo. H. Hayden), 538 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6741 Henry H. Hazen (Henry Harry Hazen, H. Hazen), 127 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7854 Jung Hee, 1142 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5858 Geo. A. Henderson (George Albert Henderson), 1141 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9666a Henry Hendrickson (Henrikson, Henry Hennrickson), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Albion Hotel, Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
9833 Knut Herlita (Herlitz, Herlets), Melba Rooming House, 214 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6297 Charley Herry (C. Herry), 860 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7191 Herbert B. Hensgen (Herbert Gently Hensgen), 341 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
148 Arthur J. Hiland, 34 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6316 Chin Share Hing, 806 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8661 Fung Sue Hing, 1104 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3269 Agon Jew Ho (Ngook Jew Ho, Ho Ngook Jew), 721½ (727½) Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2049 Yee Wing Hock, 847 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5364 Walter Hoffman, 903 Eleventh Street, Eureka, Calif.
6914 Carlo Hoisso (Loisso), 1535 Polk Street, Chicago, Ill.
8060 Edwin A. Holloway (Edwin Alphonso Holloway), 528 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8906 Suey Hom, 777 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4236 Woo Tan Hom (Hom Woo Low (Tow)), 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9415 Lee Hong, 654 Grant Avenue (345 Pacific Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.

997 Jung Kwong Hoo (Quong Hoo Jung), 345 Pacific Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8583 Lee Kong Hoo, 1122 Grant (Grand) Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3574 Eugene Horton, 485 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7686 Chong Hoy (Chang Hoy), 857 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3401 Tom Hoy, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7193a John L. Hubbert (John Leonard Hubbert), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7062 Wg Hung (Ng Hung), 37 Spofford Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
5215 Quong Hung (Quon Hong), 1103 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3665 Mack Iseman, 312 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
160 Chujiro Ishii, 110 Fourth Street (Chiijiro, % Board 3), San Pedro, Calif.
2004 Gee How Jack (Gee Hod Jack), 22 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
2333 Joe Jacob, 37 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1240 Thirteenth Avenue, East Oakland, Calif.).
5504a Johan E. Jaderberg (John Ernst Jaderberg, J. E. Jaderberg), % Alfred Green, Alaska Fish Co., 25 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3236 Pedro Jair, 1129 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
9554 Macario M. Javir, 848 Kearney Street (Macario M. Javier, 484 Kearney Street), San Francisco, Calif.
4619 Lee Jee, 874 Sacramento Street, San Francisco Calif.
2234a George H. Jenkins (G. H. Jenkins), U. S. Transport Thomas, San Francisco, Calif.
5782 Milicio Jiminas (Milicio Giminas), Transport Sherman, San Francisco, Calif.
8783 Juan Joaya, 1325 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
270a Carl S. Johnson, U. S. Transport Logan, San Francisco, Calif.
8127 Gustav J. Johnson (Gustav Walter James Johnson), 468 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4255 Wm. H. Johnson (Wm. Hazen Johnson, W. H. Johnson), U. S. Transport Thomas, San Francisco, Calif.
2454 John Jordan (Hordan) (Viren), 209 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif. (John Jordan (Viren), Rock Spring, Wyo.).
2569 Zanarias D. Jose (Zacarias De Jose, Zaccarias D. Jose), North Hotel, Columbus Avenue and Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
3402 Juan Joyn, 640 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
532 Him Wing Jue (Jue Him Wing), 775 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2184 Haw Jung (Ho Jung), 847 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2951 Jee Gar Jung, 1030 Powell (803 Grant Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.
9297 Leong Sue Kang, 765 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
785 Haldar Karlsen (Holdar Kartsen), steamship *Yale*, San Francisco, Calif.
9511 Tong Kay (Fong Kay), 1769 Valaejo, San Francisco, Calif.
4119 Chan (Chau) Kee, 864 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4033 Chin Kee (Kee Chin), 771 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3123 Wong Kee, 777 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3161 Wong Yim Kee, 735 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7230 John P. Kellen (John Patrick Kelleen, John P. Killeen, John P. Killen), 514 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5255 James J. Kelly, room 1119, Flood Building, Powell and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
8958 Sidney H. Khin (Sidney H. Khim), 655 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5847 Dale T. Kim (D. I. Kim), 762 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9420 Chan Kin, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5379 Gee Kin (Yee Kim, Yee Kin), 822 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5117 Lee King, 800 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2572 Charles Klimesch, 120 Fifteenth Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3863 Paul Knutsen, 32 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2291 Chin Kong (Kowg), 842 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (842 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
6505 Lee Kong (See Kong), 722½ Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
677 Yick Wong Kong (Wong Kong Yick), 56 Waverly, San Francisco, Calif.
6794 Juchi Kono (Juichi Kono), 559 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3382 Wong Koong (Koong Wong), 718 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5577 Chin Jow Kow (Chan Jow Kow), 562 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6570a Henry A. Kristiansen (Henry Albert Kristiansen, Henry Kristiansen), 139 Drumm, San Francisco, Calif.
5552a John Krivolapof, County Jail No. 1, Washington and Dunbar Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
16b David Kuhia, 602 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
8092 Lum Kum, 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4868 Fong Kun, 15 Collier, San Francisco, Calif.
2311 Paul Kuraica, 1036 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6023 Fung Yee Kwan (Fung Yue), 1103 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8118 Jose Laca, 55 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8299 Maunieto Lacchi (Mannieto Sacchi, Hannieto Sacchi), 217 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
9664 Jose. Lalli, 436 Bay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3443 Christiana J. Lamba (Christiano J. Lomba, Christiano J. Lambo), SS. Rose City, Pier 40, San Francisco, Calif.
2286 Theodore J. Landerback (Theodore Julias Lauderbach), Mail, care of Arlington Hotel, Long Beach, Calif. on steamer President.
5711 Jules Landes, Giant, Contra Costa, Calif.; Jules Sandes, Grant, Calif.
4814 Carl Laundison (Carl Lauridsen), 700 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7800 Jose Anton Lawrence (Jose Anton Freetas Lawrence), 635 Larkin Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Jose Anton F. Lawrence, 124 Turk Street.
6372a Ephraim Lawrie (Lowrie), SS. Coluva, San Francisco, Calif.
2330 Wm. Arthur Lawson, 1498 Guerro Street (1498 Guererro), San Francisco, Calif.
4908 Chin Lee (Chin Lim Lee), 1137 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7688 Gin Lee, 155 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
6801 Gong Wing Lee (Lee Gong Wing), 823 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.

8357 Hock Hing Lee (Yick King Lee, Lee Yick King), 855 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3016 Jan Lee (Lee Jan), 714 Grant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7776 Jung Lee, 949 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7895 Lee Wing Lee, 821 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6582 Le See Lee (Lo See), 1106 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8314 Sing Lee, 654 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2596 Yee Lee, 22 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2342 Young Yuen (Yum) Lee (Yong Yuan Lee, Lee Gong Yuen), 823 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6007 Yom Gee Lee (You Gee Lee, Lee You Chee), 861 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4796 Young Lee (Yee Yung), 819 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6241 Francisco Lemandi (Lomandi), 824 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7109 Jules Lanandat (Jules Liandat, Jules Glandat, Jules Linandat), 215 West Twenty-third Street, New York City, N. Y. (Brookdale Park, Madison, N. J.; 1025 Willow Avenue, Hoboken, N. J.).
4429 Hue Leong, 750 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3592 Tong Leong (Leong Tong), 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3583 Fernando W. Lerna (Ferinand Lerna), 332 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6433 Gee Leung, 22 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
5824 Way Leung (Leung Way), 889 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4858 Mah Lim (Mah Sin), 752 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3267 Shin Lin, 37 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
4460 Woo Shew Lim, 329 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4052 Chock Kun Lin (Kun Lin Chock), 868 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7440 Choy Lin (Choy Sin), 1005 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6498 Wong Chew Lin (Nong Chew Lin), 841 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2207 Gong Line, 503 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5708 Wm. A. Loftus (Wm. Augustus Loftus), 526 Sutter, San Francisco, Calif.
2125 Der Log, 750 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8837 Duck Sing Long (Duck Sing Low), 937 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2724a Francisco Lopez (Lopes), steamship *Ecuadore*, San Francisco, Calif.
5760 Jose (Josi) R. Lopez, 754 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
1842 Chan Louie (Choy Louie), 616 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5224 Hock Fong Louie, 763 Sacramento Street (764 Sacramento Street), San Francisco, Calif.
3061 Len Fon Louie (Louie Len Fon), 645 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7034 Sing F. Louie (Sing Fook Louie), 740 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2720 Chan Loy, 408 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
29 Chin Loy, 823 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7613 Americo Lucbesi (Americo Lucchesi), 423 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9208 Eugene Luckey, 23 South Pilgrim Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Saxon Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.).
288 James Luka, 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5380 Jayme R. Lukban, 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7524 Kee Luke, 636 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6910 Ah Lum, 658 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7786 Wong Gim Lum (Wong Gin Lum), 914 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4268 Ug Seck Lun (Sic Lun NG, Ng Seck Lun), 783 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
887 Wong Yock Lun, 1030 Stockton Street (1038 Stockton Street), San Francisco, Calif.
9202 Tonie Lung (Louie Lung), 854 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2680 Nazario Luz, Transport Sherman, San Francisco, Calif.
6802 James Lynch, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1643 Eddie McAuliffe, S. S. *Northern Pacific*, Pier 7, San Francisco, Calif.
5237 Albert L. McCabe, Immigration Station, Angel Island, Calif. (141 Fifth Street), San Francisco, Calif.
6847 James A. McCabe (James Arnold McCabe, J. A. MacCabe), S. S. *Buenaventura*, San Francisco, Calif.
7201 Wm. McCaney, S. S. *Wilhelmina*, San Francisco, Calif.
3193a Lawrence E. McCormick (Lawrence Elmer McCormick, Laurence E. McCormick), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3609 John McDonagh, 58 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5378 Donald E. McEachern (Donald Emil McEachern, D. E. McEachern), Hotel Statler, Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8511 Elmer McEwen (E. McEwen), 716 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
9818 Thos. McGuire, 537 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2832 John J. McKenna, county jail No. 1, San Francisco, Calif. (John James McKenna, 27 Regio, Edinburg, Scotland.)
5580 Jose Makalada (Makalalad), 417 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3143a Miguel Maldenado, New Olin Hotel, 1114 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4942 Vincent Malicki (V. Malecki), steamship *Columbia*, Pacific Mail, San Francisco, Calif.
659 Louis E. Maley (Maley), 545 Turk Street (1051 Kearny Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2429a Erick Malstrom (Erik Malmstrom), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5897 Chris Manojlovich (Manojlovich), 606 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2802a Eugcino Marata (Eugeino Marato, Eugenio Marato), 1138 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5539 Joseph Marigone, 790 Vallejo Street (Joseph Mangona, Joe Mangone), San Francisco, Calif.
810 Emilio (Emilio) Martin, 691 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
7368 Grover E. Martin (Grover Edward Martin, G. E. Martin), 660 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
69c Richard Martin, 1038 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Indoor Yacht Club).
6414 Alexandro (Alejandro) Martinez, Sashu Hotel, St. Anne Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Alex Martines, St. Anne Street).

5635 Antonio Jose Martinez, 453 Kearny Street (1119 Sumett Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.
6231 John (J.) Martinez, 1208 Hockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3621 Hans H. F. Martins (Hans Reinrick Freidrich Martens, Hans Heinrick Freidrich Martins, H. Martens), steamship *Marion Chilicott*, San Francisco, Calif.
3873 Bruno Manisio (Bruno Mannsio, Bruno Manzio, Bruno Mauzio), 1834 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1116 Emil A. Mauren (Emil August Maurer), 19 Wetmore Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5863 William Anthony Maxey (W. A. Maxey), General Delivery, Vellejo, Calif.
3914 Wong May (Wong Moy), 800 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7961 Peter Mazzoni (Pete Mazzoni), steamer *Modoc*, San Francisco, Calif.
4025 Adolpo P. Mendry (Adolfo Prieto Mendes, Adolpo P. Mendrs, Adolpo Prietz Mendrs), 429 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6454 Angelo Menhucci, 2239 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3357 Fred Miller (Fred J. Miller, F. J. Miller), Mound Angel, Oreg.
1948 John Joseph Miller, 154 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7109a Richard Miller, San Francisco, Calif.
4905 Leong Ming, 802 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8140 Shoeman Miyamma (Miyamora) (Shoemon Miyamura, Sheeman Miyamora), 531 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2926 John G. Molineaux (John George Molineaux), Terminal Hotel, Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7680a Bruno A. Mondieka, 144 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Bruno A. Condieka, 1923 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
8334 Tin (Lin) Moon, 333 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (Lon Moon, 733 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.).
4824 Luke T. Moore, 112 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
166 Manuel Moreira (M. Moreira), 42 Graham Place, San Francisco, Calif.
10147 Jose Moreno, 1325 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Joe Moreno, steamer *Maria*, California).
6292a Paul Morino (Pablo Morino), 223 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6317 Harry L. Morlock (Harry Lewis Morlock, H. L. Morlock), steamship *Texan*, San Francisco, Calif.
5777 Percival E. Morse (Percival Edgeworth Moise, Percival Edgeworth Morse), 174 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5798 Caesar (Caeser, Ceasar) Mortara, 744 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3924 Walter Moulder, care of Spreckels Ranch No. 11, Willits, Calif. (145 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
5027 Gaw Mow (Gau Mou, Gau Mau), 857 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4880 Andrew Charles Murphy, S. S. *Fort Sutter*, San Francisco, Calif.
6798 Roman V. Nacarrio (Nacario), 1019 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5683 Georgi Nakahara (George Nakalara, Nakahara), 520 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5693 Fong Nam (Nom), 828 Grant Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2733 Wong Nami (Nam), 1900 O'Farrell Street (1900 Fell Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2006 Charlie (Charles, Charle) E. Nelson, 116 Drumm Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6179 Edon C. Nelson (Nilsen, Nilson), 139 Drumm Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5465 Pedros Nersesian, 214 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5709 Chew Kaw Ng, 721 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4946 Chuen Yuen Ng, 733 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5371 John Ng, 845 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8897 Joas P. S. Nimes (Mimes), 77 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3639 Wong Noon (Nom Wong, Wong Nom), 901 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3089 Guido Angelo Nudi, N. W. Ellis and Powell, Woodstock Hotel, 20 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9624a Manuel Nunes (Nunies), 877 Clay Street (37 Clay Street), San Francisco, Calif.
6054 Fernando Nunes (F. Nunes), 21 Tracy Place, San Francisco, Calif.
883 Tom Nung, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8362 Edward Francis O'Brien (Edward F. O'Brien), 606 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3590 Miguel Octavio (M. G. Octavio), 691 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
743 Manuel Oliveria (Manuel Jose Olivera), 77 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3811 Chan On (Chau Ou), 947 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8374 Som Soon On, Clay Avenue (59 Clay Street), San Francisco, Calif.
8101 Yee On, 737 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5896 James J. O'Neill, 668 Clay Street (558 Clay Street), San Francisco, Calif.
6266 Thomas Henry O'Neill (T. H. O'Neil, Thos. Henry O'Neil), 387 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6619 Raoul Ortez (Ortiz), Stafford Apartments, California and Powell Streets, San Francisco, Calif.
3015 Antti J. Paavilainen (Anutti Juko Paavilainen, Antti Juko Pavilainen), Seamen's Union, 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8619 Young Pah (Kau, Pan), 924 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6958 Servero Paindinola, transport *Thomas*, San Francisco, Calif.
4969 Rehino M. Palermo (R. M. Palermo), 848 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5544 Henry Arthur Palmer, 25 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8733 Chin Pang, 1024 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
4561 Pantelis F. Panteleon (Pantelis Feliss Pantaleon), 144 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6245 Enrico Parducci, 335 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6900a Christos Pascanos, 1009 Point Lobos Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
2906 Pedro (Sopo, Sopi) Paula, 848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6504 Domenico (Domenic) Pedesano, 10 Bankam Place, San Francisco, Calif.

5661 Guiseppe Pern, 550 Green Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9009 Cirpiano Perez, 100 Vernot Street, San Francisco, Calif. (steamer *National City*).
6388 Charles Pharr, 69 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5473 Svante Pihlava, 641 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
8144 Victoriano B. Pilla (Victoriano Bustillo Pila, Victoriano Bustillo), 771 Broadway Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9533 Gee Ping, 954 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5137 Yim Kwai Ping, 1104 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Yim Kwai Ping, 780 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
9849 Louis Pistorin, 801 Broadway Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9731 Munzio Pitisei (Nunzio Pitisei), 761 Union Street (751 Union Street), San Francisco, Calif.
5987 Lee Dw Po, 874 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
583 Guilo Podesta (Guilio Podesta), 530 Greenwich Street, San Francisco, Calif.
10354 Wm. Pohn (Wm. Polm, W. Polm), 112 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4185 Lak Poi, 766 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Lock Poi, 858 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
9362 Chew Pon, 828 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
361 Chin Chee Pon (Chine Chee Pon), 915 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1301 Mon Hing Pon, 105 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
9347 Wong Pon, 27 St. Louis Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
171 Yee Pong (Pong Yee), 702 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5601 Harvey Pooley (Harry Pooley), Levy's Café, Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif., Seal Beach Co.
3411 Joe Mike Pressler (J. M. Pressler), 60 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4441 Harry D. Price (H. D. Price), 160 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2240 Antonio Prini, 153 Varrennes Place (162 Jasper Place), San Francisco, Calif.
2321 Manuel Puerto (Manuel Puerts, Manuel Puertes), 848 Kearney Place (848 Kearny Street), San Francisco, Calif.
7723 Pietrucci Pugini (Pietrucci Eugini), 377 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9690 Koe Sung Pun (Koo Sung Pun), 742 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3437 Corbelli Pusequale (Corbelli Pasquale), 471 Union Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7153 Lewis E. Pyle (Lewis Ernest Pyle), steamer *Hercules*, San Francisco, Calif.
4449 Lung Zip Quan (Quan Lung Neght), 735 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9804 Jeung Quan, 1153 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
246 Sun Quan (Quan Sun), 1142 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
10384a Jose Quiane, 1208 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5989 Hildo Quinones (Hildo Quinong), 39 Bauman Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3839 James Quinn, 547 Sansome, San Francisco, Calif.
4943 John Quirk (John Quick), steamship *Ventura*, San Francisco, Calif.
561 Fong Quon (Fong Quen), 874 Sacto (874 Sacramento Street), San Francisco, Calif.
1885 Ho Quong, 820 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4850 Lee Quong, 835 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5140 Guiseppe Rafaci (Guiseppe Raffaele), 838 Sansome, San Francisco, Calif.
8691 Francisco Ramos (F. Ramos), 1819 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8739 Arthur Ramsey, 170 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
10206a Zacarias Ranva (Ranoa), Manila Club, San Francisco, Calif.
8097 Charles L. Raulet, 55 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., care of H. P. Hills Co., Hetch Hetchy, Calif.
5786 Thomas Rauro, 821 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3959 Roy Ray Hecter, 619 South Eleventh Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6529 J. F. Reedy, Everett, Mich.
3672 John G. Reeves (John Gilbert Reeves), 352 Geary Street, San Fancisco, Calif.
4233 Pacificode los Reyes (Pacific de Los Leyes), 841 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5413 Ayris V. de Silva Rexende (Ayric V. da Silva Rezende, Ayres V. de Silva Rezende), 77 Jackson Street (746 Howard Street), San Francisco, Calif.
6282 Manuel Da Silva Rezendo (Rezendi), 77 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8114 Frank Ricciardic (Frank Riccardi, Frank Ricciardi), South Dos Palmos, Calif.
8602 Edward John Rice (E. J. Rice), 144 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7253 Jessie Rickett (Jesse Rickett, Jesse Pickett), 32 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4662 James Riley, Steamship *Caddo*, San Francisco, Calif.
3908 Vincent F. Roderick (Vincent Francisco Roderick), 353–355 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2520 Juan Romeno (Juan Romero), Transport *Sherman*, San Francisco, Calif.
6005 Wm. F. Rosner (Wm. Frederick Rosner, 1208 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Wm. Fredrick Rosner), 38 Hancock Street, Springfield, Mass.
4312 Joseph Rossi, 639 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5466 Albert E. Roth (Albert Edward Roth), 1407 Clinton Avenue, care Mrs. H. Forror, Detroit, Mich.
2494a Arthur M. Ruiz (Arthur Maximilian Ruiz, A. M. Ruiz), 944 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6243 Frank Ruiz, Steamer *Oneco*, Pier 27, San Francisco, Calif.
6760 Rafael P. Ruiz, Steamship *Para*, San Francisco, Calif.
6169 Angelo Rusca, 575 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4205 James W. Ryan (James Wm. Ryan, Overland Hotel, First and Broadway, Oakland, Calif.), Panama Hotel, Alameda, Calif.
2527 Wm. A. Ryan, 100 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5472 Frank Sabbatini (Frank Sabbadini, Burmester, Utah), 847 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
550 Fong Sam (Fong San), 745 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5608 Diego S. Samos (Diego Sanches Suarez), Steamer *Constance*, Calif. Trans. Co., San Francisco, Calif.
5447 Chew Sang (Jew Shung), 764 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1512 Gee Sang (Gee Song), 1045 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7414 Victor Sarelli (Victor Lavelli), Italian Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
5867 Lum Saw (Shaw Lim, Saw Lum), 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1085a Wm. Scheler, 60 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8833 Wm. Schimelpfenning (Wm. Schimelpünig), 1029 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6156 John J. Schmitz (John Jennings Schmitz), 444 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7289 Louis E. Schroeder (Louis F. Schroeder), 112 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8935 Allesandro Scoutegnazza, 664 Greenwich Street (Alessandro Scuoteguazza, 1827 Stockton Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2656 James Seer (James J. Seer), 235 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7156 Paulino Senda, 848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7732a Juan V. Serrano, 1138 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7434 Wong Sey, 307 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3472 Wong Poon Shek (Wong Poon Skek), 43 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
4847 Wong Shew, 824 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7842 Shue Shing, 561 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (562).
9666 Wong Show (Show Wong), 861 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8847 Gee Wong Shung, 105 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
2295 Antonio Simos (D. Simos), 77 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8370 Fred Simpkins, 644 Amelia Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Fred Ellsworth Simpkins, Fred E. Simpkins, 6446 Aurelia Street.)
8669 Chew Sing, 764 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1787a Chu Sing, 861 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2354 Gee Sing, 105 Weaverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3314 Gee Sing, 828 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5581 Gee Sing, 1031 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1035 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
5776 Gee Nom Sing (Mon), 767 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7150 Lee Sing, 1042 Grand Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4216 Lew Sing, 421 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3082 Lum Sing, 840 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3996 Mar Sing, 933 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3815 Wong Sing, 10 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
2792 Wong Sing (Sing Wong), 857 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3653 Yee Sing, 860 Washington Street San Francisco, Calif.
2896 Young Sing, 802 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8345 Al Smith, 1116 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1780 George Smith (George Smyth), Marine Cooks' and Stewards' Association, 42 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1357 Harold E. Smith (Harold Edson Smith), 124 Mason Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4490 Claude D. Smithers (Claude Daniel Smithers), 515 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6125 Theodorus Smits, 139 Drumm Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6171 Floyd G. Snelson, 750 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8594 Raymond C. Soares, 4100 Third Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (Raymond Edward Soares, 1009 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
7710 Michael Sobrano, 769 Filbert Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8435 Vincent A. Solidor, 848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8698 Chay Ban Some, 932 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3414 Ug Song (Ng Song), 932 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2320 Yee Gum Soo, 822 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5529 Gee Soon, 901 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6261 Gee Poy Soon, 804 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2941 Tom Soon, 972 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3253 Paul S. Sorensen (Paul Severn Sorensen), 753 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2594 John P. Spencer (J. P. Spencer), Navy Y. M. C. A., San Francisco, Calif.
6174 Gustave Stamp (Gustav Stamp, G. Stamp), Steamer Manos, San Francisco, Calif.
6251 Stravos Stravon, 447 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Stavros Stavron, 908 Post Street.)
604 Jung Hin Sue (Jong Hin Sue), 920 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5684 Wong Suey, 34 Rosa Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
4627 Chew Len Sung (Chew Leon Sung), 128 Oregon Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3181 Henry Svendsen (Henrick L. Svendsen), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8180 Andrew Svenson (Andrew Swenson), Steamer Stetson, San Francisco, Calif. (Andrew Swensen, Steamer Stelson.)
7229 George Tag (George Tog), 551 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7031 Lun Tai, 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2684 Wm. H. Talbot (Wm. Henry Talbot), Steamship Spokane, San Francisco, Calif.
732 Stephen T. Tassio (Stephen J.), 861 Vallijo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6047 Louis Terrano, Golden State Hotel, San Luis Obispo, Calif.
3252a James Thompson, 244 Eddy Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3197 John A. Thompson (John Alexander Thompson), 623 Pacific Street, San Francisco, Calif.
340 Chin Tin (Chim Tim, Chim Tin Cinchines), 838 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2405 Gregory E. Tindor, Angel Island, Calif.
3117 Fong Ting (Tong Ting), 828 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
8630 Heung Tom, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7388 Jackey Tom (Jackey Toun), 1180 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3246 Kong Tom, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7753 Mon Shuck Tom, 723 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9921a Quong Tom, 783 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2843 So Tom, 748 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9744 Tong Tom, 817 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9822 Waldeman Tomsen (Waldemar Tomsen), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3410 Ang Ten (Ang Ton), 748 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3878 Chang Chew Tong (Chan Chew Tong), 116 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
5106 Chew Tong, 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.

2480 Loy Tong (Tong Loy), 721½ Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5308 Wo Yui Tong (Ng Yin Tong), 802 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2255 Yee Que Tong, 609 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6361 Ton Toy, 857 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6665 Dominek Tringalla (Dominick Tringalla), 2010 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Dominik Tringalla, 2059a Powell Street.)
8433 George O. Tripp (Jorge O. Fripp), 754 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
1544 Gustaf Trykin (Gustof Trykin), 59 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3263 Wee Yune Tung (Yum Tung Woo, Woo Yune Tung), 847 Clay Street (160 Shrader Street), San Francisco, Calif.
1323 Edward B. Turner (Edward Ben Turner), Steamer Northern Pacific, San Francisco, Calif.
8445 Kee Chew Ug (Kee Chew Ng, Ng Kee Chen, Kee Chew Ny), 727 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8734 Antonio Valenguelo (Antonio Valenzuela), 765 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
7314 Manuel A. Valentine (Manuel Ahoren Valentine, Manuel A. Valentin), 65 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5774 Johanno Van Dinterren, Steamer Fort Bragg, Pier 17, San Francisco, Calif.
6745 Walter Van Winkler (Walter Van Winckler, Walter Von Winchler), 240 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9675 Jos. Robert Varney (J. R. Varney), Brawley, Calif.
6738 Alsiandro Veloro (Alojandro Veloro, Alejandro Veloro), 541 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2814 Guiseppe Vereno (Quiseppi Verveni, Guiseppi Verveno), 18 Ohio Place, San Francisco, Calif.
9791 Antono Victonovi (Antonio Victonovi, Antono Victonovi, Antonio Victonois), 1434 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4967 Salvatore Vigna, 615 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif.
5945 Ayrelio Villalobos (Aurelio Villaloboes), Str. *Isleton*, Pier 5, San Franciscoo, Calif.
7181a Joseph M. Vincent (Joseph Madison Vincent, J. M. Vincent), 66 Geary Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5972 Gee Jack Wah (Gee Jeck Wah), 4 Spofford Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
4622 Kong Wah, 828 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1248a John Walker, 150 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Jack E. Walker, County Jail No. 2.)
5906a Harold F. Walters (Harold F. Wolters), S. S. *China*, San Francisco, Calif.
9359 Ham Wang (Hom Mony, Hom Wong), 808 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5640 Charles Warakas, 214 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7889 Lloyd Ward (Lloyd Bowers Ward), United States dredge *San Pablo*, San Francisco, Calif. (L. B. Ward, 59 Stonewall Street, Atlanta, Ga.)
3711 Frank Ward, 351 Columbus Avenue (50 Union Park), San Francisco, Calif.
7951 Ug Wee (Ng Wee), 709 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7647 Yee Wee (Gee Wee), 828 Dupont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5470 Wm. Weicandy (Winandy Williams, Pete William Winandy), 387 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2146 Rayata Wincislao (Wencislas Rayata, W. Rayala), Transport Thomas, San Francisco, Calif.
6678 Arthur White, County Hospital (Ward 70), San Francisco, Calif.
9428 Clarence Whiteside, 975 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9245 Chas. Williams, 910 Montgomery Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
5125 Thomas J. Wilson (Thomas John Wilson), Transport Sherman, San Francisco, Calif.
4438a Chum Gum Wing, 775 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif. (66 Second Street, Portland, Oreg.)
4355 Gee Wing, 1032 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7467 Lee Doo Wing, 851 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9489 Wong Wing, 767 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2178 Wong Wo, 124 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3880 Lee Woh (Lee Wah), 874 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5645 Bark Yuen Wong (Wong Bark Yuen), 835 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8383 Ben Fay Wong (W. Ben Choy), 777 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
3677 Kim Taw Wong (Wong Kim Taw, Him Tow Wong), 835 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6496 Lung Wong (Wong Lung), 740 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
5818 Son Wa Wong (Wong Song Wa), 735 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5120 Soon Wong (Wong Soon, Loon Wong), 746 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6567 Thomas R. Wong, 706 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7232 Wah Wong (Woh Wong, Wong Worh), 874 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5528 Young Wong (Wong Young), 804 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7425 Dick Tu Woo, 847 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Woo Dick Fu, 82½ Second Street, Portland, Oreg.).
5842 Jew Doo Woo, 776 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4435 A. R. Wood, Jepsen Apartments, Main Lake Street, Watsonville, Calif.
1908 Horace C. Wood (Horace Cloudsky Wood), Bay Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
7707 Long Yack (Yock), 671 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
4586 Ng Lew Yam (Ng Sew Yam), 815 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
3537 Lee Yat, 1016 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
7358 Wah Jack Yee (Yee Wah Jack, Wah Jack Lee), 821 Washington Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9852 Wm. Yee, south side Jackson, near Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1223 Willie Yee, 972 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5361 Hong Yen, 920 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
7720 Yung Yen (Jung Yen (Yon)), 736 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
5314 Chin Yet (Chew Yet (Yit)), 730 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8482 Chen Yim (Chan Yim, Chun Yin (Yun), 940 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6127 Chan Bing Yim, 614 Pine Street, San Francisco, Calif.
8828 Lum Sick Yim (Lum Sik Yin, Guin Sick Yin), 51 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3009 Tsue Yim, 919 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1074a Chin Chew Yin, 1032 Stockton Street (1045 Stockton Street), San Francisco, Calif.
8942 Chin King Ying, 928 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
4454 Fouie Suey Ying (Louie Suey Ying), 616 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6370 Gee Ying, 24 Ross Alley, San Francisco, Calif.
6609 Tom Quong Ying, 1115 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
6047 Dock You (Dock Yon, Duck You (Yon), 737 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
1025 Loo You, 753 Clay Street, San Francisco, Calif.
452 Toy Ngim You (Yon), 658 Jackson Street, San Francisco, Calif.
9188 Wong You, 953 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2789 Yee You (You Yee), 867 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.
143 Foung Yuen (Yueng Foung), 924 Grant Avenue (929 Grand Avenue), San Francisco, Calif.
4329 Lee Yuen, 124 Waverly Place, San Francisco, Calif.
4270 Wong Quai Yen (Wong Nuai Yen, Wong Quie Yin), Jackson and Grant Avenue (947), San Francisco, Calif.
5368 Fong (Tong) Yut (Long Yut), 575 Grant Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
6559 Bonifacio Zabalza, 21 Tracy Place, San Francisco, Calif.
3174 Mayer Zabler (Zabler Mayer, Meyer Zabler), Hotel Retz, Eddy & Taylor (Hotel Ritz), San Francisco, Calif.
8999 Patricio Garcia, 848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SHASTA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

808 Frank Aebacete Albacete (Frank Albacete), 420 California Street, Redding, Calif.
1705 Roberto Albro, Keswick, Calif.
2035 Fred Allen, Coram, Calif. Balaklala.
1357 Erick Arb (Art), Heroult, Calif.
295 Clarence R. Basel, Idahoha Hotel, Redding, Calif.
239 Harry Borden, 214 Court Street, Redding, Calif.
1440 Morris A. Baptiste (Morris Alfred Baptiste), Golden Eagle Hotel, Redding, Calif.
290 Alec Bailey, Fall River, Mass. (Redding, Calif.).
196 George Balfeta (Bolfeta), Brlog, Hrratska, Austria (Coram, Calif.).
40 Walter D. Baxter, Golden Eagle Hotel, Redding, Calif.
1511 Bertigo Bonato (Bertig Donato), Kennett, Calif.
675 Jose Basque (Basquez, Vasquez, Vasques), Mammoth, Calif.
452 Ramon (Raymon) Castro, Rivas Altos Street, Luben, Spain. (Keswick, Calif.).
36 Emtigne (Emtignie) Chacez (Eutiguio Chacey), Redding, Calif.
2028 Anthony C. Chaves (Anthony Carvaths Corvalhs, Chaves), Mammoth, Calif.
1214 George L. Cirso (George Lester Cirso), Knob, Calif.
781 Robert David (D.) Clifford, 33 Edgerton Street south, Manchester, Conn. (Keswick, Calif.).
90 Harry Collimbiris, Coram, Calif.
1426 Roy Connor (Ray Comar, Comor), Mommoth, Calif.
708 John Cook, Center Street, Redding, Calif.
546 Estele (Eatle) Bee Cox, 203 Burgess Street, Grants Pass, Oreg. (Kennett, Calif.).
1747 Herman Stewart (S.) Cox, Ingot, Calif. (Grand Prairie, Texas).
1480 Edson Elmer (E.) Davis, Kennett, Calif.
310 Bob Dellavesa (Dallerasa, Dellavasa), 681 Broadway, San Francisco, Calif. (Heroult, Calif.).
824 James Doyle, New Burge, New York (Anderson, Calif.).
26 Henry Dumm, Circlesville, Ohio (% L. E. Baker, Redding, Calif.).
733 Giacomo Forneris, Mammoth, Calif.
381 Jose Garcie, 420 California Street, Redding, Calif.
1512 Paul Alphouse (A.) Goss, Anderson, Calif.
1786 Oliverio Georgio (Giorgio), Coram, Calif.
2058 Louis (Louie) Gianotti, Mammoth, Calif.
1713 Frank Gonzales, Redding, Calif.
574 Giovanni Gordignan (Bordignan), Kennett, Calif.
863 Manuel Gorres, Anderson, Calif.
1146 Jerry Gregory, County Hospital, Redding, Calif.
1380 Frank Harris, Redding, Calif.
868 Jesus Hernandez (Hermandez), Redding, Calif.
1126 Welter Henry (H.) Howe, Redding, Calif. (St. Caroline Hospital, Redding, Calif.).
906 John Franklin (F.) Hubbard, Upper Lake, Calif. (North Yakima, Wash.).
1197 Elmer Johnson, Anderson, Calif.
1729 Robert B. Jones, Ingot, Calif. (308 Quintard Avenue, Anniston, Calif.).
712 Andrew Kaiser, Shasta, Calif (1641 Dayton Street, Chicago, Ill.).
224 Bob Kasum, Coram, Calif.
1074 Joe Lasio (Loyero), R. F. D., Redding, Calif.
1200 Inganio (Iganio) Lujano, R. F. D., Redding, Calif.
975 Joe Manuel, 205 California Street, Redding, Calif.
615 Joseph Mattise, Redding, Calif.
788 David Miller, R. F. D. No. 8, Mount Morris, Mich. (LaMoine, Calif.).
2025 Jack Miller, Sims, Calif. (Begum, Calif.).
389 Jose S. Molina (Jose Sanchez Molina), Mammoth, Calif.
834 John Frederick Mudick (John F. Mudick), Persua, Mont.
2000 Nick Nicholan (Nick X. Nickolan), Redding, Calif.
1435 Phillipo Olono (Phillips Olono), Mammoth, Calif.
1117 Constantion A. Perez (Constantion Alonso Perex), Mammoth, Calif.
1738 Orvil Edson Perry, Redding, Calif.; Orvil E. Perry, 1140 Praul Street, Denver, Colo.
47 Richard H. Phillips, Kennett, Calif.
602 Evaristo Revias, Keswick, Calif., Evaristo Rivas, Means Street, Orense, Spain.
1591 Levi Richard, Bond Calif.; Levy Richard, Redding, Calif.
1650 Daniel Rodriquez, Mammoth, Calif.
768 Joseph Salena (Salina), Redding, Calif.
990 Carlo Tarabini (Tarrabbini), Mammoth, Calif.
1704 Clarence Charles Towl, Redding Calif.; Clarence C. Towl, Ingot, Calif.
398 Adolfo Trujillo, Anderson, Calif.
1889 George Turner, Antler, Calif.; Colusa, Calif.
1766 Bob Vovich (Podgosica, Montenegro), Keswick, Copper Co., Calif.
1666 L. W. Webster (L. Webster), Montgomery Creek, Calif.

481 Fred Whitaker, Round Mountain, Calif.
977 Rose Whitley, Redding, Calif.
1170 Jesse L. Williams, Lorenz Hotel, Redding, Calif.
1570½ Amos W. Wilson, Redding, Calif.
1292 Joe Yuen, French Gulich, Calif.
456 Carlos F. Molina, Willow, Calif.
516 Willie Robinson, Anderson, Calif.
537 Adolpho Vizcano (Adolfo Vizcano), Keswick, Calif.
689 Micagar Wallick (Micagar Scott Wallick, Micager), Knob, Calif.
1097 John Wm. Stewart, Redding, Calif.; John W. Stewart, Salt Lake, Utah.
2690 Nicola Auglia, Weed, Calif.
494 Oscar Anderson, Weed, Calif.
2290 Pietro Andreazzi (Andriazzi), Fresno, Calif.
1187 Walter E. Bertiesen, Weed, Calif.
1739 Pasquale Bianchin, Bray, Calif.
1491 Robert C. Brandenburg (Robert Clayton Brandenberg, Brandenbergh), 3014 Third Street, Ocean Park, Calif.
874 Dozier Brown, McCloud, Calif.
586 William Joseph Brown, 3591 22d Street, San Francisco, Calif.
2503 George Burns, 5th and Madison, Seattle, Wash. (Dothan, Oreg.).
709 William Carlson, 113 9th, Richmond, Calif.
2647 Edward Cole, McCloud, Calif.
1562 Fred Clarence Cole, Salt Lake City, Utah, Gen. Del. Sacramento, Calif.
1946 George Coleman, Edgewood, Calif.
800 Herbert W. Cranton (Herbert Wilson Cranton), Weed, Calif.
296 Lewis Crook, Polahatchie, Miss. (McCloud, Calif.).
2115 Floyd (Claud) Arthur Davis, Grants Pass, Oreg.
1821 Barney Devlin, Weed, Calif.
723 Louis (Lewis) Dodge, Edgewood, Calif.
20 Nick Dunba (Bunba), Dunsmuir, Calif.
1507 Howard Leroy Elliott, Copco, Calif.
428 Reynaud Fonteneau (Fonteneaux), Leicher, La. (Weed, Calif.).
369 William E. Garretty (William Edward Garretty), Copco, Calif.
645A Calvin Sylvester Garrison, San Quentin Prison, Calif.
1771 Silvio Giani (Silvio Giana), Weed, Calif.
2526 Russell Raymond Guarino, Weed, Calif.
2590 John C. Hewitt, Weed, Calif. (care of D. H. Bodine, Albany, Oreg.).
2793 George Harold Humphrey (or 583a Humphreys), Scott Barr, Calif.
1078 Percey H. Kelman (Percey Herman Kelman) Dunsmuir, Calif.
2134 William Daniel (David) Kolb, Redding, Calif.
940 Carl B. Larson (Carl Benhard Larson), Fort Jones, Calif.
1365 Frank Lasenderfer (Lansenderfer), Yreka, Calif.
1659 Ralph E. Maloney (Ralph Emmett Maloney), Dunsmuir, Calif.
2010 William Mayler, 63 6 Avenue, Richmond, Dist. S. F., Calif. (63 8th Street, Richmond, Calif.).
1797 Wong Meng (J. Wong Meng), Hilts, Calif.
1355 John Mill, Dunsmuir, Calif.
1698 Joseph F. Minot, Dunsmuir, Calif.
1575 Emil Mosser, Sisson, Calif.
1590 Fred Moyer, Mt. Hebron, Calif.
2112 Elmer Victor Meyers, Dorris, Calif.
1280 Nicholas (Nickolas, Nick) Panas, P. O. Box 621, McCloud, Calif.
473 John Paraskavopolos (Parskovopolas, Parskavopolos), Hornbrook, Calif. (Mentecs, Calif.).
1603 Edward C. W. Pierson (Edward Chas. W. Pierson, Edw. C. W. Pearson), Dorris, Calif.
2097 John Renzo, 706 Brown Avenue, Erie, Pa.
1051 Ben Richards, Happy Camp, Calif.
514 Claude Roberts, Gazelle, Calif.
2111 Milton Robinson, McCloud, Calif.
2576 Ernesto Sarti, McCloud, Calif.
971 Giovanni (Giovanis, Giovannis) Scarfin, Penoyar, Calif. (Bray, Calif.).
1658 George Scotland, Gazelle, Calif.
689 Horace Clifford Sims, Weed, Calif. (624 8th Street, Klamath Falls, Oreg.).
1072 Wong Sing, Weed, Calif.
2518 Alex Smith, McCloud, Calif.
1148 Samuel Stokes, Hilts, Calif.
1845 Frank Stone, Hornbrook, Calif.
1080 William A. Thompson, Mt. Hebron, Calif.
1013 John Turner, McCloud, Calif.
2004 Gus Vassekopaulos (Geo. Vassilopaulos), McCloud, Calif.
2202 Oscar Franklin Wade, Crane, Mo.
1868 James Talbert (Talbart) Ward, Dunsmuir, Calif.
691 Dell Clinton Waterman (D. C. Waterman), Hornbrook, Calif.
210 Ezekiel Williams, McCloud, Calif. (808 High Street, Orville, Calif.).
1576 Frank C. Williams, McCloud, Calif.
377 Joe Williams, McCloud, Calif.
2043 Harry W. Wilson, Gazelle, Calif.
2271 Wong Wing, Hult, Calif.
774 Syver Wolden, Bray, Calif.
230 Carlyle Worthy (C. B. Worthy), Box 700, McCloud, Calif.
1835 Horn Food (Fook) Yuen, Country Club, McCloud, Calif.
2698 Calvin Zerby, Grenada, Calif.
449 Howard Allen (A.) Duchermin, McCloud, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SOLANO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2089 Louis Abram, Duttons Landing, Calif., care of R. R. Bronda, Rural Free Delivery, Tulare, Calif.
2637 Grande Annibale, 118 Virginia, Vallejo, Calif.
2625 John Behety, Rio Vista, Calif. (Bihity, care of Belzar Hotel, Marysville, Calif.).
2530 Francisco Bejor, Vacaville, Calif.
2848 Torrell Roy Brooks (Terrell), Suisun Valley, Calif.
2937 Otto C. Burge (Buege), Mare Island, Box 1, Vallejo, Calif.
2234 Ham Chay (Choy), 207 Georgia, Vallejo, Calif.
3210 Charles W. Conley (Charles William Conley, C. W. Conley), Benicia, Calif.
1689 Foster Fong, Mare Island, Calif.
2596 Reynolds B. Frank (Francke, Reynolds Bens Francke), Cement, Calif.
2390 Jack Frazier, 332 Georgia, Vallejo, Calif.
2742 Harry G. Garland (Harry Gray Garland, Grey), 439 York, Vallejo, Calif.
1715 George Hall, Rio Vista, Calif.
2786 Harley Hudson, Cement, Calif. (Harley A. Hudson), Crockett Hotel, Crockett, Calif.
2069 Ali Jock, Cantelow Ranch, Vacaville, Calif.
769 John Kyrkslatt (Kyrklatt), Rio Vista, Calif.
3050 George Magrath, Benicia, Calif.
2217 Ella Marchi (Marki), Rio Vista, Calif.
3235 Peter Matrkia (Matelka, P. Matolka), Cafeteria, Mare Island, Calif.
2738 Ernesto Melendez (Ervesta Ervesto), 233 Capitol, Vallejo, Calif.
948 David E. Morgan, 428 Georgia, Vallejo, Calif.
2688 Llewellyn E. Powell, Rio Vista, Calif. (Morgan Hill).
12 Alexander J. Pyle (Alexander James Pyle, A. J. Pyle), Benicia, Calif.
2798 Lee Quock, 408 Marin Street, Vallejo, Calif.
1842 Juan Saclayan, Vacaville, Calif.
2134 Aloysius Sanford (Sandford), 133 Carolina, Vallejo, Calif.
2287 Yip K. Sing (Yip Wock Sing, Yip Rwock Sing), 500 Sonoma, Vallejo, Calif.
2072 John J. Smith, Rio Vista, Calif.
2181 Manuel C. Sores, Dixon, Calif. (Dxon).
187 Thomas Stockton (Thomas Wayne Stockton), 423 Santa Clara, Vallejo, Calif.
3340 Hen Sun, 408 Marin, Vallejo, Calif.
2796 Ing Sung, 414 Marin, Vallejo, Calif.
1350 Raymond N. Wilson, 215 Pennsylvania, Vallejo, Calif.
2431 R. W. Wolcott, Vallejo, Calif.
2683 William Wong, Suisun Valley, Calif.
3310 Toraichi Yamamato (Yamamoto), Railroad Camp, Vacaville, Calif.
3042 Evangelos Zamandes (Evagelos Zamanedes, Amgelos), 228 Penn, Vallejo, Calif.
40 Frank H. Arledge (Frank), Public Library, Vallejo, Calif.
3298 Verne Allen Baker (A.), 415 Marin Street, Vallejo, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF STANISLAUS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

784 Bulleri Agostino, Empire, Calif. (box 811, South San Francisco, Calif.)
1367 Raymon Agelar, Keyes, Calif.
93 Felipe Podaco, Almonte (Padaco), (E. P.), Modesto, Calif.
1115 Michael Andrews, Patterson, Calif. (Phoenix, Ariz.)
2057 John Reiss Azevedo (John Reis Azeveda), Modesto, Calif.
2612 Julius Bleistett (Bleistift), 502 12th, Modesto, Calif. (1741 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.)
1614 Chester Calder, Modesto, Calif.
999 Charles H. Campbell, 830 10th, Modesto, Calif.
3360 George Edward (E.) Carlson, Turlock, Calif.
3502 J. Cavarrubias (Covarrannas, Jesus Covarrubias), Modesto, Calif.
1453 George Challin (G.), Turlock, Calif.
3272 Ysabel Chabez (Chavey), Crows Landing, Calif.
1504 George Chirigates (Chirigetis), general delivery, Modesto, Calif.
3131 Calvin Allen Clemens, Thalheim, Calif.
49 Canute Crozco (Canute Orazco, Crezco), Modesto, Calif.
2860 Diminges (Domingo) Francisco Damos (Domingos Francisco Damas, Domengo Francesco Damas), Hickman, Calif.
2940 David Howard Dearborn, R. D. box 112, Modesto, Calif.
2757 Domenico (Domenice) Delirose, 630 9, Modesto, Calif.
2473 Risto Derkucker (Resto Drekucker, Derekuckes), Keyes, Calif.
599 Otto Engracie (Engracio), Turlock, Calif.
2836 Diogracias Escartin (Dogracio Escartin, Deogracios), Turlock, Calif.
2972 John Furentez (Jose Fuentez), 1213 7, Modesto, Calif.
2914 Breggi Giovanni (John Broggi, Giovanni Broggi), Patterson, Calif.
139 Sepertti Giovanni (Sippertti Givania, Sipertti Giovranie), R. R. C., Modesto, Calif.
362 Endrez Gonsaga, Oakdale, Calif.
582 Albert Hart, Modesto, Calif.
2383 Wong Hung, box 373, Modesto, Calif.
2770 Jonny P. Howard, Newman, Calif.
3406 Charlie (C.) Jackson, 128 North Michigan Avenue, Kankakee, Ill. (Crows Landing, Calif.)
3094 Joseph Johnston, Thalheim, Calif.
3569 Eulalio Juantias (Juanitas, Juanitos), 715 I, Modesto, Calif.
32 Frank (F.) Kenego, 604 Mirth, Modesto, Calif.
1753 Nick Koracench (Kovocovich, Kovacovich), general delivery, Modesto, Calif.
1638 Stoion Koronoff (Koronoff, Eronoff), R. D. "C" box 376, Modesto, Calif.
2051 Canuto Lara, Diablo, Turlock, Calif.
887 Clifford F. (C. F.) Leeds, Riverbank, Calif.
2154 Edward Harry Lindskog, R. F. D. B. box 62–B, Turlock, Calif.
2039 Narcisi Lise (Narciso Liso), E. R. R. Avenue, Oakdale, Calif.
1096 Jose Lopez, Modesto, Calif.
2873 Thomas Erskine Lothian (Lothain, Erekine Lothian), Motor R. A., Modesto, Calif. (1333 5th Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.)
1746 Barney McHarley, Route D, box 103, Modesto, Calif.
733 George Benjamin McClellan (George Benjamin (B.) McClellan), R. F. D. No. 3, Santa Rosa, Calif.
514 Macanio Marios (Macario Marias, Marios), Modesto, Calif.
994 Antonio Martinez (Antonie), Waterford, Calif.
627 Frank Maynihan (Maynehan), Newman, Calif.
1573 Eladio Mira (Eladia, Eladio Miro), R. A. No. 122, Modesto, Calif.
646 James Monroe, 809 Fifth, Modesto, Calif.
2366 Peter Moran, 809 H Street, Modesto, Calif.
3202 William Natseway, Riverbank, Calif.
2853 William Montgomery, Nelson, R. D., Box 104, Modesto, Calif.
2671 Victor Oliver, Oakdale, Calif.
236 Mateo Pagdoussalon (Pagdonsolan), Third Avenue, Oakland, Calif.
715 Anisitoo Patnobay (Anesito Patnobay), Third Avenue, Oakdale, Calif.
466 Roman Balanga Rabanal (Roman Ranalga Rabana, Roman Nalanga Rabaval), Oakdale, Calif.
2682 Petros Resmine (Rosmino), 602 Ninth Street, Modesto, Calif.
2114 Florence Roderiquez (Flironcio Roderiquez, Rodriques), Country, Modesto, Calif.
2187 Carl Styles Rose (C. S.), Modesto, Calif.
2719 Claytane Salazar (Ceydeno Salazar, Caytono), Oakdale, Calif.
1815 Agapeto Saloma (Agapito Saloma), West Railroad Avenue, Oakdale, Calif.

2922 Valeriano Sammarte (Sammarti, Valeareano Sammarte), Turlock, Calif.
1810 Joe F. Saracino, Riverbank, Calif.
1552 Esteban A. Silla, Oakdale, Calif.
432 Raymond Stewart Sharp, Keyes, Calif.
512 Peter Shields, Newman, Calif.
881 John Nickolis Sippel (Nicholas, Nickoles), Modesto, Calif.
2217 Mathew Alfred Skus, Skurs, Matt Skurs), Hughson, Calif.
2393 John Clarence Steffers (Steffens, Stiffens), general delivery, Modesto, Calif. (Elko, Nev.).
208 Marselo Tamong (Marzelo), Third Street, Oakdale, Calif.
481 Ramon Toberina (Roman Toberine, Toberiana), Rt. D, Box 138, Modesto, Calif.
2942 Stoian Velichoff (Stoian Velich Koft, Stalan Vilichoff), R. R. "C," Box 376, Modesto, Calif.
1487 Raymund de Vera (Raymundo de Vera, Raymunds), Third Street, Oakdale, Calif.
3085 Loney Franklin Walton, Crows Landing, Calif.
3831 Howard Raymon Williams (Ramond, Raymond), Rt. B, Box 74, Modesto, Calif.
1131 Alfred Wm. Wilson (W., Alford Wilson), Patterson, Calif.
2587 Eusebio Yulo (Yolo), Oakdale, Calif.
3509 Herbert Macafee, Rt. A, Box 360, Modesto, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF STOCKTON, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2448 Ambrosio Aguila (Aguilay), East Scotts Avenue, Stockton, Calif.
3432a Lazarus Andrews, Stockton, Calif.
4398 Esteban Andrino, 412 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
3583 Jose Antonio, 412 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
42 Nicholas Aranis (Aravis), Belmont Hotel, South San Joaquin, Stockton, Calif.
1140a Nick Bahamdony, San Quentin Prison, San Quentin, Calif. (Bahamony, Box 845, Stockton, Calif.)
2012 Wm. M. Banks, 117 W. Washington, Stockton, Calif.
3423a Lorins Morguitza Barilio (Morguitio Varilio, Mosquitzo Barilio, L. M. Barilio), 412 South Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
2636 Simplicio Bation, Aki Hotel, East Lafayette, Stockton, Calif.
65 Jang (Zang) Ben, 135 East Washington Street, Stockton, Calif.
1679 Maurice Bessus (Bessua), 225 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
234 Emil Bizeninski, 36 North Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
910 Toy Bong, 229 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
818 William Bryning, 119 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
2631 John Auzias DaCamora (Auzia da Camora, Ali Da Camora), 847 West Market, Stockton, Calif.
448 Francisco Canada, Lafayette House, Stockton, Calif.
1713 Louis Albino (A.) Cassanetti, 427 East Main, Stockton, Calif.
4384 Herman Castillo (Castello), 20 North Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
2682 Toy Gum (Gim) Chang, 229 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
3092a Fred Codera, 202 West Main Street, Stockton, Calif.
4067 Manail G. Costa (Casta), 318 South Eldorado, Stockton, Calif.
1399 Oscar Cope, 807½ San Pedro Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
930 Frederick Crotter, 316 East Market, Stockton, Calif.
3575 Felix Leo Cullem (L. Cullen), Imperial Hotel, Stockton, Calif. (F. L. Cullem, 1506 Ninth St., Oakland, Calif.)
82 Yit Dan, 228 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
4441 Valentin Decena, 412 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
263 Fred Eaton, 4 East Weber, Stockton, Calif.
5060 Irvie Ira Edson, 919 East Eldorado Street, Stockton, Calif. (I., 165 Third, San Francisco, Calif.)
3125 Antonio Augusto Furrerero (Antonio Augusto Fureero, A. A. Farerero), 303 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
1642 Lee Fong, 123 South Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
4971 David Fortunato, 606 West Market, Stockton, Calif.
4012 Frank Mason Glower (F. M. Glower), 5 East Weber, Stockton, Calif.
8961 Pedro Gonzalez (Gonzales), 520 North Sacramento, Stockton, Calif.
1804 Joseph Gossens, 203 East Sixth Street, Stockton, Calif.; Pauanee, 203 Sixth Street, Pauaee, Calif.
3467a John Goux, Stockton, Calif.
2480 Harry (H.) Thomas Grady, Windsor Hotel, Stockton, Calif.
2952 August Guebuerra (Yuebuerra), Bushville, Stockton, Calif.
3617 Chew Gum, 131 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
308 Crispin Gutierrez (Crispa Guturres, Crispo Guturres, Crispin Gutieres), 1220 East Scotts Avenue, Stockton, Calif.
2963 William Maxwell Harper (M., William Harper), 103 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
1140 Kaiji Hashiguchi, 228 East Eldorado, Stockton, Calif. (Hasligehi, Edwards.)
3357 Lee (See) Hay, 126 South Eldorado, Stockton, Calif.
3299 Chin Hing, 27 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
4027 Lee Hoon, 225 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
3777 Chan Jeong, 126 Washington Street, Stockton, Calif.
1487 Foy Jew, 229 Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
505 Herbert Charles (C.) Johnson, St. James Hotel, East Main, Stockton, Calif.
4937 Lucio Julioz, Union Island, San Joaquin County, Calif.
3483 Fong Kai, 137 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
2378a John Kauhani (Kauhane), Camp No. 10, Stockton, Calif.
3380 Wohg (Wong) Dong Kay, 221 South California, Stockton, Calif.
2091 Wong Kee, 113 South Eldorado, Stockton, Calif.
3907 John J. (J. J.) Koerbert, 29 East Channel, Stockton, Calif.
4625 Carl Lademan, 46 West Main, Stockton, Calif.
3469 Fred Laffin, Valley Rooming House, South Eldorado Street, Stockton, Calif.
4354 Mu Que (Mu Lang, Mu Lang Que), 225 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
1951 Lawrence Ettian Lebouf (Ettine Labouf, E. Lebonf), 324 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
68 George Lee, 822 South Harrison, Stockton, Calif.
4584 Marcelo Libra (Libre), 412 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
4486 Chon (Chan) Lin, 223 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
2573 Lee Lin, 223 South Hunter Street, Stockton, Calif.
3124 Mah Lun, 123 East Washington Street, Stockton, Calif.
4229 Pat McGuire, 4 East Weber, Stockton, Calif.
4810 Henry Ma, 123 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
3659 Lee Man, 109 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
1193 Enrico Marchetti (Marchette), Garabaldi Hotel, El Do., Stockton, Calif.
3832 Ben Ralph (B. R.), Martella, 635 East Main, Stockton, Calif.
4244 Charter Martines (Martines, Charles Martines), Stockton, Calif.
1911 Romardo (Romordo) Matas, 27 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
4535 Chesie (Chessi, Chester Beart, C. B.), Beall Maupin, Royal Rooming House, Stockton, Calif. (Cedar Falls, Wash.).
2538 Charles Henry (H) Miles, 193 Fourth Street (Reno Hotel 252 Sixth Street), San Francisco, Calif.
2874 Charles Clinton (C. H., Charles) Moore, Stockton, P. O. General Delivery, Calif. (Gallup, N. Mex.).
2988a Joe Morles, 379 South Convent Street, Tuscon, Ariz.
4526 Theodore Joseph Mueller (Joe Mueller), 1040 South California, Stockton, Calif.
739 Teodule Morillo (Teodulo Murillo, T. Morrillo), 119 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
3624a Chen (Chan, Chang) Nang, 253 (353) Washington, Stockton, Calif.
1846 Tom Nang, 146 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
2808 Patrick Neylon, Fair Grounds, Stockton, Calif. (Lindsay, Calif.).
3922 Risaku Nobuye, 46 East Lafayette, Stockton, Calif.
972 Numa, 119 South Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
4721 Albion Oquin, 42 East Main Street, Stockton, Calif.
2445 William Livingston (L) Palmer, 2007 East Sonora, Stockton, Calif.
599 Thomas Pease, 23 North Center, Stockton, Calif.
2713 Edward P. (E. P.) Peterson, jr., 315 East Market Street, Stockton, Calif.
1415 Fred Arthur Peterson, 535 East Main, Stockton, Calif.
3668 Gus Ernest (G. E.) Price, Panama Hotel, 47 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
4030 Juan Quijada, 1545 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
3035 James Davidson (J. D.) Ralph, 119 South Center, Stockton, Calif.
224 Lester G. Reardon, between railroad, South (1128 East Channell, Stockton, Calif.
898 Antonio Recalde, 412 Henter Street, Stockton, Calif.
4710 William (Billy) Revour, 24 North Street, Stockton, Calif.
4683 James Moloy (Maloy, M.) Robinson, Bronx Hotel, Stockton, Calif.
38 Fong Quong Sand (Sang, San), 47 South Center Street, Stockton, Calif.
2451 Charles K. (C.) Schultz, 1932 East Main, Stockton, Calif.
1634 Lew Sew, 124 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
3086 Jang King Shack (Gong King See, Jung King Shack), 128½ East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
13a Frank Sierra, Stockton, Calif.
14 Lee Sing, 228 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
21a Lee Long Sing, 144 East Washington, Stockton, Calif.
504 Gugar Singh, 18 West Lafayette, Stockton, Calif.
3077 Joseph Smith, 537 East Oak, Stockton, Calif.
697 Louie (Conie) Tan, 244½ Center, Stockton, Calif.
4177 Toy Teong, 229 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.
4652 Nick Turk, 748 South Fisher Street, Stockton, Calif.
2330 George C. H. Wagner, Stockton Hotel, Stockton, Calif.
4732 George Waller, 1818 Market, San Francisco, Calif. (Stockton State Hospital, Stockton, Calif.).
3695 Denver Sampton (D. E.) Willis, 18 South Eldorado, Stockton, Calif.
583 Lee Wo (Woo), 223 South Hunter Street, Stockton, Calif.
4099 Hal J. Wolvert, 315 South Stanislaus, Stockton, Calif.
3971 Jongue Yink (Jow Jue Ying), 88 East Market, Stockton, Calif.
1274 Chow Yuan (Chon Yuen), 223 South Hunter, Stockton, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SUTTER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

440 John Henry Richie, Nicolaus, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

1152 Claude Leroy Blood, Porterville, Calif.
1557 Severo Bazan (Severo Bozan), care of Edison Company, Kernville, Calif.
1857 Lavern Briggs, near Porterville, Calif.
1123 Jack Brown, care of Edison Company, Kernville, Calif.
936 Charles Efraim Carlson (Charles Efriam Carlson), Smith Apartments, Porterville, Calif.
68 Robert William Carter, Exeter, Calif.
710 Sacramento Castero, Exeter, Calif.
90 Esteian Gatello Castello (Esteban Catello Castello), Exeter, Calif.
2112 Tom Cate, Porterville, Calif.
688 Jose Collozo, Aqua Collusius, Mexico.
670 Crespin Aquilar (Aguilar Crespin), Strathmore, Calif.
801 Michael Deady, Exeter, Calif.
377 Lamberto Espino (Lamberto Espiro), Exeter, Calif.
354 Toribio Franco (Torbino Franco), Lindsay, Calif.
1832 Ben Gallott (Ben Gollett, Ben B. Gallitto), Lindsay, Calif.
196 Heon Gim (Hon Gim), Main Street, Porterville, Calif.
56 Jose Angel Guttierez (Jose Angel Jutierrez, Jose Angel Gutierrez), Porterville, Calif.
1850 Siranta T. Hilistrom (Siranta Theodore Helstrom, Sivanta Theodore Helstrom), Terra Bella, Calif.
380 Carlos Hrquida (Carlos Hrquidi), Kernville, Calif.
1637 Ira Ulysses Joyce (Ira Ulysses Joyce), R. F. D. No. 4, Porterville, Calif.
1943 Quok Lai, 112 Main, Porterville, Calif.
1739 Walter Laidley, 122 E. Porterville, Calif.
1114 Herman John Lessing (Hermen John Lessing), Terra Bella, Calif.
1944 Albert Merikofer, Porterville, Calif.
2074 Maistro Manguerto (Maistro Manjueto, Maisho Mansueto), Porterville, Calif.
129 Carlton M. Mead (Carlton Maxwell Mead), Box 53, Lindsay, Calif.
652 Francisco Mintes (Mendez), S. P. Freight yard, Porterville, Calif.
1626 Brother Oscar Mitchell, Springville, Calif. (R. F. D. No. 2, Arlington, Wash.)
67 George Francis Morey, Exeter, Calif.
1924 Edward Harold Quigley, Exeter, Calif.
179 Jesus Ramirez (Jesus Rameres), Southern Pacific Company, Work Train, Porterville, Calif.
1446 Raymond E. Riveras (Ramon E. Riveras), care of Edison Company, Kernville, Calif.
1071 Mark Ryan, St. George Hotel, Porterville, Calif.
2049 Fred Siebert (Fred Selbert), Strathmore, Calif.
1552 Lewis Clemintian Thomason (Lewis C. Thomasin), Mirage Street, Lindsay, Calif.

1221 John Vujorich, Porterville, Calif., (John Vujovich, John Vujorich), Tipton, Calif.
1724 Frank Alvin White (Frank Albin White), Oak Porterville, Calif.
1122 Richard Dave Wren, Porterville, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF VENTURA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

2350 Kumdano L. Aggarwol, post office Woodkee, Calif. Kundan Lal Aggarwol (Aggawal), Terozepare, Punjab India. Care of Hugo McGrath, Montalvo, Calif.)
690 Bunavel Aguiler (Bernavel Aquiler, Bernavel Aguilar, Bernavel Aquiler), Saticoy, Calif.
895 Bariracio Alvarado, Cucoamungo, Calif. (Mauricio Albarado, Mauricio Alarado, Cucamonga.)
807 Jos. V. Aros (Verdugo), Peru, Calif.
2864 John S. Brown, Somis, Calif. (Care of Martha Wadsworth, R. No. 32, Columbus, Ind.).
1325 Hilario Campos, Moon Park, Calif. (258 East First, Los Angeles, Calif.)
104 Juan Carrill (Carrillo), Savleis Road, Omond, Calif. (Oxnard, Calif.)
1354 Jesus Chavorria (Charrarria), Moon Park, Calif.
1332 Rafael Contreros, Santa Paula, Calif. (Rafael Contreros, Santa Paula, Calif.)
974 Ramon Carrol (Corral), Simi, Calif.
858 Pablo Castro (Castor), Ventura, Santa Paula, Calif.
988 Pablo Cervantes, Simi, Calif.
1889 Sylvester Cruz, along railroad trails near depot, Oxnard, Calif.
33 Walter A. (Alfred) Cunningham (Walter Cunningham), Fillmore, Calif.
1261 Manuel F. de Silva (Manuel Francisco DaSilva), Monta Route A, Oxnard, Calif.
1831 Louis E. (Edward) Dilis, Saticoy, Calif.
205 John Gentinez (Geutimez), Park Row, Ventura, Calif.
736 Macos Gomez (Marcos Gomes (Gomez), Marcas Gomez), Santa Susana, Calif.
1281 Esequel Gonzalez (Eacquiel (Ecquiel) Gonsalez), R. No. 2, Ventura, Calif.
2648 Harry A. Grasvenor (Harry Arthur Grosvenor), Sespe, Calif.
337 Octobiano Guiterez (Guiterrez) (Octabiano Gutierres), Ojai, Calif.
593 Jose Guiterrez (Gutierrez), Simi, Calif.
915 Ponnozo Hernandez (Harnandez, Harndez), Ventura, Calif.
516 L. Ping Hon, 721 Saviers Road, Oxnard, Calif.
680 Henry James, Ojai, Santa Paula, Calif.
2201 Inez Johnson, Box 445, Oxnard, Calif.
641 Arthur R. (Ray) Keller, 525 Seventh (528 Seventh), Oxnard, Calif.
729 Mucode Leon (Mucio de Leon), Saticoy, Calif.
1897 James T. (Thomas, Tomas) Mack, Peru, Calif.
716 Cilodora Margnes (Ellodoro Marques), M. R. A., Oxnard, Calif.
1724 Gugario Marguez, Santa Paula, Calif. (Gregario Margues, Marquez, Saticoy, Santa Paula, Calif.).
1133 Luis Masias (Marsias, Mosias, Luiz Masias), West Street, Oxnard, Calif.
278 Pedro Maytorene (Maytorena), Santa Paula, Calif. (Oak Street.)
470 George Miller, Seacliff, Calif.
511 German Misquez, Moorpark, Calif.
1250 Amelio (Aurelio) Montejo (Aurilio Monte Jo), Tempe, Aris.
1645 William A. (August) Nelson, Main Street, Saint Peter, Minn. General delivery, San Jose, Calif.
10 Adureas (Andres) Nunes, Sespe, Calif.
2365 Raymond Ojeda (Raymond C. Ojeda), 646 Samers, Oxnard, Calif.
2344 Jeff O'Neal, Saticoy, Calif.
1043 Ben Ortega (Ostoga), 104 Fifth, Oxnard, Calif.
1407 Jose Ortiz (Jesus, Jose Ortez), Camarillo, Calif.
1815 Ramon Perez, Peru, Calif.
2888 Moses (Mosses) Ponce, 716 A, Oxnard, Calif. (Calexico, Calif.).
1873 Amando R. (Reyes) Prieto, Peru, Calif.
1106 Jose Pierra (Sierra), Monta Rouse Avenue, Oxnard, M. R. A., Calif.
705 Maconio Rameriz (Macaki Ramirez, E. Jimeres), 662 A, Oxnard, Calif.
2695 Geo. P. Richard, Sespe, Calif. (George Paul Richards, care of Kern Lake Ranch, Bakersfield, Calif.).
1299 Mateo Rodriques (Rodrigues, Mates), Simi, Calif.
2859 Carlos Romero, Camarillo, Calif.
1502 Jesus Sahagurr (Sahagun), care of Doulon Ranch, Oxnard, Calif.
1807 Eldar B. (Barton) Shafer, Newbury Park, Calif.
2849 Harry C. Starks (Harry Conley Starks), 739 A, Oxnard, Calif.
1896 Harry E. (Everett) Soules, Moorpark, Calif.
1102 Sokichi (Sojichi) Sugimoto, Ojai, Calif.
406 Luis (Louis) Tapia, Saticoy, Calif.
1333 Felipe Torres (Tones), Figuero, Ventura, Calif.
697 Dionicio Travino (Trevino, Dionicia Trevino), 735 B, Oxnard, Calif.
2610 Nicholas Trejo (Niclaron Samora Trejo, Nickaron S. Trejo, Nickanor Samara Trejo), 159 Walnut, Ventura, Calif.
1647 Militon Trujilla (Miletion Trujilla), Camarillo, Calif.
744 Lee Voquich (Bequich, Bcquich), Eighth, Santa Paula, Calif.
1564 Pedro Watts, Camp Cavaria, Camarillo, Calif.
2628 John Williams, Santa Susana, Calif.
2956 Charles Wood, Camarillo, Calif.
2792 Cyrus Edward Trumbull, Ojai, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF YUBA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

871a Chin Ben,, 228 First, Marysville, Calif.
701a Nels Andreas Biron (Nels Biron), 1314 James North, Minneapolis, Minn.
143 George Clayton Brennan, Marysville, Calif.
653 Harry J. Burns, general delivery, Marysville, Calif.
770 James Caples, 232 C, Marysville, Calif.
565 Yee Chong, 211½ First, Marysville, Calif.
231 Robert Connell, Marysville, Calif.
509 Joseph Elmer (Elmer Jos.) Darwin, Marysville, Calif.
919 Thomas Fou (F.) Duck, 310 First, Marysville, Calif.
632 Lloyd Farrin, United States Hotel, Marysville, Calif.
22 Joseph Louis Funhay (Funhayer), 721 G, Marysville, Calif.
462 William J. (William) Gwinn, Aberdeen, Wash.
448 Frank Hazard, 232 C Street, Marysville, Calif.
26 Arthur Francis Ialiker, Marysville, Calif.
809 William James (James Wm.) Jolly, Marysville, Calif.
527 Milton Koldenstrodt (Koldnestrodt), Hammonton, Calif.
1074 William Joseph (Wm. J., Wm. Jos.) McKay, Marysville, Calif.
1039 Herbert Edward Maag, 200 D, Marysville, Calif.
55 S. Matsumaye, Wheatland, Calif.
379 Alfred Olsen (Olson, Oleson), 414 Fourth, Marysville, Calif.
684 Harry Pon, 110 C, Marysville, Calif.
729 John Herman Leo (Leo Human John) Rehder, Marysville, Calif.
830 Ernest Schnyder, Marysville, Calif. (Belden, Calif.).
100 Fong Sheuck (Sheuck, Scheuck), 103 C, Marysville, Calif.
660 Frederick Geo. (George Frederick, George) Shields, Marysville, Calif.
401 Fred Smith, Hammonton, Calif.
818 Joe Torres, "E" Street, between Tenth and Eleventh, Marysville, Calif.
189 Wong Tuen (Yuen), 228 First Street, Marysville, Calif.
555 Hom Se Ung, Hammonton, Calif.
99 Low Si Yen, 215 First Street, Marysville, Calif.
1197 John Yung, 226 First, Marysville, Calif.
521 Chris Peterson, St. George Rooming House, Marysville, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, HARTFORD COUNTY, CONN.

57–A Charles White, 91 North Main Street, Bristol, Conn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 13, CONNECTICUT.

4243 Frank Selfit, Bridge Street, Shelton, Conn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 6, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

2645 James Edward Hughes, 264 Ashman Street, New Haven, Conn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BACON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

238 Pink Bradley, Brunswick, Ga. (Alma, Ga.).
418 Horace G. Corbett, Rockingham, Ga.
47 Thos. Cleary Holden (Halden), 312 American Bank and Trust Co. Building, Savannah, Ga.
401 Willie James, Coffee, Ga.
428 John Robt. Johnson, Rockingham, Ga.
87 Geo. M. Lewis, Nichols, Ga.
205 Arnold Martin, Thomson, Ga.
202 Patrick P. Medders (Patrick Medders), Alma, Ga.
162 Richard Newkirk, New Lacy, Ga.
153 Oliver Oledge, Nicholls, Ga.
456 Mack Phillips, Alma, Ga.
12 Artour Rogers, Sandersville, Ga.
6 Elonza (Elonzo) Sinclair, route No. 3, Nicholls, Ga.
15 Thos. Walker (Waller), R. F. D., Nicholls, Ga.
295 Roger Williams, Macon, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BARTOW, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1306 William E. Aaron, route 3, Adairsville, Ga. (route 3, Cartersville, Ga.).
1850 William Adams, 107 Postell Street, Cartersville, Ga.
941 Fulton Chatman, Adairsville, Ga.
1237 Buddie Clayton, route No. 1, Cartersville, Ga.
1244 Denward Burnett Daniell, Adairsville, Ga. (Denward Bennett Daniell (Denward E. Daniel), 1031 Irving Park Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.).
505 J. W. Davis, Adairsville, Ga. (J. W. Lewis, Hulbert, Ark.).
708 Will Dolk, Emerson, Ga.
1149 Joe Evans, Adairsville, Ga.
363 James Finch (Tinch), Cartersville, Ga.
1698 Sebe Goodwin, Pine Log, Ga.
267 Christopher Harris, Kingston, Ga.
1808 Ed Jones, Cartersville, Ga.
1580 Samuel H. Jones (James), Atco, Ga.
420 Jerry Kincaid, Cartersville, Ga.
826 Charley Lee, Cartersville, Ga. (Charlie Lee, Trenton, Mich.).
1485 Ernest McCrary, Cartersville, Ga.
241 Walter Maddox, 8 Wofford Street, Cartersville, Ga.
1835 John Henry Morris, 18 Bruce Street, Cartersville, Ga.
1281 John C. Pendergraph (Pendergrass), Stilesboro, Ga.
121 Robert Pierce, Madison, Ga.
53 Evans Pitts, 200 Carter, Cartersville, Ga. (Lynch, Ky.).
1341 Harry Reynolds (Reynold), Wofford, Cartersville, Ga.
191 John Richards, Cartersville, route No. 3, Ga.
1713 Ellis Robinson, route No. 2, Centersville, Ga. (Elias Roberson, route No. 2, Cartersville, Ga.).
2034 Will Rogers, 9 Mull Street, Cartersville, Ga.
549 I. V. Rucker, R. F. D., Cartersville, Ga.
661 Frank Russell, Cartersville, Ga.
667 William Jasper Sanford, Emerson, Ga.
11 Hubert Scudders, Marietta, route No. 5, Ga.
242 Wiley (Willie) Sims, Cartersville, Ga.
79 Henry Smith, Marietta, Ga.
603 Sherman Smith, Taylorsville, Ga.
1342 Andrew Towns, Adairsville, Ga.
1408 Sam Walker, 11 B, Cartersville, Ga.
1590 Aleck (Alex) Wood, Cartersville, Ga.
1038 Gus Young, Emerson, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BLECKLEY, STATE OF GEORGIA.

649 Charlie Barnes, R. F. D. No. 4, Cochran, Ga.
827 Edmon (Edmond) Bolton, R. F. D. No. 2, Hawkinsville, Ga.
654 John Henry (J. H.) Brown, R. F. D. No. 1, Dudley, Ga.
432 Warren Brown, R. F. D. No. 2, Cochran, Ga.
585 Cleveland Cobb, Cochran, Ga.
353 Clayton Coney, Cochran, Ga.
834 George Daniels, Cochran, Ga.
660 John Davis, Cochran, Ga.
830 Elix (Alex, Elex) Morgan Dixon, Danville, route No. 1, Ga.
154 Willie Eugene Hollis, Cochran, Ga.
552 Miles Jackson, R. F. D. No. 4, Cochran, Ga.
352 Warren Mormon, R. F. D. No. 4, Cochran, Ga.
443 Will Parker, route 1, Cochran, Ga.
319 Ephriam (Ephram) Reddick, Cochran, Ga.
390 Will Ross, R. F. D. No. 2, Cochran, Ga.
565 Henry Smith, R. F. D. No. 4, Cochran, Ga.
191 Edgar Tanner, R. F. D. No. 4, Cochran, Ga.
420 Thomas Watkins (Wockins), R. F. D. No. 6, Cochran, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BULLOCK STATE OF GEORGIA.

1398 Arthur Andrews, Statesboro, R. F. D., Ga.
2206 Sam McCola Askew (Eschew), R. F. D., E., Statesboro, Ga.
543 Charlie Bright, Register, Ga.
613 Edgar Brinson, Statesboro, Ga.
119 Will Brown, Statesboro, Ga. (Olney, Ga.).
2212 Jonas Bryant, Statesboro, Ga.
754 Ryley (Riley) Bryant, R. F. D. No. 2, Register, Ga.

1304 Tom Bryant, Rt. No. 1, Stilson, Ga.
1553 Aaron Campbell, Statesboro, Ga.
576 Jas. (James) Campbell, Portal, Ga.
365 Walter Campbell, R. C. Statesboro, Ga. (Route 6, Statesboro, Ga.)
1898 Charlie Chambers (Chalmers), Statesboro, Ga.
1337 Alonzo (Lonzie) Chatman, Statesboro, Ga.
2076 David Davis, Brooklet, Ga.
2015 Ewell Davis, R. F. D. No. 2, Stilson, Ga.
1895 Hershel (Hushel) Davis, Dover, Ga.
747 Johnson Davis, Statesboro, Ga.
1779 Evans Dickerson, Statesboro, Ga.
444 Bud Durham (Durnham), Statesboro, Ga.
4796 Henry Freeman, Brooklet, Ga.
437 Isaiah (Isaac) Fulton, Statesboro, Ga.
454 Tom Gaskins (Gasking) Gaskin (Thomas Gaston), R. F. D. No. 1, Groveland, Ga.
276 Joe F. (J. F.) Green, R. F. D. No. 2, Register, Ga.
733 Pleas Greene, Portal, Ga.
1519 Henry Hays, Statesboro, Ga.
310 Wesley Haywood, R. F. D. No. 4, Statesboro, Ga.
806 Alex (Alick) J. Holtzch (Hoscloth), Statesboro, Ga. (R. F. D. No. 1, Brooklet, Ga.).
798 Erastus Hughes, Groveland, Ga. (Statesboro, Ga.).
58 Mitch Price Jackson, R. F. D. No. 7, Statesboro, Ga.
1090 Willie R. Jackson, 2 Institute, Statesboro, Ga.
2201 Albert Johnson, Register, Ga.
126 Edmond (Edmund) Johnson, 6 Johnson, Statesboro, Ga.
1583 Ed. Johnson, Statesboro, Ga.
2122 White Joice (Joyce), Statesboro, Ga.
913 Geo. (George) Jones, Groveland, Ga., R. F. D.
37 Taylor Jones, R. F. D. No. 2, Metter, Ga.
809 Eddie Lanier, Register, Ga. (Statesboro, Ga.).
144 Eddie Lee Lawrence, Rt. No. 1, Portal, Ga.
795 Frank Lewis, R. F. D., Groveland, Ga.
38 Solomon E. (W.) Lewis), Alney, Ga.
1732 John Little, Register, Ga.
1929 Jake Lovett, R. F. D., Statesboro, Ga.
1010 Jesse Lovett, Rt. No. 2, Statesboro, Ga.
1404 Warren Lovett, Statesboro, Ga.
1703 Will McArthur (Willie McArthur), R. F. D. A, Statesboro, Ga.
1321 Jas. (James) McCullough (McCuller), Rt. No. 2, Statesboro, Ga.
1397 Will McLeod, Portal, Ga.
80 Ancil Miller, Clito, Ga.
318 Stilis Montgomery (Montgonery), Arcola, Ga.
206 Madison Moore, Statesboro, Ga.
1078 Arthur Morgan, R. C., Statesboro, Ga.
1602 Willie Nelson, Savannah Avenue, Statesboro, Ga.
2030 Moses Newman, Statesboro, Ga.
522 Lewis Palmore, Statesboro, Ga.
834 Elmus Parks, Statesboro, Ga.
964 Frank B. Parrish, Portal, Ga.
817 Alex Pickins (Pickens), Statesboro, Ga.
1182 Andrew Pringle, route No. 2, Statesboro, Ga.
1764 Scott (Scot) Proctor, route No. 3, Groveland, Ga.
2204 Abner Rainey, Statesboro, Ga.
2060 Chas. Riggs (Charles Riggs), route E, Statesboro, Ga.
366 Willie Roffin, Rocky Ford R. F. D., Ga.
124 Gussie Ross, Portal, Ga. (Statesboro, Ga.).
5 Verdie Rountree, Statesboro, Ga.
1868 Isaiah (Isiah) Sally, Statesboro, Ga.
2209 Tom L. Sheppard (Tom L. Shepherd), Statesboro, Ga.
1368 Steve Smith, Statesboro, Ga.
158 Owen Stewart, Statesboro, Ga.
2120 Rob't (Robert) Thornton, R. F. D., Register, Ga.
393 Geo. (George) Thurman (George Therman), 8 Railroad Street, Statesboro, Ga.
107 Sylvester Wallace, Statesboro, Ga.
1514 Jim Webster, Statesboro, Ga.
715 Nelson Williams, Leeland, Ga.
1768 Charlie Williams, R. F. D. No. E, Statesboro, Ga.
2113 Dock Williams, Statesboro, Ga.
594 Frank Williams, Statesboro, Ga.
1716 Henry Williams, Statesboro, Ga.
2054 Tom Williams, jr. (Tom Williams), R. F. D., Statesboro, Ga.
1640 Will Williams, R. F. D. No. 2, Register, Ga.
1647 Paul Young, Statesboro, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BURKE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

193 Lee Adams, Vidette, Ga.
1768 Ben Allen, St. Clair, Ga.
834 Bob Anderson, R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
1224 Felix Arline, Waynesboro, Ga.
830 Henry Osborne (Osborn), R. F. D. 8, Waynesboro, Ga.
82 David Ashley, McBean, Ga.
1791 Willis (Willie) Attaway, Waynesboro, Ga.
619 Asbury Baker, McBean, Ga.
255 Thomas Barefield (Barfield), route No. 2, Waynesboro, Ga.
881 James Barnes, R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2038 Dometric (Dentries) Bartley, St. Clair, Ga.
1457 Samuel Belvin, Midville, Ga.
885 William Berry, Sordis, Ga. (Midvale, Ga.).
1111 Edward H. Boehn (Brigham), Midville, Ga.
1558 John Bonner, Waynesboro, Ga.
2434 Willie Branby (Branley), Alexander, Ga. (Munnerlyn, Ga.).
1902 Sam Brinson (Samuel Brinson), McBean, Ga.
924 Henry Brisbane, McBean, Ga.
1038 Airline (Archie) Brown, Midville, Ga.
476 Charles (Charlie) Brown, Waynesboro, Ga.
426 Dan Brown, Midville, Ga.
2407 Dozier Brown, Waynesboro, Ga.
2560 E. H. Brown (Edward H. Brown), Waynesboro, Ga.
1052 John Brown, Greenscut, Ga.
1678 John Brown, 919 Washington Street, Augusta, Ga.
1116 William Brown, Blythe, Ga.
2475 Will Bryant, Waynesboro, Ga.
2207 William Buxton, Girard, Ga.
2449 Jim Byne, Waynesboro, Ga.
1118 Joe Cann, R. F. D. 3, Waynesboro, Ga.
2173 Willie Carr, Blythe, Ga.
771 Mack Carter, Keysville, Ga.
2456 Willie J. (Johnson) Carter, Munnulyn, Ga.
1680 Nathan Cheek, R. F. D. 2, Waynesboro, Ga.
2583 Boston (Busson) Coleman, R. F. D. 1, Midville, Ga.
31 Sam Coleman, Sardis, Ga.
1929 Pierce Colson, Waynesboro, Ga.
170 Ben Cooper, Alexander, Ga.
2103 Reubin (Rhuben) Cooper, Gough, Ga.
2012 James Cristbury (Christburg), Waynesboro, Ga.
815 Tom W. (Watson) Cross, Midville, Ga.
773 Joe Cunningham, R. F. D. 2, Millen, Ga.
2440 William Daniel (Daniels), R. F. D. No. 2, Waynesboro, Ga.
2520 Manson David, McBean, Ga.
612 Ben Davis, Waynesboro, Ga.
589 Evans Davis, jr., Girard, Ga.
722 Jim Davis, Alexander, Ga.
132 Sammie (Samie, Samiel) Davis, Girard, Ga.
2436 Willie Dawson, Midville, Ga.
1656 Henry Devine (Divine), Waynesboro, Ga.
96 Geo. W. (Washington) Dixon, R. F. D. 1, McBean, Ga.
205 Dan A. Douce (Dan Douse, D. A. Douse), Waynesboro, Ga.
1857 Sidney Douce (Douse), Burke County, Ga. (Keysville, Ga.).
400 Herbert Ellison, Waynesboro, Ga.
113 Sawyer Enfield (Anfield), St. Clear, Ga. (St. Clair, Ga.).
905 Erley (Early) Eunice, R. F. D. No. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2141 D. E. (D. C.) Evans, Waynesboro, Ga.
579 William (Willie) Evans, Shellfuff, Ga.
147 Sam Farmer, Wrens, Ga.
586 Jim Farmer, Burke County, Ga. (Waynesboro, Ga.)
414½ Richard Fastin Gaines (Fastingainer, Fasterganer, Fastain Gainer), Millville, Ga. (Midville, Ga.)
614 Will Ford, Midville, Ga.
904 James Freeman, Alexander, Ga.
1934 Alvin Gibbons, Waynesboro, Ga.
224 William Gilbert, Greens Cut, Ga.
1312 Marion Gonder, St. Clair, Ga.
2001 Buddie (Budie) Green, McBean, Ga.
181 Joe Green, R. F. D. No. 1, McBean, Ga.
2129 Frank Gresham (Graham), Waynesboro, Ga.
2616 Arthur Griffin, Blythe, Ga.
1814 Jim Gunby, McBean, Ga.
1836 Jake Hall, R. F. D. No. 1, McBean, Ga.
1650 Will Hall, Waynesboro, Ga.
335 Judge Hampton (Judge R. Hampton), Perkins, Ga.
1591 Jace Hardin (Harden), R. F. D., Herndon, Ga.
1761 Ben Hargrove, R. F. D. 3, Waynesboro, Ga.
1432 Elijah Harmon, Rosier, Ga.
636 Jesse Harrison, Waynesboro, Ga.
1638 Elijah (Eliath) Herrington, Girard, Ga.
770 James Hilton (Hiltonia), Girard, Ga.
919 Willie T. (L.) Hilton, Rosia, Ga. (Rosier, Ga.)
105 Jordon Hine (Hines), R. F. D. Gough, Ga.
1137 Parish (Parris) Hollis, Waynesboro, Ga.
1982 Lindsay B. Holmes (Lonze (Longe) Bell Holmes), R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
1118 Robert Hood, Blythe, Ga.
2105 Willie Hughes, Waynesboro, Ga.
1842 Ben Hutto, Waynesboro, Ga.
2112 Frank Jandon (Jandon), 946 West Street, Waynesboro, Ga.
318 James Jandon (Jandon), Waynesboro, Ga.
22 Ernest Jenkins, Munnulyn, Ga. (Munnerlyn, Ga.).
742 John Jenkins, McBean, Ga.
2433 Frank Johnson, Burke County, Ga. (Gaugh).
1338 Charles Jones, Waynesboro, Ga.
2172 Frank Jones, Rosier, Ga.
121 James Jones, Waynesboro, Ga.
1382 John (Johnnie) Jones, Waynesboro, Ga.
2243 John Jones, Waynesboro, Ga.
1580 Taylor Jones, Waynesboro, Ga.
941 Low (Lowe) Jones, R. F. D. 2, Waynesboro, Ga.
868 Willie Jones, Midville, Ga.
2210 Alex (Alix) Kidd, Waynesboro, Ga.
2566 Miles (Milse) Kilcrease (Killcrist), R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2617 John Lawson, Girard, Ga.
1763 Robert Lawson, Midville, Ga.
2563 Handy (Handay) Lewis, R. F. D. 1, Herndon, Ga.
783 James Lewis, jr., Waynesboro, Ga.
2140 Jim Lewis, Waynesboro, Ga.
2494 Dennis Lockharrt (Locket), R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
42 James C. Lovett, Girard, Ga.
1280 Jenry McClain (Jerry McClois), Blythe, Ga.
2152 Sam McCollough (McCollough), Waynesboro, Ga.
2368 Isaiah (Isiah) McCoy, Waynesboro, Ga.
2451 Watson McCummings (McCuving, Cunnis), Munnerlyn, Ga.
1523 Oscar McIntire, Greenscut, Ga.
650 Jerry McNeal, McBean, Ga.
577 Ishmael Mack, Louisville, Ga.
161 Nesbitt (Nesbit, Nisbet) Martin, Midville, Ga.
182 Presley Martin, Blythe, Ga.
1068 Robert Mathis (Mathews), Waynesboro, Ga.
747 Jim Miller, McBean, Ga.
1743 Jessie Mills (Miles), R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2005 John Mims (Mins), Waynesboro, Ga.
2458 Johnnie Moore, Waynesboro, Ga.
2466 Bureguard Morris (Marris), Waynesboro, Ga.
2547 Jessie Napier (Jesse Nappie), R. F. D. 1, Midville, Ga.
497 Mose Nunnerally (Nunnally), Waynesboro, Ga.
1844 Ben Owens, McBean, Ga.
3 Alonza Palmer, Waynesboro, Ga.
187 Jake Palmer, Vidette, Ga.
2080 Quincey Parker, Sardis, Ga.
2259 Collins Patterson (Patison), Girard, Ga.
1803 Ben Pinkston, Midville, Ga.
2363 William Pittman (William Daniel Pitman), Waynesboro, Ga., R. F. D. 3.
1103 Henry Ponder (Ponder), Waynesboro, Ga.
211 Charles Powell (Charlie Pryer), R. F. D. 1, Herndon, Ga.
1830 Henry Presbia (Presha), McBean, Ga.
838 Henry Pruitt (Preuitt), R. F. D. 2, Waynesboro, Ga.
1262 Wodons Pryor, Waynesboro, Ga.
2201 Willie Reddis (Willie C. Redis), McBean, Ga.
107 Colson Rheney, Waynesboro, Ga.
1106 Pete Rich, Munnerlyn, Ga.
542 Port Rider, Louisville, Ga.
975 Johnson (Johnnie) Roberts, Midville, Ga.
1823 Lovett Roberts, Sardis, Ga.
644 Russell Ruff, St. Clair, Ga.

608 James Scott, St. Clair, Ga.
2256 Elbert Scruggs, Midville, Ga.
989 Aaron Sharvers (Shavers), McBean, Ga.
1949 Robert Simpson, 58 John Street, Savannah, Ga.
920 Primus Singleton, St. Clair, Ga.
372 Frank Smart, Girard, Ga.
1217 David (Z.) Smith, McBean, Ga.
1196 David (Davie) Smith, route No. 1, Herndon, Ga.
2305 Robert Syms (Sims), J. O. Appelwhite Place, Burke County, Ga., Waynesboro, Ga.
1895 Hillie (Hilley) Thomas, Herndon, Ga.
1525 Arthur Tompkins, Gough, Ga.
1883 Ed (Eddie) Tompkins, Waynesboro, Ga.
2093 John Trover, Waynesboro, Ga.
2346 Will Truitt (Tuvitt), McBean, Ga.
2312 George J. Utley, Sardis, Ga.
1514 Inus Walker, Midville, Ga. (Inous Walton, 251 East Pearl Street, Burlington, N. J.).
1317 Sam Walker, Girard, Ga.
535 Spencer Walker, Waynesboro, Ga.
2392 Henry Wallace, R. F. D. 1, Herndon, Ga.
1822 George Walthaur (Walthour), R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2450 Clifford (Clifford) Ward, R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.
2251 Freeman (Freemon) Warner, Shell Bluff, Ga.
1074 Jessie Warner, Waynesboro, Ga.
675 Eddie Washington, Midville, Ga.
1563 Willie (William) Washington, St. Clair, Ga.
50 Davis Watkins, Midville, Ga.
2394 J. A. Watkins, Greenscut, Ga.
1259 Isaiah Watts, Waynesboro, Ga.
2275 Willie White, Munnerlyn, Ga.
1204 Jim Whitehead, Waynesboro, Ga.
1380 Eddie Williams, Waynesboro, Ga.
782 Eugene Williams, McBean, Ga.
1126 George Williams, Waynesboro, Ga.
433 Henry Williams, R. F. D. 1, McBean, Ga.
1519 James Williams, Girard, Ga.
2258 Lincoln Williams, Herndon, Ga.
2658 Luther Williams, Waynesboro, Ga.
2182 Robert Williams, Waynesboro, Ga.
662 Robert M. (N.) Williams, R. F. D., Smith Place, Gough, Ga.
146 Walter Williams, Route No. 1, Box 22, Girard, Ga. (R. F. R. No. C, box 24, care M. D. Deal, Statesboro, Ga.).
1742 George Wilson, R. F. D. 4, Louisville, Ga.
1279 Jasper Wilson, St. Clair, Ga.
2418 James Wise, Waynesboro, Ga.
968 Sam Young, Rosier, Ga.
510 James Zimmerman, R. F. D. 4, Waynesboro, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTTS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

885 Rodert Byas (Robert Byars), Indian Springs, Ga.
257 Robert Campbell, Flovilla, Ga.
954 Will Cooper (Willie Caps), Conyers, Ga. (lives on cars).
888 Claud Evans, R. F. D. 6, Jackson, Ga.
871 John Freeman, R. F. D., Jackson, Ga.
873 Clark Futch, 660 Georgian Street, Savannah, Ga.
596 Nathaniel Harpness (Nathaniel Harkness, Hawkins Nathaniel), R. F. D. 4, Jackson, Ga.
904 D. H. Johnson, Jackson, Ga.
773 Earnest (Ernest) Johnson, Jinkinsburg, Ga. (Jenkinsburg, Ga.).
908 Sam McGee, Jackson, Ga.
756 Wade Ridgeway (Ridgway), R. F. D. 7, Jackson, Ga. (R. F. D. 6, Jackson, Ga.).
364 John W. Swanson (Johnie Walton Swanson, J. W. Swanson), Cork, Ga.
359 Jerry Thomas, Jackson, Ga.
681 Julius Williams, Flovilla, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHARLTON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

332 Lee B. Alexander, St. George, Ga.
144 James (Jim) Brown, St. George, Ga.
230 Davis Ford, Folkston, Ga.
298 Alfonso Griffin, St. George, Ga.
244 Daniel Gummer (Gummler), Winokur, Ga.
68 Robert Mack (Mock), St. George, Ga.
257 James Stinson (Sinston, Stinston), R. F. D. 1, Winokur, Ga.
262 Ben Tucker, Winokur, Ga.
342 Sam Woodie, Route 1, Folkston, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COFFEE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

390 Charlie M. (Morgan) Allen, R. F. D. 2, Wray, Ga.
72 General Anson, Broxton, Ga.
132 Charlie Austin, Axson, Ga.
835 Daniel W. Baker, Willacoochee, Ga.
433 Ed. (Eddie) Belcher, Willacoochee, Ga.
824 Arthur Blunt, Douglas, Ga.
1252 William (Will) E. Brewer, Pearson, Ga.
1416 Weldon Brown, Ambrose, Ga.
1848 Tom Canthen (Cauthen), Douglas, Ga.
626 Dave Courson, Willacoochee, Ga.
1325 Tom Cox, Douglas, Ga.
1021 Roseberry Crayton, Douglas, Ga.
1716 Edd Dean (Ed. Deen), Route No. 2, Pitts, Ga.
1992 James Fuller, Willacoochee, Ga.
635 Crosan (Croson) Gaddy, Douglas, Ga.
493 Louis (Lewis) Gibson, Douglas, Ga.
1432 Fred Gilbert, Douglas, Ga.
1178 Mal Gilmore, Broxton, Ga.
1680 George Goff, Douglas, Ga.
1203 Will Gordon, Willacoochee, Ga.
1763 Mack Grant, Ambrose, Ga.
1006 Sampson Harris, West Green, Ga.
1845 Cleave Hayes (Hays), Willacoochee, Ga.
2163 Henry Hill, Willachoochee, Ga.
1403 Jack (Joct) Hill, Pearson, Ga.
144 Arthur Holmes, Willacooche, Ga.
1796 Stonewall Jakson, Willachoochee, Ga.
1410 Fred James, Willachoochee, Ga.
874 Gilbert (G. W.) Jinks, Douglas, Ga.
1564 Alonso (A. Lonzy) Johnson, Douglas, Ga.
842 Joe. (Joe) Johnson, Douglas, Ga.
991 Will Johnson, Axson, Ga.
1623 Arthur Jones, Wray, Ga.
562 Johnnie (Johnie) Jones, Douglas, Ga.
44 Pete (Peter) Jones, Douglas, Ga.
2013 Leo Jordan, Douglas, Ga. (Wrightsville, Ga.).
2026 Fred Lippman, Pearson, Ga.
1943 Henry Lloyd, Douglas, Ga.
1748 Buber McClendon, Ambrose, Ga.
1409 Gordon McCowan, Ambrose, Ga.
2184 Frank McDowell, Douglas, Ga.
1206 Dave McNier, West Green, Ga.
2122 Bill McRae, Douglas, Ga.
1211 William E. (Eason) Meeks, Douglas, Ga.
1522 Hiram Miller, Willacoochee, Ga.
1066 John Millen, Willacoochee, Ga.
1751 Eugene Milton, Willacoochee, Ga.
1299 William Moore, Willacoochee, Ga.
2228 Willie Moore, Douglas, Ga.
1142 Lonnie Morgan, Douglas, Ga.
2074 Isaac Mozyck (Mazyck), Pearson, Ga.
1764 John Newton (jr.), West Green, Ga.
273 Alfred Nix, Willacoochee, Ga., R. F. D.
37 Nathaniel Odum (Adun), West Green, Ga.
491 Henry Patterson, Willacoochee, Ga.
584 John W. Patterson, Douglas, Ga.
789 Elbert L. Percy (Perry, Ferry), Willacoochee, Ga., R. F. D.
800 Thomas Perkins, Douglas, Ga.
1702 Cleve Phillips, Willacoochee, Ga.
458 Melvin Phillips, Douglas, Ga.
31 Joe P. (J. P.) Porter, Douglas, Ga.
416 Cleveland Richardson, Wray, Ga.
1669 Will Roberts, Douglas, Ga.
1228 Henry Shedrick (Shedirck), Willacoochee, Ga.
1987 Geo. Smith, Ambrose, Ga.
1611 John Smith, Pearson, Ga.
79 William Sneed, Broxton, Ga.
524 Jim Stephens, Douglas, Ga.
1963 Willie Stinage, Willacoochee, Ga.
1497 Henry Taylor, Douglas, Ga.
978 Lem (Leon) Taylor, Axson, Ga.
2042 Robert Taylor, Kirkland, Ga.
994 Charley Tolbert, Douglas, Ga.
855 Charlie Toomer, Ambrose, Ga.
1831 James Troutman, West Green, Ga.
466 Willie Turner, McDonald, Ga.
1816 Calvin Walker, Nicholls, Ga.
1002 James W. Walker, Wray, Ga.
1682 Early West, Douglas, Ga.
1586 Bennie White, Gainesville, Fla. (West Green, Ga.).
1102 Will Williams, Willacoochee, Ga.
275 Willie Williams, Douglas, Ga.
712 Jack Wright, Douglas, Ga.
1809 Mack York, Douglas, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DAWSON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

165 Emory Eslis Dillbeck, Johntown, Ga.
245 Furman Roscoe Lewis, R. F. D. No. 1, Dawsonville, Ga.
172 John (Jno.) Homer Pedgett, route No. 3, Ball Ground, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DECATUR, STATE OF GEORGIA.

62 Ras Akins, Bells Crossing, Ga.
2096 O. T. Anderson, Strickland, Ga.
243 Louis Aytch, Amsterdam, Ga.
1976 Ruben Bailey (Baley), Iron City, Ga.
806 Prim Battie, Donalsonville, Ga.
1137 Carl Bell, R. F. D., Bainbridge, Ga.
1951 Davis Bell, Lila, Ga.
1887 Harry Bell, Donalsonville, Ga.
2186 Jesse Bolden (Boldon, Goldon), Cyrene, Ga.
2039 Elder Brown, Bruton Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
875 George Brown, Bainbridge, Ga.
1194 Henry Brown, Irwinton, Ga. (51 Paulett Street, Bainbridge, Ga.)
666 Jud Brown, Bainbridge, Ga.
353 Tom Brown, route B, Bainbridge, Ga.
1154 Will Brown, Bainbridge, Ga.
799 Will Caloway (Calway, Calaway), Attapulgus, Ga.
1578 Turner Campbell, Diffee, Ga. (Campbell, Carradelle, Fla.)
552 Jas. Carter, Fowlstown, Ga.
1958 Tom Cartwright, Bainbridge, Ga.
2065 Mathew Chism (Chishm), Minehart, Ga.
2206 Jas. Conalson (Donalson), Bainbridge, Ga.
567 Geo. Coneld, Amsterdam, Ga.
1330 Daniel Cooper, Donalsonville, Ga.
1622 Charley Crawley (Crawly), Bainbridge, Ga.
668½ Jim Daniel, Bainbridge, Ga.
2140 Ralph Shepherd (Sheppard) Daniels, Donalsonville, Ga.
240 J. B. Davis (Jabet Davis), Donalsonville, Ga.
1294 Lewis Davis, jr., Strickland, Ga.
732 Shepherd Dixon, Recovery, Ga.
420 Isiah (Isaiah Drain, Iron City, Ga.
1836 Paul Dupree, Back Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
517 Lonnie (Lemmie) Fields, Attapulgus, Ga.
1638 Jas. Milton Floyd, Donalsonville, Ga.
806½ Robt. Fluett (Flewitt), Bingen, Ga.
2274½ Robt. Forst (Forest), Lela, Ga.
1283 Norman Fort, Iron City, Ga. (Forh, Faceville, Ga.)
504 Jule Fratter, Cowarts, Ala.
453 Mark George, Bainbridge, Ga.
2148 Rosier (Rozier) Girtman, Bainbridge, Ga.
1518 Coley Graham, route B, Climax, Ga.
584 Robt. Grimsley, Iron City, Ga. (R. F. D., Bainbridge, Ga.)
706 Will Hall, Calhoun Street, Bainbridge, Ga. (Callahan Street.)
216 Elisha Harris, Attapulgus, Ga. (Farmingham, W. Va.)
1202 Jerdie Harris, Cyrene, Ga.
1013 Godfrey H. Helms (Godfrey Haney Helmes), Iron City, Ga.
1831 Blecher (Belcher) Henderson, Fowlstown, Ga.
2223 Ples (Plez) Hilson, Bainbridge, Ga.
185 Frank Hinson, Webster Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
1616 Esse (Essie) Hodge, Recovery, Ga.
2047 Rich Holt, Bainbridge, Ga.
695 Harris Jackson, Iron City, Ga.
1298 Mitchell (Mitchel) Jackson, R. F. D., Bainbridge, Ga.
1177 Will Jackson, West Bainbridge, Ga. (Diffee, Ga.).
131 Charlie James, Iron City, Ga.
686 James Jefferson, Amsterdam, Ga.
1201 Henry Jewell (Jewel), R. F. D., Bobcock, Ga.

1449 Jim Johnson, Iron City, Ga.
1041 Allen Jones, Attapulgus, Ga.
507 Geo. Ples Jones, Iron City, Ga.
1618 Willie Jones, Caryville, Fla.
372 Mathew (Matthew) Judson, Climax, Ga.
1278 Will Keaton (Keyton), Helen, Fla.
2221 Jack Kendrick, Clay Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
1546 Cherry Keys, Donalsonville, Ga.
741 Arthur Kimball, Amsterdam, Ga.
2203 David King, Diffie, Ga.
904 Son (Sam) King, Bainbridge, Ga.
1147 Jas. (John) Kinsey, Fowlstown, Ga.
53 Elbert Lee, Donalsonville, Ga.
1813 Jno. Lewis, 525 Paradise Alley, Bainbridge, Ga.
413 Isaiah (Isah, Isiah), Liptrap, Bainbridge, Ga.
268 Tom McClain (Claim), Climax, Ga.
518 Johnnie (Johnie) McCloud, Bainbridge, Ga.
1181 Ward McKelvin, Climax, Ga.
171 Alfred Mason (Masm), Diffee, Ga.
1677 Elijah (Elija, Eliza) Mills, Camilla, Ga.
521 Robt. Moore, Decatur County, Bainbridge, Ga.
2179 Will Moore, R. "B." Bainbridge, Ga.
1943 Will Moseley (Willie Moseley, Will Mosely), Blakeley, Ga.
2266 E. J. Oliver, Fleming Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
475 Wm. Henry Parramore (Parrimore), Lelia, Ga. (Leia, Ga.).
1845 S. Y. Periah (Sy Perish, Sy Parish), R. F. D. "B," Bainbridge, Ga.
1519 Hill Phillips, Faceville, Ga.
1264 Cornelius (Conelius) Reed, 339 West Brvinghton Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
683 Tillman Rice, Bainbridge, Ga.
1457 Clarance (Clarence), Richardson, Cyrene, Ga.
843 Samuel Robinson (Roberson, Roberts), Camilia, Ga.
1573 Dudley Scott, Bainbridge, Ga.
1360 Jesse David Smith, Donalsonville, Ga.
307 Frank Smith, Iron City, Ga.
1073 Henry Smith, Bainbridge, Ga.
1000 Frank Stephens, Attapulgus, Ga.
2063 Henry Taylor, Bainbridge, Ga.
1166 Calvin Thomas, Attapulgus, Ga.
1415 Henry Thomas, Attapulgus, Ga.
1678 Jas. Clay Thomas, near Bainbridge, Bainbridge, Ga., R. F. D., Bainbridge, Ga.
707 Della Vickers (Dellia Vickers), Bingen, Ga.
2224 Charlie Washington (Climax Rood, Ga.), Bainbridge, Ga.
1720 George Washington, Amsterdam, Ga.
415 Willie Washington, 511 Panlett Street, Bainbridge.
1075 Jno. Henry Wilder, Climax, Ga.
1628 Albert (Elbert) Williams, Iron City, Ga.
1334 Berry Williams, Route No. 2, Brinson, Ga.
2176 Jno. Williams, 33 Washington Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
716 Jno. Henry Williams, Diffee, Ga.
1653 Sam Williams, Fowlstown, Ga.
1620 Toy Williams, Bainbridge, Ga., R. F. D.
145 Walter Williams, 732 Helen Street, Bainbridge, Ga.
1145 Willie Williams, Recovery, Ga.
536 Jno. Wilson, Bainbridge, Ga.
1409 Mann Wilson, Donalsonville, Ga.
1240 Morgan Wilson, Fowlstown, Ga.
1305 Will Wilson, Climax, Ga.
2169 Frank Wooten, Marianna, Fla.
1484 Richard Wright, Bainbridge, Ga.
218 Early Young, Donalsonville, Ga.
1615 Jim Young, Donalsonville, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DOOLY, STATE OF GEORGIA.

307 Adell Allen, Pinehurst, Ga.
1715 Henry Allen, route No. 4, Vienna, Ga.
814 John Beal, Vienna, Ga., route No. 1.
180 John Wesley Belk, Pinehurst, Ga.
874 Randall Bell, Pinehurst, Ga.
917 George Bonds (George Bons) (Bans), route No. 1, Finleyson, Ga.
1450 James Bradley, Vienna, Ga.
276 Joe Brown, Finleyson, Ga.
1492 Judson Brown, Vienna, Ga.
150 Ray (Bray) Bryant, Vienna, Ga.
513 John Byrom, Montezuma, Ga.
249 Jessie Campbell (Jesse Cambell), Vienna, Ga.
977 Jerry Carter, Vienna, Ga.
1786 Clifford Chambliss, Pinehurst, Ga.
569 Ray Clark (Roy Clark), Pinehurst, Ga.
1008 Albert Clarke (Albert Clark), R. F. D., Pinehurst, Ga.
532 Comer Cobb, R. F. D., Byromville, Ga.
451 Goob Cable Cobb (Goob Cobb), Pinehurst, Ga.
1873 Ernest Conyers, Vienna, Ga.
1393 Dave Davis, Vienna, Ga.
80 Charlie Dean, Vienna, Ga.
1823 Henderson Dunn, Shellman, Ga.
630 John Dwight, Kathleen, Ga. (Vienna, Ga.).
278 Amos Edge, route No. 4, Vienna, Ga.
50 Robert Edwards, Pinehurst, Ga.
520 Fountain Evins, R. F. D. 5, Vienna, Ga.
382 Brazzie Feagin (Bozzie (Bazzie) Feagin), Vienna, Ga.
1819 Willie Felder, Vienna, Ga.
1812 Jessie Felton, R. F. D. 4, Vienna, Ga.
558 Garfield Gibson (Gebson), 318 Wall Street, Macon, Ga.
1864 James Goolsby, Unadilla, Ga.
1437 Fred Gordon, Unadilla, Ga.
1412 Walter Hardy, Montezuma, Ga.
784 George Fleming Hayes, Unadilla, Ga.
751 Sam Hayes, route No. 6, Vienna, Ga.
1903 James Hix, Vienna, Ga.
985 Will Holts (Willie Holts), Vienna, Ga.
1055 Willie Hormon, Vienna, Ga.
362 Adam Howell, route No. 5, Byromville, Ga.
1883 Thomas Jackson, route 4, Vienna, Ga.
670 Will Jackson, Vienna, Ga.
242 Elijah James, Vienna, Ga.
1076 Henry James, Pinehurst, Ga.
945 John Henry Jenkins, Vienna, Ga.
1110 Willie Lee Johnson, Unadilla, Ga.
1558 Enoch Lewis, R. F. D. 4, Vienna, Ga.
1162 Robert Lewis, Pinehurst, Ga.
1769 Eli Lynch, R. F. D. 4, Vienna, Ga.
490 Joe McCray, Pinehurst, Ga.
991 George McGee, Vienna, Ga.
461 John McKenzie, Byromville, Ga.
1357 Arthur McKnight, Palatka, Fla. (Arthur McNight, Pulaski, Ga.).
1285 C. Miles, Byromville, Ga.
642 Arthur Mitchell, R. F. D. 3, Vienna, Ga.
1708 Zeke Moore (Zebe Moore), R. F. D. 4, Vienna, Ga.
1261 Floyd Moreland, Unadilla, Ga.
1353 Hudie Palm, R. F. D. 6, Vienna, Ga.
1924 Wallace Perry (Wallace Peiry), R. F. D., Vienna, Ga.
1707 Willie Pitts, Vienna, Ga.
421 Simon Pollett, R. 1, Byromville, Ga.
1095 Willie Roberson (Robersom), route no. 4, Vienna, Ga.
598 Glayds Sanders, Unadilla, Ga.
328 Will Small, Lilly, Ga.
1758 Lucius Smith (Lucies Smith), Byromville, Ga.
1677 Jimmie Lee Simmons, Lilly, Ga.
68 Arthur Stubbs, Unadilla, Ga.
1817 Will Tatum, Byromville, Ga.
1025 Joe Thomas, Vienna, Ga.
1857 Willie Wadkins, Pinehurst, Ga.
1861 Sam Walker (Sammie Walker), Vienna, Ga.
1900 Wesley Walker, Vienna, Ga.
11 Jodie Webb, R. F. D. 2, Unadilla, Ga.
20 Jack Westbrook, Vienna, Ga.
1028 Nick Whitehead, Unadilla, Ga.
1293 Wilson Wilcox, Lilly, Ga.
757 Henry Williams, Montezuma, Ga.
397 Mancy Wilson, Vienna, Ga.
1717 James Woodards, Unadilla, Ga.
860 Will Young, Bainbridge, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF EFFINGHAM, STATE OF GEORGIA.

237 Edw. (Edward) Aiken, Primrose, Ga.
771 Thos. G. Amos (Thomas Gibson Amos), Springfield, Ga.
481 Jno. Blackwell, Washington, Ga.
532 C. Blond (Bland, Bond), Rincon, Ga.
368 Thos. (Thomas) Bostick, Clyo, Ga.
134 Ned Brantley, Rincon, Ga.
376 Thos. Brewton, Egypt, Ga. (route No. 3, Daisy, Ga., care Jno. Perwsby).
309 Mose Brooker (Moses Booker, Mose Brooks), Meldrim, Ga.
534 Dolphus Brown, Pineora, Ga.
348 Henry Brown (Henry Burns), Oliver, Ga.
29 Solomon Brown, route No. 1, Marlow, Ga. (217 Farm Street, Savannah, Ga.).
696 Will Brown, Pineora, Ga.
681 Wm. (William) Brown, Pineora, Ga.
335 Geo. W. (George Washington, George W.) Bryant, Guyton, Ga.
777 Lewis Bryant, Pineora, Ga.
327 Walter Busby, Clyo, Ga.
355 Fred Cason (Casin), Quitman, Ga.
263 Richard Chisman (Chismon), Marlow, Ga.
675 Theopolia (Theopolis) A. Cole, Clyo, Ga.
666 Otis Cooper, Guyton, Ga.
94 Daniel Dupree (Dupren), Marlow, Ga.
776 Alex Edwards, Egypt, Ga.
538 Jack Gillard, Rincon, Ga.
366 Geo. (George) Gordon, Clyo, Ga.
318 Eulia Griffin (Griffen), route No. 1, Rincon, Ga.
39 Henry Hagan (Hagins), Egypt, Ga.
594 Henry W. Jackson (Henry Jackson), Tuscalem, Ga.
526 Thos. Jenkins, Egypt, Ga.
218 Emmett Johnson (Johnston), Guyton, Ga.
819 Henry Johnson, Egypt, Ga.
559 Frank Jones, Springfield, Ga.
151 Phelix (Philex) Jordan (Philex Johnson, Jordon), Egypt, Ga.
28 Frank Laws, Guyton, Ga.
454 Frank Lewis, Rincon, Ga.
389 Eddie Lovit (Edie Lovit, Edie Love, Eddie Love), Rincon, Ga.
540 Jas. Lovit (Lovet, James Lovett), Rincon, Ga.
225 Geo. (George) McRoy, Pineora, Ga.
825 Will Moreland, Pineora, Ga.
471 Jno. H. (John Henry) Morrison, Pineora, Ga.
448 Sam Mutry (Moultry, Moulty, Motley), Clyo, Ga.
521 Lewis Norman, Meldrim, Ga.
110 Thos. (Thomas) Parker, Marlow, Ga.
865 Cornelius Powell, Pineora, Ga.
546 Jas. (James) Rivers, Egypt, Ga.
280 Chas. (Charles, Charlie) Roberts, Pineora, Ga.
46 Paul Robertson, Pineora, Ga.
177 Robt. (Robert) Sapp, Guyton, Ga.
715 Wm. (William) Sanders, Pineora, Ga.
432 Charlie Schley, Meldrim, Ga.
466 Jesse J. Searles, Meldrim, Ga.
182 Jno. (John) Smith, Springfield, Ga.
501 Willie Smith, Springfield, Ga.
77 Jno. B. (John Benjamin, John B.) Wallace, Rincon, Ga.
768 Jno. (John) Washington, Pineora, Ga.
861 Walter Watson, Oakfield, Ga.
282 Bill Williams, Pineora, Ga.
321 O. C. Williams, Rincon, Ga.
858 Thos. (Thomas) C. Williams, Guyton, Ga.
756 Willie Williams, Egypt, Ga.
786 Jos. (Joseph) Young, Meldrim, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FLOYD, STATE OF GEORGIA.

334 John Anderson, R. F. D. 6, Rome, Ga.
151 Gus Austin, 815 East Twelfth Street, Rome, Ga.
3058 Charles Banks, Shady Side, Rome, Ga.
2718 Felton Barnes, Calhoun Avenue, Rome, Ga.
3057 Ed Bell, West Thirteenth Street, Rome, Ga.
2955 Everett Bridges, Holmes Street, Rome, Ga.
2851 George Campbell, Rome, Ga.
2754 Charlie Cannon, care Mrs. Sallie Phillip, Rome, Ga.
1673 Thomas Chatman, R. F. D. 4, Rome, Ga.
1594 Samuel Woodson (W.) Coats (Samuel Woodson Coates), 205 East Main, Rome, Ga.
1774 Thomas Lindsey Cothron (L. Cothran), Route No. 5, Rome, Ga.
3193 Hurley Davis, Kingston Road, R. F. D., Rome, Ga.
1984 Charles George (G.) Denton, R. F. D. 1, Silver Creek, Ga.
2791 Charlie Douglas (Douglas), West Rome, Ga.
3033 Frank Eart, R. F. D. 5, Cedartown, Ga.

1804 Will Evans, 503½ Broad Street (303½ Broad Street), Rome, Ga.
1869 Jim Foster, Early, Ga.
128 Claud Fowler, South McLin Street, Rome, Ga.
815 Harrison Garrett, 102 Klaving Street, Rome, Ga.
2128 Warren Wesley Green (Warren Green), South McLin Street, Rome, Ga.
1777 Walter Grey (I. W. Grey), Alabama Road, Rome, Ga.
3119 Thomas Grier, 5 River Avenue, Rome, Ga.
2875 Henry Grisson, Moupin Street, Rome, Ga.
1456 Ed Haines, R. F. D. 8, Rome, Ga.
1381 Fred Hale, Lindale, Ga.
266 Lonnie Harris, 19 North McLin, Rome, Ga.
1998 Charlie Headen, Rome, Ga.
1683 John Heath, East Twelfth Street, Rome, Ga.
1266 Robert Heath, East Fourth (East Fourteenth Street), Rome, Ga.
2043 Andy Hensley, Rome, Ga.
1534 Scoot Hernton (Scott Hernton), R. F. D., Rome, Ga.
1899 John Thomas (T.) Holcomb, 516 Branham Avenue, Rome, Ga.
2481 Frank Jackson Hudgins (Frank J. Huggins), Rome, Ga.
518 George Herman (H.) Hudson, Lindale, Ga.
3170 Allen Johnson, Rome, Ga.
2054 Charlie Homer (H.) Kelly (C. H. Kelly, Charley Homer Kelly), West Fourth Avenue, Rome, Ga.
2065 Will Langston, 26 Etowah Terrace, Rome, Ga.
296 Paul Long, Route 11, Rome, Ga.
869 Edward A. Lyle, Rome, Ga. (3003 North Broadway Street, St. Louis, Mo.).
1376 Will McCarver, 7 China Berry Street, Rome, Ga.
2081 Clarence (Clarance) McDemon, 5 Pennington Avenue, Rome, Ga.
366 John McVey, R. F. D. 2, Rome, Ga.
1304 Howard Martin, 100 South Broad, Rome, Ga.
656 Lonnie Matthews, Rome, Ga.
440 John Thomas (T.) May, Route 2, Rome, Ga.
192 Joseph Means, 511 East Second Street, Rome, Ga.
2250 Nathan Monroe (M.) Owens, R. F. D. No. 8, Rome, Ga.
177- Carey Parker, Cave Spring, Ga.
2888 Dock Webb (W.) Phillips, R. F. D. 2, Rome, Ga.
702 Ira Mathew Compton Pollard (Ira Pollard, Ira M. C. Pollard), R. F. D. Lindale Pike, Rome, Ga.
2675 Charlie Printup, 18 Second Avenue, Rome, Ga.
742 William (Will) Roper, 800 Railroad Street, Rome, Ga.
1910 James Sanders, R. F. D. No. 9, Rome, Ga.
3054 Homer Smith, 33 Etowah Terrace, Rome, Ga.
862 Robert H. (Hardy) Smith, Silver Creek, R. F. D., Ga.
1931 William Arthur Smith, Etowah Terrace, Rome, Ga.
1449 John Spring, R. F. D. No. 8, Rome, Ga.
525 Jerry Stephens, 102 True, Rome, Ga.
3090 Frank Stocks, 203 Maple, Rome, Ga.
559 Will Talley, Rome, Ga.
597 Ed Tanner, Cave Spring, Ga.
2348 James Thompson, R. F. D. No. 2, Adairsville, Ga.
1408 George Turner, 318 East 12th Street, Rome, Ga.
2939 Robert Lee (L.) Turner, East 12th Street, Rome, Ga.
773 Clarence Wacaster, 1502 Garden Avenue, Rome, Ga.
1267 Julius Signor (S.) Wilson (J. S. Wilson, Julius S. Witson, Julius Sigman Watson), R. F. D. No. 3, Rome, Ga.
2807 John Waterson (Watterson), Byrd, Ga.
1210 Arthur Wolfork (Woodfolk), Silver Creek, Ga.
66 Sam Wright, Lindale, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF GWINNETT, STATE OF GEORGIA.

744 Jewett Back (Jaret Beeh, Jueth Beck), Duluth, Ga.
1570 Leo C. Brannon (Leo Christopher Brocon, Leo C. Brocon), Buford, Ga.
1136 Jos. Byrd (Joseph Byrd), Duluth, Ga.
940 Will Chandler (Well Chandler), Lilburn, Ga.
523 Andrew Cunningham (Andrew Cunenham), Loganville, Ga.
1287 John Daniel, Buford, Ga.
700 Clarence Falls, Lilburn, Ga.
873 Thos. Greeson (H. Thomas Greeson, Thomas Greason), Dacula, Ga.
1839 Will James (William James), Lilburn, Ga.
1947 (1917) Wm. Henry Jones (Willie Henry Jones), Buford, Ga.
1003 Robert Lowe (Robt. Lowe), Duluth, Ga. (Grayson, Ga.)
1367 Henry McDaniel (Henry McDanial), Buford, Ga.
1951 Morgan Smith, Loganville, Ga.
1711 Mack Tanner, Suwanee, Ga.
1706 Henry Taylor, Loganville, Ga. (Fifth Street).
1955 Will Thomas, Buford, Ga.
681 Henry Washington, Duluth, Ga.
1814 Willie Williams (Willie T. Williams, Willie Pamonus William, Willie Premones Williams), Dacula, Ga. (R. F. D. No. 2, Buford, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LEE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

725 Charlie May Bell, Leesburg, Ga.
226 Charlie Carter, North Leesburg, Ga.
751 John Cowart, Leesburg, Ga.
106 Richard Daniel (Danus), route No. 5, Leesburg, Ga.
10 Roscoe Dennis, Smithville, Ga.
524½ Fred Dublin, Leesburg, Ga.
52 Johnnie Glemfusley (Johnie Glemfutley, Johnnie Clemfusly), Leesburg, Ga.
181 Johnnie Gowan (Johnnie Gowen), Leesburg, Ga.
599 William Hawkens, Smithville, Ga.
776 John Hayens (John Haynes), Smithville, Ga.
404 Simon Holley, Smithville, Ga.
275 Anthony Jackson, Leesburg, Ga.
613 Willis (Willie) Jackson, Leesburg, Ga.
681 Archie Johnson, Leesburg, Ga.
710½ Marion Jones, Leesburg, Ga.
536 Gene Malone, Smithville, Ga.
265½ Amos Mathews, Lee County, Ga. (Leesburg, Ga.).
541 Roger Milvin (Melvin, Meloin), Leesburg, Ga.
10½ Sam Moore, Leesburg, Ga.
789 Dan Owens, Leesburg, Ga.
148 Tom Perry, Smithville, Lee County, Ga. (Leesburg, Ga.).
196 Henry Rawlain (Rawkin), Leesburg, Ga.
908 David (Dave) Reese, Leesburg, Ga.
65½ George Smith, Leesburg, Ga.
66 George Smith, Leesburg, Ga.
198 Fed (Fred) Stocks, Desota, Ga.
474 Louis Talley (Tally), Desota, Ga.
300 George Thomas, Cobb, Ga.

838 Roy Walker, route No. 2, Sasser, Ga.
219 Diamond Watts, route No. 5, Leesburg, Ga.
851 Steve Watts, route No. 5, Leesburg, Ga.
167 George West, Albany, Ga., % W. H. Newsome, Albany, Ga.
270 Calvin Williams, Leesburg, Ga.
531 Cris (Chris) Williams, Leesburg, Va.
861 James Williams, Leesburg, Ga.
117 Johnnie (Johnie) Williams, Smithville, Ga.
221 John Henry Willis (John Henry Williams), Sasser, Ga. (Smithville, Ga.).
25 Homer Wilson, route No. 4, Leesburg, Ga.
893 Eugene Wright, route No. 4, Leesburg, Ga.
785 Clifford Young, Leesburg, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF MACON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

14 Richard Barner (Barnes), 1014 Elbert, Macon, Ga.
310 Earnest (Ernest) Brown, 116 Enterprise Street, Macon, Ga.
192 Robert Cato, extra gang (foreman Chas. Cain), camp cars, Central of Georgia Railway.
109 Robert Jones, 135 Hall Street, Macon, Ga.
44 Frank Kendred, 354 Pine Street, Macon, Ga.
165 Jessie Kennedy, 21 Hawthorne Street, Macon, Ga.
70 Cornelius Love, 132 Jackson Street, Macon, Ga.
182 Moody Ross, 165 Hazel Street, Macon, Ga.
86 Henry Russell, 227 Turpin Street, Macon, Ga.
378 Zonie (Zonnie) Smith, 313 Telfair Street, Macon, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MADISON, STATE OF GEORGIA.

738 Sim Baldwin (Sims Balden, Sim Balden, Sim Baldin), Comer, Ga.
842 Luther Bullock, Danielsville, Ga.
961 Henry Collins, Hull, Ga.
69 Cleveland Curry, Comer, Ga.
647 Oscar Davenport, Comer, Ga.
883 Clifton Goss Eberhart, Danielsville, Ga.
841 Farman (Fammon) Favoris, Hull, Ga.
275 John Gaines (Ganes), route No. 2, Royston, Ga.
711 Ernest (Earnest) Garman, Carlton, Ga.
383 Eddie Glenn, Winterville, Ga.
8 Otlio (Otler, Other) Johnson, Comer, Ga.
943 Dock Kimball, route No. 2, Carlton, Ga.
234 Will Moon, Comer, Ga.
1012 Flora Sarden, Colbert, Ga.
1307 Daniel (David) Shaw, Comer, Ga.
1065 Jerry Smith, Commerce, Ga.
742 Jesse (Jessie) James Stowden, Colbert, Ga.
361 Oscar Taylor, Hull, Ga.
66 David Winn, route No. 2, Carlton, Ga.
5 Fleming Franklyn (Fleming Franklin, Fleming F.) Wright, Hull, Ga.
702 Charlie Wynn (Charley Winn), Comer, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MORGAN, STATE OF GEORGIA.

346 Ben Boswell, R. F. D. No. 5, Madison, Ga.
351 John Boswell, Madison, Ga.
1297 Nathen (Nathan) Brown, Godfrey, Ga.
1236 Will Bryant, Buckhead, Ga.
356 Felix Chatman, Madison, Ga. (67 B West Merrits Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.)
908 Charlie Mathew (Matthew) Copeland, Farmington, R. F. D. No. 3, Ga.
923 Will Cross, Buckhead, Ga.
231 Gola (Sola) Giles Dalton, Swords, Ga.
1393 E. D. Davis, Madison, Ga.
95 Bell Durden (Durdin), Madison, Ga.
903 Jessie Durden, Farmington, Ga., R. F. D. No. 3.
113 Rufus Durden, Route No. 1, Newborn, Ga.
1301 Claude (Claud) Ellis, Madison, Ga.
949 John Ellis, Madison, Ga., R. F. D. No. 6.
1313 John Elmore, R. F. D. 7, Newborn, Ga.
1052 George Evans, Apalachee, Ga.
533 Calhon (Calhoun) Fitzpatrick, Bostwick, Ga.
1120 Sam Franklin, Apalachee, Ga.
398 Frank Greer, Buckhead, Ga.
192 Sidney Harris, Buckhead, Ga.
1165 James Hilsman (Hillsman), Apalachee, Ga.
828 Dave Howard, High Shoals, Ga.
1055 Fred Johnson, Madison, Ga.
1602 Isaac Alonzo (Isacc Alonza, Isaac A.), Jackson, route No. 8, Mansfield, Ga.
924 Reuben (Rubbin, Robert) Johnson, Madison, Ga.
829 William Johnson, Buckhead, Ga.
1632 Joseph Flipper Lackey, Machen, Ga.
1253 Samuel Laurence (Lawrence), Madison, Ga.
1155 Jake Lee, R. F. D. No. 1, Apalachee, Ga. (R. F. D. No. 1, Madison, Ga.).
1351 Respy Paschal, R. F. D. No. 2, Madison, Ga.
1159 Will Prior (Pryor), R. F. D., Madison, Ga.
291 Will Roberson (Robertson), Apalachee, Ga.
830 Shepherd Ross, Madison, Ga.
1129 Logan Stephens, Madison, Ga.
861 Arthur Walker, Buckhead, Ga., R. F. D. No. 1.
1478 Cleveland Ward, R. F. D., Rutledge, Ga. (R. F. D., Madison, Ga., care Jake Wilson).
1088 Tom Ward, Newborn, Ga., No. 1.
321 Garner Williams, Madison, Ga.
495 Ernest Wilson, Rutledge, Ga.
1053 Frank Wright, R. F. D. No. 2, Rutledge, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PIKE, STATE OF GEORGIA.

857 H. Brown, Milner, Ga.
411 Jake (Johe) Caldwell, Williamson, Ga.
111 Ben H. Cheney (Ben Hill Cheney), Neal, Ga.
1602 Garland Coach (Cooch), Barnesville, Ga.
974 Alonza Davis, Route No. 2, Williamson, Ga.
1559 Charlie Fambro, 225 Washington Street, Barnesville, Ga.
394 Wm. H. Few (William Henry Few, Wm. Heney Few), Barnesville, Ga.
1033 Abe Flemister, Neal, Ga.
355 Crawford Gilbert, Barnesville, Ga.
745 Sam Hosey (Pike County, Ga.), Zebulon, Pike, Ga.
1340 Robert Jackson, Railroad, Barnesville, Ga.
913 Julius Jefferson, Milner, Ga., R. F. D. No. 1.
1334 Lige Jenkins (Elijah, Lige Jenhins), Barnesville, Ga.
892 Ben Jeter, Williamson, Ga., R. F. D. No. 2.

776 Henry Johnson, Barnesville, Ga.
239 Joseph O. Johnson (Joseph Osborn), Barnesville, Ga.
1329 Henry Lovett, Williamson, Ga.
729 Hosea Matthews (Hozier Matthis, Hozier Matthews), Molina, Ga. (care of J. A. Goins, Toccoa, Ga.).
1246 Luther Martin, R. F. D. No. 1, Concord, Ga.
835 Horace Montgomery, Barnesville, Ga., R. F. D.
119 Julius O'Neal, Barnesville, Ga.
1055 Parker Reid, Concord, Ga.
515 George Sims (Lims), Meansville, Ga.
1105 James West, Williamson, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RICHMOND, STATE OF GEORGIA.

745 Ulysses Barton (Ulysees Barton), Richmond County, R. F. D., Ga.
289 Turner Brinson (Tanner Brinson), Grettersville, S. C.
166 Henry Bryant, R. F. D. No. 1, Augusta, Ga.
426 Johnnie Butler, Westover, Ga.
16 Willie Daniel, Hephzibah, Ga.
751 Joe Edwards, 600 Gloinnett Street, Augusta, Ga.
477 Arthur Hill, R. F. D. No. 1, Augusta, Ga.
250 Wade Johnson, Hephzibah, Ga.
451 Wm. Elisha Kirby (William Elisha Kirby), R. F. D. 3, Hephzibah, Ga.
437 Arthur Lewis (Arthur Louis), R. F. D. 2, McBean, Ga.
4 John C. Smith, R. F. D. 2, Augusta, Ga.
457 Rufus Smith, Richmond County, Ga.
825 John Spier, R. F. D. 1, Augusta, Ga.
657 Wallace Walltower (Wallace Waltower), Hephzibah, Ga.
102 Gordon Williams, R. F. D. 2, Augusta, Ga.
581 Mack Williams, Richmond County, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF STEPHENS, STATE OF GEORGIA.

389 Zim Baker, Toccoa, Ga.
183 Jim Beck, Toccoa, Ga. (Westminster, S. C., Holly Springs, Box, Westminster, S. C.).
307 John Brown, Toccoa, Ga.
344 Moses Brown, Toccoa, Ga.
728 William Bryant, Deer Court, Ga.
762 Jim Clark, Taccoa, Ga.
400 Albert Conley, Colboun, Ga. (Columbus, Ga.).
105 John Henry Daniel, Toccoa, Ga. (Shipping Port, Pa.).
193 Hodges Dooley (Doaley), Toccoa, Ga.
708 Claude Edmondsom (Edmundson), Toccoa, Ga.
595 Edd Farr, Toccoa, Ga.
245 David Felder, Toccoa, Ga.
600 Oates (Odis, Oatis, Otis) Freeman, Toccoa, Ga.
556 Willis Goodwin, Toccoa, Ga.
435 Eddie Grant, Toccoa, Ga.
369 Robert (Robt.) Hammonds, Toccoa, Ga.
86 John Heyman (Heymon), Toccoa, Ga.
242 Alford Hicks (Alfred Hix, Alfred Hicks), Toccoa, Ga.
737 W. C. Hunter, Toccoa, Ga.
49 Robert (Robt.) Jackson, Toccoa, Ga.
197 Tom Jenkins, Toccoa, Ga.
594 Cal Jones, Toccoa, Ga.
612 Lonnie Knox, Toccoa, Ga.
301 Charlie (Chas.) Lewis, Toccoa, Ga.
273 Willie Lewis, Toccoa, Ga.
138 Charlie Lockhart (Lockhort), Toccoa, Ga.
618 Leo McGee, Toccoa, Ga.
341 Joe Miller, Toccoa, Ga.
346 William (Wm.) Mitchell, Toccoa, Ga.
266 Mansie (Mausie, Mancie) Moon, Toccoa, Ga.
143 Ross Morris, Toccoa, Ga. (Morsis, 708 Rosemary Street, West Palm Beach, Fla.)
508 D. C. Pendergrass, Toccoa, Ga.
637 Will Phemister (Phemester), Toccoa, Ga.
57 W. G. Powell, care C. W. Lane & Co., Toccoa, Ga. (U. G. Powell, Grantsville, Ga.)
477 June Prather, Toccoa, Ga.
480 Henry T. (Thomas) Roberts, Dearcourt, Ga.
640 Albert Rucker (Albert Purcell Ruker, Albert Purcell Rucker), Toccoa, Ga.
48 Luther Rucker, Toccoa, Ga.
260 Love Sims, Toccoa, Ga.
281 George (Geo.) Smith, Toccoa, Ga.
134 Thomas (Thos.) H. Smith, R. F. D. No. 2, Marten, Ga.
462 Charley Spikes, Toccoa, Ga.
13 Arthur Stancil, Toccoa, Ga.
284 Austin J. Stancil, R. F. D. Toccoa, Ga.
467 Lewis H. Taylor, Toccoa, Ga.
374 Dock (Doc) Williams, Toccoa, Ga.
180 Joe Williams, Toccoa, Ga.
244 Orange Williams, Toccoa, Ga.
569 Sloan Williams, R. F. D. No. 1, Avalon, Ga. (Martin, Ga.).
526 Arthur Wilson (Willson), Toccoa, Ga.
417 Tommie Winn, Toccoa, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TAYLOR, STATE OF GEORGIA.

545 John Porter Brown (John P. Brown), Mank, Ga.
250 Monroe Bryant, R. F. D. Butler, Ga.
668 Albert Durham, Butler, Ga.
45 Emanuel Ford, Rupert, Ga.
240 Jimmie Greene, Butler, Ga. (Jimmie Greer, Charing, Ga.)
611 John Hamilton, Reynolds, Ga.
95 A. C. Irvins (A. C. Evans), Reynolds, Ga.
440 Jessie Kendrick (Jesse Kendrick), Reynolds, Ga.
66 Charlie Johnson, Butler, Ga. (Reynolds, Ga.)
614 Will Lester, Reynolds, Ga.
144 John Jones, Rupert, Ga.
627 Joe Lewis, Enfanto, Ala.
517 Willie Mahome (Willie Mahone), Reynolds, Ga.
134 George Tarwell, Butler, Ga. (Charing, Ga.)
256 Chas. Wiggins, Howard, Ga. (Charlie Wiggins, Butler, Ga.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WEBSTER, STATE OF GEORGIA.

227 Wm. Theo. Alston (William Theodore Alston), Preston, Ga.
185 Richard Bell, Preston, Ga.
205 Florence Bryant, Richland, Ga.
103 Zack Humbell, Preston, Ga.
244 Will Paul (Pawl), Richland, Ga.
271 Homer Pool (Poole), Preston, Ga.
28 Fate Smith, Preston, Ga. (Americus, Ga.)
356 Livingston Wright, Weston, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WILKES, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1203 Willie D. Anderson, Washington, Ga.
728 Will Artus (Artles, Willie Arteer), Rayle, Ga.
188 Willie Barnes, Aonia, Ga.
917 John Bolton, route 1, Washington, Ga.
1076 Isiah Booker, R. F. D. No. 1, Tignall, Ga.
1612 James Burden, Tignall, Ga.
497 John Calloway (Callaway), Washington, Ga.
1617 Frank Carter, Washington, Ga.
1573 Jesse (Jess) Carter, Tignall, Ga.
687 Andrew E. Christopher, Rayle, Ga.
293 Cajah Coalman (Coleman), Tignall, Ga.
1437 Will Collins, Washington, Ga.
365 Chandler (Chandle) Colley, Washington, Ga.
276 Ernest (Earnest) Curry, Washington, Ga.
928 John Davis, R. F. D. No. 1, Tignall, Ga.
1239 Lonnie (Lennie) Davis, Wilkes County, Ga.
1764 John Henry Evans, Washington, Ga.
1758 Tom Fleming, Washington, Ga.
104 Will Harden (Hardin), Washington, Ga.
939 Roy Harman (Roy Harmon), Metasville, Ga.
906 Charlie (Charley) Harris, Washington, Ga.
1255 James Harris, Aonia, Ga.
679 Paul Heard (Hear), Darling, Ga. (Danburg, Ga.).
1093 Thos Kendrick (Kendrich), R. F. D., Washington, Ga.
1568 Robert Kennedy (Bob Kennedy), Washington, Ga.
1714 Clayton Asa (Claton, Claton A.) Kinley, Lincolnton, Ga.
1363 John Henry Mays (Mayes), R. 2, Washington, Ga.
610 Henry Milner, Washington, Ga.
1297 Jess Moseley (Jessie Mosby, Jesse, Jesse Mosley), Aonia, Ga.
1641 Will Moss, Washington, Ga.
335 George D. Pettus (Pettis), Washington, Ga.
704 Charlie (Charley) Robinson, R. F. D. No. 4, Washington, Ga.
707 James Sims (Simms), Washington, Ga.
922 Roy Smith, Washington, Ga.
864 Jim Tate, Tignall, Ga.
758 Chas. Edward Taylor, Tignall, Ga.
1402 Jean (Gene) Thomas, Philomoth, Ga.
341 John Sanders Wheatley, R. No. 3, Metasville, Ga.
1647 Frank Williams, Tignall, Ga.
318 Ianders Williams, R. F. D. No. 2, Washington, Ga.
1407 Jake Willis (Williams), Aonia, Ga.
778 Jake Willis (Jabe Wellis, Jabe Willis), Tignall, Ga.
856 John Wingfield (Winfield), Washington, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WORTH, STATE OF GEORGIA.

1185 Green Alford, Sylvester, Ga.
624 Mose Allen, Sylvester, Ga.
890 Lucius Allison, Sylvester, Ga.
1724 Earnest (Ernest) Battle, Sumner, Ga.
1898 Willie Beachum (Beachom), Route No. 3, Ty Ty, Ga.
907 Ed Bell, Warwick, Ga.
39 Moses Bentley, Bridgeboro, Ga.
1655 Levander Boyd (Levunder) (Lavender Boyd), Sumner, Ga.
1651 Martin Breland, Sumner, Ga.
1215 Antney Brown, Worth Acree, Ga. (Anthony Brown Acree, Worth County, Ga.)
1266 Oscar Brown, Sylvester, Ga.
809 Benjamin Bryant, Sumner, Ga.
1490 William H. Bryant, Route No. 1, Sylvester, Ga.
123 Andrew Cheney, R. F. D. No. 1, Warwick, Ga.
1064 Witty Christopher (Wittie Chiristopher), Sylvester, Ga.
1565 Ezekiel Cloud, Shingler, Ga.
1568 Garfield Coleman, Route No. 1, Sylvester, Ga.
1187 John Collins, Sumner, Ga.
57 Thomas Crumley, R. F. D. Doerun, Ga.
583 Dock Daniels, Sumner, Ga.
1700 Oscar Davis, R. F. D. Sylvester, Ga.
639 Other Davis, Sylvester, Ga.
1257 Buck Denard, Acree, Ga.
371 Dan Dewhart, Bridgeboro, Ga.
786 Henry Edwards, R. F. D., Doerun, Ga.
1116 Sam Fair, Sumner, Ga.
357 Robert Felph, R. F. D. No. 1, Ty Ty, Ga.
289 John Floyd, Acree, Ga.
1484 Lucius (Lucious) Fowler, R. F. D. No. 1, Acree, Ga.
1326 Marsy Graham, Bridgeboro, Ga.
899 Robert Hall, Shingler, Ga.
1208 Clifford Harris, Worth, Oakfield, Ga.
118 Charity Henderson, Oakdale, Ga.
1509 Henry Hilliard Hight, Sylvester, Ga.
960 Alma Hillsman, R. F. D. Doerun, Ga.
300 John Jenkins (Jinkins), Route No. 4, Sylvester, Ga.
1449 William A. Jestice, Sumner, Ga. (William A. Jeffers, Sumner, Worth County, Ga.)
415 George Johnson, Acree, Ga.
1258 Nathan Johnson, Bridgeboro, Ga.
703 Plemon Johnson, R. F. D. No. 2, Sylvester, Ga.
1411 Willie Johnson, Sumner, Ga.
237 Willie Johnson, Oakfield, Ga.
764 Antney Jones, Acree, Ga.
938 Henry Jones, Oakfield, Ga.
1141 Nathaniel Jones, R. F. D. No. 2, Sumner, Ga.
1571 Will Jones, R. F. D. No. 3, Sylvester, Ga.
908 Clyde (Clide) Keet, Sylvester, Ga.
1098 Robert Kendrick, Warwick, Ga.
599 Frank Knight, Sylvester, Ga.
558 Homer Lester, Sylvester, Ga.
492 Shelley (Shelby) McClellan (Shelly), Acree, Ga.
1068 Arthur McCrary, Shingler, Ga
1451 Torence McNair, Sylvester, Ga.
406 Tom Mitchell, Sumner, Ga.
1572 James Montgomery, Acree, Ga.
1117 Clyde Muckerson, Sylvester, Ga.
22 John Newberry, R. F. D. Acree, Ga. (Johnnie, R. F. D. 1, Acree, Ga.).
902 Will (Willie) Newberry, Acree, Ga.
1597 Lonnie Nichols, route No. 1, Ty Ty, Ga.
889 Sam Nichols, Sylvester, Ga.
462 Frank Parker, Bridgeboro, Ga.
1283 Will Perkins, Waycross, Ga.
1554 Remus Peterson, Acree R. F. D. Ga.

1031 Rolling Peterson (Rollin Peterson, Rolling Perterson), Sylvester, Ga.
693 Cliff Powell, Sumner, Ga.
513 Ed Richardson (Edd Ritchardson), Worth, Oakfield, Ga.
245 Jimmie Richardson, Sylvester, Ga.
686 Lonzie Riley, Sylvester, Ga.
2851 Sol Frederick Robertson, Ashburn, Ga.
763 Harrison Ross, Warwick, Ga.
131 Pete Sams, Bridgeboro, Ga.
1751 Jep Scott, Warwick, Ga.
294 Joseph Semour (Seymour), route No. 1, Warwick, Ga.
1078 Lonnie Simon, Sylvester, Ga.
1026 George Smith, Sylvester, Ga.
1583 Orange Smith, Bridgeboro, Ga.
380 Walter Smith, Sylvester, Ga.
194 Warren Smith, Sylvester, Ga.
569 Will Stafford, Poulan, Ga.
164 James Sullivan, Sylvester, Ga.
1658 Will Taylor, Warwick Ga.
1128 Jim Thomas, Poulan, Ga.
823 Vester Thomas, R. F. D. 1, Acree, Ga.
850 Henry Willis Tiggett (H. W. Tigett), route No. 2, Sumner, Ga.
925 Henry Turner, Sylvester, Ga.
885 George David Washington, R. F. D. 3, Ty Ty, Ga.
546 George Jacob Washington, route No. 1, Sumner, Ga.
1884 Will Washington, Sylvester, Ga.
374 Bennie Webb, R. F. D. 1, Ty Ty, Ga.
43 Prymus Webb, Sylvester, Ga.
1563 James White, route No. 3, Ty Ty, Ga.
275 Sam Whitehead, Sylvester, Ga.
692 Arthur Williams, R. F. D., Doerun, Ga.
1730 Arthur Williams, Sylvester, Ga.
835 George Williams, Sumner, Ga.
44 John Charles (John Charlie) Williams, Worth County, Oakfield, Ga.
1639 Julian Williams, route No. 4, Sylvester, Ga. (1004 Jefferson, Street, Quitman, Ga.).
1349 Willie Williams, Sumner, Ga.
64 Elbert Willis, Sumner, Ga.
346 Rufus Wimbush (Winbush), Sylvester, Ga.
270 John Wise, Sylvester, Ga.
1454 Willie Wood, Poulan, Ga.
1313 Bull Yansey, Sylvester, Ga.
1547 Amous (Amos) Yarber, R. F. D. 2, Sylvester, Ga.
1383 William Young, Sumner, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CEDAR, STATE OF IOWA.

1566 Ira B. Carl, Tipton, Iowa.
1087 Charley Stewart, Odessa, Mo. (Adessa, Mo.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CERRO GORDO, STATE OF IOWA.

2284 Adolph Daniel Neath, Cerro Gordo Hotel, Mason City, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF IOWA.

507 George Ross, 208 Washington Street, Sacramento, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF IDA, IDA GROVE, STATE OF IOWA.

1006 Wilbur Topping, Ida Grove, Iowa (Gillette, Wyo.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF IOWA, STATE OF IOWA.

662 Prosper A. Holvert (Hallroett), care of John Gohring, Morengo, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF JONES, STATE OF IOWA.

1472 Clio Willard Brown, Monmouth, Ill. (Monmouth, Iowa).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LYON, STATE OF IOWA.

774 Stewart Burton, Rock Rapids, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SIOUX, STATE OF IOWA.

1580 Oscar Butts, Alton, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, SIOUX CITY, STATE OF IOWA.

3280 Raymond (Ray) Clary, Camp Cody, Company D, Sixth Nebraska, Demming, N. Mex. (2618 Grand Street, Sioux City, Iowa).
157 Albert Henning, Rutland Hotel, Sioux City, Iowa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF CRAWFORD, STATE OF KANSAS.

9 Jessie Albert (Jesse A.) Robertson, 116½ North Smelter Street, Pittsburg, Kans.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTLER, STATE OF KANSAS.

2034 Silas E. Moody, Lawrence, Kans.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HARPER, STATE OF KANSAS.

1400 Fred Benjamin (B.) Hoke (Hake), Harper, Kans.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF KANSAS.

1339 Edward (Ed.) Ambrose, 17 South Sixth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2954 Charles Armenta, 712 South Fourth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
332 Alexander Batch (Butch), 626 Reynolds Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1401 James Bodden, 21 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
1273 Clyde Burgess, 76 North Ferrer Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3611 Joseph P. (Crast) Campbell (Joseph Patrick Campbell), 1255 Scotland Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1855 Pantalion Canto, Union Pacific Yards, Kansas City, Kans.
663 James Clifton Danaby, 508 South Second Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1186 Herman F. Dorwald (Jr.), 1274 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
1687 John Ray Easley, 119 Oak Street, Kansas City, Mo.
1783 James Elwood, 832 Packard Street, Kansas City, Kans.
899 Joseph John Foley (John Joseph Foley), J. J. Grier Camp, RR. Yards, Kansas City, Kans.
2389 Eugene J. (Jay) Foster, 932 Northrup Street, Kansas City, Kans. (823 East Fourteenth Street, Kansas City, Mo.).
3366 George W. (Washington) Foye, 742 Colorado Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
1284 Sherman Franklin, 60 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3390 Raymond H. Gilchrist, 836 Homer Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1610 Claude Groves, 705 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans. (Hardy, Ark.).
3388 Isaac F. (Franklin) Gray, 839 Shawnee, Kansas City, Kans. (618 South Mill Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
280 Gaberiel Gustierrer (Gabriel Gustierrer, Guterres), South Valley and R. R. Yards, Kansas City, Kans.
3017 Michael Hachinski (Hackinski), 19 South Mill Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2841 Frank Hale, 702 Seventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2507 Charles Henderson, 611 South Second Street, Kansas City, Kans. (730 Muncie Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
1383 Lenord Hontz (Leonard Houtz), 215 South Tenth Street, Kansas City, Kans. (1035 South Pyle Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
672 William Hurst, 654 Shawnee Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1828 John Mike Jivier (Jiwles), 629 Osage Street, Kansas City, Kans.
680 James Johnson, 578 South Fifth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3218 Frank Jones, 649 Northrup Street, Kansas City, Kans. (Oakdale, Tenn.).
785 Marion (Macum) James Jones, 514 Shawnee Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2506 Siphes (Sephes) Jones, 580 South Fourth Street, Kansas City, Kans. (549 South Second Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
1726 Arthur C. Kee, Kansas City, Kans.
516 Charley (Charles) Kelly (E. L. Kelly), 627 South Third Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3309 Fred Kelley, 70 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans. (Stuart, Okla.).
1141 Harold Byron Koethoff (Kotthoff), 214 North Valley, Kansas City, Kans.
2289 John S. (Stephen) Lake, 741 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
1103 James Monroe Loney, 402 Shawnee Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
2245 Albert Lopez (Lopes), South Valley and R. R. Yards, Kansas City, Kans.
3417 Michael (M.) McKeen (McKeon), Cudahy Fire Hall, Kansas City, Kans. (551 North Homer Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
1205 John F. (Frederick) McMackin, 834 South Tenth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
74 Harvey Arnold Marse (Harry A. (Arnold) Morse), 1025 Ford Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3716 Albert Edwin Mattingley (Albert E. Mattingley), 713 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans. (721 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
2738 J. E. D. Mead (John Elkanah Davis Mead), 616 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2244 Fred Meyer (Fred Eameal Meyer), Twenty-first Street and Bunker Street, Kansas City, Kans.
617 William Miller, 621 South Third Street, Kansas City, Kans.
994 James Moore, 21 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
3170 Fred M. Norman, 613 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans. (Frd'k Monroe, 604 Shawnee Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.).
2590 Richard H. (Homer) Parker, 624 South Sixth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3276 Frank Points, 620 South Sixth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3077 Johon W. (William) Proctormond, 103 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
2056 Jonas (Jones) Harrison Reeder, 704 Shawnee, Kansas City, Kans.
1146 Robert Rivey (Rivers, Rivlrs), 103 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans. (103 Shawnee, Kansas City, Kans.)
2141 Caunto Rodigues (Canuto Rodigus, Rodignues), S. Valley and Railroad Yards, Kansas City, Kans.
294 Wm. John Sanders, 1201 South Mill Street, Kansas City, Kans.
804 Mark D. D. (Delyfatte) Scribuner (Mark Scribener), 713 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1815 Joe Shulwsky (Shulinsky), 526 South Sixth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2712 Paul E. (Ellsworth) Sick (Shick), 939 Miami Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
2089 William Le Roy Sickels (Sickles), 110 South Fifth Street, Kansas City, Kans. (710 South Fifth Street, Kansas City, Kans.).
41 Joe Smith, Hoisington, Kans. (702 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.).
1457 John Smith, Kansas City, Kans.
2676 William Smith (William Harry Smith), 910 South Mill Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1844 John Sneetoca (Snetoca, Snetoka, Snettoca), 748 Central Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
3744 William Sparks, Cypress and Fifth Avenue, Kansas City, Kans. (Texarkana, Ark.)
2642 Edwin L. C. (Leonard Charles) Spellman, 67 South Fifteenth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
1585 Steve Frank (Steve F.) Stackathis, 309 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
3810 Leo Stehmer (Stahmer), 1046 Argentine Boulevard, Kansas City, Kans.
1863 Nick Surtala, 547 Central Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
3501 Thomas Swain, 103 Kansas Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
53 Guy Wm. Taylor, 75 North Tenth Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2413 Ben (Benjamin) Turman, 629 South Seventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3791 Victor Vinish (Vinch, Vinsh), 29 South Park Avenue, Kansas City, Kans.
1093 Harry R. (Raymond) Williams, 546 South Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Kans.
3752 Willie Williams, 100 North Third Street, Kansas City, Kans.
534 John C. (Cahicey) Winn, 931 Riverview, Kansas City, Kans.
2479 Samuel Roscoe Rice, 608 South Park Street, Kansas City, Kans.
2382 Leonard Mason, 737 Park Avenue, Kansas City, Mo. (614 South Eighth Street, Kansas City, Kans.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SALINE, STATE OF KANSAS.

539 Charles Daniel Crawford, general delivery, Salina, Kans.
1936 Frank Crowley, R. R. 1, Salina, Kans.
1509 Frank J. Gravette (Gravett, general delivery, Le Suer, Minn.), 320 North Seventh Street, Salina, Kans.
1833 Albert E. Johnson, 252 North Ninth Street, Salina, Kans.
1638 James Edwards (James E.) Owens, 138½ W. (N) Santa Fe, Salina, Kans.
569 James Philio (James W. (Willie) Philio, Northumberland, Pa.), general delivery, Salina, Kans.
1351 Harry Lincoln Robison (H. L., H. L. Robinson), 639 North Third Street, Salina, Kans.
122 Jose Sanceda (Sancedes), 143 North Tenth Street, Salina, Kans.
1829 Walter Louis (L.) Sheppard, general delivery, Salina, Kans.
1407 Scottie Sutton, 217 North First, Salina, Kans.

619 John Wesley, North Santa Fe, Salina, Kans.
142 Louis Floyd Wicker, Falun, Kans.
401 George Wilson, Route 1, Salina County, Kans.
567 Frank Ellis Murphy, 148½ North Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kans.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF ALLEN, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1183 George (Geo.) Addie, Oakdale, La.
707 Sidney Addison, Oakdale, La.
927 Joseph Ahearn (Ahern), Emad, La.
1508 Will Alexander, Oberlin, La.
1236 Melford Alex, Moding, La.
2135 Charles (Chas.) Andrews, Emad, La.
410 Joe Andrews, Monroe, La.
1824 Flood Armster, Oakdale, La.
210 Arthur Bailey, Elizabeth, La.
1503 Jesse Baldwin, Oakdale, La. (Elizabeth, La.).
1752 Ed Ballard, Elizabeth, La.
1536 Christopher Banks, Elizabeth, La.
1006 Jule Bapiste (Batist) Oakdale, La.
1490 Richard Bates, Elizabeth, La.
1999 Lige Beaver (L. Beaver), Elizabeth, La.
1441 Lincoln Blankenship (Lincoln Blankenship, L. B. Blankenship), Oakdale, La.
798 Phil Blossom (Fil Blossom), Emad, La.
57 William (Willie) Boyd, Oakdale, La.
521 Charlie (Charley) Brister, Pawnee, La.
80–b George Brown, Oakdale, La.
104 James Brown, Oberlin, La.
280 Jack (Jake) Brown, Oakdale, La.
600 Jake (Jacob) Brown, Oakdale, La.
579 Ruffin Brown, Oakdale, La.
1237 Will Brown, Oakdale, La.
432 Fred Bullin, Pawnee, La.
1326 Bob Burke, Elizabeth, La.
983 Clarence Burke, Oakdale, La.
478 Junior (Junoir) Butler, Oakdale, La.
882 Nathan Burnett (Burnette), Le Blanc, La.
1546 Ed. Candy, Emad, La.
1679 Isaac Captain (Capptin), Kinder, La.
870½ Cornelius (Columbus) Carter, Oakdale, La.
1285 Sam Carter, Emad, La.
67 Charlie Ceasar (Ceaser), Kinder, La.
1728 Frank Chaney, Greensburg, La.
1133 Tom Chapman (Chatman), Emad, La.
415 Ed Charlton (E. D. Charlton), Elizabeth, La.
674 Henry Clifton, Elizabeth, La.
281 Richard I. Cockran (Cockrhan, Cockoham), Emad, La.
2195 Burn Codd (Cudd), Hampo, La.
95 Lim Coleman, Oakdale, La. (Lem Colman, Benson, La.).
2291 Marius Coleman, Kinder, La.
999 William Collins (Williams Collins), Elizabeth, La.
1613 James Comb, Elizabeth, La.
423 Mose Comper (Camper), Elizabeth, La.
378 David Congus, Hampo, La.
1461 Will Cottrell, Kinder, La.
241 Jesse Craig (Jessie Croy), Gliger, La. (Yelgar, La.).
2091 Edward G. Criswell (Griswell, Edward Grove Griswell, Edw. G. Griswell), Elizabeth, La.
43 Bishop Curtis, Oakdale, La.
736 Joe Cutwright, Elizabeth, La.
2204 Dan Davis, Moeling, La.
1782 Henry Davis, Oakdale, La.
1017 Leonard Davis, Opelousas, La.
1377 Rogers Dickerson, Elizabeth, La.
2122 Henry Dixon, Oakdale, La.
2253 Henry F. Douglas (Henry Frank Douglas), Reeves, La.
1287 Joe Duprey (Dupre), Opelousas, La.
498 William Farris, Oakdale, La.
1540 Will Edwards (Edword, Edward), Elizabeth, La.
129b Luke Faulker (Farquar, Farqnar), Elizabeth, La.
37 Oscar Fields, Emad, La.
458 Ed Franks, Oberlin, La.
2026 Joseph Frisco, Yealger, La. (Yelgar, La.).
1127 John Gillum (Gilliam), Oakdale, La.
2198 Babe Gipson, Emad, La.
1383 Chester Goudean, Oakdale, La.
1363 Emil (Emile) Green, Elizabeth, La.
546 Ollie Green, Oakdale, La.
1734 Dave Griffin, Elizabeth, La.
379 Will Griffin, Elizabeth, La.
1011 Ray (Roy) Hall, Oakdale, La.
1502 Jesse Hamilton, Oakdale, La.
1071 Perry (Pery) Hamilton, Oakdale, La.
1145 Joseph Handley, Ward, La.
1086 Luther Harper, Oakdale, La.
780 Birdie Harris, Emad, La.
1955 J. E. Harris (James E. Harris), Oakdale, La.
607 Lou Harris, Oakdale, La.
601 Marvin Harris, Oakdale, La.
2130 Willis (Willie) Harris, Oakdale, La.
170 James Hayes (Jim Hays), Woodville, La.
1126 Gus Hempstead, Oakdale, La.
2265 Clarence Henderson, Elizabeth, La.
1157 James Henderson, Oberlin, La.
846 John Henderson, Moeling, La.
474 Dan Henry, Washington, La.
1489 Dan Hollius (Hollin), Hampo, La.
628 Clinton Holmes, Oakdale, La. (Powhatan, La.)
1065 Marion Holmes, Oakdale, La.
1791 Isaac (Issac) Howard, Oakdale, La.
2022 Ed. Jackson (Jockson), Oakdale, La.
493 Scott Jackson, Oakdale, La. (Gainesville (Gamesville), La.).
274 Anderson Jasper, Oakdale, La.
1066 George (Geo.) Jefferson, Oakdale, La.
1387 Arthur Johnson, Elizabeth, La.
2032 John Johnson, Emad, La.
756 John W. (Jno. W.) Johnson, Emad, La.
1500 Will Johnson, Reeves, La.
2087 Will Johnson, Elizabeth, La.
2214 Ed. Jones, Oakdale, La.
1811 Frank Jones, Oakdale, La.
2310 Henry Jones, Yelgar, La.
1153 John H. Jones (John Jones), Oakdale, La.
1545 Will Jones, Colfax, La.
164 Willie L. Jones, Oakdale, La.
985 Enoch Killingsworth (Killingworth, Killinguth), Remis (Renus), La.
398 Charlie King, Oakdale, La.
1815 Gustave Lang (Lange, Gustove Lange), Word (Ward), Ga.
1234 Arno Lange, Ward, La.
1251 Tom Lawson (Lawsom), Oakdale, La.
1141 Eugene Albert Lee, Oakdale, La.
813 Nathan Leo, Alexandria, La. (Nathen, Oakdale, La.).
2312 John L. Leonard, Elizabeth, La.
826 Geo. (George) Lett, Guy, La.
1101 Gilbert Lewis, Mockling, La.
128 John Lewis, Oakdale.
171 Mack McCoy, Elizabeth, La.
1538 Thomas McCray (McCroy), Oakdale, La.
183 Henry Lee McDaniel (Henry McDaniel), Oakdale, La.
1650 Angus McDonald (Agust McDonald), Oakdale, La.
1223 Lee McHenry, Oakdale, La.
1891 Sam McNeal, Yelgar, La. (Yealger, La.).
225 John Mallet (Mallett), Kinder, La.
1934 Curet Maylasie, Oakdale, La.
988 John Miles, Guy, La.
1564 Frank Simon S. (Frank Simeon S., Frank Simon Samuel) Miller, Reeves, La.
2308 John Milton, Elizabeth, La.
211 Will Montgomery, Oakdale, La.
1853 Robert Moore, Oakdale, La.
2257 Gilbert Morgan, Oakdale, La.
1874 John Thomas Murphy, Oakdale, La.
1081 Joseph M. (John M.) Murray, Oakdale, La.
931 Willie Myers (Myres), Oakdale, La.
1606 State (Slode) Nettles, Emad, La.
206 Jack Newton, Elizabeth, La.
2248 Albert Norris, Oakdale, La.
945 Adam Overby (Overly), Oakdale, La.
902 Ray (Roy) Parker, Ward, La.
1149 Willie Patterson, Elizabeth, La.
1674 James E. (James) Penix, Oakdale, La.
408 Johnnie Perry, Reeves, La.
1988 Will Perry, Oakdale, La.
1885 Lang Phillips, Oakdale, La.
1789 Willie Pickens, Oakdale, La.
1799 John Pittman, Oberlin, La.
1727 Andrew Powell, Elizabeth, La.
1245 Robert Powell, Elizabeth, La.
1474 Sam Powers, Oakdale, La.
1464 Frank Poydras (Paydress), Reeves, La.
476 Ed Poydrass (Poydross), Reeves, La.
82 Abram Price, Oakdale, La.
1617 J. Gould (Jay Gould) Randle, Elizabeth, La.
1213 Nathaniel Ranson (Ransom), Oakdale, La.
1525 Garfield Relleford, Emad, La.
301 Alex Rose, Emad, La.
2240 Ed. (Edd) Russell, Oakdale, La.
2 Robert M. (Robert Middleton) Satcher, Elizabeth, La. (Satcher, Robert M., Beaumont, Tex.).
1772 Frank Scott, Garland, La.
691 James B. Shelton, Oakdale, La.
1318 James Sils (Siles), Oakdale, La.
827 John L. (John Lee) Simmons, Emad, La.
2066 Charley (Charlie) Simpson, Oakdale, La.
816 Joe Sims, Oakdale, La.
1276 Eddie (E.) Smith, Emad, La.
920 Henry Smith, Remis, La. (Renns.)
9 Jim Smith, Elizabeth, La.
1668 Sam Smith, Yealger (Yelgar), La.
522 Sam Smith, Emad, La.
1472 Will Smith, Baton Rouge, La.
2234 A. L. Swiney (Swinney), Hampo, La.
105 Lawrence Taylor, Oakdale, La.
91 Robert Taylor, Guy, La.
1345 John Thomas, Emad, La.
1421 Sam Thomas, Pawnee, La.
683 Wiley Thomas, Oakdale, La.
73 Alex Thompson, Le Compte, La.
948 George Thompson (Thomson), Pawnee, La.
1890 George Turner, Oakdale, La.
2211 Arthur Valerie, Yelgar, La. (Yealgar, La.)
587 Henry Vann (Vau), Elizabeth, La.
842 Clarence Viree (Virrr), Emad, La.
1720 A. B. Walker, Oakdale, La.
679 Alex Ward (Alex Word), Oakdale, La.
622 Sam Ward (Moore), Pawnee, La.
874 Louis Warr, Elizabeth, La.
446 George (Geo.) Washington, Jackson, Miss. (Reeves, La.).
1997 James Washington, Guy, La.
837 Jos. (Joe) Washington, Oakdale, La.
561 Regnell White, Oakdale, La.
2150 Ed. Williams, Oakdale, La.
465 Erwin (Ervin) Williams, Ten Mile, La.
2140 Jerry W. (Jerry Willie) Williams, Kinder, La.
724 Joe Williams (J. O. Williams, Joe Williams), Oberlin, La.
1091 Louis Williams, Kinder, La.
2086 Nathan Williams, Emad, La.
1692 Wallace Williams, Elizabeth, La.
2188 Jack Wilson, Guy, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF EAST BATON ROUGE, BATON ROUGE CITY, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

3035 Charley Alexander, 3038 America, Baton Rouge, La.
1358 Nelson Ambeau, 140 Hickey Street, Baton Rouge, La. (Nelson Ambrose, care of Ala. Power Co., Parrish, Ala.).
1766 Willie Anders, Bartville, Ala.
1703 Dan Angrum, Baton Rouge, La. (Decatur, Baton Rouge, La.).
2292 Frank Bernard, Lansing, Mich.
2057 Jim Beverly, Slaughter, La.
1006 Isadore Black, R. F. D. No. 3, Baton Rouge, La.
3200 Jordan Branch (1415 Gracy Street, Baton Rouge, La. (815 Persimmon Street, Baton Rouge, La.).
544 Louis Brown, Brick Yard Alley, Baton Rouge, La. (near brick yard, care of B. R. Coal & Towing Co., Baton Rouge, La.).
29 Randolph Carter, No. Blvd. & Bonnecase Street, Baton Rouge, La. (Rudolph Carter, Bonnecose Street, Baton Rouge, La.).
2417 Eugene Causey, 349 Liberty Street, Baton Rouge, La.

1154 San Celestin (Sam Celestin), 235 Olivia Street, Baton Rouge, La.
1082 Will Charles, 1731 Convention Street, Baton Rouge, La.
3203 Eugene Davis, South Royal Street, Baton Rouge, La.
1645 Harry Davis, North Baton Rouge, La.
2173 Jesse Davis, Baton Rouge, La. (Jessie Davis, Baton Rouge, La.).
1737½ John Davis, 702 S. Blvd. Street, Baton Rouge, La.
965 Richard Davis, Tucker, La.
1513 James Harry Deal, Route 1, Baton Rouge, La. (R. F. D. No. 1, Baton Rouge, La.
2994 Jerry Duncan, 802 Florida Street, Baton Rouge, La. (820 Florida Street, Baton Rouge, La.).
31 Arthur Fields, Baton Rouge, La.
1650 John Foster, Slaughter, La.
1695 Fred Freeman, Baton Rouge, La.
3407 Louis Germany, 1617 North Boulevard, Baton Rouge, La.
1357½ John Gojidis (John Goidis), Montrel, N. J.
975 Jimmie Hart, R. F. D. No. 1, Baton Rouge, La.
2230 Jno. Heslop, Route No. 1, Baton Rouge, La. (John Heslop, General Delivery, Montgomery, Ala.).
3697 Ed Hicks, R. F. D. No. 1, Baton Rouge, La.
3300 Henry Lewis Hill (Henry Louis Hill), R. F. D. No. 2, Baton Rouge, La.
1281 Dave Jackson (Done Jackson), Bridge Alley, Baton Rouge, La.
1583 James Jackson, Bond, La.
2898 W. H. Jackson, Baton Rouge, La. (Baton Rouge, La., care of M. R. Reed).
3003 Will Jackson, Baker, La.
1264 Jordon Johnson, Baton Rouge, La.
2475 Escoe Jones, 741 St. James Street, Baton Rouge, La.
3425 Jerry William Jordon, Route No. 3, Baton Rouge, La.
249 Cleveland Kelly, 1331 Gayosa Street, Baton Rouge, La. (St. Louis & Iron Mountain Railroad, Alexandria, La.).
2555 Allen Konner, Baton Rouge, La.
2637 George Kirby, General Delivery, Baton Rouge, La.
1404 Willie Lee, R. F. D. No. 1, Baton Rouge, La. (R. F. D. No. 1, care of Mrs. Julia Crumbolt, Scotland, La.).
50 Johnie Lyons, Route No. 4, Baton Rouge, La.
1230 Joe Montgomery, 904 Frisco Street, Baton Rouge, La.
1623 Thomas Moore, Baton Rouge, La.
1461 Henry Nelson, 933 St. Charles Alley, Baton Rouge, La.
2211 Larry Perry, 134 Third Street, Baton Rouge, La.
2196½ Henry Peterson, 216 South Boulevard, Baton Rouge, La.
2839 Walter Poole, 119 Red Stick, Baton Rouge, La.
1756 Adam Preston, 110 13th, Baton Rouge, La.
2799 Eddie Ratliff, Baton Rouge, La.
313 Johny Reason (Johnny Reason), Burtville, La.
1125 Frank Ross, Arbroth, La.
3659 Bernard Roy, jr., 819 Costello Street, Baton Rouge, La.
3272 Herman Schwager, 1325 R. R. Avenue, Baton Rouge, La.
2861 Sonny Small (Lonny Small), Natchez, Baton Rouge, La.
3014 Jet Snowden, 806 Fannie Street, Baton Rouge, La.
175 Alference Spears, 515 Main Street, Baton Rouge, La.
534 Charles Andrew Spencer (C. A. Spencer), 323 Lafayette Street, Baton Rouge, Ala.
414 John Sullivan, Baton Rouge, La., care Section Man, Monroe City, Wis.
2689 Carl Burll Swan (Carl Barl Swan), R. F. D., Fort Worth, Tex.
2120 Early Taylor, Irene, La.
259 Ed. Thomas, 1120 Africa, Baton Rouge, La. (1128 Africa, Baton Rouge, La.)
1107 Henry Thomas, 809 Railroad Street, Baton Rouge, La.
3078 John Thomas, R. F. D. No. 3, Baton Rouge, Va.
2163 Prince Washby, Amite County, Miss. (Smithdale, Miss.)
1260 Jefferson Washington, Baton Rouge, La.
162 Jeremiah Washington, Freyoux Bottom, Baton Rouge, La.
3282 Charlie Watson, North Baton Rouge.
2809 Louis Watson, St. Joseph Street, Baton Rouge, La.
2072 Jeff White, R. F. D. No. 1, Baton Rouge, La.
1737 Albert Williams, 723 Brick Yd. Alley, Baton Rouge, La.
3060 Arthur Williams, 6 Ward (1635 Convention), Baton Rouge, La.
2857 Dove Williams, Baker, La. (Box 22, La.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF EVANGELINE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

673 Joseph Adam (Adams), Ville Platte, La.
366 Cleveland Anderson, Meridian, La.
421 Robert Bengmon, Scotland, Ala.
844 Jonas W. Brown, Biloxi, Miss.
1333 Leopolon Brown, Biloxi, Miss.
1968 Emile Commeaux (Comeaux Comeau), Ville Platte, La.
741 John (Jake) Davis, St. Landry, La.
724 Sylvester Elliot, Pawnee, La.
891½ Albert Polica (P.), Fontenot, Reddell, La.
1719 Arteon Fontenot, Ville Platte, La.
1162 Durand Fontenot, Chataignier, La.
451 George Frith, Meridian, La.
610 Will Glover, St. Landry, La.
1022 Tom Grave, Pine Prairie, La.
1943 Joe Harrison, Meridian, La.
1390 Robert Hawkins, Meridian, La.
1290 Oral (Orel) Henderson, Chataignier, La.
1348 Charles J. Jones, Meridian, La.
695 Armand Lafleur, Plaisance, La. (Ville Platte, La.)
1016 Cleveland Lewis, State Line, Miss.
571 Felix Matt, Basile, La.
286 Herbert Perry, Meridian, La.
1891 Sam Phillips (Philips), Kentwood, La.
546 James Quinley, Turkey Creek, La.
991 Alex Robertson, Turkey Creek, La.
1522 Will Robertson, Turkey Creek, La.
1716 Jules (Jule) Soileau, Mamou, La.
968 Adeol Thomas, Ville Platte, La.
664 Damon (Damond) Thomas, Ville Platte, La.
1299 Prosper Thomas, Ville Platte, La.
1728 Robert Thomas, Meridian, La.
981 Willis (Willies) Thomas, Mamou, La.
511 Will Thompson, Meridian, La.
441 Joseph Washington, Basile, La.
1215 Douglas White, Meridian, La.
1477 William White, St. Landry, La. (Eunice, La.).
404 John Young, Covington, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF FRANKLIN, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1202 Jesse (Jessie) Alexander, R. F. D., Delhi, La.
1251 Wilburn (Wilbure) Babcock, Crowville, La.
951 Bluitt (Bluett) Bailey, Winnsboro, La.
500 Wm. Baker, Wisner, La.
1759 Wm. Bell, Crowville, La.
732 Jonas Brown, Delhi, La.
1039 Charlie Carloss, Winnsboro, La.
1638 Robert. A. Chillings (Robt. Allison Chillings, R. A. Chillings), Franklin, La.
1451 Henry Cooper, Gilbert, La.
1224 George Fields, Winnsboro, La.
1209 Governor Foster (Garuner Foster, Garaener Foster), Wisner, La.
908 F. Silas Franklin (Silas Franklin), Wisner, La.
1768 Poter (Porter) Graham, Natchitoches, La.
1133 H. Harlington (Hiller Harrington), Gilbert, La.
987 Henry Jones, R. F. D. 1, Winnsboro, La.
1116 Hezekiah Jone, Aubrey, Ark. (Winnsboro, La.)
1178 Watson Lawrence (Laurence), Delhi, La.
1117 A. G. Madden, Winnsboro, La.
1560 Bill Madden, Winnsboro, La.
1484 Daniel C. Martin (Daniel Clarence Martin, D. C. Martin), Gilbert, La.
315 Jesse B. Martin, Crowville, La., (Jesse Bonnie Martin, care J. F. Williamson, Crowville, La.)
1698 Bill (Bus) May, Delhi, La.
1024 Dave Morris (Norris), Baskin, La.
1302 Felm Mullen (Flem Mullen), Winnsboro, La.
1615 Fredlin Oir (Fredlen Oir), R. F. D. 2, Winnsboro, La.
1723 John Phillips, Winnsboro, La.
1770 Charlie Pitts, Wisner, La.
703 Meredith Rials, Winnsboro, La.
996 Dee Lee Robinson (Lee Robinson), Winnsboro, La.
1640 Ephraim Rollins (Robinson), Crowville, La.
1562 Isaac Solomon, Prentiss, Miss., (Isac, Chase, La.)
898 Leo C. (Lea, Lee) Wallace, Winnsboro, La.
111 Tom Walls, Amori, Miss., (Thomas Wale, Barkin, La.)
96 Leander Williams (Leonida Williams), Chase, La.
1613 Mose Williams, Crowville, La.
583 Henry Wilson, Eisner, La.
32 Mack Wilson, Baskin, La., (Mock, care Baskin Lumber Company, Baskin, La.)
146 Sam Wilson, Winnsboro, La. (Sam Wilson, jr., Wisner, La.).
901 Theofield (Theoppile) Alex, Olivir, La.
1235 Oscar Barthceckham (A. B. Beckham), Olivier, La.
1481 Charles (Charley) Bass, New Iberia, La.
46 Ross Bell, Boyou Goula, La. (care Weeks Salt Co., Weeks, La.).
881 Fanget (Fareget, Fangel), Darisent, Jeanerette, La.
884 Junius Davis, New Iberia, La. (care J. R. Colley, Hoffman, Tex.).
1952 Peter Declouet, Loreauville, La.
2022 William Dorsey, 531 Jane, New Iberia, La.
575 Sincire (Sincere) Francis, Field, New Iberia, La.
1611 Hilary, Huthson, 741 Madison, New Iberia, La.
1689 Robert Johnson, 406 Field Street, New Iberia, La. (Eunice, La.).
1497 Louis San, Jeanerette, La.
478 Oneil (O'Neil) Simon, Jeanerette, La.
1603 Samuel Simon, Jane Street, New Iberia, La.
328 Anthony Tillman (Tilman, Gilman), New Iberia, La.
1945 Alfred Ward, Jeanerette, La.
2026 Henry Washington, Jeanerette, La.
2159 Barcey (Borsey, Barsey) Williams, LaFayette, New Iberia, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF IBERVILLE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1481 Junius (Junious) Alexander, Sunshine post office, La.
1416 Louis Ambrose, jr., Plaquemine, La.
987 Edw. Anderson, Plaquemine, La.
1083 Harry Anderson, Whitecastle, La.
1908 John Anderson, Sunshine, La. (Plaquemine, La.)
1862 Pink Bradford, Plaquemine, La.
1318 Isaac Bridgewater, Plaquemine, La.
279 James Brockman, Maringouin, La.
382 Charles Brown, Whitecastle, La. (Bayou Goula, La.)
1306 Johnnie (Johny) Brown, Plaquemine, La.
451 Joseph Brown, Plaquemine, La.
1113 Charley (Charlie) Cezar, Grosse Tete, La.
19 Richard Clark, route No. 2, Plaquemine, La. (Plaquemine, La.)
1209 Patton Cockley (Cokley, Cokly), Sunshine, La., care Geo. Cousins, Marrero, La.
1046 Pearlington Cox (Perlington F. Cox), Plaquemine, La.
1325 Edward Cross (Gross), Plaquemine, La.
1521 Jos. Crossing, Grosse Tete, La.
501 Harry De Cree (Decree), Plaquemine, La.
569 Chas. Ellis, Plaquemine, La.
207 Sidney Ennis, Plaquemine, La.
1911 Allen Foster, jr., Whitecastle, La.
1418 Walter Foster, Plaquemine, La.
634 Hosea (Hosey) Franklin, Plaquemine, La.
154 Spencer Franklin, Rosedale, La.
560 Louis Grant, Grosse Tete, La.
1771 Richard Griffin (Greffin), Grosse Tete, La.
1901 J. C. Habinger, Central Hotel, Plaquemine, La. (John Calhoun Habinger, Plaquemine, La.)
381 Calvin Harris, Bayou Goula, La.
1220 Chas. (Charley) Harris, Plaquemine, La.
1791 Wilson Henderson, Sunshine, La.
9 Richard Jenkins, Seminary, Plaquemine, La.
126 Joseph John, route No. 2, box 58, New Iberia, La. (Joseph Joes, Plaquemine, La.)
1288 Thomas Johnson, Grosse Tete, La.
1572 Varice Johnson, Plaquemine, La.
571 Andrew Jones, Plaquemine, La.
1920 Bud Jones, Plaquemine, La.
964 Richard Jones, Plaquemine, La.
805 Willie Lee, Bayou Goula, La.
1315 Allen Lessenberry, Plaquemine, La.
193 Henry Lewis, Dorceyville, La.
1373 Ralph Lewis, Whitecastle, La. (Dorseyville, La.)
608 Samuel Locks, Grosse Tete, La.
16 James Lodge, St. Gabriel, La.
1518 James Mack, Plaquemine, La.
99 Ernest Martin, Plaquemine, La.
1440 Joseph Martin, Plaquemine, La.
965 Jules Mitchell, Bayou Goula, La.
1444 Chas. Isaih (Isaiah) Mongie, route No. 2, Plaquemine, La.
2127 Ernest Morgan, St. Gabriel, La.
1466 Anthony Nicholas, Dorseyville, La.
1855 Geo. Washington Parker, Plaquemine, La.
995 Wallace Patterson, Plaquemine, La.
1345 Hilton Perry, Grosse Tete, La.

241 Jerry Powers, Plaquemine, La.
204 Henry Revish, Plaquemine, La.
413 Kenneth Richardson, Plaquemine, La.
700 Freddie Robertson, Rosedale, La.
601 Guss (Gus) Ross, Plaquemine, La.
606 Louis Walker (Wallace), Plaquemine, La.
1810 Frank Sheppard, Plaquemine, La. (Maringouin, La.).
50 Hayes Smith, Plaquemine, La.
273 Sam Smith, Plaquemine, La.
Willie Smith, Whitecastle, La.
1310 Chas. Stewart, Plaquemine, La.
1412 Sam Stocks (Stock), Plaquemine, La.
596 Gabriel Tally, Plaquemine, La.
2079 Charley Taylor, Main Street, Plaquemine, La.
130 Willie Taylor, Plaquemine, La.
1715 Willie Elliot Thomas, Plaquemine, La.
870 Louis Thompson, Plaquemine, La.
185 Phil Travers, Plaquemine, La.
1038 Adrianus Gerardus Von Osterhaut (A. Von Oosterhaut, Adrianus G. Von Oosterhaut), Plaquemine, La.
1427 Fred Wakefield, Whitecastle, La.
144 Ulisse Watty (Uless), Plaquemine, La.
2100 Alfred White, Bayou Goula, La.
582 Annanias Williams, Plaquemine, La.
306 Charlie (Charley, Charely) Williams, Plaquemine, La. (Evergreen Plantation, Plaquemine, La.).
1212 Elijah (Eligher) Williams, Plaquemine, La.
281 Jessie Williams, Grosse Tete, La.
1331 Charley Witherspoon, Plaquemine, La.
270 Archie Young, Plaquemine, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF LAFAYETTE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1829 Jonnie Brooks, Lafayette, La.
1143 Joe Broussard, Lafayette, La.
1588 Theogene Castille, Lafayette, La.
558 Walter Charles, Scott, La.
1909 Remie Demouchet, Broussard, La.
2324 Moses Gallien, Lafayette, La.
991 Louis Guidry, Lafayette, La.
1458 Oscar Harrison, Lafayette, La.
376 Willis Harson, Lafayette, La.
2279 Robert Hebert (Herbert), R. F. D. 3, Lafayette, La.
48 Ernest Henry, Youngsville, La.
2055 Douglas Higgins, Lafayette, La.
1223 Geo. Hilaire, R. F. D., 2, Lafayette, La.
1049 Augustin Hypolite, Broussard, La.
2053 Lucien John, Near Lafayette, La.
160 Clarence McCane, Lafayette, La.
2104 Whitney Mouton, 129 Taylor Street, Lafayette, La.
1551 Lee Nelson, Broussard, Lafayette, La.
1338 Gus Perry, 204 Fifth Street, Lafayette, La.
2466 Paul Smith, 802 Third Street, Lafayette, La.
1522 Adelma Sonnier, Lafayette, La.
1004 Jno. Auguste Walters (John A. Walter, John August Walter), Lafayette, La.
1379 Eugene Washington, R. F. D., 1, Lafayette, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF MOREHOUSE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

529 Louis Anderson, Mer Rouge, La. (Bastrop, La.).
117 Collie Averitt (Colly Averitte), Mer Rouge, La.
1157 Colvin Baily (Colvin Bailey), Oak Ridge, La.
428 Willie Baly (Willie Baley), Collins, La.
377 Elijah Brownfield, Bastrop, La.
1169 Guy Coats (Guy Coates), Parkdale, Ark.
205 John Davenport, Mer Rouge, La. (Bastrop, La.).
1243 Brandon Dixon (Brandon Dickson), Collins, La.
1384 Richard Dorsey, Oak Ridge, La.
1564 Lige Foster, Bastrop, La.
903 Arthur Furlow (Arthur Furlough), White, Ark.
1226 John Garrison, Oak Ridge, La.
723 Bob Gibbs (Rob't Gibbs), Mangal, La.
1171 Jas. N. Hamilton (James N. Hamilton), route No. 8, Bastrop, La.
1545 Emmett Hansey, Oak Ridge, La.
1451 Haywood Harris, Bastrop, Ga.
1435 Morgan Hodge, Mer Rouge, La.
1241 Will Holmes, Mer Rouge, La.
714 General Jackson, route No. 3, Bastrop, La. (Oak Ridge, La.).
1231 Willie Jackson, Collins, La.
239 John James, Bastrop, La.
1515 Albert Johnson, R. F. D. No. 1, Gallion, La.
1478 Earle Jones (Earl Jones), Bonita, La.
1261 Jack Jones, Doss, La.
1379 Sy Jones, Mer Rouge, La. (Bastrop, La.).
824 James Jordan, Argunta, Ark.
1218 Jonas Knox, Gallion, La.
1250 Charley Lee, Newellton, La.
547 Henry Lewis, Jones, La.
1519 Robert Lindsey, Collinston, La.
809 George McLauren, Oak Ridge, La.
867 Book Mansfield, Bastrop, La.
462 Willie Moore, Bastrop, La. (Jones, La.).
1173 Oscar Morris, Bastrop, La.
47 Simmie Morris (Simmy Morris), Doss, La.
862 Ellis Moseley, Mer Rouge, La.
1329 Jim Mullen, Bastrop, La.
616 John Newman, Gallion, La.
52 Andrew Page, Collinston, La.
373 James Penny (James Peny), Jones, La.
827 George Randal (George Randel, Geo. Randle), Gallion, La.
1204 Joseph Ray, Oak Ridge, La.
1392 Nelson Richardson, route No. 3, Bastrop, La.
1406 Benj. Casel Robinson (Benjamin Casel Robinson, Benjamin Casel Robertson, B. C. Robertson), Eldorado, Ark.
388 Jesse Sanders (Jessie Sanders), Doss, La.
826 Alex Smith, Bastrop, La.
157 Jimmie Smith, Bastrop, La.
1063 Willie Smith, Jones, La.
812 Ural Spurlock, Jones, La.
730 Oliver Taylor, Mer Rouge, La.
392 Preacher Venerable, Mer Rouge, La.
1437 Robert Walker, Pine Bluff, Ark.
676 Booker Washington (Booker Hubert Washington), Oak Ridge, La.
1242 Tom Washington, Collinston, La.
810 Abe Williams, jr., Bastrop, La.
1367 George Williams (Geo. Williams), Mer Rouge, La.
655 Henry Williams, Mer Rouge, La.
789 Henry Williams, Mer Rouge, La. (Collinston, La.)
1312 Leonard Williams, Bastrop, La.
476 Reuben Williams, route No. 3, Bastrop, La.
1313 Will Williams, route No. 3, Bastrop, La.
1378 Louis Winston, Oak Ridge, La.
371 Robert Young, Jones, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF NATCHITOCHES, CITY OF NATCHITOCHES, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

2565 James Allen, Natchitoches, La.
2098 Frank Baker, Natchitoches, La.
447 Will Baskin, Baton Rouge, La. (Garmm, La.)
2846 Antoine J. Bond, Natchitoches, La.
1113 Clint Boyd, Natchitoches, R. F. D., La.
2589 J. A. Brantley (John Almon Brantley), Goldonna, La.
69 Monroe Chatman (Chapman), Campti, La.
1230 Dan Collins, Village Mills, Tex.
2396 Baronty Daniel, Longview, Tex.
2123 Alfred David (Alford Davis), Cypress, La.
2842 John David (Davis), Marthaville, La.
2947 Joseph M. (Nathen) Davis, Hagewood, La.
166 Basil Day, Flora, La.
1098 Edward Duberry, Victoria, La.
515 Mathild (Mathill) Duncan, Aloha, La.
938 Mack Dunn, Campti, La.
505 Olum Dyas, Natchitoches, La.
923 Joe Edey, Mora, La.
2424 Bert Ellis, Campti, La.
1009 Edward N. (E. N.) Finn, Campti, La.
249 Arthur Harris, Clarence, La.
2047 Joseph Hamilton, Shamrock, La.
1927 Jessie Hart, Montrose, La.
61 E. E. Heister (Hestis, E. Hesiter), Timon, La.
1671 Grady Hughen (Hugien), (Grady Hugient), Kisatchie, La.
315 Mitchel Gains (Gaines), Powhatan, La.
1507 D. C. Goins (Darins C. (Christopher) Goins), Natchitoches, La.
1744 Geo. Jackson, Zimmerman, La.
1388 Oscar James, Montrose, La.
1337 Elvy Johnson, Flora, La.
1532 Kerry Johnson (Kary Johnson, Carey Johnson), Victoria, La.
1498 Cleve Jones, Mora, La.
1636 David Jones, Natchitoches, La.
2439 John Jones, Mora, La.
1485 Lewis Jordan, Provencal, La.
749 Sefes Knott (Knot) (Lefro Knots), Mora, La.
1654 James Knowles, Castor, La.
2616 Shelton Lacy, Victoria, La.
2956 Junius Lewis, Cloutierville, La.
778 Sonny Lewis, Natchitoches, La.
822 James Liken, Powhatan, La.
1675 Shedrick (Shredick) Little, Shamrock, La.
1335 Dan Lyons, Victoria, La.
2918 John Davis McLean, Goldonna, La.
2217 Lewellyn McMillan, Victoria, La.
867 James McNeal, Goldonna, La.
985 Jim Marshall, Texarkana, Ark.
2597 Ed Martin, Victoria, La.
1324 Washington Mathews, Provencal, La.
1887 William Mathis, Powhatan, La.
902 James Matkin (James Ira Matkin), Gorum, La.
2603 Florentine (Floratin) Metoyer, Derry, La.
950 Richard P. Mezier (Porter Meziere), Campti, La.
1880 Lee Miller, Provencal, La.
378 Mack Miller, Melrose (Bermuda), La.
1924 James Nash, Natchitoches, La.
467 Mack Nash, Trichell, La.
1501 Bert Opdyke (Opeyke), Campti, La.
454 Nathan Perot, Campti, La.
662 John H. Polk (J. H. Polke), Vowells Mill, La.
2275 Earl N. Polke (Newton), Vowells Mill, La.
2277 Buford Pye, Luella, La.
1721 Eugene Rachal, Montrose, La.
2298 Otis Reese, Campti, La.
261b Henry Sanders, Robeline, La.
1648 Charles James (Charlie) Saser, Victoria, La.
847 Gus Severe (Sevare), Natchitoches, La.
2701 Dock Singleton, Marthaville, La.
2485 Ansy Smith, Mora, La.
1451 Lenord (Leonard) Smith, Natches, La.
1378 Mose Stephens (Stephen), Campti, La.
1506a Melbert (Milbert) Syas, Natchitoches, La.
2167 Charley (Charlie) Taylor, Derry, La.
2427 Gus Thomas, Natchitoches, La.
2006 David Washington, Natchitoches, La.
2085 James Watson, Montrose, La.
2150 Billy Williams, Campti, La.
2595 Frank Williams, Natchitoches, La.
386 Oswald Williams, Provencal, La.
2680 Ring (King) Williams, Campti, La.
3036 Willie Williams, Chopin, La.
603 Andrew Wilson, Cypress (Natchitoches), La.
2003 Frank D. Meziere, Campti, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 9, CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

129 Nick Aples, 1121 St. Mary Street, New Orleans, La.
105 T. Barker (Thos. Baker, Barker), 2520 Phillip Street, New Orleans, La.
1611 L. (Lucius) Bearnon, 1907 Josephine Street, New Orleans, La.
1029 Major Brown, 2337 Jackson Street, New Orleans, La. (2337 Jackson Street, New Orleans, La.)
965 C. E. (Clarence E., Clarence Elliot) Bruce, 1111 St. Mary Street, New Orleans, La.
301 Jim Cain (Carter), 2106 Jackson Avenue, New Orleans, La.
524 Samuel Colar, 2028 Felicity Street, New Orleans, La.
1993 E. P. Davis, 1025 St. Andrews Street, New Orleans, La. (Edward Paul Davis, 1404 Saratoga Street, New Orleans, La.).
2066 O. (Oscar) Davis, 2217 Josephine Street, New Orleans, La.

370 N. J. Denny (Nicholas Jacob, N. J. Denninger), 500 Felicity Street, New Orleans, La.
1043 J. Farrandino (Jerry Farendins, Ferendins, J. Ferendino), St. Andrews Street Landing, New Orleans, La.
556 John Fields, 2130 Philip, New Orleans, La.
328 Charles Foler (Toler), 2330 Jackson Avenue, New Orleans, La.
1826 Renzy Foucher (Ranze Faucher), 602 Soraparu Street, New Orleans, La.
268 George Gatlin (Gatlen), 620 St. Mary Street, New Orleans, La.
1248 M. Gauldin (Meurice Glandin, Glaudin), Canal and Franklin Streets, New Orleans, La. (2010 South Franklin Street, New Orleans, La.)
1276 H. Hamilton (Joseph Hamilton, J.), 1724 Felicity Street, New Orleans, La., care Moberly Cypress Co., Moberly, La.
2064 H. Harris (Arthur Harris), 2706 St. Andrew Street, New Orleans, La.
2057 H. (Matthew) Henderson, 2330 Jackson Avenue, New Orleans, La.
1969 V. (Victor) Jacobs, 2714 Josephine Street, New Orleans, La.
2023 L. (Larry) Jones, 705 St. Mary Street, New Orleans, La.
1827 Robert Lee, 715 St. Mary Street, New Orleans, La.
1699 Ed (Edward) Miller, 634 St. Andrew Street, New Orleans, La.
227 Halpin Nash, 2035 Felicity Street, m New Orleans, La. (2032 Felicity Street, m New Orleans, La.)
661 W. (Wilkinson, Wilkerson) Nelson, 2316 Jackson Avenue, New Orleans, La.
727 W. (William) Rainey, 2811 Philip Street, New Orleans, La.
155 Edward Ridley (Riddley), 2212 Jackson Street, New Orleans, La.
1712 Samuel Robinson, 2100 South Liberty Street, New Orleans, La.
1054 T. (Thompson) Robinson, 2323½ Jackson Avenue, New Orleans, La.
192 John Rowe, 2718 Jackson Street, New Orleans, La.
646 John (J.) Sanders, 1807 Baronne Street, New Orleans, La.
1660 R. J. Taylor, 1930 Camp Street, New Orleans, La. (Robert James Taylor, 1920 Camp Street, New Orleans, La.).
405 Charles Thompson, 2227 Dryades Street, New Orleans, La.
2069 L. (Louis) Tonin, 501 St. Andrew Street, New Orleans, La.
597 W. (William) Vallery, 2920 Philip, New Orleans, La.
1494 A. (Arthur) Youngblood, 2221 South Franklin Street, New Orleans, La. (2221 Dryades Street, New Orleans, La.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 13, CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

48 Jake Bauer (Jacob Bouer), 5817 Chestnut Street, New Orleans, La.
1157 Cornelius Brock, Lacroix Plantation, Plaquemine, La. (Cornilius Brock, 418 Eliza Street, New Orleans, La.).
3408 Arthur Brooks, Algiers Lower Coast, La. (New Orleans).
4176 Henry Brooks, Park (Avenue) and Walnut Street, New Orleans, La.
3998 Felix Brown, 632 Hidul Street, New Orleans, La.
3910 Willie Brown, 1314 Patterson Street, New Orleans, La.
4511 John Burke, Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.
1790 Cornelius L. Cosimere (Cornelius Louis Cosimere), 9 Audulon (Audubon) Place, New Orleans, La.
3587 Geo. (George) County, 1013 Brooklyn Avenue, Algiers, La.
3979 B. B. Davis, 453 Calhoun Street, New Orleans, La.
2885 Albert Eagland, 1427 Joseph Street, New Orleans, La.
1064 Oscar Edwards, 3103 Carrollton Avenue, New Orleans, La.
3176 Almont Eugene (Almon Eugene), U. S. Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.
1807 Leo Flood, 1335 Patterson Street, New Orleans, La.
1565 Arthur Fredericks, 114 Alunia (Clunia) Street, New Orleans, La. (Arthur Fredericks, 114 Elmira Street, Algiers, La.)
953 Albert Frelat, 1025 Patterson Street, New Orleans, La.
2579 Jose D. Garcia, 1510 Calhoun Street, New Orleans, La.
1333 Buddy Giles, 338 (3308) Carrollton Avenue, New Orleans, La.
1343 Felix Golf, 7324 Elm Street, New Orleans, La.
2361 Gustav B. Hansen, 17 Audubon Place, New Orleans, La. (Gustav Balle Hansen, 15 Audobon Blvd., New Orleans, La.).
3373 Geo. Harris (George Harris), 1980 Verette (Venette) Street, New Orleans, La.
4416 Robert W. Hartiens (Robert Watson Hartiens), 6025 Annunciation Street, New Orleans, La.
3436 Robert C. Hinton, 1225 Arabella (Anabella) Street, New Orleans, La.
2414 Chas. Johnson (Charles Johnson, Charley Johnson), 5502 Perrier Street, New Orleans, La.
504 Ed Johnson, 527 Walnut and Magazine Streets, New Orleans, La.
1133 Joseph Johnson, 7470 Plum Street, New Orleans, La. (7470 Ann Street, New Orleans, La.).
1296 Sam Johnson, 1314 Brooklyn Street, New Orleans, La.
2158 Gus Jones, 4417 Monroe Street, New Orleans, La.
3154 Harry J. Kegereis (Harry Joseph Kegeries, Kegereis), 539 Pacific Avenue, New Orleans, La.
3072 Freeman Lewis, 8601 Elm Street, New Orleans, La.
4282 Arthur Luke, 1117 Burdette Street, New Orleans, La.
2177 Stith (S.) McDonald, 554 Octavia Street, New Orleans, La.
2754 Chas. McKay, 3838 Carrollton Avenue, New Orleans, La. (Charles McKay, alias Dan Gray, 3838 Carlton Street, New Orleans, La.).
2188 Wm. (William) Martin, 8221 Maple Street, New Orleans, La.
3889 Edw. (Edward) Moore, 1331 Teche Street, New Orleans, La.
4292 Louis J. Morgan, 1311 Patterson Street, New Orleans, La. (Louis Joseph Morgan, 1137 Patterson Street, New Orleans, La.).
2801 John F. Murphy, Cairo, Ill. (John Francis Murphy, 215 Oliver Street, New Orleans, La.).
4097 Joseph Murphy, 962 Hy Clay Avenue, New Orleans, La.
2662 Knut P. (Paul) Odgren, Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.
3266 Edward Peters, 310 Atlantic Street, New Orleans, La.
154 Senovia Pierce, Pelican and Wagner Streets, Algiers, La. (Senovia Piere (Piece), Pelican, Wetcier and Wagner Streets, Algiers, New Orleans, La.).
2319 Daniel Reid (Daniel Reed), 7370 Burthe Street, New Orleans, La.
1657 Robert L. Reid (Robert Lenard Reid, Robert Leonard Reed), Marine Hospital, New Orleans, La.
2824 Carmelo R. Rey (Carmelo (Carneuo) Rodrigues Rey, 145 State Street, New Orleans, La.), 5926 Hurst Street, New Orleans, La.
2064 Frank J. Ricks, Orleans Parish, La.
3957 Eugine Sanders (Eugene Sanders), 201 Mississippi Street, New Orleans, La.
357 Jacob Sharp, 617 Homer Street, New Orleans, La.
1131 (Lewis) Louis Simons, 1403 Octavia Street, New Orleans, La.
1735 Alfred Stovall, 1114 Webster Street, Algiers, La.
1601 Ernest Tannehill (E Tannehill), Thayre Street, Algiers, La.
3661 Loyd Thomas (Lloyd Thomas), 925 Adams St., New Orleans, La.
2440 Harry Thompson, 8319 Burthe Street, New Orleans, La.
1559 John Walker, 7431 St. Charles Street, New Orleans, La.
3769 Joseph Walter, 3726 Carrollton Street, New Orleans, La.
3122 Emil Washington, Hagan Avenue, New Basin, New Orleans, La.
2753 Wm. Waters (William Walters), Leonidas & Colopesa Streets, New Orleans, La.
2185 Kelly Weber (Kelley Weber), 1371 Olive Street, New Orleans, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF POINTE COUPEE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

50 Ernest Andrews, Locour, La.
1325 Floyd Banks, Livonia, La.
1745 Clifton Benon (Bannon, Torbut, La.), Torbert, La.
677 Clarence (Clerance, Clarance) Bell, Anchor, La.
381 Isaac Bell (Belle), Torras, La.
1260 Richard Belser, Livonia, La.
845a James Pelton, Blanks, La. (Fordoche P. O., La.).
918 Isiah Bowler (Isaah Boler), Blanks, La.
938 Geo. Breuhear (George Beshears), Fordoche, La.
459 Alex (Aleck) Brown, Brooks, La.
1848 Henry Butler, Lettsworth, La.
1406 Jimmie Carroll, Fordoche, La.
256 Willie Carter, Livonia, La.
659 Ernest Clebert, Lakeland, La.
95 Edward Cress (Cross, Ed. Cross), Lottie, La.
1594 Arthur Cross, Grosse Tete, La.
821 Allen Davis, McCrea, La.
1582 Joe Davis, Red Cross, La.
1604 Zeno Davis, Cochis, La.
1219 York Denis (Denise, Davis), Lacour, La.
425 Alphonse Derozin, New Theads, La.
1569 Jack Franklin DeSall (Desall, Desal), Lakeland, La.
1754 Sam Earls, Navenswood, La. (1611 Tent Street, Alexandria, La.).
1024 Henry Franklin (Franklins, Lottie, La.) Valverda, La.
1075 James Gilliard (Gillard), Jamis, La.
1710 James Hall, Tonas, La.
1466 Will Handy, Torras Cemo, La.
580 Henry Harrell (Harrold), Anchor, La.
668 Johnson Harris, Red Cross.
1415 Solomon Hogan (Hogan), Tunis, La.
1404 James Jackson, Livonia, La.
896 Manse Jackson, Lottie, La.
1813 Allen Jefferson, Red Cross P. O., La.
1595 Wm. J. Jefferson, Fordoche, La.
612 Achille Johnson, Lottie, La.
1781 Alex Johnson, Blanks, La.
1800 Brown Jones, Batchelor, La. (Erwinville, La.).
834 Ernest Jones, Raccourci, La.
1753 Geo. Jones, Morganza, La.
195 Geo. Kelly (George, Geo. Kelley), Livonia, La. (Walter, Tex.).
1861 Walter Legarde (Legard), Innis, La.
867 Ivy Loor, 538 Garden Avenue, New Orleans, La.
1719 Fred Luker (Lueker), Torras, La.
1715 Zick (Zack) McGee (Maggie), Montgomery, Ala.
1198 Joe Manchester, Ventress, La. (Hermitage, La.).
1615 Alfred Martin, Brooks, La.
1344 Willie Martin, Fordoche, La.
893 William Mason, Livonia, La. (Legonier, La.).
1376 Berry Mays (Benny Mayers), Torras, La.
323 Willie Minifieux (Minnifeux, Minnifux), Livonia, La.
1442 Henry Mitchell (Mitchel), Bryon Sava, La.
1659 Thomas Neville (Naville, Thos. Neville), Port Barre, La.
795 Mose Parner (Palmer), Red Cross, La.
306 Dan Perkins, Erwinville, La.
1579 Walter Perkins, Brooks, La.
190 Albert Pilius (Albert Pielus, Arthur Pielus), Blanks, La.
750 Dave Porter, Blanks, La.
899 Willis Roads (Will Roads, Will Rhodes), Lottie, La.
1003 Wiley Robertson, Lakeland, La.
876 Isaac (Iseral) Rodgers, Oscar, La.
703 Joseph Simpson, Lottie, La.
1748 Chas. (Charles, Charlie) Smith, Blanks, La.
591 Milton Smith, Batchelor, La.
1716 Ed Taylor, Brooks, La. (Batchelor, La.).
904 Frank Taylor, Batchelor, La.
722 Elbert Thomas, Byron Current, La.
1526 Island Thomas, Livonia, La.
675 John Trumph, Apelousoi, La.
10 Dan Wade, Torras, La.
1581 Joe (Jos.) Washington, Lacour, La.
1648 Turner Webb, Quinton, La.
832 Jackson C. West (Jackson Cofield West, J. C. West), Blanks, La.
828 Joe Wiggins, Brooks, La.
962 Harry Wilcox, Morganza, La.
1009 Oliver Williams, Livonia, La.
1792 Rainey Williams, Livonia, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF RICHLAND, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1756 John (Jno.) Adams, Delhi, La.
844 Alfred Allen, Mangham, La. (Rayville, La.).
994 Riley Anderson, Mangham, La.
1291 Hallard Barton, Rayville, La.
172 Isaac Bearden (Biarden), Holly Ridge, La.
1613 Harry Bradley, Holly Ridge, La.
1748 Nell Brady, Holly Ridge, La.
1183 Sam Brown, Delhi, La.
1758 Brisco Butler, Holly Ridge, La.
35 Nathaniel Butler, Delhi, La.
1153 Anthony Byman (Bynum), Vicksburg, Shreveport & Pacific yard office, Monroe, La. (Girard, La.).
284 Lafayette Ernest Coats (Ernest Lafayette), Hattiesburg, Miss. (Mitchiner, La.).
639 Phil Cook, Fallidigger, Ala. (Holly Ridge, La.).
1117 Twilly Crotson (Crotean), Alto, La.
1184 Edward Dumas, Mangham, La.
966 Lawrence (Lawerence) Dunlap, Holly Ridge, La.
964 Ike Edwards, Rome, Ga.
961 George Elsey, West Grove, Ark.
193 Willie Green, Dunn, La.
671 Charley Hardly, Holly Ridge, La.

849 Judge Harris, Girard, La.
253 Robert Harris, Holly Ridge, La. (Girard, La.).
1592 Tom Harris, Holly Ridge, La.
329 John Hill, Girard, La.
600 Harris Hosey, Holly Ridge, La.
1456 Willie Howell (Willis Howell), New London, Ark.
1170 Bennie Jackson, Holly Ridge, La.
452 James Johnson, Holly Ridge, La.
426 Wardlaw (Wardlow) Jones, Bardell, La. (Rayville, La.).
495 Alex Logalza, Jonesburg; post office, Rayville, La.
1059 Jim Larkin, Holly Ridge, La.
164 Henry Lewis, Holly Ridge, La.
166 Tric Lipovac (Fric L. Porac, Piric Liperiac, Pirio Lipiriac), Lucknow, La.
208 Will McMurry, Holly Ridge, La.
931 Adie Madow, Rayville, La.
785 Charley Mason, jr. (Charles Mason, jr.), Dunn, La.
1657 Claude Means (Claud Means), Dunn, La.
947 Mack Miller (Mack Millian), Mangham, La.
672 Ernest Nash, Delhi, La. (Fort Logan H. Roots, Little Rock, Ark.).
400 Charles Pool, Crew Lake, La.
504 A! Pickens. Holly Ridge, La. (route 4, box 61, Edwards, Miss.).
509 Jack Roberts, Delhi, La.
782 Hezikiah Robinson (Hezekia Robinson), Holly Ridge, La.
891 Albert Ross, Holly Ridge, La.
690 Ruffin Scott, Mangham, La.
806 Jack Smith, Delhi, La.
1679 James Smith, Holly Ridge, La.
1377 Walter Smith, Holly Ridge, La.
149 Earnest Spencer, Alto, La.
1303 Bailum Straw, Holly Ridge, La.
1755 Lucius Taylor, Rayville, La.
1004 Henry Thomas, Holly Ridge, La.
750 James Thomas, Holly Ridge, La.
831 Leon Julian Thomas (Leon Julius Thomas), Lucknow, La.
885 Roy Thomas, Magham, La. (306 West Fourteenth Street, Argenta, Ark.)
1283 John Toderbrick (John Todobrik), Gerard, La.
516 Milan Totatovic (Milan Tatatovic), Lucknow, La.
438 Gabriel Washington (Gabe Washington), Delhi, La.
1107 Jake Welford, Harrisonburg, La.
1013 Robert Whittle, Rayville, La.
1609 John Wiggins, Holly Ridge, La.
1254 Eddie Williams, Alto, La.
1076 Johnnie Williams (John Williams), Holly Ridge, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF SABINE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

733 Scott Barnes, Fisher, La.
1142 Wm. (William) Bradford, Fisher, La.
1024 Erwin Brown, Tarp, La., (Ervin, Toys, La.)
264 Richard Brown, 609 Fosythe, Beaumont, Texas.
1797 Jno. Wm. (John William) Byrd, R. F. D. No. 3, Many, La.
1895 Louis Cameron, Coburn, La. (Lewis, Coburon).
1694 Lewis Wm. Cohen (Louis William Cohen), Coburn, La.
821 Jas. (James) Davis, Robeline, La.
474 Peter Douglas (Douglass), Fisher, La.
1925 Jno. Drane (Drave), Gandy, La.
1435 Jno. (John) Evans, Zwolle, La.
640 Henry Farris (Farres), Alexander, Ala.
252 Will Forbes, Fisher, La.
87 Jas. (James) Allen Fox, Noble, La.
1007 Frank Garner, Many, La.
1860 Albert Hamilton, Pleasent Hill, La.
833 S. Louis Henderson, Shreveport, La.
593 Jas. (James) Johnson, Gandy, La.
277 Charley Johnston, 805 Fannin, Shreveport, La.
532 Dennie Johnston, Rain, La. (Ragil, La.)
911 Benj. (Benjamin) Franklin Jones, Florien, La.
792 Cartrice (Catrice) Lynch, Robeline, La.
1186 Frank Maxie, Zwolle, La.
1790 Henry Montgomery, Coburn, La.
1472 Jake Owens, Horbeck, La.
36 Will Perkins, Farmerville, La.
343 Aaron Roiser (Roisser, Boisser), Gandy, La.
756 Ralph Scott, Pleasant Hill, La.
1877 Lonzo Simms, Aekins, La.
1937 Manuel Smith, 505 Clifornia, Oklahoma City, Okla.
1841 Arthur Spears, Hornbeck, La.
1521 Geo. Taylor, Gandy, La. (George, Zwolle, La.)
463 Jessie Thomas, Hornbeck, La.
483 Willis (Willie) Toombs (Tombs), Zwolle, La.
149 Charley (Charlie) Walker, Oak Dale, La.
112 Edward Whitten, Frison, La.
1846 Willie Dean Williams, 6th Texas Avenue, Port Arthur, Tex.
921 Jas. (James) Williamson, Windfield, La.
856 Ellis Willis, Carthage, Tex
1718 Jessie Jas. (James) Wood, Gandy, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, PARISH OF ST. LANDRY, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

664 Sullivan Albert (Alfert), Port Barre, La.
1570 Clovice (Clouise) Arville, Opelousas, La.
1234 Gus Atkinson, Port Barre, La.
809 Isaac Bass, Garland, La.
817 Edward Bell, Sugarland, Tex. (Washington, La.).
316 James Belton (Bilton), Eunice, La.
835 Walter Bernard (Berand), Opelousas, La.
152 George Albert Blood, Beggs (Washington), La.
628 Adam Bowden (Allen Bowdes, Adam Bouden, jr., Allen Bowden), Eunice, La.
623 George (Geo.) Brooks, Eunice, La.
96 Eraste Broussard (Edraste Brassard, Edraste Braseard), route No. 3, Church Point, La.
1202 Samuel Carroll (C.) Brown, Washington, La.
730 Wilbert Butler, Eunice, La.
1294 Wash Cameral (Comerel), Eunice, La.
278 Henry Charles, Port Barre, La.
1835 Oscar Cross, Krotz Springs, La.
1936 Edmond Dejean, Port Barre, La.
1589 Nathaniel Denton, R. F. D. 4, Opelousas, La.
805 Frank Dockins, Melville, La.
251 Robert Dunnigan (Dunigan), Port Barre, La.
1275 Benjamin Felix, Eunice, La.
107 Jimmie Florence, R. F. D. 2, Opelousas, La.
122 Murry Ford, Big Cane, La.
1101 Melton (Milton) Francoise (Franbois), near Lawtell (Lawtell), La.
112 William Greene (Green), Edgar, La.
1949 Andrew Gillory, Port Barre, La.
117 Arehien (Arolien, Orelien, Orelino) Gillory, route No. 3, Church Point, La.
129 Alex Hall, Big Cane, La.
202 James Hayes, Emad, La.
47 John Ilford (Ilfird), Barbreak (Barbreck), La.
528 Dave Johnson, Eunice, La. (Kirbyville, Tex.).
1499 John Johnson, Melville, La.
237 Henry (Hy) Jones, Joyce, La.
1634 Pat Jones, Morrow, La.
1629 Ottis Keller, Eunice, La.
1165 George Lang (Land), Eunice, La.
760 Alcee Lableau (LeBlanc, LeBleau), Eunice, La.
952 Simon Lee, Palmetto, La.
1860 Will Lewis, Eunice, La.
63 Gilbert Ledet, Cataro, La.
1338 Joseph Malbrue, Chataignier, La.
1879 Lest Marks, Bayou Current, La. (Bayou Kernt, La.).
957 John Mingo, R. F. D. No. 2, Opelousas, La.
29 Sam Mitchell, Eunice, La.
1730 John Baptiste (B., John Baptiste Newill) Newell, Port Barre, La.
1098 Onezeme Oliver, Church Point, La.
1911 Willie Parker, Big Cane, La.
1693 Willie (Will) Patterson, Eunice, La.
1947 William Pinkney, Port Barre, La.
402 Pinkens Pleasant, Roso, La. (Mansfield, La.).
821 Phire Poam (Pranc, Phranc), Church Point, La.
826 Marshall Reuben, Lebeau, La.
1443 Oscar Riddo (Rideau), Eunice, La.
191 Jeams (Geams) Robertson, Baton Rouge, La.
625 Sam Robinson, Eunice, La.
1270 Thomas L. Sasser, Eunice, La.
253 Robert Semien, No. 3, Church Point, La.
1461 Mathew (Matthews, Mathews) Shields, Palmetto, La.
1900 Erwin (Eurrvin) Simeon, Eunice, La.
1676 O'Neil Simeon (Oneal Simien, ONeil Simeon), Eunice, La.
1919 Joseph Soileau (Soilleau), Eunice, La.
1768 Austin Stephens (Auston Stephen), Cataro, La.
843 Norris (Maurice) Bruce Suiter, Melville, La.
65 Joseph Texano (Texeno), Gold Dust, La.
66 Joseph Thiery, jr. (Joseph Thiery), Washington, La.
548 Joseph Thomas, Washington, La.
1559 Willie Thomas, Washington, La.
517 Charlie Vallire (Charles Vallier), Church Point, La.
1819 Walter Washington, Palmetto, La.
657 Bentley (Bently) Williams, Washington, La.
540 Oscar Williams, P. O., Washington, La. (Port Barre, La.).
111 Lucien Willis (Wills), route No. 1, Opelousas, La.
510 Martin Trenton (T.) Wilson, Eunice, La.
1094 Grant Winfrey, Church Point, La.
46 Charlie (Chas.) Young, Lebeau, La. (Palmetto, La.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF TERREBONNE, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

201 John Allen, Donner, La.
1888 Alfred Anderson, Chacanoula, La.
2371 Joseph Biko (Joseph Biho), Houma, La.
352 Joseph Brunet (Joseph Bennett), Donner, La.
955 Walter Burrow (Walter Butnow), Ellendale post office, La.
864 Marcus Carbin (Marcus Corbin), Donner, La.
1994 Henderson Gibson, Ellendale post office, La.
1068 Robert Harris, Ellendale post office, La.
2134 Sam Harris, Houma post office, La.
1754 Lindsey Hawkins (Linsey Hawkins), Schriever, La.
1093 William Hawkins, Houma, La.
446 Charles Hines (Charles Himes, Charles Hinus), Schriever, La.
1535 Samuel Johnson, 923 Russell Street, Houma, La.
929 Tom Johnson, Donner, La.
2311 Eddie Madison, Ellendale post office, La., care O. D. Leach Hardwood Co., Lottie post office, La.
483 Jack Victor Maolowe (Jack Victor Mariowe, Jack Victor Marlow, Jack Martowe), 846 College Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.
914 Leon Masley (Leon Mosley), Shriever (Schriever), La.
2210 Freddie Moses (Freddie Mosis), Gray, La.
223a Beverly Roberts, Gibson, La.
133 Haywood Smith, Ashland Plant, Houma, La.
1831 Walter Smith, Donner, La. (Orange, Tex.)
1798 Joe Spencer, Houma, La.
621 Ealford Stokes, Donner, La.
1228 Jack Williams, Houma, La.
1243 Gus Winchester, Schriever, La.
790 Lawrence Young, Houma, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF UNION, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

1496 Albert L. Armstrong (Albert Leonard Armstrong), route No. 8, Farmerville, La.
412 Andrew Ford, Spencer, La.
1560 Charles (Charlie) Henry Ford, Junction City, Ark. (Junction, Ark.-La.)
1168 Elox Gipson (Gibson), Bernice, La.
676 Lillian Harris, Spencer, La.
1258 Augustus Jackson, Farmerville, La.
1276 Sterling Peter Jones (S. P. Jones), Downsville, La.
874 Allen Jordan, Spearsville, La.
664 Dan Moore, Paden, Okla. (Randolph, La.)
246 William Moore, Marion, La.
1463 William Moore, Marion, La.
27 Lee Pickett, Spencer, La.
1039 Walter Price (Brice), Farmerville, La.
1176 Willie Pylant, Bernice, La.
505 Joe Robinson, Marion, La.
1631 Halloway Melton Roseman (Halloway M. Roseman), Lillie, La.
1233 Wright Simon, El Dorado, Ark.
1313 Henry Walter Spigner (H. W. Spigner), Crossett, Ark.
28 Perry Trip, Spencer, La.
1411 Floyd Traylor, Warren, Ark.

1457 Robert Walker, Downsville, La. (Walnut Lane, La.)
734 Willis Watley, Bernice, La.
1636 Sheridan (Sherdan) White, Junction City, La. (Junction City, Ark.)
834 Robert William, Spencer, La.
1097 Oliver Wright, Marion, La.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE PARISH OF VERNON, STATE OF LOUISIANA.

217 George Avery, Marianna, Tex. (Forest Hill, La.).
787 Sanford Avery, Victoria, Tex. (Pickering, La.).
1097 Rule Banks, Alden Bridge, La. (Alma Dune, La.).
2106 Joseph Baptist, Cravens, La.
33 Mathie Barnes, Leesville, La.
1731 Joe Beard, Cravens, La.
465 Geo. (George) Boan, Leesville, La.
1241 Richard Bradford, Farwell, La.
1411 Lee Branch, Fullerton, La.
1028 Harry Brewer, Fairview, La.
1318 Tom Briggs, Lake Charles, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1828 Artice Lee Brown, Neame, La.
757 James B. (Benie) Brown, Cravens, La.
1015 Leonius Brown, 2021 Shreveport, La.
1307 Junior Burnett, Cravens, La.
1094 Albert Burney, Fullerton, La.
1140 Arthur Bush, Plaquemine, La.
990 John Wm. (J. W.) Cole, Fullerton, La.
1043 Dan Collins, Bond, Miss. (1940 Washington Street, Gary, Ind.).
42 Washington Cook, Fullerton, La.
1849 J. A. Cowen (Cowan), Eaden, Ala. (Monroe, La.).
1606 Tom Cross, Leesville, La. (Cora, La.).
1487 Fisher Daniels, Cravens, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1615 Will Davis, Leesville, La.
1166 Wm. (William) Henry Davis (William H. Davis), Bellview, La.
171 Gaston Decotie, Chenevville, La.
1439 Harvey Eatson (Easton), Cravens, La.
521 Henry Edwards (Edward), Farewell, La.
660 Sam Edwards, Winnifield, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1177 Will Elmore, Bryan, Tex.
378 Carry (Carroy) Fobbs, Pickering, La.
2061 Henry (Hy) Fountain, Eddiceton, Miss.
500 Joe Francis, Farewell, La.
650 Johnny (Johnnie) Gallaspie, Leesville, La. (Vivion, La.).
1826 Chas. Gandy, Fullerton, La.
1726 Ed Graham, Cora, La. (Leander, La.).
257 Cleveland Grant, Meadville, Miss. (Fullerton, La.).
2291 John Griffin, De Ridder, La.
1901 Reese Guy, Leesville, La.
1912 Chas. (Charles) Manuel (Chas. M.) Hackett, Fullerton, La.
956 George Hall, Cravens, La.
93 Richard Harris, Farwell, La.
16 Jesse Henderson, Farmerville, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1375 Wm. Phillip Herman (William Phillip Herman, William P. Hermann, William Phillips Hermann), 772 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo. (Thirty-third Avenue, Twenty-eighth Street, Meridian, Miss.)
1392 Frank Hersey (F. Hensley), Vicksburg, Miss.
417 George Houston, Neame, La. (Merryville, La.)
314 Lawrence Hunt, Barham, La.
162 Perry (Percy) Hunter, Fullerton, La. (Forrest, Miss.)
124 Vee Jenkins, Bleakwood, Tex. (Fullerton, La.)
1155 Chas. J. Johnson, Fullerton, La.
2220 Henry Johnson, Fullerton, La.
1092 Neil Johnson, Pickering, La.
2379 Pauly Johnson, Oakdale, La.
158 William Johnson, Cravens, La.
2050 Ed Jones, Fullerton, La.
1728 Henry Jones, Cravens, La.
1890 Will Jordan, Leesville, La.
251 Eucebe H. Josa (Eucebio Hino Joso, Eucebia Hinojosa, Eucebi H. Josa), Grat, Trevino, N. L., Barham, La.
1518 Richard Keelan, Summerfield, La.
1841 Henry King, Alexandria, La.
898 Robert Lavena (Lavene), Plaquemine, La.
1921 John Lee, Cora, La.
2135 Ernest Lewis, Farwell, La.
486 Chester Harrison (C. H.) McDowell, 310 DeVillinerve, Beaumont, Tex.
91 Sam McGhee (McGee), Fullerton, La. (Kent Wood, La.).
2136 John (Jno.) Marcello, McComb City, Miss.
739 Claud Lee Martin, Waycross, Ga.
1715 Robert (Robt.) Martin, Plaquemine, La.
710 Wm. Murphy Mathews (William Humphrey, Wm. Humphrey Matthews), 1248 West Fifty-second Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1217 Wylie Meadows (Wyllie Medows), Alexandria, Ala. (Oakdale, La.)
1444 Joseph Mitchell, Savannah, Ga. (Fullerton, La.)
705 Ed Moore (ED More), Albany, Ga.
140-A Harry Odom (Harry O Dom), Camp No. 12, Fullerton, La.
1704 Rufus Owens, Leesville, La.
619 Frank Poender, Ludington, La.
1537 Joe Proctor (Practor), Stables, La.
161 Charley (Charlie) Rhodes, Farwell, La.
836 Bill Richardson, Ludington, La.
1629 Jeff Richardson, Leander, La.
1143 Jim Rigmaiden, Lake Charles, La.
2354 Lee Roberts, Pickering, La.
1093 Lafe Robinson, Leesville, La.
2255 Will Robinson, Fullerton, La.
587 Eron Rolls, Barham, La.
1800 Amilo (Amilio) Salinas (Salinos), Aqualequas, N. Leon, Mexico.
1007 Wvaldo (Uvaldo) Sands, Cravens, La.
511 Jack Sanders, Grabow, La.
1936 Chas. (Charles, C. O.) O'Connor Shell, Leesville, La.
989 Joe Shorter, Fullerton, La.
1073 Ancell Smith, Cora, La.
142 Charlie Smith, Clinton, La. (Cravens, La.).
950 Henry Smith, Leesville, La.
1882 Henry (Hy) Smith, Fullerton, La.
1774 Henry Smith, Cravens, La.
1450 Robert Smith, Many, La.
837 Louis Solace (Salazer, Lewis Salazer), Cravens, La.
2259 Henry (Hy) Stelle, Stamps, Ark.
1459 Sidney (Sid) Talbot, Homer, La.
2161 DeWitt Taylor, St. Helena Parish, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1924 Huntley Toliver (Tolivur), Cravens, La.
2066 Ray Tolivar (Toliver), Lecompte, La. (Fullerton, La.).
1961 Monico (Monogo) Vasquez, Aqualequas, North Leon, Mex. Aqualequez, R. D., Leon, Mex.).
3 Bob Walker, Gibsland, La. (Neame, La.).
138 Claud (Claude) Walker, Fullerton, La.
2330 Harry (Henry) Walker, Minden, La. (Princeton, La.).
1152 Chas. Wallace, Chenevville, La.
1657 Tom Warmsley, Stables, La.
664 Henry Watson, Pickering, La.
1523 Kirk Curtis White, Burham, La.
666 Albert Williams, Pinewood, La.
1632 Alex Williams, Palmetto, La.
1570 Benj. (Benjamin) Williams, Cravens, La.
1374 Ed Williams, Fullerton, La.
2147 Geo. (George) Williams, Burham, La.
1237 Julius Williams, Franklin, Miss.
1454 Mathew (Matthew) Williams, Shubuta, Miss.
729 Tom Williams, Leesville, La.
244 Charley (Charlie) Woods, Wilsonville, Ala. (Fullerton, La.).
1122 Joe Worthy, Jefferson, Ala.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY, ME.

2927 Wilfred Moran, 5 Knox Street, Lewiston, Me.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, PORTLAND, ME.

1279 Russell Fred (Russell F.) McLaughlin, 40 Winter Street, Portland, Me. (General Delivery, Sioux City, Iowa).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, BOSTON, MASS.

1188 John Adolf Olson, 64 Paris Street, East Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 10, BOSTON, MASS.

88 Joseph E. O'Connor, 482 East Fourth Street, South Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 15, ROXBURY, MASS.

308 Richard Blake (Richard Blake, alias Frank McCarthy), 2821½ Wash, Roxbury, Mass.
549 John A. Blanchard, 101 Cedar, Roxbury, Mass. (25 Clavemont Park, Boston, Mass.)
485 John Botolinski (Botlinski), 263 Highland, Roxbury, Mass.
693 John J. (John Joseph) Brennan, 26 Iffley Road, Boston, Mass. (19 Frawley).
1238 Byron A. (Byron Alvah) Clement, 146 Boylston, Boston, Mass.
729 John Coleman, 19 Linwood, Boston, Mass. (Gainsville Road, Readville, Mass.)
1659 Artemen K. (Artemus Kenneth) Collins, 39 Linwood, Roxbury, Mass.
126 John Connell, 231 Highland, Boston, Mass. (26 Cranston, J. P.).
250 Patrick J. (Patrick Joseph, Patrick Joseph Comura) Conners, 1427 Columbus, Roxbury, Mass. Roxbury, Mass.
957 Richard H. (Richard Henry) Dalton, 44 Iffley Road, Boston, Mass. (1124 Bolivar Road, Cleveland, Ohio).
1863 Thos. L. Doyle, 275 Centre, Boston (30 Brawley Ok.).
634 Albert Feierabend, 26 Highland, Boston, Mass.
545 John A Forts, 2680 Washington, Boston, Mass.
500 Robert French, 6 Copley, Boston, Mass.
2120 Walter T. E. (Walter Thomas E.) Gleason, 143 Columbus, Boston, Mass.
692 Louis Hoff, 97 Marcella, Boston, Mass.
157 Geo. R. Holme (George Russell Hulme), 20 Forbes, Boston, Mass.
785 Chas. D. Joubrey (Charles Gilbert Jandry), 85 Charles, Halifax, Nova Scotia (85 Charles, Boston, Mass.).
2086 August Lack (Lakk), 118 Cedar, Boston, Mass.
985 John T. (John Thomas), Leach, 16 Cedar Park, Boston, Mass.
1961 John Long, 32 Codman Park, Roxbury, Mass.
585 Thos. Loughlin, 3135 Washington, Boston, Mass.
1538 Lewis Lynds, 19 Atherton, Boston, Mass.
1876 Jas. F. McVarnish, Jas. F. McVarish, James Francis McVarish), 31 Norfolk, Boston, Mass.
678 Edw. J. (Edw. Joseph) Moore, 8 Centre, Boston, Mass. (33 Lawn).
1101 Wm. H. (Wm. Henry) Mundy, 87 Dorr, Boston, Mass.
1796 Leroy F. (Leroy Finell), Osborne, 4 Millmont, Boston, Mass.
2250 Adam Ostel, 31 Lambers, Boston, Mass.
2078 John J. (John J. A.) Quinn, 93 Sheridan, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
2326 Ralph W. (Ralph Waldo) Roseman, 109 Cedar, Roxbury, Mass., % Md. D. & C. Co., Aberdeen, Md.
2331 Kenneth J. (Kenneth Joseph) Smith, 9 Elmore, Boston, Mass.
1713 Thomas (Thomas F.) Sullivan, 44 Bromley Park, Boston, Mass. (24 W. Lacock, Pittsburg, Pa.).
2372 Thos. Thorne, 44 Bromley Park, Boston, Mass.
48 Leon Yaconnello (Leon Yaconiello), 17 Morley, Boston, Mass.
369 Adolph Watska (Adolf Watska), 3 New Heath, Roxbury, Mass.
550 Edw. J. White, 288 Centre, Boston Mass. (11 Wise Street).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 17, BOSTON, MASS.

1700 Wm. A. Boyd, 24 Magnolia, Boston, Mass.
2096 Coburn, W. (Coburn William) Fife, 99 Alexander, Boston, Mass.
1042 Walter A. (Walter Allen) Fitzpatrick, 16 Judson, Boston, Mass.
1881 Edward W. Fuller, 20 Peverill, Boston, Mass. (Alfred W. (Alfred Wilkes) Fuller, 20 Faulkner, Dorchester, Mass.
1229 Jno. Jos. Haley, 84 Savin Hill, Boston, Mass. (616 Columbia Road, Dorchester, Mass.)
1578 Martin J. Hannon, 21 Dean, Boston, Mass.
975 James E. Hayes, 610 Dudley, Boston, Mass.
707 Edward J. Holland, 12 Fairbury, Roxbury, Mass.
1381 Yee Wing Jack, 48 Savin Hill, Boston, Mass.
640 Joseph Kelley, 1129 Dorchester, Boston, Mass. (1120 Dorchester, Dorchester, Mass.)
1414 John Kirby, 6 Letterfine Terrace, Dorchester, Mass. (John J. Kirby, 6 Letterfine Terrace.)
661 Wm. J. Long, 20 Doris, Dorchester, Mass.
1336 Jas. D. MacLellan, 8 Lafayette Park, Roxbury, Boston, Mass.
635 John Mee, 192 Blue Hill (108 Myrtle), Boston, Mass.
1539 Chester R. Merrill (Chester Robert), 23 Hancock, Boston, Mass.
777 Alexander D. Munroe (Alexander David Monroe), 20 Sexton, Boston, Mass.
1790 Edmund Perry, 5 Dunn Court, Dorchester, Mass.
2234 Thos. F. Ryan, 22 Monadnock, Dorchester, Mass.
2018 Helge I. Selander, 45 Judson, Boston, Mass. (Helge Isacson, 74 East Main, Waterbury, Conn.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 18, DORCHESTER, MASS.

1013 Morris Bensabet (Moe (Morris) Bensabat), 118 Devon Street, Dorchester, Mass.
548 Mils (Miles) Burns, 68 Percival Street, Dorchester, Mass.
2311 Louis Cohen, 21 Intercale Street, Boston, Mass.
2275 Richard Arthur (Richard A.) Davis, 7 Leroy, Dorchester, Mass.
1903 Timothy Gavin, 112 Norton Street, Boston, Mass.
455 Arthur Frederick Heffernan (Arthur F. Hefferman), 9 Kimball Street, Boston, Mass.
715 John Joseph (John J.) Irwin, 257 Columbia Road, Boston, Mass.
865 Patrick Kelly (Patrick Kelley), 39 Draper, Dorchester, Mass.
1419 Bernard A. Lyons (Bernard Ambrose Lyons), 31 Duncan Street, Boston, Mass.
2222 Joseph Daniel (Joseph D.) McCarthy, 10 Gibson, Dorchester, Mass.
1096 Marco Naugel (Vangel Marco), 1382 Dorchester Avenue, Dorchester, Mass.
1157 Percy Silsabee (Percy S.) Omar, 27 Juliette, Dorchester, Mass.
2285 Edw. I. Smith, 60 Lawrence Avenue, Boston, Mass. (Edward Irving Smith, 60 Laurence Avenue, Boston, Mass.
1627 John Joseph (John J.) Sullivan, 111 Bowdoin, Dorchester, Mass.
720 John J. Sullivan (John Joseph Sullivan, J. J. Sullivan), 11 Ditson, Dorchester, Mass.
1087 John A. (J. A.) Walker, 4 Columbia Terrace, Dorchester, Mass.
827 Thomas Warren (Thomas W.) Walsh, 149 Bowdoin, Dorchester, Mass.
2357 Harry Arthur (Harry A.) Wolfe, 134 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BELTRAMI, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

2273 Oscar Englund, Rainy River, Canada (Rainy River, Ontario).
35 Carl Strom, R. R. No. 4, care of O. Nerval, Warren, Minn. (Hackett, Minn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHICAGO, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

785 Fritz Oscar Andren, Rush City, route 1, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF DULUTH, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

2942 James Angilos, 1405 Ninety-eighth Avenue, West Duluth, Minn. (1315 Ninety-ninth Avenue, West Duluth, Minn.).
1634 John Toivo Manninen, 1612 One hundred and third Avenue, Duluth, Minn. (214 North Fifty-third Avenue, W. Duluth, Minn.; 217 Second Avenue, W. Duluth, Minn.).
2279 Hugo Johnson, No. 6, Fifty-third Avenue, Duluth, Minn. (West Duluth, Minn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF DULUTH, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

1122 Erik Fritzel Carlson (Erik Fritgal, E. F.), 920 Garfield Avenue, Duluth, Minn.
2994 John Owen (J. O.) Williams, 331 West Third Street, Duluth, Minn.
2881 Erick Einer (E.), Larson, 2103 West First Street, Duluth, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ITASCA, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

2478 Harry Pommerville (Pomerville), Grand Rapids, Minn.
1088 Walter Erick (E.) Saari, Dunbar, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

4639 William E. Minor, 801 Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

832 Ernest Anderson, 816 Eighth Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 6, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

454 George Jasperson, 1815 Fifth Street, South Minneapolis, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 12, CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

833 Herbert Finseth, 3957 Forty-second Avenue, South Minneapolis, Minn. (route 2, Binford, N. Dak.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MORRISON, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

1666 Michael Kafton, Broadway West, Little Falls, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

1073 Harry Gibbons, Proctor, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

547 John F. (John) Norberg (John Frederick), 415 Fayal Road, Eveleth, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 6, COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

28 Jacob Alanen, 125 Sellers Street, Hibbing, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF ST. PAUL, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

364 Erick (Eric) William Carlson, 514 Canade Street, St. Paul, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 7, CITY OF ST. PAUL, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

505 Monte C. Billings, care of Bush Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Monte Carl Billings, 345 Rice Street, St. Paul, Minn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TODD, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

37 Allie Enblom (Emblom), Sauk Center, Minn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WASECA, STATE OF MINNESOTA.

958 Joseph Konrath, Waseca, Minn. (route No. 1, Waseca, Minn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BENTON, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

637 Jim Allen, Lamor, Miss.
525 John Anderson, Michigan City, Miss.
665 Ervin Berry, Grand Junction, Tenn. (Grand Junction, Route No. 2, Tenn.).
751 Will Gray, Michigan City, Miss.
626 Tom Harris, Lomor, Miss. (Wosco, Tenn.).
742 Cleve Hopson, Hickory Flat, Miss.
728 Haywood Hordge, Grand Junction, Route No. 2, Tenn.
753 George Hunt, Grand Junction, Route No. 2, Tenn. (Pine Bluff, Ark.).
335 Earl Jenkins, Lamar, Miss. (Saulsbury, Tenn.)
796 Isaac Loson, Saulsbury, R. F. D. Tenn.
719 Willie Parham (Parkham), R. F. D. 2, Grand Junction, Tenn.
211 Steve Sassar (Sasser), Lamar, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF BOLIVAR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

313 Ed Adams, Shaw, Miss.
2420 Willie Adams, Merigold, Miss.
3243 Renels Alridge, Shelby, Miss.
2300 Jim Amons (Jim Amos, Jim Ammons), Duncan, Miss.
3020 James Anderson, Shelby, Miss.
680 Joe H. Anderson, Shaw, Miss.
969 Louis Anderson, Skene, Miss.
2371 Horace Atkins, Shelby, Miss.
2640 Dollis Baker (Dollie Baker), Shaw, Miss.
1126 Joseph Baker, Duncan, Miss.
2094 Mancer Ball, Merigold, Miss.
2892 Ed Barney (Ed Barnery), Mound Bayou, Miss.
770 Robert Beachman, Alligator, Miss.
3184 Edgar Bell, Shaw, Miss.
2468 Willie Benson, Shelby, Miss.
1132 William Beverly, Shelby, Miss.
1736 Elijah Birks, Shaw, Miss.
3024 Will Richard Blakemore (Will Richard Blakemore, Will R. Blakeman, Boyle, Miss.), Boyle, Miss.
2669 Archie Blue, Shelby, Miss.
280 Wade Boswell, Alligator, Miss.
1631 M. C. Calester (McAllister Braddick, McCallster Braddick), Mound Bayou, Miss.
1910 Sam Brady, Shelby, Miss.
3364 Will Bradshaw, Merigold, Miss.
2337 Johnnie Brady, Pace, Miss.
2582 Joe Bragg, Cleveland, Miss.
2250 Robert Brand, ORielery, Boyle, Miss.
3291 Willie Brewer, Shelby Miss.
1416 Joe Briggs, Shelby, Miss.
1907 Dave Brooks, Cleveland, Miss.
895 James Brooks, Pace, Miss.
1449 Burl Brown, Boyle, Miss.
1959 Clarence Brown, Duncan Miss.
2467 Ellis Brown, Mound Bayou, Miss.
2209 Houston Brown (Huston Brown), Shelby, Miss.
3194 J. M. Brown (Israel Moses Brown, Israel M. Brown, Cleveland, Miss.), Deventer, Mo.
2890 James Houston Brown (James Huston Brown), Pace, Miss.
1095 John Brown, Shelby, Miss.
1538 John W. Brown, Shelby, Miss.
307 Leon Brown, Cleveland Miss.
2363 Leroy Brown, Shelby, Miss.
343 Thomas Brown (Thos. Brown, Chambers, Miss.), Shelby, Miss.
2977 Herman Bryant, Shelby, Miss.
160 Nelson Bryant, Cleveland, Miss.
3049 Johnnie Burrell, Duncan, Miss.
736 Joseph Butcher, Cleveland, Miss.
2545 Willie Calhoun, Josiephine, Miss.
1435 Eddie Campbell, Shelby, Miss.
1796 Columbus Carter, Duncan, Miss.
2409 Julius Carter, Mound Bayou, Miss.
2052 Hesie Causey, Mound Bayou, Miss.
3461 Lory Chatman, Shaw, Miss.
1664 George Childs, Merigold, Miss.
2674 Will Chreston (Will Christon), Duncan, Miss.
2395 Dan Clarke (Dan Clark), Merigold, Miss.
642 Finus Clarke (Finus Clark, Finnous Clark), Shelby, Miss.
3055 M. T. Clark, Shelby, Miss.
2251 Sam Clarke (Sam Clark), Shelby, Miss.
1961 Walthall Coleman, Shaw, Miss.
749 Will Coleman, Duncan, Miss.
2370 Willie Coleman, Merigold, Miss.
78 George Cooper (Geo. Cooper), Shelby, Miss.
2267 Dennis Crawford, Merigold, Miss.
219 Leroy Crawford, Shelby and Pertshire, Miss.
3464 Will Crowell, Route No. 3, Cleveland, Miss.
3191 Jake Dandridge, Shaw, Miss.
1286 Sam Daniel, Duncan, Miss.
2881 Albert Davis, Merigold, Miss.
19 Dennis Davis, Merigold, Miss.
1362 Henry Davis (Henery Davis), Shelby, Miss.
3559 Ira Davis, O'Riley, Miss.
3546 Joe Davis, Pace, Miss.
1433 Lincoln Davis, Alligator, Miss.
744 Nelson Davis, Pace, Miss.
2689 Will Davis, Shelby, Miss.
1366 Lovett Dawson, Merigold, Miss.
3260 Louis Deal, Alligator, Miss.
1803 Louis Delaney, Duncan, Miss.
172 Joseph Denton (Joseph Benton), Shelby, Miss.
3519 Willie Diggs (William Diggs), Duncan, Miss.
2126 Fred Dixon, Huspuckana, Shelby, Miss.
578 Harry Doss, Merigold, Miss.
1190 Isiah Durham (Isaih Durham), Duncan, Miss.
2454 Oscar Eaklilen (Oscar Eakkillen), Cleveland, Miss.
1592 Thomas Edwards, Alligator, Miss. (Thomas Edwards, Alica, Miss.).
1518 Jim Ellis, Shaw, Miss.
1660 Milas Eubanks (Miles Eubanks), Alligator, Miss.
3467 Dave Ewing, Alligator, Miss.
2038 Harry Ewing, Mound Bayou, Miss.
2193 Robert Esell, Mound Bayou, Miss.
2131 Charlie Foster, Josiephine, Miss.
1088 Ernest Fulton, Shelby, Miss.
3121 Jim Gales, on board camp cars Y. & M. & R. R., working with extra gang (Memphis).
841 James Galloway, Merigold, Miss.
2884 Jesse Garden, Duncan, Miss.
2857 Louis Gilmore, Pace, Miss.
899 Alex Gilliland, Mound Bayou, Miss.
1220 Dave Givens, Shaw, Miss.
2035 Richard Givens, Boyle, Miss.

250 Roger Gordon, Merigold, Miss.
1223 Fred Granger, on board Y. & M. V. camp cars, Mississippi Division, Y. & M. V. Railroad.
2588 Tom Grayer, Mound Bayou, Miss.
1308 Abe Green, Cleveland, Miss.
2449 Abe Griffin, Shelby, Miss.
2463 Frank Griffin, Duncan, Miss.
1183 Ben Hall Pace, Miss.
2469 Ben Hampton, On board camp cars, Y. & M. V. R. R., Memphis, Tenn.
3356 Bolton Harris, Alligator, Miss.
2565 Joohn Harris, Cleveland, Miss.
1498 Mike Harris, Shaw, Miss.
2137 Sam Harris, Duncan, Miss.
3193 Columbus Harrison, Shelby, Miss.
79 Winnon Hatton (Winnon Hatten), Skene, Miss.
312 Willie Haynes, Duncan, Miss.
3255 Joseph B. Hector, Pace, Miss.
932 Earl C. Heap (Earl Clifton Heap), Cleveland, Miss.
3506 James Henderson, Alligator, Miss.
43 Alonzo Hill, Marigold, Miss.
660 Jim Hillman (Jim Hilman, Jim Heelliman), working with extra gang on board Y. & M. V. R. R. Co., Mp. Div. Y. & M. V. R. R.
728 Henry Hines, Chambers, Miss. (Hey Heinds, Shelby, Miss.)
3355 Joe Hinton, Shelby, Miss.
641 Joe Hodges, Huspuckena, Miss.
3442 Henry Hogun, Duncan, Miss.
143 Will Hollinds (Will Hollins), Gunnison, Miss.
1236 George Holmes, Shelby, Miss.
3402 Ed Howe, Skine, Miss.
10 Leroy Hoyt, Station G, Memphis, Tenn.
303 Jerry Hughes, Shelby, Miss.
929 Massey Hughes (Massy Hughes), Shaw, Miss.
96 Sam Hughes, Boyle, Miss.
727 Ike Hunt, Hushpeckena, Miss.
3052 Fred Hunter, Merigold, Miss.
1713 James Jackson, Cleveland, Miss.
705 Miller A. Jamerson (Miller A. Jamison), Pace, Miss.
3100 Abraham Johnson, Shelby, Miss.
3497 Elie Johnson, Boyle, Miss.
3172 Frank Johnson, Shaw, Miss.
655 Henry Johnson (Hey Johnson, Henery Johnson), Duncan, Miss.
981 Henry Johnson, Shelby, Miss.
2334 Isiah Johnson (Iscek Johnson), Duncan, Miss.
2265 Johnnie Johnson, Shaw, Miss.
3114 President Johnson, Shelby, Miss.
331 Robert Johnson, Shelby, Miss.
1952 Robert Johnson, Skine, Miss.
1953 Sullivan Johnson, Duncan, Miss.
1553 Tom Johnson, Alligator, Miss.
2031 Will Johnson, Mound Bayou, Miss.
656 Will Henry Johnson (Will Henery Johnson), Cleveland, Miss.
3222 William Johnson, Shaw, Miss.
155 William Johnson, Skene, Miss.
3383 Bob Jones, on board camp cars Y. & M. V. R. R. C., working with extra gang, Memphis, Tenn.
1412 Cleveland Jones, Cleveland, Miss.
2510 Fred Jones, Shelby, Miss.
293 John H. Jones, Boyle, Miss.
1581 Peter Jones, Duncan, Miss.
1271 William Jones, Shaw, Miss.
122 Richard Jordan, Shaw, Miss.
1072 Robert King, Shaw, Miss.
3037 Clint Kinnard, Duncan, Miss.
2422 Harry Knight (Harvey Knight), on board camp cars, Y. & M. V. R. R. working with extra gang, Memphis, Tenn., Division Y. & M. V. R. R.
2174 George Kline, Shaw, Miss.
738 O. L. Lapree (C. C. Lapree, O. P. Lepree), on board camp cars, Y. & M. C. R. R. Co., working with extra gang, Mississippi Division, Y. & M. V. R. R.
1885 James Lathers (James Lasters), Shaw, Miss.
3360 Frank Lee, Marigold, Miss.
1128 Jordan Lee, Shaw, Miss.
3401 William G. Lee, Shelby, Miss.
172 Joseph Lenton (Joseph Denton), Shelby, Miss.
947 Garrett Leonard, Shelby, Miss.
2665 Fletcher Lewis, Merigold, Miss.
305 John Lewis, Chambers, Miss. (John Lewis, Shaw, Miss.)
2512 John Lewis, Shaw, Miss. (John Lewis, Lavin, Miss.)
2312 Horace Logan (Forest Logan), Shelby, Miss.
1229 Alex Longmire (Alex Longine), Shelby, Miss.
1703 Willie Lewis, Skene, Miss.
1573 Edd Love (Ed Love), Shelby, Miss.
2278 George Love, Alligator, Miss.
853 Rafe Luckett, Merigold, Miss.
810 Kenny McDaniel (Kenny McDonale, Kenney McDaniell), Duncan, Miss.
669 John McDonald, Gunnison, Miss. (Jno. McDonald, Duncan, Miss.)
2389 Oliver McGee (Oliver McGehee), Skene, Miss. (Shaw, Miss.).
2058 James McKee, Merigold, Miss.
222 Dennis McKinley, Cleveland, Miss. (Dennis McKenney, R. F. D. No. 2, Cleveland, Miss.)
3453 George McMullen (Geo. McMuller, George McMullen), Merigold, Miss.
3626 Albert Mack, Pace, Miss.
3285 James Mack, Shaw, Miss.
173 Melvin Mack, Duncan, Miss.
3281 Moses Mack, Cleveland, Miss.
223 Willie Mack, Shelby, Miss.
2662 James A. Majors, Rudyard, Miss. (James Alexander Majors, Boyle, Miss.)
672 January Mallett, Shelby, Miss.
2655 Josh Malone, Hushpuckena, Miss.
3511 Silas Marks, Cleveland, Miss.
3035 Solomon Martin, Merigold, Miss.
2746 James Merkerson, Shelby, Miss.
3248 Jake Miles, Skene, Miss.
3269 Will Mills, Gunnison, Miss.
2920 Lige Mims (Lige Mins, Lige Minus), Boyle, Miss.
584 Will Mitchell, Mound Bayou, Miss.
1085 G. H. (George Henry) Moore, Alligator, Miss.
870 Joe Moorehead, Duncan, Miss.
2484 Alma Morgan, Shelby, Miss.
3458 Eugene Morris, Shelby, Miss.
1337 Amus (Amos) Mullen, Duncan, Miss.
1109 Ike Nelson, on board camp cars Y. & M. V. R. R. Co., Mississippi Division Y. & M. V. R. R.
2605 Noah Odd, Shelby, Miss.
93 Frank Page, Boyle, Miss.
1920 James Patterson, Alligator, Miss.
3231 Jacob Perkins, Chambers, Miss.
3009 Will Perkins, Shelby, Miss.
2620 Chas. A. Phelps, Shaw, Miss.
243 George Phillips, Alligator, Miss.
633 Coy Pinkston, Shelby, Miss.
2260 Abraham Pollon, R. F. D. 8, Cleveland, Miss. (Abraham Polin, Cleveland, Miss.).
974 Eugene Porter, Shelby, Miss.
776 Henry (Henery) Porter, Merigold, Miss.
1300 Willie Price, Shelby, Miss.
1205 Ed Printt (Pruitt), Merigold, Miss.
1448 Alfred Puff, Cleveland, Miss.
540 Samuel Quillings, Mound Bayou, Miss.
1833 Willie Rastus, Alligator, Miss.
3334 Ernest Reed, Duncan, Miss.
1508 Sam Reed, Boyle, Miss.
1636 Jesse Roberson (Robinson), Shaw, Miss.
2611 Charlie Rollings, Cleveland, Miss.
1225 Abraham Ross, Shelby, Miss.
3451 Thomas Ross, Skene, Miss.
1627 Anderson Rucker, Shelby, Miss.
3468 Willie Rumley (Runely), Duncan, Miss.
1380 Andrew Rush, Duncan, Miss.
1731 Albert (Alvert) Russell, Alligator, Miss.
3535 Ignomar Russell, Alligator, Miss.
1979 Wess Sanford (West Sanford), Shelby, Miss.
3412 Eulis W. Scott, Deeson, Miss. (Ellis Wes. Scott, Shelby, Miss.).
2562 Walter Scott, Shaw, Miss.
2982 Willie Scott, Alligator, Miss.
2400 James Shelton, Shaw, Miss.
404 John Shepherd, Cleveland, Miss.
2578 Bless Simms (Sims), Boyle, Miss.
3480 Willie Sims (Williw Simys), Mound Bayou, Miss.
3123 Robert Sisson, Alligator, Miss.
2952 Augustus Smith, Marigold, Miss.
3174 Charlie Smith, Shelby, Miss.
2985 Joe Smith, Mound Bayou, Miss.
695 Walter Smith, Shaw, Miss.
1762 Wyatt Smith, Skene, Miss.
3261 Isadore Snodgrass, Alligator, Miss.
585 Alen (Allen) Spencer, Shelby, Miss.
1178 Fred Steele, Boyle, Miss.
234 Robert Stevenson, Marigold, Miss.
2341 Lee Stewart, Duncan, Miss. (Lee Stevart, Turner, Miss.)
2614 Lewis Stewart, Shelby, Miss.
1152 Melvin Suggs, Duncan, Miss.
1351 Andrew Sullivan, Marigold, Miss.
1446 John H. Supsion (Simpson), Hushpuckana, Miss.
1806 Morgan Thirsty, Hushpuckana, Miss.
218 Ed Thompson, Skene, Miss.
521 Leacher Tigg (Tegg), Cleveland, Miss.
3640 Richard Turner, Shelby, Miss.
619 Anderson Turpin, Shelby, Miss.
2362 John Sanders, Duncan, Miss.
2268 Jordan Sanders, Marigold, Miss.
2234 Archie Sanford (Sandford), Boyle, Miss.
2368 Harry Thomas, Boyle, Miss.
1724 Isiah Thomas, Alligator, Miss. (Izia Thomas, Alligator Lake, Miss.).
2827 Jeff Thomas, Alligator, Miss. (Duncan, Miss.).
948 Isiah Triplett, Skene, Miss.
1673 George Turner, Pace, Miss.
1331 Zett Veasey, Shelby, Miss.
40 Jim Walker, O'Reley, Boyle, Miss.
1087 Henry Ward (Henery Word), Mound, Bayou, Miss.
2188 James Ward, Cleveland, Miss.
3205 Columbus Ware, Alligator, Miss.
3240 James Washington, Skene, Miss.
752 Kelly Washington, Marigold, Miss.
2a Weldon Washington, Shaw, Miss.
39a Presley Watkins, Skene, Miss. (Chambers, Miss.)
259 Ollie Weisinger (Weissinger), Shelby, Miss.
2917 Johnnie West, Cleveland, Miss.
2775 Frank White, Pace, Miss.
2210 Tom White, Hushpuckena, Miss.
167 Sylvester Wiggly, Shelby, Miss.
994 Joe Wilburn (Welburn), Shaw, Miss.
2280 John Wilks, Shelby, Miss.
691 Albert Williams, Alligator, Miss.
2004 Albert B. Williams (Albert Burrus Williams), Cleveland, Miss.
13a Charlie Williams, County Farm (Charles Williams, care J. S. Zaung, Cleveland, Miss.).
169 Clarence Williams, Cleveland, Miss.
2500 Early Williams, Shelby, Miss.
3217 Ed. Williams, Shelby, Miss.
3447 Eddie Williams, Shelby, Miss.
2845 Rodger Williams, Gunnison, Miss. (Roger Williams, Shelby, Miss.).
369 Ras Williams, Marigold, Miss.
2416 Sol Williams, Shelby, Miss.
2074 Will Williams (Willie Williams), Cleveland, Miss.
761 Willie Williams (Will Williams), Cleveland, Miss.
3332 Willie Williams, Md. Bayou, Miss.
3462 John Willis, Renova, Miss.
3520 Charlie Wilson, Shelby, Miss.
82 Rumble Wilson, Shaw, Miss.
1306 Levy Wilson (Levi Wilson), Cleveland, Miss.
2342 Lee Wise, Huspuckana, Miss.
2552 John Woodruff, Rolling Fork (Shelby, Mass.).
463 Johnson Wright, Shelby, Miss.
3549 Walter Wright, Shelby, Miss.
788 Joseph Young, Merigold, Miss.
26 Tom Young, Shelby, Miss.
1133 Willie Young (Willy Young), Duncan, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHICKASAW, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1062 Jesse Atkinson (Jessie Atkinson), Houston, Miss.
959 Bugg Buchanan, Buena Vista, Miss.
1317 Wm. Carter, Houston, Miss.
394 Jno. Alexander Cole (John Cole), Okolona, Miss.
652 Link Chatman, Houlka, Miss.
1129 Charlie Crockett, Houlka, Miss. (Route No. 1, Box 42, Aubrey, Ark.
90 Beach Doss, R. F. D., Houston, Miss.
1044 Emmitt (Emmet Hastings Dotson (Emmit Hastings Dotson), Pyland, Miss.
1409 Wm. Edwards, Okolona, Miss.
764 Eddie Fields, Egypt, Miss.
1337 Curley Gates, Pyland, Miss.
1225 Wm. Gates, R. D., Houston, Miss.
1022 Columbus Griffes (Griffin), Houston, Miss.
1235 Jim Griffith, Houston, Tex.
831 Robert Gunn, Egypt, Miss.
859 Lawrence (Laurence) Hays, Okolona, Miss.
739 Will Hopes, Houston, Miss.
223 Nero Huggins, Woodland, Miss.
1134 Sam Hughes, Okolona, Miss. (350 Jackson Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
1042 Wm. Lewis Ivy (Willie Lewis Ivy), Okolona, Miss.
61 Harris Jones (Harrison Jones), Houston, Miss.
989 Wm. Lewis, Houston, Miss.
1083 Earl Linzy, Houston, Miss.
1386 Curtis Lipsey, Houston, Miss.
948 John H. Mathis, Houlka, Miss.
786 Isaac Miller, Okolona, Miss.
103a Wilson Moore, R. F. D. 2, Okolona, Miss.
438 Columbus Naugles, Buena Vista, Miss.
248 Wm. Reid (Reed), R. F. D. 1, Houlka, Miss.
1274 Cleve Thompson, R. F. D. 1, Troy, Miss.
1115 Lonnie Thompson, Woodland, Miss.
390 Henry Vance, R. F. D. 1, Okolona, Miss.
885 Willie Wallace (William Wallace), Vern Vleet, Miss. (Van Vleet, Miss.).
182 Ora (Orae) Ware, Van Vleet, Miss.
1012 Tom Washington (Tom Walson), Houlka, Miss.
975 James White, Pyland, Miss. (Shannon, Miss., R. F. D. 1).
296 James Williams, Okolona, Miss.
1073 John Wilson, Okolona, Miss.
1199 David S. Witherspoon (David Saunders Witherspoon), Okolona, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FORREST, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

865 Nathan Bailey, Hattiesburg, Miss., near Brookhaven Lumber Co.
1711 Henry Bolton, Goot Loaf, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1414 John Brown, East Pine Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
665 Charlie (Charley) Bullard, Hattiesburg, Miss.
827 Clem Chatham (Chatman), Hattiesburg, Miss.
1425 Houston Claiborne (Clayborn), Curry Street, Hattiesburg, Miss. (Carry, Hattiesburg, Miss.)
233 Will Clark, McLaurin, Miss.
950 Ad Clarke (Add Clark), New Orleans, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1446 Ben Cleveland, Hattiesburg, Miss.
20 Jno. A. Duke (John Allison, J. A. Dukes), 1115 West Tenth Street, Little Rock, Ark.
199a Lloyd Evett, route No. 6, Hattiesburg, Miss. (Olek Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.)
701 Collins Foster, Carnes, Miss.
522 Eli Grady (Ely Graddy), Carnes, Miss.
137 David Hall, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1622 Tom Hall, C. D. Powell Camp, Hattiesburg, Miss.
815 Hugh Harris, 712 Mobile Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1434 Jesse (Jessie) Harris, Carnes, Miss.
682 Robt. (Robert) Henderson, Sixth Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
164 Romulus (Romulus) Hill, 9 Ninth Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
574 C. W. (Charles W., Charles Willard) Hines, 404 Mobile Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
779 L. N. Hudinburgh (Lewis Newton Hudiburgh, Lewis N.), 403 East Pine Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
60 Page (George) Johnson, Front Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
705 Will Johnson, 117 Batson Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1269 Will Johnson, Gravel Line, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1311 Jordan Jones, Hattiesburg, Miss.
638 Augusta (Auguster) Jordan (Jordin), 800 Whitney Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1429 Simon Lang, Alledge Quarters, Hattiesburg, Miss.
70 J. W. Laurent, Newman's Quarters, Hattiesburg, Miss.
677 Marsh Lee (Marsh Daniel (D.) Lee), Hattiesburg, Miss.
1038 Will McCaskell, Newman Quarters, Hattiesburg, Miss.
968 Steve McDaniel, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1419 J. T. (James T., James Tyson) McDonald, Falensdale, Ala. (Faunsdale, Ala.)
1246 Dave McGee (David, Dave Magee), Hardy Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
527 Deason C. (D. C.) McLaurin, 6 Seventh Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
313 Lucius W. Morse (Lucious Walter Morse), Petal, Miss.
1626 Lugie M. (McKinley) Netter, 226 Box Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
146 John Otis, Mobile Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1689 Fred Owens, Fifth Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1541 Henderson Peters, Hwb., Miss.
1097 Byron (Byrun) Phillips, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1076 Sam Ratliff, Railroad Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
42 John Rogers, Hattiesburg, Miss.
8 Jake Sampson, Bogalosa, La.
180 Gus. W. (Guss William) Simpson, Maxie, Miss.
1381 Jones (James) Sims, box 226, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1653 Jim Stamps (Stamp), McLaurin, Miss.
42 Will Stevens, Wards, Ala.
1175 Calvin Thomas, Newman Quarters, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1631 Elijah Thomas (Eligia thomas), box 226, Hattiesburg, Miss.
801 Ellis Thomas, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1448 Nathan Thomas (Thompon, Thompson), Hattiesburg, Miss. (McLaurin, Miss.)
211 Geo. B. Tolbert (George Bracy Talbert), 717 Whitney Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
176 Will Tremble (Trambell), Atlanta Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
906 Robert S. (Sylvester) Walker, Petal, Miss.
82-A Jesse (Jessie) D. Watson, 213 Oak Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.
1220 L. J. (Lewis J.) Wheeler, Hattiesburg, Miss.
632 Quitman White, Hattiesburg, Miss.
281 Jim Williams, Hattiesburg, Miss.
761 John Winston, route No. 1, box No. 104-A, Ittabana, Miss. (700 Front Street, Hattiesburg, Miss.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HARRISON, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

1477 Swin Alexander Bjork, American steamer *Flirt*, Gulfport, Miss.
2060 Berthel Bjorklundh (Bjarklundh), Stockholm, Sweden (Stockholm steamship *Flirt*, Gulfport, Miss.).
354 Aster Booth, route No. 1, Gulfport, Miss.
1923 Dan Brown, 234 George Street, Jackson, Miss. (Gulfport, Miss.).
1144 Joseph Brooks, 14 Twenty-sixth Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
1221 Willie Burke, 430 East Division Street, Biloxi, Miss.
1668 Ollie Byrd, Gulfport, Miss.
277a Sylvester Davis, Biloxi, Miss.
2541 Robert Dean, Lyman, Miss.
88 Alfonso (Alphonce) Dotson, 3205 Twentieth Street, Gulfport, Miss.
1054 Moses Joseph Dukes, 1636 West Beach Street, Biloxi, Miss. (3735 Clara Street, New Orleans, La.).
1051 Bill Easley, Lyman, Miss.
380 Tommy Ellis, Maria Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
2217 Nicolo Feblan (Fablan), Mississippi City, Miss.
2484 Tom Fails, Lyman, Miss.
492 Thomas T. Fortenberry (Thomas (Tom) Talmage Fortenberry), 2313 Twenty-fourth Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
1358 Will Foster, Howison, Miss.
471 Jimmie Gilbert, Gulfport, Miss.
1955 Frank Gray, Long Beach, Miss. (Moos Park, Miss.).
2246 Jim Griffin, Lyman, Miss.
828a Gus. Jos. E. Hadley (G. J. E. Hadley), 1418 Twenty-sixth Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
234 Joseph Hart, West Beach Street, Gulfport, Miss.
958 Charlie (Charley) Herd (Charly Heard), Lexicon, Miss. (Lyman, Miss.).
551 Will Hinton, R. F. D., White Plains, Biloxi, Miss.
553 Reece Holliman (Hollimon), Howison, Miss.
1064a Fred House, Biloxi, Miss.
2620 Frank Jackson, Gaston Point, West Gulfport Street, Gulfport, Miss.
1157a Ike James, Mellard, Ala.
2631 David Louis Johnson (David L. Johnson), R. F. D. 2, Biloxi, Miss.
860 John Lizana, Pass Christian, Miss.
976 James Lockett, Lyman, Miss.
2081 Leory Love, Gulfport, Miss.
1936 Henry McGill, Saucier, Miss.
43 Napoleon Madison (Napolian Maddison), Twenty-fourth Street, Gulfport, Miss.
2099 Sun Manuel, 126 Twenty-ninth Street, Gulfport, Miss.
2535 Ricardo A. Morland, 2503 Fourteenth Street, Gulfport, Miss. (R. A. Morlan, box 702, El Paso, Tex.).
1993 Willis O. Nicholson (Willis Orlando (Orlanders) Nickolson, W. O. Nickolson), Lizana, Miss.
1550 Louis Pace, Lyman, Miss.
340 Henry Parker, De Lisle, Miss.
2502 Pellom Peters, 2501 Thirteenth Street, Gulfport, Miss.
151 Douell (Donell) Robinson, Lizana, Miss.
285 George L. Rinel, 1065 La Fayette Street, Elizabeth, N. J.
1916 Willie Sanders, Lyman, Miss. (Gloster, Miss.).
2146 Ellie Smith, Utica, Miss.
1167 Henry Smith, 1419 Thirtieth Avenue, Gulfport, Miss., box 1072, St. Augustine, Fla.
428 Ike Smith, Gulfport, Miss.
666 Socks Smoothe, Lyman, Miss.
671 James Hilton Spicer (James H. Spicer), Gulfport, Miss.
1279 Dennis Thomas, Twentieth Street, Gulfport, Miss.
1884 Oluf (Louf) Thomassen, Am. S. S. *Flirt* on the seas.
2356 Albert Thompson, Biloxi, Miss.
1190 Arthur Clayton Thompson (Arthur C. Thompson), Pass Christian, Miss.
2187a Carmello Villanedo (Carmello (Carmelo) Villamedo, general delivery, Biloxi, Miss.
594 John Jensen Vowells (John J. Vowells), 1613½ 20th Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
2367 Archie Warren, Gulfport, Miss.
1756 Ed (Edward) Watson, Fayard Biloxi, Miss.
2449 Henry T. Wichard (Henry Thomas Wichard), 1104 East Howard Street, Biloxi, Miss.
2637 William Wood, Lyman, Miss.
565 Freddie Williams, Thirtieth Avenue, Gulfport, Miss.
873a Henry Williams, Gulfport, Miss.
950 John Williams, Lyman, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAFAYETTE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

94 Walter Allen, route No. 5, Oxford, Miss.
412 John Arnold, box 321, Oxford, Miss.
1278 Ernest Bynote (Earnest Bynote), Burgess, Miss.
406 Tom Cook (Tum Cook), R. F. D. 1, Water Valley, Miss.
427 Jim Gregory, Oxford, Miss.
547 Robert Hayes, Oxford, Miss.
984 Willie Joiner, Taylor, Miss.
924 Walter Jones, Oxford, Miss.
353 James Owen (Mills), Lafayette, Miss.
135 Marshall Phillips, Burgess, Miss.
209 Joe. Resman, Lafayette, Miss.
726 Clarence Simmons, Etta, Miss.
1265 James Smith, Oxford, Miss.
122 Victor Lee Tatum (Victor Lee Talum), Oxford, Miss.
69 Geo. Thomas (George Thomas, George Themers), Oxford, Miss.
238 Frank Woodall, Water Valley, Miss. (Frank Woodell, route No. 6, Oxford, Miss.).
165 L. C. Young, route No. 4, box 4, Oxford, Miss.
79 Frank Berry, route No. 1, Oxford, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAMAR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

67 Willard Barnes, Lumberton, Miss.
920 Jim Betts, Lumberton, Miss.
99 High Black, Clyde, Miss.
625 Andrew Bonner, Lumberton, Miss.
1122 Elzey (Ellsy) Brown, Purvis, Miss.
481 Joseph Bryant, Lumberton, Miss.

940 Sandy Calhoun, Lumberton, Miss.
922 Jake Cooper, Lumberton, Miss. (Firmwood, Miss.)
382 John Cooper, Sumroll, Miss.
551 Will Davis (Dovin), Purvis, Miss.
735 George Fitzgerald, Lumberton, Miss.
336 John Flood, Purvis, Miss.
981 Will Floyd, Lumberton, Miss.
752 Ike Friend, Epley, Miss.
392 Wash Fumches (Fuscher), Clyde, Miss.
617 Will Grass (Gross), Purvis, Miss.
817 Everett W. Greene (Everett, Everette, Willie Green), Clyde, Miss.
821 Clinton Hall, Lumberton, Miss.
1063 Harmond (Harmon) Harrell, Sumroll, Miss.
275 Frank Harris, Clyde, Miss.
377 Shirtnell Harris, Purvis, Miss.
1030 Rance (Rond, Rom, Rona) Hartfield, Lumberton, Miss.
982 Calyop Jenkins, Purvis, Miss.
954 Frank Jenkins, Lumberton, Miss. (Frank Leo Jenkins, Caraopolir, Pa., Frank L. Jenkins, Coreopolis, Pa.)
1126 Print Jones, Mossville, Miss.
715 Sam Jones, Purvis, Miss.
183 Willie Jones, Lumberton, Miss.
83 Levi (Levy) Johnson, Purvis, Miss.
1135 Will Johnson, Clyde, Miss.
477 Arthur Ladner (Lodina, Badner), Lumberton, Miss.
740 Marshall (Marshal) Loper), Boxterville, Miss.
686 Ernest (Earnest) McDonald, Boxterville, Miss.
553 James McGraham, Purvis, Miss.
41 Frank Pendleton, Carnes, Miss. (Pendelton, Lumberton, Miss.)
1163 Charley (Charlie) Polk, Clyde, Miss.
316 Bryant Ramsey, Sumroll, Miss.
324 Dorsey (Darsey) Robinson, Sumroll, Miss.
705 Joe Smith, Lumberton, Miss.
819 Tom Smith, Clyde, Miss.
786 Willie Thomas, Clyde, Miss.
51 Sam Tarmbo, Sumroll (Sumrall), Miss.
535 Hubbard Vuquhart (Vuguhart), Purvis, Miss.
120 Doyle Walker, Lumberton, Miss. (Bogalusa, La.)
321 Alex Wash, Sumrall, Miss.
50 Ernest (Earnest) Washington, Lumberton, Miss.
1092 Ervin (Erven) Webb, Clyde, Miss.
1047 William A. Wellborne (William Alonzo Wieborn), Sumrall, Miss.
114 Sam Wells (Willis), Boxterville, Miss.
175 Robert Whitfield, Lumberton, Miss.
235 Cade Williams, Boxterville, Miss.
771 Henry Woods (Wood), Lumberton, Miss.
115 James Edward Arnold, Tupelo, Miss.
1111 John Groves Barrett (Grower Barret, J. G. Barret), Plantersville, Miss.
1630 Aaron (Aron) Borum, Plantersville, Miss.
1836 Calvin (Clavan, Calvon) Brown, Baldwyn, Miss.
829 Isam Caldwell (Isom Coldwell), Guntown, Miss.
185 Siviner Coleman (Siviner Colemon), Tupelo, Miss.
109 Andrew Culp, Route No. 5, Tupelo, Miss.
972 Mike Daniels (Daniel), Nettleton, Miss.
269 Wm. Denman (Denmon), Shannon, Miss.
550 Grant Fields, Shannon, Miss.
506a Will Easley, Baldwyn, Miss.
499 Arrelious Griffin, Shannon, Miss.
318 John Henderson, Tupelo, Miss.
295 Rex Hopkins, Saltillo, No. 3, Miss. (Saltillo, R. F. D. No. 3, Miss.).
1697 Manuel Jesse, Tupelo, Miss.
945 James Barney (Barnie) Johnson, Tupelo, Miss.
116 Tom McGaughy, 339 Front Street, Tupelo, Miss.
425 James Merry, Tupelo, R. F. D. No. 1, Miss.
358 George Miller, Belden, Miss.
1179 Ollie Miller, Nettleton, Miss.
122 Willis (Willie) Moody, Tupelo, Miss.
1302 Jesse (Jess) Moore (Jesse Moor), Verona, Miss.
614 B. (Bee) Owens, Shannon, Miss.
88 Fred Outlaw, Tupelo, Miss.
1536 Frank Petterson (Patterson), Orr Street, Tupelo, Miss.
2022 Nerbin (Nosbin) Priddy (Norman Preddy), Belden, Miss.
292 Thos. Smith, Tupelo, Miss.
1246 Will Smith, Tupelo, Miss.
1610 James Spencer, Tupelo, Miss.
1415 Lonzy (Loney) Sykes, Tupelo, Miss.
1679 Roy Sykes, Tupelo, Miss.
1033 John Wilson, 320 Orr, Tupelo, Miss.
654 Lem (Len) Woods, Tupelo, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PIKE, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

103 Davis Anderson (Andrews), Osyka, Miss.
1247 Joe Anderson, R. F. D. McComb, Miss.
429 George Barnes, McComb, Miss.
628 Edgar Black, McComb, Miss.
136 Tom Bridges, Fernwood, Miss.
1113 Clifton Brown, McComb, Miss.
2006 Joseph Brown, Southwest Corner Twelfth and State Streets, Chicago, Ill. (214 Desota Street, Macomb City, Miss.).
330 Willie Brown, 205 Marguritte Street, McComb, Miss.
678 Alvy Carr, Fernwood, Miss.
1177 John Compton (John H. Compton), McComb, Miss.
274 Sam Cooper, McComb, Miss.
1569 Charley Daniels, Fernwood, Miss.
1179 Tobias Dykes, R. F. D. 4, Magnolia, Miss.
1326 Eugene F. Eiland, 1134 LaBranch Street, McComb, Miss.
89 George Gatlin, Fernwood, Miss.
713 John Stevens Green (John Stephens Green), Magnolia, Miss.
53 Lonzie Greer, McComb, Miss.
1953 Leslie Hamilton, 925 Wall Street, McComb, Miss.
113 George Harper, McComb, Miss.
1286 Shelby Jackson, near McComb, Miss.
1493 Jayguse Jenkins (Jackson), McComb, Miss.
559 General Johnson, Magnolia, Miss.
2020 Tommie Jones (Tommey Jones (Tommet Jones)), Osyka, Miss.
1284 Charlie Lewis, Summit, Miss.
1520 Edgar Lewis, Magnolia, Miss.
389 Pink McGowen (Pink McGowan), R. F. D., Summit, Miss.
147 Alex Magruder, McComb, Miss.
703 Moses Massey (Moses Massy), Magnolia, Miss.
691 Esco May, Magnolia, Miss.
1354 John Morgan, Magnolia, Miss.
579 Allen Morris, Summit, Street, McComb, Miss.
743 Lowery Owens, McComb, Miss.
88 Carey Patterson, 221 Madison Street, McComb, Miss.
1268 Chas. Raiborn (Charlie Raiborn), Magnolia, Miss.
1735 Jesse Robinson (Jesse Raiborn), McComb, Miss.
598 Johnnie Robinson (Johnie Robinson, Jonnie Robinson), Osyka, Miss.
1718 Walter Sanders, Chatawa, Miss.
1173 Charley Smith (Charlie Smith), Magnolia, Miss.
1003 John Smith, Magnolia, Miss.
1670 Willie Smith, McComb, Miss.
905 Tom Swanigan (Tom Swearigan), McComb, Miss.
67 James Taylor, McComb City, Miss.
129a Will Thomas, McComb City, Miss.
1220 Fred Turner, McComb, Miss.
1504 Murray Varnado, Osyka, Miss.
1064 Wm. Webb (William Webb), Johnston Station, Miss.
558a Leon Williams, 512 Summit Street, McComb, Miss.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BARRY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

398 Rector Smith, 457 West Broad, Savannah, Ga.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BUTLER, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2416a Roy Alfred Boly, 944 Park Avenue, Poplar Bluff, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CASS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

341 Thomas Arthur Lacy, Drexel, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DUNKLIN, STATE OF MISSOURI.

1723 Henry Jones, Malden, Mo.
1171 Warren Martin, Malden, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF JASPER, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2515 Alvin Callen, Juno Hotel, East Main Street, Webb City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

1971A Harold E. Beal, general delivery, Kansas City, Mo.
2240 James Clark, Wyoth, Oreg. (515 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

1762 Paul Lewis Brady, 1853 Jefferson Street, Kansas City, Mo.
1219 Charles Lee Hatcher, 1727 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

709 Sherwood Ray King, 3537 Jefferson, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

109b Tom Cook, 702 Admiral Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO 6, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

808 Otto Dorrell (Dorell), 205 East Thirteenth, Kansas City, Mo.
474 Paul G. Schiller, 1611 Campbell, Kansas City, Mo.
931 Arthur Chester (Arthur C.) Theodore, 1614½ Oak, Kansas City, Mo.
671 Jois (Joit) Wiggins, 1619 Campbell, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 7, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

994½ Frank J. Megrem (Megerm, L. Megerm), 330 Maple Street, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

482 Harry Bradshaw, 1710 Paseo Street, Kansas City, Mo.
1155 John C. Kendall, 1212 Euclid Street (1212 Lydia Street), Kansas City, Mo.
1207 Harry R. (Randolph) Rapley, 1211 Highland Street, Kansas City, Mo.
2315 Howell Workcuff, 1320 East Fourteenth Street, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 14, CITY OF KANSAS CITY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

940 Jess C. Littler, 2719 Cypress Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NEW MADRID, STATE OF MISSOURI.

1915 Otis James (J.) Henley, Marehouse, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PEMISCOT, STATE OF MISSOURI.

500 Jim Smith, Foust, Mo.
2044A Ward Young, Hayti, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF RIPLEY, STATE OF MISSOURI.

182 Frank Daniel Stone, Grandlin, Mo.
851 Victor Smith (country), Doniphan, Mo. (Doniphan, Mo.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF ST. JOSEPH, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2387 Frank J. Alexander, 2301 South Sixth Street, St. Joseph, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2507 William Allen (Wm. A.) Bibbs, 321 Chauteau Avenue, St. Louis, Mo. (Spring and Olive Street Road, St. Louis County, Mo.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO 5, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

43 Henry Edward Happe, 1214 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
508 Richard Jones, 13 Gay Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 7, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

347 Baugher, James E. (J. Edward, James Edward), 1103 Morrison Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
332 Herget, Harold, 1309 Dillon Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 8, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

956 John Dobrich, 720 Soulard Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 18, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

1707 George C. (G. C.) Davis, 1867a Cass Avenue (1935 North Market Street), St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 19, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

872 William Shoemaker, 3111a North Market Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 20, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

926 Rudolph H. Geffrey (Rudolph Herman Guffroy, R. H.), 1528 Bacon Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO 24, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2736a Joseph E. Dumont, 5400 Arsenal Street, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 27, CITY OF ST. LOUIS, STATE OF MISSOURI.

2270 Arthur Burns, 5721 Roosevelt Place, St. Louis, Mo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF BEAVERHEAD, STATE OF MONTANA.

1187 John Larance Riley, 115 Thirty-first Street, Ogden, Utah (Fort Douglas, Utah).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF BLAINE, STATE OF MONTANA.

646 Delbert Baxter (Bexter), Zurich, Mont.
1225 George Backman, Great Northern Railroad Construction Co., Chinook, Mont.
39a John Joe (John) Cardene, Turner, Mont.
88 James Cosgrove, Chinook, Mont.
1007 Peter Harry Dillingham, Zurich, Mont.
975 Pete Etentoff (Pite Eftinoff), Coburg, Mont.
1543 Alvin M. Foss, Hydro, Mont. (Havre, Mont.).
665a Lloyd Harper, Saco, Mont.
48 William Harvell, Chinook, Mont.
891 Elmer Hendricks, Warrick, Mont.
512 Lester Higgins, Cleveland, Mont.
1370 John Holmgren, Chinook, Mont.
377a John Lambrecht, Turner, Mont.
632 Joe Lukl, Clarkson, Nebr.
1330 George Mandres (Mandras), Harlem, Mont.
592 Mont Minto Mellone (Mellon, Montague Minto Mellon), Chinook, Mont.
1234 Ivan Pool Milaon (Ivan Mellon), Lohman, Mont.
1281 Christopher Andreas (A.) Peterson (Andreas Christopher Petersen), Chinook, Mont.
763 Peter Poppovich (Popovich, Better Poppovich), Chinook, Mont.
1277 Mike Riesy (Mike John Riesis, Mike Riegy), Harlem, Mont.
1784 Edward Settera, Chinook, Mont.
1097 Thomas Vincent Shannon, Harlem, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF BUTTE, STATE OF MONTANA.

1346 Otto Aebi (Oebi), 447 South Ohio Street, Butte, Mont.
8525 George Allard, Butte City, Mont. (Helena, Mont.)
3141 Harry Allen, Galina and Dakota Avenues, Butte, Mont.
2770 Conrado Amador, 339 South Arizona Avenue, Butte, Mont. (Conrodo Amodor, 110 South Idaho Avenue.)
66 Erik (Eric, Erick) Anderson, 815 East Talena Street, Butte, Mont. (815 East Galena Street.)
811 John Anderson, 553 South Arizona Avenue, Butte, Mont.
2883 John Anderson, 904 South Wyoming Avenue, Butte, Mont.
4522 William Anderson, 313 South Arizona Avenue, Butte, Mont.
1446 Aist Anemagians (Arst Anemogians, Ckrt Anemogillis), 901 Utah Avenue, Butte, Mont.
274 Geo. Assimakopulos (Geo. A. Assimakoupulos, Geo. Aasima Kopulos), 17 West Galena Avenue, Butte, Mont.
1615 John Augustine, 240 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5698 Wm. Baird, 247 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2318 John Baner (Bauner), (John Bauer), 427 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
4319 Thomas Barker, 455 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
7561 Ernest Barnett, 305 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4903 Earl Barnhart, 20 West Park Avenue, Butte, Mont.
3381 David Barry (Borry), 714 North Wyoming Avenue, Butte, Mont.
4545 Jacob Basharn, 433 South Arizona Street, Butte, Mont.
4797 Wm Baynes, 119 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2039 Ewald Beck (Avald Beck, Evald Beck), 433 East Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
832 Harry Beck (Back), 55 East Park Avenue, Butte, Mont.
3820 Gust (Gus) Beckstrom, 320 South Dakota Street, Butte, Mont.
1443 Howard Beebe, 209 Colorado Street, Butte, Mont.
539 Alfred Bergerin, 331 North Wyoming Street, Butte, Mont.
5549 Walter Betsing, 1322 Madison Street, Butte, Mont.
3187 James M. Bishop (James Marvin Bishop, James Manin Bishop), 27 South Main Street, Butte, Mont. (alias Ray Wisner, County Jail, Butte, Mont.).
4118 John Blomquist, 1122 East Park Avenue, Butte, Mont.
7338 Dan P. Bonna (Dan P. Boone, D. T. Boone), county jail, Butte, Mont.
1407 Harry Bonner, 37 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1388 James Bonner, 1501 West Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
5606 James Bonner, 69 East Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
1213 Henry P. Botherell (Henry Roscoe Bothwell), 1128 Grand Avenue, Butte, Mont.
2183 Con Bower (Con Barr), 227 East Park Avenue, Butte, Mont.
6930 John Boyce, 643 Dakota Street, Butte, Mont.
541 Dan Boyle, Norwood Annex, Butte, Mont.
89 Dennis Boyle, 507 East Main Street, Butte, Mont.
4809 Patrick Boyle, 28 East Woolman Street, Butte, Mont.
6844 S. (Stephen) Brachtendorf, 738½ Maryland Street, Butte, Mont.
6617 Herbert A. Brackett (Herbert Allen Brackett), Penn Building, West Park, Butte, Mont.
516 Otis Bradley, Butte, Mont.
6935 Michael Brennan (Breman), 501 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
3089 Mike (Michael) Brennan, 147 Charles Street, New York City, N. Y.
2177 Patrick Brennan, jr. (Pat. J. Breman, Patrick J. Breman), 501 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
4209 James Brennen (Brennan), 438½ South Wyoming Street, Butte, Mont.
2321 James Burbage, 511 North Main Street, Butte, Mont., care of Tamarock Mine, Black Bear, Idaho.
2182 Vere Burkovich (Voso Burkovich, Varo Beksovich, Voro Kurkovich), 488 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
3351 Albert L. Calhoun (Albert Lerois Calhoun (Cathoun), Albert Lewis Calhoun), 433 South Main Street, Butte, Mont.
5218 Cornelius Callahan, 311 East Front Street, Butte, Mont.
7736 Thomas Cameron, 315a East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
1216 Leroy J. Cannon (Leroy John Cannon), Oxford Hotel, Butte, Mont.
8109 Thomas J. Caplis (Thomas Jaspher Caplis, Thomas Jasper Caplis (Coplis)), 58 West Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
2087 Patrick Carroll, 107 West Quartz Street, Butte, Mont.
3340 James Carty (Carthy), 10 East Gagnon Street, Butte, Mont.
2478 Hugh Casey, 103 West Broadway, Butte, Mont. (care M. S. Telephone and Telegraph Co.).
2011 John Casey (James Casey), 1027 Wankwzha Street, Butte, Mont.
4748 Lee Sui Chan (Chan), 430 South Arizona Street, Butte, Mont.
6853 Patrick Christopher, 600 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
1126 John Clifford (transient), Butte, Mont.
462 A. E. Coates (Al. E. Coates, H. E. Coates), 104 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
1165 Albert Cole, 623 Utah Street, Butte, Mont.
6747 James Collins, 455 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1787 Edward A. Condon (Edward Aloysius Condon), 105 South Colorado Street, Butte, Mont.
8207 Pat Conley (Pat Connolloly), 427 Main Street, Butte, Mont.
2203 John Connell, 48 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
7448 James Connolly, Casper, Wyo.
4543 Patrick J. Connors, 33½ East Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
3282 Neil Convery, 26 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
8060 Albert F. Cooley (Albert Franklin Cooley), 411 South Dakota Street, Butte, Mont.
2526 Tom Cora (Sam Cora) (no address), Butte, Mont.
7217 John Cosgrove, 1144 West Park Street, Butte, Mont.
8020 Thomas J. Coyle, 100 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
7948 Patrick Cremin, 29 East Quartz Street, Butte, Mont.
5196 John Curran, 443 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2689 Milan Dachoff (Milon Dachoff), 6 West Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
1724 Warren (Warner) Dahlman, 343 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
4752 Francis E. Deniff (Francis Eugene Deniff), 516 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
2091 John Doherty, 227 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
8510 Patrick Doherty, 521 North Wyoming Street, Butte, Mont.
6090 Bernard O. Dougherty, 129 Anconda Road, Butte, Mont.
2101 Dennis Donahue (Donohue), 302 North Arizona Street, Butte, Mont.
507 Frank Her Donahue Frank Herbert Donoghue, Donoughue, Frank Her. Donoughue), 27 South Main Street, Butte, Mont.
1418 Mike Donlin (Michael Donlan, Donlon, Mike Donlan), 29 East Quartz Street, Butte, Mont.
3937 Patrick Donovan, 455 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
817 Con Downey, 34 East Woolman Street, Butte, Mont.
2993 Wm. J. Driscoll, 316 West Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
3748 James Duffy, 1008 West Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
6759 Terence Duffy (Ternce Duffy), 240 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2422 John Duggan (Duggon), 627 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
2126 Elmer Eastman, 240 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. (Eureka, Utah).
2584 Albert F. Emlich (Albert Fred Ermlich, Emlich), 1501 Harrison Avenue, Butte, Mont.
3404 Wm. C. Emmett, 496 Broadway, Butte, Mont. (care Snowstorm Mine, Troy, Mont.).
4350 Simon E. Endan (Simon Elfrid Emham, Embam, Enbam), 536 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
3140 Edgar C. Enger, 747 Utah Street, Butte, Mont.
3841 Harry R. Erickson (Harry Rufus Erickson), 540 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2080 Augustine Esquanna (Augutsin Esquerra, Esqurra, Augustin Esguna, 430 South Ohio Street, Butte, Mont.
1390 Clifton Estep (Eslep), Freemont, Nebr.
868 Wm. F. Eubank (Wm. Fred Eubank), 61 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
4784 Erick Fan, 10 East Gagnon Street, Butte, Mont.
2279 Ludwig Farseth, 10 East Gagnon Street, Butte, Mont.
4106 James Fay (Jim Fay), 15 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
874 Patrick (Pairick) Ferry, 37 East Bolmay Street, Butte, Mont.
3595 John Fisher, 225 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
7823 Thomas Fitzgerald (Fitsgarald), 360 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
8076 Martin Flaherty, 205 Quartz Street, Butte, Mont. (205 West Quartz Street).
2774 Harvey J. Foley (Arvey Joseph Foley, Arvery), 9 East Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
5135 Ah Fong, 24 West Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
3992 Ray E. Foster, 11 South Montana Street, Butte, Mont. (Ray Emmons Foster, Bowers Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.)
3146 James A. Franklin, 1031 South Arizona Street, Butte, Mont. (James Arthur Franklin, Plasaville, Idaho).
6071 William J. Fraynd (Wm. John Fraynd, Wm. Fraynd), 401 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
8617 Patrick Frazer, 417 North Wyoming Street, Butte, Mont.
4134 Jim Foo Fum (Gim Foo Hum), 24 East Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
8270 Thomas H. Gah, 102 South Main Alley, Butte, Mont.
4287 Daniel Gallager (Gallagher), 337 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4536 James Gallagher, 66 North Granite Street, Butte, Mont. (166 West Granite Street).
5787 Joseph Gallagher, 337 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
7864 Thomas J. Gara, 160 North Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
284 Mike Gasser (Gosser), 286 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
8561 Joe Geisleichter (Jos. Geisteichta, Geisleichta, Joe Foyer), 10 Gagnon Street, Butte, Mont.
6285 Ernest Giannoni (Grannoni, Geannoni), Florence Hotel, Butte, Mont.
4640 Fred Giannoni (Frederick Paul Granmoni), Florence Hotel, Butte, Mont.
3602 Fred Gilbert, 704 Utah Street, Butte, Mont.
5762 Dan Gillispie (Gillespie), 322 North Arizona Street, Butte, Mont.
6874 Thomas Ginty, 215 East Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
3138 John Gioannetti (Giovannetti), 116 West Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
4696 Hes Leung Gong, 114 South Main Street, Butte, Mont.
43 Pat Grady, 603 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
2512 Patrick Grant, 5 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
487 Peter Grant, 15 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
4682 Patrick Greene (not located), Butte, Mont.
822 Frank Hagen, 241 East Granite Street, Butte, Mont. (244 East Granite.)
7432 Dennis Haggerty (Haggarty, Denis Haggarty), 26 W. Broadway, Butte, Mont.
8194 Patrick Hagle (Patrick Nagle), 80 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
6871 Yalmer Hakkinen (Jahmer Hakkinen), 412 East Park Alley, Butte, Mont.
1157 Wm. Hanson, Florence Hotel, Butte, Mont.
703 Frank Harding, 527 Chicago, Butte, Mont.
4487 Denis (Dennis) Harkins, 29½ East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
2200 Martin Harkins, 26 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
7522 John Harley (Healey), 14 East Woolmin Street, Butte, Mont.

7371 John P. Harrington, 918 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
5035 Tim Harrington, 627 North Main, Butte, Mont.
6485 Robert Harrison, 10 West Washington, Butte, Mont.
2721 Thomas Harrison, 17 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6442 Frank W. Harvey, South Butte Post Office, Butte, Mont.
4601 Peter Hastings, 26 East Quartz, Butte, Mont.
7515 Daniel Healy, 510 East Mercury Street, Butte, Mont.
8162 John Healy (Healey), 23 North Quartz, Butte, Mont. (West Quartz.)
5119 Harold Hedman, 204 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2015 Edward Heneghan, 534½ Edway, Butte, Mont.
7868 Patrick Heneghan, 427 North Main, Butte, Mont.
3264 Egnas Heotelis (Keotelis), 67 East Park, Butte, Mont.
137 John Herlihey (Herlihy), 603 North Main, Butte, Mont.
7164 Martin Joseph Higgins, 574 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8107 John Hiltunen, 315 East Park, Butte, Mont.
566 Arthur Hivala, Wallace Blk., East Park, Butte, Mont.
1534 Silus Hokknen (Silins Hokkanen, Selens), 420 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1368 Emil Holli, 525 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2540 John A. Hoper (John Arthur Hoper), 550 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
2914 Wing Sien Hor (Hoe, Wing Sew Hor), 112 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
7943 Edward P. Hoyne, 209 North Montana, Butte, Mont.
452 Thomas Hrang (Heans), 217 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
1461 William Hromis (Hronis), Woodrow Hotel, Butte, Mont.
7585 Yam Hum (Hum Yon), 117 South Main, Butte, Mont.
1179 Yuen Hung Heum, 38 East Quartz Street, Butte, Mont. (Yuen Hung Hum), 39 East Murcury).
5023 Axel Isaacson, 24 South Gaylord, Butte, Mont.
8159 Wallace W. Jacobson (Wallace Whelman (Whelman) Jacobson), 493 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
3531 Riza Jamal, 222 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
1505 Nelson Jame (Jane), 615 East Murcury, Butte, Mont.
1313 Herman Jarvey, 319 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5388 Hugh Gerald Jeffery, 745 South Main Street, Butte, Mont.
4675 Olie J. Jenson, Niagara, Butte, Mont. (Niagara, Wis).
1514 Julius Johanson (Johnson), 332 South Main, Butte, Mont.
7895 Carl Johnson, 347 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
3556 Harry Johnson, Lincoln Hotel, Butte, Mont.
5756 John Johnson, 245 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6734 Oscar Johnson, 431 South Main, Butte, Mont.
2330 Wm. S. Johnson (W. S. Johnson), 3 L. Nelson Hotel, Butte, Mont.
8608 Wetar Jumso (Witkar Yumsa), 9½ North Oklahoma, Butte, Mont.
3873 Alexander Kahlia (Kahila), 402 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1500 Michael Kane, 104 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
1180 Stanford Kangas (Sanfred Kangas), 832 East Murcury, Butte, Mont.
1567 John L. Karmodi (Carmody), 231 Montana, Butte, Mont.
1395 Peter Keane, 20 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
2145 Patrick Kearney (Pat'k Keaney, Pat Keaney), 225 North Main, Butte, Mont.
3194 Bartholomew Kellerher (Bathotomwen Kellehar, Bartholomero Kelleher), 7 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
1620 Reginald (Reginold) Kellett, 406 East Murcury, Butte, Mont.
4181 Claude L. Kelley (Kelly), Butte, Mont.
1635 Martin Kelley, 33 West Copper, Butte, Mont. (Kelley, 120 West Daly, Walkerville, Mont.).
2209 Patrick Kelley (Kelly), 823 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
620 Cyrus D. Kelly (Kelley), 332 South Main, Butte, Mont.
5799 Ray Kelly, 50 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
2882 John Kennedy, 51 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3308 Edd Kerkela (Kerkle), 27 East Copper, Butte, Mont.
6596 Carl J. Kern, 33 Anaconda Road, Butte, Mont.
2095 Aerid Kertin (Arvid Kerttie, Arvid Kertla, Arird Kerttie), 364 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
921 Urho Kesti, 420 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. (Urko Kesto, Urho Kesti, 700 West Galena).
4899 Walter E. Kimbro (W. E. Kimbro), 218 South Dakota, Butte, Mont. (Walter E. Kimlino), Rexburg, Idaho.
7546 Hubert Kinahan (Hugh Kinahan), 224 South Main, Butte, Mont.
649 Henry Kind, 278 Park, Butte, Mont.
6890 John A. Kongsbach (Kongsback), 216 East Quartz, Butte, Mont.
7489 Alfons J. Krause (Alfons John Krause), 110 West Granite, Butte, Mont.
537 Olaf E. Kugala (Kujala), 518 Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6178 Nocica Kujunzich (Noorca Kujunzich, Norrco Kujungrich, Novica Kujunzich), 528 East Murcury, Butte, Mont.
7095 Nik Kusovich (Nik Koesovich), 801 East Park, Butte, Mont.
4132 Arthur Kytta, 1322 Madison, Butte, Mont.
3895 David Laatikainen (Laatikaimen), 420 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1435 Wm. A. Laipinen (Laiteinen), 126 Covert Street, Butte, Mont.
8415 George Land (George Lank, Lauk), 112 West Galena, Butte, Mont.
3539 Mike Landers (Michael Landers, Mike Laders), 115 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
3905 Darrius L. Large (Darius Lenuel Large, Daries Lenuel Large, Darius J. Large), 2340 Harrison Avenue, Butte, Mont.
1805 Carl Larson (Carl Larsen), 705 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
6315 Wm. Larson, 348½ or 318½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
7169 Paul B. Lathrop, 22 South Main, Butte, Mont.
1842 John Lavin, 502 North Main, Butte, Mont.
4743 Patrick (Patric) Lavin, 512 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
6549 Leo F. Lawrence, 643 South Utah, Butte, Mont.
3491 Edd Lehto (Ed Lehto), 332 East Park, Butte, Mont.
2029 Paul Loitz, 14 East Gagnon, Butte, Mont.
6961 Frank Lesa (Liss), 337 Virginia Street, Butte, Mont.
3570 Ah Hung Leung (Ah Hugh Leung), 28 West Mercury, Butte, Mont.
8219 Jack Lewis, 1 D. Nelson Hotel, Butte, Mont.
3550 Alix Lindburg, 24 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
289 Mike Lizotte (Lizotti), Dorthy Block, Butte, Mont.
8063 Nathaniel Lloyd (Nathaniel L. Lloyd, Nathanal L. Loyd), Hennessy Annex, Butte, Mont.
6183 John Long, San Francisco, Calif.
5429 Webster Long (Wester Long, Lang), 514 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3137 Lewis Lovirsh (Louis Lovrish), 320 East Mercury, Butte, Mont.
1160 John Lukan (Luken), 517½ South Dakota, Butte, Mont.
7492 Victor Lundgren, 226 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
1310 Gam Lungton (Gam Lung Tom), 24 West Mercury, Butte, Mont.
645 Cunni Luinni (Onni Linna), 253 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
8882 Thomas A. Luoma (Thomas Augusti Luoma), 2001 Walnut, Butte, Mont.
1946 George Luthy (George Raymond Luthy, Geo. R. Lethy, Raymong George Luthy), 324 Howard Block, Butte, Mont.
8098 James W. Lynch (James Wesley Lynch), 10 Broadway, Theatre Block, Butte, Mont.
8453 Cornelius McBride, 520 North Idaho, Butte, Mont.
2941 Peter McBrien, 34 East Quartz, Butte, Mont.
1679 Wm. McCann (Wm. Henry McCann, McConn), 112 South Main Butte, Mont.
113 Tim J. McCarthy, 356 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
6279 Barney McClorey, 422 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
76 Patrick McClorey, 306 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
6583 Cornelius McCole, 1404 C Street, Butte, Mont.
8169 Thomas McCue, Lennox Hotel, Butte, Mont.
4817 Charles F. McDaniels, 722 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
3277 Archie A. McDonald, room 320, Goldberg Block, Butte, Mont.
6164 Morman (Norma R., Norman R.) McDonald, 237 Colorado, Butte, Mont.
8620 Thomas (Tom) McDermott, Butte, Mont. (Burke, Idaho).
8294 John B. McElaney (McEleney), 225 Main North, Butte, Mont.
7979 Arthur J. McElroy (Arthur James McElroy), 23 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
6652 Patrick McFadden, 316 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
5991 Edwin S. M. McGary (Edwin Stowe Mark McGary, McGory), 17 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
8204 Con McGill, 337 E. Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4877 Edward McGill, Dorthy Black, Butte, Mont.
1783 Charles D. MacGillivray (Charles Daniel MacGillivray), 322½ North Main, Butte, Mont.
3307 Ed McGinley, 507 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8127 Peter McGlinchey, 523 North Montana, Butte, Mont.
5913 Patrick J. McGuinn, 501 North Main, Butte, Mont.
1400 Patrick McGuire (McGuyane), 104 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
4244 Alexander (Alex.) McInnis, 600 South Dakota, Butte, Mont.
7346 Peter McKenna, Carpenter Creek, Mont. (14 East Cooper, Butte, Mont.)
5438 John McLaughlin, 110 E. Woolman, Butte, Mont. (Cardona House, Burt, Idaho.)
2593 Patrick McLaughlin, 227 East Park, Butte, Mont.
6753 Peter McLaughlin, 120 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3706 Wilson McLaughlin, 501 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8323 Martin McNulty, 126 East Park, Butte, Mont. (Mart McNully, 585 Idaho Springs, Colo.)
3704 John McQuaid, 133 East Park, Butte, Mont. (Leadville, Colo.)
2054 Patrick McVeigh, 452 East Platinum, Butte, Mont.
7404 James Macrae, Abis (Apex) Hotel, Butte, Mont. (MacRae, Dep. of Justice, Los Angeles, Calif.
781 Patrick Manhan (Mahone, Monhan), 430 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
2124 Wm. Maher, 623 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2596 Timothy Mahoney, 603 North Main, Butte, Mont.
636 Carl Malmloo, 360 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6555 Owen Mangan, 26½ East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
5100 Thomas Mannion, 41 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
1930 Frank Markel, 1316 Madison, Butte, Mont.
1905 Charles (Charlie) Marks, 29 West Silver, Butte, Mont.
8021 Peter Marras, 20 North Silver, Butte, Mont. (20 West Silver).
2997 Walter Matson (Mattson), 14 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
5643 William Mattson, 338 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3773 Francis Meehan, 27 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
8595 Charles E. Mill (Charles Edwin Mills), 209 Colorado, Butte, Mont.
4967 Evo J. Miller (John Miller), 2001 Nevada, Butte, Mont.
3453 Wm. Mitchell, 26 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3450 Michael Moi (Moy), 430 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8250 Edward (Edmund) Monk, 41 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5201 Wong Moon, 102 South Main Alley, Butte, Mont.
3236 John Moore, 5 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
8197 Wm. Moore, Northern Hotel, Butte, Mont.
2389 Frank E. Morgenson (Frank Edgar Morgenson), 112 West Galena, Butte, Mont.
1476 Oscar Morising (Morsing), 56 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5095 Mike J. Morrisey (Mike Joseph Morrisey), 468½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4915 Daniel Moynihan, 526 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
5338 James P. Mulderig (James Patrick Mulderig), 1312 Hobson, Butte, Mont.
4684 Michael Mulderig, 1312 Hobson Street, Butte, Mont.
1962 Michael J. Mulligan, 517 North Main, Butte, Mont. (Hennessy Annex).
131 Jarlath F. Mullin (Muller, Jarlath Franch Muller), Muller Block, South Montana, Butte, Mont.
4444 Steven Mullin (Stephen Mullin), 14 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
6271 Anthony Murphy, 104 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
6329 Matthew Murphy, 26 North Broadway, Butte, Mont. (26 West Broadway).
702 Thos. T. Murphy, 901 Utah Avenue, Butte, Mont.
3481 Wm. Murphy, 225 North Main, Butte, Mont.
5530 Arthur H. Murray (Arthur Henry Murrary, Murroy), 121 South Colorado, Butte, Mont.
7748 Matthew Murray (Matthews Murray), 211 South Ohio Street, Butte, Mont.
6764 Anthony J. Muscaro (Anthony Joseph Muscaro, 9 North Clark Street, Butte, Mont.
6638 Batt Nealon, 430 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
8557 Andrew Nelson, 21 South Dakota, Butte, Mont.
1172 Frank Nelson, 501 North Main, Butte, Mont.
3597 Ole Nelson, 10 East Gagnon, Butte, Mont.
2259 Edward Newell, 321 North Idaho, Butte, Mont.
958 Wm. Newell, 27 W. Quartz, Butte, Mont.
2534 Yow Ong Ng, 430 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
4222 Mills E. Nielson (Nils Edwin Nilsson), 1334 Iowa, Butte, Mont.
946 Charles Nonde (Charles Bonde), 730 East Park, Butte, Mont.
2449 John Norton, 412 West Granite, Butte, Mont.
4387 John Norton, 412 West Granite, Butte, Mont.
338 Febi Nousiainon (Nousianen), 20½ North Grant, Butte, Mont.
6311 George E. Nutt, 37 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4860 Alfred Nygard, 353 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. (Arizona Hotel, Butte, Mont.).

840 Nagas Nygren (Magnus Nygred, Magnus Nygren), 636 East Park, Butte, Mont.
4584 Francis O'Brien, care Gen. Del., Butte, Mont., (23 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.).
6940 Patrick O'Brien, 28 East Quartz, Butte, Mont.
8412 Patrick J. O'Brien (Patrick Joseph O'Brien), 512 North Main, Butte, Mont.
495 Thos. O'Brien, County Hospital, Butte, Mont.
6855 Dennis O'Connell, 304 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
4703 James O'Connell (O'Connel), 631 South Dakota, Mont.
2072 John O'Jala (O'Jola, Ojola), 932 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6558 Abraham (Abarham) Olson, 332 South Main, Butte, Mont.
2060 John O'Neill, Clarence Hotel, Butte, Mont.
2577 Tom O'Neill, Florence Hotel, Butte, Mont.
8134 Thomas O'Rilley (O'Reilly), 507 North Main, Butte, Mont.
332 Peter Orva (Orava, Orova), 365 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
241 Joseph O'Shea, 24 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
4633 Peter Osle, 721 East Mercury, Butte, Mont.
271 Henry Paanola (Paarola), 363 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2986 Joseph Raymond Paetter (Poettee, Jos. R. Poettee), 5311 Wyauhing Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa.
6110 Isaac Pala (Pola), 402 East Broadway, Butte, Mont. (Box 138, Mullen, Idaho).
4514 Nicola Pavichavich (Parvichavich, Parvickavich), 313 East Park, Butte, Mont.
2482 John Payton, 26 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1636 John Peabody, Rear 414 South Dakota, Butte, Mont.
5493 Frank L. Pellissier (Pellissee), 53 West Park, Butte, Mont.
4796 Harry G. Perkins (Harry George Perkins), Butte, Mont.
2588 Albert Peterson, 1943 Warren, Butte, Mont.
3399 Ira C. Petree, Finlin Hotel, Butte, Mont.
3829 Martin Phillips, 16 East Gagnon, Butte, Mont.
701 Frank Pirc (Pierce), 536 East Warren, Butte, Mont.
8542 Alex Posharsky (Alexander Pasharsky, Alexander Posharsky), 223 Anaconda, Butte, Mont.
6689 Oney Powell, 715 East Front Street, Butte, Mont.
2393 Daniel D. Powers, 14 South Quartz, Butte, Mont.
2888 Cluck (Chcuk, Chick) Quan, 115 South Main Alley, Butte, Mont.
1913 Jack Quon (Jack Onon), 109 Broadway Alley, Butte, Mont.
373 Mike Tom Radich, 709 East Mercury, Butte, Mont.
6075 Rod Rankin, 10 South Idaho, Butte, Mont. (14 North Washington).
2435 Charles H. Raymond (Charles Harmon Raymond, Charles Harman Raymond), 502 South Mont., Butte, Mont.
63 George F. Raymond, 104 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
973 Leroy Raymond (Le Roy Raymondtte), Hansen Packing Co., Mont.
6508 Fred Rayner, 8 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
8580 Owen Reilly (Owen Reilley), 103 Bell Street, Butte, Mont.
4337 Edwin V. Richards, 341 East Mercury, Butte, Mont. (326 Curtis Street).
4486 James P. Rigs (James Patrick Riggs), 118 South Main, Butte, Mont.
2996 Pat Rochford, 205 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
1210 Arist Rodaphineas (Arist Rodophinas), 517 South Main Street, Butte, Mont.
1748 Timothy Rohan (Timothy Rohon), 240 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6180 James Rooney, 80 East Park, Butte, Mont.
1248 James T. Ross (James Thomas Ross, J. T. Ross), Doyle Hotel, Butte, Mont.
4101 Robert Rutan, 246 East 60th Street, New York, N. Y. (Robert F. Putan, Colonial Hotel, Butte, Mont.).
334 Victor Saari, 808 East Park, Butte, Mont.
3275 Charley Sables (Charlie Sables), 330 South Mont., Butte, Mont.
4328 Baseloos Safromopoulez (Baseleus Safeanopoulos, Basceleos Sofeanopoulos, Baseloos Saframopoules), 427 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
8657 William F. Salonka (William Frank Salonka, Wm. Frank Solonko, Wm. Frank Solonka, W. F. Solonko), 219 West Galena, Butte, Mont.
8075 Pat Sanmon (Pat J. Sammon, Pat J. Sommon), 433 South Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4372 John B. Santhez (John B. Sanchez), 404 West Galena, Butte, Mont.
530 Dirk Schants (Dirk Schautz), Mueller Hotel, Butte, Mont.
2516 Patrick Schiles (Patrick Shiels), 422 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5587 T. A. Schonberger, Leonard Hotel, Butte, Mont.
8600 Frank Schooley, Clock Block, Butte, Mont.
6979 Albert Schimann, Curtis Block, West Park Street, Butte, Mont.
3968 Frank Ernest Schwatke (Frank Earnest Schwatke), 1512 Irvine, Butte, Mont.
8192 Wm. J. Sharpe, 447 South Ohio, Butte, Mont.
5630 Dennis Shea, 5 West Copper, Butte, Mont. (Denis Shea, 59 West Copper Street).
456 Eugene Shea, 26 East Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
7773 Patrick Shea, 808 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8509 David Sheehan, 607 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
3464 Jeremiah Sheehan (Jeremiah M. Sheehan), 107 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
8618 John Shields, Butte, Mont.
3649 Arthur P. Sinks, 56 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
88 Ole Sliper (Ole Slipper), 112½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4658 Pat Sloan, 503 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2074 Geo. Smilomick, 224 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
6243 Thomas S. Smith (Thomas Starr Smith), Vroom Hotel, Butte, Mont.
8121 Peter Smirnis (Oster Smirris), 343½ South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
5468 Alexander Sofas (Alexander Safos), 427 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
6632 Alfrando Sorin (Alfrado Sorine, Alfredo, Alfredo Sorin), 124 South Arizona, Butte, Mont.
1708 Joseph Spelich (Joe Spelich), 244 South Warren, Butte, Mont.
2722 Charles Spoja (Alfredo Sorin), 515 Warren, Butte, Mont.
2871 George Stamatis (George G. Stamatis), 112½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
111 Mike Stanton, 48 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
2490 Wm. B. Staritt (Wm. Badger Sterritt), 1024 Utah Avenue, Butte, Mont.
5482 James P. Stenson, 43½ East Park, Butte, Mont.
5225 Patrick J. Sugure (Sugrue), 333 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2257 Cornelius Sullivan, 14 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
8553 Dan C. Sullivan, 23 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
461 Dennis (Denis) Sullivan), 34 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
2174 Dennis Sullivan, 225 North Main, Butte, Mont.
7738 George Sullivan, 17 East Sliver, Butte, Mont.
173 Jerry M. Sullivan, 309 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2869 John Sullivan, 61 East Broadway (361 East Broadway), Butte, Mont.
3902 Joseph J. Sullivan (Jas. J. Sullivan), 627 North Main, Butte, Mont.
7517 Mike Sullivan, 627 North Main, Butte, Mont.
1280 Patrick Sullivan, 521 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
4786 Stephen B. Sullivan (Stephen Bryan O'Sullivan), 300 South Colorado, Butte, Mont.
3549 Thomas J. Sullivan, 415 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1610 Thomas Sullivan, 16 East Gagnon, Butte, Mont.
1583 Edward Sumdman, 628 East Galena, Butte, Mont.
4029 John C. Sumter (John Carl Sumpter), 406 Warren, Butte, Mont.
2385 Albert Sundquist (Albert Sundkrist), 521 East Galena, Butte, Mont.
1111 Oliver Swanson, 10 East Gagnon, Butte, Mont.
1064 James Sweeney (James F. Sweeney), 69 East Copper, Butte, Mont.
7574 Michael Sweeney, 402 Third Street, Portland, Oreg. (401 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.).
6870 Wm. P. Symons (Wm. Percy Symons), 53 West Park, Butte, Mont.
1988 Henry Systrup (Lystrup), 26 West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
4240 John Tachmier, 733 East Mercury, Butte, Mont.
1731 John R. Taggert (Taggart), 131 West Copper, Butte, Mont.
1645 Kabronco Talsido (Fabronco Talsido), County Jail, Butte, Mont.
7929 Ralph R. Terry, 600 West Mercury, Butte, Mont.
163 Nick Tevas, 4 North Arizona, Butte, Mont.
194 James Lorenze (Lorenzo) Thomas, 502 South Montana, Butte, Mont.
3295 Rolland Thomas (Rowland Thomas), 10 East Gagon, Butte, Mont.
8563 Charles Tichonen (Chas. Tiihonen, Chas. Tichonen), 276 East Park, Butte, Mont.
1469 August Titkajarvi (August Pitkajarvi), 49 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
2538 Erick Tolonen (Tolenen), 354½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
568 Jelmar R. Torikka (Jalmar Torikka, Jarmar Tonkka), 402 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
1155 Evan W. Tiskafson (Tostafson) (Eben W. Tostafson) (Tostapson), King Block, West Park, Butte, Mont. (1 King Block, Butte, Mont.).
8071 Dan Towey, 303 North Main, Butte, Mont.
7847 Stephen Traner (Tranpr), 28 East Copper, Butte, Mont.
8432 George T. Trischman, Elwood Block, East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3024 Omar R. Tunch (Omer R. Bunch), 333 Utah Avenue, Butte, Mont.
8094 Sidney Turner, 217 West Park, Butte, Mont.
2965 Michal Twomey (Michael Twomey, Mike Twomey), 344 West Granite, Butte, Mont.
8272 Aaati Tyrvainnen (Aatie Tyrvainen, Aati Tyrvainer), 420 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.
694 Russell B. Basbinder (Vasbinder) (Russell Benjamin Vasbinder), 118 South Main, Butte, Mont.
6776 Percy R. Veinot (Percy Raymond Veinot), 750 Centennial Avenue, Butte, Mont.
2631 Wasil Wacuk (Wasel Wacuk), 1037 West Steele, Butte, Mont.
4560 James Walker, Colfax, Iowa.
1601 Fred Walquist, 228 East Park, Butte, Mont. (Florence Hotel, Butte, Mont.).
8589 John Walsh, 604 North Main, Butte, Mont.
4643 Martin Walsh, 126 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
955 Warren L. Walters (Waters) (Warren L. Watters), 412 North Washington, Butte, Mont.
363 Elias Wandick (Wanvick, Wauvick), 227 Anaconda Road, Butte, Mont.
3782 Wm. J. Ward (Wm. Jos. Ward), 118 South Oklahoma (Oklahoma), Butte, Mont.
7549 Barney Waters (Barrey Waters), 26 W. Broadway, Butte, Mont.
6775 Mike Waters, N Street, Broadway, Butte, Mont.
5772 Melville Watson, 302 South Main, Butte, Mont.
6992 Robert Webber, 35 North Main, Butte, Mont.
8228 Peter O. Weigand (Peter Otto Weigand) (not located), Butte, Mont.
1918 Herbert B. Williams (Herbert D. Williams), 28 East Quartz Street, Butte, Mont.
6125 Michael Welsh, 15 West Woolman, Butte, Mont.
4072 James White, 8 West Cooper, Butte, Mont.
2601 Robert F. White, 303 South Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
4220 Thomas Whority (Whirity), 5 Copper, Butte, Mont.
6845 Walter Wiggiuton, 546 East Galena, Butte, Mont.
6454 Frank Williams, 538 East Mercury, Butte, Mont.
6634 Harry D. Wilson, 120 North Montana, Butte, Mont.
6536 Peter L. Wilson (Peter Leo Wilson), 1712 Hobson Avenue, Butte, Mont.
6325 Hum Wing (Hom Wing), 207 South Main, Butte, Mont.
7308 Jalmer Wirkkala (Wirkkola), 118 South Oklahoma, Butte, Mont.
6360 Lee S. Walkowicz (Walkowitz), Aberdeen Post Office, box 344, Wash. (1304 M Division, Butte, Mont.).
8030 Rudolph Wuerl (Wuerd, Wued), 629 West Granite, Butte, Mont.
1161 Thos. Woods, 23 West Quartz, Butte, Mont.
453 Manuel Yost, 510½ West Galena, Butte, Mont.
5485 John A. Young, 437 South Hopkins, Butte, Mont.
3368 Nick Zikiem (Zikiin), 224 South Arizona Street, Butte, Mont.
3626 Michael J. Roddy, 511 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
5644 Joseph Rodgers, 48 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
8125 Jerry Shea, 26 East Copper Street, Butte, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CARBON, STATE OF MONTANA.

1392 Raymond Anderson, Bearcreek, Mont.
1197 Geo. Bulmerich (George Blumerich, Blumreich), Joliet, Mont.
1584 Mighill Christ, Flat Avenue, Red Lodge, Mont.
1087a Arthur Cox, Joliet, Mont.
1636 Otto Erber, Fromberg, Mont.
153 Geo. (George) Hanni, 214 South Platt, Red Lodge, Mont.
7 Emil Hanssha (Kanasha) (Emel Kansala, Emil Kansala, Emil Kansaha), Red Lodge, Mont.

613 Herman Haryu, Bearcreek, Mont. (201 South Haggin, Red Lodge, Mont.)
1596 Anthony Hocko, Bridger, Mont. (Antony Hocko, Tony Hocko, Budjer, Mont.)
84 Wm. Cecil Jenkins (William Cecil Jenkins), Belfry, Mont.
916 Thos. Karney, Beaver, Wyo. (Thomas Kearney, San Francisco, Calif.)
1098 Arvid Kumpula, South Platt, Red Lodge, Mont.
1715 Adolph Malm, Bridger, Mont.
1457 Wm. H. Phillips, care of Victor Person Logging Camp, Usk, Wash. (William Henry Phillips, Silesia, Mont.)
71 W. Chas. Pokel (William Charles Pokel, William C. Pokel, William Chas. Pokel), Roberts, Mont.
253 Robert E. Ritchie (Robert Earnest Ritchie, Robert Ernest Ritchie, Robt. Ernest Ritchie), Bridger, Mont.
1772 Wm. Sale, 224 South Platt, Red Lodge, Mont. (William Salo, 224 South Platte, Red Lodge, Mont.)
908 Jovan Teslic (Teslic Jovan), 607 South Broadway, Red Lodge, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CASCADE, STATE OF MONTANA.

1471 James C. (Cavil) Adams, Tracy Hotel, Great Falls, Mont. (808 Yegen Block, Butte, Mont.).
4061 Sam A. Adams, 515 Seventh S., Great Falls, Mont.
829 George Ahern, 114 Third S., Great Falls, Mont.
2415 Herbert Lee Aleshire, 901 Seventh N., Great Falls, Mont.
3192 Robert Allen, Hotel Belmont, Great Falls, Mont.
5754 William Allen, city jail, Great Falls, Mont.
5627 John Abraham Anderson, San Coulee, Mont.
2091 Nels (Nils) Anderson, 1117 Ninth S., Great Falls, Mont.
4492 Paul Anick, Daly Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1214 Reino Antila, Stockett, Mont.
4012 Jacob Askelo (Askeli), Stockett, Mont.
5183 Lee Fred (Freed) Austin, Vaiden, Miss.
3805 John Jacob Bailey, 508 Con., Great Falls, Mont. (general delivery, Portland, Oreg.).
4692 Harry L. Barnes, Great Falls Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
928 Marsh Barnes, Belt, Mont.
3154 James Barnhart, Fife, Mont.
1492 Clarence Bearnish (Clareance A. Bearnish), 409 Sixth S., Great Falls, Mont.
4023 James Maciey Beattie (James Macjey Bottie), Warner, Alberta, Canada.
3988 Wm. Clair Bechdel, 416½ Cent. N., Great Falls, Mont.
5728 Henry H. Behm, care Works G. N. Ry. Co., 326 Sixth, Mason City, Iowa.
6017 William J. (John) Behm, boarding car, G. N. Ry., Great Falls, Mont.
1310 Nenny (Benny) Bell, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont. (409 West Second, Casper, Mont.
3831 Wyman Boddie, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
922 Thomas Boler (Thomas George Boler), bunk car, North Side, Great Falls, Mont.
5382 Alvin August Borth, Ulm, Mont. (Great Falls, Mont.).
5629 Chas. Wm. Brindley, Cascade, Mont.
4701 Geo. F. (Frederick) Brown, 410½ First S., Great Falls, Mont. (Oakland Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.).
2853 Joseph Brown (Joseph Browne), 802 Powell, Waukegan, Ill. (Ft. Benton, Mont.).
1424 Harry H. Burnett (Harry Hilton Burnett), 905 Fourth S., Great Falls, Mont.
5039 Franklin O. (Orville) Burns, Portage, Mont.
4495 Charles Caldwell, 1918 Oak, Kansas City, Mo.
5799 Roy Cameron, 402½ Second S., Baatzs Blk., Great Falls, Mont.
3756a Frank Carly (Carley), Great Falls, Mont.
5831 James Robert Carnes, Fort Shaw, Mont.
3097 Jim Casello, Ulm, Mont. (Great Falls, Mont.).
2878 John Casey, 559 Snelling, St. Paul, Minn.
2867 Tim James Casey (Timothy James Casey), Bridge, Belt, Mont. general delivery, Casper, Wyo.
2280 John Chernitsky, Columbus Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1577 Joe Chiringhelli (Ghiringhelli), Sand Coulee, Mont.
1166 Svatco (Svatco) Christoff, 623 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
5995 Stanley Churceff (Churcheff), 808 Second N., Great Falls, Mont.
5463 James Cimolino (Cimolina), 412 Third S., Great Falls, Mont.
2134 Harry C. (Clifford) Clark (Harry E. Clark), 410 Third S., Great Falls, Mont.
1006 Joseph Clayton, 215 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
4839 Edward Cline, 216½ First S., Great Falls, Mont.
742 John Emmet (Emett) Cline, Tracy Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2062 John H. Coldwell (John Henry Colwell), 505 Fifth S., Great Falls, Mont.
4714 Leslie Paul Cole, 313 Eleventh S., Great Falls, Mont. (Jordon, Mont.).
3052 James Collins, Minnesota House, Great Falls, Mont.
859 Arthur Colt, 26 Joy Street, Boston, Mass.
5314 Tom Cowley, Grant Smith Camp, Great Falls, Mont. (Florence Hotel, East Broadway, Butte, Mont.).
4929 Thomas Coyle, Rainbow Dam, Great Falls, Mont. (Cambrose, Alberta).
3456 Roy Allen Cramer, Grand Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2200 Isaac P. (Patrick) Crisp, 109 Second S., Great Falls, Mont. Box 461, Elma, Wash.).
883 Hugh Crites (Crikes), Kingsburg Block, Great Falls, Mont.
826 Homer R. Croden (Crowder) (Homer R. Crowden, Homer Crowden), Winston Salem, N. C.
3272 John Cromin (Cronin), Black Eagle, Mont.
4611 Mike Cucich (Cutich), Belt, Mont.
1332 Joseph Cunningham, 119 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
4909 Daniel Daly, Black Eagle, Mont.
2558 Sam Davenport, Des Moines, Iowa.
4892 Ernest (Ernis) C. Davis, 514 Second S., Great Falls, Mont. (Box 7, Deer Lodge, Mont.).
5062 Gus (Gust) Davis, Great Falls, Mont.
1922 Sullivan Davis, G. N. Boarding Camp, Great Falls, Mont. (807 Walnut, Kansas City, Mo.)
1463 Nathony DeMays, Billings, Mont. (Anthony D. Mayo, Anthony DeMayo, Deer Lodge, Mont.).
5301 Al John Denler, 402½ First S., Great Falls, Mont.
607 Arthur D. (Dudley) Devlin (A. C. Devlin), 828 First SW., Great Falls, Mont.
660 Ernest Dodson, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
483 John Doherty, Hamil Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1660 Wilburt A. Duff (Wilbert Arthur Duff), Supply, Ark.
1795 Menis Emico (Enrico Menis), Black Eagle, Mont.
362 John Charnai (John Charnak) Erlindson, Sand Coulee, Mont.
781 Harry Eskalund (Eskund), 412 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
3922 Louie (Louis) Exnin, Great Falls, Mont.
2005 Frank H. (Hugh) Fahey, Coy Block, Great Falls, Mont. (general delivery, Baltimore, Md.).
130 Norman Patterson Ferguson, 608 Fourth S., Great Falls, Mont.
1755 Gasper (Gesper) Fiorella, 215 Seventh S., Great Falls, Mont.
4433 Bert Willard Flemister, Sixth S., between Eighth and Ninth, Great Falls, Mont.
5321 Edward Floring, Camp on West Side, Great Falls, Mont.
3631a Ralph Ford, Lincoln House, Great Falls, Mont. (Ralph Albert Ford, Corwin, Kans.).
3987 Ernest D. Free (Earnest DeFree), 521½ Sixth S., Great Falls, Mont.
1606 Bridido Fuentes (Brigido Fuentes), Geeution House, Yard Office, Great Falls, Mont.
2289 Leo Gables (Cables), Great Falls, Mont.
4347 Grover Gaffney, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1878 Phelix Z. Gaidy (Phelix Zipmont (Zigmond) Gaidy, Felix Zigmond Gaidy), 311½ Central, Great Falls, Mont.
5862 Clifford Garcia, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
4272 Lewis Gelotti (Celotti), Black Eagle, Mont.
518 Games (James) Gillin, 211 First, Great Falls, Mont.
4420a George Goodrow, 316 Ninth S., Great Falls, Mont.
5553 Geo. Wm. Grikscheid (Grikscheit), 209 Sixth N., Great Falls, Mont.
1827 Ray Guattier (Ray J. Gaultier, Ray John Gaultier), general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
3742 George Wm. Hansen, 810 Second N., Great Falls, Mont.
3875 William Emil Hanson, Mont. Lodging House, Great Falls, Mont.
388 Alf Yestanes (Yeatanes) Harding, Union Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2166 Andrew Harris, Daly Hotel, Great Falls, Mont. (Hotel Willard, First and Madison, Spokane, Wash.)
1886 Vernon Hart, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
4422 Robert Harvell, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
3944 William Hastings, Great Falls, Mont.
2469 Alexander Hay, Sims, Mont. (Augusta, Mont.)
649 William P. Hastings, Great Falls, Mont.
2445 John Henen (Hennen, Herman), Conrad, Mont.
913 James Heslin, Black Eagle, Mont.
3901 Daniel Hogg (Hagg, Dan Hogg), care of James Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2692 Harry D. Holland (Harry Holland), general delivery, Great Falls, Mont. (San Francisco, Cal.).
3116 Arche L. Holmes, Odessa, Mo.
2649 John Hormick (Hornick), Minnesota House, Great Falls, Mont. (Clayton, Wis.).
4846a George Howard, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
4938 Fred Will Hunning, Sand Coulee, Mont.
5573 Ralph Jackson, 1221 Carson, Pittsburg, Pa.
3239 Torey Elmer Jackson, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
5925 Henry Cornelius Janen (Jansen, Henry Camillas Jansen), 316 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
2809 Titus Soremus (Sorinus), Jasperson, Weise Hotel, Central Avenue, Great Falls, Mont.
1844 Herman Jensen (Jenen), City Jail, Great Falls, Mont.
2980 Niels Peters Jensen, Salem, Cascade County, Mont.
256 Charlie Johnson, Big Falls, Great Falls, Mont. (Williston, N. Dak.)
5215 Fred Richard Johnson, Ronneby, Ben County, Minn.
209 Martin Herman Johnson, 228 Eighth S., Great Falls, Mont.
2330 Will Johnson, 920 McNeal, Shreveport, La. (Shrewport).
4246 Clarence Johnston (Johnson), Great Falls, Mont. (box 398, Yazoo City, Miss.).
4074 John Daniel Jones, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
5356 Natt Jordan (Nat Jordon), 13 Seventh S., Great Falls, Mont.
5581 Patrick Jordon (Jordan), Weise Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
602 Nick Jaintros, 418 Fourth SW., Great Falls, Mont.
4249 Vincent Juiljis (Kuljis, Vincti Kuljis, Vincent Juljis), 504 Second SW., Great Falls, Mont.
3999 Tom Kapnihes (Kapinhes), box car G, Northern Railway, Great Falls, Mont.
4927 Peter Katsonis, general delivery, Ross, N. Dak. (boarding car, G. N. R. R. Co., Great Falls, Mont.
3528 Robert M. Keeler, Cascade, Mont.
4178 John Joseph Kelly, Board of Trade Hotel, Great Falls, Mont. (general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.).
5302 John Robert Kelly, 101 First N., Great Falls, Mont.
4154 Mainchy Kelly, 618 Cottage, Pawtuckett, R. I.
5832 Harvey Kelm (Henry Kalm (Kilm), Harry Kelm), Milwaukee Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
3921 Tom Koski, Imperial Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2752 Martin Karl, Smelter Avenue, Black Eagle, Mont.
2870 Elmer Kroeger, Geyser, Mont.
3437 Albert Lanard, 215 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
2710 James Lees, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
5914a John Lenti (Lehti), 109 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
545 Emil Lepisto (Lipiston), Stockett, Mont.
4490 Leslie Lesar, general deliver, Great Falls, Mont.
5532 Henry O. (Otto), Lindaas, 826 Seventh S., Great Falls, Mont. (318 North Yakima, Tacoma, Wash.
5368 Nels Lindvik (Linsvik), Nils Lindvik), 1112 First N., Great Falls, Mont.
307 Whereley (Wherley) Miller Long, Black Eagle, Mont.
1309 James W. McCready (James Wesley Garnett McCready), Sims, Mont.
3761 Obie McGee, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
5297 Michael McGinn, 1708 Eighth N., Great Falls, Mont.
2714 Jos. McIntyre, Royal Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1170 Hayes McMongeny (McMongery), Great Falls, Mont.
4427 Carl Magnuson, 426 Sixth S., Great Falls, Mont.
5825 Carl Maki, 511 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
3389 Joli Mamish, Cascade, Mont.
4732 William Jos. Mann, 314 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
654 Henry C. (Clayton) Manning, 609 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
2089 Tony Markkrian (Mirrkoin), care of division roadmaster office, G. N. Ry., Great Falls, Mont.
4733 George Marsette, Great Falls, Mont.
1961 Frank Martin, 914 Fifth S., Great Falls, Mont.
5624 Robert Archie Martin, 612 Fifth N., Great Falls, Mont.
4508 Hisamutsu Matsuskito (Hisamtsu Matsushita, Hisanatsu Matsushita), Great Northern R. H.

3464 Nick Mautis (Mantis), 100 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
4771 Logan Himing (Fleming) Metcalf, care of Chalmers Sales Co., Sixth and First W., Great Falls, Mont.
3806 Tom Michich (Michrald), Black Eagle, Mont.
5668 Chas. Mickles (Nickles, Charles Nickles), general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
1622 Elek Milinar (Malinar, Molinar), Great Falls, Mont.
2999a Conrad Moe, Great Falls, Mont.
2668a Peter Moe (Mol), Great Falls, Mont.
2107 Clarence S. (Stuart) Moerke, Bell, Mont.
5649 Hassan (Hasson) Montsuan, Hardy, Mont.
4265 Lee Moore, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
3214 Antonio D. Morio (Antonio D. Mario, Morio), 306 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
2401 John Morrison (John Morris), West Great Falls, Mont.
979 Alex Morton, 1600 Third N., Great Falls, Mont.
290 Kosten Moysink, Sand Coulee, Mont.
5080 Dennis (Denis) Murphy, 519 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
4432 James Murphy, Waco, Tex.
3387 Jacob Myliymaki (Myllymaki), Geyser, Mont.
1664 Ben Nelson, Imperial Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
3410 Carl Nelson, Gt. Northan Boarding Car, Great Falls, Mont.
4985 Oscar Nerlainen (Merlainen, Oscar Merlainen), Great Falls, Mont.
2338 Thomas Patrick Nolan (Dolan), City Jail, Great Falls, Mont.
465 Nils Chas. Noraas (Norass), Daly Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
4181 Matt Nordahl, 412 Fifth N., Great Falls, Mont.
3676 Patrick Henry O'Brien, 1412 Seventh N., Great Falls, Mont.
3978 Manas (Manass) O'Donnell, St. Paul Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
3278 Max Olson, 622 (622½) First N., Great Falls, Mont.
1837 James R. O'Meil (James Buell O'Neil, O'Meil), 900 Fourth N., Great Falls, Mont.
2170 John T. (Thomas) O'Neill (John Thomas O'Neil), Great Falls, Mont.
1892 Joseph Otreviba (Joseph Jacob Otremba, Otrembo), route No. 2, box 10, Pierce (Piers), Minn.
1020 Michael H. Ots, West Side, Great Falls, Mont.
52 Fred R. Palmer (Palme), Burlington Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2168 Glen M. (Morton) Palmer (Glenn Morton Palmer), 700 Second N., Great Falls, Mont.
170 Walter Palmer, Great Falls, Mont.
4563 George Pandoff, 316 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
342 Gust Pappas (Papas), Gt. Nor. Ry. Yards, Great Falls, Mont.
2414 David Park, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
5992 James Morton Pate, San Coulee, Mont.
3518 Pate Pavletick (Pete Pevlitch, Pavletick), 412 Fourth S., Great Falls, Mont.
5507 Alexander Pawlock (Pavolok, Pavolock), 300 Central W., Great Falls, Mont.
1053a Anart Henneng (Henning) Pederson (Anart Henning Pedersen), 424 Fifth S., Great Falls, Mont.
4621 Ole Peterson, Great Falls, Mont. (415 Ash, Anaconda, Mont.)
3719 Chas. (Charlie) G. Pinkham, Hunamsville, Mo. (609 North Main, Butte, Mont.)
1517 John J. Poole (John F. Poole), 109 Second Street, Great Falls, Mont.
5406 (4506) Bill Poovich (Papovich, Popovic, Popovich), Sand Coulie, Mont.
2599 George Poppis (Poppas, Pappas), boarding car, G. N. R. R. Co., Great Falls, Mont.
765 Arjin (Arjen) Post, Jersie Dairy, Great Falls, Mont.
926 George Poulos, 206–206½ First Street, Great Falls, Mont.
4604 Peter Racovich, 307 Fourth Street, Great Falls, Mont.
2484 John Rekstad, Sand Coulee, Mont.
3515 James Rennis, Minnesota House, Great Falls, Mont.
2753 James Rigby, 621 Fifth, North, Great Falls, Mont.
5529a John L. (Lawrence, Laurence) Riley, rooming house, First Street, Great Falls, Mont., General Delivery.
5749 August Rill (Kill), 502 First Street, Great Falls, Mont.
3873 Amadeo Rivera, 305 Fifth, South, Great Falls, Mont.
2571 Andres S. Rodringnez (Rodrignez), General Delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
2113 Mathew J. Rogers (Rodgers, Mathew Jenkins Rodgers), Great Falls, Mont.
3912 Will Root, 402 Third, South, Great Falls, Mont.
6032 Jack Rose, Gold Butte, Mont.
2880 John Elmer Ruse (Rue), Clifton, Texas.
5996 James Russell, Opera Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
4159 Earl Seitz Rutledge, 408 First, Southwest, Great Falls, Mont.
2413 Fred Sailer, 405 First, Southwest, Great Falls, Mont.
2154 William Solopek, boarding car, G. N., Great Falls, Mont.
3981 Nickolas (Nicholas, Nick) Samila, 121 First, South, Great Falls, Mont.
1666 Chas. W. (Wm.) Schmidt, Lewiston, Mont.
861 Hoyt Schafer, General Delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
3057 Orville Shafer, Dearborn Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
4090 Harry David Simon, 401 Second, South, Great Falls, Mont.
4746 William George Sinomsen (Simonsen, Simonson), 215 First, South, Great Falls, Mont.
3526 James Sinclair, Fife, Mont.
4372 Joe Shoffen (Joe Shoffen, Joe Skoffen, Skaffan, Skoffan), Sand Coulee, Mont.
2222a George Slattan (Sletten), 309 First, South, Great Falls, Mont.
3604 Ira Smith, G. N. Ry., Great Falls, Mont.
4505 Robert Smith, 616 Ninth, South, Great Falls, Mont.
1667 Samuel D. (David) Smith, R. No. 2, Paris, Ky.
3884 Martin Smolcic, 408 South Fifth, Greta Falls, Mont.
4564 Fred Sohl, 1217 Eighth, North, Great Falls, Mont.
1358 Mamoth Solonox (Salomon, Melnero Selmenon, Mamoth Solomon), Cascade, Mont.
4461 Thomas Sotkvich (Sotkveh, Sotkch), Palace Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1137 Willie Spencer, corner Great Northan Yards, Great Falls, Mont.
2014 Peter Sperry (Pete Sperry), 712 Third, South, Great Falls, Mont.
5169 James G. Blaine Stark, Great Falls, Mont.
1545 Rollin F. (Frederick) Stehling, 548 Scott, Columbus, Ohio.
121 Joseph Stephenson (Stevenson), Railway Yards, Great Falls, Mont.
4642 Harry Mahoney Stewart (Harry Stewart), Kentuckey, Fulton, Ky.
3442 Elwin James Stone, Section 6 Northeast, Smith River, near Milligan on ranch, Cascade, Mont.
3012 Cleo Stratlein (Oleo Stratlion), care of B. L. Johnson, Great Falls, Mont.
4610 Hal Smith Stuart, Sand Coulee, Mont.
4031 Antti Suandakanen (Suandokanen), Stockett, Mont.
3065 Chester Sullivan, 109 Second Street, Great Falls, Mont.
560 Harold F. (Fred) Sullivan, 210 Eighth Street, Great Falls, Mont.
988 Alfred H. Snymore (Symore), Manville, Alberta, Canada.
3784 Victor Swanson, 612 Second Street, Great Falls, Mont.
1161 Carl Will (William) Swanstrom, 525 Seventh North, Great Falls, Mont.
2562 Wilfred Switzer, 324½ Second Street, Great Falls, Mont.
4018 John Tassoulis (Tsatsoulis), G. N. Bunk House, Great Falls, Mont. (West Yards, Mont.)
4730 Sam Tentes (Fentes), 209 First Street, 202 First Street, Great Falls, Mont.
5317 Kurt Thass, Burlington Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
1651 Samuel (Sam) Thompson, 305 Ninth S., Great Falls, Mont.
3577 Elmer Elland (Nelland) Tracy, St. Paul House, Great Falls, Mont.
3476 Corbin Trotter, 317 First N., Great Falls, Mont.
5712 Russell W. Truckey, 1300 Eighth N., Great Falls, Mont.
627 Arthur M. (Michell) Trudwell (Arthur Michell Trudell), Stockett, Mont.
3448 Davis Vallanatos (Danis Vallonostos), G. N. Section House, West Side, Great Falls, Mont.
3415 Arthur Vanderbilt, 316 Fourth S., Great Falls, Mont.
3906 Joseph Velaich (Velacich), 1028 S. Gaylerd, Butte, Mont.
143 Francis Vetquorkey, general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.
4535 Severt E. (F.) Vidrik, Norway, Bergent, Norway.
552 Albert Vickery (Albert Vickrey), Geyser, Mont.
3645 Wayne Walden, 417½ First S., Great Falls, Mont.
2314 Jacob Walppu, Stockett, Mont.
5589 Wm. Lester Ward, Rainbow Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
312 James Warren, Lowe Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
4526 Erick Wedell, 5103 Gray, Chicago, Ill.
1280 Lester Ainsley Wentworth, 617 Fifth N., Great Falls, Mont.
4033 Hermon Wetzel, Sand Coulee, Mont. (Herman, Trego, Mont.)
626 Lars Wick, 316 First S., Great Falls, Mont.
3911 Harry J. Wilbur, 209 Second S., Great Falls, Mont.
1361 Joseph H. Wiley, Great Falls, Mont. (Henry, La Crosse, Wis.)
3807 Frank James Willaims (Williams), Packing Plant, G. F. Meat Co., Great Falls, Mont.
2268a Frank Wilson, 1302 Eighth N., Great Falls, Mont.
3270 Fay Woods, Aberdeen, S. Dak. (Great Falls, Mont.)
328 Toku Yamashita, Belt, Mont.
3959 Fred D. Young, Great Falls, Mont.
5113 Pete Zarich (Zerich), Tracy, Mont.
1229 Albert W. Zarkney (Albert Williams Zarensky, 612 First N., Great Falls, Mont.
651a Francis Aloysius Doherty (F. A. Doherty), Great Falls, Mont.
4456 Basilios Karamouxia, Sheridan, Wyo. (Karamouxis, 210 First Avenue, So., Great Falls, Mont.
1600 Roy Bert McBride, Minnesota House, Great Falls, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CHOUTEAU, STATE OF MONTANA.

2181 Volney E. Alexander (Volnev Edward Alexander), Square Butte, Mont.
1427 Harry Armstrong, Big Sandy, Mont.
2265 Wm. C. Armstrong (Wm. O. Armstrong), Ravanne, Kans.
3078 Wm. Baker (William Baker), Big Sandy, Mont.
2503 Leo S. Bradford (Leo Stevens Bradford), Big Sandy, Mont.
2655 Lance T. Broder, Highwood, Mont.
1244 Henry Bruce, Virgelle, Mont.
2984 August F. Burgehat (Burgechat, August Frank Burgchat), Carter, Mont.
154 John Ike Cline, Ashmoor, Mont.
1443 Wm. Cob (William Cobb), Big Sandy, Mont.
2852 Thos. K. Collins (Thomas Kirkwood Collins, Thomas K. Collins), Carter, Mont. (Kenilworth, Mont.).
1121 W. D. Cunningham (William D. Cunningham, Wm. D. Cunningham), Lomo, Mont.
2540 Tony Dobrovoly, Box Elder, Mont.
382 George Duffy, Genou, Mont.
569 Jack East, Montague, Mont.
1112 Arthur L. Ekberg (Arthur Lewis, Arthur Lewis Eckberg), Geraldine, Mont.
470 Edward Eliasson (Ezard Eliasson), Aznol, Mont.
2748 Walter Erwin (Ervin), Shonkin, Mont.
67 Harry Fleming (Henry Fleming), Square Butte, Mont.
1247 Harry Frederick, Sollid, Mont.
1031 Arthur Goheen (Arthur L. Goheen, Arthur Loreno Goheen), Virgelle, Mont. (Bellingham, Mont.).
990 Clarence Gussett (Gossett), Highwood, Mont.
2228 Mike Heasy (Heaney), 115 Eleventh Street north, Great Falls, Mont.
998 Roy E. Henderson (Roy Edward Henderson), 616½ First Avenue, Great Falls, Mont. (Graceville, Mont.).
589 Ernest Hoffman (Oscor Ernest Hoffman), Fort Benton, Mont.
1834 Ramond Homeyer (Homexyer, Raymond Homeyer), section 3, township 25, range 5 east, Carter, Mont.
1794 Leslie M. Hurlburt (Leslie Melvin Hurlbert, Leslie Melven Hurlburt), Gates, Mont.
76 Edward H. Hurtienna, Norbert, Mont. (Great Falls, Mont.).
892 John Illa (Illo), Fort Benton, Mont. (Great Falls, Mont.).
697 Chas. J. Jones (Charles Jesse Jones), Geraldine, Mont.
1057 Carl R. LaBronte (Carl Roderick Le Bonte, Carl R. La Bonte), 3761 Temple Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
1684 John Lahti, Portage, Mont.
548 August N. Lakahas (August Mike Lakshas), Big Sandy, Mont.
1134 John Leonard, Loma, Mont.
2982 Ray (Roy) Machel, Carter, Mont.
2214 Wm. E. Maness (William Edward Maness), Ashmoor, Mont.
927 Thomas Marks, Lytell, Mont.
2458 Henry H. Newman (Henry Herman Neumann), Fort Benton, Mont.
1537 Ole Olsen, Fort Benton, Mont.
693 Frank R. Perry (Frank Raphael, Frank Rapeal), 23 Thirty-third Street, St. Louis, Mo.
1563 Wm. Polokis (William Palokis, William Polokis), Shonkin, Mont. (Deming, N. Mex.).
603 Walter Reed, Fort Benton, Mont.
1734 Rob't R. Rowe (Robert Bertrand Rowe), Big Sandy, Mont.
3560 Wm. F. Schwartz (William Frederick, Wm. Frederick), Kabo, Mont.
2758 Ralph A. Shaw, Big Sandy, Mont.

1091 Jim Siers, Pine Ridge, South Ridge, S. Dak.
2111 Dare Smith, Square Butte, Mont.
1286 Oscar Soderquist, Geraldine, Mont.
2261 Carl W. Stroup, Big Sandy, Mont.
1126 Jacob S. Strus (Jacob Raymond Strause), Carter, Mont.
2755 Clifford Sundberg (Sundborg), Highwood, Mont. (Kansas City, Mo.).
1949 Emmett Thompson (Emmett Edison), Big Sandy, Mont.
1742 Louis (Lewis) Walker, Big Sandy, Mont.
2948 Elmer Wood, Big Sandy, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CUSTER, STATE OF MONTANA.

415 Earl Lowell Adams, 17 North Fourth, Miles City, Mont.
164 Arthur J. Arnold, 1701 Leighton Boulevard, Miles City, Mont.
2327 Harry Ball, sec. 8, 12 N., 47 E., Le Grand, Mont.
26 Carl Griffith (Griffin) Becker, 115 South Sixth, Miles City, Mont.
2613 Roy W. Beckman (Roy Beckman), Milligan House, Miles City, Mont.
1589 James Bothwell, 112 North Eleventh, Miles City, Mont.
2270 Edwin (Edward) Burbonia, 208 Atlantic, Miles City, Mont.
2441 James H. Cain, Pleasant Street, Miles City, Mont.
2408 Leon Warn Campbell, general delivery, Miles City, Mont.
2503 Arthur Challender, Mizpah, Mont.
40 Geo. Corliney, Grill Cafe, Miles City, Mont.
22 Carling Davenport, Third and Pacific, Miles City, Mont.
2569 Thomas Dickson, Ismay, Mont.
669 Peter M. Drake, 1614 Fort, Miles City, Mont. (care of Armour & Co., Miles City, Mont.).
868 Evan Engebritson, Miles City, Mont.
1581 Tom P. Field, City Hall, Miles City, Mont.
2041 Geo. W. Flock, Kruger, Mont. (Seneca, Nebr.).
2333 Iver Fretter (Iner Frettie), 805 Main, Miles City, Mont.
1258 Albert Gackle, corner Sixth and Palmer, Miles City, Mont.
78a Louis Bernhard Godeon (Godeon Bergen), L. Goden Godosmo, Norway (care of A. D. Menzier, Eloose, Canada).
1159a A. J. Gold, Hospital, Miles City, Mont.
823 Ham Goon, Second Street, Miles City, Mont.
713 Jesse R. (Jessie Raymond) Graham, Broadus, Mont.
740 William John Graham, Broadus, Mont. (Windthorst, Sask., Canada).
1376a Carl Hagan (Hagen), Miles City, Mont.
1283 William R. Haines, NP-R-W between Seventh and Eighth, Miles City, Mont. (between Seventh and Eighth R/W, Miles City, Mont.).
2699 Arthur Raymond Haver, Mizpah, Mont.
1145 John Heide, jr., Fort Keogh, Miles City, Mont.
1145 Arthur Raymond Haver, Mizpah, Mont.
1672 John Hickey, No. 6 extra gang, C. M. & St. P. Ry.
1715 Henry S. Holmes, Miles City, Mont.
566 George A. Holzman (George Holzman), Miles City, Mont.
1579 Christopher Kinsel, 1103 Valley, Minot, N. Dak.
1700 John Henry Kinsley, Ismay, Mont.
697 Joseph D. La Barge, Tongue River Dam, Mont. (Joseph De La Barge, Tongue River Dam, Miles City, Mont.)
1774 Fred Lambeff, box 882 Miles City, Mont.
1749 Billy (Bullar) Lawrence, Fair Ground, general delivery, Miles City, Mont.
845 Gee Hung Lock, Second, Miles City, Mont.
967 Frank W. Malone, Hathaway, Mont. (Mandan, N. Dak.).
490 Albert Charles Miller, Fort Geogh, Miles City, Mont.
1127 Joe Moore, El Paso, Tex.
2673 John O'Brien, Milligan House, Miles City, Mont.
2686 Toy Park, 703 Main, Miles City, Mont.
2081 Loy Robinson (Robison), North Fifth, Miles City, Mont.
903 Ferdninando Roccoo, 615 River, Miles City, Mont. (Ferdinand Rocco, Glendive, Mont.).
859 Wm. Seldom, Miles City, Mont. (Burbank Theater, Los Angeles, Calif.).
2198 Edward S. Shank, Fort Geogh, Miles City, Mont.
2650 Harry Stamates (Stamatis), Inghams Cafe, Miles City, Mont. (Ingham Cafe, Mont.).
9 Edwin Swanson, 118 South Lake, Miles City, Mont.
2713 William H. Trigg, 917 Main, Miles City, Mont.
2581 A. Turner, Miles City, Mont.
96 Toy Wah, 703 Main, Miles City, Mont.
1025 Jack W. Ward, Dible Ranch, Miles City, Mont. (care of Dribels Ranch, Miles City, Mont.).
1203a William B. Wicks, Miles City, Mont. (care of Penitentiary, Deer Lodge, Mont.).
1931 C. F. Wilson, corner Fifth and Fort, Miles City, Mont.
1121 Gus Noble Wilson (Guy Nobles (Noble) Wilson), Baker, Mont.
218 Fred Wolff, Miles City, Mont.
2615 Louie Yen, 703 Main, Miles City, Mont.
44a John Elsa Young, 207 South Fourth, Miles City, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF DAWSON, STATE OF MONTANA.

786 Maurice (Morrice) Henry Anderson, Van Norman, Mont. (Circle, Mont.).
1913 John (J.) Armstrong, Richey, Mont.
2694 Roy Bennett, Glendive, Mont.
3527 Peter Biggs, Glendive, Mont.
2328 Tom Bjelland (Tom Biel Land), Jordan, Mont.
2223 Floyd Chester (C.) Chambers (Floyd Chambers), Bloomfield, Mont.
2483 Floyd L. Bradley, Bloomfield, Mont. (Anaconda, Mont.).
1721 Jack Cooper, Glendive, Mont.
2025 Patrick Curran, Box 246, Glendive, Mont. (Currian, 817 Seventeenth, Rock Island, Ill.).
8105 Milton Davis, Richey, Mont.
2236 Frank DeRusha, Glendive, Mont.
467 Thomas J. Evans, 231 Merrill, Glendive, Mont.
2020 Ed. Evanson (Evenson), 101 East Main Street, Glendive, Mont. (Cando, N. Dak.).
2708 Robert Cecil (C.) Farrington, Foss Rooms, Glendive, Mont.
1950 Benjamin Fischer, Marsh, Mont.
1a Stanley Geviske (Gewiske, Gewiski), Glendive, Mont.
2479 George H. Gossen, Retah, Mont.
2987 Alex Gustavson, Glendive, Mont.
3087 Henry L. Hickey, Jordan, Mont.
168 Oli Holland (Ola Holland), Glendive, Mont.
13 Arnold C. Ihme, Richey, Mont.
44 Carl Johnson, general delivery, Glendive, Mont.
1129 Frank Johnson, box 674, Glendive, Mont.
651 Guello Joseph, Cohagen, Mont.
3458 Charles Judge, Glendive, Mont.
76 Victor Kanjanto (Victa Kajanto), general delivery, Glendive, Mont.
1069 Walter Klotzbach (Walter Forrest, Forest Klotzback), Glendive, Mont.
767 Carl Fred Kuethe (Kusthe), Preston, Minn. (Phon, Mont.).
1038 Paul Langdiwski (Longourki, Langiwski), Glendive, Mont.
878 Foen Joseph Laurence (Forn J. Lawrence), Lismos, Mont.
2257 Maurits Laxesvele (Maurits Laxesvele), Weldon, Mont.
817 Kenneth McSween (MacSween), 7 Lurebost, Stornoway.
551 Paul Hiram (H.) Middleton, Glendive, Mont.
2842 Robert Munroe (Munro), Glendive, Mont.
2207 Victor W. Myer (Meyer), Bloomfield, Mont.
1370 Alfred Arnts Olson, Hodges, Mont. (Bordeaux, Wash.).
1774 Stewart Orr, Lismas, Mont.
2469 Walter Harold (H.) Parker, 308 Nolan Avenue (W. H. Glendive, Mont.).
2513 Robert Martin Preuss, Glendive, Mont.
2745 Ralph Richards, Glendive, Mont.
2787 Harry Sanders, Glendive, Mont.
1023 John Lornce (L.) Shoemaker, Bruce, Mont.
3163 Bernard A. C. Shubring (B. A. C. Shubring), Glendive, Mont.
86 Reiar (Riear, Riar) Solen, Glendive, Mont. (Berch Hills, Sask., Canada).
a90a Grover C. Thompson, Glendive, Mont. (care of American Consul, Calgary, Alberta, Canada).
2864 Martinens Trandum, box 246, Glendive, Mont.
2185 Mat Walsh (Mott or Matt Walsh), Glendive, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF DEERLODGE, STATE OF MONTANA.

1157 Geo. P. Alasa, "World at Home" Shows (Shoe), Anaconda, Mont.
1579 Andrew Anderson, 207 Ash Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1832 Oscar Anderson (Oscar Andrew Anderson), 817 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
219 Antonion Anthony (Tony Antonion), 414 Ash Street, Anaconda, Mont.
642 Jaakka Antillio, Anaconda, Mont.
773 Ludvig Antonich, 1016 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
873 Peter (Pete) Antonich, Brown's Quarry, Mont.
1725 Edwin Earl Auburn, Delmonico House, Anaconda, Mont. (Earl Edwin Auburn, Hesper, Mont., care of T. C. Cochran).
1868 Thomas Barrett, 1009 East Fifth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
757 Gustaf Bartal (Gustav Bartel), "World at Home" Shows, Anaconda, Mont.
2467 Rudolph Beitlich (Beitlick), 300 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1560 John Benson, 713 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2227 Chas. Blake, 207 Front Street, Anaconda, Mont.
313 John Bosar, 600 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont. (R. F. D. No. 1, Valley, Mont.).
1987 Edward Boyle, 721 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont. (4012 South E Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
624 Nicholas (Michael) Burns, 1024 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
298 Fred Carlson, "World at Home" Shows, R. D. No. 2, Box 71, St. Charles, Ill.
322 Luigi Ceccanato (Cecconato), Upper Camp Washal Smelter, Anaconda, Mont. (box 426, Spokane, Wash.).
1533 William Chisholm, 803 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2422 Giovanni Colace, 613 West Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1501 John Coleman, 609 East Fourth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2198 Patrick Coll, 4823 Kincaid, Pittsburg, Pa.
75 Frank J. (James) Collins, 702 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont. (Frank Collins, 403 East Granite Street, Butte, Mont.).
1921 Francisco Coltelle (Frant Coltello, Francesco Coltelle), 215 Washington, Anaconda, Mont.).
601 Richard L. (Laurence) Crossman, South Cross, Mont. (Southern Cross, Mont.).
135 John Cunningham, 418 Alder Street, Anaconda, Mont. (721 East Fifth Street, Anaconda, Mont.).
2139 Peter Cunningham (Cuningham), Southern Cross, Mont.
1991 Jos. Davich (Jeft Dabich, Teft), Browns Quarry, Mont.
725 George L. (Leslie) Davis, 617 Locust Street, Anaconda, Mont. (general delivery, Conrad, Mont.).
2569 Edward Day, 224 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont. (Manhattan Cafe, Idaho Falls, Idaho).
2305 Cornelius Donovan, 4 Main Street, Anaconda, Mont. (680 South Sixth Street, East Salt Lake City, Utah).
1843 Con Driscoll, 521 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont. (general delivery, McGill, Nev.).
1300 Jos. Jas. Duggan (James Joseph Duggan), Keelcher House, Anaconda, Mont.
1274 Frederick Dunn, 5 Main Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2239 Roy C. Eller (Roe C. Eller), Grand Pacific Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
240 Wm. Erickson, 617 East Eighth Street, Anaconda, Mont. (617 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.).
617 Lozer (Lazar) Evanovich, 212 Alder Street, Anaconda, Mont. (box 6, Lehigh, Mont.).
1670 Einar Field, Washoe Park, Anaconda, Mont.
1461 Paul Franich, 228 East Park Street, Butte, Mont. (Southern Cross, Mont.).
957 Peter Govorivich (Govoroch, Govorovoch), 312 Adams Street, Anaconda, Mont.
846 Mack (Mach) Green, 1100 South Grant, Bay City, Mich.
2037 Aneto Grose (Amato Grosse, Ameto Grose), 709 West Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
209 Elmer G. (George) Hammond, "World at Home" Shows, Anaconda, Mont.
1663 Peter Henriksen (Henriksin), 713 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2077 Wm. Heppting, "World at Home" Shows, Plains, Pa.
14 Andrew B. (Bayne, Boyne, Bane) Johnson, drawer B, Anaconda, Mont. (Opportunity, Mont.).
80 Carl Johnson, 215 Cedar Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1279 Ingal (Ingnal) Johnson, 415 Ash Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1420 Paul Johnson, Warm Springs, Mont.
669 Anthony Jordan, 510 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
652 Pat. King, 511 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
923 Eli Kocich, 911 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont. (Elaj, Eli Kocich, Lafferty, Ohio).
747 Fred V. (Valentine) Koehler, 509 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1480 Mike Kolar, 604 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.

1252 John Kolsto, 861 East Fifth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1183 Sing Chin Kwok (Chin Kwok Sing), Warm Springs, Mont.
2040 Dave (David) Kyhno, 413 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
465 Frank E. Leonard, 604 Spruce Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1563 Ira Lindsay, 716 East Seventh Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2331 John W. Lucey, 506 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2280 Edward Ludquist (Ed Lundquist, Edward Julius Lundquest, Edward J. Lundquist, 217 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.), 36 East Main Street, Potter Hotel, Battle Creek, Mich.
1619 Kenneth (K.) Lundle, 717 Cedar Street, Anaconda, Mont.
273 Bert McCann, Browns Quarry, Mont.
1982 Edward (Ed) McCoy, 309 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont. (general delivery, Garland, Utah).
1941 Dan McDonald (Dan R. McDonald), 80 East Park Street, Butte, Mont.
1591 Wm. McGalvan (Cavlan, Gavlan), Sioux Falls, S. D.
2485 Patrick Marian (Marion Pericich, Marian Paricick, Paricich), 407 Birch Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1151 Sam Miller, 1008 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1117 Felix Monaco, Washoe Park, Anaconda, Mont.
1686 Swan Munson, 216 Chestnut Street, Anaconda, Mont.
434 John Murphy, 509 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2020 Robert Murphy, 213 Second Third Street, St. Cloud, Minn.
1224 James Murray, Southern Cross, Mont.
1960 James H. (N.) Murray, 816 East Commercial Street, rear, Anaconda, Mont. (516 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.).
612 Mandius, Norein (Norem), 505 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
424 John Oana, 8½ Main Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1756 Knut Oberg, 606 Alder Street, Anaconda, Mont. (215 Trent Avenue, Spokane, Wash.).
2327 John O'Brien (J. C., Charles O'Brien), Southern Cross, Mont.
610 Austin O'Malley, 511 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1295 Colman O'Malley, 511 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1781 Albert J. (John) Parmley, 309 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont. (248½ West South Temple Street, Salt Lake, Utah).
2025 Sylvester J. Rost (John Post), 407 Cedar Street, Anaconda, Mont. (286–288 State Street, Erie, Pa.).
122 Geo. M. Poston (George Poston), 101 North Maple Street, Anaconda, Mont.
777 Richard Prenderfast (Prendergast), 703 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
644 John Preschern, 813 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
613 Thomas Quilliam, 8 Main Street, Anaconda, Mont.
40 Duro Radinich (Radonich), Lost Creek, Mont.
664 Luco Radovich (Luko Radosevich, Cuka, Radosovich), Browns Quarry, Mont.
165 Pat. (Patrick) Regan, 205 East Eighth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1291 Donald A. Reid (D. A. Read), 317½ East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2041 Ulusess (Ulysses, Elysses) Roscoe, 1104 East Sixth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2397 Oliver Rousseau, "World at Home" Shows, en tour Stockton, Calif.
2010 Sam Ruase, 410 Alder Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1441 Philip Ryan, 522 East Fork Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1687 Jos. Sandos (Szabados), 521 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont. (Fargo, N. Dak.).
2404 Philip (Philips) Sarno, 1 Main Street, Anaconda, Mont.
35 John Shea, Southern Cross, Mont.
281 Mike Shepa, 600 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2005 Miko J. (M. J., Mike Joseph, Joseph Mike) Shine, 103 Chestnut Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2396 Joe Shovelin, 917 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2105 Bud (Budd) Smith, C. and A. Camp, Washoe Smelter, Mont., care of U. S. Reserves, Lonepine, Mont.
1100 Patrick (Purrick) Smyth, railroad yards, Anaconda, Mont. (care of agent, N. P. Ry., Elliston, Mont.
627 Mike Stanich, 818 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
887 Jos. Steel (Steele), 321 East Commercial Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2209 Daniel E. Stine (Dan E. Stine), 817 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
469 Dan Sullivan, 877 Herman Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1491 John Sullivan, 5 West Copper Street, Butte, Mont.
62 M. J. Sullivan (Mike J., Michael J.), Southern Cross, Mont.
1435 Neal Sullivan, 322 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
2321 Harry A. (Albert) Summoniat (Siemoniat, Harry Summoniet), "World at Home" Shows, J. A. Clyde, Rock Falls, Ill. (Care of Y. M. C. A., Gary, Ind.)
261 Rudolph Susany, 507 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.
719 Gus Swanson, 116 Main Street, Anaconda, Mont. (404 East Third Street, Anaconda, Mont.).
234 John Sweeny (Sweeney), 1920 Waverly Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
1120 Klos E. (Klas Emil) Svenson, 601 East Park Street, Anaconda, Mont.
33 Peter Turnbanky (Trumbaneky, Trunabanky), 224 East Commercial Avenue, Anaconda, Mont.
2145 Harry Tucker, 1001 East Fifth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
703 Steve Useloc (Uzeloc), C. and A. Camp, Anaconda, Mont. (215 Ash Street, Anaconda, Mont.).
538 Deem Vern (Vern Deem, Vern O. Deem), Kalamazoo, Mich. (1205 N. Buadnick, "World at Home" Shows).
665 M. P. Yockovitch, Browns Quarry, Anaconda, Mont. (Milo P. Yuckovich, Bearcreek, Mont., Browns Quincy, Anaconda, Mont.).
2338 Thomas (Tom) Walker, Montana Hotel, Anaconda, Mont.
618 Everett White, Okolora, Mo. (Okolona, Miss.).
1575 Julius R. Wilkinson (J. R., Joseph Ruber Wilkinson), 505 Hickory Street, Anaconda, Mont.
932 Peter B. (Pete Bernhart) Wilson, "World at Home" Shows, Arnegard, N. Dak.
755 Charles Yermitya (Yermitza), Southern Cross, Mont. (Butte, Mont.).
1849 Mike Zellick (Zillick), 1112 East Sixth Street, Anaconda, Mont.
1136 Mike Alamm, Mines Lumber Co., Deer Lodge County, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF FERGUS, STATE OF MONTANA.

2762 Peter Angelsi (Angelesi), Denton, Mont.
1441 Mariono Arrioti (Mariotti), (Mariano Arroit), Hanover, Mont.
2278 Ben Bankston, Denton, Mont.
4010 Sullivan Berger, Gilt Edge, Mont.
3009 William Berger, Gilt Edge, Mont.
2259 Steve Bogdanovich, Hamilton and Twenty-first Streets, Cleveland, Ohio. (Steve Bogundvich, 404 Sixth Street, Calumet, Mich.).
3804 Daniel William Brownson (D. W. Brownson), Lewiston, Mont.
3793 Leslie H. Brownson, care of Sheriff, Lewiston, Mont. (Leslie Henry Brownson, care of Sheriff, Miles City, Mont.)
3166 Henry Ernest Carlson (Harry Carlson), Lewiston, Mont.
4123 Marehalo (Marshall) S. Calvert, Eagle Hotel, Great Falls, Mont. (M. S. Calvert, Nouton, Mo.)
4097 Chris. H. Christensen, Day House, Lewiston, Mont. (Chris Hald Christensen (Christensen), Christ H. Christensen, Hobson, Mont.).
3043 Daniel Roy Clifford (Daniel R. Clifford), Gerhard, Mont.
4176 Clarence E. Couradson (Clarence Emil Conradson), Winifred, Mont.
2051 James Contos (Cantos, Jame Contos), Norton, Mont.
1263 Ray Cook, Brooks, Mont.
4401 Edward Carl Corcoran, Saco, Mont. (Phillips Co., Mont.) (Earl, Saco.)
1274 Marko Crbas (Mark Orbas, Marko, Marko Arbas), 106 East Broadway, Lewiston, Mont.
2127 William E. Davis (William Ezra Davis), Judith, Mont.
610 J. Austin Diffie (J. A. Diffie), Culver Rooms, Lewiston, Mont.
1346 Roy Dunn, Lewiston, Mont.
211 Carl O. Erickson, Flowerce, Mont.
2377 George William Fox, Lewiston, Mont.
1663 Andrew Gilbert, 4178 Army Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Andrew C. Gilbert, Stanford, Mont. Falls, Mont.)
3695 Ike Fudge Gillespie (Gillispie), 101 West Main Street, Lewiston, Mont.
307 Louis Gomez (Gamez), Stanford, Mont.
2773 William P. Goodwin, Belmont Hotel, Great Falls, Mont.
2901 Leonard Gray, Grass Range, Mont.
1696 Edwin Halbert (Edwin M. Hulbert), Lehigh, Mont.
3296 Alf. Martin Hansen, Roundup, Mont.
97 Julius M. Hansen (Julius Martin Hansen, J. M. Hansen), 802 Evelyn Street, Lewiston, Mont.
489 Ernest Haywood, Denton, Mont.
4567 Edward Heaths, Day House, Lewiston, Mont.
522 Oscar Henley, Coffee Creek, Mont.
4630 Herman O. Hentajavi (Hantajarvin), Hilge, Mont. (Hantajarne, Hilger.)
180 Eskil Walfred (Walfrid) Hermanson, Moorehead, Minn.
3615 Evan Hovrud (Horvud), Zuby, Mont.
780 Alfred Joseph Irving (A. J. Irving), Lewiston, Mont.
215 Elda James Irwin, Denton, Mont.
148 Andreas M. Johnson (Andreas Marcelius Johansen, Johnsen), 319 Farewell Street, Lewiston, Mont.
23 John Robert Jones, Lewiston, Mont. (J. R. Jones, Carnoroon Llannig R. S. O., Wales).
137 John (Jon) Dor, Lehigh, Mont.
4589 Gregory A. Kamtchey, Danvers, Mont. (Gregory G. Kamtchey (Kantchey), Square Butte, Mont.)
4667 Peter Alma Lish (P. A. Lish), Housac, Mont.
1320 Andrew P. Manoske (Andrew Paul Manoshe (Manoske), Andrew Manaske), Grass Range, Mont.
2366 Oscar B. Massoz, Fresno, Mont. (Shonkin, Mont.).
2827 Harry Raymond Maycie (Harry R. Maycie), Lewiston, Mont.
3041 Henry S. Moen, Coffee Creek, Mont.
4119 Peter O'Conner, Lewiston, Mont.
986 Thomas R. Owens (T. R. Owens, Thomas Richard Owens), European Hotel, Lewiston, Mont.
1207 Carl C. Pearson (Karl O. Person, Carl Oscar William Pearson, Karl Person), Lewiston, Mont. (Kachia, Mont.).
743 Harry T. Perry (H. T. Perry), 122 East Broadway, Lewiston, Mont.
158 Sam (Samuel) Pruitt, Winifred, Mont. (Grassy Lake, Alta, Canada).
857 Richard Radugan (Radigan, R. Radigan), care of sheriff, Lewiston, Mont. (Janeaux Street, Lewiston, Mont.).
1819 Henry O. Reinhart (Henry Otto Reinhart, H. O. Reinhart), Gerhard, now Buffalo, Mont.
4505 Harry Rodopolous (Rodapulos, Rodopulos), 409 Main West Street, Lewiston, Mont. (Place Hotel, Lewiston, Mont.).
2057 Louis Romanik (Romanink), Lehigh, Mont.
507 Herman Seastrom, 1127 Semlin Drive, Vancouver, B. C.
360 Will Shea, Delburne (Alberta County), Mont. (Alberta, Canada).
2411 Olis R. Simmons (Olis Ross Simmons, O. Ross Simmons), Buffalo, Mont.
3927 David Smith, Hanover, Mont. (Miles City, Mont.).
1845 Eddie Stone, Bright Hotel, Lewiston, Mont.
1467 Andrew Nelson (Nielson), Toft, Carneill, Mont.
1490 William Lee Thomas, Coffee Creek, Mont.
3894 William Threlpeld (Threlkeld), Little Crooked, Mont.
4888 William E. Toole (W. E. Toole), Hamilton, Mont.
4438 George Trusty, Stanford, Mont.
2484 Aelyn G. Turnbull (Allyn Gardiner Turnbull, Allan), Coffee Creek, Mont.
1836 Frank Vickrey, Roy, Mont.
446 Howard Ward, 4428 Maple Street, Spokane, Wash.
3878 Walter C. Whitney, Windham, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF FLATHEAD, STATE OF MONTANA.

1185 Alfred K. Anderson, Kintla, Mont.
288 John Ernest Andersen, Hotel Norden, First Avenue W., Kalispell, Mont.
1951 John Baron, Paola, Mont.
2180 James Bennett, 620 Edmond Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
122 Clayton James Brown (James Clayton Brown), Third Street, Polson, Mont.
1240 Matteo Candion (Candron), Columbia Falls, Mont.
842 Pasquala (Pasquali) Gardona, Columbia Falls, Mont.
1392 Jess Curtice, Creston, Mont.
299 W. J. Davis (William Davis, Willie Davis), Whitefish, Mont.
1705 John B. Downey (J. B. Downey), 316 Central, Whitefish, Mont.
1563a Guy Edgell, 316 South Secker, Traverse, Mich.
960 Harold Leslie Fox, Oliver Gulch, Mont.
2069 Harry Gordon, Union Hotel, Whitefish, Mont.
591 John P. Grady, Columbia Falls, Mont.
35 Charles Gunderson, 28 Lupfer, Whitefish, Mont.
950a John Harriman, Water front, Bay Street, South San Francisco, Calif.

506 Jesse Hayden, Whitefish, Mont.
453 Wm. Earl Helmerl, Fourth Street, Polson, Mont.
1578a A. Geo. Jensen, 45 Central, Whitefish, Mont.
1879 Chas. (Charlie) Johnson, Whitefish, Mont.
94 Kekran Kasborian (Dekran Kasbarian), Olney, Mont.
983 Dan Davis Keaaweamahi (Dan Davis Keaucamahi, Kealveamhi), 480 John Ena Road Honolo, Whitefish, Mont.
1264 Howard Allen Kelly, Somers, Mont.
563a Geo. Ketchum, Whitefish, Mont.
1961 John Ward King, Coram, Mont.
1964 John H. Kirk, care Hospital, Kalispell, Mont.
1567 Jos. John Lammers, Radium Hotel, Whitefish, Mont.
1915 J. C. Langtry, 419 Second Street, Whitefish, Mont.
239 Patrick McDermott, Columbia Falls, Mont.
1337a Thos. McGovern, Kalispell, Mont. (State Prison, Deer Lake, Mont.)
534 John Meebolt, Polson, Mont.
1155 Howard Chas. Meredith, Central Hotel, Whitefish, Mont.
222 Frank Meyers (Myers), Paola, Mont.
1341 Arthur Lee Miller, Whitefish, Mont.
1562 Philip (Phillip) J. Moran, Culbertson, Mont.
105 James Murphy, Whitefish, Mont.
920 Oscar Nelson, Essex, Mont.
615 Alonzo Nichols (Nicholas, Nichlas), 3224 State Street, Chicago, Ill.
1035 James O'Brien, Kalispell, Mont.
2100 Lawrence O'Connor, 45 Central, Whitefish, Mont.
1195 Joseph Quaife, 303 Second Street, Whitefish, Mont.
1096 John Willis Ramsey (John Wm. Ramsey, John Willis Ramsey, M. D.), Dayton, Mont.
65 Herman Reed (Reeb), 411 Railroad, Whitefish, Mont.
58 Fred Ursel Reed (Frederick (Fredick) Ursel Reed), Polson, Mont.
1454 Philip Seller, Paola, Mont.
1255 John Service, Bolton, Mont.
571 Henry (Harry) James Smith, Marion, Mont.
548 Elmer Walke, Belton, Mont.
1682a Andrew Lewis Weaver (Andrew L. Weaver), Creston, Mont.
2097 Walter P. Wilkinson (W. P. Wilkinson), Central Avenue, Whitefish, Mont.
1179 Andrew Buschino, 4 Baker Avenue, Whitefish, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF HILL, HAVRE CITY, STATE OF MONTANA.

3109 E. (Ed.) Anderson, Havre, Mont.
862 Homer Edwin Ash, East First Street and Seventh Avenue, Havre, Mont.
3447 John Berry, Havre, Mont. (Beery, Marshal, Ark.)
1135 Glen Ralph Berry, Gildford, Mont.
732 William Boyer (Willie Bayer), Havre, Mont.
3117 Carl (Karl) Bretzke, Havre, Mont.
1630 Charlie J. (John, Charlie) Brown, Brinkman, Mont.
825 Joseph Brown, Sweet Spring, Mont.
1918 Isiah Crawford (Isaiah Crawford, Isaiah Carl Crawford), Monticello, Ark.
253 Martin D. De Haan (Martin De Haan), Box Elder, Mont.
206 Jones Dewey Dillon, 1523 Fifth Street, Havre, Mont.
3315 Chas. Eugene Dingman, Havre, Mont.
702 Gust Drager, Joplin, Mont
2296 Roy M. (Milton, Melton) Easley, 1006 First Street, Havre, Mont.
2089½ Alvin J. (Julius) Erickson, Nanson, N. Dak.
1314 Jerone (Jerome) Ferrell, Argina, Ark.
582 Mace Henry Ford, 815 Second Street, Havre, Mont.
390 Alfred L. (Laurence) Garner, Havre, Mont.
1696 Frank Gentile, Havre, Mont.
167 Wm. Charles Gordon, Rudyard, Mont.
1894 Wm. Gordon, Havre, Mont.
1729 Raier C. Hamersnes (Raier Olsen (Olson) Hamersons), Havre, Mont.
752 Wang Hang, Havre, Mont.
2521 Goel (George) Horkey, Havre, Mont.
1173 Richard Hastings, Joplin, Mont.
286 Jesse U. (Ulyses) Hayes, Havre, Mont.
814 Hubert N. (Hurbert M.) Heinen, Laredo, Mont.
2558 Robert Hepburn, Whitiash, Mont.
257 Edward (Ed.) Heater, Havre, Mont.
261 Jos. Hodgeson (Joseph Hodgson), Havre, Mont.
3520 William Harbluk (Hrabluck), Hingham, Mont.
212 Frank James, New Orleans, La.
2145 William Johnson (W. Johnson), 4004 Ninth avenue, South Seattle, Wash.
2928 Martin (Martan) Kauchagion, Inverness, Mont.
2805 Jack King, Havre, Mont.
3091 Lee Boul (Bowl) Kong, Havre, Mont.
480 Arthur Landmeer (Landwer), boarding car, G. N. R. R., Havre, Mont.
2901 Andrew Macek, 734 Second Street, Havre, Mont.
1081 Sam Magnusen (Magnuson), Havre, Mont.
922 J. A. (Jay) Miller, 209 West Sixth Street, Devil's Lake, N. D.
2634 Paul A. Miller, Box Elder, Mont.
2880 Henry Mosquite, Gen. Del., Harlen, Mont.
427 Chas. Overices, Havre, Mont.
1852 Carl L. Paulson, Joplin, Mont. (care American Consul, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada).
2601 Otto Pohl, Box Elder, Mont.
3015 Robert Rubey, Chester, Mont.
601 John Rashowig (Rashowiz), George, P. O., Mont.
1049 Archie Reid (Reed, Ried), Gen. Del., Havre, Mont.
1758 Albert E. (Emmanuel, Emanury) Rockney, Hingham, Mont.
2486 Eddie Rockney, Hingham, Mont.
1193 Carl L. Scheidt, Havre, Mont. (Litchfield, Minn.).
1373 Oscar Schilling, Joplin, Mont.
1022 Edward Schober, Reiseker, Alberta.
1565 Fred Schram, St. Joseph, Mont.
2214 Wm. C. (Charles) Schroeder, Wiltner Building, Havre, Mont.
1002 William Shine, Park Hotel, Havre, Mont.
602 Harry Spencer, between First and Second, West, Havre, Mont.
55 Francis Jos. Stanley, 1021 Second Street, Havre, Mont.
973 Chas. Stein, Havre, Mont.
1837 Ralph W. Stokes, Havre, Mont. (general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.).
2236 John N. Talleral (John Morgas Talleraas, John Margas Talleraas).
5312½ Frank A. Titan, St. Cloud, Minn.
819 Willis Thompson, Havre, Mont.
3137 Bernard Tschrettar (Bernhart Tschritter), Laredo, Mont.
2992 Shed Ware, Arkadelphia, Ark.
4 John Weber, general delivery, Havre, Mont.
222 Herman Freeman, Joplin, Mont.
3569 Mathie Roxford (Roxfred) Triplett, 1101 Third Street, Havre, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF LEWIS AND CLARK, STATE OF MONTANA.

103 Lee Roy Armstrong, Pine Street, Helena, Mont. (3313 Fifth Avenue W, Seattle, Wash.)
2110 Paul Backe, Holter, Mont.
659 Ralph E. Barnum (Ralph Emerson Barnum), 102 Bristol Hotel, Helena, Mont.
1527 Peter Ballon, Helena, Mont.
2219 Ferdinand Bergen (Ferdinand Newmon Bergen), 218 Breckenridge Street, Helena, Mont.
1758 Steve Berger, 45 South Main Street, Helena, Mont.
382 Nelson H. Brewer, East Helena, Mont.
1239 Virginal Cassandra (Virginia Cassandra), East Helena, Mont.
1491 Matt Corbett, Rimini, Mont.
2009 Sylvester Coyne, box 1622, Spokane, Wash. (517 Racine Avenue, Chicago, Ill.)
43 Joe Crespean, East Helena, Mont.
973 John Dean, 15 North Ewing Street, Helena, Mont.
675 John Deneby (John Deneby), Holter, Mont.
134 Sam Denny, near Great Northern Depot, Helena, Mont.
213 J. E. Dodd (Joseph Edward Dodd), Kellogg, Idaho.
674 Leslie H. Ennie (Leslie Herbert Ennis), Helena, Mont.
1755 Mike Evich, Marysville, Mont.
472 Melvin Fisher, Blue Sulphur Springs, W. Va. (Clemens, Mont.)
1665 Harry Floyd, Craig, Mont.
697 Frank Friesheim (Frank Friesham), Holter, Mont.
2145 Giles Gibson, Holter, Mont.
726 John Haller (John Kalla), Bristol Hotel, Helena, Mont.
2002 Walter Harris, 2333 Division Street, Baltimore, Md.
2045 Curtis A. Heikes (Curtis Alvie Heikes), Roundup, Mont.
592 Francis L. Howe (Francis Lee Howe), Wolf Creek, Mont.
573 Jimson Sufo, Round House, Helena, Mont. (Jinzon Sudo, Herberts Ranch Valley, Helena, Mont.
652 Otto H. Johnston, R. F. D. No. 1, box 69, Walla Walla, Wash. (Otto Hugo Johnson, East Helena, Mont.)
367 Chas. Kalstead (Charlie Kalstead), Holter, Mont.
946 Bennie C. Lachlin (Bennie C. Laeblien, Bennie Cornelius Laeblein), Hogan, Mont.
1125 Ikey Lehte, Herberts Ranch, Helena, Mont. (Ikey Lehto, Herberts Ranch Valley, Helena, Mont.)
848 Roy J. Leighton, Holter, Mont. (Lincoln, N. C.)
752 Yound Pak Lenng (Young Pak Lenng), 213 South Main Street, Helena, Mont.
579 J. E. Lill, 1407 Helena Avenue, Helena, Mont.
2026 John Lokon (Loknor, John Lokno), East Helena, Mont.
993 Earl Madson (Earl Madsen), Helena, Mont.
708 Albert Martinez (Alberto Martinez), Wolf Creek, Mont.
2191 John Matson (John Watson), Holter, Mont.
94 Mike Michalakis, Holter, Mont. (Anomeras, Greece.)
1283 Mike Millisan (Millisan), Holter, Mont.
1986 Chas. Moran, R. F. D. A, Helena, Mont.
2212 Mardur Neadeno (Mardur Neadeano), Wolf Creek, Mont.
13 A. E. Norton, Helena, Mont. (Arnie Eugene Norton), Puento, Calif.
665 Anton Moren Nosue (Anton Nosen, Anton Nosan), East Helena, Mont.
1000 Nick G. Palatos, Austin, Mont. (Neck George Palatos, Neck G. Palatos, 3305 Watling Street, Indian Harbor, Ind.
1924 Mike Pappas (Nick Pappas), Michell, Mont.
2388 Eli Prodovich, Holter, Mont.
801 Berhardo Raminus (Bernardo Ramiries, Bernado Ramiries), Wolf Creek, Mont.
2170 James Reid, Helena, Mont.
1275 Juan G. Rice (Juan G. Rios), Wolf Creek, Mont.
1112 Mike Rieskovak (Mike Riskoosk), Brickyard, Helena, Mont.
2125 Harry B. Roberts (Harry Beverly Roberts), Helena, Mont.
1958 John Rodak, East Helena, Mont.
1596 Joe Sarak (Joe Zarak), East Helena, Mont.
647 Lee Schiedde (Lee Schields, D'Lee Shields), Atlas Block, Helena, Mont.
1567 Geo. Schwertt (Geo. Schmerdt), Rimini, Mont.
32 Donald A. Shea (Donald John Shea), Augusta, Mont.
918 Paul E. Sheldon, R. F. D. A, Helena, Mont. (Paul Edwin Sheldon, Helena, Mont.).
1641 Arthur L. Shepard, box 1632, Butte, Mont. (Arthur Lee Shepherd, Rimini, Mont.).
870 Oscar Shaff (Oscar Shaffer), 213 East Lindale Avenue, Helena, Mont.
916 Dan Sidick (Dan Sikich), East Helena, Mont.
2111 John Stinor, Canyon Creek, Mont.
566 Wm. J. Sullivan, Bristol Hotel, Helena, Mont.
584 Joseph Tavolich, Augustus, Mont.
433 Leon Waddell, care Hal M. Shelby, Princess Ka Hippodrome Theater, Los Angeles, Calif. (Placer Hotel, Helena, Mont.).
735 Harry Wauson, East Helena, Mont.
83 John Ward, East Helena, Mont.
1451 Kotera Watanable (Kotara Watanable, Kolaro Watanabe), Wolf Creek, Mont.
1900 John Wells, Rimini, Mont.
1178 Frank Williamson, Rupert, Idaho (Frank Williams, Rimini route, Helena, Mont.).
2069 Wong Bing Yung, San Francisco, Calif.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MEAGHER, STATE OF MONTANA.

277 David B. Aspenstrom (Avil Bink Aspenstrom, David Aspenstrom), White Sulphur Springs, Mont.
85a Jacob K. Bordvig (Jacob Kornelius Jacobson (Jacobsen) Bordvig), Lennep, Mont.
227 James Brower, Martinsdale, Mont.
870 Jack Cosby, Lewis, Mont.
350 Austin Egeraas (Egeriss), Lennep, Mont.
236 Anton Ermenc, Fort Logan, Mont. (Bear Creek, Mont.).
339 Naum George, Three Forks, Mont. (205 East Park, Butte, Mont.).
101 Paul Hanekan, Ringling, Mont.
358 George Haralabos (Haralbos), Three Forks, Mont.
119 Ole Gudmundsen (G.) Hebnes, Lennep, Mont.

126a Kirkos E. Lialios (Lialios, Mike J. (James) Lialios), Ringling, Mont.
291 Chas. William Lockwood, 111 North Bassett Street, Madison, Wis.
393 Dan McIntyre, Ringling, Mont.
34 Andrew Monos, Ringling, Mont.
154 Frank Moran, Ringling, Mont.
315 Nat Oberman, 1415 Fulton Avenue, New York, N. Y. (box 504, Harlowton, Mont.).
226 George Pallas, Three Forks, Mont. (box 800, North Grosvenordale, Monn.).
37 Louis Patroskosa, Ringling, Mont.
52 Henry M. Peters, Ringling, Mont.
127 Jens Sandanger (Saudanger), White Sulphur Springs, Mont.
185 Charlie (Chas.) Stromberg, White Sulphur Springs, Mont.
139 Teji (Tiji) Wtsu, Three Forks, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MISSOULA, STATE OF MONTANA.

61 Orville Sumner (O. S.) Wimpey, Missoula, Mont. (en route, Missoula, Mont.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MUSSELSHELL, STATE OF MONTANA.

2358a Emmet Wells Allen (E. W. Allin), Braddyville, Page, Iowa.
1369 Harry T. Allen, 421 Second Street east, Roundup, Mont.
1093 Henry J. Beahn (Henery J. Beahn), Roundup, Mont.
25a Andrew Bender (Bendor), Sheridan, Wyo. (Carneyville, Wyo.).
64a Julio L. Cervantis (Julio Lechuga Cervantes, J. L. Cervantes), Roundup, Mont.
2117a Claude R. Classon (Claude Roland Classon), Roundup, Mont.
710a Peter Evanko, Ryegate Muss, Mont.
1735a John Gaskey, Klein Muss, Mont.
778 Elmer J. Johnson, Roundup, Mont.
236 Constantine Karaesiliotis (Constantin G. Karacsiliotis, Constantine G. Karaesiliotis), Roundup, Mont.
1752a August Kasun (August Kasum), Klein Muss, Mont.
1452 Anton L. Kazelickki (Antone Louis Kozelickki, Kozelichki), Klein, Mont.
1215 Wm. E. Keserich, Roundup, Mont.
2119a Chas. Kukkoner (Charles Kukkonen), general delivery, Klien Musselshell, Mont.
401 Alfred Luther Lightner, Lavina, Mont.
924 Edward McDonald (Ed. McDonald), Roundup, Mont.
832 Clyde O. McLain (McLain, Clyde O.), Traveler's Hotel, Roundup, Mont. (Crows Lake, Minn.).
356a Jake Magdich (Jake Mogdich), Absher, Musselshell, Mont.
1213 Claud Murphy, Musselshell, Mont. (care of T. S. Steed, Casper, Wyo.).
15 John Murphy, Warm Springs, Mont.
939 Walter Edward Ott, Roundup, Mont.
1074 Fred Robinson, Klien, Mont.
880 Fred Wm. Sauer, Roundup, Mont.
1122 Eike Schnath, Roundup, Mont.
1204 Ervin Sturgill, Palace Hotel, Roundup, Mont. (Glenrock, Wyo.).
1694 Jos. Thomas (Joseph Thomas), Rothlemay, Mont.
2471a Roy E. Thompson (Roy Elmer Thompson), Roundup Muss, Mont.
519a Elmer Ray Van Horn (Elmer Roy Van Horn), Klein Muss, Mont.
46a Thos. L. Wilson (Thomas Leonard Wilson, Thomas L. Wilson), Melstone, P. O., Musselshell, Mont.
510 Harvey K. Wright (Harvey Grant Wright), Ryegate, Mont. (605 East Washington Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF PHILLIPS, STATE OF MONTANA.

1757 Tom S. Moen, Saco, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF RAVALLI, STATE OF MONTANA.

434 John Thompson Burdit, Corvallis, Mont. (general delivery, Great Falls, Mont.).
409 Victor Evanoff, Darby, Mont.
100 Omer Haynes, Stevensville, Mont.
842a Wm. (William) Earl Morrow, Cass Lake, Minn. (care of Whaley Bros., Florence, Mont.).
281 Mike Shoemaker, Victor, Mont. (5311 North Grand Avenue, Cragin, Ill.).
666 Cresancio Somidio (Cresencio Somideo, Somidea), Stevensville, Mont.
847 Archie Terlino, Stevensville, Mont.
875 Joe I. Vuckovich (Joseph I. Vuckovich), Darley, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF RICHLAND, STATE OF MONTANA.

710 Jerry Carrion, Savage, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SHERIDAN, STATE OF MONTANA.

1703 Walter Baldwin Allen (Walter B. Allen), Poplar, Mont.
2148 Jack Anderson, Scobey, Mont.
1907 Lauritz Anderson (Laurits Anderson), Wolf Point, Mont.
1592 Lawrence Anderson, Bamville, Mont.
773 Thos. Anelette (Thomas Analette), Culbertson, Mont.
1115 Nels (Neils) Emmons Bang, Froid, Mont.
376 Ernest Orizine Brillion (Ernest Brillion), Scobey, Mont.
1274 Sidney W. Brodenick (Sidney Wm. Broderick), Plentywood, Mont.
79 Theodore O. C. Carlson, Flaxville, Mont.
2645 Robert Eugene Carter, New Liberty, Ill.
727 Roy Robert Clinton, Plentywood, Mont.
3251 Fred Dodd Coey (Fred D. Coey), Wolf Point, Mont.
315 Archie Martie Cray (Archie M. Cray), Flagville, Mont.
2623 James Crosby.
2255 John Daley (John Dahley), Plentywood, Mont.
1915 Harvey Dailey, Wolf Point, Mont.
1272 Geo. E. Deacon (Geo. E. Decon), Wolf Point, Mont.
36 Frank Dezewieski (Frank Drzewieski), Wolf Point, Mont.
403 Alex Eastman, Brockton, Mont., care of Lewis Lambert, sr., Culbertson, Mont.
3459 Ole Efteland, Scobey, Mont.
650 Freemond Einerson (Freeman T. Einerson, Fremond B. Einerson), Poplar, Mont.
214 Ira Jay Elliott (J. Elliott, Ira J. Elliott), Homestead, Mont.
2291 Clarence Theodore Fielstad (Clarence Feilstad), Outlook, Mont.
1904 Mike Fitzgerald, Bainville, Mont.
948 Lawrence (Laurence) J. Frazier, Wolf Point, Mont.
413 Otto Goll, Froid, Mont.
2303 Rolph Gordon (Ralph Gordon), Redstone, Mont.
2634 Halvor N. Harang (Halvor Haring), Kable, Mont.
1294 William L. Harrison (William Harrison), Bainville, Mont.
3489 Edward Henke, Culbertson, Mont.
1753 Wesley J. Hindle (Wesley Hindle), Scobey, Mont.
3455 Daniel J. Horn (Daniel J. Horan), Bainville, Mont.
2729 Hans C. T. Jensen, Plentywood, Mont.
15 Oscar Johnson, Pindell, Md.
1613 Robert Johnson, Comertown, Mont.
3095 Emil Kinhult (Emil Kirihult), Wolf Point, Mont.
1399 Edwin Kirk, Flaxville, Mont.
414 Mike Kosbiscke, Wolf Point, Mont.
794 Oscar C. Lakevold (Oscar C. Lakewood), Poplar, Mont.
19 Joseph Norbert Lerat, Wolf Point, Mont.
3200 Wm. Lewis (William Lewis), Wolf Point, Mont.
522 Walter Elroy Lowman (Walter E. Lowman), Outlook, Mont.
2321 Royal McCoy, Whitetail, Mont.
1484 James McGowan, Raymond, Mont.
2665 John D. Martin, Wolf Point, Mont.
3496 Roy T. Masterman, Froid, Mont.
756 Louis W. Meads (Meods), Plentywood, Mont.
1606 Ike Means, Brockton, Mont.
158 John F. (John E.) Monaghan, Wolf Point, Mont.
3388 John James Moran, Bainville, Mont.
3579 Leon Ties Amelius Nelson (Leon T. Nelson), Dagmar, Mont. (Whitefish, Mont.).
237 Leon M. Nickerson, Flaxville, Mont.
1455 Charles A. Olsen, Froid, Mont.
1986 Walfred Ferdinand Olson (Walfred Derdinand Olson, Walfred F. Olsen), Flaxville, Mont.
1918 Peter Olson, Whitetail, Mont. (Sisseton, S. Dak.).
2528 Oscar Orvick (Oscar Orick), Scobey, Mont.
189 Fritz Alphonse Presner (Fritz Alphonso Presber, A. Presber), Scobey, Mont.
3623 Eugene Edward Remick, Flaxville, Mont.
2776 Alfred Remington, Westby, Mont.
2587 Felix Rezon, Bainville, Mont.
70 Robert J. Ross, Wolf Point, Mont.
952 John Roule, Scobey, Mont.
196 Thos. D. Ryon (Thomas D. Ryan), Redstone, Mont.
929 Frank St. Claire (Frank St. Clair), Wolf Point, Mont.
1876 George A. Schamaharn (G. A. Schumahorn), Poplar, Mont.
812 Henry A. Selvig (Henry C. Selvig), Outlook, Mont.
1832 George R. Smith, Scobey, Mont.
2084 John Smith, Froid, Mont.
1507 Martin Sorensen, Plentywood, Mont.
1989 Glen N. Stover (Glen L. Stover), Wolf Point, Mont.
3541 James Toomey, Calumet, Mich.
839 Edward Trauba, Opheium, Mont.
3424 Ralph Truax, Plentywood, Mont.
3154 Chas. R. Turk (Charles Richard Turk), Wolf Point, Mont. (3475 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.).
1063 Frank W. Verne (Frank Vernett), Froid, Mont.
655 Wilford Weske, Plentywood, Mont.
1795 Howard B. West, Mondak, Mont.
3567 Richard B. Willoughby (Richard B. Willoughly), Scobey, Mont.
1498 Jack Wilson, Whitetail, Mont.
2579 John Wolfe, Plentywood, Mont.
652 Leroy P. Rapley, Bainveille, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SILVER BOW, STATE OF MONTANA.

97 Daniel Alvin Bales, 64 Missoula Avenue, Butte, Mont. (Pendleton, Oreg., Silver Bow Co., Mont.).
3380 Edward W. Bates, 1918 South Idaho Street, Butte, Mont.
967 Russel Lawrence (L.) Beatty, 839 North Montana, Butte, Mont., Mont. St.).
988 Dave Briscoe, St. Joe, Mo. (Divide, Mont.).
1173 Edward Stevens (S.) Brott, 155 East Center, Butte, Mont.
1782 Richard Paul Brown, 428 East Mullen Street, Centerville, Butte., Mont.
267 James John Byrnes (Burns, James J. Byrnes), 336 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
1801 Neil Campbell, 823 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont. (410 East Broadway, Butte, Mont.).
569 Napoleon W. Carter, 2046 Farrell, Butte, Mont.
997 Peter Casale, 3 Smelter, Meaderville, Mont.
2095 John Casey, 27 Clear Grit Terrace, Butte, Mont.
351 Charles Collins, 709 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
313 Charles H. Conde, 1827 Garfield, Butte, Mont.
1186 Frederich Aloysius Conroy (Frederick Aloysius Conroy, Fred A. Conroy, Frederick Aloysius), 26 West Daly Street, Walkerville, Cook City, Mont.
836 William Levi Craig, 2311 Amhurst Street, South Butte, Mont.
2088 James Henry Cunningham, 331 East Woolman, Butte, Mont.
1930 Patrick Daly, 739 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
3076 Inman Deal, Box 661, Livingston, Mont. (care Kenwood Building, West Broadway, Butte, Mont.
3278 Michael P. Doherty (Michael Doherty), 926 East Pacific, Butte, Mont. (849 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.).
1384 John (John J.) Driscoll, 51 West Agate Street, Butte, Mont.
1134 William Dyne, Billings, Mont.
2900 Horace James Edwards, 1130 East Galena, Butte, Mont.
1875 August Enlund, Freeley, Mont.
252 John Fleck, 23 West Pacific Street, Butte, Mont.
1881 Wilford Ford, 1130 East Galena, Butte, Mont.
1488 Patrick (Pat.) Gannon (Patrick Gamon), 849 North Main, Butte, Mont.
365 Sisto (Sesto) Gheli (Ghelpi), 204 West Daly, Walkerville, Mont.
2619 Antonio Giannaugeli (Giomunayeli, Giamunayeli), American House, Daly, Walkerville, Mont.
3203 John Gilmore, 116 Blue Wing Avenue, Walkerville, Mont. (27 Quartz Street, Butte, Mont.
2385 Romeo Gingras (Gingros), 3046 Floral Boulevard, Butte, Mont.
2539 William Albert (A.) Glaefke (Glaefke, Glaifke), southeast corner Fifth and Transit, Walkerville, Mont.
2146 Michael Goggin, 616 North Alaska, Butte, Mont.
3215 Peter Golden, 129 West Summit, Butte, Mont. (Gilmore, Idaho).
1147 Clarence A. Head, Preston, Idaho.
3186 Michael Healy (Henley), 808 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2340 James A. Hill, 1104 Anarbor, Flint, Mich. (Silver Bow, Mont.).
1773 Eric (Erick, Erich), Johnson, 419 East Third, Anaconda, Mont. (Camp No. 6, Joyce, Wash.).
2735 Joe Joel Johnson (Joel Johnson, Joe J. Johnson), 2204 Fir Street, Butte, Mont.
1972 David A. Jones, 1306 Talbot Avenue, Butte, Mont. (Fresno, Calif.).

1436 David Richard (David R.) Jones, Cikers, Colo. (Delta, Colo.).
2611 Martin Kearney (Kurney), Mullen House, Butte, Mont.
1640 Owen Keenan, 108 Mullen Street, Centerville, Butte, Mont.
603 Daniel (Dan) Kelly, 800 North Main, Butte, Mont. (741).
508 Henry Clyde (C.) King, Pocatello, Idaho (care O. S. L. R. R. Co., Lima, Mont.).
1493 Charles U. Kirbry (Chas. V. Kirby, E. Kirby), Browns Gulch, Walkerville, Mont.
3389 John F. (T.) Lewis, 1935 Shattuck Avenue, Oakland, Calif. (sheriff's office, Sacramento, Calif.)
861 Ross P. Linden (R., P. Linder), Orifino, S. B. County, Mont. (Ore Fino).
1391 Thomas Logan, Nissler, Mont. (106 South Main Street, Helena, Mont.).
568 John Lonkala (Loniala, Lonkakla, Lonkola), 405 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
1183 Cornelius McGinley, Basin Creek, Butte, Mont.
2140 John McIntyre, 7 West Pacific, Butte, Mont.
2785 Peter McKinna (McKivva), 356 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
1580 Thomas A. McMahon, 310 Pine Street, Butte, Mont.
1403 Joseph McNulty, Mullin House, Butte, Mont.
1224 Dennis Mahoney, 700 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
1791 John Francis Mahoney, 709 North Main, Butte, Mont.
374 Michael Mahoney, 709 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2889 William Maimy (Malmi), 405 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
2886 Frank Maroot (Moroott), 1011 Faucett (Faucett), Butte, Mont.
553 Michael Joseph (J.) Marron, 1042 East Park, Butte, Mont.
3111 Harry Miller, Columbia Gardens, Mont.
1981 Verne Moberly, 140 Walnut, Butte, Mont.
2277 Archie Moore, Mullin House, Butte, Mont.
551 Antone Morello, 4 Montana, Meaderville, Mont.
2168 Anders Johon Moyts (John Moytes, Moyts), 1017 Faucett Street, Butte, Mont.
703 John Murphy, 739 Main Street, Butte, Mont.
145 Michael Patrick (Mike P.) Murphy, 747 West Main, Butte, Mont.
1549 James Murtagh, 129 West Summit, Butte, Mont.
3064 Edward Norris, 929 Talbot Avenue, Butte, Mont.
1016 Timothy (Tim) O'Brien, 709 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
2707 Andrew O'Connell (O'Connel), 649 North Main, Butte, Mont. (849 Mont.)
1216 Michael Francis O'Grady, 406 West Broadway, Butte, Mont. (406 West Boardman Street).
2896 John Joseph (J.) Phillips, 831 North Montana, Butte, Mont.
1953 Charles Herbert (Chas. H.) Phipps, 15 (Clair) Grit, Butte, Mont. (Clear Char).
2873 Robert James (J.) Reynolds, 94 Pine Street, Butte, Mont. (511 North Jackson, Butte, Mont.
665 William Henry Rule, 28 West Center, Butte, Mont.
536 Andrew Runeburg (Runeberg), Williamsburg, Butte, Mont. (Williamsburg, Mont.
102 Peter Ryan, 928 Minah Street, Butte, Mont.
3319 Charles John Salo (J. Sale), 2 East Summit, Butte, Mont.
2092 Bagdan Saniordzijo (Saniordsijo), 11 Duggan Avenue, Butte, Mont.
196 Antone Sever, 212 Shields Avenue, Butte, Mont.
1838 Daniel James (J.) Shea, 722 North Wyoming, Butte, Mont.
1837 Dennis Shea (Dennis P. Shea), 5 West Copper, Butte, Mont. 166 East Center Street, Butte, Mont.
3283 Daniel Sheehan, 808 North Main Street, Butte, Mont.
679 Daniel (Dan) Shields, Concord block, Butte, Mont. (433 Anaconda Road, Butte, Mont.
12 Edward (Edwin) Wesley Simpson, Gregson, Mont.
3213 Thomas Smith, 1732 Thornton Avenue, Butte, Mont.
2003 Walter Stopson, 126 Covert, Butte, Mont.
1730 Fred Striegel, Columbia Gardens, Butte, Mont.
810 Bartholomew (Batt) Sullivan, 115 Minah, Butte, Mont.
1542 Dan M. Sullivan, 745 North Main Street, Centerville, Mont.
2515 Dennis (Denis) Sullivan, 808 North Main, Butte, Mont.
2260 Dennis D. (Denis) Sullivan, 26 West Daly, Walkerville, Mont.
494 James J. Sullivan, 57 Bennett Street, Butte, Mont.
1667 Patrick Sullivan (Patrick D. Sullivan), 112½ East Broadway, Butte, Mont. (Mullin House, Room 82, Butte ,Mont.)
2184 Patrick Dennis (D.) Sullivan, 504 West Woolman Street, Butte, Mont.
1768 Quinn Sullivan, 808 North Main, Butte, Mont.
3002 Timothy Sullivan, 356 East Granite, Butte, Mont.
2203 Frank Swanson, 1122 East Park, Butte, Mont. (1029 East Galena, Butte, Mont.).
1100 Arthur Michael (M.) Thorkman, 126 Covert Street, Butte, Mont. 345½ East Granite Street, Butte, Mont.
135 Cornelius Toomey, 5½ Agate Street, Butte, Mont.
1605 Noah Arthur Toomey, 118 Minah, Butte, Mont.
2443 William Claybra Turtle, Portland, Oreg. (Silver Bow, Mont.).
1456 James Walsh, 412 West Daly, Walkerville, Mont.
3299 Humphrey Woody (Woodey), 733 West Main Street, Butte, Mont.
1629 Patrick Barry, 5 Duggan Avenue, Butte, Mont.
674 Timothy Joseph (J.) Harrington, 724 North Montana Street, Butte, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF STILLWATER, STATE OF MONTANA.

647 John O. Brown (John C. Brown), Absarokee, Mont.
732 Sam Ainland (Sam Anliand, Sam Aneland), Laural, Mont.
299 Christ Drapanes (Drapones), Columbus, Mont.
296 Wilford Granger (Wilfred Granger, Wilfred Grauger), Columbus, Mont.
52 Grover Scrichfield (Grover Cleveland Scrichfield, Grover C. Scrichfield), Stickley, Mont.
8 Peter Tefetan (Pete Tafetan), Billings, Mont.
515 Paul Mitro, Billings, Mont.
47 Chas. A. Nelson (Charles Albert Nelson), Belmont, Musselshell County, Mont.
807 James O'Brien, Broadview, Mont.
33 George Adolph Patrick (Geo. Adolph Patrick), Park City, Mont.
763 Nels Ryan (Ryen), Park City, Mont.
315 Wm. Sherwin (William Sherwin, William Shirwin), Stickley, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF TETON, STATE OF MONTANA.

875 Knut Akre, Conrad, Mont.
808 Arf Allie, Aszia, Asia (Glacier Park, Mont.).
2262½ Fred Anderson, Power, Mont.
2549 Christos (Christian) Alstrom, Brady, Mont.
526 Robert Banks (Robert Washington Banks), Family, Mont.
82 Alex Raymond Beeson, Cut Bank, Mont.
412 Benjamin L. Blair, Cut Bank, Mont.
1857 E. H. Boswell, Enterprise, Oreg.
2378 Alexander Burke, Sherburne, Mont.
38 Jos. R. Callaghan (Joseph Raymond Callaghan), 5515 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Conrad, Mont.).
1896 Bert L. Campbell, B. Board, Cincinnati, Ohio.
51½ Donald LaChance, general delivery, Havre, Mont. (Landale, Alta, Canada.
1166 Nicholas G. (Nicholis) Charn, 56 West Park Street, Butte, Mont. (Choteau, Mont.).
2275 Harry Clark, Valier, Mont.
652 Carl S. Clausen, Conrad, Mont.
2518 Lester A. (L. A.) Culp, Cut Bank, Mont.
2411 James Emmett (Emmet) Dalton, Brady, Mont.
555 John Davies, Fulton, Pa.
56 Walter E. Davis, Williams, Mont.
50 George Duncan (George J. Duncan), Cut Bank, Mont.
193 Joseph A. Dupell, Cut Bank, Mont.
188 Carl Edward, Demers, Mont.
1429 Godfred L. Erickson (G. Ericksen, G. L. Ericksen), Cluny, Canada (Aalesund, Norway).
231 Noble Fanell, Williams, Mont.
525 John Fenos, Great Falls, Mont. (extra gang Great Northern Ry.)
544 Peter Fikiris (Pete Fikilis), Cut Bank, Mont.
901 Earl A. Garrett, Conrad, Mont.
786 Wilmer C. Gill, Cut Bank, Mont.
2363 Roland Gissing, Lowry, Mont.
2318 Don Frank Glacier, Cut Bank, Mont.
689 Martin Grasswich (Grasswick) (Martin E. Grasswick), Conrad, Mont.
1863 John Hall, care Great Northern, Cut Bank, Mont. (Tampa, Fla.).
583 Morris Hammer (Hemmer), Cut Bank, Mont.
1020 Conrad M. Huff (Hoff), Conrad, Mont.
1082 Alfred Humphrey, Conrad, Mont.
1987 Ajan Hussan, Aszia, Turkish Asia (care Great Northern, Glacier Park, Mont.).
2251 Ludwig H. Jacobson (Ludvig, Ludvig Herbert Jacobson), Thief River Falls, Minn. (Garland, Wyo.).
1134 Albert Jaeger, Valier, Mont.
32 Alfred Rudolph Jensen, 612 Granite Street (care J. P. J. Jensen, Wupaca, Wis.), Williams, Mont.
116 Carl (Karl) Johnson, Brady, Mont.
1266 Ernest Ivan (Iver, Ivar) Johnson, West Edmonton, Alta, Canada (Cut Bank, Mont.).
513 Fred J. Jones (Fred Jones), Power, Mont.
2340 John Lang, Browning, Mont.
2399 Lewis Lewis, Conrad, Mont.
1456 Roderick Liagate (Lidgate), Turgoose, British Columbia.
1600 Paul R. Lindquist, 2509 Seventh Street, South Minneapolis, Minn.
524 Jesse Raymond Lord (Jess), Cameron, Pa.
2244 James Lucas, Detroit, Mich.
2197 Thomas McCod, Cut Bank, Mont.
238 George McGowan (Geo.), Ironandail, Mo.
159 George McGown or McGowan, Cut Bank, Mont.
119 Wm. McLean (William), Conrad, Mont.
2597 Ener Mahlum, Cut Bank, Mont.
1305 Adelmo Marchetti, Pendroy, Mont. (Barga, Lucca, Italy).
1124 Guy W. Martin, Colonial Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2226 Herman D. Miller, Sweet Grass, Mont.
2345 Jim Moroney, Pendroy, Mont. (Pesha, Italy).
2425 Speros Mousuras (Mousaras), Conrad, Mont. (care Great Northern extra gang).
432 William A. Murrey (Wm. Murray), Cut Bank, Mont.
617 Otto Albert Nelson, Sherburne, Mont.
1917 Laurits (Laurits) Nilansen, Sweet Grass, Mont.
1085 Joseph Nolan, Gilman, Mont.
1954 Albin John Nystrom, Dutton, Mont.
1099 Emil Olson, Power, Mont.
1646 Jack Orik (Onik), Cut Bank, Mont.
705 Arthur L. Palmer, Cut Bank, Mont.
1398 William (Wm.) Peck, Waymart, Wayne, Pa.
1663 Elton Perry, Choteau, Mont.
256 John Price (Pryce), Fairfield, Mont.
2458 Jose Ranires (Rainires) (Jose Ramis (Ramires), care G. N.), Cut Bank, Mont.
1507 Roy V. (Ray) Rydberg, Brady, Mont.
2428 Austin C. Scott, Hotel Valier, Valier, Mont. (Continental Hotel, Ellis & Powell, San Francisco, Calif.).
618 Walter A. Sering (Soring), R. R. D., Cranfordville, Ind.
2266 Thomas Percy Shand, care Phoenix Construction Co., Collinston, Utah (117 Howard Street, Keene, N. H.).
905 Jim W. Singley, Fairfield, Mont.
1452 Anataro (Anaitaro) Sutierras (Anaitario Gutierres), Cut Bank, Mont.
254 Charles Thompson, Harlem, Mont.
2161 Victor Tietgr (Tietge), Cut Bank, Mont.
1299 Webster Todd, Conrad, Mont.
289 Frederick H. Wentworth (Fredrick Hudson, Fredrck Hudson Wentworth, Frederick Hudson Wentworth), Fairfield, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF TOOLE, STATE OF MONTANA.

961 Sarfus Bagagphaisheak, Ethridge, Mont. (Sarfus Bajagpaisheak, Chester, Mont.)
320 John Nicholas Bailey, Sweet Grass, Mont. (John Nocholos Bailey, Ipswich, S. Dak., John Nicholes Bailey.)
816 Christ Bartsch (Chris Bartsch), Sweet Grass, Mont.
134 Steve Brinda (Steve Brenda, Stevene Brinda, Steve Bernda), Alos, Mont.
722 Alexander T. Brown, Portage, Me. (Owen, Me.)
416 Charles Edward Byerly, Galota, Mont.
852 John Chambers, Masinsin, Canada. (Portland, Oreg.)
406 Geo. H. Cherves (Geo. H. Chorvas), Shelby, Mont.
325 George Washington Clements, Sweet Grass, Mont. (Whitlash, Mont.
815 Bernard A. Clemmons (Bernard A. Clemons, Bernhard A. Clemens), Shelby, Mont.
247a Jack Irwin Cloud (Jack I. Cloud), Gould Butte, Mont.
378 Joe Priscoli (Joe Driscoll), 673 Yesterway, Seattle, Wash.
253 John Duncan, Shelby, Mont.

2303a Harry Evans, Sweet Grass, Mont., care of B. F. Lumber Co., Bonners Ferry, Idaho.
77 Frank Fine, Sunburst, Mont.
820 Joe Florian, Shelby, Mont.
699 Kazar Frashian, Hingham, Mont. (Kazar Farashian, Devon, Mont.)
491 William John Griffith Gale (William John Griffen Gale), Kevin, Mont.
811 Homer Harper, Great Falls, Mont.
648 John Horen, Shelby, Mont. (Aloha, Wash.)
297 James Andrew Johnson, Devon, Mont.
504 Leonard Powell Johnson, Shelby, Mont.
89 Irwin Carl Kartack, Milwaukee, Wis. (Irwin C. Kartack, Cut Bank, Mont.)
233 George William Kipp, Shelby, Mont.
921 Ivon Konstad (Ivan Korstad, Iver Korstad), Shelby, Mont.
828 Fred Leonahrdt (Fred Leonhardt), Sweet Grass, Mont.
364 Henry McLean (Henry Norman McLean), Hanna, N. Dak.
472 Ben Martin, Shelby, Mont.
822 Harry Edward Milliman, Cut Bank, Mont.
795 Elmer Peterson, Shelby, Mont.
891 James Clifford Peterson (James Clifford Pederson), Shelby, Mont.
679 Wm. Geo. Ponton (William George Ponton), Sweet Grass, Mont.
957 Charles Robinson, Shelby, Mont. (Chas. Robinson, care of Grand Union Carpet Co., Tacoma, Wash.
746 Eurylee Salisbury, Shelby, Mont.
768 Charles Henry Sley (Chas. Henry Sly, Charles Henry Sly), Sweet Grass, Mont.
920 Antony Smith (Anthony Smith), Shelby, Mont.
756 Frank J. Smith, Devon, Mont., care of J. J. Smith, Harne, Mont.
578 William Allen Smith, Sweet Grass, Mont. (William Alan Smith, Billings, Mont.)
387 Andrew Teohonozuk (Andrew Techonozuk, Andrew Techonezuk), Whitlash, Mont.
50 Geo. Washington Wagoner (G. W. Wagner (Geo.), George Washington Wagner), Shelby, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF YELLOWSTONE, STATE OF MONTANA.

1583 Walter R. Laverne (La Verne), corner Minnesota and Broadway, Billings, Mont. (Minnesota and Twenty-eighth).
2526 Anton (Antone) Leland, Billings, Mont.
3133a Raymond Frank Leonard, 1218 East, Billings, Mont.
597 Frank Lever (Leber, Lebro) (transient), Billings, Mont.
556 Lemuel J. Legan (Logan, Lemuel J. Legar), 13 South Twenty-seventh, Billings, Mont.
2292 Harold Ritchey McDowell, Franklin, Pa.
2601 Matt Loukola, general delivery, Billings, Mont.
3521 Alexander McPherson, Laurel, Mont.
3348 Patricio Mainspac (Patrico Mainspac, Maiceopac), route No. 1, box 33, Billings, Mont.
3571 Elmer Marshall, Carleton Hotel, Billings, Mont., Elmer G. Marshall, general delivery, Denver, Colo.
1782 Louis Martines (Martinz, Luis Martines), Ballantine, Mont.
2313 Pablo Martinez (Maidalena E.), Guanagato, Mexico.
971 Thomas M. (Murphy) Maxwell, Laurel, Mont.
855 Casma Mehallock (Mechallock, Casmer Mechallock), Laurel, Mont.
2923 Albert L. Mertins, 2605 Second south, Billings, Mont.
2613 Louis Meyer, Billings, Mont.
1850 Jacob Miller, route No. 3, Billings, Mont.
2554 Will Mills, Hesper, Mont.
1143 James Montgomery, Onyx Hotel, Billings, Mont.
3298 Wm. C. Mor, Broadview, Mont.
559 Henry Nelson, 21 South Twenty-seventh, Billings, Mont.
2739 Frederick Lee Nichols (Fredrick, Fredorick), 2502 Sixth north, Billings, Mont. (313 Grand, north, Bozeman, Mont.).
2433 Ed Olsen, Hesper, Mont.
2705 John Edmond (Edmund) Olson, McCormick Hotel, Billings, Mont.
1861 Yee Pan (Pon), St. Louis Café, Billings, Mont.
1367a Peter Pandis (Paudis), Northern Pacific Hotel, Laurel, Mont.
73 Charles Wm. Paul, 1606 Minnesota, Billings, Mont.
1347 Clair Peters, Hesper, Mont.
2775 Christ Peterson (Chris, Chris Peterson), Hesper, Mont.
2832 John Petropaulos (Petropulos), Laurel, Mont.
3249 John Petros, Billings, Mont.
427 James Walter Phillips, Midland Hotel, Billings, Mont.
2574 Peter Reiber (Weber, Pet Reiber), route No. 2, Billings, Mont.
1012 Michael Reilly, 79 Fairmont, Newark, N. J.
1310 Julius Repnak, Billings, Mont.
3383 Andrew Res, 104 South Twenty-fourth, Billings, Mont.
677 Robert M. (Monroe) Richardson, Savoy Hotel, Billings, Mont.
2328 William Rivers, Hesper, Mont.
2625 Charles Roberts, Huntley, Mont.
1416 William Rolph, Worland, Wyo.
2375 Jessie Ross, Laurel, Mont.
1260 Constantin Roth, 112 South Twenty-fifth, Billings, Mont.
334 Edward H. (Henry) Scherer, 308 South Thirty-first, Billings, Mont.
1748 Clyde Schoonover, general delivery, Billings, Mont.
2103 William Shea, 90 Webster, Summerville, Me.
1874 George Lee Sheldon, route No. 2, Billings, Mont.
1540 Tom (Thomas) Shields, 106 South Twenty-seventh, Billings, Mont. (106 South Twenty-fourth).
3310 Jack Shirley (Shriley), 208 Am. B. & T. Co., Billings, Mont.
2660 William T. Shorter, Hesper, Mont.
2020 Edward Smith, 23 South Thirtieth, Billings, Mont.
2849 Homer E. Smith, 206 North Twenty-fifth, Billings, Mont.
61a Jess Smith, care of R. L. Ackitt, Billings, Mont.
3468 Otho Sours, route No. 2, box 20, Billings, Mont.
139a Marshall Toutsch, Billings, Mont.
1039 Sam Filia (Fillis), 6 North Twenty-seventh, Billings, Mont.
3336 Edson Francis Finlay (E. F. Finlay), 214 North Twenty-fourth, Billings, Mont.
2567 Robert Foley, Route No. 1, Acton, Mont.
271 John William Foster, Laurel, Mont.
137a Henry T. Gallagher, Hyde Park, Hyde Park, Mass.
2519 Peter Gallis (Callis, Callos), Laurel, Mont.
3590 Clifford Raymond Gasway, Route No. 2, Billings, Mont.
3320a John Gintock, Billings, Mont.
708 Frederick Gottlob (Gotlob) Glueck (Frederick G. Glueck), 111 No. 23, Billings, Mont.
1229 Cornelio Guiterrez (Guetarrez), Hesper, Mont.
1314 Ben Richard Hackney (Ben Hackney), McCormick Hotel, Billings, Mont.
1363 Fred Hattman, Pompeys Pillar, Mont.
2597 Mathor (Mathas) Ellis Hibbeln, Western House, Billings, Mont.
3651 William Lorenso Highfill, Billings, Mont.
452 Harold Otto Boffard, 3013 Second N., Billings, Mont.
3371 Walter Hunt, 227 North Third, East St. Louis, Ill. (503 St. Louis, East St. Louis, Ill.).
76 William Jackson, Hesper, Mont.
3450 Nick James, San Carlow Hotel, Billings, Mont.
961 Jesse I. (Irvin) Jay (Jesse Erwin Jay), Olive Hotel, Billings, Mont.
808 James Johnson, 15 South Twenty-sixth, Billings, Mont.
1059 Will (Well) Johnson, Coumo, Tex.
2974 Rush G. Jones, general delivery, Billings, Mont.
893 Ragnold (Regnold, Rognold) Kebernick, Southern Hotel, South Twenty-seventh, Billings, Mont.
3054 Joe Kinsman, Hesper, Mont.
1623 Roger E. Klane, Western Producing, Seattle, Wash.
1244 Manole Konstantimi (Constantimi), Morden, Mont.
3317 William Larkin, 2622 Minnesota, Billings, Mont.
1614 Anton Abeland, Delmar Hotel, Billings, Mont.
3617 Jose Albere, Billings, Mont.
2603 Guie Allen, Billings, Mont.
3275 Min (Mim) Ally, Billings, Mont. (Yegen, Mont., Route No. 1).
1166 Linka A. (August) Anderson (Augaust Anderson), 114 South Twenty-ninth, Billings, Mont. (114 South Twenty-eighth).
400 Martin Anderson, Moosmain, Mont.
2848 Demitro Arenas (Atenas, Atanos), N. P. R. R. Yards, gang No. 2, Billings, Mont. (extra gang No. 2).
56 George Bailey, Southern Hotel, Billings, Mont.
993 Axel Bemberg (Brecberg), Billings, Mont. (hospital).
7 Edwin Benjamin, 114 North Twenty-third, Billings, Mont. (general delivery, Butte, Mont.).
2887 Harry Bowden, Laurel, Mont.
683 John H. (Henry) Burke, Broadway Hotel, Billings, Mont.
2471 Ambrose Burton, 103 South Twenty-fifth, Billings, Mont.
2339 James V. Cahey (Vahey, James Vahey), Box 436, Billings, Mont.
1735 Herbert A. Campbell, Rex Hotel, Billings, Mont.
2406 Andris Carmona (Cavmona), Billings, Mont.
1350 Geo. Chabez (Chaves), Raten, New Mexico.
2708 Henry Chaw (Chow), Boston Cafe, Billings, Mont.
876 Arthur Deal, Southern Hotel, 27 South, Billings, Mont. (Northern Hotel).
2379 Samuel Theo. Douglas, Laurel, Mont.
2859 John J. Dunning, Southern Hotel, 27 South, Billings, Mont.
1378 Melvin Eggbaken (Eggebaken), Rushford, Minn.
1805 Chas. L. Elben, 202 South Broadway, Billings, Mont. (202 South Twenty-eighth).
1037 Jim Evans, Burmont, Tex.
763 Roy Farr, Gen. Del., Billings, Mont.
538 William D. Farrell, Delmar Hotel, Billings, Mont.
1972 Tony Trouch (Trosh), Laurel, Mont.
1685 Bertol (Ballo) Tudon, N. P. Camp, Billings, Mont.
142 Ralph Underwood, Billings, Mont. (223 South Brown, Spokane, Wash.
143 Tom Vasby, Delmar Rooms, Billings, Mont.
3581 Clarence E. Wailing, 2620 Minnesota, Billings, Mont.
1519 Sam Wait, Laurel, Mont.
3401 Ed Walker, near Laurel, Mont.
266 Thomas (Tom) Wallace, 2620 Minnesota, Billings, Mont.
464 Milton Weinheimer, 2763 Madison Road, Cincinnati, Ohio.
38 John Wesley, South 24th, Billings, Mont.
84 Francis H. Wilbra (Francis Wibra), 1041½ North 31st, Billings, Mont.
2697 Clarence Harris Willett, Laurel, Mont.
966 Lilburn T. (Thomas) Williams, general delivery, Billings, Mont.
2034 Allen Woodward, 210 North Twenty-fifth, Billings, Mont.
2522 Ward Zollinger, Laurel, Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BURT, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

421 Linlie O. Cordry, Lyons, Nebr.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CHEYENNE, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

42 Clifford W. Brown, Akron, Colo. (Sidney, Nebr.).
900 Alexander Coleman, 3984 Nice, Nicetown, Philadelphia, Pa. (Philadelphia, Pa.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DIXON, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

597 Samuel George (G.) Canavan, route 2, Ponca, Nebr.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

835 Floyd Lindly, Sadonia, Tex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MADISON, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

1086 John Griffin, 80 Second Avenue, Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada (200 South Fifth, Norfolk, Nebr.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF OMAHA, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

1918 Robert Ashley, O'Briens Hotel, Omaha, Nebr.
1683 William R. Moore, 1112 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, CITY OF OMAHA, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

193 John Frayaur, 1940 Vinton Street, Omaha, Nebr.
3726 Archy D. (I.) Roberts, 901 South Twentieth Street, Omaha, Nebr.
3329 Floyd Herbert (H.) Stone, 2710 South Twenty-fourth Street, Omaha, Nebr.
4321 Nathaniel (Nat.) Seymour, 2511 Marcy Street, Omaha, Nebr.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF OMAHA, STATE OF NEBRASKA.

1534 Charles P. Maule, 1407 North Fortieth Street, Omaha, Nebr.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, MANCHESTER, N. H.

364 Arthur Paquette, 474 Cartier Street, Manchester, N. H.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, N. H.

1750 James McKenna, 5 Parker Street, Portsmouth, N. H.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF COLFAX, STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

1136 Celestino (Celestiono) Romero, Dawson, N. Mex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DONA ANA COUNTY, STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

89 Gregorio M. Martinez, Anthony, N. Mex. (Gregoria, Darley, N. Mex.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SOCORRO, STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

764 Amado Gallegos, Bernardo, N. Mex.
1307 Bernardo Chavez, Magdalena, N. Mex. (Berlin, N. Mex.).
387 Tomas Garcia, Riley, N. Mex. (Santa Rita, N. Mex.).
933 M. P. Otero, Magdalena, New Mexico.

LOCAL BOARD OF UNION COUNTY, STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

754 Joe Rival Trinidad, Colo. (1309 Linden Avenue, Trinidad, Colo.).
28a Emencia Garcia, Moses, N. Mex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LEE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

247 Homer Colbert, Gresham, N. C.
331 Wm. Bennie (Burnis) Cox, Jonesboro, N. C.
934 Nemiah Grant, Graham, S. C.
734 Jesse Gilmore, Gulf, N. C.
385 Bonvil (Bonnie), Earl Jackson, Sanford, N. C.
705 Jonah Johnson, Osgood, N. C.
173 Mickson (J. Mickson) McCutchean, Sanford, N. C.
636 James McKay, Johns Station, N. C. (Sanford, N. C.).
495 Baxter McLaughlin, Sanford, N. C.
756 Dave McNeill, Sanford, N. C.
81 Johnnie Payton, Sanford, N. C.
673 James Pollock, Sanford, N. C.
81 George Porter, Sanford, N. C.
471 Ora Quick, Cusinock, N. C.
374 Hosco Tally, Sanford, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF YADKIN, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

645 Gurnie (Gurney) F. Brown, Hamptonville, N. C.
856 Henry F. (Franklin) Cook, Cycle, N. C.
624 Walter E. (Everett) Evans, Jonesville, N. C.
451 Harvey C. Harris, Boonville, N. C.
361½ John Holleman (Halleman), Swan Creek, N. C.
909 Wm. V. (Verna) Hutchins (Hutchens), Yadkinville, N. C.
946 Ephraim F. McCollum, East Bend, route No. 1, N. C. (East Bend, N. C.)
780 Grady Smith, Boonville, N. C.
248 Emmet Spikes, Boonville, N. C.
593 Rob't Sprinkle, Jonesville, N. C. (Boonville, N. C.)
407 Rob't Grady Stokes, Cycle, N. C.
328 Wint Swain, Swan Creek, N. C.
788 Wm. Clinton Thomas, East Bend, N. C.
352 Wm. J. L. (T.) Vestal, Boonville, N. C.
443 Willie S. (Samuel) Walker, route No. 1, Boonville, N. C. (Boonville, N. C.)
916 Isaac Wilkins, Yadkinville, N. C.
547 William A. (Aaron) Williams, East Bend, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF YANCEY, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA.

461 Clyde Branks (Claude Clyde Banks), Burnsville, N. C.
101 John Edwards, Pensacola, N. C.
298 John Clayton Green, Boonford, N. C.
1043 Walter Ledford, Pensacola, N. C.
218 McKinley Massey, Pensacola, N. C.
915 Brown Mitchell, Waynesville, N. C.
59 Arthur Henry Ray, Cane River, N. C.
46 George Washington Rogers, Burnsville, N. C.
662 Floyd Woody, Pensacola, N. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 7, CITY OF CINCINNATI, STATE OF OHIO.

3800 Charles Davis, 532 West Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
3783 Essie Long, 635 Carlisle Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
6085 Thomas Marshall Nave, 521 Elm Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
5812 Fred Schultz, 537 West Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 8, CITY OF CINCINNATI, STATE OF OHIO.

277½ Harry Burns, 3544 Spring Grove Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF COLUMBUS, STATE OF OHIO.

3962 Leopoldo Alcares Faustino, 156 South Seventeenth Street, Columbus, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF COLUMBUS, STATE OF OHIO.

511 Claud Mug Hunter, 836 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF CLEVELAND, STATE OF OHIO.

2105 Arthur J. Lauster, 4911 Carnegie Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
4213 Cecil Whitley, 2493 East Thirtieth Street, Cleveland, Ohio (2249 Scovill Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio).
4819 Eugene Williams, 2282 East Thirtieth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 9, CITY OF CLEVELAND, STATE OF OHIO.

3007 John Bogan (Bogans), 3026 Scovill Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
3171 Samuel Kohn, 2550 East Fifty-fifth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF GALLIA, STATE OF OHIO.

322 Chauncey McClelland Stewart, Gallipolis, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF TOLEDO, STATE OF OHIO.

192 Stephen L. Caswell, R. F. D. 1, Box C, Toledo, Ohio.
5678 William C. Hales (William George Hales), 334 Ontario Street, Toledo, Ohio.
972 Vandorn B. Valentine, 376 Pinewood Street, Toledo, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN, STATE OF OHIO.

2155 David Aller, 4 Wood Street, Youngstown, Ohio.
4473 Michael (Mike) Kelly, 510 Flint Hill Street, Younstown, Ohio.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF BAKER, STATE OF OREGON.

1544 David Lavine Ernst (Arnst), Buchannan, Huntington, Oreg.
1702 Henry Ferguson (Furguson), Sheridan, Wyo. (Heybrook, Wash.).
1693 Jas. (James) G. Fowler, Main, Baker, Oreg.
1603 Earl Gibson, Homestead, Oreg.
1224 Jno. E. Land (John Edward Lane), Huntington, Oreg.
1508 Mason H. McCowan (Mason Hugh McCowen), 1929 Washington Street, Baker, Oreg.
7 Kaushiro (Kaiichiro, Kiichiro) Makino, Whitney, Oreg.
1271a Jno. Minor, Baker, Oreg. (John Miner, care of Worthams Shows, Salt Lake, Utah).
415 Chas. L. (Charles Lindon) Myers, Lime, Oreg.
945 Thos. W. Mylin (Thomas William Mylan, Thos. P.), 1708 Pear, Baker, Oreg.
1488 Leland R. Pearson, Elks Hotel, Baker, Oreg. (5038 West Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.).
1504 Archibald Phillips, O. K. House, Baker, Oreg.
1573 Chas. (Charley) Rob't Potter, Fifteenth and Chico, Baker, Oreg. (Sixteenth and Chico Streets).
899 Leonard T. Roller (Raller), Huntington, Oreg.
1295 Walter A. (Arthur) Schlifske, Sparta, Oreg. (Minneapolis, Minn.).
961 Fred Smith, Camden, W. Va.
1378 Olen Charley Taylor, 1243 Second Street, Baker, Oreg.
224 Jno. B. Tibben (John Burnett), Baker, Oreg.
1501 Jack (Jack P.) Warren, Homestead, Oreg. (Oxford Hotel, Denver, Colo.).
321 Carl H. (Homer) Wright, Huntington, Oreg.
167 William Butterfield, Bakersfield, Calif. (Sparta, Oreg.).
513 Arthur Nelson, Huntington, Oreg. (Lincoln Street, Huntington, Oreg.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CLACKAMAS, STATE OF OREGON.

1267 William Guy Bay, West Linn, Oreg.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF COLUMBIA, STATE OF OREGON.

872 Charles W. Burchett, Salem, Oreg. (Chas. Wesley (C. W.) Burchett, Rainier, Oreg.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF DOUGLAS, STATE OF OREGON.

1487 John William Hess, Myrtle Creek, Oreg.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF KLAMATH, STATE OF OREGON.

783 Patrick J. Burke, Klamath Falls, Oreg. (Patrick Joseph (P. J.), St. Maries, care of box 374, Idaho).
1010 Tom Canas, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
64 Robt. (Robert) Curtis, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
562 James Daley, Pembroke, Ontario, Canada.
794 Daniel Wesley Davis, Keno, Oreg.
738 Jacob Brett Evans, Modoc Point, Oreg.
751 David Jennings Freeman, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
696 David Douglas (David D.) Forrester, Algoma, Oreg.
326 Antonio Garbino (Garbino Antonio), Klamath Falls, Oreg.
677 Frank Jones Gorke, Klamath Falls, Oreg. Calif.)
997 Charles Gunnerson, Cholíquin, Oreg. (North Bank Hotel, 511 Twenty-first Street, Portland, Oreg.)
840 John Kurakoff, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
449 Fred Beb Littlefather, Ponka City, Okla.
576 Thos. J. Martin, Klamath Falls, Oreg. (Thomas John, Tuolomne, Calif.).
1165 Archie Roland McDonald (Archie Ronald MacDonald, Archie R. MacDonald), Klamath Falls, Oreg.
687 George R. (Geo. R.) Morris, 812 Oak Street, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
950 Elexander E. Noble, Lorella, Oreg. (Alexander Edward, Constantia, Calif.
1245 Thomas Patrick Nond, 638 Main Street, Klamath Falls, Oreg. (Redding, Calif.).
549 Morius D. (Morius Dye) Pellisson, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
1039 Albert Morton (A. M.) Pike, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
573 Vasilios Sarantopilos, 727 Folsom Street, San Francisco, Calif. (Vasilios P. Sarantopulos, 2 North Fifth Street, Portland, Oreg.).
780 Jack Stea, Algoma, Oreg.
487 Charles Edward (Charlie E.) Thompson, Algoma, Oreg.
320 William Geo. Williams, Klamath Falls, Oreg.
1012 Olin Ray Yates, Anticok, Wash. (Alin, Yakima, Wash.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF PORTLAND, STATE OF OREGON.

9 Andrew J. Johnson, New Perkins Hotel, Portland, Oreg.
2382 Thomas William Shannon, Linnton, Oreg.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 9, CITY OF PORTLAND, STATE OF OREGON.

822a Sydney Gardner Bell, 512 Hancock Street, Portland, Oreg. (518 Hancock Street, Portland, Oreg.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF UNION, STATE OF OREGON.

1415 William James Barnes, O'Connel Rooming House, LaGrande, Oreg.
448 William Joseph Bolan, Adams Avenue, LaGrande, Oreg.
637 Krim Chin, Chinese laundry, LaGrande, Oreg.
1181 William Gerald Cooper, 1306 O Avenue, LaGrande, Oreg.
129 Peter (Pete) Gust, LaGrande Oreg.
11 John Franklin Spahn, 2107 Third, LaGrande, Oreg.
990 Emanuel Teske, Fir, LaGrande, Oreg.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 17, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

1070 Walker William (William W. Walker), 218 West Chelten Avenue, (218 West Coulter Street, Philadelphia, Pa.)
1627 Henry Neuse, 1409 Nixon Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

1051a James Wilson, care of American Realty Co., Providence, R. I.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BARNWELL, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

2222 James Adams, Allendale, S. C.
1628 Jim Alexander, Hattieville, S. C.
3248 Emerson Allen, Barnwell, S. C.
52 Willie Atwood, Lauren, S. C. (Blockville, S. C.).
81 John Bailor, Greenwood, S. C.
216 Benjamin F. Ballard (Benjamin Franklin Ballord, Benjamin Franlin Benton), Barnwell, S. C.
1295 Willie Barber, Fairfax.
2564 Walford Barton, Barnwell, S. C.
646 Minor F. Baugh (Minor Floyd Baugh), Martin, S. C.
1943 Mike Beaufort (Mike Beaufort), Fairfax, S. C.
1168 Seymour Best, Cave Station.
1682 Roy Betton Bodiford (Roy Belton Bodiford), Blockville, S. C.
661 Robert Bradford, Blackville, S. C.
2355 Ben Brown, Allendale, S. C. (McClellanville, S. C.).
1632 Dan Brown, Allendale, S. C.
1595 James Brown, Allendale, S. C.
2629 Jesse Brown (Jessie Brown), Barnwell, S. C.
191 James Bryant, Kline, S. C.
1887 Tom Calhoun, Blackville, S. C.
2121 Lucius Carter, Blackville, S. C.
148 George Cato (George Cato), Robbins, S. C.

423 Andrew Cave (Andrew Cane, Andrew Krane), Allendale, S. C.
1114 Elijah Charlton, Barnwell, S. C.
1875 Isom Charlton, Barnwell, S. C.
1250 Willie Christopher, Williston, S. C.
603 Henry Coin, Barnwell, S. C.
2203 Robert Cooper, Blackville, S. C.
2282 Bill Corley, Blackville, S. C.
2096 Arthur Davis, Donora, S. C.
1771 Joe Davis, Baldock, S. C.
2313 Robert Demmons, R. F. D. Willis Place, Blackville, S. C.
534 John W. Dickerson (John Wesley Dickerson), Fairfax, S. C.
331 Richard Dunbar, 239 State Street, Barnwell, Ga.
117 Walton Dunbar (Walter Dunbar), Dunbarton, S. C.
924 John Dyches, Barnwell, S. C.
107a Joe Eady, chain gang No. 3, Barnwell, S. C.
1085 Jacob Elkin, Allendale, S. C.
2443 Holly Ellison, Ulmer, S. C.
1239 Cliff Enix, B. F. Boylston Place, Blackville, S. C. (care Frank Owens, Blackville, S. C.
1117 Anthony Flowers (Antony Flowers), Martin, S. C.
2755 John H. Frederick (John Henry Frederick), Hattieville, S. C.
1834 Lawton Frederick, Williston, S. C.
1452 Ben Garvin, Allendale, S. C.
947 Elliott Garvin, Allendale, S. C.
3222 Henry Garvin, Blackville, S. C.
2483 Ed Gathers (Edd Gethers, Edd Gathers), Allendale, S. C.
2441 Ben Gibbs, Allendale, S. C.
1603 Emanuel Geiger (Emanuel Gieger), Allendale, S. C.
649 John B. Gethers, Allendale, S. C.
641 David Gibbs, Allendale, S. C.
3387 Willie Glover, Dunbarton, S. C. (Embree, S. C.)
1317 Lucius Gray (Luscions Gray), R. F. D. 11, Allendale, S. C.
2158 Clifford Grayson, Allendale, S. C.
1202 Robert Green, Allendale, S. C.
2926 Geo. Greene, Meyers Mill, S. C.
2597 Henry Greene, box 847, Augusta, Ga.
124 Hubert Hall, Valdosta, Ga.
231 Elbert Harley, Williston, S. C.
631 Vincent Harley, Barnwell, S. C.
2565 Willie Harris, 937 East Union Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
2316 Anderson Hay, Cave, S. C.
106 George Hazel, Appleton, S. C.
106 Will Henderson, Orangeburg, S. C.
993 Richard Heywood, near Kline, S. C.
1311 Louis Hismith (Hi-Smith), Dunbarton, S. C.
3311 Henry Isaac, Martin, S. C.
1032 James Jackson, Barnwell, S. C.
1644 Richard Jacobs, Barnwell, S. C.
1189 George Jenkins, Donora.
1741 Walter Jenkins, Allendale, S. C.
129 Jesse Johnson, Allendale, S. C.
2109 John Johnson, near Kline, S. C.
450 Joseph Johnson, Donora, S. C.
1462 Wilson Johnson (Wilson Knell Johnson), Sylvania, Ga.
1410 James Kearse, Allendale, S. C.
2205 James Kelly, Allendale, S. C.
3388 Ervin Key, general delivery, Augusta, Ga. (Ervin Hay, Elko, S. C.)
1209 Willie Levi Kinsey (William Levi Kinsey, Willie L. Kincey), Barnwell, S. C.
80 John Gary Kirkland, R. F. D. Allendale, S. C.
2976 Lowman Lewis (Lownan Lewis), Ulmer, S. C.
826 Edward Loadholt, Fairfax, S. C.
2823 Wiley McDowell (Wiley McDowel), Augusta, Ga.
465 John Matthews, R. F. D. 1, Allendale, S. C.
2062 Abraham Meyers, Barnwell, S. C.
1086 David Meyers (David Myers), Barnwell, S. C.
2168 Henry Meyers (Henry Meyer), Barnwell chain gang No. 3.
586 Allen Mingo, Bomberg, S. C.
2091 Willie Moseley, Barnwell, S. C.
867 Luther Murphy (Luther Murphey), Williston, S. C.
3296 Willie Nelson, Barnwell, S. C.
1469 William Patterson (Wm. Patterson), Barnwell, S. C.
2809 Jack Payne, Barnwell, S. C.
98 Sam Perry, Barnwell, S. C.
2498 Akard (Alard) Plowde, Barnwell, S. C.
327 Mock (Mack) Richardson, Allendale, S. C.
1130 Clifford Robertson, Allendale, S. C.
39 James Robinson, Barnwell, S. C.
8033 Joseph Rodgers, Donora, S. C.
26 Hansford Rouse, R. F. D., Allendale, S. C.
1301 Dave St. Clair, Allendale, S. C.
2896 Wm. Sanders, Ulmer, S. C., care Percy all Allendale, S. C.
1045 Daniel Scott, near Kline, S. C.
721 Willie Sease, Meyers Mills, S. C.
890 Willie Shaw (William Shaw), Robbins, S. C.
253 Jerry Smith, Barnwell, S. C.
159 Lang Smith, Millettsville, S. C.
1095 Plumber Smyth (Smith) (Plumber Smythes), Barnwell, S. C.
1703 Henry Staley, Hattieville, S. C.
1850 John Stallings, Dunbortor, S. C.
1440 John Steadman (John Steabmans), Ulmer, S. C.
971 John Stokes, Donosa, S. C.
2769 Rollin Stokes, Fairfax, S. C.
204 Julian Sykes, Barnwell, S. C.
2142 Charlies Taylor, Sycamore, S. C.
1002 Will Taylor (Will Tyler, Willy Tyler), Mellettville, S. C.
3381 James Tedder, R. F. D. 1, Barnwell, S. C.
1754 Willie Thompson, Allendale, S. C.
1385 Peter Tilly, Donora, S. C.
77a Norman Turner (Norman Twiner), Martin, S. C.
2336 Goven Vance, Blackville, S. C.
141 Ben Walker, Meyers Mill R. F. D., S. C.
3075 Robert Walker, Martins, S. C.
1003 Clarence Washington, R. F. D., Allendale, S. C.
1693 Stephen White (Steven White), Allendale, S. C.
3239 Rufus Wilkes, Barnwell, S. C.
968 Bill Williams, Snellin, S. C.
1253 Chris H. Williams (Chas. Henry Williams, Chas. H. Williams), Blackville, S. C.
577 Clinton Williams, Barnwell, S. C.
798 Cyphus Williams, Rincon, Ga.
101 Elmore Williams, Millegeville Road, Augusta, Ga.
115 Josey Williams, Kline, S. C.
593 Percy Williams, Dunbarton, S. C.
4 Robert Williams, Blockville, S. C.
1827 Willie Williams, Meyers Mill, S. C.
3378 George Wilson, Ulmer, S. C.
2276 Robert Williams (Raleigh, N. C. (convict—Barnwell, S. C.).
514 Richmond Wroten (Richmond Roten), Barnwell, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BERKELEY, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

323 Henry Aiken, Lalson, S. C.
602 Julius Bennett, Goose Creek, S. C.
544 Wm. Bennett, Goose Creek, S. C.
1078 Charles Brown, Amensdawm, S. C.
74 James Brown, Bonneau, S. C.
902 Joe Brown, St. Stephens, S. C.
1448 Louis (Lewis) Brown, Cordesvill, S. C.
193 Thomas (Tomas) Brown, R. F. D. 1, Ridgeville, S. C.
426 Thomas Brown, Cross, S. C.
2049a Samuel Caldwell (Colwell), P. O., Ladsden, S. C.
2015a Ben Comine (Comius, Conius), Gough, S. C.
150 Geo. Griggers (Driggers), Summerville, S. C.
1098 Sam (Samie) Ford, Cross, S. C.
1208 John Franklin, Wando, S. C.
2126a Wm. Legare (William Legree), St. Stephen, S. C.
1443 John W. McConnell (Wilburn McConnell), box 850, Charleston, S. C.
219 Samuel (Sam) Nixon, care Porter Wentworth Lumber Co., Springfield, Ga. (Jamestown, S. C.)
316 Wm. (William) Phoenix, Savannah, Ga. (Berkeley, S. C.).
685 Cornelius Region (Cornelus Regon), St. Stephen, S. C.
915 Abraham Shephard (Sheppard), Summerville, S. C.
269 John Singleton, Mt. Holly, S. C. (Mancks Corner, S. C.)
210 Josephus (Joseph) Singleton, Jamestown, S. C.
298 Francis Smith, Wando, S. C.
1137 Jesse (Jessie) Swiney, Monks Corner, S. C.
1273 Geo. (George) Washington, Yamasee, S. C.
951 Julian Washington, Oakley, S. C.
567 Julian Weathers, Buck Hall, S. C. (Black Hall, S. C.)
688 Douglas Williams (Duglass William), Goose Creek, S. C.
1395 Eddie Wright, Mt. Holly, S. C.
684 Willie Wright (Writes), route No. 1, Ridgeville, S. C.
989 Wm. (William) Wrighton (Wrighten), St. Stephens, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CALHOUN, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

968 John Brigmer (Brizmer, Brigmon), St. Matthews, S. C.
1253 David Felder, R. F. D., Swansea, S. C.
633 Jake Noble, Fort Motte, S. C.
907 W. G. Perkins, St. Matthews, S. C.
1034 Tom Pou (Pon), St. Matthews, S. C.
259 Prince Reese, Columbia, S C. (Reece, care Carolina Veneer Co., Columbia, S. C.
1125 Peter Tilly (Tilley), Cameron, S. C.
348 Willie C. Wallace (W. Clay Wallace, W. C.), Fort Motte, S. C.
1378 Arthur Wilson, Columbia, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARENDON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1789 Gabe Bacot (Gable Bascott, Gobe Bacot), Alcolu, S. C.
2515 General Benbow, Summerton, S. C.
216 Allen Bennett, Summerton, S. C.
1486 Bonie Bennett, Summerton, S. C.
2217 Nathaniel Booknight (Brockinton, Nathahiel Booknight), Alcolu, S. C.
1719 Ed Bracey (Bracy), Rimini, S. C.
2735 Lloyd Brand, Turbeville, S. C.
1639 Ciscero (Cicero) Brown, Pinewood, S. C.
1495 Martin Brown, Alcolu, S. C.
904 Milton Brown, Rimini, S. C.
2174 Joe Chestnut, Alcolu, S. C.
1248 Melton Clarke (Clark, Milton Clark), Summerton, S. C.
2038 Marion Dingle (Dingle Marion), Jordan, S. C.
608 James Davis, Foreston, S. C.
1992 John Davis (John T. Davis), Turbeville, S. C.
790 Moses Dozier, Alcolu, S. C.
2715 Pinkney (Pinckney, Pickney) Floot, Silver, S. C.
312 John Fulwood, New Zion, S. C.
2040 Ernest (Earnest) Goodman, Manning, S. C.
535 James Gantt, Alcolu, S. C.
2346 Elijah Gratic (Grotic), Alcolu, S. C.
2020 Jacob Green, Summerton, S. C.
957 William Green, Alcolu, S. C.
93 Tom Hannah, Alcolu, S. C.
1920 Jomus Horim (Jirmous Horim, Junius Harvin), Summerton, S. C.
1893 Benjamin Heriott, Rimini, S. C.
1552 Asa Holladay, Alcolu, S. C.
683 Archy Howard, R. F. D. 1, Rimini, S. C.
1863 James (Jim) Howard, Nash Co., S. C.
1210 Jesse (Jessie) Hunter, Alcolu, S. C.
1216 George Jackson, Pinewood, S. C.
613 George Jackson, Manning, S. C.
1135 Thomas Clarence Jackson, Gable, S. C.
736 Willie James, Rimini, S. C.
554 James Johnson, Rimini, S. C.
2170 John Johnson, Gable, S. C.
1902 Otis Jones, Route No. 2, Summerton, S. C.
771 Mose Laney, Rimini, S. C.
1739 Vander Lawson, Summerton, S. C.
2498 Eddie Lewis, Turbeville, S. C.
571 John Lucas, Alcolu, S. C.
1567 James McConico, Rimini, P. O., S. C.
1839 James McCray (McRay), R. F. D. 1, Charleston, S. C. (Manning, S. C.).
264 Sunny (Sammy, Sonny) Boy McKnight, Manning, S. C.
410 Frank Mayers, Alcolu, S. C.
2572 Henry Mitchel (Mitchell), Gable, S. C.
2024 Fred Mosley (Mosely), Gable, S. C.
774 Josh Moses, R. Rimini, S. C.
942 Early Mozong (Monzon), Summerton, S. C.
2707 Willson (Wilson) Pearson, Summerton, S. C.
1940 William Pressley, Gable, S. C.
2139 John Henry Small, Alcolu, S. C.
590 Marion Smith, Manning, S. C.

1545 Benjamin Spears, Turbeville, S. C.
2669 Walter Taylor, Manning, S. C.
105 James Weston, Alcolu, S. C.
177 Frank Williams, Alcolu, S. C.
1813 Ruban (Reuben) Williams, Summerton, S. C.
2461 Willie Williams, Alcolu, S. C.
2303 Wilson Williams, Davis Station, S. C.
1505 Emory Wilson (E. W. Wilson), Turbeville, S. C.
1281 Joseph (Joe) Young, Gable, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF FLORENCE, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

270 James Allen, R. F. D. 1, Effingham, S. C.
3742 Julius Allison, Poston, S. C.
2856 James L. Anderson (James Lawrence Anderson), 404 McQueen, Florence, S. C.
165 Moses Bacotte (Moses Bacot), R. F. D. 1, Florence, S. C.
3907 George Barno, 205 Janet (Jannett) Street, Florence, S. C.
2993 Jeremiah Boyd (J. J. Boyd), Scranton, S. C.
2297 Flemming Branboy (Flemon Brayboy), Lake City, S. C.
8293 Dan Brockington, 642 Brunson Street, Florence, S. C.
318 Wm. Brockington, R. F. D. 3, Timmonsville, S. C.
1502 Charlie Brooks, 1107 East Pine Street, Florence, S. C.
2991 L. Brooks, Lake City, S. C.
8401 Peter Brown, Lake City, S. C.
3223 Archie Campbell, 28 North Sumter, Florence, S. C.
3081 Jeff Cannon (Cannone), Florence, S. C.
835 Wm. Canty, Scranton, S. C.
2921 Robert Carter, 905 Evans Street, Florence, S. C.
2348 James Casey, Cartersville, S. C.
3896 Willie Cockfield, Scranton, S. C.
2836 Herbert E. Cook, R. F. D. Lake City, S. C. (Herbert Eugene Cook, R. F. D. Florence, S. C.)
3508 Samuel Cooper, Lake City, S. C.
2981 Dalphus Davis, Pamplico, S. C.
1533 Elma Davis, Florence, S. C.
8361 Peter Davis, Cartersville, Florence, S. C.
3049 Wesley Davis, 414 McInnis, Florence, S. C. (414 McQueen Street, Florence, S. C.)
2665 John Dinkins, 402 Barringer Street, Florence, S. C.
2150 Horace Eddy (Eady), Florence County, S. C.
2120 W. Thos. Eddy (Eaddy), Florence, S. C.
3245 Eston Erdin (Etson Ervin), Pamplico, S. C.
3363 Benj. Gardner (Ben Gardner), R. F. D. No. 3, Timmonsville, S. C.
2472 John Gardner, Knoxville, Florence, S. C.
257 Isaac Robert Gibbs (Robert Gibbs), R. F. D. Florence, S. C.
3261 John Gibbes (John Gibbs), Timmonsville, S. C.
2601 Marion Goodman, Timmonsville, S. C.
2400 Charlie Gregg (Charley Gregg), Palmetto Street, Florence, S. C.
2093 Edward Gregg, Scranton, S. C.
1845 Thomas Gurley, Timmonsville, S. C.
1627 Henry Hand, Florence, S. C.
3840 Tom Hickson, Olanta, S. C.
1822 Amos Howard (Amous Howard), Mulberry, Florence, S. C.
1753 Charlie Howell, Florence, S. C.
2644 Willie J. Huggins (Willie Jackson Huggins), South Warley, Florence, S. C.
3827 Walter Hunter, Florence, S. C.
3506 John Isom, 204 East Marion, Florence, S. C.
2100½ Duncan L. Jackson (Duncal Leon Jackson, D. L. Jackson), Gregg Avenue, Florence, S. C.
1476 Ervin James, Florence, S. C.
3636 John James, R. F. D. Florence, S. C.
1678 John James, 40 Front, Florence, S. C.
1985 Lem (Leon) Jeffords, R. F. D., Effingham, S. C.
359 Marion Jenkins, Florence, S. C.
2141 Charlie (Charley) Johnson, R. F. D. 3, Timmonsville, S. C.
8622 Edward (Edwards) Johnson, 1112 East Magnolia, Florence, S. C.
2620 Harry Johnson, Florence, S. C.
2733 Henry Johnson, Florence, S. C.
3678 Moses Johnson, Timmonsville, S. C.
353 Oliver Johnson, R. F. D., Florence, S. C.
205 Marion L. C. Jones (Marion Cordie Jones, Marion C. Jones), Hyman, S. C.
8089 Johnnie Jordan, 2 South Dargan Street, Florence, S. C.
2223 Henry July, 111 East Evans, Florence, S. C.
2035 Herbert King, Timmonsville, S. C.
2433 Fulton Kirby, Cartersville, S. C.
1565 Thomas Levy, Wood Street, Timmonsville, S. C.
219 Robert Logette (Legett), Florence, S. C.
3865 Nathaniel Long, R. F. D. 1, Hannockburn, S. C.
173 Arthur McCall, Mars Bluff, S. C.
2034 Loyd McClam, Lake City, S. C.
353 John McKay, Florence County, S. C.
218 James McLendon, Florence, S. C.
284½ Joe McRea (McRae), Lake City, S. C.
2439 Fred Martin, Florence, S. C.
2005 Enoch (Enock) Mayrant, R. F. D. 3, Timmonsville, S. C.
2945 Henry Mickle (Mickel), 50 Stackley, Florence, S. C.
2718½ Benny (Bennie) Moore, 210 Sumter Avenue, Florence, S. C.
3307 Louis Murray (Lewis Murry), Lake City, S. C.
3247 George Murry, Flendale, S. C.
1574 Ed. C. Myers (Edward C. Myers, Edward Calbert Myers), Florence, S. C.
3604 Henry Nelson, 411 North Dargan, Florence, S. C.
1632 James Patterson, R. F. D. 1, Florence, S. C.
1510 Wm. Perry (Terry, Will Terry), 207 East Cheves, Florence, S. C.
1773 Jerrey (Jerry) Prophet, 1105 East Cheves, Florence, S. C.
152 Edd Prosser (Ed Prosser), R. F. D., Florence, S. C.
251 Cleo Ramsey, Florence, S. C.
1891 Sam Richardson, 806 East Cheves, Florence, S. C.
2883 Walter Richardson, 704 East Cheves, Florence, S. C.
3493 Wm. H. C. Robertson (Wm. H. C. Robinson, Wm. Henry Clay Robinson), Florence, S. C.
1629 William Robertson (Roberson, Willie Roberson), Tennille, Ga. (Tennille).
2279 John Rowell, Claussen, S. C.
2739 Joseph Sanders (Saunders), Florence County, S. C.
2154 Walter (Walker) Scott, Timmonsville, S. C.
979 Eddie Singleton (Eddie Singletary), Florence, S. C.
1929 Thomas Singleton, First, Florence, S. C. (Front, Florence, S. C.).
2758 Joseph Smith, Florence, S. C.
2524 Malchia Stewart, 218 West Forty-sixth, Savannah, Ga.
2580 Ben Strong, Cartersville, S. C.
3873 Harrison Tann, 33 Buckeye Street, Florence, S. C.
2255 James Thomas, Florence, S. C.
3792 Harrison Thomas, Effingham, S. C.
3444 Walter Thompson, Florence, S. C.
2683 Newton Toney, 617 Hackley Street, Florence, S. C.
3317 Willie Van Buren, Cartersville, S. C.
685½ John Walton, 504 Fifth Street, Florence, S. C.
3794 Sam Washington, Poston, S. C.
2068 Edward Harrison Watson (Edward H. Watson), Marlboro Street, Florence, S. C.
426 John Wells (John Benj. Wells, J. B. Wells), 18 West Evans, Florence, S. C.
2308 Alfred (Alford) White, 621 Railroad Avenue, Florence, S. C.
3163 James Wilkins, Florence, S. C.
3825 Ed Williams (Ed. W. Williams), Kingsburg, S. C.
369 Garfield Williams, Claussen, S. C.
3218 Isaac Williams, 90 Tradd, Charleston, S. C.
1967 John Williams, Olanta, S. C.
3669 Sam Williams, Lake City, S. C.
1673 Andrew Wilson, 802 Cheves, Florence, S. C.
2755 Eunice Wilson, Pamplico, S. C.
2820 Joseph Wilson, Timmonsville, S. C.
2840 Willie Wingate, Timmonsville, S. C.
1820 Tom Woodbury (Tom Woodberry), Pamplico, S. C.
956 John Wright, Pamplico, S. C.
3473 Doc Young, Florence, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF GREENVILLE, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

1908 Ed Aiken, Third Street, Woodsidemill, Greenville, S. C.
185 John Albert, (traveling man) Greenville, S. C.
1328 Charlie Anderson, 167 Coffee Street, Greenville, S. C.
329 John Armstead, Greenville, S. C.
811 Henry Barnett, Travels Rest, S. C.
3675 Braton (Draton) Bates, Little Mountain, S. C. (Greenville County, S. C.)
479 Frank Berry, 23 Grays Alley, Greenville, S. C.
7 Frank Bowen (Brown), route 7, Greenville, S. C.
1665 Aike Brown, Greenville, S. C.
338 John Henry Brown, Greenville, S. C.
2227 Clarence Edward Burmeiter (Burmiester), 25 Second Street, Greenville, S. C.
1014 John Burns, Greenville, S. C.
869 Fred Haskel (Haskell) Cain, 33 East Fifth Street, Woodside, Greenville, S. C.
3370 Butler Cink (Clinks) Cales, 306 Cook Street, Greenville, S. C.
123 Doc (Dock) Cannon, Dills Hill, Greenville, S. C.
592 Mollie Burton Carrell (Mallie Burton Carroll), 208 (214) Mulberry Street, Greenville, S. C.
1684 Lalon Cason, Seneca, S. C. (130 Marseilles Street, Greenville, S. C.)
1389 Marshal (M., Marshall), Churchwell, R. F. D. 3, Greenville S. C.
1886a Will Cook, Eau Claire Street, Columbia, S. C. (115 Lloyd Street, Greenville, S. C.)
2114 Ulysses Cousin (Counsin), Greenville, S. C.
3078 George Cowen (Cohen), 144 Palmetto Avenue, Greenville, S. C.
2178 James Cunningham, Greenville, S. C.
2729 Clyde Davis, 219 Green Street, Greenville, S. C.
3662 James Davis, 320 Washington Street, Greenville, S. C.
192 Willie (Willis) Davis, Greenville, S. C.
3296 James Grakeford (Drakford), Greenville County, S. C.
3810 or 3815 James Dunlap, 371 Hudson Street, Greenville, S. C.
1440 W. W. Durham, Greenville, S. C.
2254 Frank Durham Edison, 253 River Street, Greenville, S. C.
2211 George Malcom Edmunds, Greenville, S. C.
2445 Fletcher Elrod, 928 Echole Street, Greenville, S. C.
2338a Henry Earle Emory, Greenville, S. C.
2919 William Faifon, 1001 East Washington Street, Greenville, S. C.
3792 Levy Curtie Frank (Levy Curtie Frank Fleming), 55 Avenue, Greenville, S. C.
1647–a William Hendrix (Henry) Foster (Forester), Greenville, S. C.
3583 James Gantt, Greenville, S. C.
3420 or 3525 Willie Lee Gardner, 111 Rowley Street, Greenville, S. C.
2334 Henry Gaston, 223 Meadows Street, Greenville, S. C.
3021 James Earnest (Ernest) Gravely, 16 Fourth Street, Greenville, S. C.
3347 Charles Melton Greene (Chas. M. Greene), R. F. D. 3, Greenville, S. C.
1850 Peter Guy, Greenville, S. C.
938 Ezell Harris, Agusta Road, Greenville, S. C.
2779 Howard Harris, 233 Sullivan Street, Greenville, S. C.
2184 Thomas Harris, 114 East Broad Street, Greenville, S. C. (Spartanburg, S. C.).
2508 Charles Alexander Henderson, box 23, Greer, S. C. (box 21, Greenville, S. C.).
419 John Hester, R. F. D. 2 (R. F. D. 5), Greenville, S. C.
3328 Charlie Hill, 27 Frost Street, Greenville, S. C.
2896 James Hines, Nada Greater Shows, Greenville, S. C.
4045 Homer Hooner (Homer Hooper), Woodside Mill, Greenville, S. C.
4024 Asberry (Ashberry, Ashbeny) Hunter, 114 East Broad Street, Greenville, S. C.
2039 Will Jackson, 430 Washington Street, Greenville, S. C. (Trotter Street, Greenville, S. C.).
3490 Henry Jacobs (Rais), Pendleton, Greenville, S. C.
1282 or 1284 Judge F. Janes (James), 217 Church Street, Greenville, S. C. (in jail, Pickens, S. C.).
1444 Andrew Johnson, Greenville County, S. C.
3590 James Johnson (Johnston), Greenville, S. C.
130 Joe Johnson, 313 Lee Street, Greenville, S. C.
3849 John Jones, 209 Parkins Alley, Greenville, S. C.
2238 Henry Leake (Leaks), Greenville Street, Greenville, S. C.
532 Albert Ernest (Earnest) Leath, 7 Second Street, Greenville, S. C.
3185 James Norman Leatherwood (in jail waiting trial), Greenville, S. C.
3176 Ernest H. (Ernest Henry Lester, Earnest, Lister), Lester, Fifth Street, Victor Mill, Greenville, S. C. (Greer, S. C.).
2602 Arthur Lewis, 496 Birnie Street, Greenville, S. C.

1812 William Lewis, 111 West Broad Street, Greenville, S. C.
1785 Will (Will Leonard Linton, Willie Linton), Linton, Washington Extension, Greenville, S. C.
889 Albert McBride, Washington Road, Greenville, S. C.
1935 John McCoy, 4 Birnie Street, Poinsette Mill, S. C.
3252 Charles Murphy McKinney, McGee Mill, S. C.
1420 Eddie Madox (Maddox), Coffe Street, Greenville, S. C.
206 Haskel Metts (Haskle Mety, Mentz, Mets), Paris Street, Greenville, S. C., care Southern Railroad Co., Washington, D. C.
302 Frank Montgomery, Oscar Street, Greenville, S. C.
2323 James Moon, R. F. D. 1 (R. F. D. 5), Greenville, S. C.
1609 Jose Morris, Parkersville, S. C.
626 Zarius (Zarschur, Zaricus) Murphey, 209 Green Street, Greenville, S. C.
3097 Charles Newson (Newsome), 4 Second Street, Greenville, S. C.
3211 George Francis Ogden (traveling man), Greenville Co., S. C.
1784 Lawson Pendergrast, 30 Queen Street, Greenville, S. C.
270 Francis Marion (Marvin) Pike, 122 Green Street, Greenville, S. C. (15 James (Jones) Street, Greenville, S. C.).
2740a Toy Pittman, Greenville, S. C.
1421a Henry Osbourn (Osborn) Pool, R. F. D. 4, Greenville, S. C.
3300 Monroe Poole, Oscar Street, Greenville, S. C.
281 Shilow Redew (Paden, Padin), 619 Moores Line, Greenville, S. C.
3034 Frank H. Revis, Victory So. 124, Greenville, S. C.
819 Samuel Iler Richey, Denwood, carrier No. 9, Greenville, S. C.
317 Will Roberts, 317 Nichols, Greenville, S. C.
1469 James Robinson (Robertson), 320 Washington Street, Greenville, S. C. (R. F. D. 5, Greenville, S. C.).
3168 Joe Robinson, West Greenville, S. C.
3468 Will Poland (Roland), R. F. D. 3, Greenville, S. C.
4047 Wister Rosemond, 312 McCoy Street, Greenville, S. C.
1143 Earle Rucker, 121 Broad Street, Greenville, S. C.
112 Odius Sales, Mount Carmel, S. C.
1498 Lutner Sampson, 118 Gower Street, Greenville, S. C.
1774 Dan Sanders (traveling man), Greenville, S. C.
3446 James Shipman, 23 Dills Street, Greenville, S. C.
3215a Gus Sizemare (Gusstavrs Sizemore, Gusstaves Sizemore, Gustavens Sizemore), Substation Post Office No. 10, Greenville, S. C. (Substation Post Office No. 10, Duncan Mill, Greenville, S. C.).
3218 Elorce Smith, 120 Elm Street, Greenville, S. C.
544 Joe Thomas Smith (J. T. Smith), 118 Duncan Street, Greenville, S. C.
2341 Albert Richard R. Smith, 36 Allen Street, Greenville, S. C.
1918 Weston Smith, Greenville Co., S. C.
2725 William (Wm.) Smith, Jenkins Street, Greenville, S. C.
3585 Betton (Belton) Spearman, 413 Mansell Street, Greenville, S. C.
3738 John Strother, Greenville, S. C.
1359 Claude Thompson, 12 Hammett Street, Greenville, S. C.
2853 Gabe Thompson, 205 Echo Street, Greenville, S. C.
3665 Golden Thompson, 617 Boyd Street, Greenville, S. C.
7a Fletcher Valentine, 310 Bailey Street, Greenville, S. C.
2117 Allen Walker, 118 Parker Street, Greenville, S. C.
1927 George Walker, Greenville, Goodwin Street, Greenville, S. C.
1283 William Walker, Webster Street, Greenville, S. C.
285 Boykin White, Rutherford Street, Greenville, S. C.
3253 James White, 101 Mayfield, Greenville, S. C.
2565 George Washington Williams, Ann. Street, Greenville, S. C.
1839 Leo Williams, Greer, S. C.
3331 Melvin Williams, 416 Calhoun Street, Greenville, S. C.
2577 Oliver Williams, Parkins Alley, Greenville, S. C.
2489 Ira Thedora (Theodore) Wilson, 9 Wallace Street, Greenville, S. C.
438 Ed Wofford (Woffard), 175 Endle Street, Greenville, S. C.
3487 George Wood, extra gang, railroad force, Greenville, S. C., care Southern Railway, Greenville, S, C.
3029 Dan Workman, Greenville, S. C.
58 Fletcher Wright, Pullam (Rullam, Rulham) Creek No. 505, Greenville, S. C.
2715 Lonnie (Lonnae) Wright, Elford Street, Greenville, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAURENS, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

2664 Maxie Albert, route No. 1, Laurens, S. C.
1503 Will Anderson, on railway, Laurens City, S. C.
2122 Clifford Barker, Mountville, S. C.
8 Dave Bird (Byrd), Laurens, S. C. (care Westinghouse Clearch Kerr Co., Sheffield, Ala.).
1657 Joseph Booker, Laurens, S. C.
2847 Thornley Brice (or Thomley Brice, Col. Thonley Bryce), care County Jail, Abbeville, S. C.
1984 George Bradley, Lands Ford, S. C.
3210 John Burton, Laurens, S. C.
1243 Will Carnes (Curnes, Cerns), Woodruff, S. C. (care Spartan Mill Grain Co., Spartanburg, S. C.).
147 John Carter, Cross Hill, S. C.
3182 Ralph Copdland (Copeland, Raip Copeland), care Southern Railway Company, Greenville, S. C.
2450 Gary Davis, Fountain Inn, S. C.
2917 Lewis Davis, Clinton, S. C.
1542 Eunice Guy Fleming, 91 Academy, Clinton, S. C.
1478 Albert Gary, Clinton, S. C.
1310 Arthur Hill, Arther Authur), Laurens, S. C.
255 John P. Hogan (J. P. Hogon or Hogan, John Peel Hogon or Hagan, John Peel (or Teel) Hogan), Clinton S. C., R. F. D., or care Lydia Mills, Clinton, S. C. (Mountville, S. C.)
2455 Walter Hoover, Watts Mill, Laurens, S. C.
2185 A. B. Hunter, Laurens, S. C.
1184 Edward Hunter (Edgar Hunter, Col., Edgar Hunter), care Geo. C. Odiorne, Clinton, S. C.
1491 David Irvin, Laurens, S. C.
2716 John Jacks, Renno, S. C.
2865 Will Jackson Col. care W. P. Smith, R. F. D., Kinards, S. C. (Clinton, S. C.).
3155 Jesse Johnson, Laurens, S. C.
2607 John McCullough, Greenville, S. C. (Clinton, S. C.).
1130 John (Jno.) McQueen Col., care Geo. C. Odiorne, Clinton, S. C. (Clinton, S. C.).
2337 James Martin, Clinton, S. C.
901 Will (Willie) Mathis, Kinards, S. C., (care W. P. Smith).
245 Sam Mills, Gray Court, S. C.
749 Charley (Charlie) Murphy, Mountville, S. C. (care of Wess Madder, Mountville, S. C.).
1587 Gus Pasley, 532 Fleming Street, Laurens, S. C.
1932 Andrew Phelps Col., route 1, Laurens, S. C., care Railway Co., Dunn, N. C.).
2049 Millard M. Pool (Marcellus Poole, M. Poole), Laurens, S. C.
1726 Casper Rice Col., box 8, route No. 3, Laurens, S. C.
3308 Clarence Robinson (Roberson), Goldville, S. C. (care W. C. Dobbins, Goldville, S. C.).
1104 Werley (Worley or Warley) Rucker, care Marion Grant, Waterloo, S. C.
1921 Will Scott, Laurens, S. C.
3014 Charlie (Charley) White Col., Kinards, S. C. (care E. W. Workman).
2593 George E. (G. E.) Williams (George Elexander, or Alexander), Watts Mill, Laurens, S. C.
1637 Johnnie (Johnie, Johny) Workman, Laurens, S. C. (care Southern Railway Co., Richland, S. C.).
1412 Nance (or Manu-Manue)? Manuel Young (Nanse, or Namuel) Young (Clo.), Clinton, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LEXINGTON, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

836 Henry Anderson, Swansea, S. C.
2205 Henry Bowman, Barr, S. C.
1334 McDuffy Cohen, Swansea, S. C.
1094 Feaston Davenport, Leesville, S. C.
1611 James (J. C.) Clyde David, New Brookland, S. C.
1914 Ed. (Edd) Davis, Lexington, S. C.
2150 Melton N. Davis, Swansea, S. C.
2341 Will Dennis, Little Mount Lexington, S. C.
1950 Luther Dreher, 2, Gilbert, S. C.
1253 Joseph Earle, Swansea, S. C.
2254 Archie Eleazer (Elazer), Peak, S. C.
1919 John Fulton, Cayce, S. C.
2719 Ernest Geiger, Lexington, S. C., are Caparis Stone Co., Harve de Grace, Md.
2693 Frank Gillian (Gilliam), Pomaria, S. C.
1682 John Grant, Cayce, S. C.
162 Mitchell Harris, Eastover, S. C.
1746 Summer Harris, Lexington, S. C.
2591 J. W. Hendrix, Gilbert, S. C.
2463 Arthur Veston (Vesten) Hughey, Swansea, S. C.
1553 J. P. Jackson, R. F. D. 2, Lexington, S C.
1838 Dolphus James, Cayce, S. C.
910 Elex Johnson, 6, Lexington, S. C.
325 Rufus Johnson, New Brookland, S. C.
2146 Stafford Jones, Swansea, S. C.
43 John Junias, Columbia, S. C.
848 Tillman Knots (Knotts), Thor, S. C.
1033 Willie Percy (Perry), Camden, S. C.
404 David M. Phillipps (Phillips), New Brookland, S. C.
1743 Jesse Raymond, Lexington, S. C.
1418 Henry Reeves, Cayce, S. C.
2143 Jessie Riley, Swansea, S. C.
1441 Frank Lambert (F. L.) Rivers, New Brookland, S. C.
84 Johnnie C. Rowell (Johnie Rowell), R. F. D., Steedman, S. C.
1174 Willie Harry (H.) Schmidt, New Brookland, S C. (69 Oliver Street, New Brookland, S. C.).
773 Joseph Smith, Pelion, S. C.
2720 Otis Smith, Leesville, S. C.
1079 Will Smith, Miami, Fla.
2733 James Russell Stephenson, Darden Hotel, Cayce, S. C.
1528 N. G. Stone, Raleigh, N. C.
1328 Joseph Strother, Lexington, S. C.
681 Sheppard (Shepperd, Shepherd) Taylor, Leesville, S. C.
2650 Daniel Wages (Wagas), New Brookland, S. C.
889 Judson Willie (J. W.) Weaver, New Brookland, S. C.
1800 Joe Wiggleton (Wiggeton), Peak, S. C.
1379 Rufus William (Williams), Lexington, S. C.
2398 Walter Williams, Lexington, S. C.
2619 Jerry Wise, Barr, S. C.
511 Robert Wynn (Wynne), Cayce, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

2834 John J. Adair (John Jefferson Adair), Welford, S. C.
2716 W. M. Allen (Willie Monroe Allen), Fairmont, S. C.
2425 Govenor B. Anderson (Governor Boots Anderson, Gov. B. Anderson), Reidville, S. C.
19 Edward Arter (Artur), Spartanburg, route No. 5, S. C.
177 Ream Ballinger (Ballenger), Welford, S. C.
1979 Russell (Russel) Bailew, box 82, Son, Greenwood, S. C.
2854 Andy Batty, Woodruff, S. C.
2765 John H. Bivings (Bevins), Wellford, S. C. (John Henry Bivings, Wellford).
1256 Ed. Bowen (Bowie), Fairforest, S. C.
1319 Ed. (Edward, Edie) Bowie, Woodruff, S. C. (Rosemont, N. C., care T. C. Thomas Bros.).
615 Cliff Brown, 6 Don Street, Greer, S. C.
180 P. L. (Paul L.) Cook (Cooke), 44 (4) Duke Street, Duncan Mill, Greenville, S. C. (7 Seventh Street, Greenville, S. C.)
876 King Dandy, route No. 4, Woodruff, S. C.
1323 Wiley Elias, Fairforest, S. C.
184 Fohn H. (John, John Hamilton) Foster, Landrum, S. C.
1166 Leander Foster, R. F. D. 3, Wellford, S. C.
1538 Thomas (Tom) Foster, Woodruff, S. C.
2123 Sam Fowler, route No. 1, Greer, S. C. (Thickety, S. C., care Knoxville Concrete Co.).
2887 Oliver Glenn, Spartanburg, S. C., route No. 3.
1396 Joe Griffin, Reidville, S. C. (also Muscle Shoals, Ala.).
1366 Lee Harris, Woodruff, No. 2, S. C.
2295 Will (William) Jackson, Construction, N. C. (Campobello, S. C.).
1944 W. M. (William M.) James, Greer, S. C.
695 L. J. (Lee J., Lee Julius) Jones, Fairmont, S. C.
2867 W. E. (Willie E., Willie Erastus) Jones (Janes), North Charlotte, Charlotte, N. C.
250 Thomas (Tom) Liley, Wadesboro, N. C.
1901 H. B. McClintock, Woodruff, S. C.
2352 John McElrath, R. F. D. 1, Fountain Inn, S. C.
1491 Otis Martin, Inman, S. C.
1052 Arthur L. (Arthur Lee) Massey, Tecco, Ga. (Spartanburg, S. C.).
1646 Luther Massey (Massy), 1 Twenty-fourth Street, Greer, S. C.
2350 Thomas Massey, 5 Twenty-third Street, Greer, S. C.
2698 Christopher C. Mills, Campobello, S. C.
2464 Clarence Montgomery, Woodruff, S. C.
2836 W. J. A. C. Moore (Willie J. A. C. Moore, Willie James Arthur Clayton Moore), route 1, Inman, S. C.

1360 James G. Nelson, Springfield, Ill., general delivery (box 444, Altavista, Va.).
2347 I. L. Owens (Isaac Lester Owens, Isaac L. Owens), Eatonton, Ga. (Woodruff, S. C.).
1508 Lawrence Pearson, route 5, Woodruff, S. C.
624 C. B. Richards (C. Britton Richards), route 3, Inman, S. C.
851 Ganey Riffey (Rippey), route 1, Fingerville, S. C.
2533 Jim Rosenam (James Rosemond, Roseman), Woodruff, S. C.
2490 Hallie Sanders, Fairmont, S. C.
1102 Robert B. Sane, route 4, Campobello, S. C.
2061 Arthur S. Shell (Shell, Arthur Shell), Fountain Inn, S. C.
23 Benjamine (Benj.) Smith, Campobello, S. C.
1022 G. C. Smith (Grower C. Smith), Greenville, S. C.; care Monogan Mill, Greenville, S. C.
2551 Richard Smith, Inman, S. C.
2522 James B. Suddeth, route 8, Greenville, S. C.; care E. Osteen, Arlington, S. C.
1836 Joseph E. Taylor (J. B. Taylor, Joseph B. Taylor), 36 Woodruff Street, Woodruff, S. C.
2552 Charley (Charlie) Thomas, route 5, Spartanburg, S. C.
1232 Sam Tucker, Enoree, S. C.
2220 Hyram H. (Hiram) Wallace, route 3, Spartanburg, S. C.
621 Fred Wilkins, Wellford, S. C.
932 Jesse (Jessie) Wilkins, Landrum, S. C.
34 John Williams, R. F. D., Fairmont, S. C.
1991 W. F. Willie (William Frederic Willis), Tucapau, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF YORK, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

923 Sam Barnes, Rock Hill, S. C.
1015 Albert Baxter, R. F. D. 1, Edgmoor, S. C.
1371 Willie Beel (Willie Bell), Rock Hill, S. C.
85 Charley Berry (Chas. Berry), Rock Hill, S. C.
1547 William Brandon (Willie Brandon), R. F. D. 7, York, S. C.
876 Dock Brown, B. Bullocks Creek, S. C. (Bullox Creek, S. C.).
1671 Frank Campbell, Rock Hill, S. C.
217 Robert William Clack (Robert Wilson Clack), Fort Mill, S. C.
1503 Noah McK. Collins (Noah McKinley Collins), R. F. D. 3, Rock Hill, S. C.
10 James Douglas, Rock Hill, S. C. (United States Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.).
1462 William H. Garvan (William Henry Garvan), R. F. D., Rock Hill, S. C.
1561a Carl Green (Greene), Fort Mill, S. C.
1572 Benj. (Benjamin) Harris, Rock Hill, S. C.
1091 Richard Hart, R. F. D. 1, Lesslie, S. C.
1416 Johnnie (Jonnie) Hough, Fort Mill, S. C.
699 William (Will) Hunt, York, S. C.
1136 James Van Hutchison (Jas. V. Hutchison), 5 West Black Street, Rock Hill, S. C.
677 Jazel Johnson (Hazel Johnson), 327 Pond, Rock Hill, S. C.
132 Westley Kithcarld, R. F. D. 7, Clover, S. C. (Westley Kithcard, care Albert Heuitt, Charlotte, N. C.).
1674 Charley (Charlie) Lewis, Rock Hill, S. C.
1615 Otis (Odis) McFadden, Fort Mill, S. C.
1743 Arthur McMurry, R. F. D. 4, Rock Hill, S. C. (Arthur McMurray, R. F. D. 1, Rock Hill, S. C.).
1582 Charlie Meeks, McConnelville, S. C.
1028 Andrew Miller, Ridgeway, S. C.
925 Mack Mullen (Mac J. Mullen), 962 Railroad Avenue, Rock Hill, S. C.
72a James Neely, Fort Mill, S. C. (Fort Mill, Route No. 3, Fort Mill, S. C.).
1257 Rob Patterson (Rob Patteson), Fort Mill, S. C.
1695 Dodsen (Dodson) Pride, Cherry Farm, Rock Hill, S. C.
1383 Fred Reid, Fort Mill, S. C.
208 Thomas Reid, Fort Mill, S. C.
1799 Will Roberson, Rock Hill, S. C.
943 Wm. S. Sanders (Willie S. Sanders, William Simpson Sanders), Union, S. C.
1039 Fred Sullage, Fort Mill, S. C.
1486 John Tarbell (John Tarbett), Rock Hill, S. C.
1036 John Thoon (John Thorn), Fort Mill, S. C.
688 Robert Wookman (Workman, Worbeman), Rock Hill, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DAVISON, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

610 George E. (Edward) Lindley, 236 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
737 Edward J. Smith (Joseph, Edward Smith), 72 Congress Street, care of People's Hotel, Detroit Mich. (428 Huron Street, Cheboygan, Mich.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF KINGSBURY, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

680 Frank Arthur Streblow, Arlington, S. Dak.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF BLOUNT, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

17 Robert Alexander, Ninety Six, S. C.
797 Towns Allen, Liberty, S. C.
1007 Henry Austin, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
728 Walter Bagwell, McKelder, Tenn.
1387 Homer Bailey, First Avenue, Albany, Ga.
1549 John Bass (Johnie Bass), Alcoa, Tenn.
807 Wm. Beauford (William Beauford), Maryville, Tenn.
2108 Hugh Bell (Hugh Belle), Friendsville, Tenn. (Bluefield, W. Va.).
2384 Tom Benton, jr (Tom Breeden, jr.), R. F. D. 2, Edna, Ala.
626 Horace Boykin, Alcoa, Tenn.
1176 Andrew Brown, Maryville, Tenn.
1755 Robert Henry Brown (Robert H. Brown), Baird, Tex.
1342 James H. Buchannon (James Hadly Buchanan, J. H. Buchannan), Maryville, Tenn.
2067 Chas. S. Burt (Chas. Burk, Charlie Burk, Charles Burt), Maryville, Tenn.
1249 Douglas Burt, Prattsville, Ala.
872 Sidney Burton, Maryville, Tenn.
89 Juan Canter, 206 Fernando Street (206 San Fernando Street), San Antonio, Tex.
260 Henderson Carroll (Henderson Carrell), Jacksboro, Tenn. (Maryville, Tenn.).
75 James Elbrege Carter (James Elbridge Carter, James Elberge Carter), Elmwood, Tenn. (Maryville, Tenn.).
1738 John Carter, Maryville, Tenn.
2078 Pollie C. Carter, Friendsville, Tenn.
2372 Tom Carter, Maryville, Tenn.
788 Robert Cates (Robert Gates), 28 Auburn Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
186 George Clark (Clarke), Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
2388 Willie E. Cochran (William Ely Cochran, William Early Cochran), Maryville, Tenn.
812 Chas. Colley (Charlie Colley), Jasper, Ga.
1261 Lewellyn (Llewellyn) Collins, Brown Station, Ala.
1573 Riley Conner, Alcoa, Tenn.
1419 Lee Cooper, Chilhowee, Tenn.
35a Marcus George Cornell, Alcoa, Tenn.
2036 Lincoln Cornett, Maryville, Tenn.
1264 Wm. Joseph Cotner (William Jasper Cotner), R. F. D. 1, Rockford, Tenn.
1329 Ramond Cox (Raymond Cox, Romond Cox), Louisville, Tenn.
106 Wm. Cox (William Cox), Townsend, Tenn.
158 Adolfo Cumpairs (Adolph Cumpiars, Adolfo Cunpian), care of Aluminum Co., Maryville, Tenn. (San Antonio, Tex.).
561 Ernest Chas. Davis (Ernest C. Davis), Calburn, Va.
55 George Davis (G. Davis), Alcoa, Tenn. (431 Richardson Street, Atlanta, Ga.).
1064 George Davis (Geirge Davis), route No. 1, Maryville, Tenn.
198 Glen Davis, Tellehoma, Tenn.
277 John Wesley Davis, Hayneville, Ala.
1668 Thomas Davis, Maryville, Tenn.
2135 Edd Dunn, Veal, Ga. (Neal, Ga.)
2017 Chas. Edmonds (C. E. Edmonds, Charlie Edmonds), Maryville, Tenn.
1954 Wm. Edwards (William Edwards), Montgomery, Ala.
126 John Elder, Hickman County, Tenn. (Centerville, Hickman Co., Tenn.)
2193 Joe Henry Ellis, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
810 Claude Thos. Evans (Claude Thomas Evans), Spartanburg, S. C.
1981 Julius Finerson, Alcoa, Tenn.
392 Dan Floyd, Boguchitts, Ala.
133 Ed Floyd, Jacksonville, Fla.
248 Edward Foster, Maryville, Tenn.
1870 Griffin Foster, Route 1, Rockford, Tenn. (Braleton, Ala.)
341 Jose Fransto, No. 1 dela Cruz No. 8 Sttillo, Coahuila, Mexico (Maryville, Blount Co., Tenn.).
289 Wilkin Fritts (Wilken Fritts), Lenoir City, Tenn.
108 Vassar Garlington (Vasser Garlington), 130 Ave A, Birmingham, Ala.
867 Jacob Givahan, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
41 George Glover (Geo. Glover), Atlanta, Ga.
1467 Wade Grover, Micco, W. Va. (Wade Glover, Calhoun Falls, S. C.)
1663 Jesse Grace, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
1502 Isham Greer, Olds, Va.
1537 Collie Hamilton, Maryville, Tenn. (Colley Hamilton, Roanoke, Va.)
1732 Willie Handley, Alcoa, Tenn.
696 Spencer Hays (Spencer Haye), Maryville, Tenn.
1357 Macey Carl Heaton, Mint, Tenn.
1510 Joe Henderson, Aluminum, Plant. (Maryville, Tenn.)
1930 Russell Henderson, Vonore, Tenn. (Hopewell, Va.)
101 Easter Hudson (Ester Hudson), Alcoa, Tenn.
266 Robert Hudson (Robert Hodson, Robert Henderson), 911 Plant Street, Macon, Ga.
959 Curley Hughes, Birmingham, Ala. (Curley Hughs, Goodwill, W. Va.
2072 Lewis Hughes (Lewis Hughs, Lewis Hugler), Route - LaFayette, Ala. (R. F. D. 4, Lafatte, Ala.).
2310 Sam Humphreys, Montgomery, Ala. (Sam Humphrey, care General Hospital, Knoxville, Tenn.)
309 George Ivins, 288 Auburn Ave., Atlanta, Ga.
714 Forrest Jackson, Alcoa, Tenn.
1318 Frank Jackson, Maryville, Tenn.
1885 Horace Jackson, Alcoa, Tenn.
965 Jas. Baker Jenkins (Jas. Bakin Jenkins), Maryville, Tenn.
648 George Jetter, Montgomery, Ala.
840 Joe Johnson, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
1305 Will Johnson, Massasittes, Va.
1339 Henry Jones, Maryville, Tenn.
466 William D. Johnson (Billie D. Johnson), 316 South Central Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
783 Oliver Jones, Memphis, Tenn.
1060 R. L. Jones, Maryville, Tenn.
1293 Samuel A. Jones (Sam Alexander Jones, Sam A. Jones), Montgomery, Ala.
1606 Wesley Judge (Hudge), Boliger, Ala.
18 Green Juster (Justice), 73 Parker Street, Atlanta, Ga.
1447 Jesse Larkins, Omar, W. Va. (Jesse Larkin, York, Ala.)
777 Emmett Albert Law (Emert Albert Law, Ernest Albert Lowe), Maryville, (Marysville), Tenn.
900 John Lawson, Demopolis, Ala.
46 Eugene Lee, Maryville, Tenn.
897 Tony Lee, Columbia (Columbus), Ga.
1695 Jordin D. Lewis (Jordan Lee Lewis, J. D. Lewis, Jordon Lee Lewis), Maryville, Tenn.
903 W. H. Lewis, Maryville, Tenn.
1731 Cortes Lowe, Alcoa, Tenn.
418 John Henry Low (Lowe), Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
784 Walter McCary, Maplesville, Ala.
114 Elihu McClannahan (Clannahan, McClanahan), Chilhowee, Tenn.
332 John L. (Lee) McDaniel, Moultrie, Ala.
1916 John McKinney, Alcoa, Tenn.
1328 Jim McTaggart, Marietta, Ga.
82 Berry Mannis, route No. 3, Chattanooga, Tenn. (Berry Manis, Alcoa, Blount County, Tenn.)
84 Rabin Marvel, city No. 3, Maryville, Tenn.
1157 James Maxwell, Rydal, Ga. (St. Gironda, Pittsburgh, Pa.).
1761 Henry Merrill (Merril), Alcoa, Tenn.
1420 Brake Merritt, Montgomery, Ala.
1013 John Floyd Miller, Greenback, Tenn.
1299 Chandler Mize, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
1031 Jas. Montgomery, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
2081 James Kelley Moore, Montgomery, Ala.
526 Joe Moore, Carters (Harters), Ga.
309 Charles Morales, route 3, Maryville, Tenn.
1652 John Henry Morgan, Alcoa, Tenn.
1243 Henry Morris, Augusta, Ga.
1103 Jas. Verles (Verless) Morton, Maryville, Tenn.
2328 Robert Mosley, Palham, Ga.
1317 Hoag Marsh, Maryville, Tenn.
553 Wm. Aaron Myers, Maryville, Tenn.
1846 Bob (Bobb) Nelson, Demopolis, Ala.

1839 John Owens, Rocks Branch, N. C.
36 Manuel Palomo (Polomo, Palomo), 916 Laredo Street, San Antonio, Tex.
663 Henry Pate (Henry Anderson Pate), Maryville, Tenn.
2059 Houston Patterson (Houston Peterson), Al. Plk. (Maryville), Tenn.
805 Henry Phelps (Henry Philips, Henry Phillips), Maryville, Tenn.
814 Jos. Henry Potter (James Henry Potter), rural delivery 6, Maryville, Tenn.
517 Sam S. Pring (Sam Spring, Sam S. Spring), Chattanooga (Churchwell), Tenn.
2238 William Hamilton Proctor, Cades Cove, Tenn.
895 Fred Quinnee (Quinnce, Fred Quince), Maryville, Tenn.
11 Spencer Ramsey, Chattanooga, Tenn.
1428 Charles Reece (Charlie Reese), Bradley, Ga.
403 William L. Robbins (William Lee Robbins), Covington, Ky.
6 John Lee Robertson, Maryville, Tenn.
539 Jos. W. Roper (Joseph W. Roper, Joseph Washington Raper), Inglewood, Tenn.
818 Sidney Rose, Friendsville, Tenn.
1148 Gilbert Ryes, Maryville, Tenn.
1152 James Sanders, Maryville, Tenn.
1410 Matthew Sanders, Aluminum Plant, Maryville, Tenn.
1320 Edgar Simmons, rural delivery 3, Maryville, Tenn.
2171 Jeff Singleton, James Island, S. C.
1123 Allison Smith, Maryville, Tenn.
133 Edward Smith, 603 Americus Avenue, Maryville, Tenn.
1039 Henry Smith, Maryville, Tenn.
632 Thomas Smith, Maryville, Tenn. (Tom Smith, 515 Twenty-sixth Street, Bessemer, Ala.).
847 Chas. Spurling, R. F. D. 2, Walden, Tenn. (route 2, Walland, Tenn.).
735 John Steel (John Steele), Charlotte, N. C.
1396 Richard Stephenson (Richard Stevenson), Alcoa, Tenn.
1564 John Tallent, Tellico Plains, Tenn. (Alcoa, Tenn.).
870 Howard Terrill (Howard Terrell), Alcoa, Tenn.
2114 Frank Thacker, Maryville, Tenn.
473 John Thomas, Union Town, Ala.
45 Sam Thomas, Woodstock, Ala.
581 Robert S. Tidwell, Maryville, Tenn.
94 Arnold Vinol (Arnold Vidal, Arnold Vinal), 1139 Hospital Street, New Orleans, La.
2394 James Walker, Alcoa, Tenn.
1211 Joseph Walker (Ben Walker), Maryville, Tenn.
1757 Kesler Darwood Walker (Kesler D. Walker, Kesler Derclard Walker), Knoxville Pike, Maryville, Tenn.
76 Mat Walton (Nat. Walton), Maryville, Tenn.
206 Willie Washington, Alcoa, Tenn.
132 James Watson, 216 South Street, Jackson, Miss.
915 Antainie West, Bryson City, N. C. (Antinie West, Swain County, N. C.).
1298a Peter West, Alcoa, Tenn.
1612 George Whitfield, 506 Ind. Avenue, Maryville, Tenn.
1369 Joe Williams, Birmingham, Ala.
147 John Williams, Townsend, Tenn.
667 John Williams, 2 Edison Street, Maryville, Tenn. (318 Wall Street, Macon, Ga.).
635 Lonnie Williams, Mascot, Tenn. (Lounie Williams, Alcoa, Tenn.).
1417 Louis Winger, 511 South Decatur Street, Montgomery, Ala. (S 11 Decatur Street, Montgomery, Ala.).
1380 Claborne Young (Claborne Young), Jasper, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CAMPBELL, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

185 George Brooks, Lafollette, Tenn.
1938 Sam Brown, Lafollette, Tenn. (Nelson Street, Knoxville, Tenn.).
732 Will Burks, Lafollette, Tenn.
1469 Lee Carpenter, 13 Authras, Tenn.
685 Roy Evans (Ray Evins, Ray Evans), Sweet Water, Tenn. (Lafollette, Tenn.).
1690 Ed. Fossil, Lost Creek, Tenn. (Ed Fossie, R. F. D. No. 1, Lost Creek, Tenn.).
1076 Claude Gist, Lafollette, Tenn.
1940 James Guyle (James McGuyee), Peabody, Tenn.
1958 William Luster Hall, Lafollette, Tenn.
718 John Wm. Horne (John Wm. Horn), Lafollette, Tenn.
1411 Will James (Willie James), Jellico, Tenn.
125 James Hillman (James Heilman), Jellico, Tenn.
62 Andrew Hunter (Anarew Hunter), Jellico, Tenn.
59 Walter Lee Johnson, Westbourne, Tenn. (W. L. Johnson, Jellico, Tenn.).
910 Eugene Jones, Jellico, Tenn.
818 Jim Luckey (Jim Lucky), Lafollette, Tenn.
1374 West May, Jellico, Tenn., care of Zickraft Co., Jellico, Tenn.
1857 Sam William Pasley, Lafollette, Tenn.
959 Luther Pond, Cupp, Tenn.
236 Geo. (George) Rowe, Westbourne, Tenn.
1137 Luther Smith, Westbourne, Tenn.
1844 Amos Taylor, Lafollette, Tenn.
1318 Walter Watkins, Lafollette, Tenn.
1296 Solomon Williams (Solmon Williams), Woodridge, Tenn.
1849 Harrison Wilson, Duff, Tenn.
328 Sam Woods (Sam Wood), Peabody, Tenn.
727 Claude Younge, Cotula, Tenn. (Claud Young, Gatliff, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF HENRY, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1494 Hurdle Anderson, Puryear, Tenn.
1622 Herbert Crutchfield, Peters Hill, Paus, Tenn. (Paris, Tenn.).
1609 Wausea Jaures (Waussea (Wausea) Juares), Paris, Tenn.
1536 Isaac (Isac) Jones, Cottage Grove, Tenn.
1021 Lee Kelley (Kelly), Paris, Tenn. (Henry, Tenn.).
173 Percel (Purcel) Cletis Tansil, Paris, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF KNOXVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1993 Thos. Jefferson Anderson (T. J. Anderson), 509 Chestnut Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
2366a Clarence Brabson, 313 Kings Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
2059 Clarence Brady (Clarnce Brady), Lousdale, Knoxville, Tenn.
214 Cleveland Brown, 130 Vance Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (1616 Walnut Street, Knoxville, Tenn.).
2304 Ben G. Burch (M. G. Burch), 101 Tennessee Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
2026 John Cambell, 148 South Dell Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (148 Ovell Street, Cleveland, Ohio).
1047 Joe Childers, 130 Vance Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
2379 Will C. Cobb (William Calvin Cobb, William C. Cobb), 303 Olive Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (19 West Cherry Street, Columbus, Ohio).
2991a Sam H. Cook, Knoxville, Tenn.
1077 Chas. Edw. Duncan (Chas. Edward Duncan, Charles Edward Duncan), Willow Street, Lincoln Park, Knoxville, Tenn. (Willow Street, Knoxville, Tenn., Firdale, Wash.).
1839 Olise Ellenberg (Olise Ellenburg, Olise Ellinburg), Arlington, Knoxville, Tenn.
111 John Randolph Gilliian (Jno. Randolph Gilliam), Minnesota Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
689 Willis Hill, East Riverside Drive, Knoxville, Tenn.
1248 Will Howard, 130 Vance Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
998a Dan Johnson, Knoxville, Tenn.
2678a Lewis Johnson (Lous Johnson, Louis Johnson), Knoxville, Tenn.
2985a Lloyd Johnson (Lloyd Johnson), 558 Brandy Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
2692 Nell Johnson (Neal Johnson), Knoxville, Tenn.
2029 Albert Lee, 1419 West Fifth Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn. (1218 Marion Street, Knoxville, Tenn.).
458 Robert A. McDaniel (Robert A. McDainels, Robert A. McDaniels), 411 Dale Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn.
2810 James Ogle, 411 Dale Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
1844 Nelson Pierce, Speedwell, Tenn.
2952 Claude G. Roche (Claud Gerald Roche, Claud G. Roche), 1515 Vernon Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (410 Twenty-eighth Street, Hoquiam Wash., Etowah, Tenn.).
2776 John Henderson Rush, route 6, Knoxville, Tenn.
1989 Banard G. Sanford (Branam G. Sanford), 1722 Clinton Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
1373 Anderson Senters, 300 McConnel Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (care De Woody, Federal Buildings, Cleveland, Ohio).
2331 John Smith, 212 Logan Street, Knoxville, Tenn. (general delivery, Greenville, S. C.).
2619 Will Smith, Ohio Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn. (route 1, Knoxville, Tenn.).
370 John Harley Spencer (John Harley Spenser), Bloom 10, Knoxville, Tenn. (Bloom Street, Knoxville, Tenn.).
1928 Clarence Suggs, Knoxville, Tenn.
1456 Homer Williams, 1918 Orange Street, Knoxville, Tenn.
327 Robert Young, Texas Avenue, Knoxville, Tenn. (care Southern Express Co., Rome, Ga.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LAUDERDALE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2056 Henry Allen, Route No. 6, Ripley, Tenn.
1698 John Booth, Route No. 5, Ripley, Tenn.
67 Rufie (Ruble) Brown, Route No. 3, Halls, Tenn.
247 John Thomas Byler, Blythesville, Ark. (Route No. 2, Ripley, Tenn.).
1763 Avery Charpple, Gates, Tenn.
1120 Frederick H. (Howard) Clay, Ripley, Tenn.
619 Ollie Crowell (Crowel), Route No. 6, Ripley, Tenn.
1966 Willie Current, Maydee, Tenn.
833 Charlie (Charley) Dennis, Maydee, Tenn.
579 Abe Fields, R. F. D., Ripley, Tenn.
1613 Ed. Forest (Forrest), Grenada, Miss.
962 Nathan Hudson, Maydee, Tenn.
1521 Richard Ingram, Luxora, Ark.
1260 Will Johnson, Route No. 3, Halls, Tenn.
1888 Frank McGowan, Ripley, Tenn.
1143 Hervie Mann, Route No. 7, Ripley, Tenn.
1808 Henry Morton, Ripley, Tenn.
668 Ernest Redmond, Route No. 7, Ripley, Tenn.
1249 Willie Reed, Ripley, Tenn.
1914 Hollis Richardson, Curve, Tenn.
1523 Frank Shaw, Ripley, Tenn.
328 William Louis Sims, Halls, Tenn.
1601 Jeremiah Smith, Route No. 7, Ripley, Tenn.
2097 Shelby Stanberry, Ripley, Tenn.
1474 Frank Hurd (Herd) Taylor, Curve, Tenn.
1370 Mose Thornton, Luxora, Ark.
378 Addies Walker, Cherry, Tenn.
803 Brazy Wethers (Weathers), Mengelwood, Tenn.
704 Charlie Williams, Route No. 3, Halls, Tenn.
2131 Isaac Williams, Gates, Tenn.
786 Jerome Wilson, Luxora, Ark.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF M'MINN, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

879 Patrick H. (P. H.) Bledsoe, Englewood, Tenn.
1511 Robert Fortner, R. F. D., Etowah, Tenn.
1095 Robert Maynard (Maynary) Frost, Estamah (Etowah), Tenn.
843 Grover Givens (Givins), Sweetwater, Tenn.
128 John H. Harrison, Etowah, Tenn.
145 Edgar A. Jewell (Edgar Jewell), Etowah, Tenn.
525 Melvin Kinsley (Knicely), Sweetwater, Tenn.
1481 Luther Lyons, Athens, Tenn.
768 Thomas Matlock, Athens, Tenn.
972 Charley Mooney, McMinn County, Tenn. (Etowah, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF NASHVILLE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1470 Jno (John) Henry Allen, factory No. 1, Nashville, Tenn.
1316 Green Anderson (Green F. Anderson, jr.), 139 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
613 John T. Anderson (John T. Anderson), 536 Fifth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
403 Luther Base, 2104 Eighth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1016 Hilliard Batey, 106 Lewis Street, Nashville, Tenn. (2325 Church Street, care Mary Handley).
753 Sterling W. Berry, alias George Brady (Sterling D. Berry), 214 Sixth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
115 Wm. F. Blackburn (William Frank Blackburn), 455 Chestnut, Nashville, Tenn.
1765 Mose (Moses) Andrew Body, 928 Maple Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1200 Luther Boyd, Huberts Alley, Nashville, Tenn.
1819 Amos (Amis) Brooks, 1021 Hawkins, Nashville, Tenn.
621 Andrew Brown, 54 Lewis, Nashville, Tenn.
1731 Robert Brown, 602 Magazine Street, Nashville, Tenn.
634 Ed Buntin, 1105 Hawkins, Nashville, Tenn.
1015 Luther Clarence Burton (Luther Clarence Burton Osmurt, Luther C. O. Burton), 1020 (1021) Second Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
728 Isaiah (Isiah) Caldwell, rear 1015 Eighth Avenue (1015 Sixth Avenue), South Nashville, Tenn.

1417 Madison Cannon (Connor), 1014 Overton, Nashville, Tenn.
1892 Henry Cheatham, 1013 Ninth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1827 Robert Childress, 807 Stevenson Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
919 Willie Castello (Costello), 151 Cherry, Nashville, Tenn.
2534 Johnnie Covinan (Govinan, Johnny Govinan, John Govian), 151 Cherry Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1694 John Morgan (Jno. M.) Crossfield, 915 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn. (Vanhoy Hotel, Mansfield, Ohio).
1186½ Chester Crutchfield, 23 Green, Nashville, Tenn.
1380 Wm. (William, W. M.) Dorris, 819 Division Street, Nashville, Tenn.
248 Isaac Easley, Sixth and Lee Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1383 George (Geo.) Elder, 28 Perkins Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2248 Sam (Samuel) Ewing, between 6 and 7 Peabody (607 Peabody Street), Nashville, Tenn.
445 William Fleming, 304 Fourth Avenue (care St. Thomas Hospital), South Nashville, Tenn.
900 Ed. Garnett, 311 Fifth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2380 Oscar Garrett, 21 Many Street (Maury Street), Nashville, Tenn.
1077 Jim Gentry (Gentey, Genty), 412 Peabody Street, Nashville, Tenn.
163 Fred Gilbert, 200 Second Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1490 Beverly Torry Gill (Beverley Leroy Gill, B. F. Gill), 1161 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
1698 Raymond S. Gleaves (Raymond Leon Gleaves, Ray one), 10 Willow Street, Nashville, Tenn.
471 Luther Gooch, 180 Fillmore, Nashville, Tenn.
1492 Barney Govman, 151 Cherry, Nashville, Tenn.
166 Ed. I. Green, 633 (636) Bass Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1283 Frank P. Green (Greene), 706 Bass Street, Nashville, Tenn.
373 Sam Houston Green, 708 Fogg Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2032 Lewis Gulley (Gully), 127 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
231 Joseph (Joe) Hall, 605½ Lee Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1012 Will (William) Hartman (Hastiman), 233 Fifth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
462 Percy Haynes, 224 Fillmore, Nashville, Tenn.
2078 Joe Haskins (Hasking), 101 Fifth (101 Sixth Avenue), South Nashville, Tenn.
968 Charlie (Charley) Howard, 505 Horton Avenue (505 Hawkins Street), Nashville, Tenn.
143 Chas. (Charlie) Huggins, 220 Second Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1315 Chas. L. Johnson, 453 Humphrey, Nashville, Tenn.
490 Clarence Jones, 625 Bass Street (1005 Ridley Avenue), Nashville, Tenn.
926 Harvey Johnson (H. Johnson), Frout (Front), Nashville, Tenn.
565 John (Johnie) Jordon, 1006 Archer Street (605 Lea Avenue), Nashville, Tenn.
217 Edgar Arthur Kelly (Kelley), 515 Seventh Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn. (Canton, Ohio).
1240 Geo. Kelly (George Kelley), 220½ Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1969 Chas. (Charley) Kirk, 824 Overton, Nashville, Tenn.
798 Dean Knight, 317 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1717 Cornelius (Comelius) Lane, 326 Third Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2105 Abe Larkin, 1007 Archey, Nashville, Tenn.
2085 Ben Lans, Peabody, Nashville, Tenn.
2321 Ben (Benny) Lawrence, 417 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
618 Wm. (William) Lytle, 1 Academy Place, Nashville, Tenn.
2348 Clarence McCord (Clarence Britton McCord), 1311 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
989 Wm. A. McDearmont, 808 Wood Street, Nashville, Tenn (613 Eighth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.).
1068 Owen McNalley (McManey), 122 (1222) LaFayette, Nashville, Tenn.
1857 Andrew McNairy, 928 Ewing Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1902 Bethram (Betram) A. Martin, 42 East Hill, Nashville, Tenn.
717 Cordell Martin (C. Martin), 906½ Eighth (Sixth) Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
72 King Martin, 824 Overton, Nashville, Tenn.
880 Rufus Martin, 918 Shortvine Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2485 John S. (Sylvester) Matson, 513 Dennunbru, Nashville, Tenn.
487 Robert Meigle (Mingle, Neighle), 27 Springhead Street, Nashville, Tenn. (rural route No. 8, Woodbine, Tenn.).
80 Hayes Milan (Hays Milan), 200 Fifth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2188 John Henry Miller, 605½ Lea Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
2090 Willie Edward Moore, 1314 Twelfth (1313 Thirteenth) Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1952 Jim Moss, 703 (803) Eighth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1583 William Murray, 707 Sixth Avenue (439 South Tenth Street), South Nashville, Tenn.
1665 Edw. Wm. Nesby, jr. (Edward William Nesby, jr.), 1530 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
834 Tom Overton, 206 Fifth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1098 Henry Page, R 1405 Broad, Nashville, Tenn.
601 John Philips (Phillips), 415 McGavocks, Nashville, Tenn.
396 Walter Ratcliffe (Ratcliff), 807 Overton, Nashville, Tenn.
980 Bess Richardson, 213 Fifth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2251 John Raoch (John Roach), 1308 Twelfth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1591 Henry Robinson, 816 Eighth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1238 Lacy (Lacey) Rucker, 6 Tutwilerlew, Nashville, Tenn.
1351 Robert Rucker, 1021 Fairview, Nashville, Tenn.
1231 Wm. A. (William Albert) Rucker (Rocker), 156 Wharf Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1845 Geo. Saders, Stevenson Avenue (920 Emmy Avenue), Nashville, Tenn.
701 Will (William) Shaffer (Shofer), 622 (632) Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2276 Ernest Spuinell (Spinnell, Spinell), 1210 alley between Broad and Dennunbru (1210 Broad and Demombreum), Nashville, Tenn.
2047 Jos. F. (Joseph (Hoseph) Franklin) Starnes, 173 Fain Street, (1032 Hamilton), Nashville, Tenn.
1554 Chas. W. Steele, 723 Ninth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1568 Rob't (Robert) Stevenson, 717 Ninth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
5 Jesse (Jessie) Stokes, 1429 Fifteenth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.

1990 Rob't Swint, 715 Ewing Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
90 Henry Thomas, 1026 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
2420 Jas. (James) Thompson, 1206 McGavock, Nashville, Tenn.
1532 Carl Vaughn, 1021 Tenth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
818 James (Jim) Henry Wade, Partu Brick (Partie & Buck), Crockett Street, Nashville, Tenn.
2396 Joe. Wade, 412 First Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
754 Matthew Turner Wade, 625 Eighth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
905 Tom Walker (Waller), Edgehill, near Carter, Nashville, Tenn.
1055 Jas. (James) Thomas Ward, 27 Garden, Nashville, Tenn.
713 Robert Weakley, 824 Ewing Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1401 Ernest Webb, Fourth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
380½ Ernest Webb, Fourth Avenue, Nashville (1338 Fourth Avenue, South Nashville), Tenn.
747 Wm. Henry Webb, 708 Eighth Avenue, South Nashville, Tenn.
1823 John Wharton, 137 Lafayette, Nashville, Tenn.
386 Anthony (Arthur) F. Whitsell, 19 Spunghead Street, Nashville, Tenn.
1067 Albert Wilkes, 113 Fain, Nashville, Tenn.
501 Ulra K. Williams (Wilkins), 1316 McMrock, Washington, Tenn. (2707 College Avenue, Alton, Ill.).
1245 A. D. (S. D.) Wilson, 1112 Bate Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1111 Chas. (Charley) Wisner, 929 Bass, Nashville, Tenn.
888 Clarence W. Woods, 824½ Fourth Avenue (824½ Twenty-fourth Avenue), South Nashville, Tenn.
2337 Nick (Mick) Wright, 325 Fourth Avenue, Nashville, Tenn.
1451 Geo. (George) York, Lewis, Washington County, Tenn. (53 University Street, Nashville, Tenn.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ROANE, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

25 Henry Alston, 311 Spring Street, Rockwood, Tenn.
189 David A. Giles, Dehue, W. Va. (Roane County, Tenn.).
248 Chas. Alvin Jordan, 222 Trenton Street, Harriman, Tenn.
1216 Nish Martin, Rockwood, Tenn.
1287 Arthur Powell, Rockwood, Tenn.
1441 Columbus Price, Rockwood, Tenn.
201 Alonzo Rogers, Rockwood, Tenn.
1333 Clarence Roy (Clarence Ray), Rockwood, Tenn.
849 Henry Harrison Richards (Henry Harison Richards), Harriman, Tenn.
1178 Bunyon Rush (Bunyan Bush), Rockwood, Tenn.
364 Rob't Harris Russell (Rob't Harrison Russell), Glenalise, Tenn.
444 James Walter Stewart, 515 Trenton Street, Harriman, Tenn.
1369 Bill Stypes, R. F. D. No. 1, Kingston, Tenn.
1647 Geo. W. Taylor (George Washington Taylor), R. F. D. No. 5, Kingston, Tenn.
1291 Jno. Thos, Underwood, Cardiff, Tenn.
1330 George Trigg, Rockwood, Tenn.
1723 Jas. Byron Welch, Rockwood, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SULLIVAN, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

2785 Ed Hutchins (Ed Hutchens), Kingsport, Tenn.
644 Fred Jackson, Kingsport, Tenn.
227 Charlie Jeter (Charley Jeter, Chas. Jeter), R. F. D. No. 1, Carlisle, S. C. (care of J. W. Oliver, Kingsport, Tenn.).
605 Early Johnson, Kingsport, Tenn.
2710 John Andrew Johnson, Kingsport, Tenn.
2133 Samuel Johnson, 507 College Street, Bristol, Tenn.
2439 Vick Johnson, Kingsport, Tenn.
1052 Wm. Johnson (William Johnson), Kingsport, Tenn.
81 Charlie Jones (Chas. Jones), Kingsport, Tenn.
1482 Frank Jones, Kingsport, Tenn.
2 Wallace K. Keeney (Wallace R. Keeny), Kingsport, Tenn.
2586 Harry Kendrick, Dye Camps, Kingsport, Tenn.
2589 Mack Kidd (Mark Kidd), Kingsport, Tenn.
525 Lonnie Kimbrow, Kingsport, Tenn. (care of Cement Corporation, Kingsport, Tenn.).
2428 Tom Kinnard, Kingsport, Tenn. (Decatur, Ala.).
2395 Joseph Ludford, Fall Branch, Tenn. (Joseph E. Ledford, box No. 1, Larado, W. Va.).
1659 Leonard Lee, Kingsport, Tenn.
1888 Robert Littlejohn, Kingsport, Tenn.
2754 Benj. F. London (Benjamin Frederick London, Benjamin F. London), 344 Woodlawn Avenue, Bristol, Tenn.
2140 Gurney Lowe, Bristol, Tenn.
2761 Frank Lyle, Kingsport, Tenn.
1777 Haywood Lyles, Kingsport, Tenn.
1188 Thomas Andrew McBroom (Thomas Andrew McBrown, Thos. A. McBrown), Kingsport, Tenn.
875 William Maitly, Kingsport, Tenn.
1521 Warren R. Marshall (Warren Rawlett Marshall, Warren Marshal Rawlett), Kingsport, Tenn.
2473 Clarice Martin, Kingsport, Tenn.
2285 Bee Mitchell, Kingsport, Tenn.
1837 William Henry Morris, Kingsport, Tenn.
712 Frank Mosely (Mosley), Kingsport, Tenn.
296 Cloyd Nathaniel Page, 112 Second Street, Bristol, Tenn. (care of Kingsport Restaurant, Kingsport, Tenn.).
2513 Jay Parker, Kingsport, Tenn. (Camp Federal Dye, Kingsport, Tenn.).
2482 Ezekiel Persinger, Kingsport, Tenn.
2127 Rufus W. Poore, Fordtown, Tenn.
753 Earnest C. Reaves (Earnest C. Reans, Reaves), Kingsport, Tenn.
2269 James Rhodes, Kingsport, Tenn.
1931 James Richardson, Kingsport, Tenn.
2625 David Rodgers (Daniel Rodgers, Dav. Rodgers), Kingsport, Tenn.
1644 Arthur E. Sanders (Arthur Eugene Sanders, A. E. Saunders), 204 Alabama Street, Bristol, Tenn.
1429 Jim Sanders (Jas. Sanders), Kingsport, Tenn.
236 Richard Sanders, Kingsport, Tenn.
340 Cloyd Shoecraft, Kingsport, Tenn.
2431 Harrison Adams, Kingsport, Tenn.
2479 James Aikens, Kingsport, Tenn.
2624 Comer Almond (Comes Almond), Kingsport, Tenn.
2560 Johnnie Bailey (John Baley), Kingsport, Tenn.
1541 Robert Beale (Robert Bealer), Bristol, Tenn.
1043 Phelix Bibbs, Kingsport, Tenn.
1568 John Bralley, Gibsontown, Kingsport, Tenn.
488 Budy Brown, Boston, N. C. (Care C. C. & O. Ry. Co., Kingsport Tenn.)
589 Harvey Louis Brown, H. C. Brooks Camp, Kingsport, Tenn.
1037 Ned Brown, Kingsport, Tenn.
905 William Brown (Will Brown), Kingsport, Tenn.

2352 Eugene Cleveland Broyles, 340 Woodlawn Avenue, Bristol, Tenn.
1621 Edwin L. Burkbart, 1030 Hill Street, Bristol, Tenn.
443 Walter Burton (Walter Barton), Kingsport, Tenn.
405 Will Cann, Kingsport, Tenn. (Care R. E. Oliver, Kingsport, Tenn.)
959 Greer Cobb, Kingsport, Tenn.
2331 Blair Collins, Broad Street, Bristol, Tenn.
445 Arthur Combs, Kingsport, Tenn.
2587 Elbert Combs, Bristol, Tenn.
1714 Will Conley (Will Connelly), Kingsport, Tenn.
316 Loney Cook, Kingsport, Tenn. (Care J. L. Holt, Kingsport, Tenn.)
992 Witt Crawford (Milt Crawford), Kingsport, Tenn.
1073 Edler Davis, Kingsport, Tenn.
1353 Fred A. Dobson (Fred Alfred Dobson), Kingsport, Tenn.
625 Jerry Draper, Kingsport, Tenn.
2592 William Duncan, Kingsport, Tenn.
1739 Reuben Durham (Reuben Duham), Kingsport, Tenn.
998 Martin Edwards, Kingsport, Tenn.
1673 Joseph Henry Fain (Joseph Henry Faun), Kingsport, Tenn.
1443 James Patrick Fani (James Patrick Faun (Fain)), Kingsport, Tenn.
449 William Harness Fanning (William Harness Johnson), Sixteenth Street, Bristol, Tenn.
463 Ernest Fields, care Fed. Dye Plant, Kingsport, Tenn. (Kingsport, Tenn.).
1791 Roy L. Foster, Kingsport, Tenn.
1726 Willie Franklin, Spartanburg, S. C. (Kingsport, Tenn.).
2582 Frank Green, Kingsport, Tenn.
2330 H. Carl Hackady (Hachrody, Horhrody), Rural Free Delivery No. 2, Bristol, Tenn.
2442 R. B. Hacker, Kingsport, Tenn.
1652 Robert E. Hall (Robert Edward Hall), corner Anderson and Eighth Streets, Bristol, Tenn.
2139 Richard Hampton, Kingsport, Tenn.
871 Will Harris, Kingsport, Tenn.
2284 Nibie Osborne Harrison (Nevil Osborne Harrison, Nebie Osborn Harrison), 552 Lake Street, Bristol, Tenn.
1699 Charlie Hayes, Bristol, Tenn.
703 Manning Hickman, 904 Fifth Street, Bristol, Tenn. (J. Manning Hickman (J. M. Hickman), Blountville, Tenn.)
1467 William Simpson, Oliver Camp, Kingsport, Tenn.
606 William Thomas Smith, Kingsport, Tenn.
2720 Henry Staples, Kingsport, Tenn.
2370 Charles Stine, Blountville, Tenn.
2209 Lucius D. Switzer (Lucius Depue Switzer, Lucius D. Switzer), Kingsport, Tenn.
2449 Worley Bell Tate, Kingsport, Tenn.
50 Amor Thomas (Amos Thomas), Kingsport, Tenn.
1196 James Towns, Kingsport, Tenn.
2623 Thomas Walker, Kingsport, Tenn.
1945 George Wallace, Kingsport, Tenn.
1969 William Washington, Kingsport, Tenn.
2043 Lawyer Watson (Watson), Kingsport, Tenn.
144 Sam Watson, Kingsport, Tenn.
397 James Wm. M. Wells (James William Marshall Wells), 1006 Crundey Alley, Bristol, Tenn.
1735 Charles White, Kingsport, Tenn.
2809 Wm. Franklin Wiley (William F. Wiley), Kingsport, Tenn.
1236 David Williams, Kingsport, Tenn.
2486 Edgar Farmer Williams, 944 State Street, Bristol, Tenn.
1349 Fred Williams, Dye Plant Camps, Kingsport, Tenn.
2419 Ossie Williams (Onsey Williams), Kingsport, Tenn.
1656 Glover Witherspoon, Kingsport, Tenn.
1639 Ez Woffords (Ez Wofford), Kingsport, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF SUMNER, STATE OF TENNESSEE.

1465 Joseph Birdwell, Cottontown, Tenn.
1724 Archie Francis (Frances) Bransford, jr., Gallatin, Tenn.
644 James Cecil Cook, Portland, Tenn.
454 James Thomas Graham, Hendersonville, Tenn.
551 Joe Harper, Route No. 2, Gallatin, Tenn.
1489a John Harris, Rural Route, Bethpage, Tenn.
487 Clida Hicks, Gallatin, Tenn.
184 Robert Hullett, 25 Smith, Gallatin, Tenn.
827 Theodore D. McMurray (McMurry), Westmoreland, Tenn.
1609 James T. Sumners (Summers, Jas. T. Summers), Westmoreland, Tenn.
1931 Wm. McKinley Walton (William McK. Walton), Gallatin, Tenn.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF CAMERON, STATE OF TEXAS.

2052a Jose Cavazos, Sebastian, Tex.
100 Dionicio Trevino (Treveno), Santa Maria, Tex.
833 Encarnacion Garcia, Santa Maria, Tex.
805 Juan Gonzales, Point Isabel, Tex.
1547 Juan Cisneros, San Benito, Tex.
891 Julian Gonzales, La Feria, Tex.
838 Manuel Lopez, Fronton Street, Brownsville, Tex.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF CARBON, STATE OF UTAH.

948 John Alexander, Castlegate, Utah.
842 John Allred, Sunnyside, Utah (Ruby Valley, Nev.).
761 Walter Allenhaynes (Allehunas, Allenhaynas), Rains, Utah.
1581 Robert Beebe Bailey, Helper, Utah.
1140 Isidoro (Isadore) Barela, Price, Utah.
801 Constantine Blavegolakis, Hiawatha (West Hiawatha), Utah.
965 Harry J. Boyle, Price, Utah.
878 John Caragilo (Caraglio), Sunnyside, Utah.
759 Joseph (Joe) Emil Carlisle, Sunnyside, Utah.
411 Joe Atilano (A.) Carrilla, Price, Utah.
498 Charles Ray Chidester (Chidister), Helper, Utah.
620 John Crocco, Price, Utah.
580 Abraham Davis, Helper (444 North Fourth W., Salt Lake City), Utah.
1371 Edward Albert (E. A.) Edwards, Hiawatha, Utah.
592 Joseph Frank Eshenuri (Eshenower, Eshnower), Helper, Utah.
1203 Joe Ferguson, Castlegate, Utah.
27 Rosario Turano Finito (Furana Finita, Rosario Furano), Storrs, Utah.
346 Spirito Firaglio (Feraglio), Helper, Utah.
910 Henry William Fisher (Willish, Henry Fisher), Preston Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (Helper, Utah).
435 Frank Fituber (Filiafer, Filafer), Cameron, Castlegate, Utah.
929 Mike Fragilack (Fragilach), Standardville, Utah.
158 Alonso Ganquin (Gonquin Alonso, Jonquin), Kenilworth, Utah.
482 Louis Gennetteo, Helper, Utah.
1067 Joe Elias Griego (Grego), Rains, Utah.
1062 Onofre Gurule, Price, Utah.
921 Tiovo M. (Toivo Matthew) Humalamaki, Clear Creek, Utah.
775 William Jeffs, Price, Utah.
293 Matt Kalalinios (Kataclinig, Katalincih), Rains, Utah.
1084 Fukuimatsu Kiesaka (Fukumatsu Kusaka, Fukumastu), Fijiheiki, Japan, or Fujishima, Japan.
764 Harry (Henry) James Kinsman, Rains (box 176, Helper), Utah.
982 Louis Le Rou (LeRou), Storrs, Utah (general delivery, Chicago, Ill.).
1466 Jim Lore, Sunnyside, Utah.
817 Iraclis (Eracles) Malekakis, Sunnyside, Utah.
34 Angelos Manukarakis (Manukarakes), Clear Creek, Utah.
332 Harold March, Helper, Utah.
75 Marcos Martinez, Price, Utah.
1983 Mariza Martinez (Martnez, Narsizo Martines), Price, Utah.
1913 Jokquin Montoya (Montaya, Jokguin, Joaquin Monoya), Helper, Utah.
308 Joseph H. Patterson, Price, Utah.
1282 Joseph Prizybylo (Joe Pisterai, Pistrai), Price, Utah.
207 Anselmo (Anselmi) Puolamaki, Clear Creek, Utah.
826 Sam Rosse (Rossi), Helper, Utah.
802 Charles (Charli) Rossi, Rains, Utah.
1125 John B. Rovero, Helper, Utah.
5 Miguel Ruiz (Rus), Rains, Utah.
708 John Garcia, Helper, Utah.
782 John Saravotakis (Saravlakis, Saravalakis), Castlegate, Utah.
192 Harry Otis Seay, Helper, Utah.
492 Jesse Smith, Kenilworth, Utah.
937 Rial B. (Bradshaw) Strickland, Rains, Utah.
1301 John Tunnah (Tunnak), Sunnyside, Utah (general delivery, San Francisco, Calif.).
317 Albert Trugillo, Price, Utah.
748 Shigeru Uchida, Castlegate, Utah.
1176 Venceslos Valasquez (Velasquez), Price, Utah.
1814 Ernest Elbert (Delbert E.) Van Camp, Helper, Utah.
1765 Scott Vaughn, Helper, Utah.
870 Paul Vanderes (Vanteres, Venteris), Kenilworth, Utah.
1836 William A. Woolsey (Wooley), Sunnyside, Utah.
1629 William (W.) G. Young, Y. M. C. A., Helper (Sparks), Utah.
650 Josif Zumadakis, Hiawatha, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF JUAB, STATE OF UTAH.

725 Fred Johnson, Eureka, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF OGDEN, STATE OF UTAH.

369 Jack Aldrich, camp at Park Avenue and Twenty-eighth, Ogden, Utah.
1982 Thomas Bramble (Robert Bramble), Ogden House, Ogden, Utah.
751 Clarence L. Brown (Clarence Nelson (Nelaen) Brown), 269 Twenty-first Street, Ogden, Utah.
918 Elmore Russell Dotson, 218 Twenty-fourth Street, Ogden, Utah.
2773a Harry D. Downey, Chicuia, Mexico.
2056 Norman C. (George, Norman G.) Finlayson, 169 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1039 Karl M. (Marion) Gardner, Knight Hotel, Ogden, Utah.
316 Leo Hing, 322 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
419 Wm. Johnson Hingley, 239 Patterson Avenue, Ogden, Utah.
2092 Chas. W. James, 217 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1159 John H. (Harrison) Jeanes (J. H. Jeanes), 548 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
912 Benjamin F. (Franklin) Lee, New Washington Rooming House, Ogden, Utah.
1690 Rose Logindece (Ross Logiudice, Ros Logindice, Loguidece), 2001 Washington Street, Ogden, Utah.
2110 John Wm. McDonough, room 10, Union Depot, Ogden, Utah.
584 Leong Moon, 18 Ninth Street, Ogden, Utah.
662 Lew (Leu) Moon (Lew Mon), 2468 Lincoln Avenue, Ogden, Utah.
1581 Sam Perrott, general delivery, Ogden, Utah.
315 Wong Ping, Bon Ton, Ogden, Utah.
704 Henry Rivero, 2548 Ogden, Utah.
2172 Pedro (Pete) Romero, 218 Twenty-fourth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1082 John H. (Harold) Rose, Weber Hotel, Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1661 Tuckichi (Inokichi, Twokishi) Rubota, 255 Twenty-fourth Street, Ogden, Utah.
199 Gustav Schmachtel, 427 Thirtieth Street, Ogden, Utah.
759 Bruno Ewald Schmall, Weber No. 25, Ogden, Utah.
1996 Walter James Sheehan, 177 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1154 Benjamin F. (Franklin) Sullivan, 217 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.
909 Wong Poo Sun, 2446 Lincoln Avenue, Ogden, Utah.
761 Sedrick (Sedrich) Earl Syng, 139 Twenty-sixth Street, Ogden, Utah.
1807 Jesse B. (Bell) Tansil, 2961 Grant Avenue, Ogden, Utah.
613 Phillip Vasiliu (Philip Vasilin, Vasiliu), Vanness or Van Ness Hotel, Ogden, Utah.
1140 Ed. Walker, 2218 Washington Street, Ogden, Utah.
1365 Liliro Zananella, Ely, Nev. (Lihro Zananelta (Lihro Zananella, Lithro Zananella), Ogden, Utah.)
1702 Tom Karras, 130 Twenty-fifth Street, Ogden, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, SALT LAKE CITY, STATE OF UTAH.

3027 Gust Pappas, 555 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2912 George Paugos (Pangos, G. Pangos), 529 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
a3392b Ulysses William Payne, 41 Havil Street, Camberwell (41 Havil Street, Camberwell SE.).
1673 Emil Carl (Carl Emil) Petersen, 127 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
510a George Pidd, 920 West Fifth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1522 John Plur, 145 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2650a Ed Pokorny, Lambard Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
196 Charley (Charlie) Pryor, Plaza Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
123 Christ Reckoris (Reckois), 555 West Second Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
862 John Redo, 560 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2449a Frank Reinke, 64 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1151a Joseph Francis Rouche (Rouech, F. Roueche), 634 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2756 Dalin (Dalip) Russit, 549 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.

3 Wm. Mantinus Samuelson (Wm. Samuelson), 929 South Third Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
898 Suridin (Nuridin) Shaban, 556 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (559 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah).
189 Frank Leford (L.) Smith, Continental Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2584 Jim F. (P.) Smith, Cliff House, Salt Lake City, Utah (Tucson, Pima County, Ariz.).
921 Delfino Suniga (Sunijo), 574 West Fourth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2756a Ferando (Feranando) Vallejo, 560 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2129 Steve Varas, 458 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
998 Albert Ward (Alfred Ward), Salt Lake City, Utah.
1423 William Wells, 9 Third Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2654 Marks Kishiba (Kishiba, Kisina, Kinnon, Kisiha), 155 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2778a Emil Koch, 151 Southwest Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah (50 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah).
1904 Albert Willard Lang (Long), 78 West Broadway, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1833 Harry K. Lavantes, 549 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Harvey Levantes, 201 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
120 Joseph Lukich, 415 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1689 Jack McCally, 57 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2633 George Charles McCarty (McCarttey), 265 West Sixth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (3525 Twentieth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
1687 Taneto Mariyama, 150 West Third Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2803a Arthur (Arthurr) Masse, Sheldon Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah (Castella, Calif.).
3685a Leo Irving Matthews (Leo Mathews), 606 South Sixth Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2194 Spiros Michael (Michel) Mazanis, 542 West Third Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1053 Joseph W. Miller, 565 Southwest Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2783 Homer Moran, 419 Southwest Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1817 Anton (Antono) Mottle, 528 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2240 Tony Myerlovich, 415 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3878a Albert Joseph (J.) Newell, 323 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2460 Nasen Nexer (Kasem Nezer), 549 West Second Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1101 John S. O'Neil (O'Neill), 116 West Fourth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
95 Alejondra Olivo, 53 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Alejondra, 536 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah).
1574 Pete Paggagnorgen (Pappagrorgen, Pitt Pappagrorgin), 165 West Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
343 Thos. E. (Evelyn) Goddard, 2 Sperry Street, Salt Lake City, Utah (care Phoenix Cons. Co., Grace, Idaho).
3152 Carl Lee Green (Greer), Vancouver, B. C. (South Seventh Street, Salt Lake City, Utah).
202 Lawrence Asa Green, 2100 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1424 Gustave H. Gripentrog (Herman Gripentrog), 255 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1829 Edw. F. Hall (Ed Hall), 123 West Fourth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1122a George Hall, 2242 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2855 Alma Hambleton, Salt Lake City, Utah.
440 Sam Harding, 31 West Third Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1682a Harry Hardy, 1624, Kansas City (city jail, Salt Lake City, Utah).
1686 George Hasanis (Hasapis), 529 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2838a Andrew Jacobson (Andes Jakopson), 63 South Second Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1366 John Oliver Jagger (Jaggar), Cliff House, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3123 John H. Jones, Continental Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2905 John James Joyce, Cosy Hotel, 704 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3007 John Jubeck, 279 West Third Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
293 Harry Shoso Jurnawa (Jurnkawa, Furnkawa), 346 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1324 Neapton D. Kambouris, 560 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Neapton Kambouris, 1124 Fifteenta Avenue, Moline, Ill.).
191 Mike Kanelnjash, 418 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Leyden Coal Co., Leyden, Colo.).
2964 Kockichi Kawauo (Kokichi (K.) Kawano), 346 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1453 Lyman Kelsey, 281 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3101 Thos. F. (Frank) Kirchner, 58 First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1293a Walter Goodrich Clark, general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah.
488a Joe Constanzo (Cootango, Coatango) Costino (Joe Costina, Joe Cootango Costina), 71 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2235 A. T. Cowan (Corwin, H. B. (A. T.) Corwin), general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah.
738 Lee Crawford (Crowford), 6 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3046 Edw. (E.) Crebs, 41 West Third Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2715 Clifford C. (Clarence) Curtis, 707 West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2505 Panegis Demopoulos (Panagis Demopoulous), 509 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1289 James Walter Dodd, Lake Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2701 John Steven Donnelly (Donelly, John S. Donnelly), 15 Phipps Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3864a Walter Warren Dulberg, 1649 Elson Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (62 Richards Street, Chicago, Ill.).
2101 Evan Dudley Edwards, 474 South Temple Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1936a Roy Elliott, Alexandria Apartment, room 206, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2184 Presley Ennos, 54½ South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2761 Ingelo Eravant (Eravgant, Travigant, Angelo Erarigant), 953 West Temple Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
a3420b Ernest Gastof Erickson (Ernest Erickson), 2840 West Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1843 Jesse C. Evans, Shelton Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
785 John L. (Lawrence) Farrar, Pacific Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah (general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.).
2137 Vernon R. Foster, 58½ West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1592 Charles Garbick (Garbrick), 152 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2297 John Alaxkis (Alxakis, Alexakis), 458 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3057 Sam Alie (Alli), 549 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2193 Geo. Reed Allen, 239 West Eighth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Kendall Square, Place 4).
2845a Joseph Garfield (Carfield, Corfield) Apsden, 1256 West Eighth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (5220 South Trafton Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
97 Thomas Baxter (Boxter), 5 Thornton Court (or avenue), Salt Lake City, Utah.
2241 Barney Beckman, 1339 South Second Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
159a Samuel Belzman, 753 Post Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1914 Barney Berotto, 427 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
373 Steve Bosta (Basta), 470 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2653 Edw. Bradley, Sheldon Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3122 John Thomas Bradley, Shelton Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
966 John Brawner, 150 South Second Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
668 Wm. Hugh Brown, general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2262ab James Harvey (H.) Budd, 1250 South Eighth Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1104 Carl Burnson (Brunson, Bronson), 459 South First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah (175 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
550 James (J.) Caravanos, 501 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
3081 Peter C. Carruthers (Peter Carruthers), Palmer Hotel, West First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2959 Frank Cavora (Cavela, Cavcia), 118 West Second Street south (Second One hundred and eighteenth Street south), Salt Lake City, Utah.
2925 Sam Chinn, 54 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
481 Philip West, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1682a Myron Johnathan Westerman, 1139 Indiana Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1490 Carl D. Williams, Parl Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2937 Shigematsu Yakimura (Shigimatsu Yukimura), 127 West First Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
436 Margereto Ydalo (Ydalgo), 578 West Sixth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2022 Kamal Yesem, 549 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1695 Earnest A. (Ernest, Ernest Albert, Ernest A.) Ziegler, Cliff House, Salt Lake City, Utah (2739 East Falls Streets, Niagara Falls, care of Federal Department of Justice, N. Y.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF SALT LAKE, STATE OF UTAH.

433 Albert Lewis Addington, 25 North First West, Salt Lake City, Utah.
430 Earl Frederick (Earl F.) Allen, St. Mark's Hospital, Salt Lake City, Utah (1913 Sullivan Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.).
1140 Thomas Anderson (Arthur Street), Garfield, Utah (564 Tuttle Court, Salt Lake City, Utah).
206a Thomas Austin, Delta, Utah (general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah).
1782 Marselino Bantieto (Marselino Bantisto), 104 West Temple Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1310a Earl Irvin (Earl Erwin) Buhler, 3 East North Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
48 Encarnasion Carrillo (P. Encarnasion Carrillo), room 13, 164 North Third Street W., Salt Lake City, Utah.
259 Jim Cayanella (Jim Campanello, Campanella), 610 West Ninth Street, West Salt Lake City, Utah.
613 Gordon Fenton Cooper, 70 East North Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
850 Isidore (Isidor) Cussaroff, employed Columbia Tapping Co., Chicago, Ill. (Salt Lake City, Utah).
1061 John Oliver Emory (J. O. Emory), 270 West Temple Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
341 Wm. Theodore Fortney (William Theodore Fortney, W. T. Fortney), 326 North Fifth Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
512 George Genovich (Geo. Genovich), Salt Lake City, Utah.
2427 John Sidney Harding (John Harding), 18 North First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2167 Francis M. Hess, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1134 John James Hogan, 23 North First Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2182 Stephen James James (Stephen James), 827 Quince Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2034 Fred Kenyon, 157 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah (112 Reno Street, Buffalo, N. Y.).
204 Peter John Krantz (Peter John Kranitz, P. J. Kranitz), Salt Lake City, Utah.
1367 Edwin Daniel Lambourne (Edwin Lambourne), 234 East Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1885 Herman Lessche, 1018 West Third Street north, Salt Lake City, Utah (section gang, Oldaferry, Idaho).

1312 William James Leary (W. J. Leary), Salt Lake City, Utah.
274 James Lee, 168 North Second Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah (703 South Hays Street, Pocatello, Idaho).
273 James Daniel McBride (J. D. McBride), 240 West Temple Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah (Adrain Hotel).
1565 Augustin Marrarreto (Agustin Nararrete), room 13, 164 North Third West, Salt Lake City, Utah.
78 Homer Quille Mitchell (Homer Quillie Mitchel, Homer Quillian Mitchell), 124 West Temple Street north, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1581 James Molnar, 531 West Fourth Street north, Salt Lake City, Utah.
697 Howard Oddrey Morris, 258 West First Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
948 Harry Parker Rawlins (Harry Parkery Rawlins, Rallins), 258 West First Street north, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1231 Amado Rodriques (Amado Rodriques), 164 North Third Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
655 Joe Miller (Joe M.) Rose, care of Pleasanton, San Francisco, Calif. (168 A Street, Salt Lake City, Utah).
2353 Robert L. (Robert Lillard) Russell, 1237 Girard Street, Washington, D. C. (2 Louise Apartments, Salt Lake City, Utah).
709a Charles Fay Seitz, 1919 East Twenty-first Avenue, Denver, Colo.
826a Axel Severen (Axel Seveirn), 149 Girard Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
356 Turlow Weed Smith, 120 North Second Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
760 George Stavropoulos, 235 North Fifth Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2173 Lorenzo H. Thomas, 256 North Seventh Street west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2328 Armulfo Vargas, sugar house, D. R. G. R. R., Utah (sugar house, Salt Lake City, Utah).
2216 Charles Wilburn Watson (Charles Wilbur Watson, Charley Watson), Salt Lake City, Utah.
1138 Thomas Wilson, 114 L Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 4, SALT LAKE CITY, STATE OF UTAH.

1411 Martin Acosta (Acasta), 337 (332) South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2398 Edward Anderson, Placer Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2351 Marshal (Marshall, M. N.) Ney Angood, Wayne Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1718 Bert Barker, 235 South Eighth Street east (562 First Avenue), Salt Lake City, Utah.
2477 Andrew Benson, 574 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
130 Harry Bickenbach, Wilcox Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
961 Joseph Borbas (Borbos), Lincoln Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1832 Paul J. Brehm, jr., 56 Orpheum Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah (Paul J. Brehn, 3928 Cole Brilliantee Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.).
1802 Karl Manford (Monford, Man) Brines, Commercial Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1584 Howard H. Brothers, 68 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
469 Henry Brown, 141 Social Hall Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1471 Thomas Walter Burke, 11 Orpheum Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1660 Tony Butkovich (Bokscovitah), 533 West Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2045 Elmer Lee Campbell, 68 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1148 Raymond Allen Clark, 39 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1360 Fred K. Cole, Kenyon Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
494 Henry Crane, Belmont Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1897 Melvin R. (Clyde) Daniels, 68 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
769 Leo Dixon, Knoxville, Tenn.
1162 Timothy E. Driscoll (Drisscoil), 260½ South Maine Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1907 Thomas Edwards, care of justice of peace (Thomas Lizzia Edwards, City Hall), Reno, Nev.
1676 Nick Ellpolus (Elliopulos), 76 East Fifth Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
611 Manuel (Marcelino) Equiso (Equisa), Salt Lake City, Utah.
1287 Emil Erickson, 68 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1847 Leo Farrell, 68 East First Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1313 Salin (Salim) Feititi (Feitite), 567 Sixty-second (East Second) Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2043 Wm. Jos. (J.) Gallagher, 375 South Second Street east, Salt Lake City, Utah.
680 Marcus (Marcos) Garcia, general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah (Josefia Ricardo, Albuquerque, N. Mex.).
1205 Clifton H. (Harry, Harvey) Gibson, 163 East Second (1652 Second) Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
177 Robert Wm. Gill, 30 Belmont Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.
570 John Albert (A.) Gonans (Gowans), Kenyon Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
846 Emil T. (Fredtjol) Haugan, 127 East Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2411 George A. Hanson (Hansen), care of Lincoln House, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1095 Ted J. (John) Harris, 270 East Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
673 Alfred Hinken, 19 Orpheum Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1092 Frank (Henry) Hinkey, Toraine or Touraine Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2739 James Arthur Holland, general delivery, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2381 John (Johan) Julius Johansen, 20 East Broadway, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2309 John P. (J. P.) Karas, jr., 404 East Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2539 Edward Redman (Redmond) Keating, 19 Orpheum Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1702 John Kenney, 14½ East First Street south, Sale Lake City, Utah.
1203 Emerson E. (Earl, Eral) Kershaw, 224 (225) South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1114 Ora (Ony, Orra) Abraham King, 4 Shelmerdine Court, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1594 Dan James (J.) Knowles, 341 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
423 Thomas E. Lacey (Lacy), 62 Second Street south, Salt Lake City, Utah.
872 Carl LeClaire, Linion Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
222 Elmer Lehman, Mens Hotel or News Hotel, Orpheum or Orpherson Alley, Salt Lake City, Utah.
386 Ivan George Lilyenall (Liljeval), 20 East Broadway, Salt Lake City, Utah.
477 James Lynch, 26 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
772 Luther Alfred McClaren (McLaran), Lincoln Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1869 Donald (Donald F.) McNeill, Alton Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah (218 West Fourth Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah).
1078 William Maloney, 16½ Comm Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1906 James Markin (Mackin), 16½ Commercial Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
833 Jas. R. Martin, New Grand Hotel, 450 Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1813 Kenneth Mather, 44 East Second Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2647 John Michulich (Mikulic, Mikulich), 465 West Second Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
284 Robert Nelson (Transient Nelson), City Jail, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1282 Howard Newson (Newsom), 242½ South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2405 James O'Leary, 426 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
519 John (J. R.) Parsons, 32 East Second Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1962 William Peterson, 215 East Fourth Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2085 William John Price, Roy Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2247 Ing Ramirez (Ramiers, Romios), South Temple Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2587 Thos. Aloysius Randall, Lincoln Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1408 Jas. L. Rose, Y. M. C. A., Walker Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2010 Wong Sang (Leng, Lang), 214 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1920 William E. (Elbert) Saunders (Sanders), 137 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
500 Chas. E. (Edgar) Scherer, 137 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1932 Albert Shannon, City Jail, Salt Lake City, Utah (General Delivery, Denver, Colo.).
344 Lloyd (Loyd) Sheesley, 315 East Second Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2065 Bert Shrope, Alton Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
359 Lee Slayton, jail, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1011 John Gordon Smith, 39 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2231 Charles Sutton, 14½ First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah (Camp No. 1, Olmstead, Utah).
2410 John Thamaki, 68 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2722a Joe Thompson, Warren, R. I.
1669 Harry Tierpsky, 204 K street, Sacramento, Calif.
2307 Apolonia (Apolenio) B. Urtado, 55½ East Second Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1362 Charlie Webster, Lincoln House, Salt Lake City, Utah.
721 Geo. White, 39 East First Street South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
221 Richard Pinckney White, Parma Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah (care Phoenix Construction Co., Ogden, Utah).
1005 Evert Yoder, Overland Hotel, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1432 Howard B. (Barton) Zollman (H. B. Zollwan, Zallman), Lincoln House, Salt Lake City, Utah.
861 Frank Walcsak, care jail, Salt Lake City, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, STATE OF UTAH.

1724 John Emil Aman (Oman), 93 Carr Fork, Bingham (Bingham), Utah.
4161 Konstantonis J. Armonis, box 742, Bingham Canyon, Utah (R. F. D. 2, box 576 A, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1412 James Melvin Arnold, 703 Johnson Street, Ammilo (Amarillo), Tex.
1554a Joe N. Baker, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2921 Joseph Bertoncello, New Miners' Hotel, Bingham, Utah.
4709 Charles Burton, Hotel No. 1, Garfield, Utah.
314 George B. Caravidos (George Caravidos Belaw), U. C. Shops, Bingham, Utah.
1484 John Emil Carlson, Bingham, Utah.
2861 Tony Lloyd Castor, Welby, Utah.
2453 Thrasivulos Coliopoulos (Thrasmulas Coleopoulas), C-3, Smelter Camp, Garfield, Utah.
3116 Joseph Costellos (Costello), 578 (575) Main, Bingham, Utah.
4683 Homer Curtis, Garfield, Utah.
2091 Evangelos Danoukitos (Evagelos Danonsitos), C-8, Garfield Smelter, Utah.
969 Sam Dowte (Daute), Magna, Utah.
4405 Ralph Walter Emerson, 54 Railroad Avenue, Bingham, Utah.
2115 Evald Erickson, U. S. Mine, Bingham, Utah.
147a Grustiono Federico, Lead Mine, Bingham, Utah.
3118 James Gavrilakis (Gavilakis), 580 Main, Bingham, Utah.
4567 Steve Gelletti (Gehlett), Welby, Utah.
3905 Guiseppe Guilani (Guiliani), R. R. 1-58, Bingham, Utah. (U. C. Hotel, Copperfield, Utah)
4667 Peter Gaz (Giz), 560 Main Street, Bingham, Utah.
1885 Domeni Giachetti (Dominic Giachette), Phoenix, Bingham, Utah.
1754 Louis Gust, box 967, Garfield, Utah.
1917 Isaac Hendrickson (Henderson), Bingham, Utah.
1555 Perry R. Houston, Magna, Utah.
4360 Wilford Gustave Johnson, Route No. 1, Sandy, Utah.
2577 Ethemios Kapsis, Rizos Drug Co., Copperfield, Utah.
3037 Nick P. Katcimigas, 241 Main, Copperfield, Utah (care of Copperfield Mercantile Co.).
2613 William G. Kekas (William Gkekas), Copperfield, Utah (Copperfield, Bingham, Utah).
726 James Stephen Kennedy, 68 Carr Fork, Bingham, Utah.
3937 Nels H. Larson (Nil Larsen), Hotel No. 2, Garfield, Utah.
3292 Boris Lazeroff (Lazereff), 2 Brunswick Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
678a Abe Ramell Leonard, Grand Hotel, Bingham, Utah.
1666a Clement Merlin Lewis, Bingham, Utah.
1671 Adm Mesud, 11 Arthur Street, Garfield, Utah.
4586 Alfred Mattson (Mattsson), Bingham, Utah.
116 Henry (Hary, Harvy) J. Mellon, Hotel No. 3, Garfield, Utah.
3682 John Miller, 24 Sixteenth Street, Kewankee, Ill.
1225 Matthew (Mathew) Monoven, R. R. Box 99, Bingham, Utah.

562 John C. Mooskis (Moskis), Magna, Utah (Wash.).
1552 J. Osato (Asato), Magna, Utah.
990a Clyde Ira Packard, R. F. D. 1, Garfield, Utah.
3547 George Phillis, No. 5–E, Smelter, Garfield, Utah.
2497 John Pikras, box 23, Magna, Utah.
346 Manuel Pradas (Prados), care of Slavonian Store, Bingham Canyon, Utah.
606 Sam Brinkkila (Prikkila, Prinkkibl), route No. 1, box 99, Bingham, Utah.
3273 Joseph (Jas.) A. Roberts, Fortuna Mine, Bingham, Utah.
1771 Eduardo (Edwardo) Romero, Garfield Camp, Garfield, Utah (Smelter Camp, Garfield, Utah).
1887a Martin Sanchez, R. F. D. No. 6, Salt Lake, Utah.
730 John Sangham (Sanghan), 112 Pomplum, Naudnaoa, Spain (care of Salt Works, Salt Lake, Utah).
2304 Antone Sarikakas, Cantroy Coffee House, Bingham, Utah.
4465 Christ Shinas (Christ J. Shinas), box 271, Magna, Utah.
2379 Olaf George Sederland (Olaf Georg Soderland), Hyland Boy Hotel, Bingham, Utah.
4278 Tom Suni, R. R. Box 99, Bingham, Utah.
4086 Herbert Emil Thompson, Fox Hotel, Copperfield, Utah.
2750 Walter Thorsen (Thorsin), Arthur, Garfield, Utah.
3458 Harry Earl Triplett, Hotel No. 3, Garfield, Utah.
482 Tom Vlahos (Viakas), Viakos), 155 West Second, South, Salt Lake, Utah.
2417 Arvid Wells, 80 Carr Fork, Bingham, Utah.
1469 Carl D. Williams, Park Hotel, Salt Lake, Utah (Missoula, Mont.).
3732 Herschel Williams, Bingham Canyon, Utah.
2188 William C. Wood, Corunna, Mich.
951 Nick Zia, Bingham, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DISTRICT NO. 2, COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, STATE OF UTAH.

1519 German Azari, Alta, Utah.
65 Victor Blasko, work car, D. & R. G., Salt Lake, Utah.
237 Jack Bramer (Braymer, Jack Braymer), Murray Café, Murray, Utah.
486 Roy Brigham, sugar station, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1194a Edward Godfrey Carlson, 2731 Adam Street, West Jordan, Utah.
573 William C. Cox (William Abysius Cox), 2450 South Third Street east, Salt Lake City, Utah.
930 Carl Denton, Alta, Utah.
245 Thomas Alonians Farrel (Thos. A. Farrell), Woods Row, Murray, Utah.
844 Floyd W. Gilbert, Central Street, Midvale, Utah.
1941 Charles Gorman, Alta, Utah.
1614 Hanen Hassan, West Sixteenth south, Murray, Utah.
1289 Roscoe Hooper (Roscoe Wells Hooper), Main Street, Midvale, Utah.
1371 Lee Thomas Jeremy (Jereny), route No. 3, Murray, Utah.
1009a Charles (Charlie) Kim, Midvale, Utah.
1613 Isadora (Isadore, Idadora) Lantsner, State Street, Murray, Utah.
684 Garlech (Garlich) Marcharasion, 5006 South Eleventh east, Salt Lake City, Utah.
465 Kasanasa (Kanasa, Kazansa) Okazaki, 2468 South Eleventh east, Salt Lake City, Utah.
1365 John Thomas Taylor (John T. Taylor, Jack), 21 South Sixth west, Salt Lake City, Utah.
2186a John Vos, Edgerton Street, Pipestone, Minn.
155 Manuel Vuknironick (Manual Vuknironick, Manwal Vuknironack), Riverside Street, Murray, Utah.
484 Kaabo Kustan Winperaen (Kustaa Winperaen, Kaala Kustaa Winparin, Winperdin), Alta, Utah.
646a Jessie Woods, box 68, route No. 1, Sugar Station, Salt Lake City, Utah.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF TOOELE, STATE OF UTAH.

1024 Edwin (Elvin) Anderson, Ophir, Utah.
334 Fred George Anderson, Tooele, Utah.
402 Jose Arros (Arias), Morenci, Ariz.
178 Guerino (Gnerino, Giarino) Beghetti, Stockton, Utah.
901 Wm. Walter (W.) Blair, Wendover, Utah (921 South First Street, Canon City, Colo.).
245 John Joseph Cadogan (J. Codogen, John Joseph Codogon), Wendover, Utah.
704 Constantinos Castaniotis (Castaneotis), Broadway, Tooele City, Utah.
415 Alfred Charles Conway (A. C. Conway), Springfield, Ill.
180 Richard Ragan (R.) Darling, Tooele, Utah.
158 Rawson Ferrin (F.) Gardner, Wendover, Utah.
508 Harry Ellsworth (H.) Gillette, Tooele, Utah.
605 Swan Holmes, Ophir, Utah.
1012 William Hansen, Tooele, Utah.
1019 Basiletous (Basolius) Kavallas (Basileios Kaulias), Broadway, Tooele, Utah.
981 Neil C. Knudtson (Knudson), Tooele, Utah.
195 Nick Meardick (Mardich, Mike Meardich), Vine, Tooele, Utah.
269 James Muldoon, Burmester, Utah.
47 Oscar Nelson, Ophir, Utah.
1093 Jas. A. Paraskovopoulos (Anast Paraskevopoulos, Paraskovopoulos), Vine, Tooele, Utah.
776 Arreliano Pedido (Podido), Stockton, Utah.
804 Ferdinand Peterson, Ophir, Utah.
188 John Phenos, Tooele, Utah (540 West Second south, Salt Lake City, Utah).
378 Silvano (Silviano) Rangel, Lofgreen, Utah.
340 Tjitte Reitsma, Third, Tooele, Utah.
341 Lewis Andrew (L. A., Lewis A.) Smith, 208 Iowa Avenue, Joliet, Ill.
889 Plasido Taso, St. John, Utah.
122 Ulysses Grant (G.) Todd, Ephraim, Utah (Topliff, Utah).
31 Robert E. Young, Block Pine, Idaho (Scranton, Utah).

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE AND CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

653 James Douglas, 329 Williams Street, Charlottesville, Va.
1896 James Payne, 320 Williams Street, Charlottesville, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF ALEXANDRIA, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

2237 James Barksdale, 1500 King Street, Alexandria, Va.
2107 John Hawkins, 2107 Potomac, Va. (Care E. Dare, Prosperity, S. C.)

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF DINWIDDIE, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

253 William Gunner, 325 Lavenus Lane, Petersburg, Va.
642 Garfield Jones, Ford, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF LOUISA, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

10 Frederick Watson Milhado, Mineral, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

162 John Terry, Mecklenburg, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF NANSEMOND, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

658 Charlie Smith, Pitch Kill Road, Suffolk, Va. (Pitch Kettle Road, Suffolk, Va.).
1831a Willis John Copeland, R. F. D. 3, Suffolk, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF NORFOLK, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

607 George Riddick, 815½ Liberty Street, Norfolk, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF NOTTOWAY, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

661 James W. Bernard, Blackstone, Va., R. F. D. No. 1. (J. W. Bernord, Windsor, Ontario, Canada.)
320 Robert Cobb, Willville, Va. (Clarks Hill, S. C.)
130 R. F. (Robert Frank, Robert F.) Fitzgerald, Blackstone, Va.
11 Wash Howard, Crewe, Va.
61 Zealous Jolley, Burkeville, Va.
84 Tobb (Tob) Moore, Blackstone, Va.
1087 Edward Robertson, Crewe, Va.
217 J. H. (James Henry, James H.) Williams, Bloxom, Va.
974 Robert Fowlks (Fowlkes), Crewe, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

823 Nathan Cunningham, 704 (784) Griffin Street, Portsmouth, Va.
3177 John Angus McDonald, Portsmouth, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF PRINCE GEORGE, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

4579 Ernest Richardson, Virginia Heights, Hopewell, Va.
3321 John Powell, Railroad Avenue, Richmond Hotel, Hopewell, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF RICHMOND, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

1687 George McCall, 1000 North Fifth Street, Richmond, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF ROANOKE, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

287 Gus Freeman, Crozier Furnace, Roanoke, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF ROANOKE, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

1927 James Lampkins, 330 Third Avenue, Roanoke, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF TAZEWELL, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

2067 Bud Gentry, Pocahontas, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF WARWICK, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

3762 Enrique Hernandez Norville, high seas, boat *P. H. Crowell.*
3187 Fred Douglas Brown, 14 Leppeth (Leffett) Avenue, Newport News, Va.
3808 Clarence Butler, 542 (743) Twenty-third Street, Newport News, Va.
2502 Harvey Cary (Carey), Eighteenth Street, Newport News, Va.

LOCAL BOARD FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON, STATE OF VIRGINIA.

2208 Daniel Williams, Charleston, S. C.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SPOKANE, SPOKANE CITY, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

570 Robert Armstrong, 218 Queen Avenue, Hillyard, Wash.
963 John Balzaretti, R. F. D., Spokane, Wash.
1983 Harvey (Harry) Garrett Beck, 211 Diamond, Hillyard, Wash.
878 Roy Brackett, Elk, Wash.
1744 Geo. Van Dyke, R. F. D. 1, Spokane, Wash.
2079 John Evans, Tyler, Wash.
2687 Alfred (Alford) Hall, R. F. D. 1, Medical Lake, Spokane County, Wash.
1601 Tusneta (Tsuneta) Hayashi, Mead, Wash.
2424 Joseph Earl Hunt, care of hospital, Medical Lake, Wash.
1684 Chas. A. Jeffries (C. A. Jeffries), 515½ Market Street, Hillyard, Wash.
1541 Carl Johnson, R. F. D. 6, Spokane, Wash.
2997 Roland Edward Korfhage, R. F. D. 1, Mead, Wash.
1306 Edwin Taylor Lavigne (Edwin T. Lavique, Edwin Taylor Lavique), R. F. D. 7, Spokane, Wash.
476 Jim Melton, Orangeville, N. C. (care of Edwards & Bradford Lumber Co., Elk, Wash.).
1748 Fiorentino Viot Michels (Michele), Hillyard, Wash.
1843 John Clement Miller, Elk, Wash.
409a Benj. C. Minton (B. C. Minton, Benjamin Clarence Minton), Irricana, Alberta, Canada.
587 Makafo Nayae (Nayao) (Mokoto Nagaro or Nagao), Hillyard, Wash.
1723 Edward (Ed) O'Leary, 202 Olympic, Hillyard, Wash.
1366 Carl Bernhard (Bernahard) Olson, Elk, Wash.
2515 Jimmy Omori (Jim Omori, Jimmy Omeri), Liberty Lake, Wash.
1914 Walter Byron Parks, 252 Sixteenth Avenue, Vancouver, B. C.
683 Noble Pierce, Medical Lake, Wash.
2146 Chester Arthur Powell, Elk, Wash.
200a Arnold M. (Arnold Mathew, Matthew) Rhodda, R. F. D. 3, Cheney, Spokane, Wash.
35a Ralph Shepherd, general delivery, Hillyard, Wash.
2060 Charles Shilder, Hillyard, Wash.
85 Charles Shriver, Kiesling, Wash. (care of Deloney Bros., Lamona, Wash.).
1730 Ray Simmons, Rosalia, Wash.
2648a Abner Garrett (Abner G.) Smith, R. F. D. 2, Fairfield, Wash.
996 Frank William (Williams) Smith, Fairfield, Wash.
868 Roy H. Tee, Box 65, Latah, Wash.
1260 Leslie Dare Thompson, Chaney, Wash.
1802 Dennis Torney (Denis Tornay), Hillyard, Wash.
2777 Peter Wandflush (Wandflub), Elk, Wash. (room 805, Arctic Building, Seattle, Wash.).
1189 August George Welber (Weiler), 3241 Southport, Chicago, Ill.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF TACOMA, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

395 Gust Johnson, 1119½ South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.
833a Wm. (William, W.) Kemp, 3612 Winchester Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
289 Chas. R. (Charles Robert) Logan, Tacoma, Wash. (care of Peter Bruce, Bruce Place, St. James, Winnipeg, Canada).
1204 Sam T. (S. T., Sam Townsend) Loose, Donnelly Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
766 Gust Macaris (Macres, Macras, or Macros), 1726 South Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1123 Chas. A. (Chas. Albert, Charles Albert) Matson, 713 South Yakima Street, Tacoma, Wash.
267 John G. (John George) Miller, county jail, Tacoma, Wash.
808 Thos. (Thomas, Tom) Miller, 1519 Pacific Avenue, Craft Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.

1834 Angelo Montemurro (Angelo M. Montemurro), South Wellington, British Columbia (Tacoma, Wash.).
1736 Dwight B. Morey, Lyden Hotel, Tacoma, Wash. (301 East Franklin, Redfield, S. Dak.).
320a Charles W. (Chas. W.) Morgan, 1115 South J Street, Tacoma, Wash. (Kellam, Alberta, Canada).
130a Chas F. (Chas. Frederick) Morris (Chas. Morris), 1535 Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
73 Wener (Werner) Muller, 982 Rogers Place, New York (Bronx, N. Y.).
1090 Adolph Nelson, 1305 South Ninth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
517 Sam (Samuel) Nelson, 1562 Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
1147 A. J. O'Brien (Andrew James O'Brien, jr.), 622 Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1331a Francisco Paviera, Pacific Commissary, Camp Lewis, Tacoma, Wash. (668 King Street, Seattle, Wash.).
1198 Carl (K.) Prinz, 23 Cottage Street, Jersey City, N. J.
A1718a Lamont A. (Lamont Adolfus) Pulley (Lamont Pulley), 901 Twelfth Street, Lethbridge, Canada (Tacoma, Wash.).
356 H. C. (Harold Clyde) Albough, 1418 Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1319 Carl John Anderson, 607 South Eye, Tacoma, Wash.
948 Jose A. Aquila (Aguilar), 1140 Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1049 Dan Bloom, 811½ Pacific Street, Tacoma, Wash.
142 Edw. Brown (Edward Brown), 218 Cliff Street, Tacoma, Wash. (Mineral, Wash.).
1434a John (J.) Brown, Carlton Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
1397a Felix Carabalia (Carbalia), San Remegio, Cebu, P. I.
1189 Harold G. Carson (Harold Goldwin Carson), Hotel Tacoma, Tacoma, Wash.
801a James Edw. Clark, room 410 Fidelity Building, Tacoma, Wash.
1516 Wilber Conklin, 1356 Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1030 John W. (John William) Craig, 214½ St. Helens Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
477 Fred C. (Fred Clifford) Davis, Rainier Hotel, 1520 Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
1556 Harold C. (Harold Charles) Ellis, 718 South L Street, Tacoma, Wash. (box 227, Monroe, Wash.).
1708a Perry Ellis, Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
1396 Thos. Fake, box 99, Tacoma, Wash.
1641 Will B. Gardner, 1011 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1051a Geo. W. (George W.) Geary, care of Vice Consul, Vancouver, British Columbia (Victoria, British Columbia).
1490 Chas. W. Gesa (or Gosa), 1223 North Twenty-eighth Street, Tacoma, Wash. (1223 North Twenty-eighth Street, Seattle, Wash.).
345 Jos. A. (Joseph Albert) Girard, 1533½ Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
450a Arthur Greer, 9 Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
509 Milton Hansen (Hausen), Imperial Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
1726 Walter J. (Walter Jeremiah) Harkin, 1551 Broadway, Tacoma, Wash. (Byrun Hotel, 2017½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
1171 Edw. Henry (Henery), 1709 Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1397b Arthur L. (Arthur Lyn) Johnson, last address: Delmonico Hotel, Tacoma, Wash. (Patretia Hotel, Vancouver, British Columbia).
296 Bernt (Bunt) Johnson, McKenna Lumber Co., McKenna, Wash. (1522, Tacoma, Wash.).
1187a Qinetane Quijade (Quirbano Quijada), Pacific Commissary, Camp Lewis, Wash.
1806 Winthrop E. (Ernest) Reed, 737 D Street, Tacoma, Wash.
227a Frank Reda, Tacoma, Wash. (Prince Rupert, British Columbia; 817 Thirteenth Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
645 Otto Rork, 1710 South Yakima Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1676a Lee (Leo) Richmond, 1403 South K Street, Tacoma, Wash. (care of Broden Copper Co., Rancongua, Chile, S. A.
268 Clite B. (Cleto Bantigan) Rustia, 521 North Yakima, Tacoma, Wash. (Milwaukee Tug Co., foot of Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
44b Carl L. (Carl Leo) Sandberg, 1220 South L Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1392 Jimmy Sing, 1511 South Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1064a John W. Smith, general delivery, Tacoma, Wash.
1591 Frank Strzelecki, 1610½ Tacoma Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1238 Harvey A. (E.) Sutherland, 5824 Fifty-second Avenue, Portland, Oreg. (1110½ South K Street, Tacoma, Wash.; 126½ Russell Street, Portland, Oreg.; 1008 South I Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
1410a Murle Taylor, Ellensburg, Wash. (care of Paulsens Camp No. 2, Hoquiam, Wash.).
62 Herman Ullram (Ullran), 730½ Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1116a Aurelio Valquex or Varquez (Aurelio Varquez), New Sailors' Home, Tacoma, Wash., Old Town.
1092a Henry Whiteside, 513 North E Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1171a Fred Wilkins (Williams), Ivanhoe, Minn.
266 Thos. Williams, 216 K Street, Tacoma, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, CITY OF TACOMA, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1350 Joseph Anderson, 715½ Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, TACOMA, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

941 Veta Alepanni (Veto Allepami), box 909, Tacoma, Wash.
401 Ivan Antonoff (Com), 1814 Corn Street, Tacoma, Wash. (1814 Commerce Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
599 Harry Bredo Bugge, 2235 (8235) East Morton Street, Tacoma, Wash.
987 Homer Jackson Cason, 1140 Market Street, Tacoma, Wash. (1149 South Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
1842a Frank Coker, 2030 East Thirty-fifth and T Streets, Tacoma, Wash.
730 William Craig, Berkeley Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
1510a Curtis E. Dunnar (Curtis E. Drinnen, Curtis Elder Drinnen), Kentucky Hotel, Tacoma, Wash. (North Bend, B. C.).
745a Raburn Eberts, general delivery, Tacoma, Wash.
945 Guido Fanci, 507 South Eleventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1200 Henry W. Hansen (Henry William Hansen), 901 East Harrison Street, Tacoma, Wash.
8905 Oliver Goodvig (Oliver Grodvig), 519 South Thirty-fourth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
21 Guy Hepfer (Guy Hepper), South Fourteenth and Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1480 Henry J. Hermsen (Heny J. Hennson), 2120 South E Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1248 David Elmer Button (David E. Hutton), 1012½ A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1523 Gustave Johnson, 1216 A Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1585 Ragner Johnson (Hagnor Johnson), 1402 East Twenty-sixth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
974 Doctor Petrio Jones (Doctor P. Jones, Dr. Petrio Jones), 1149 Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.
17 B. C. Kinnear (Berton Charles Kinnear, Berton C. Kinnear), Laurence Hotel, Tacoma, Wash. (Lawrence Hotel, Tacoma; Pierce, Wash.).
1151 Maurice Lehaye (Maurice Labaye, Maurice Laboye), South Ninth and Market Streets, Tacoma, Wash.
762 William Lanque (Wm. Langue), Alaska Hotel, Main Street, Seattle, Wash.
1833 John Helmer Larsen (John Helmer Laison), 2319½ Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash. (521 East Thirtieth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1099a John Leablaws (John Slablom, John Seablem), R. D. 4, box 210, Tacoma, Wash (1305 East M Street, Tacoma, Pierce, Wash.)
508 Ralph Lightfoot, 1330½ Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.
1324 Harry Magnuson, St. Paul and Tacoma Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
495 Martin G. Magnuson (Martin Geo. Magnuson), 1338 Market Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1419 Joseph Walter Moran (Morreen), 1110 South E Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1865 Matt R. Moreen (Matt K. Moreen), 402½ East Twenty-sixth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1430 Donald Neill, N. P. Hospital, Tacoma, Wash.
1622 Byll Ohliuski, 2623 East L Street, Tacoma, Wash.
899 Leonard Roberts, Thistle Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
164 John Roe, Hotel Sherman, Seattle, Wash. (2623 East L Street, Tacoma, Wash.).
593 Irving H. Schwab (Irving Howard Schwab), Goodwell Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
197 Allen Lloyd Scott, 1922 South E Street, Tacoma, Wash. (Allen Lloyd, West Blaine, Mo.: Tacoma, Wash.).
327 John Sullivan, St. Paul and Tacoma Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
1765 John J. Sullivan (John Joseph Sullivan), St. Paul and Tacoma Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
725 Charles Sutherland, 1146½ Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.
1730a Harry Allen Thomas (Harry Allan Thomas), Utah Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.
5118 Donato Verderico (Donato Verderico), 712 South Fifty-seventh Street, Tacoma, Wash.
1413a Lonie H. Ward (Lonie Homor Ward, Louie Homor Ward), 512 East Twenty-eighth Street, Tacoma, Wash.
478 Frank Noble Woodring, 4062 (4046) South A, Tacoma, Wash.
350 Carl Zakrison (Carl Zakrikson), 1414 East Twenty-eighth Street, Tacoma, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF THURSTON, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1228 Hans Petersen Pladt (Bladt), house boat, East Bay Avenue, Olympia, Wash.
1068 Mat Bolick (Belick, Matt Bellick, Mat Belick), camp No. 1, Bordeaux, Wash.
1686 John Boug, camp No. 1, Bordeaux, Wash.
118 Jack Earl Branch (alias Foley), Olympia, Wash.
1265 or 1266 Carl John Carlson (Carlsonn), Delphi, Wash.
1443 William Albert DuRocheu (DuRocher, W. A. DuRocher), camp No. 4, Bordeaux, Wash.
971 Ole Ness Egge, general delivery, Olympia, Wash.
584 Floyd Heintzelman, R. F. D., Olympia, Wash.
799 Joel M. Hoglund, Rochester, Wash.
986 Jesse (Jessie) Jackson, Union Mills, Wash.
80 William H. (Wm. H., Wm.) Jacobson, Union Mills, Wash.
1120 Homer Hiram Jonus (Imus, Jmus), Rochester, Wash.
22 Amos Lampineau (Arthur Hansen, Amas Lampinean, Armas Lampinean), Tenino, Wash.
700 Albert Mattson, camp No. 7, Bordeaux, Wash.
1006 Ray (Roy) Moore, 1402 Lester Avenue, Olympia, Wash.
754 Jack Murray, Seattle (Tenino), Wash.
21 Courtney S. (Sherman) Payton, care of A. L. Brown farm, Nisqually, Wash.
914 Christ Peter (Christ Pete, Crist Pete), 501 King Street, Seattle (Delphi), Wash.
568 John Askel (Johan Aksel, Johon Askel) Pienimaki, Wausau Tean, Little Rock, Wash.
1294 Sam Popovech (Popovich, Poporesch), McIntosh, Wash.
1686 Adi Puro (Pero), 116 Fourth Avenue South, Seattle, Wash.
824 John Godfred Schuhart (John Godfred Schuchart), care of Fir Tree Lumber Co., 4048 McQuine Street, Tacoma, Wash.
299 William Scila, camp 4, Bordeaux, Wash.
1631 Charles R. Smith, 427 Cherry Street, Olympia, Wash.
1189 William J. Smith, Bordeaux, Wash.
1696 John (Tom) Surma, McIntosh, Wash. (John Sunkwic, Sinkwic, Allen House, Olympia, Wash.).
1408 Larry Vern Tallant, Sixth and Columbia Streets, Olympia, Wash. (Laury Verne Tallant, corner Columbia and Sixth Streets, Olympia, Wash.).
783 Wm. Franklin Thompson, Sixth and Columbia Streets, Olympia, Wash.
1632 Leon James Warner, route No. 3, Olympia, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF YAKIMA, CITY OF YAKIMA, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

2139 Joe Frizzo, Ricaoso Veicenza, Italy (United States Reclamation Service, Tieton Canyon, near Naches, Wash.).
2770 Ralph B. Gordon, Sydney Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
4623a John Elmer Hollmeyer, Yakima, Wash.
2683a Oscar Hanson (Hansen), Selah, Wash. (Selah, Wash.).
4597a Edmund Vance Hastings (Edmund Hastings), Panama Hotel, Yakima, Wash.
1383a John Christopher Hogan, route No. 1, Granger, Yakima, Wash.
1237a John Richard Johnson, Toppenish, Wash.
3660 Walter Johnson, N. P. bridge carpenter, North Yakima, Wash. (Dawson Springs, Ky.).
862 Lee Ah Kim, 125 South Front Street, North Yakima, Wash.
6787a Harry Leeroy Kimball, 115 North Second Street, Yakima, Wash.
716 Rex George Laird, 15½ South Third Street, North Yakima, Wash.
2812 W. T. McGuire, 413 East Second Street, Fremont, Nebr. (Willis McGuire, Moxee City, Wash., 451 East Second Street, Fremont, Nebr.).
2908 Gordon (Gradon) Roy McKinney, R. F. D. No. 1, Granger, Wash.
4409a George Henry Martin, South Topp Avenue, Toppenish, Wash. (Topponish).
5399a Kohochi Matsumuro, 5 East Chestnut Street, Yakima, Wash.
3021 John Pearl Murphy, Outlook, Wash.
4809a Edward Chiks Nasu, White Swan, Wash. (E. C. Nasu, Chika).
5283a Rosario Pantoza (Panteya), Yakima, Wash.

8786 John Rasiani (Raziani), Granger, Wash. (Wapato, No. 2, Wash.).
3318a Charles Louis Ratto, North Fourth Avenue, Yakima, Wash. (Fourth Avenue, House, Yakima, Wash., Wilcox Rooms, Yakima, Wash.).
420a George William Ross, Moxee City, Wash.
2179a Joe Santos (Santoes), North Yakima, Wash.
4678a Edward Rudolph Achelpohl, 4½ Eyak Avenue, Yakima (4½ East Yakima Avenue, Yakima), Wash.
4279 Charles (Charlie) Harry Allen, general delivery, Yakima, Wash.
1717 Frank Allender, N. P. bridge carpenter, North Yakima, Wash. (Prairie Pipe Line Co., Yates, Center, Kans., Tulsa, Okla.).
2598 Maurice Ayde, route No. 5, North Yakima, Wash.
2595a Andrew Bertalan, 1514 Roosevelt Avenue, Yakima, Wash.
8174a Clarence M. Bird, White Swan, Wash.
830 Edgar Burdett Bly (E. B. Bly), Columbia Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
1853 Paul E. Brower, Wapato, Wash.
2019 Geo. Henry Browne, Sunnyside, Wash.
922 Joseph (Joe) Butcher, Empire Hotel, North Yakima, Wash. (care of deputy collector of customs, Calexico, Calif.).
2750 Wallace Robert Deery (W. R. Deery), Granger, Wash.
2546 Will Deese, Salisbury, N. C. (care of Diamond Lumber Co., camp No. 5, Ontonagon, Mich.).
649 Alvin Edward Donohoe, 127 North Front Street, North Yakima, Wash.
1340 Earl Graham Doughty, route No. 4, Yakima, Wash. (718 Terrace Avenue, Aberdeen, Wash.).
8764 George Cariveau, White Swan, Wash. (Sydney Hotel, Yakima, Wash.).
324 Carl Elmer Carlson, Selah, Wash.
3045 Walter Percy Church, route No. 5, North Yakima, Wash.
967a Sam Clyn, Melbourne, Australia (general delivery, Yakima, Wash.).
383 Ray Lloyd Collins, Sidney, Nebr.
4532 James Stewart Conway, Michigan Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
2107 Herbert Dean Corbin, Pacific Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
3970 John James Corrigan, Panama Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
3989 Theodore Foss, Sunnyside, Wash.
504 Fred Schneckenburg, North Yakima, Wash.
2882 Vance Searle, Sidney Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
4814a Loukas Simantieas (Simentiras), Lennox Hotel, Yakima, Wash.
3531a Charles Theodore Smith, R. F. D. No. 1, Toppenish (Yakima), Wash.
4626a Ellis Niel (Neel) Smith, 303 South Third Avenue, Yakima, Wash.
4422 William Paul Stewart, Roma Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
3565 Eli Stibas (Strobas), North Yakima, Wash.
3396 Henry Culland Sullivan, Elk Hotel, South First Street, North Yakima, Wash.
1573 Axel Swanson, Naches, Wash.
5499a Buchard Symmonds, Grand Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.
1140 Jay Tagg, Wenas, Wash.
285 Earl John Titus, 615½ South First Street, Yakima, Wash.
1644 William Joseph Turner, Northern Pacific Railroad Yards, North Yakima, Wash.
3578 Sam Tychsen, Wapato, Wash.
5201a Russell Van Fossen, Yakima, Wash.
4454a George Dewey Waldron, route No. 3, box 23, Yakima, Wash.
2691 James White, White Swan, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SHERIDAN, STATE OF WYOMING.

2999 John E. Mortenson (Martinson), Scobey, Mont.
507 Knut (Knute) Severson, Poplar (Popular), Mont.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF SWEETWATER, STATE OF WYOMING.

1608 Earl William Gray, guard, Union Pacific Railroad, Granger, Wyo.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF BELLINGHAM, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

758 Frederick Stanley Burnet, 314½ West Holly Street, Bellingham, Wash.
1026a William David Curtis, 2200 North Street West, Bellingham, Wash. (Kerrisdale, British Columbia).
24a Arthur Joseph DeYoung, Savoy Hotel, Bellingham, Wash.
1336 Alford Thjorbjono (Alfred Thjorbjom) Erickson, 310 Ohio, Bellingham, Wash.
124 James Worthington Ferguson (Eagle Hotel, C, Bellingham, Wash. (Eureka Hotel, Chestnut and Railroad Avenue, Bellingham, Wash.).
1677 Frank D. Fielder (Fiedler), 311 Grand Avenue, Bellingham, Wash.
800 Stewart Folkerth (Solirth), 1130 Sixteenth Street, Bellingham, Wash.
1780a William Thomas (T.) Guyton, 700 West Holly, Bellingham, Wash.
1524 Anton Arvid (A.) Hagman, 2206 East, Bellingham, Wash.
995 Edgar Hangen (Haugen), 1616 Humbolt, Bellingham, Wash.
289a Ellis Byron (B.) Hughes, Savoy Hotel, Bellingham, Wash.
1933a Olaf Johnson, Albany Hotel, Dock and Chestnut L., Bellingham, Wash.
171 Albert Fred Klueter (Kleuter), 2621 Iron, Bellingham, Wash.
1490 Knut Knutson, Chestnut and Dock, Royal Hotel, Bellingham, Wash.
1469 Anton Kordich (Kordick), 1190 Gamble Street, Bellingham, Wash. (811 Tenth Street, Bellingham, Wash.).
680a Angus McCaulay, 1117 Seventeenth Street, Bellingham, Wash. (Angus Allan (Allen) MacAuley, Chuckanut Canning Co., South Bellingham, Wash.
1718 Edward McKinney (Edw. M. McKinney), 505½ West Holly, Bellingham, Wash.
133 John Maudsley, 309 North, Bellingham, Wash.
1068 Oscar Nelson, 1315½ Dock, Bellingham, Wash.
827 Bernard Reynolds, 2309 Walnut, Bellingham, Wash.
1159 Giacomo Rossi, 1310 Iowa, Bellingham, Wash. (1926 James Street, Bellingham, Wash.).
1376 Peter Stone, 202 Chestnut, Bellingham, Wash. (general delivery, North Yakima, Wash.).
281 Angelos Vassos, 309 Flora, Bellingham, Wash. (722 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
1853 Frank Welford, steamship *Winber*, Bellingham, Wash. (Fred (Frank) Wilford, care of P. A. F. Co., *Winber*).
1698 Kelly Whbey (Uhbey, Wobey), 601½ West Holly Street, Bellingham, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR CITY OF EVERETT, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1715 Lawrence L. (League) Abercrombie, 3409 Broadway, Everett, Wash.
85 Erick Augustus (Augustinus, A.) Anderson, 2511 East Grand, Everett, Wash.
1618 George Washington Barton, 3421½ Broadway, Everett, Wash.
102 Alkiviadis Bellos (Alkivadis Bellas), 1807 Hewitt, Everett, Wash.
2050 Earl Cain, Station A, Everett, Wash. (Havre, Mont.).
353 Wm. John Callahan (Callahen), 1827 Virginia, Everett, Wash.
928 Albert Carl Carlson, 2625 Rockefeller Avenue, Everett, Wash.
1432 Argirs (Argvis) Condinos, 3201 Hewitt, Everett, Wash.
1917a Harry Cooke, Everett, Wash. (care of local board No. 3, Portland, Oreg.).
1316 Benjamin Harrison Davis, 2809½ Rucker, Everett, Wash.
1440 Tom (T.) F. Elliott, Everett, Wash.
1587 Jewel F. Follenius, Colby, Everett, Wash. (303 North Rodney, Helena, Mont.).
738 Traintafilos (Triantafilos, Triantsfilos) Harros, 2808½ Oakes Avenue, Everett, Wash. (1717 Hewitt Avenue, Everett, Wash.).
1146 Jan (J.) Van Der Dock, 2514 Rucker, Everett, Wash.
137 Walter D. Hyer, 2920 Norton, Everett, Wash.
997 William Jackson, 3522 Colby, Everett, Wash.
457 Carl Gunnar (Gumnar) Johanson, Everett, Wash.
258 Fred Johnson, Dolphin Hotel, Everett, Wash.
496 John Adolph Johnson, 2511 East Grand, Everett, Wash.
744 John Edward Josefson (John Josefson), 3405 Kromer, Everett, Wash.
1979 Roy Calvin Lloyd, 3615 Friday, Everett, Wash.
1258 James McDonald, Bayview Hotel, Bond Street, Everett, Wash.
919 Daniel Sankey (S.) McKinney, 1805 Wall, Everett, Wash.
876 Max Herman Maire, Grand View Hotel, Everett, Wash.
1118 Peter Cornelius Monstad, 3528 Lombard Avenue, Everett, Wash.
1714 Jack Allison Murry, steamer *Verona*, care of City Dock, Everett, Wash.
1214 Carl Enoch Ohland (Ohlund), 1502 Grand, Everett, Wash.
509 Ole Olson (Olaf Olson), tug *Olympic*, Everett, Wash.
582 Paul Olson (Olsen), box 998, Everett, Wash.
360 Nickolas Pothoras (Potharas), 2205 Norton, Everett, Wash.
86 Floyd Price, 1309½ Hewitt, Everett, Wash. (general delivery, Tacoma, Wash.).
1036 Henry Adolph Redmann (Henry A. Redman), 2715 State Street, Everett, Wash.
1237 Fred Robertson, 2814 Grand Avenue, Everett, Wash.
527 Edw. Rubberg, 2222 State, Everett, Wash.
1753a Clarence Herman Slosson, Minnesota Hotel, Everett, Wash. (Clarence Slosson, 461 Keefer Street, Vancouver, British Columbia).
819 Roth L. Smith, Everett, Wash.
1876 William Edw. Spencer (W. E. Spencer), Bayview Hotel, Everett, Wash.
1973 John Stamatopoulos, 2205 Norton, Everett, Wash.
1032a Edward Turner, Everett, Wash.
1324 Marinus Von Yperson, 2526 Rucker Avenue, Everett, Wash. (Marimes Van Yperen, box 392, Lynden, Wash.).
606 Louis Austin Wilbert, 2928 Wetmore, Everett, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION 1, COUNTY OF GRAYS HARBOR, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

143 Andrew Regmus (Ragmar) Alfredson (Andrew R. J. Alfredson), McCleary, Wash.
1554 Carl O. Alfredson (Carl Oscar Alfredson), McCleary, Wash.
343 Carl Backman (Beckman), Elma, Wash.
792 Chas. H. Beale (Beals), Cosmopolis, Wash.
344 Harry Brown, Ferdinand, Ind.
677 Edward George Burkston, Stevensville, Wash. (Stearnsville, Wash.).
82 James Burns, Melbourne, Wash.
1048 Nels Johan Carlson, Polson Camp 8, Wash. (Polson Camp 8, Humptulip, Wash.)
544 Henry J. Caron, general delivery, San Francisco, Calif. (Aloha, Wash.).
1343 Wm. R. Carter, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1640 Angel (Angel H.) Chalos, Elma, Wash.
323 Charles C. Clark (Charles Cleveland Clark), Montesano, Wash.
1744 William Coffey, Satsop, Wash.
38 John Wesley Dawn (J. W. Dawn), 1035 Lex Street, Covington, Ky.
1539 Georgies Evangelon Ferlios (Georgios Evangelon Ferlias), Elma, Wash.
53 James LeRoy Green, Cosmopolis, Wash.
737 Louis Green (Lewis Greene), McCleary, Wash.
852 Ira Oscar Hardin, care Carson Lumber Co., Mineral, Wash. (Hordin, Rural Free Delivery, Elma, Wash.)
1697 Wm. Livingston Holmes, general delivery, Spokane, Wash.
1525 Frank Howart (Frank Harwart), Whites, Wash.
313 Harvey Parker Hubler, Bay City, Wash.
86 Edgar Bruce Hughes, Niocleps, Wash.
45 Erick Johnson, 306 East Heron Street, Aberdeen, Wash.
676 Robert Sigfid Johnson (Ronert Sigfried Johnson), Camp 5, Matlock, Wash.
375 Wm. John Jordon, Cosmopolis, Wash.
405 Maurice Eugene Kelly, Rural Free Delivery, Elma, Wash.
432 Allen Kilgers, First and F Streets, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1088 Wm. Kilpatrick, McCleary, Wash. (268 Third Street, Portland, Oreg.)
785 Harry Kuhn (Kuhu), First, between G and H Streets, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1104 Walter Lynne, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1455 Fred Lyons, Renton, Wash.
333 Charles Walter McDonald, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1832 T. Leonard Miller, McCleary, Wash. (Bostwick Hotel, Tacoma, Wash.)
558 Elmer Morris, First, between G and H Streets, Cosmopolis, Wash. (Basin, Mont.).
1382 Pat O'Cannell (Patrick O'Connell), Bay City, Wash.
1242 Tom Reilly, Walla Walla, Wash.
1646 Clarence Renfraw (Renfrau), Fifth and I Street, Cosmopolis, Wash.
999 Charles Robbins, Aloha, Wash.
251 Alli Muhammed Roshan (Mohammed Roshau), McCleary, Wash.
803 John Franklin Rowley, Aberdeen, Wash.

85 Harvey Joseph Satanas, Chehalis Reservation, Oakville, Wash.
705 Leopaldo Selpasion, Fifth and I Streets, Cosmopolis, Wash.
1420 Geo. Tedoff, Carlisle, Wash.
1429 John M. Triestedt (Friestedt), Sioux City, Iowa.
472 Leonard Sigfried (Sigfrid) Tulberg (Tullberg), Polson Camp 4, Hoquiam, Wash.
768 William Turner, R. F. D. 1, Elma, Wash.
664 Chester Clarence White, general delivery, Puyallup, Wash. (Lenton, Oreg.).
339 Gustav Wiborg, Carlisle, Wash.
230 Timotheus Skilevetis (Timotheas Sklavenetis), Elma, Wash.
1626 William A. Vormelker (Wm. Andrew Vormelker), Hobert, Wash.
749 Emil Wakto (Emil Walto), E. P. Hotel, Broadway, Tacoma, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF GRAYS HARBOR, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1978 Rachmet Ali, 703½ 23, Hoquiam, Wash.
2534 Carl Adolf (Adolph) Anderson, 2633 Pacific Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash. (Bay View Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.).
1516 Ybarre Antonio (Antonio Ybearra, Ybarra), Eagle rooming house, Hoquiam, Wash.).
1382 Charles Bacon, Aberdeen, Wash.
2702 Peter Baschinkski (Boschinski), 420 Heron Street, Aberdeen, Wash.
163 John (Johan) Blomberk, 700 East Market, Aberdeen, Wash.
1128 Jesse (Jessie) Albert Bower, Camp No. 2, Wishkah Water Project, Aberdeen, Wash.
25(28a) Dale Brock, Bay City Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.
2525 Algot Damel (Algat Daniel) Carlson, Aberdeen, Wash.
866 Andrew Carlson, 317 L, Hoquiam, Wash.
333 Earl Edward (E. E.) Caton, Aberdeen, Wash.
1860 Louis Clark Chapin, Northwestern Hotel, Hoquiam, Wash. general delivery, Sumas, Wash.).
2495 Harry E. (Harry) Chase, Hoquiam, Wash.
2135 Leonard Coffee, 321½ South G, Aberdeen, Wash.
1785 John Collins (Collin), 2404 Aberdeen Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.
1568 T. Deluco, Grace Hotel, Duluth, Minn. (Tuner Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.).
1113 Arthur B. Dollar, Savoy Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.
2089 Thomas H. English, 313 South F, Aberdeen, Wash.
2666 Olof Reinhold (Olaf Reinhold) Forsgren, 1310 East Hoquiam, Wash.
2487 Herbert Clayton Gage, 721 Hill Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.
115 Frank Gallagher, Aberdeen Lbr. & Shingle Co., Aberdeen, Wash.
2312 Albert Edgar (A. E.) Gerard, 154 Oliver, Waldon, Mass.
1928 Leland Getcher (Gotcher), 215 Eighth Street, Hoquiam, Wash. (Tacoma, Wash.).
1214 Dominick Greteus (Gootheus, Grethens, Grethens), Sargent Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.
2403 Erick Jno. (Johan) Albert Granstrom (Grantstrom, Grundstrom), Robinson, Minn.
1636 Ernest Handeln (Handelin), 518 East M, Aberdeen, Wash.
203 Fred Haynes, Grant Hotel, Aberdeen, Wash.
712 Eric L. Haselblade, 915 West Heron, Aberdeen, Wash.
867 Otto Sigfrid Hendrickson, 709 East Seventh Street, Aberdeen, Wash. (4 No. Third Street, Portland, Oreg.).
1250 Albert Sidney Johnson, Glenwood Hotel, I Street, Hoquiam, Wash.
626 Ernest Johnson, 518 Market, Aberdeen, Wash. (Fifty-ninth Street, Seattle, Wash.).
407 Nestor Konela (Nestav Kahala, Nesbor, Nestor Kahala), 912 East Wishkah, Aberdeen, Wash.
989 Justus (Jutus) Kataja, Aloho, Wash.
1454 Bert Kelly, Connor rooming house, Hoquiam, Wash.
764 Geo. Krsticevick (Krsticevich, Krsticivich), 300 Herman Street, Aberdeen, Wash.
2032 John Lagger (Legger), Wishkah Road, Aberdeen, Wash.
371 Phil S. (Phil Sheridan) Lesh, 112½ West Hume, Aberdeen, Wash. (111½ West Bume).
5068 Warner Lindblom, Outlook, Mont.
1245 Vide Landic (Vido Gandic), 306 West King, Aberdeen, Wash.
122 Alex (Axel) Hjalmer Loff, 2418 Queets Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.
1065 Farns J. (Johnar) Lotonan, Markham, Wash.
644 Ivan (Ivon) Charles Merrell, Hillsboro, Oreg. (Hillsboro Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.).
378 John W. (John Williard) Miller, Portland, Oreg.
1389 Joe Milkovich (Jeo (Geo) Milovich), 210 West Hume, Aberdeen, Wash.
92 Carl Oscar Nelson (Carl Nelson), 911 Eklund, Hoquiam, Wash.
1625 Einer Joner (Einar Jover) Nelson, St. Joseph's Hospital, No. G, Aberdeen, Wash.
13 Hjalmar Johan Ostrom (Johan Hjalmar Ostman), 317 L, Hoquiam, Wash.
957 Alfred Otth, 2214 Simpson, Hoquiam, Wash.
2248 Carl (C.) Owings, 410½ East Wishkah, Aberdeen, Wash.
998 Harry (J.) Julius Peterson, Aberdeen, Wash.
973 Jack Phillips (Phillips), c/o Skinner & Eddy, Seattle, Wash. (Oxford Hotel, Heron Street, Aberdeen, Wash.).
1522 Howard L. Robinson, 2620 Cherry east, Hoquiam, Wash.
906 Riley Martin Schofner, Washington Hotel, Hoquiam, Wash.
2706 Erik Edward Smilter (Smulter), Riverside, Hoquiam, Wash.
2124 Lars Johan Sorensen, 1005 East First, Aberdeen, Wash.
1316 Carl Albert Swanson, Aberdeen, Wash.
138a Natendad Tabor (Tobar, Natividad Tobar), general delivery, Aberdeen, Wash.
1019 Wm. Thomas, 627 Lincoln, Hoquiam, Wash.
357a John Tirkonen, 101 Clark Street, Aberdeen, Wash.
508 G. Vlahov (Grgo Vcahov, Vlahov), 836 I Street, Hoquiam, Wash.
701 Frank (H.) Hugh Ward, Hotel Yester, Seattle, Wash.
2570 Levi West, 306 East First, Aberdeen, Wash.
1213 Raulin Retherford Whitehouse, 212½ Eighth, Hoquiam, Wash.
199 Victor Wirta, 712½ East Wishkah, Aberdeen, Wash.
1555 Charles Woodyard, Northwestern Rooming House, Hoquiam, Wash.
2229 James Woodyard, Northwestern Rooming House, Hoquiam, Wash.
822 Daniel (Daneal) Espedal, 1009 East First, Aberdeen, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF KING, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1906 Conrad Anderson, Minilia Hotel, Everett, Wash.
894 Edward Anderson (E. Anderson), Clear Lake, Wash.
2069 Emil Anderson, Monroe, Wash.
2000 Frank Anderson, Renton, Wash.
1766 Halfdan S. Arneson (Halfdan Severir Arneson), Burge, Norway.
3461a Moorman White Baldwin, North Bend, King County, Wash.
2674a Frederick Bane, Skykomist, King, Wash.
20 Edward Sterling Barrett, Duvall, Wash.
5271a Richard Francis Bennetts (Richard F. Bennett), R. F. D. No. 1, Kirkland, King, Wash.
2489 Joseph Boicern, Edgewick, Wash.
1664a Walter Lee Bothell, third house from school, Bothell, Wash.
3640a Stephen Botico, 35 Place 311, Chicago, Ill. (25 Place, Chicago, Ill.).
2841 Andrew Carlson, Washington Hotel, North Bend, Wash.
768 Charles Carlson (Charles Carbon), Kirkland, Route 2, Wash.
1353 Samuel Albert Chamberlain, Tolt, Wash.
3672a Oscar Lafayette Childers (Oscar Layfette Childers), R. F. D. No. 2, Seattle, King, Wash.
4032a Norman Edwin Crooks, R. F. D. No. 6, box 208, Seattle, King, Wash.
1611 Charles Edward Daniell (Chas. Edward Daniell), Alpine, Wash.
4463a1 Henry Droge, R. F. D., Monroe, Wash.
2129 Elbert Elliott (Elbert Elliot), Cedar Falls, Wash.
2198 Frank Fisher, High Point, Wash.
1241a Elmer Axel Fyr, Duvall, Wash.
4 Herbert Gaffney, 930 Seventh Illinois Street, Lyons, Iowa.
1339 Jim Gale, Kerriston, Wash.
2461 Baptist Ginsiano (Baptiste Fuisiano, Baptiste Ginsiano), Newcastle, Wash.
1857 Theodore M. Globus (T. M. Globus), Barnestown, Wash.
424 Cecil Earl Griffin, Fall Creek, Oreg.
2024 Harry Oliver Guinn, Cedar Falls, Wash.
4160a William Hayden, R. F. D. No. 2, box 44, Kirkland, King, Wash. (R. D. No. 2, box 44, Kirkland, Wash.).
429 James Hutchison, R. F. D. No. 2, box 155-B, Seattle, Wash.
932 Daniel Jones, Bellevue, Wash.
283 Ellis Johnson, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash.
4872a Robert Johnson (Robt. Johnson), R. F. D. 1, Bellevue, King, Wash.
831 Robert Jones, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash.
4205a Rudolph Leroy Jones, 2, box 23, Renton, Wash. (Rudolph Jones, R. D. No. 2, box 23, Renton, Wash.).
3637a Peter Kabor, mail, Skagit Log & Boom, Cedar Falls, Wash. (Peter Kabur, Chicago, Ill.).
1746 Charles Radford Kearney, East Seattle, Wash.
1932 Julius Koblenser, Barneston, Wash. (care of Kent Lumber Co., Barneston, Wash.).
477 Ole Larson Lillestoll (Ole Larsen Lillestol, Ole Larson Lillestoe), Edgewick, Wash.
4161a Floyd Thomas Lapp (Floyd Lapp, Floyd Thomas Lapp), Snoqualmie, Wash.
4268a Charles McDonald (Charles MacDonald), Snoqualmie Falls, Wash.
4432a Harry Jos. Martin (Harry Joseph Martin), San Jose, Santa Clara, Calif.
475 Earl Franklin Mason, R. F. D. No. 2, box 328 (Ninety-third and Aurora), Seattle.
582 Uno Mattback, Newcastle, Wash.
4777a Claude Freeman Mattice (C. F. Mattice), R. F. D. 6, Seattle, King, Wash.
657 Tony Meyers, West Seattle 5422-20 West Seattle, King, Wash.
1795a Alford Minniard, past address in United States, Hobert, Wash. (Alford Miniard, present address, Lotus Hotel, Vancouver, British Columbia).
2167 Edward Peter Moore, Richmond Beach, Wash.
1612 David E. Morgan, Kenwood, R. F. D. No. 6, Seattle (202, box 316).
4619a Meldren Morris, R. F. D. No. 1, box 284, Seventy-fifth and East Fortieth, Seattle, Wash. (Melvin Morris, box 284, Route 1, Seattle, Wash.).
218 Stanley Edward Morse, Lake Forest Park, R. F. D. No. 6, Wash. (R. F. D. 6, Seattle, Wash.).
750 John Nakymen (John Makynen, John Mokynen), Newcastle, Wash.
2579 John Baptiste Newtens, Duval, Wash.
1266 Charles O'Leary (Chas. O'Leary), Skykomish, Wash.
1925 Charles Ulric Phiben (Chas. Ulric Phiben), Snoqualmie, Wash.
3789a James Potts, box 357, No. 2, Seattle (King), Wash.
3974a Pat John O'Neill (Pat J. O'Neill), Skykomish (King), Wash.
907 Albert Richert, Cedar Falls, Wash.
1270 Wayne Edwin Rogers, 8503 Wallingford Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
4731a Eschael J. Saylers (Eschael J. Salyers), Williams, Teton, Mont.
1388 Felix Richard Schroer, Riverside, N. J.
865 Adolph Carl Schultz (Adolph Carl Schultze), North Bend, Wash.
2345 Henry Charles Scott, Issaquah, Wash.
1936 Henry Smith, 811 Maynard Street, Seattle, Wash. (Scenic, Wash.).
816 Ray Spurgeon, 2303 Wilson Street, South Bellingham, Wash. (Ray Spurgion, 2303 Wilson Street, South Bellevue, Wash.)
1845 Harold Stogsdiel (Harold Stogsdill), Hobard, Wash.
1139 Jacob Werner Sund, Newcastle, Wash.
2056 Pete Suttle (Pete Duttle), Pittsfield, Mass.
641 Karl Swanson, camp 2, Woodinville, R. L., Wash. (Woodinville, Wash.)
2549 Nels Swanson, Kerriston (Keriston), Wash.
1850 Suyeo Terashi, Chisan, Japan. (Sueya (Suyeo) Terashi, Skykomish, Wash.)
1386 Morris Ruben Waite, Eighty-fifth Street W. and Thirty-second Avenue NW., Seattle, Wash.
177 Raymond Howard Wheeler, R. F. D. No. 2, box 328, Ninety-third and Aurora (R. F. D. No. 2, box 328), Seattle, Wash.
586 Jonas Wichasterson (J. Wichstrom), Kerriston, Wash.
1343 Dan Wickard, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash.
1039 Richard Wylie, 301 Maynard Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1444 Bortolo Zanoni (Bortola Zanoni), Renton, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF KITTITAS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

49 Joseph Due, Kittitas, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF KITSAP, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1041 Everett Stephens Bevins, Port Gamble, Wash.
1371 Sigurd Levin Birkland, Park Madison, Wash.
659 Frank Burk, Port Gamble, Wash.
953 Homer Leo Darling, Port Gamble, Wash.
1390 Joseph Ross Denny, Oxford Hotel, Bremerton, Wash. (Twentieth and Stout Streets, care of Mercedes Apartment, Portland, Oreg.).

102 (102a) Frank Duber, 1037 Warren, Bremerton, Wash.
275 Claude Harold Emerson (Clyde Harold Emerson), Port Gamble, Wash.
109 George Farrell, post office box 501, Bremerton, Wash.
809a (809b) Fred Fowler, Seqewamish, Wash. (Suquamish, Wash.).
1802a Fritz Grote, Port Blakely, Wash.
1016 Otto John Horn, Port Orchard, Wash.
299 Otto Larsen Jerdet (Otto Larson Jerdet), 8–B, wired from New York City (1330 First Avenue, box 56, Seattle, Wash.).
1006½ Frank Arthur Johnston (Fred Arthur Johnston), Port Gamble, Wash.
1008 Richard Dunham Karr (R. D. Karr), 645 Burwell Avenue, Bremerton, Wash.
1376 James Blaine Kerby (James Blaine Kirby, J. B. Kirby), Tenth and High, Bremerton, Wash.
1523 Tom A. Lindberg, 210½ Front, Bremerton, Wash.
254 Charles Edward Mason (Chas. Edward Mason), Port Gamble, Wash.
341 Albert Louis Miller, Silverdale, Wash.
244 Clifford Morris Nelson (Clifford Moris Nelson), Paulsbo, Wash.
378 Lars Opdahl, Paulsbo, Wash.
1144 Peter Alfred Pederson, Paulsbo, Wash. (removed to Dutchess, Alberta, Canada).
688 Anton Ramsey, Port Orchard, Wash. (Anton L. Ramsey, rural free delivery No. 2, East Stanwood, Wash.).
1385 Arthur Usitalo, route No. 1, Paulsbo, Wash.
489 Claude Henry Wheeler (C. H. Wheeler), Port Orchard, Wash.
889 Joseph Kitchell Wilson, 615 Washington, Bremerton, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF LEWIS, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

467 Robert Herman Ambanen (Robt. H. Ambanen), Pe Ell, Wash.
3509a Frank D. Baggenstos (Frank Domini Boggenstos), Pe Ell, Wash.
4008a Leo Edward Baranowicz, Adna, Wash.
69 Gilbert (Gilberto) Bertoluccl, Bunker, Wash.
2580 J. Adam Bezemer (Jay Adam Bezemer), Ethel, Wash.
225 Willard Bowen (Willard H. Bowen, W. H. Bowen), Mossy Rock, Wash.
1213 Major Boyd, Mineral, Wash. (Chehalis, Wash.).
1427a Edward T. Brown (Edward Thomas Brown), 302 East Pine Street, Centralia, Wash.
573 Harold Walter Brown, R. F. D. 1, Chehalis, Wash.
2717 Lawrence H. Buchanan (Lawrence Harvey Buchanan), Bunker, Wash.
450 Fred Burleson, Wader, Wash.
841 Silvio Caramell, McCormick, Wash.
90a Bert W. Caron (Bert Caron, Caron), care of S. W. Porter, Eveline, Wash.
2015a Charles S. Chase (Charles Samuel Chase), Toroda, Wash. (Toledo, Wash.).
1049a John J. Chili (John Joseph Chilia), Pe Ell, Wash.
409 Theodore Cole, 621 South Tower Street, Centralia, Wash.
1840 James G. Collins (James Galveston Blaine Collins), 969 Chehalis Avenue, Chehalis, Wash.
2731 Nick Dafnes (Dafner), Onalaska, Wash.
34 Nels Ferdinand Dahlberg, Lindberg, Wash.
2693a Ralph Chester Dicken (R. C. Dicken, A. D. Picken), Centralia, Wash.
2475 Costas P. Ducas (Costas (Custus) Peter Ducas), Busy Bee Café, Centralia, Wash.
288a John Dugger (John David Dugger), R. F. D. 2, Winlock, Wash.
226 Elmer J. Duprey (Elmer Joe Duprey, Elmer Duprey), Alpha, Wash.
974 George Earl Eyler, general delivery, Centralia, Wash.
1217 John Filis (John Filia, Filio), R. F. D., Centralia, Wash.
1823 George Finki (Finni, Findra, Findro), Centralia, Wash.
2622 George W. Ford (George Wilbur Ford), 115 East First Street (115 East Pearl Street), Centralia, Wash.
1019 Oscar Fredman, Independence, Wash.
1089 John Frechlick (Froehlech, Fraehlich), McCormick, Wash.
2078a James E. Gale, Mineral, Wash.
1455 Howard George Grout (Grant), Onalaska, Wash.
62 Frank Carl Hall, Oroville, Calif.
3472a Louis Hansen, Winlock, Wash.
1140 James A. Hawkins (James Archie Hawkins), Napavine, Wash.
2645 Nick Hill, 620½ North Tower Street, Centralia, Wash.
187 Edward A. Hinan (Edward Andrew Hinan, Edward Hinnan), Onalaska, Wash.
565a Frank A. Hinks (Frank Albert Hinks), State prison, San Quentin, Calif. (Centralia, Wash.).
1932 Kokichci Hirano, Nobeoka, Japan.
1372 Harvey (Harvy) Hostettler, 616 Franklin Street, Chehalis, Wash.
1162 Arthur P. Hubbard (Arthur Phelan Hubbard), Tower Avenue, Centralia, Wash.
807 William Hunt, Glenonia, Wash.
2727a Earl Hunter, Knowlton, Wash.
1605a Ben James, 307½, Centralia, Wash. (Tacoma, Wash.).
20a George W. Johnson (George Wm. Johnson), Ninth Street, Chehalis, Wash.
586 Otto Johnson, Independence, Wash.
2381 Martin Julseth, McCormick, Wash.
14 Guy Keene, Glenoma, Wash.
1284 Elmer Keholo (Koholo), Independence, Wash.
2612a Clifford Kettleson (Kettelson), Onalaska, Wash.
4428a Peter Kraemer, Littell, Wash.
2657 John Kurtti, White Salmon, Wash.
39 Otto Laukkarinen, Malone, Wash.
1896a Robert Dewey Long, care of T. J. Long, Chehalis, Wash.
36a Jesse L. Morris, Centralia, Wash. (Jessie L. Morris, Jessie Morris), Travelers Hotel, Vancouver, British Columbia).
934a James B. Morrison, Centralia, Wash.
2643 John E. Mukka (John Errison Mukka), Centralia, Wash.
2372 James Nelson, Oroville, Wash.
1172a Charles Pekola, McCormick, Wash.
1180a Pietro Piercami, McCormick, Wash.
1879 John Puippo (Prippo), R. D. 2, Box 82, Rochester, Wash.
630 Mike Rakich, McCormick, Wash.
856 Floyd Rector, Bunker, Wash.
170 Robert E. Reforetre (Robert Erwin Reforetre), Chehalis, Wash.
1807 Christopher A. Reinks, (Christopher August Reinks), Olds, Alberta, Canada.
1632a George F. Reinsan (George Frederick Reimann), Alpha, Wash.
2175 Pete Resick (Pete Resich), Winlock, Wash.
1024 Jake Roberson, Doty, Wash.
1663a Fred J. Rosebrock (Fred James Rosebrock), R. F. D. 2, Chehalis, Wash.
2602 Karllo Michael (Mikael) Rullo, Littell, Wash.
37 Rudolph G. Salo (Rudolph Salo, Solo), Castlerock, Wash.
848 George B. Schacht (George Benjamin Schacht, George Benjamin Schact), 409 or 489 South Washington Street, Centralia, Wash.
2379 Ernest Schwanke, 791 Prindle Street, Chehalis, Wash.
2780 Julius Schwanke, 791 Prindle Street (871 Prindle Street), Chehalis, Wash.
1403 James W. Slinger (James Wilbur Slinger), Mineral, Wash.
1821 Charles Smith, Waiville, Wash.
2125 Floyd Smith, Forest Wash.
189a L. S. Bowers (Leonard Southmore Sowers), 759 Jefferson Street, Chehalis, Wash.
997 Sylandt Paul Spain, 408½ North Tower Street, Centralia, Wash.
2574a Ernest J. Stincel (Stencil), 669 New York Avenue, Chehalis, Wash.
2396 Jesse E. Swan, 502 North Gold Street, Centralia, Wash.
627 Pietro Torre (Torre Pietro), general delivery, Centralia, Wash.
1880 S. S. Michael Watala (Stin Sthure Michael Aantala, Stin Schum Michael Amatala), Adna, Wash.
1013 Ralph Wilson, Mayfield, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY OF SEATTLE, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

441 Thomas Anderson, 5130 Trinity Place, Seattle, Wash.
1136 Wm. C. Bersie (Wm. Currier Bersie), 2419 West Fifty-seventh Street, Seattle, Wash.
465 Sherman L. Chaney (Sherman Lee Chaney), 934 West Fifty-ninth Street, Seattle, Wash.
13 Bert O'Connor (O'Conner), 6012 Fourteenth Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
914 Thos. E. Flatebo (Thomas Erickson Flatebo), 7710 First Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
1649 Carl Frederickson, 1539 West Sixty-second Street, Seattle, Wash.
363 Olof Grubisland, 2044 West Fifty-sixth Street, Seattle, Wash.
36 (or 125a) Elmer Hansen, 7029 Sixteenth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
111 Frederick J. Hendrickson (Frederick Joel Hendrickson), 114 West Eighty-first Street, Seattle, Wash.
748a Alexander Irvine, 3020 West Sixtieth Street, Seattle, Wash.
2011a Hans Jacobsen (Jacobson), 7710 First Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
99 Oskar Jansson, 5224 Tallman Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
823 Roy V. Lightner (Roy Verne Lightner, R. L. Lightner), 5320 Tollman Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2005 John J. McCuen (John James McCuen), 7007 Seventh Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
144 Nils E. Magnusen (Nils Elis Magnuson), 43 West Fortieth Street, Seattle, Wash.
439a Felipe Montaya (Montoya), Stimson Mill Co., Seattle, Wash. (St. Paul, Minn.)
1035a Theodore Nicolas (Teodore Nicolas), Stimson Mill Co., Seattle, Wash.
304 Tom O'Leary, 7042 Twenty-third Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
1257a Larry C. Outlaw (Larry Clayton Outlaw), 111 North Seventy-fifth Street, Seattle, Wash.
335a Albenio Palamato, St. Paul Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
65 Constaine Pappas (Constaine A. Pappas, Constantinos A. Pappas), 1529 West Forty-ninth Street, Seattle, Wash.
1560a Pedro Perz, Stimson Mill Co., Seattle, Wash.
299 Emanuel Stolson, 1547 West Forty-seventh Street, Seattle, Wash.
596a Leslie Castle Chadwick, 922 Fifteenth Street NW., Seattle, Wash. (922 Fifteenth Avenue, North Seattle, Wash.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 5, CITY OF SEATTLE, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

104 Gus Albin, 225 (223) Eastlake Street, Seattle, Wash.
2783 Frank Alden, Denismore Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Boston Hotel, First and Fulsun Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
484 Earl (Carl, Karl) Ludwig Anderson, 212 Boren Avenue, North Seattle, Wash.
90 George Andrews, 218 Fourth Street, North Seattle, Wash.
177 Arthur C. Arnston (Arthur George Arntson, A. Arntson, Arthur G.), 64 Vine Street, Seattle, Wash.
824 Harry W. Aska (Aka), Bell Street Dock, Seattle, Wash.
2289 Kaishin Barmatoff, Russia (Kaishin Barmatoff, Seattle, Wash.).
600a Otto Erhard F. Benson (Fritgof (Feitjof) Benson), 2038 Westlake Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1900 George L. (Frank, F.) Booken, aboard ship fishing, Seattle Wash.
2278 Walter (Walon) Nelson (W. N.) Bremer, U. S. transport *Prook*, Seattle, Wash.
2701 Stephen W. (Warren) Burrows, Bree Street Dock, Seattle, Wash.
1555a Volney Herbert (H.) Burt, 656 Elliott Avenue, North Seattle, Wash.
325 Erick Carlson (Carlson Erick), 2105½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2651 Samuel Carr (Car), 307 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1534 Lewis E. (Elmer) McCarrell, 2016 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (2016 Westlake Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
332 Edward Chlopeck (Chlofeck), 1920 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (New Cecil Hotel, Seattle, Wash.).
2820 Howard Clark (Clerk), 603 Harrison Street, Seattle, Wash.
2185 James Abraham Cole, 1934 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2073 George Edward Curlette (Curlett), 212 Blanchard Street, Seattle, Wash.
774 Andrew W. Cyr, 409 Denyway Street, Seattle, Wash.
690 Chas. Arthur Eddy, 2227 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1921 Daniel (Danial) Lewis Emmett, 1820 (1806½) Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1228a Erick (Erik) Harold Erickson (Erik Harold Erikson), 1931 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (2816 East Madison Street, Seattle, Wash.).
2175 Harold M. Erickson (Magnus Enocksen, Magnus Ericksen), Seventh and John Streets, Seattle, Wash.
1688 Hillard Etherington, 916½ Howell Street, Seattle, Wash.
32 Hilmar Fladberg, 2020 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
161 John Olson (Olsen) Forseth, 804 Virginia Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1895 Anton Galaburda, steamer *Ares Maru*, Seattle, Wash.
2800 James Gill, Hotel Roosevelt, 1800 block Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2863a Charles R. Gilmore, 1224 Howell Street, Seattle, Wash.

1912 John Gorgon (Gergon), 2204 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1267 David D. E. Gustafson (David Gustaf Emanuel (G. E.) Gustafson), 2402½ Third Street, Seattle, Wash. (1608 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
1951 Robert Hall, Livingston Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
314 Hartvig Hansen, 161 Harrison Street, Seattle, Wash.
2253 Joseph Hansen (Hanen), 2205½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1138 John (J.) Ben Hinkle, 2107 Westlake Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1214 Henry Hubbard (Hubbord), 2122 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
166 Joseph P. Hull, *Prinz Waldemar*, United States war prize, Seattle, Wash.
2452 Fedore Jamesziak (Jamesczik), steamer *Area Maru*, Seattle, Wash.
2410 Carl Gunnar (Gunner) Johanson, 708 John Street, Seattle, Wash.
1159 Martin Johnson (Johnison), 1821½ Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
990 John Carl Jones, 500 West Republican Street, Seattle, Wash. (R. F. D. No. 1, box 15, A. Turnwuter, Wash.).
2207 Max Joseph Junker, 804 Virginia Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2371 John Keave (Keawe), U. S. S. *Prinz Waldemar*, Seattle, Wash.
579 Ralph G. (Gaylord) Kenyon, 1904 A Minor Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1152 Peter Kitka, Bell Street Dock, Seattle, Wash.
475 Bertel Kormmedal, Livingston Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2467 Machudn Knerik (Machuku, Kearik Machuku), *Awa Maru*, Seattle, Wash.
201 Walter Labor, 2610 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2390 Wm. Lane, 86 Stewart Street, Seattle, Wash.
1466 Oscar Lanner, U. S. A. T. *Croon*, Bell Street Dock, Seattle, Wash.
1853 Jacob Latsepomg (Jnob Lietsepomg, Jacob Latsefomg), *Awa Maru*, Seattle, Wash.
2408 Frakich Martin (Marin) Lawrence, 92 Virginia Street, Seattle, Wash.
264 David Lauritson (Lauriston), 2221 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2489 Ole Lefa (Lepa), *Awa Maru*, Seattle, Wash.
1469a John Enokson Lian, 2012 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1394 Thos. J. (Jacob) Lee, Pier 14, Seattle, Wash.
2298 Lorents Lorentsen, 86 Virginia Street, Seattle, Wash.
752 Stanley McCloskey (McClosky), 1934 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
449 Clarence Myers, 2822 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
629 Dimenty Nobread (Novosad, Noboead), Seattle, Wash.
1454 Thos. J. (Joseph) Nolan, 1737 East Seventeenth Street, Cleveland, Ohio (Livingston Hotel, Seattle, Wash.).
2798 Olaf (Olof, O. K.) Kilen Olson, 1894 (1804) Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
243 Earl Meri (Merle) O'Neal, 2610 First Street, Seattle, Wash.
1171 Robert Hatherly Park, 1812 Bellevue Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1976 Delbert Parker, cable ship *Burnside*, Seattle, Wash. (Brawley, Calif.).
685 Raymond Jos. Barnes, 1924½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2129 Isak Peterson, 86 Virginia Street, Seattle, Wash.
2829 Willard (William) Andrew Peterson, 2018 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
490 Reginald Walter Pilling, 107 First, North Seattle, Wash.
1652 Henry Pupuka (Pupka), Bell Street Dock, Seattle, Wash.
2135a Marcal Rodrigons (Marcol Rodrigus), 62 Bell Street, Seattle, Wash.
213 Fred Safro, 516 Pontius Street, Seattle, Wash.
381 Arthur Roland Shaw, 913 Thomas Street (Albrecht apartment 5, 1911 Ninth Avenue), Seattle, Wash.
847 Joseph Shebey (Wheiby, Wheby), 2205½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
101 Erfimiss (Erfimios) Sikos, 1829 Minor Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1347 Albert F. (Ferdinand) Smith, 961 Thomas Street (Hotel Dawson, 1624 Fourth Street), Seattle, Wash.
2430 Donald Dryton Smith, New Washington Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
297 Howard Geo. Skelding, 1120 Howell Street (806 East Howell Street), Seattle, Wash.
1908 Francis J. Starr, 1216 Harrison Street, Seattle, Wash.
1265 Alfred Walter Street, 2007 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
22 John Suomi (Luoma), 2705 Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2353 Percival (Percivel) John Thompson, St. Regis Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2582 Ambrosen Tiad, U. S. transport *Crook*, Seattle, Wash.
595 Jas. Jos. (J.) Tierney, 2305 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1107 Daniel Timmerman (Timmermans), S. S. *Fulton*, Pier 14, Seattle, Wash.
56 Oscar Tonneson (Tonnisen), 161 Harrison Street, Seattle, Wash.
1293 Geo. Smith Twiss (Teiss), 202 Republican Street, Seattle, Wash.
329 Martin Walsh, 2712 Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
143 Melhim Yanya (Yahya), 515 Demsy Way, Seattle, Wash.
2271 Knut Olaf Anderson, 314 Second Avenue west (Brundox Hotel), Seattle, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 6, CITY OF SEATTLE, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

3486 Charles Walter (C. W.) Abbott, Dawson Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1942 Richard Aldequerre (Aldeguena, Aldeguerra), pier No. 2, Seattle, Wash.
2081c Charles F. Anderson, general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
167a Tolstoi (Tolstoid, Tolstei) Anderson, 6554 Nineteenth Street NW., Seattle, Wash.
2270 Kinegries Haigo (Kynegiros Hadji, Kinegrios Haigi, Kinegiro Hoigi) Apostolon, 216 Spring Street, Seattle, Wash.
2474 Louis Arata (Arota), 1321 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1516a or 1518a Peter Arnsen (Arneson, Arnson), 85 Genica Street, Seattle, Wash. (84 Genica Street, Seattle, Wash., care Alaska Fishermen's Union).
571 John (Johan) Algot Aronson, 401 Fifth Street, Seattle, Wash.
3671 Ray (Roy) James Bailey, 601 Sixth Avenue (121 Yesler Way), Seattle, Wash.
1523 George Armour Bailly (Baihly, Baibly), 401 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
1098 Edward Henry Barbin, Right Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2805 Nicolas D. (Nicolnos Demetnos) Beciarias, 1313 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Nicolas Demetrios Beciarias, Sixth and Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.).
2595 Charles Beck, Rainier Grand Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (care of E. A. Kelton, Napa, Calif.).
2689 Julius H. (Julian Hachanova) Benedicto, 1108½ Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Sequoia County Club station, Oakland, Calif.).
712 Carl Benson, 413 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1373 William Ackley Betts, Y. M. C. A., Seattle, Wash.
208 John Aron (Jann Aron) Bjork, 1110 Cherry Street, Seattle, Wash.
2309a Peter Blocher, United States Infantry recruiting station (5113 Mead Street), Seattle, Wash.
1690 Paul M. Vaude Bogart, 424 Jefferson Street, Seattle, Wash.
56as or 56sa Barno Bond, general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
2537 Ben Anderson (B. A.) Borgen, 1601 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3172 Carl Oscer (Oskar) Bostrom, Dawson Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1080 Floren Earl Boyce, 1527 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
279 Leonard Broman, Presley Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Palm Hotel, Spokane, Wash.).
3298 Chester Arthur Brown, Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2722 Walter Brown, 110 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
2116 Arthur Browning, Hill Crest Hotel, Fourth and Spring Streets, Seattle, Wash.
3020 Godfrey Bunting (Banting), 301 Zinndorf Apartments, Seattle, Wash. (Los Angeles, Calif.).
922 Floye Foster Budrick (Floyd Foster Burdick, Bundick), 84 Seneca Street (2125 Seventh Avenue), Seattle, Wash.
1332a Edward Burghduff, 1423½ Sixth Street, Seattle, Wash.
2167a Clyde Byron, Second and Pike Streets, Cortland Flats, Seattle, Wash.
2415 Bert Henry Campbell, Coleman dock, Seattle, Wash.
2616 William Clarence Campbell, 1511½ Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2043 Joseph Carman, 1114 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (general delivery, Sacramento, Calif.).
2940 William Jack Carter, 1822 Fifth and one-half Avenue (1322½ Fifth Avenue), Seattle, Wash.
3707 Antonio Castro (Costro), Candon Hotel, First Avenue (Puget Sound Steamship Co.), Seattle, Wash.
1591 Simon Christensen (Christenson), Parker Hotel, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Seattle (1138 E Street, Tacoma), Wash.
1019 Henry Christianson (Christiansen), Seneca Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1399 Einar Carl Christoferson, 410 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3022a Ludvig Peter (Ludwig Petter, Ludwig) Clausen, Y. M. C. A., Seattle, Wash.
2885 Richard A. Clements, 701 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
932b John Lee Cohen, Maine Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
3799 Samuel Colon (Colen), 1421½ Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
15b Alex Colson, Firemen's Union, 1503 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
483a Leslie G. (Lestie Grover, Leslie Grover) Conrad, 88 Yesler Way, Seattle, Wash. (444 Cavrall Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada).
1909a John L. Cook, 717 Marion Street, Seattle, Wash.
4011a Raymond Cooley (Raymond Evans Cooley), Palace Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
301 Ralph Coupe, Colman Rock, Seattle, Wash.
3527 Eric Dahlberg, steamship *Guy C. Goss*, Seattle, Wash.
2350 Hazen Dall (Doil), 409 James Street, Seattle, Wash.
4070 Ewteim Davichink (Ebmulin Duluquk, Dubuquk, Ewticly Daviclink), United States Detention, Seattle, Wash.
4081 Bert Davis, 1428 Sixth Street, Seattle, Wash.
4077 George Ernest (Erness) Davis, 509 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2406 Frank Deutschman, Hub Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Frani Deutschman, general delivery, Tacoma, Wash.).
114a Harry Dopkins, Second and University, Brooklyn House, Seattle, Wash.
1369 John H. Dotterwick, Grand Pacific Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (John Frederick Dotterwick, Loring Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
472a Jose Duran, general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
275 Anthony M. (A. M.) Dwyer, Savoy Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2489a Basil Dzansaloff (Basal Dzansoloff), Fifth Avenue and James Street, Seattle, Wash. (Bazel Dosansofoff, c/o Russian Consulate, Seattle, Wash.).
1175a Dan Dzagoff (Zagobb, Dzagott, Dzogoft), Hotel Runton (Renton), Seattle, Wash.
2178 Floyd Edmond (Edmund) Edwards, 1531 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1621 Frank Egan, 1532 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1359 Andrew Eleftheriadis, 513 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (117 Third Street south, Seattle, Wash.).
1449 Loral (Loval) Ellis, Federal Hotel, Third and Pine Streets, Seattle, Wash.
1938 Ernest E. (E. E.) Fitzgerald, Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2668 Seldon Flynn, New Vendom Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Northern Pacific Roundhouse, Seattle, Wash.).
1839 Thomas Joseph Foley, 1532 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1133 Joseph Fontes, 320 Union Street, Seattle, Wash.
2311 David Alfonso Francis, Planters Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
736a W. J. Freblad (Harry W. J. Fredblad, H. W. J. Fredblad), Seamen's Home, Seattle, Wash.
3890 John Fuller, 701 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3732a Toda Funkaina (Furukawa, Funikaina), 611 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
672 Edward Roy Gaskin (Gaskins), Fourth Avenue Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
200 Merle Gilmore, 1321 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3346 Olof (Olaf) Algot Goranson, 401 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1280 Allen Noel (A. N.) Gordon, general delivery, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
2607 Alfred Peter Gransfor (Granfors), 1513½ Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1027a Harold Joseph Gray (Grey), 905 Spruce Street, Seattle, Wash.
2242a Mikal Dehart Grotte (Mikal Grotte), 216 Spring Street, Seattle, Wash.
3937a Ed Gruenberg, city jail, Seattle, Wash.
2177 Wilfred John Gush (Wilfred Gush, Gash), 1525 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
733 August Gustafson, 722 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
3745 Nieff Haccin (Niffe Hacein, Niffe Haccin), Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
452a George Hadoff, general delivery, Seattle, Wash. (c/o Aberdeen Lumber and Shingle Co., Humptulips, Wash.).
896 James Thomas Hanby, Vendome Hotel, First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (James Tom Hanley, James Thomas Hanley), 45 Canal Street, New York City, N. Y.

2978 Carson Hanks (C. K. Hanks, Carson Harks), 1629 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3500 Haakon E. Hansen, pier 7, schooner *Senator*, Seattle, Wash. (Haakon Elias Hanson, 1330 First Avenue, postal route 201, Seattle, Wash.).
1146b Robert R. Hartley, Rainier Grand Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (70 South Mentos Street, Pasadena, Calif.).
3808 Charles R. Haugland (Charles Rangvald Haugland), steamship *Port Angeles*, pier 10, Seattle, Wash.
573 Herbert Edward Heggs, 913 (916) Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
321c John Hennesy, Alaska Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1176a Harold B. Henson, Statler Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
168 Elmer Lee Hill, Hill Crest Hotel, Fourth and Spring Streets, Seattle, Wash. (Elmer Leigh Hill, Paulsbo, Wash.)
682 Griffith Norman Hilton, 607 Marion Street, Seattle, Wash.
3520 John Renald Hillyard (Willhard), 1600 First Avenue (Martinique Apartments), Seattle, Wash.
502 Carl Johan Hokanson (Hokansen), 717 Spring Street, Seattle, Wash. (Winchester Hotel, 76 Third Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
3293 Harry Holevas, 1109½ Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
662 Sverre (Soerre) I. Holm, Hotel Perrin, Seattle, Wash.
3561 George H. R. Hosen (Hosea), Fifth and Jefferson Streets, Seattle, Wash.
453 Aheleas Hrestu (Aheleas Hrester, Uheleas Hrester), 605 Jefferson Street, Seattle, Wash.
2152 Thomas Frederick (Fredrick) Huzzy, 1018 James Street, Seattle, Wash. (2527 Wark Street, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada).
3704 Carl Oscar Ingeman, 1607 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
742 Henry Jackson, 605 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
3998 John Michael (Michail) Jennings, 80 Yesler Way, Seattle, Wash.
2594 Carl Adolph Johansen (Adolf Ovinus Johansen), Hotel Perrine, Seattle, Wash.
3349a Andrew Johnson, Puget Sound Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
3508b Charles Johnson, Colman Dock (Dock), Seattle, Wash.
1425 Clarence W. Johnson (C. Arthur W. Johnson), Hammond Lumber Co., steamship *Travel*, Astoria, Oreg. (Clarence Arthur Wilber Johnson, Seattle, Wash.)
1410b Emil Johnson, general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
113 Fred D. Johnson, Diller Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (general delivery, Portland, Oreg.).
3341 Olaf Oscar Johnson, 401 Fifth (1330 First) Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1598 Oscar G. Johnson, 504 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
7280a Peter Johnson, Arling Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1687 William Johnson, Hotel Perrin, Seattle, Wash.
3690 Chester Ralph (R.) Kellogg, Britannia Beach, British Columbia, Canada.
1189 Frank Kelly, 1314 Second Street, Seattle, Wash. (Frank Kelley, 452 Anderson Street, San Francisco, Calif.)
3335 Nicholas (N.) Kluff, 84 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
2463 Jacob Knoll, general dellvery, Seattle, Wash. (Hotel Maes, 192 Fourth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
2893a Raymond Evans (E.) Kocher, general delivery, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
3827 Louis John Kraft, 1516 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
638 Axel George (Georg) Kruse, 401 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
555 Gustof Mauritis (Gustaf Maurits) Kruse, 401 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1077 Alden Kuhn, 807 Railroad Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3888 Arvid Kvick, Royal Hotel (401 Fifth Avenue), Seattle, Wash.
3700 Joseph C. LaChapelle, 602½ Pine Street, Seattle, Wash. (Joseph Charles La Chapelle, room 45, Federal Hotel, Third Avenue and Pine Street, Seattle, Wash.)
3501a Claud Ladue (Laue), Nord Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
3732b George Langley, general delivery, Seattle, Wash. (Crockett, Calif.).
2888a Peter Lineval (Eneral, Encral), Alaska Hotel (84 Seneca Street), Seattle, Wash.
1663 John Howard Langley, jr. (Jack Howard Langley), Hotel Barker, Sixth Avenue and Pine Street, Seattle, Wash.
1044 Christopher Larson, 410 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Christoffer Larson, box 291, St. John, Oreg.)
3094 Nickilas Lavanoff (Nickolas Lauenoff), 719 (119) James Street, Seattle, Wash.
1353a William Lee, Wright Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (care of American consulate, Victoria, British Columbia).
1155 Harold T. Lindsay (Lindsey), Leamington Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1295 Ernest Martin Lindstrom (Londstrom), Sailors' Union, Western Avenue and Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
1966a William Loesch, New Grand Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (general delivery, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1156 Ralph Losey (Lasey), general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
2570a Manuel P. Luna (Lana), Second and Marion Streets, Seattle, Wash.
3568 H. E. Lusher, Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (general delivery, Reno, Nev.).
2186 Robert Emmet (R. E.) McCarthy, 84 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
754a R. McCoy (Robert McCoy), Hotel Alaska, Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
730 John D. McDonald (John Daniel McDonald), 1322 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2636a Lester Roy McGehan, Angles Hotel, Port Angeles, Wash.
3987 Hector John McInnis, 712 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
821 Kenneth McKenzie, 119 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (New Cecil Hotel, Seattle, Wash.; 361 Second Avenue, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada).
1936 James Edward McMahon (James E. McMahon), 1019 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1491a Hans Magisos, Travellers Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1131 Gerald Loyd Mahoney (Mahaney, G. L. Mohaney), Y. M. C. A., Fourth and Madison, Seattle, Wash.
1154 Roy Jessie (Jesse) Malnville, 1411 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
4079 William S. Manterstock, 821 Railroad Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Wm. Slade Manterstock, 400 West Altee Street, Pendleton, Oreg.).
3093a Max Marribo, 1308 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (1818 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
161a John Martinson (J. Martinson), Alaska Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
838 Abel Masond, 517 Madison Street, Seattle, Wash. (Alhle Masond, Alhie Med Masond, 1505 Fifteenth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
3232b Buichi Matsaura (Burchi Matsaurce, Buichi Matsawrer, B. Matsurra), Dearborn Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
723 Wm. John Meakin (William J. Meakin), Suite 402, Royal Alexandria Apartments, Bute Street (Brite Street), Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
278 John Joseph Meehan (J. J. Meehan, John Josep Meehan), 1109½ Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2834 Charles Melhorn (Hans Mehlhorn), Kenneth Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
213 Norton Mitchell, Merlin Apartments, Spokane, Wash. (625 Summit Avenue north, Seattle, Wash.).
3208a David B. Morbeck, Elks Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Joyce, Wash.).
5073a Magnus Theodor Monsen, Scandinavian Sailors' Home, Seattle, Wash.
471 Frederick C. Murray (Frederick Charles Murray), Right Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1329 Raymond E. Nash (Raymond Edward Nash), 410 Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
434 Alfred Benjamin Nelson, 1525 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Alfred Beiyassin Nelson, 303 Twenty-second Street south, Seattle, Wash.).
3646 Lawrence Ernest (Earnest) Nelson, 1107 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
159 Itti Axel Nelson (Otto Axel Nelson), 1424 First Street, Seattle, Wash.
137 George Joseph Nester, 414 Jefferson Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
898 Enoch Nordahl, 514 University Street, Seattle, Wash.
732 Gustof E. Nordstrom (Gustaf E. Nerdstrom), 84 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
2712 Lionel V. V. Norman (Lionel Valentine Victor Norman), 606 Eighth Street, Seattle, Wash.
1457a Edward Nyberg (Nyborg), 84 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.
992a Eugene O'Masse (Eugene O. Masse), 89 West Yesler Way, Seattle, Wash.
1105a Danile Oniss, Seaman's Home, 1601 Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Daniel Oniss, Daniel Oness, 172 Carroll Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.).
878 Juan Ortes, City Hall, care of Police Department, Seattle, Wash. (care of Zeller Packing Co., Deer Harbor, Wash.).
3899 Oscar Overland, Grand Trunk Dock, Seattle, Wash. (Oskar Overland, Sailors' Union, 84 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash.).
1755 Charles L. Painter, 415 Madison Street, Seattle, Wash. (box 153 Canal, Winchester, Franklin County, Ohio).
2842 Arthur Placia (Arthur Paloia), 706 Yesler Way, Seattle, Wash.
2670 Christas Panagandas, 810 Pine Street, Seattle, Wash. (Christos Panagoudas, Hoquian, Wash.).
1003b Orin Tolaf Parsons, Seattle, Wash. (Orrin Tolof Parsons, 503 Beesrard Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.).
2935 Gust Nickolas Perry, 216 Spring Street, Seattle, Wash.
2244 Hans Gotfried Pester (Hans Pester), 916 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
217 Frederick J. Pope, Central Hotel, Fourth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
645b Andrew Poppas (Andrew Pappas), general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
3284 Arthur Potter, 1800 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Care Duthe Shipbuilding, West Seattle, Wash.)
214 Floyd Priest, 815½ Third Avenue, New Richmond Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
3938 Charles W. Rae (Charles Wm. Rae), 1413 Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
224 Matti Rakikainen (Matti Rakekainen), 108 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
277 Walter Rask, 1114 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1126 Roy Allen Randall (Roy A. Randall), 1019 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3449 Charles Read, Hotel Perrin, 901½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2891 Fred Edward Reid (Fred E. Reid), 1412 Third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2053a Arthur Cecil Rhodes, 170 Fawcus Street. (Johannesburg, Transvaal, South Africa.)
3258a James Rogers, 711 Jefferson Street, Seattle, Wash. (25 South Street, New York City, N. Y.)
648a Milton Rosenstein (Wm. Milton Rosenstein), Northern Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
705 Francis I. Ross (F. I. Ross), Grand Pacific Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
3480a Allen Richard Rowland, 1202 First Avenue, North Seattle, Wash. (Camp O, Johnson Straits, British Columbia, Canada. 1202 Twelfth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.)
139 Michael Ryan, Astoria Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
743 Carl Axel Rydbon, New Richelieu Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Carl Axel Rydbom, Care Skinner & Eddy, Seattle, Wash.)
1307 Clarence Ryan, Steamer *Sol Duc*, Coleman Dock, Seattle, Wash.
252 Benjamin R. Salmonson (Benjamin Robert Salmonson, 706 Yesler Way, Seattle, Wash.
2632 Frank Savage, 104 Seneca Street, Seattle, Wash. (1918½ Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
944 Anton Schoning, 401 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3516 Victor Schumaker (Victor Schumacher), Central Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
843 Delbert Ellis Scoggins, 913 Eighth Street, Seattle, Wash. (General delivery, Miami, Fla.)
4068 Bonnom Clyde Scott, 318 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (Care Brooks Sewing Machine Co.; general delivery, San Diego, Calif.)
1379 Ronald Leckie Senger, 1530 Seventh Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
286 John Shannon, 772 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
3716a Thomas Henry Shields, general delivery, Seattle, Wash. (T. H. Shields, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada.)
2769 Louis Singer, Hotel Rhine, Seattle, Wash.
830 Ernest Skagseth, 1601½ First Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Ernest Skogseth, Care Powells River Co., Seattle, Wash.)
2129a Alfred C. Smith, 607 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (839 Sixth Street, Seattle, Wash.)
1728 Herbert Leroy Snyder, 1110 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2875 Erick Anders Soderlund (Soderlund), Arlington Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
7573a Marcus Soderlund, Masters Mate, Petolass Arcade Building, Seattle, Wash.

493a Harry Solkoff, Hotel Seaton, Seventh Avenue, South Seattle, Wash.
2746 Signard Smestad (Sigvard Smestad), 1210½ Second Street, Seattle, Wash.
3395 John H. Stanbitz, Victoria Hotel, Seattle, Wash. John H. Staubitz, general delivery, Bremerton, Wash.
91 James D. Sullivan, 510 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1377 Wm. Svenson, Alaska Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1641 Sten Sture Swanson (Steu Steve Swanson), 401 Fifth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
3286 Albert Thayer, 83 Pike Street, Seattle, Wash.
3102 Charles Ernest (Earnest) Taylor), City Jail, Seattle, Wash.
3 Richard Elmer Thomas, Central Hotel, Fourth and University, Seattle, Wash.
1590a Albert W. Thompson, Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Care H. C. Lumber Co., Twenty-first and East D Streets, Tacoma, Wash.)
202 Edward R. Thompson, 710 Spring Street, Seattle, Wash.
1196 Sidney Thompson, Granger, Wash. (Camp Lewis, American Lake, Wash.; Steamer *Athlon*, Pier 4.)
607 William Thompson, Seward Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
862 William Graham Thompson, Edmonds, Wash. (1806 Howard Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2468 Thomas Jefferson Tucker, Diller Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2125 Joseph A. Turcotto (Turcotte), general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
1110a Fred Wm. Unvericht (F. W. Unvericht), Albany Hotel, Third Street, Seattle Wash. (Albany Hotel, 30)
224a Apolonis Vallaflores (Apolonio (Apoloino) Villaflores), 690 Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2485 Louis Elliot Vergovich (Vugovich), 916 Third Street, Seattle, Wash.
2312 Herbert W. (J.) Walker, Alaska Hotel, Western Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1333 John Wm. Wallen, 1103 Third Avenue (2108 Yesler Way), Seattle, Wash.
3364 Andy Sherman Ward, 702½ Pine Street (2019 Ninth Avenue, apartment 5), Seattle, Wash.
2370b Lisle Wardwell, Palmer Hotel, Seattle, Wash. (Lisle Douglas Wardwell, Billings, Mont.)
1012 Oscar Wasberg (Wosberg), Arlington Hotel (1324 Sixth Avenue), Seattle, Wash.
2476a Phillip Watkins (Phillip LeRoy Watkins), general delivery, Seattle, Wash.
3759 Earl Wendell Webb, 1406 Third Street (Monmouth Apartment, No. 28), Seattle, Wash.
735 Harry B. Weidman (Harry Benjamin Weidman), 414 Terry Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
997 John Weisgearber (Wengearber), 718 Sixth Street, South Seattle, Wash.
4087 Harry LeRoy West, 715 Ninth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2921 Edward Wharton (E. Wharton), Antlers Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
1724 Matty Wharton (Motly Wharton, M. Wharton), Green Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
988 Goode Wille, care of T. F. Young, Fisher Building, Seattle, Wash.
1467 Forest E. Fred (Ted) Williams, 320 Union Street (4410 West Wall Street), Seattle, Wash.
364 Aden Wilson, 1118 Third Street, Seattle, Wash.
251 Clifton Woodman, 1326 Seventh Street, Seattle, Wash.
2688 Charles D. Yank (Yark, Yauk), 1515 West Hazzard Street, Seattle, Wash.
389 Theo Yi Li (Shio Yi Li), Y. M. C. A., Seattle, Wash.
1101 Jacob D. Young (J. D. Young), 1511½ Eighth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
1916a Arthur Anderson, Puget Sound Hotel, Seattle, Wash.
2451 Ralph E. Davis, 1322 Five and one-half Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
2842a Nels August Nelson, 3519 Juneau Street, Seattle, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 3, CITY OF SEATTLE, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

57 Walter Joseph Waldron, 1816 Twelfth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.
295 Carl Gunnar Franson, 414 Thirteenth Avenue, North Seattle, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

718 J. W. (G.) Van Arsdall, Three Lakes, Wash.
1680 John Sailer (Sailor) Beckstrom, Edmonds, Wash.
1104 Andrew Berg, Index, Wash. (Grace Hotel, 528 Superior Street, Duluth, Minn.).
1522 Carl Frederick Booklund (Carl Fred Broklund), 808 Railway Street, Joliet, Ill.
1195 William Brown, New Boston, Mich.
1634 Chas. Butl, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
1494 Edward Cotter, Gold Bar, Wash.
1083 Erick Erickson, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
1196 Lester William Fox, Snohomish, Wash.
47 John Frank Hart (John Hart), care of O. H. Lee, Maltby, Wash.
20 Gustav Henschel, R. F. D. 2, Snohomish, Wash.
1065 James Edward (J. E.) Hill, Three Lakes, Wash.
123 Frank Hillsman, Three Lakes, Wash.
722 Frank Louis Horman (Herman), 80 Yester Way, Seattle, Wash.
753 Fred Murie (F. M.) Johnson, Three Lakes, Wash.
839 Perry Latimer (Lotimer), Three Lakes, Wash.
253 George McIntosh, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
1474 Don McVey, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
1612 Joe Mathewson, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
698a Fred Miller, R. F. D. 1, Hartford, Wash.
767 James O'Donnell, camp 1, Edmonds, Wash.
670 Albert O'Rielly Hooper (Albert O'Riley Hooper, Albert O'Riley), Avenue A, Index, Wash.
999 Axel Osteriof, Index, Wash.
1025 Harold S. Price, Monroe, Wash.
361 Andrew Rekdal, Monroe, Wash.
307 Howard H. Schultz, Fort Yukon, Alaska.
207 Mehi Sviller (Seiller), near Index, Wash.
1347 Ben Smith, Sultan, Wash.
1011 Earl Oliver (Owen) Stephenson (Earl O. Stevenson, Stephenson), Cadillac Hotel, Monroe, Wash. (High Rock Camp, Monroe, Wash.).
724 Charlie (Chas.) Thompson, Sinbar, Wash.
215 Chas. Herbert Wilson, Owl Rooming House, Spokane, Wash. (Charles Wilson, Three Lakes, Wash.).

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF SNOHOMISH, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

1172 Reinert Aarstad, Darrington, Wash.
558 Thomas Stafford (S.) Adams, Tulalip Reservation, Tulalip, Wash.
1183 Andrew Anderson, Pilchuck, Wash.
116 John Anderson, Darrington, Wash.
1092 Joseph Biron, Robe, Wash.
884 August Carlson, Ebey Logging Co., Camp Arlington, Wash.
958a John Robert Carlson, Marysville, Wash.
1129 Robert Cole, Bryant, Wash.
584 Arnt Dahl, Hazle, Wash.
697 John Lobban Gowie (John Lobben Cowie), East Stanwood, Wash.
992 Ben Hanson, Granite Falls, Wash.
1157 Jesse James Hanson, R. F. D. 2, Arlington, Wash. (Hatch, Coudersport, Pa.).
257 Clare B. Haynes, Granite Falls, Wash. (Clare Benham (Burnham) Haynes, 2432 Pacific Avenue, Hoquiam, Wash.).
67 Oscar Hedenstrom, Darrington, Wash. (300 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash.).
111 Louis Kilpatrick, Petoras, Wash. (Melbourne, Wash.; Vancouver, B. C.).
1009 Bensdykt Koshi (Benedykt Koski, Koshi), Granite Falls, Wash.
87 John Johnson Lilleoren, Arlington, Wash.
21 Mack Moragas (Maragas, Makis Maragos), Granite Falls, Wash.
998 John Dave Nordstrom (Darc Nordstrom), Oso, Wash.
1164 Athansian Oaklamanin (Athanasion Oaklamanin), Granite Falls, Wash.
162 Anton Olson (Antone Olsen, Anton Olsoni), Ebby Logging Co., Camp Arlington, Wash.
135 Knut (Knute) Olson, 700 Boren Avenue, North Seattle, Wash.
1241 Max Ramsey (Ramsay), Charleston, Ill.
846 John Harlan (Harlen) Sanders, Arlington, Wash.
393 John Sawyer, East Stanwood, Wash. (519½ Seventh Street, Seattle, Wash.).
872 William Skidler, Pilchuck, Wash.
9 Orville Spork, rural delivery, Arlington, Wash.
173 Albert Wilson, Oso, Wash.
947 John Emil (E.) Wilson, Ebey Logging Co., Camp Arlington, Wash.
1624 Kid Yonkey, Arlington, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION 2, CITY OF SPOKANE, STATE OF WASHINGTON.

2192 Arvid John Anderson, Chicago Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1390 Walter Edgar Anderson, Yale Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2141 Arthur T. Arata, Polum (Palm) Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
592 William August, West 115 Fourth Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1875 John Balasko (Balaska), 419 West Trent Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
2434 Joe Baziak (Bagiak, Bosick), 228 North Main, Spokane, Wash.
2094 Nels Belgum, Chicago Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2314 George Bellos, Washington and Second Streets, Martin Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
844 Jayt Binford, 8 Stevens Street, Spokane, Wash.
472 Edison Blalealey, West 417½ Trent, Spokane, Wash.
1236 William Boyd, Fairmont Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1036 Jeff Brandon, Calax (Galax) Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1868 Thomas Warren Brock (Brack), City Jail, Spokane, Wash.
830 Louis (Loul) Burfeind, South Bellingham, Wash.
2017 Clarence Butler, North 515 Washington Street, Spokane, Wash.
2346 Oscar Carlson, Ember Hotel, Spokane, Wash. (Molma Hotel, 415½ Main Street, Spokane, Wash.)
169a Bryce Burgess M. (Miller) Cartwright, St. Regis Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1171 Albert Casperson, 507 Trent, Spokane, Wash.
174 Mano Civarella (Marco Ciavarretta, Ciavarella), Whitefish, Mont.
2150 Ernest F. (Frederick, Frederic) Cox, 226½ West Sprague Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
454 Leo Aloysius Davis, 420 First Street, San Francisco, Calif.
1974 Rias Dean, Betsy Precinct, Spokane, Wash.
991 Bertrin Levoice Douglas (Bertrein (Bertrain) Levaice Douglas), care S. A. A. C., Spokane, Wash.
193a Daniel Frank Downey, Davenport, Wash.
200 Michael Thomas Downs, Olympia Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1598 Frank Mauritz Easterdahl, Marine Barracks, St. John, Oreg. (Great Northern Hotel, Spokane, Wash.)
886 Solomon Shapsal Ehrlich, Lake Bay, Wash.
2027 Ernest Emanuel Elford, Raymond Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
526 Nick Elleff, 519 Sixth Avenue, Seattle, Wash. (Globe Hotel, Spokane, Wash.)
1535 Edward Entwistle, 225 Granite Block, Spokane, Wash. (225 Granite Building.)
977 Felix Olf (Olaff) Erickson, Spirit Lake, Idaho.
2380 John Eagander, New York Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1489 Charles Foster, Owl Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1125 Charles Ralph Foster, Savoy Hotel, Spokane, Wash. (General delivery, Seattle, Wash.)
633 Milo Frederick, 1215 Sherman Avenue, Hood River, Oreg. (210 West Sprague, Spokane, Wash.)
1619 Wm. (William) Lynn Garvey, 325 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
2343 Grover (Graver) Goldston, 229 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1101 Lee Alanson Gotwalt, West 505 Trent Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1589 Fred Goulder, Northan Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2091 Robert Kingsley (Kniley) Graves (Francis Cling Mars), Seattle Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
52 Clarence Victor Gray, care of International Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1065 James Albert Graves, Casem D'Alene (Couer d' Alene) Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
533 Elmer George Green, Kent route No. 2, Spokane, Wash.
1091a Elmer C. (Earl) Greenberg (Greenburg), City Jail, general delivery, Spokane, Wash.
649 Wendell Ellsworth Gridley, 10 West Second, Spokane, Wash. (Y. M. C. A., Portland, Oreg.)
568 Homer McKinley Guilkey, Chicago Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2099a Erastus Hankins, Rosalia, Wash.
730 Frank Harris, 120½ North Stevens, Spokane, Wash.
578a Frank Reuben Harris, Peddicord Hotel, Spokane, Wash. (Claresholm Alta, Canada (until Jan. 1, 1918).)
1161 Thomas Hays, 509 Trent, Spokane, Wash.
1524 Frank Herman (Harman), Como Hotel, Spokane, Wash.

2012 John Adolph Hopeberg, West 326 Pacific Avenue, Spokane, Wash. (South Stillwater, Minn.).
272 Theodore Holbert, 234 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1485a Guy Wm. (William) Houte, Tekoa, Wash. (Willows, Calif.).
1544 Gus Huddleston, 515 Washington Street, Spokane, Wash.
1832a Henry Nicholas, Hustad, Webster, S. Dak. (Dempsey Hotel, Spokane, Wash.).
217 James Joggin (Goggin), 230 Main, Spokane, Wash.
1903 Ed. Johnson, Pantage Theater, Spokane, Wash.
2078 Olaf Johnson (Jonsson, Jousson), 206 North Washington Street, Spokane, Wash.
2144 William Jordan, Betsey Precinct, Spokane, Wash.
1191 Andy Kalla, Milwaukee Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
828 Stanislaw Kasemank, Como Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
446 Benj. Keddi (Benjamin Keddis), Logan Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
937 John (Jno.) Keiper, Ohio Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1074 Willie Kelley (Keily), 37 Main, Spokane, Wash.
738 John T. (Fall) Kendrick, 232 Riverside Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
525 Thos. (Thomas) Joseph Keyes, Spokane, Wash.
685 Thomas King, 234 West Main, Spokane, Wash.
1446 Pete Kontos (Peter (Petar) Knodos), 215 North Bernard, Spokane, Wash.
446a Frank Korte, Leland Hotel, 22 (221) Riverside, Wash.
1513 Charles (Charley) Oliver Lafferty, general delivery, Spokane, Wash.
972 Nick Constantine Laris, 505 South Bernard, Spokane, Wash. (620 Columbia Street, Seattle, Wash.).
1719 Carl Lingsbrenden, 206 Washington, Spokane, Wash.
2371 Patro Lrotto (Trotto), 9 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1833 Louis Manervich (Mancevich), Union Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
754 Olaf Martinson, Griffin Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1747 Martin Mike Mazzal, Lee Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
611 Glen Melanie, West 509 Trent, Spokane, Wash.
2394 John Mill, 215 West Bernard, Spokane, Wash.
1377 Fred Henry Miller, 284 West Main, Spokane, Wash. (1218 Denny Way, Seattle, Wash.).
812 Marko Minimkovich (Milinrovich, Norko Milinkovich), 235½ Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
2008 Gunnasuke Morimato (Gonnosuke (Gunnasuka, Gunasuka) Morinto), Hamilton, Mont.
1582 Arvid (Arid) Nikka, Seattle Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
138 George Noble (Nable), 326 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1955 Jakejiro Nogani (Nogai), Highland, Wash.
342 John Arthur Now, Betsy Precinct, Spokane, Wash.
224 Fred Dan Oberg, Great Northan Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1201 Joseph (Jos. J.) O'Neill, Grand Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
442 John Wesley Orr, Owl Lodging House, Spokane, Wash.
803 Angelo Paolo, Spokane, Wash.
121 Gust Papon (Pauon) Pappahristu (Papsu Pappahristie), West 427½ Main Street, Spokane, Wash.
169 Lyman Olson Parker, Norland Hotel, Spokane, Wash. (Rinker Hotel, North Yakima, Wash.).
2338 James (Jas.) Powell, 1008 Ide, Spokane, Wash.
1968 Herman Rasor (Kohr), Spokane, Wash.
856 Mat Regina (Regena, Rogena), Trent Avenue Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
231 Robert Rich, 535 Granite Block, Spokane, Wash. (501 North Main Street, Colfax, Wash.
548 James Rigos, Plastino Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
842 Harry J. (James) Riley, Vestula Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1500 Antonio Roso, 45 West Riverside, Spokane, Wash.
1493 Samuel Johns Rowe, West 325 Main, Spokane, Wash.
1854a Chas. Parrent Rowland, West 109 Conanch, Bartellsville, Okla. (Rowland Chas. Parent, Como Hotel, Spokane, Wash.).
1536 Dell Geo. Russell, 2331–3 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash. (Ross Lake, Idaho).
2109 Edward Ryan, Seattle, Wash. (Seattle Hotel, Spokane, Wash.).
1287 John M. (Matt) Salmon, Gordon Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
765 Axel Samuelson (Sammuelson, Sanmuelson), 240 Main, Spokane, Wash.
753 Geo. N. (George Nick) Sarantopulos, North 221½ Post, Spokane, Wash.
5 Givoanni Scottelo, Scotia, Wash.
579 Harry Samuel Skillcorn (Skilicorn), Berlin Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1966 William Soinsen (Sornsin, Sorsen), 422 Y. M. C. A. Building, Spokane, Wash.
1030 Harry Stollar, 330 Lincoln, Spokane, Wash. (1336½ South Figueron Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
97 William Harold Stolp, Berlin Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
172 Albert Strant (Strand), Chicago Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2413 Wong Suck, 337 Trent Alley, Spokane, Wash.
990 Mike Summers (Sumers), Dempsey Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
755 John Susko (Soshko, Sushko), Griffin Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
206 Swan Swanson, California Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1862 Erick Sweet, 414½ Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
930 Ignax Tedor, 221 Main Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1664 Herman Fred Wademite (Frederick Wadmite, Herman Fredrick), Whitis Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
566 Robert Walters, St. Nicholas Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
483 David Holt Weaver, Seattle Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1821 Edward Weasling, Great Northern Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2323 George Frederick (Freduck) Wilson, Third and Lincoln, St. Louis Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1266 Destefani (Destifani) Wincenso (Vincenso), West 20 Riverside, Spokane, Wash.
1325 Hobart (Robert) Woulfe (Woulfr), Carlisle (Carlyl) Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
2064 Ashby Clarence Wright, Logan Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
1498 James Clarence Wright, Three Hills, Alberta, Canada (Cover de Alene Hotel).
912 Edward Young, 323½ Trent Avenue, Spokane, Wash. (general delivery, Davenport, Iowa).
2412 Stanley Anthony Zientek, 515 Trent Avenue, Spokane, Wash.
1039 Edward Dolan, Logan Hotel, Spokane, Wash.
811 Boaz Fay, 3116 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
432 William A. Hartley, Midway Hotel, Sprague, Wash.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, COUNTY OF HAWAII, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

706 Jose Botelho, Honchina Hakalau, Hawaii.
5585 Epefanio Cabisan (Epefanie Cabison, Epifani Calirson), Onomea, Hawaii (Pohala, Hawaii).
200 Lario Caravalho, Kutuihaele, Hawaii.
4659 Juan Espinoso, Papeekeo, Hawaii (Juan Espinosa, Hakalau, Hawaii).
960 Gabino Gabuiani, Ookala, Hawaii.
5088 Dolore Galarsa, Honohina, Hakalau, Hawaii.
4759 Antonio Hilario, Onomea, Hawaii.
1518 Antone Jardin, Honokaa, Hawaii.
5093 Sam Peter Kanemoku, Kukuihaele, Hawaii (Sam Peter Kanemoku, Holualoa, Kona, Hawaii).
1782 Charley Kahumoku, Piopio, Hilo, Hawaii.
4138 David Kaimi, 999 Kamehameha, Hilo, Hawaii.
4657 Joe K. Kanohohusahiwi (Joe Knohohasuhiur, Joe Kanohohasuhiur), Hilo, Hawaii.
4319 David Keanui (Daiz Kiu), Kukuihaele, Hawaii.
2912 David Kuhia, Hilo, Hawaii.
3689 Ernest B. DeLima, Hakalau, Hawaii (Ernest Bneare de Lima, Breard Ernest Lima, 914 Alapai Lane, Palama, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii).
5670 Pedro Medina, Hilo, Hawaii.
681 Seichi Misuno, Camp Waiakaa Mill, Hilo, Hawaii.
322 John Naehu, Papaikou, Hawaii.
5827 Manuel Nasario, 9 Miles Olaa, Hawaii.
5597 Leon Nasareno, Onomea, Hawaii (Leon Nasarino, Leon Nazarano, Onomea, Papaikou, Hawaii).
2407 Phillip Kuamori Paauhau (Philip Kuanoni Paauhau), Honokua, Hookena, Hawaii (Philip K. Paauhau, Honokaa, Hawaii).
3538 Jose Pacheco, Paduilo, Hawaii.
4509 Juan Pacheco, Paauilo, Hawaii.
380 Ramon Pacheco, Honokoa, Hawaii.
2180 David Pohina, Papaikou, Hawaii (David Pohian, Hoopulea, Hawaii).
1558 Kim Su Pun, Kalopa, Kamakua, Hawaii.
2945 Francisco Rosalia, Kukuihaele, Hawaii.
1157 Tomes Santiago (Tomers Santiago), Onomea, Hawaii.
2646 Ustakio Santiago, Honomu, Hawaii.
1253 John Serrano (John Serrono), Papeakou, Hawaii.
947 Tokuyoshi Shimabuku, Kohala, Hawaii (Tokuyoshi Shimaboku, Kakala, Hawaii).
3597 John A. Silva, jr. (John A. Silva), Hilo, Hawaii.
808 Robert Huskinson Smith (Robert H. Smith), Lale, Oahu.
5460 Eujenio Solel, Papeekeo, Hawaii.
5583 Anselmo Sorino, Mahalua, Papaikou, Hawaii.
4194 Joaquim de Souza (Joquim DeSouza), Omanuiu, Hilo, Hawaii.
82 Manuel Dias Souza (Manuel Dias de Souza), Konokaa, Hawaii.
442 Juan Bautista Torres, Olao, Hawaii.
4073 Kameichi Ueda, Piopio, Hilo, Hawaii.
3162 Low Yau, Kamehemeha, Hilo, Hawaii.
319 Tak Yee Keaau, Olaa, Puna, Hawaii.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF HAWAII, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

542 Manuel Teixern (Teixeira) Aguner, Pahala, Hawaii.
38 Fai Phin (Fai Phinaiou) Aiona, Makapala, Kohala, Hawaii.
388 Charles Aniu, Kohala, Hawaii.
546 Pedro Arances, Kohala, Hawaii.
402 Manuel August Avilla, Hawi, Hawaii (1772 Luso Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
102 Teborcio Basnillo (Teburcio Basinflio, Teburcio Basnillo), Kohala, Hawaii (Honomea Store, Hilo, Hawaii).
976 Bernhard Bausch (Bansch, Bainsch), Alika S. Kona, Hawaii (Alika Hoopulea, Hawaii).
1705 Pedro Bernalte (Bermalte), Naalehu, Kau, Hawaii.
355a Maximo Billienoba (Billianoba), Hawi, Kohala, Hawaii.
416 Bernabe Borendo, Naalehu, Hawaii.
1035 Apolinario (Apalinario) Cabico, Takala, Kau, Hawaii (Honokau, Hawaii).
166 Pak Chong (Pak Chang), Hawi, Hawaii (Hawi, Kohala, Hawaii).
1255 Roperto Dano, Naalehu, Kau, Hawaii.
1262 Nicolas De La Cruz (Nicolas De Lacruz), Makapala, Kohala, Hawaii.
523 Provapio Ejerito (Procapio Ejinito, Procupiv Ejercito), Halawa, Kohala, Hawaii (1019 Stockton Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
340 Bernabe Gayla (Gaila, Saila), Pahala, Hawaii (Wainaka Camp No. 2, Hilo, Hawaii).
1108 Godencio Gomabon (GoDenciu Gumabon), Naalehu, Kau, Hawaii (Hilo, Hawaii).
1100 Riyozo Hashimoto, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
390 Edwin B. (E. B.) Herkes, Honnapo, Kau, Hawaii.
1065 Teruya Hidemaso (Hidemasa), Holualoa, N. Kau, Hawaii.
454 Kametaro Hirokawa (Holakawa, Hilakawa), Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
5 Bak Hun Hoe (Paeh ques Haeh), Hawi, Hawaii.
1147 Sabulo Iha, Kohala, Hawaii.
1688 Luswig (Lubwig, Lutwig) Joseph, Jaluit, Hoopulea, Marshall Island, Honolulu, Hawaii.
207 Pederico Juanico, Naalehu, Hawaii.
25 William Kamaka, Okoe, S. Kona, Hawaii, Hoopulea (Watertown, Oahu, Hawaii).
1749 Arakaki Kame, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1221 Kamao Kamitani, Napoopoo, Hawaii.
1684 Meisei Kaneshiro (Kameshiro), Kohala, Hawaii.
1522 Abraham Keaweohala (Keaweokala), Kohala, Hawaii.
1367 Peter Kelii, jr., Kaanhuhu, Hawi, Hawaii.
545 John Kuala, Kamuela, Hawaii.
784 Choon Wha Lee (Lea), Won Kau, Ham Kyung, Korea (Volcano House).
1088 James (Janes) McKonald, Holava, Kohala, Hawaii.
367 Ropu Mabait Makilino (Makalino), Kaihu, N. Kona, Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii.
65 Vecente (Vesents) Manoanares, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii (Pahala, Amanlu, Hilo, Hawaii, Amanlo).
646 Tsukuda Masasho Miokishi, Kamuela, Hawaii.
1236 Kumakichi Miyahara, Kamuela, Hawaii.
961 Thomas Morata (Morato), Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
73 Juan La Morena (Tuan La Morena, Juan la Morena), Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
853 Juichi Nagahama, Puakea Plantation, Kohala, Hawaii.
391 Masao Narimatsu, Halawa, Kohala, Hawaii (Pahala, Kau, Hawaii).
1289 Inacio Orusco, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
302 Doudalio (Saudalio) Pacheco, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
1211 Simeon Paliquin (Poliquin), Union Mill, Kohala, Hawaii (Union Mill, Mountainview, Hawaii).
223 Like Paulo, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
1026 William Jack Peha, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
1243 Joseph Rodrigues (Rodrigus), Hilea, Kau, Hawaii (Wailua Plantation Co., Oahu, Hawaii).

687 Constancio Rosales (Anastacio Rosales), Kohala, Hawaii.
796 Pedro Salano, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii (Okoia, Hawaii).
202 Alfonzo Santos, Kohala, Hawaii (Wahiawa, Hawaii).
1594 Joe Sousa, Holualoa, N. Kaua, Hawaii.
1144 Elias Taberes, Halawa, Kohala, Hawaii.
1706 Morita Takemoto (Takemato), Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.
527 Nakamura (Nakamaro) Tamae, Puakea Plantation, Kohala, Hawaii.
1296 Pascasio Tondo, Hawi, Hawaii.
1689 Emil Carl Yitkowski, Pahala, Kau, Hawaii.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 1, CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

1934 William Aipanian, Kaimuki, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3015 Oscar Berger, 29 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1855 Henry A. Bishaw, 958 Punahou (Punahou), Honolulu, Hawaii.
3464 Manuel R. (Manuel Rauf) Carreira, 2005 F. Luzo Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (819 Mission Street, care of Acme Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.).
223 Henry Castro (Henry Casto), 722 Laimi Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3037 Fook Way Choy (Kook Wah Choy), Kapahulu & Waialae, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2140 Levi Martin Ezdro (Levi Martin Azdra, Levi Martin Ezera), Monsarrat, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1693 Katuma Fukunaga (Katuma Fukunaja, Kazuma Fukunaga), Beretania Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3989 Chee Gau, Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii (Manoa, care of Sun Kong Sug Co., Honolulu).
2590 Edward Guthrie, 1274 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3403 Ernest Nalani Heen (E. Heen), Honolulu, Hawaii.
4067 Matsichi Inamori, Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2506 Randall P. Jenkins (R. P. Jenkins), 8 Miller Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (Salt Lake City, Utah).
1604 Charles Kahai (Charlie Kahai), Seventh Avenue, Kaimuki, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2729 Kaaea Kahi, Kakaako, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3745 Keao Kalakaua, Fort Street Honolulu, Hawaii.
2548 John Kamiko, Hailciki, Honolulu (Waikiki, Honolulu), Hawaii.
1393 Henry Kane Kelekoma, care of J. C. Michaels, 501 Hershovitz Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.
315 Thomas Lacuseta (Tomas Lacuesta), Planters' Shed, Honolulu, Hawaii (care of Libby, McNeil & Libby, Kahalun, Oahu).
890 Hing Chong Lum (Lum Hing Chong), Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3007 Ivan Warren Mason, Pleasanter Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii (Monrovia, Calif., Cumberland Hotel, 243 South Olive Street, Los Angeles, Calif.).
1341 John Thomas Meadows (J. T. Meadows), box 115, Axton, Va., U. S. A.
4159 Frank R. Monis, Fort and Beretania Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2519 Joseph Morales, Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Lule Rooming House, corner Fort Street and Kukui, Honolulu, Hawaii.
628 Kenichi Nekomoto, 1605 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4022 John Nuu or Nun, Honolulu, Hawaii.
728 Mitsonobo Okada (Mitsunoba Okada), Manoa, Manoa Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1910 Chang Yuen Pang, 1 Mastumoto Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1883 Shigeichi Sasaki, 1319 Date Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
914 Wong Sheong, Beretania, Honolulu, Hawaii.
556 Kauahi Sonokai, 661 South Queen Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2013 John Tincheira, 1281 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4180 Chu Tom (Tom Chu), 9 Christy Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
150 Taku Wada (Takeo Wada), Bert and Pensecola Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2387 Herbert A. Watson, 532 Hotel Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1281 Kama Zukeran, Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

LOCAL BOARD FOR DIVISION NO. 2, COUNTY OF HONOLULU, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

7102 Pedro Abadon, Kahuku, Hawaii.
6203 Rufino G. Abal, Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii (Kaneoahe, Oahu).
2198 Antonio Abanador (Abanador Antonio), Waikane, Oahu, Hawaii.
1394 Juji Abe, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
6297 Candido Abillon, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5453 Rafael Abong, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7891 Simon Abrasaldo (Hbrasado), Awalle Road, Honolulu.
6287 Lincoln Archin, Panahi Street, Hon., Hawaii.
7846 Esperezion (Esperegion, Esperidion) Acodicon, Aiea, Hawaii (Aiea, Oahu).
4133 Amcosia Acosta, Waimalu, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
3558 Elias (Eleas) Adlas, Watertown, Hawaii.
1144 Nicholas (Nicolas) Africa, Scho. Bks., Hawaii.
1645 Laguinsad Agnasio (Agnasio Lagunsad), 995 Dowsett Lane and Knights, Hon., Hawaii.
5438 Jose Ago, 1331 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6593 Geregolio Agohop, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
1740 Francisco Aguilar (Aguilar), 1 Welei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
639 John Aguilera, 616 North Hotel Street, Honolulu.
2230 Ilirao (R.) Ahon, Robinson, Hawaii.
5209 Taro Akamine, Waianu, near Pearl City, Hawaii.
2211 Domingo Akino (Akimo), Scho. Bks., Hawaii.
7752 Seijaburo Akijama (Akiyama), Scho. Bks., Hawaii, care of Construction Quartermaster, Oahu
6877 Manuel G. Alamillo, Liliiha, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha St., Hon.).
7024 Clemente (Clemepte) Albaro, Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii (McCabe, Hamilton and Renny).
7543 Gregorio Alberto, King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1167 Doroteo (Doroteo) A. Albesa, King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4869 Amado (Himado, Amedo) Albito, Iwiles Road, Honolulu, Hawii.
2966 Pedro Alcantra, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
153 Hermogenes Alcantra (Alcantara), Iwilei Road, Honolulu.
6253 Elicerio (Eleireo, Aiecerio) B. Alconaba, 324 Vineyard, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5827 Jose (Josa) Alejandro (Alegandro), Iwiki Road, Honolulu, Oahu (Iwilei Road, Hon.).
56 Pastor Alesna, Ewa, Hawaii.
7063 Pedros (Pedro) S. Alesna, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
7993 Esteban E. (Encabo) Algoso, Waipahu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
5716 Elino Aligaygay (Alligay), Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii.
8386 Juan Alisna (Alison) (Halawa Camp 14), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
8336 Roman Alison, Leelehua (Lellehua), Oahu.
8429 Marciano Alodillio, River, Honolulu, Hawaii (care of Abana, Iwilei, Hon.).
3735 Justo (J.) S. Alteros, Watertown, Hawaii.
5667 Roman Alvarez (Alborez), 3 Ewili Street, Hon., Hawaii.
4312 Fellis Amada, Iweli, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6346 Katsuichi Amano, Tajii Camp, Honolulu, Hawaii (Hawaii Shimpo Sha, Honolulu, Hawaii).
5745 Jose Amingay, Post Laundry Camp, Costner, Hawaii (Post Laundry, Castner, Oahu).
2777 Isidoro Amora, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1534 Crispulo Ampong (Anysong), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
3880 Santiago Anceta, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
2483 Ignacio Andalis, Waipri, Waipahu, Hawaii (Waipio, Waipahu, Oahu).
6505 Antonio Andam, Waiaphu, Hawaii (Oahu Sugar Co., Oahu).
7277 Leon Andam, Wailua, Oahu, Hawaii.
1906 Nicolas D. Andrade, Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii (1224 Hihki (Hiliha, Liliha) Street, Hon., Hawaii).
7910 Cayiyano C. Andraes (Cayitano Castillo Andraes), Lilihaur King, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha near King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
3107 Juan Angot, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6258 Pablo Anisita (Aniseta), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Hawaii).
7347 Santiago Anvada (Anoada), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
1716 Luis Anri (Louis Anria, Luis Anriyo), Liliha and King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1003 John Apio, Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7710 Kama Arakaki, Warmahi, Oahu, Hawaii (care Honolulu Plantation Co., Oahu.
8137 Antonio D. (Dias) Aranda, Ewa, Oahu.
6811 Camente Arangeon (Carmente Arangeon), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
3534 Isidoro Arangeon (Arangeon), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii. Hawaii (Waialua, Oahu).
263 Vicente Arcelias (Veceito Arcileas, Vecento Arcilios), Helamaud, Wahiawr, Hawaii (Halemano, Wahiawa, Oahu).
5519 Esedro Arcinol (Esedoro Arcivol), Kukui Lane and Nuuom Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Kukui Lane and Nuuanu Street, Honolulu).
6791 Pedro Ardesir, no permanent home, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5501 Bonifacio Ariliano (Ariliano), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
6485 Dalmacia Arivalo (Dalmacia V. Arivalo), Robinson, Hawaii.
8319 Jacobo Arme, Waianae, Oahu.
351 Buta (Ota) Asato (contractor), Waipahu, Oahu.
5257 Shinkami (Shinkano) Asato, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
7832 Manual (Manuil) Asibis, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1549 Manuel Asino, North King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2442 Manuel Aso, Ewa, Hawaii.
6881 Felix Astimaro, Maunawai, Hawaii (Onomea Plantation, Hawaii).
8079 Eduardo Asuncion, Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
6619 Larenzo Atoling, Wahiawa, Oahu.
8123 Agustie Atupen (Agustin Atupan), Liliha and Kukui, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5181 Crespo Avanto, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8739 Emeterio (Emeterio, Emitirio) Ayala, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
1080 Severino Baay, Waipio Waipahu, Hawaii.
2220 Bernardino Bacol (Bernandino Bacot, Bacol), Ewe, Oahu, Hawaii.
8699 Simon (Simon) Bagoyo, Kawailoa, Oahu, Hawaii (Kawailoa, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii).
1620 Francisco (Francisko) Bakaran (Francisco Bakuiran), Scho. Bks., Hawaii.
1679 Thomas Baiabal, Cattabato Mendenau, P. I. (Helenano, Oahu).
896 Silvano (Salcido) Balcido (Selvino Salcedo), Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3312 Simeon Baldio, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1323 Seoncio Belduke, Siliha, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha Street, Honolulu).
7300 Cotalino Balinsoila, Camp No. 3, College Walk, near Vineyard Honolulu, Pekeekeo, Hawaii.
6477 Mateo Balles, Iwilei Road, opposite jail, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7304 Miguel Bansis (Bausis), Liliha Street, near King, Honolulu, Oahu.
323 Joaquin Bantillan, Honolulu.
6615 Juan Bantoy, 933 Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5061 Pedro Bantoy, 933 Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3240 Hermagenes (Baptista), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
4888 Valentin Barkin, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
4462 Canuto Basoel, Waipahu, Hawaii.
4264 Tomas Batian (Bation), Kahuku, Oahu.
5495 Nicaniasi (Nicamas) Bautista (Nicanor A. Banntiste), Wahiawa, Oahu.
2354 Pedro S. (Saladino), Bautista, Walpahu, Hawaii.
4311 Anias Bayo, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
1379 Gervano (Berbacio) Bayonas, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
2416 Kurt Behring, Oahu Prison, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4699 Ramon Beliana, Pupukea, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8480 Gregorio (Gregario) Beloria, Aiea, Oahu.
1308 Vicente Benardino (Benaidino, Bemardino), 1331 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3052 Basilio Beniga, Iweli, Honolulu, Hawaii (Iwilei Road, Honolulu).
2099 Jose P. Bentorello, Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii (Libby, McNeil & Libby, Kahuluu, Oahu).
4513 Juan Bernette, Liliha Street, Honolulu.
8309 Tiburcio Bersaluna (Bersaluna), Mili Camp, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
6882 Tiborsio Bersaluna, 733 Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (Tiborsio A. Bersaluna, care of Kaneohe Court House, 733 Palama, Honolulu).
1101 Benito Besa, 1224 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
807 Lazaro Besana, Ewa, Hawaii.
2897 Casimino (Casimiro, Casemiro) Bevita, Waialua, Oahu (Wailau, Oahu), Hawaii.
5532 Jaredinirio C. Biason (Guadinrio C. Biason), Dowsit Lane (Dawsett Lane), Honolulu, Hawaii.
4521 Simplicio Bios, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4973 Francisco Bitancur, Kahuku, Hawaii.
1267 Lucio Biate (Baite), 124 Aala (125 Aala), Honolulu, Hawaii.
7662 John Blossom, Jack Lane (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny), Honolulu, Hawaii.
2017 Juan Boisan (Boisan, Brisas), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8043 Esteband (Esteban) Bolado, Castran (Castner), Oahu, Hawaii.
926 Victor Bolcioras, 71 Nunana (71 Nuuanu), Honolulu, Hawaii.

4332 Florintino (Floventino) Bolloa (Bollo, Bollio), Wahiawa (Wahawa), Oahu, Hawaii.
2325 Antero Borja, Ewa, Oahu.
7551 Marcelo Borromeo, Waipahu, Hawaii.
4795 Krell Boyko, Kalihi Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3817 Henry (Harry) Geo. Brandt, 1387 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Kekaha, Hanai).
734 John Gonsalves Brito, Waipahu, Oahu.
4593 Babalo Broca (Pablo Roca), Aala Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2566 Miguil Buatis, Winstern Building, Hotel Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6609 Apolonio Buenconcijo (Buenconeyo, Buenconejo), Leahi Home, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6151 Agrifino Buhat, Libbyville, Oahu, Hawaii.
5312 Noberto (Norberto) Bulahan, Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8221 Macilo (Marcilo) Bubrona (Marcello Barbona), No. 26 Wailloa, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7322 Locas Burlasa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
4956 Mariano Cabalis (Gabalis), Honolulu, Hawaii.
2941 Premitibo (Premetibo, Premetebo) Cabaong, Liliha Street near Kukui, Honolulu (Oaho, Hawaii Preserving Co.).
461 Faustino Cabuhat, care of Filipino Mission, Honolulu.
4993 Benbenuto Cacafranca, Waipahu, Hawaii.
4648 Isaac Cadapan (Kadapan), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2611 Magdaleno Cador (Madalina Cadon), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5625 Michor Cafe, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3710 Canoto Calibo (Canuto), Watertown, Oahu.
876 Felix Caliso, Ewa, Hawaii.
5006 Antone Calvente, Waipahu, Oahu.
3619 Juan Camarinez, O K Block, Iwilis (care of Hawaiian Pineapple Co.), Honolulu, Hawaii.
1717 Luranco (Lurenco) Camat, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4449 Casino Campos (Campius) Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii, care of Mr. C. L. Bravo, box 11 (Casiano Campos), ranch 9, Solidad, Calif.
6901 Victor Campos, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
6310 Victor Canay, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
4278 Catalino Fernandez Canon (Catalino F. Canon), 1224 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8151 Pedro Canonigo, Dowsett Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6322 Putincano Canoy, Ewa Plantation, Ewa, Hawaii.
139 Casiano Caradenio (Cardino), County Jail.
7228 Dionecio Careit (Dionisio Carcit), Waianae, Hawaii.
3570 Meliton Cariet (Cariel), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
6665 Cayentano Carion, 474 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5514 Pedro P. Caromba (Pedro Caromba), Puuloa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5572 Joseph N. Casconcellos (Joseph Neors Vasconcellos), 1713 Frmandez, Honolulu, Hawaii (1713 Fernandez, Honolulu).
8673 Isidro Casindo, OK Block No. 2, Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5002 Piorincio Castilliore, 7 Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
382 Simon G. Castillo, 836 Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1127 Francisco Castro, Iweili, Honolulu, Hawaii (Kealia, Kaieai).
8415 Horio (Honorio) Castro, 7 Camp, Puuloa, Oahu (37 Camp, Puuloa, Honolulu, Hawaii).
8144 Marcos Cataguk, Ewa, Hawaii.
1403 Pedro Catalan, Waipio, Oahu, Hawaii.
1914 Julian Catan, Waipahu, Hawaii.
3393 Lorencio Celaroisio (Calarosio), Wahiawa, Hawaii (Wahiawa, Oahu).
1104 Welcome (W.) Chalaliche, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
7869 Chin Lung Chan (Chin Sung Chan), 1307 Lihiha Street, Honoluulu, Hawaii.
383 Kawai Lun Chang, 1049 Nuunau, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2714 Lee Sar Cheong, Aala Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2872 Harry Fong Chin, 3334 Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii (American Canning Co., Honolulu, Hawaii).
6531 Kamali Chinen (Chinin), King Street, Palana, Honolulu, Hawaii King Street, Palama, Honolulu).
1230 Sin K. Ching (Sin Kwai Ching), Camp 2, Vineyard Street, Honolulu.
1504 Kap Su Cho, Lulehua, Oahu, Hawaii (care A. W. Eames, Wahiawa).
2638 Kim Song Cho, Honolulu, Hawaii (Constructing Quartermaster Castner, Oahu).
3986 Ho Chong, Auld Lane, Honolulu.
2308 Bo Chong, Liliha, near school, Honolulu, Hawaii.
966 Kwan Ching Chong (Kwan King Chong), King & Maunken, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1016 Youn Dai Choon, near corner Liliha and King Streets, Honolulu, Oahu.
5263 Chin Chow (Chaw), 440 North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii Chaw Chin, Kakui Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
7165 Lun Choy, Pearl City, Oahu, Hawaii.
8757 Jun Ke Choy, 1288 Asylum Road, Honolulu.
2904 Sai Chong Chun (Chun Sai Chong, Sai Chun Chong), No. 2 Camp, Vineyard, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6904 Woon Hack Chun, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2427 Hari Cilonowsky (Cilonowskng), 1415 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1332 Pablo Cintron, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6290 Drimo G. Clemente, King Street, Honolulu.
5425 Macario B. Codosale (Kadosale), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii (Macario B. Cadosate, Kadase, Kadosle; Macasio B. Cadosale, Macasio Baldeiras Codosale, Oakala, Oahu.
642 John Concepcion, Aala Street, Honolulu, Box 781.
6900 Benacio (Benancio) N. Constantino, Kahalun, Oahu, Hawaii.
5641 Bernaldo Cordoba, Pali, Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii (Liliha Street, Honolulu).
1313 Bisenti (Bisnti) Corrino, Watertown, Oahu, Hawaii (Watertown, Oahu).
5050 Joao Jose Correa, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6655 Antone de Corte (Antone DeCorte), Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8069 Antonio D. Cortes, Kahalun, Oahu, Hawaii.
27 Benito Cortez, Kahuku, Hawaii.
528 Pedro Cristobal, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
3330 Teodoro (Feodoro) G. Cruz, 1320 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (1320 Punchbowl Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
7606 Rufino Cuaresma (Cuarisma), Kahuku, Hawaii.
3968 Ah Chow, Waipahu, Hawaii.
1490 Eusibio (Euseblo) Cuesta, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii, Ewa, Oahu.
5278 Pedro M. Culmmario (Culmmaris, Culminaris), Kahalun, Oahu (Kahuula, Oahu), Hawaii.
3298 Joseph H. (Hernandez) Curtis, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.

8217 Maricano Decanay (M. Decany, Marciano Dacanay), Eleventh, Honolulu, Hawaii (Alaska Packers' Association, Nakanek, Alaska).
4160 Antonio da Costa, 1813 Colbun Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4126 Andres P. Dadison, Iwili Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7500 Sabino Daguimol, Waipahu, Hawaii.
3025 Jose D. Dais, Kahalun, Koolaupoko (Kahaluu, Oahu), Hawaii.
2814 Italio Delamadi (Delamidi), Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2664 Egnacio Dalanio (Narcancis), Aiea, Hawaii.
8457 Sagio Dalegadid (Sagaio Dalegdid), Aiea, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4597 Gonsalo Daleon, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
5197 Jorgo P. Dandoy (Danduy), 3336 Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6378 Senon Dato, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6356 Simeon David, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
2052 Donato Dayre, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
140 Melancio Deaguson, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
3643 Santiago Debebaro, Hauula, Koolauloa, C. C., Honolulu, Hawaii.
7183 Benito Decamp (Decampo), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
7802 Pedro de la Crosse, King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2842 Paulino de la Cruz, King and Liliha Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (Ewa Sugar Co., Oahu).
8766 Pedro de la Cruz, Filipino mission, King Street, Honolulu.
2474 Alejandro (Alejandero) Delaustria, Schofield Barracks (Ewa Sugar Co., Oahu), Hawaii.
127 Elias Delosantos, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5114 Mariliiano Demacolagan (Demacolangan), Kahuku, Oahu, Hawaii.
5116 Fernando Denaqui, Ewa, Hawaii.
5429 Gracio Desario, camp 2, Vine Yard (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny), Honolulu, Hawaii.
3884 Bonifacio S. Diano, Kahalun, Oahu, Hawaii.
6865 Palame Diano, Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
954 Aleho (Aliho) Digula, Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7068 Pedro Dizon, 995 Dowsett Lane and King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7100 Pedro O. (Odena) Dizon (Pedro Dizon), Waipahu, Hawaii.
4023 Francisco Dogoman, Ewa, Hawaii.
5026 Filemon Dolaca, 52 Kukui Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
567 Alejandro Domingo, Ewa, Hawaii.
8655 Ki Myung Dong, Inter Island Steamship Co., Kailelain (S. S. I. I. S. S. Co., S. S. *Kaiulani*).
1024 Sun Lee Dong (Lee Dong Sam, Lee Dong Sun), Wahiawa (post laundry, Schofield Barracks, Oahu), Hawaii.
1834 Juse Doran, camp 2, Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Oahu.
272 Emilio Dorante, camp 4, Puunene, Main Island (1335 River, Vine Yard), Honolulu, Hawaii.
5748 Charlie (Ch.) Dubos, Schofield Barracks.
6693 Casiano Dulalaz, 1583 River, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2599 Guillermo (Juillermo) Dumiao, Schofield Barracks, Waiawa.
267 Alberto Duque, Ewa, Oahu.
7240 Maximo Duroya (Duraga), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5233 Evan Dvinaninoff (Dvinaninopt), King Street, corner Peterson Lane.
1742 Taminosuki Ebesugawa (Taminosuke, Taminosuki Ebesugano), Waiaee, Pearl City (Moililli Street, Honolulu), Hawaii.
270 Teofilo E. Efhan (Ahan, Teofilo Eltagundi Efhan, Ahan), Waipahu, Hawaii.
646 Procopio Ejercito, 707 Kalihi Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4212 Anacito Z. Ejipto (Anacieto Zuria Ejipto, Anaclito Egepto), Waipahu, Hawaii.
6864 Ponciano Elao, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4151 Andres Elegen, Waipahu, Hawaii.
6596 Macalio Elinko (Erinko), Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Oahu (Kipahulu, Maui).
1897 Francisco Elorde, Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu.
5557 Edward Emil, 733 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
407 Zacarias C. Enriques, 745 Richard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7644 Celestino Eomo (Euma, Cumo), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2685 Peldan Erenio (Erenio Pedian), Castner, Oahu, Hawaii.
4599 Juan Erinia (Duan Arinir), 1113 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6833 Bonifacio Escorpion, Liliha and Kukui, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8697 Eusibio Espaho, Kawailoa, Oahu, Hawaii.
103 Silbino Espanioi (Espanol), Kahuku, Hawaii.
105 Cornelio Espanola, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
3508 Feles Espanto, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7 Sanson Eucibio (Lucibio G. Samson, Eucibio K. Samson), Watertown, Oahu.
8196 Bernardo Farem, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1150 Tinay Fastina (Fastina Tinay (Tuiay)), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
2812 Leong Fat, 24n Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii.
52 Juan Felisarta, Ewa, Hawaii.
8374 Alejandro Fereo (Ferer), Philippino Camp, Kahuku, Oahu (Kahuku Plantation, Kahuku, Oahu).
4862 Alfonzo Fernandes, 4 Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6953 Leoncio Fernandes (Farnandes), 444 North King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4676 Pedro Farnandez, Kahuku, Hawaii (29 Lafayette Street, Stockton, Calif.).
468 Mateo Fernando, Kunia, Hawaii.
8018 Joseph Ferreira, 527 Punhale Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
98 Solbodor Flora (Floro, Salvador Floro), Iwilei Road, Honolulu Company Twenty-fifth Infantry, Schofield Barracks).
1372 Alfredo Flores, Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu, Hawaii.
7696 Baristo Flores, Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
186 Gaudenicio Folinas, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
216 Francisco Fornor, Waipah, Ewa, Hawaii.
6591 Felix Franco, Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu, Hawaii.
8224 Joseph Frazier, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4817 Eustaquio Fresco (Eustalquio Freco), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1648 Frank Freitas, Kamahameha Fourth, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2792 Edward Freitas, Kamehameha III Road, Kalihi, Oahu, Hawaii (care of Mrs. Wm. Manewa, Waiakiki).
6389 Joseph Freitas, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
5038 Seichi Fukita (Fujita), Aala Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
115 Julian C. Gadiana, Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1999 Isokichi Fukuda, Vineyard, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4434 Martin Galera, Ewa, Oahu.
7025 Besilio Galisia (Basilio Galisio), Lain Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Lani Lane, Honolulu).
5472 Elino Gamo, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
5738 Adriano Gapol, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4294 Catalino Gapol, 17 Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5562 Torbio (Toribio) Gapol, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.

3574 Lope Gasa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
1405 Juan Gelhany (Hilhan, Gethary), Kahuku, Oahu, Hawaii.
2678 Harry K. (Kauhane) Gilman, Manawai, Waiuea, Oahu, Hawaii (care of Jack Doyle, Oahu Railroad Co.).
4203 Gregorio Gintu (Ginter), River, Honolulu, Hawaii.
332 Robert Gohier, Kamehameha School, Hawaii.
5648 Mariano Gomez (Gomeg), 43 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7586 Servando Gomez, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5600 John Gonsalves, River Street, between Kukui and Vineyard, Honolulu.
1074 Tomazio Gonzalves (Gonsalves, Tomizio Gonsalves), Vineyard Street, Camp No. 2.
4405 Felix Goricho, Helemand, Oahu.
91 Nakata Gosuka (Gosuke Nakata, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
2054 Sevastian (Sebastian) Goviera, Waialua P. O., Oahu, Hawaii.
5164 Kenei Goya, Waianae, Oahu, Hawaii.
5992 Miguel Greene, No. 2 Camp, Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Miguel Greenet, Camp No. 2, Vineyard Street, Honolulu.)
4509 Juan Gulmayo (Goromayo), Kunia, Oahu, Hawaii. (1401 Lilihi Street, Honolulu.)
519 Manuel Guagardo (Guajardo, Guagavdo), Honolulu, Hawaii. Camp No. 2, Vineyard Street, Honolulu).
970 Sabistre (Silvestre) Gupun, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2111 Tong Gut, Pauahi & Smith, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1290 Yasuke Hakamatsu, Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
38 Andrew Halalu, Hanapepe, Kauai.
5289 Leo Harrington, Castner, Oahu.
5270 James D. Harris, 130 Berelania Street, Honolulu, Hawaii. (130 Beretania Street, Honolulu).
7783 Sayo Harugo (Haruzo Sayo), School Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2182 Agapito Haspio, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5743 Toolchiro Hatakeyama, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
607 Pablo Hernandez, Ah Leong Block, King Street, opposite O'N. & L. Co.
6617 Buta Higa, Waipahu, Hawaii.
459 Kama Higa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
7676 Ticei Higa, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
363 Ahuso Hiiko, Waiabu Pineapple Plantation, Oahu, Waiabu. (Heiko Ahuso, Oahu Pineapple Co., Oahu.)
6032 Punciano (Ponlano) Hinaot, 20 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3065 Jose Hinayon, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
72 Tomoichi D. Hioki (Tomoichi Hioki), Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5500 Seizo Hirado (Hirada), Kualaea, Koolaupoke, Oahu. (Libbyville P. O., Oahu).
1266 Vicenti (Vicente) Hiraldo (Vicente Heraldo, Vecinte Hiraldo), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
843 Pedro Hiron, O. K. Block, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5733 Hishiyo Hiresawa, Kukui Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
306 Oshiro Hitaro, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2152 Carl Hoff, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3344 Kim Young Hon (Hau, Kim Young Hon), Panao Valley, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4682 Nobuhiko Hondo (Honda), Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7717 Foo Lum Hong, Liliha Street, near King, Honolulu, Oahu. (Puahi Street, Honolulu, Oahu. Care City Mill Co., Honolulu.)
6590 Pang See Hong (Hang), 150 Hotel Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5294 Geiza L. (Luzaki) Honokichi, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
5105 Lee Sung Hoo, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
6212 Tamotsu Hoshino, Puuloa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
3719 Domingo Howard, King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
50 Fu Hown (Fu, Houn), 5 Corkscrew Lane, Honolulu.
4464 Geronimo Hoyo (Hogo), 1934 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii. (1925 Liliha, Honolulu).
5742 Chang Kum Hung, Luluku, Kaneohe, Koolaupoko, Oahu, Hawaii.
3711 Marcos Ibe, Waipahu, Hawaii.
2542 Kim Dai (Tai) Hung (Kim Dai Sung), Waipahu, Hawaii.
7689 Noriono (Mariono) Idei, Pearl City, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
5236 Tokujo Igi, Kaneohe Koolaupoko, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Tokuso Igi, Haiku, Peahi Main.)
3363 Manuel P. (Pereira) Ignacio, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4434 Ariston Ihara (Hiar), Waialua P. O., Oahu, Hawaii.
636 James Shimichi (Shichie) Iida, Honolulu.
1428 Gisho Ikehara (Ikehara), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
6733 Benigno Ilagan (Beniano Ilogan), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
5535 Kyoshin Inafuku (Jorahuku Kyoshiai), Wahiwa, Hawaii.
8289 Kaichi Inouye, Kumanoa Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (K. Inouye, the Western Life & Casualty Co., Kamanoa Lane).
7611 Gregorio Irakoon, Iwilei (Iwilei) Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8786 Gerogoro (Gerozoro) Isago, Kaneohe, Oahu.
4442 Kato Ishimatshi, Waialua, Oah (Oahu), Hawaii.
8413 Kaname Ishimoto, Puuloa Hawn Dredging Co., Honolulu, Hawaii.
1998 Shizuku (Shizuka) Ito, Yamashiro Hotel, Geretania, Honolulu.
6496 Sabis Jabier (Sabas Jairer), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
8419 Delphino Jaciento, 440 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Delphin Jacinto, 440 North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
979 Catalino Jacintho (Jacinta), Kahuku, Hawaii.
3981 Ignacio Jacinto, Kahuku, Hawaii.
1465 Jelton (Jeltan) Jack, Kuickui (Kukui) Street, Honolulu.
8214 John Jacob (Hering), Jack Lane, Nuuanu Valley, Honolulu.
5632 Francisco Jaiman, Waipahu, Hawaii.
1930 Beato Jamalon (Biato Jumalon), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2224 Bebego Jaruwe, Liliha Street, Honolulu.
8292 Ciriaco Juago (Juego), Iwilei, Honolulu, Oahu (Iwilei Road, Honolulu).
2626 See (Loe) Sui Jing, King Street, Honolulu (Plantation Maui).
4966 Peter Josiah, North Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Libby-McNeill Cannery, Oahu).
6265 Bonifacio Jorakina (Jorkuia, Jorgina), 3739 River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2015 Marcelo Juguilon, Waipahu, Hawaii.
2387 Kawamato Jukichi (Jukichi Kawamoto), Waimanalo Plantation, Oahu.
6207 Pio Kaalama, Maunakea No. 138, Honolulu.
3780 John Honua Kaha, Kalihi Hospital, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5067 George H. Kahaawinui (Kahaawiniu), Alewa Height, Honolulu (Alewa Heights, Honolulu).
3395 Junior K. Kahau (Kuhiu), 956 Alapai Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (440 West King Street, Honolulu).
6692 James Kahuwali, Moiliili, Oahu (Moiliili, Honolulu).
8742 Arthur Kaihe, Ala Moana Road, Kalia, Honolulu, Hawaii.
46 Simeon Kailau (Kainiau), Waimea, Kauai.
2985 Maiki (Makai, Mapai) Kaili, Kamehameha Fourth Road, Honolulu, Hawaii (United States Navy, Puuloa, Pearl Harbor).
1194 Higa Kamaboo (Kimoboo), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
8212 Jack Kamae, Reinhart's sampan, Pier 16, Honolulu.
6878 Sam Kamaun, 475 Kukine, Honolulu, Hawaii (475 Kuakini Street, Honolulu).
6286 Nakata Kamasto, Warpio, Oahu, Hawaii.
5781 Gunichi Kametani, Voneyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (care of M. McIntyre, Pearl City).
1443 Kichitaro Kametani, River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
101 Yoshio (Yoshie) Kamisato, care of Kyushuya Hotel, Aala Lane, Honolulu.
3343 Herman (Hermann) Kamoku, 1812 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii (Herman Kamoku, I. I. S. N. Co., Honolulu).
5146 Hiapo Kana, care of S. S. *Manuakea*, Honolulu, Hawaii (I. I. S. N. Co., Honolulu).
1345 Ryoli Kanashiro, Wahihiawa, Hawaii.
7652 Kiro Kaneshiro (Ziro Kanishiro, J. Kaneshiro), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
7641 Kamata (Kamato) Kaneshiro, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Honolulu Plant Co., Honolulu).
8112 Hammyo Kanichi (Kainchi (Konichi) Hommyo), Schofield Barracks.
80 Keigi Kanno, Lali, Oahu, Hawaii (Laie, Oahu).
3855 Augustine Kasay, Ewa, Hawaii.
502 Matio Katanio, 440 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4175 Jurishi Kato, Watertown, Oahu, Hawaii.
547 Yasukichi (Yasukiichi Akatsuka, Yasukiehi), Slaughter House Lane, Honolulu.
2776 Joseph K. Kauakikau (Joseph Kania Kauakahilau, Jos. Kama Kana Kilihau), 1457 Auids (Auid) Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4008 John Kaululaau (Kaululaau), near Liliha, Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii (care of Mrs. Oscar Cox, Wailua).
1148 Rinzo Kawahara (Kunahara, Kawahora), Fort Shafter, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4515 David Kawikihale (Kawikihuli, Kawikihali), 613 Waiakamelio, Honolulu, Hawaii (inmate county jail, Honolulu).
6597 Gregorio Kayna, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Aiea, Ewa, Oahu).
4415 Munami Kazui (Minami Kazui, Kazui), Kalaao, Hawaii.
250 Joe Kaeha (Keaha), Buckle Lane.
4919 Solomon Keahalio (Kaehalio), Waimea, Hawaii (Koolou, Oahu).
8239 John Keanu, 936 Kane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6809 Moses Keanu, Aala Lane, Honolulu (United States Engineer Department, Puuloa, Oahu).
7244 William (Wm.) Keao, King and Beretania Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
451 Miguel Keilhat (Keilhat), Kawaeloa, Oahu, Hawaii.
2 Peter Keliiwaiwaiole, 1412 Kaulawela Lane, Honolulu.
2448 Isoda Kenzo, 422 North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2825 Manuel Kikewa, Aiea, Hawaii (care of O. R. R. & Land Co., Honolulu).
7723 Hark Sop (Soo) Kim, 1802 Artesian, Honolulu, Hawaii.
338 In Kul (Kurl) Kim, Schofield Barracks, construction quartermaster, Oahu.
5773 Sar Yong Kim, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
7399 Kumuo Kimura (Kimma), Beretania Street, Honolulu, Oahu (fireman, I. I. S. N. Co.).
467 Kankichi Kinashita (Kinashita), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Aiea, Oahu).
593 Maximo Kisil, Pali Camp, Kaneohe, Oahu.
6430 Katsuji (K.) Kitamura, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
1935 Densuke Kitano, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
6016 Sasuke Kiyohiro, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
7111 Chiwojo Kiyuna, care of Komeya Hotel, corner River and Panahi Streets, Hawaii.
8720 Antone Koloua, steamship *Caludine*, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1289 Sadamitsu Komoti (Komori), Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
7654 Charles Kopa, Kalihi-Waena, Honolulu, Hawaii (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny).
239 Kentari Koyama (Kataro Koymo), Hala Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6196 Cha Moon Ku, Liliha and King Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny).
8229 William Ku, 422 School Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
331 George Kuasay (Kuaasay), Liliho Street, Honolulu, Hawaii Haw'n Fertilizer Co., Iwilei).
5878 Gus Kuewa (Kuewr), Waimea, Oahu, Hawaii.
1263 Kanichi Kuimisutsu, Maunukea No. 31, of room, Honolulu. (Kamchi Kuimiatsu, room No. 31, Maunakea Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.)
4033 Jum Chul Kum, Waipahu, Hawaii. (Kum Chul Kim, Waipahu, Oahu.)
374 Moichi Kumataro, Hiroshima Ken, Japan (Wahiawa, Oahu).
6385 Zenzo (Zengo) Kumeno, Honolulu, Hawaii (*Star of Finland*, Honolulu), Callao, Peru.
8178 Tiodoro Labas, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
7222 Dionisio Labilla, 933 Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2979 Juan M. Laboris (Lorobis, Larrobis), Kahuku, Hawaii.
134 Engracio Lacio, Kahalun, Koolaupoko. (Engrasio Lasio, Kahalun, Koolaupoko, Oahu.)
8268 Engracio Lacio, 440 King Street.
6326 Lui Lakey, 296 Kukui Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (1178 Nuuanu Street, Honolulu.
5262 Felix Lalona, Watertown (Oahu).
6542 Vincente Lansing, Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6358 Vincenti Larot, Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
394 Tin Yee (Tinyee) Lau, 1713 King, corner Kalihi, Honolulu.
3119 Lumauta Laurean (Lauream Lumanta, Lumanto), Oahu, Hawaii (44 King Street, Kohala, Hawaii).
7668 Dionicie S. Lavendero, Kahaluu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii (Dinicio S. Lavendero, Labandero, Kahaluu, Oahu).
5134 Chung Lee (Lee Chung), Kukui, near Liliha Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
4068 Ket Kong Lee, Kulakau, Honolulu, Hawaii (Kalakaua Avenue, Honolulu).
506 Sung Sim (Lim) Lee, Waheawa, Oahu (Wahiawa, Oahu), Territory of Hawaii.
4054 Louis Leon (Leon), Puuloa, Oahu (Puuloa, Oahu), Hawaii.
4689 Hung Gut Leong (Leong Hung Gut), 72 Hotel Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
4761 Ki Chan Leong (Leong Ki Chan), 1140 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
5022 Juan Llano, Ewa, Territory of Hawaii.

7331 Severino (Seberino) Licong, Ewa.
4323 Frank Lililehua, Long Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6081 Gregorio (Gregoria) De Ortez Limpiado (Gregorio D. Limpiado), Ewa, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii.
5810 Ho Wah Lin (Liu), Nemanu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Nuuanu Street, Honolulu).
2199 Shing Lo, 1464 Liliha Street, Honolulu.
8664 Mitchell Labo, 123 Vineyard Street, Honolulu.
2282 Pedro Lomongo, Waianae (Waianae, Oahu), Territory of Hawaii.
7759 Amelio Lomoya (Lomoyo, Lemoya), Hauula Hoolauloa, C. C., Honolulu, Hawaii.
5698 Domingo Lopez (Lokej), Kalihi Hospital, Honolulu, Hawaii. (Honolulu Constructing & Draying Co.).
1548 Rodrigo Lopez, No. 14 Lilika Street, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
1221 Moses Losada, 14 Lilika Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6736 Lau Low, Lilika, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
1578 Culeng Lucio, King Street, Honolulu (1113 Liliha, Honolulu), Territory of Hawaii.
976 Yan Hoon Lum (Lum Yan Hoon), Manakeap Hotel, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.
5112 Juan E. Luna, Kahaluu, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii (Juan Eluna, Vineyard Street, Camp 2, Oahu).
3236 Trabocio (Trebocio) Lusada, Waianae, Territory of Hawaii.
4363 Fortunato (Foriemato) Luspo, Luluku, Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii.
726 Ken Na M (Kan Na. M), corner Liliha and King Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha and Vineyard, Honolulu).
3426 Kalomio Macdo, Dowsett Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii, care of Lord Young Co., Pearl Harbor.
899 Catalino Madanay, Waipahu, Hawaii.
40 Banias Magdaleno (Magdaleno Banias, Banas), Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4886 Santiago Maghanoy, Waianae, Hawaii.
1437 Saturmino Maghinay, 174 Back Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (174 Buckle Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii).
8095 Palcido D. Magiangit (Placido Dabodabo Magiangit, Placido Magiangit), Waipahu, Oahu (Waipahu, Oahu), Hawaii.
712 Maximo Maglinte (Magliante, Maximo T. Maglinte), Watertown, Oahu, Hawaii.
277 Elpedio Magpiong, 1180 Peterson Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1008 Fortunato Magsayo, Kahuku, Hawaii.
5056 Vincente Magtalna, Lilika D. King, Honolulu, Hawaii (Wahiawa, Honolulu, Hawaii).
638 David Mahiai (Dd. Mahiai), Oahu Prison, formerly at Peppekeo, Hawaii.
7355 Antonio (Antonio) Mahusay, Dala Block, Aala Lane, Honolulu, Oahu (Aala Block, Aala Lane, Honolulu).
558 Fred Maiwald, Kukui, Honolulu, Hawaii.
387 Tokuzo Makanishi (Nakanishi), Kauluwela, Lane and School, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5288 Joe Makia, Goldmine, Iniki, Honolulu, Oahu (Iwilei, Oahu).
5330 Severo (Sibro) Males, Aala and King Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1895 Magdalino S. Malikay, Watertown, Hawaii.
4616 David Malo, Lail (Laie), Hawaii.
235 Pedro M. Mandapot (Mandapat), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii (post-office box 207).
7171 Eugenio Mangubot, 70 North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8777 Vincente Mansares, 15 Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7066 Pedro Mantiad, Waianae, Hawaii (Waialua Plant Co., Bango 7661).
3228 Crisanto Manuel, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4902 Santiago Manuel, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii (Ewa, 1831 Liliha Street, Honolulu).
382 Guadioso Marcelo, Moililile Road, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3151 Donato Mardo, 24 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (United States naval station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu).
430 Baison Mariano, Hotel Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Mariano Baison, Aiea, Oahu).
4072 Alfred Marke (Marks), Gulick Avenue, Kalihiuka, Honolulu (Gulick Avenue, Honolulu).
77 Manuel S. Marquez (Manuel Souza Marques, Manuel Souza Marks), Ewa, Oahu.
7257 Tanetino Marsa (Tanstino Marsa, Faustino Marsa), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4554 June Martines (Martinis), no permanent home, Honolulu.
3423 Martin (Martinus, Martinees) Martinez, Kaliki Hospital (Kaliko Hospital), Honolulu, Hawaii.
6695 Rinjiro Masaki, Desha Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (Gingiro Masoki, Oohu Jail).
8030 Leizaburo Mashima, 1080 River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4942 Keao Matai, Waiaena, Oahu, Hawaii (road department, Waialua, Oahu).
7702 Eugenio Matiliano, Waiaena, Oahu, Hawaii (Waialua, Oahu).
6976 Inocencio Matola (I. P. Matola), Watertown, Oahu.
1417 Mitsujiro Matsumoto, Waipahu, Hawaii.
4081 Sanjiuro Matsuura, Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6775 Joseph K. (Keao) Maunupau (J. K. Maunupau), Lilika, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha Street, Honolulu).
3923 Masato Meyeyama, Dowsett Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
948 Mamerto Medel (Mamerto Madel), 1079 Aala (1036 Aala), Honolulu, Hawaii.
6751 Legorio (Gregro) Medina, 995 Dowsett Lane, Palama, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3063 Tom Mee, Cunha Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (care New Oahu Carriage Co., Honolulu).
7309 Louis De Mello (Luiz de Mello), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5530 Manuel Mendez, Hauula, Oahu, Hawaii.
6364 Vesente Mendosa, Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
308 Fernando Mendoza, Kalkai, Cebu, Philippine Islands (care Lieut. O. S. O'Meal, First Infantry, Schofield Barracks).
300 Francisco Mercado, county jail.
5351 Delfin A. Mendoza, 995 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Dolfin A. Mendosa, Q Y Buildings, Wahiawa, Oahu).
1520 Leandro Mercado, Ewa, Hawaii.
7726 Placido Merced, Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1909 Rafael J. Merino (Rafael Jimineh Merino), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
94 Pedro Miano, Kemo, Waiahea, Hawaii.
6240 Lawrence Michel, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii (care Federal Telegraph Co., Oahu).
444 Geronimo Micolob, 440 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
214 Masaichi Mitsubayoshi, Dowsett Lane, Honolulu.
3802 Skiuatsu Miyagusuku (Miyagusuhu, Mujagusuku), School Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8184 Koki Miyake, 1135 Pau Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7287 Kaze Miyamoto, Waipohu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
1826 Kame Miyashiro (Miyaskiro), Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
1030 Ushi Miyashiro, Pearl City, Oahu, Hawaii.
8669 Pedro Mohosey, Koloa, Kauai (Mohasay Pedro, Honolulu, Plantation, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii).
3664 John Molina, Kawailoa, Oahu, Hawaii (Waialua, Oahu).
8195 Leon Moncel, Winston Building, Honolulu, Hawaii (Mancel, Mancol), Winston Building, Honolulu).
5186 Shunichi Monden, Waipahu, Hawaii.
2592 Narandan Moniko (Moniko Narandan), Lilika (Liliha Street), Honolulu.
4969 Cornelio Monlape (Monlope), Waiaena, Oahu, Hawaii (Waialua, Oahu).
3187 Pedro Monsuno, Castner, Hawaii.
2634 Benito Morales, 3 Aala Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6020 Pablo Moralis (Moralez), Wahaina, Oahu, Hawaii (Waluaiua, Wahiawa, Oahu).
3447 Jacinto Morello (Murillo), North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
663 Isaburo Mori (Mori Isaburo, Iseenre), Maunakea Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1407 Nakahiro (Nakahira, Makahiea) Motoichi, Makua, Hawaii. (Care of O. R. & L. Co., Oahu.)
5757 Jose de Motta (Jas. da Motta), No. 5 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6903 Lilichi (Llichi) Murakami, River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5516 Masata Murakawa (Murakana), River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2562 Shintaro Murata, Kahuka, Hawaii.
1723 Ariston B. Mustaho (Mostoho, Mustako), Kahuluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2526 Batiano (Babiano, Babiaro) Nadan, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5922 Iwamtsu (Iwamatsu) Nakada (Noamatou), Waimalu, Aiea, Hawaii.
3247 Seishu Nakama, Waipahu, Hawaii.
3145 Neogoro Nakamura, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii. (Pearl City.)
1415 Masugi Nakase, Heeia, Koolaupoko, Oahu, Hawaii.
7555 Kami Nakasune, Hujane, Akinawa. (Haw. Pres. Co., Wahiawa, Oahu.)
5919 Kazuichi Nakata (Nakala), Waisu, Pearl City, Hawaii. (Fisherman H. Saige, Waisu, Oahu.)
1931 Heshiro Nakayawa, 1336 Nuuanu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2856 Kalaiwao (Kalauao) Namau, 1211 Piama, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7978 Marcelo Narciso (Marcelo A. Narsico), Kahaiua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7590 Egmedio Y. (T.) Natad, Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
6311 Fiabiano Navalto (Navalta), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
2761 Cirelo (Cirilo) Nesneson, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
7754 Francisco Del Nieves (Francisco Delas Nieves), Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
4535 Kitaro Nishimura (K. Nishimura), Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
3721 Isidoro Nisinsan (Nisnisan, Nisnison), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5709 Murakami Nitaro (Murakami Nitale), Pearl City, Hawaii.
823 David Noah, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
5104 Frank Nobriga, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2461 Vientine Nobriga, jr., Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2859 Kamaro Nohara, Honolulu, Hawaii (Honolulu, Oahu).
8406 Francisco Coba Notes (Francisco Netes), Kahaluu, Oahu.
3406 Malesas Nunes, Kunia, Oahu, Hawaii.
3223 Alihandro Obrigal, Liliha near Kakui, Honolulu, Oahu. (Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Honolulu.)
6589 Salvador De (de) Ocampo, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
583 Segundo de Ocampo, Costner, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
989 Alihandro Ocoimo, Leilehua, Oahu, Hawaii.
3286 Symion Ocso (Oeso), Waisiua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4204 Plasido Ogo (Ago), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
921 Junzo (Jinzo, Jingo) Ohara, Desha Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4579 Gaudencio Oliverca (Oliveros), Ah Leong Block, Aala, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2807 Nicolas Olpoc (Ulpoc), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
8313 Anastacio Omongos, Aiea, Punelon, Honolulu.
6460 Mon Yong On, Honolulu, Hawaii (P. O. box 1345) Wilika Wahiawa (P. O. box 1345, Liliha Street, Honolulu.)
6819 Keohokii (Keohoket) Opio, Waialu, Oahu.
7318 Alberto M. (Manzo) Orallo, Waipahu, Hawaii.
8404 Louis Calderon Ormetite, 1032 Auld Lane, Honolulu. (Ormenita Louis (Louis Ormenita), 1032 Auld Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.)
3586 Juna Damasio Ortiz (Juan Damasio (Damacio) Ortiz), 440 North King Street, Hawaii.
4162 Exequiel Ortus, post tailor shop, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
5349 Kishio Oshiro, Watertown, Pualoa (Oahu), Hawaii.
2221 Toku (Tohu) Oshiro, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
1565 Shuichi Ota, vineyard re Lilihua, Honolulu (A. Ota, Oahu).
599 Pedro Paalisbo, Puuloa, Hawaii (Kapahulu, Honolulu).
7546 Angel Pabiling, Waipahu, Hawaii (Ambil Pabling, Waipahu, Oahu).
5152 Pedro Pabingquit (Pabingwit, Pabinguit), Waianae, Oahu, Hawaii (Waianae, Oahu).
4894 Micade Pablo (Pablo Micade, B. Serrano), 9 Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7444 Alejandro Pacarat, Waialua, Oahu, Howaii.
2122 Nemecio M. Pacarro (Paearro, Nemicio M. Pacarro), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
7370 Manuel Sarcedo Pacheco, Ewa, Oahu.
2567 Domingo Paclipan, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1657 Antonio (Antonino) Padayhag, Kahukee, Hawaii (Kahuku, Oahu).
969 Eulogio Padilla (Padillo, Eulogia Padilla), 1860 Lilihu (Liliha) Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
422 Roman Pagala, 1 Waipahu, Hawaii.
5770 Mamerto F. Pagaragan, Waipahu, Hawaii (Mamerto Taballag Pagaragan, Fagaragan, Waipahu, Oahu).
3171 Pedro Pajuay, 10 Iwelei (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny), Honolulu, Hawaii.
3007 Maximo Palangan (Palagan), Waipahu (Oahu), Hawaii.
590 Antone Palemino, Schofield Barracks (Antonio Palomino, 45 Varennes Place, San Francisco).
5460 Joe Palenapo (Palenapa), Kauluweia, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1523 Mariano Palitang, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
321 Elasio (Esalico) F. Palmares, Kahuluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2824 Crispo Palocis, 9 Lilika (Liliha) Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2290 Juan Panangitan, Kahuku, Hawaii.
5631 Jan Shun Pang (Sang Jan Shun), Nuuanu Street, near Bishop Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3285 Tom Sai Pang, Kukui (Beretania and Mauna Kea), Honolulu, Hawaii.

5251 Francisco Pangcog, Ewa, Hawaii.
5705 Diego Paniagua, Waipahu, Hawaii.
217 Lopi (Loopi) Pao, Waialua post office, Oahu, Hawaii.
6476 Joseph Paoa, Asylum Lo Ne King Street (Ashlum Road, near North King Street), Honolulu, Hawaii.
6898 Gregorio Pongio (B. Clizalago), Puuloa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
6738 Eufemio Paraiso, Hauula Koo Lauloa Col., Honolulu (Hauula, Oahu), Hawaii.
6817 Demerito (Demetrio) Parco (Demetrio Pasco), Waianae (Waianae, Oahu), Hawaii.
2648 Ho Chun Park (Park Ho Chun), Fort Street, near fire station, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3318 Yllonco Parro, Libba Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7774 Constantino Pasco (Paseo), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8373 Antonio Pascus, Immigration Station or City Prison (City Prison or Immigration Station), Honolulu, Hawaii. Oahu.
3913 Valintin (Valentin) Pasmala, 995 North King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
410 Toraino Pasuan, 1319 Pumahou Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4629 Luis Patches (Patchis), Kahuka, Hawaii.
6580 Jose Bantista Patino, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
8127 Camillo Patriarca, Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2973 Narsiso (Nariso) Paulino, Waheawa (Wahiawa) Oahu, Hawaii.
4788 Andrea Payod. Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
678 Pedro Felix (Felix Pedro), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
2247 Apolonio Pendanz, Kawailoa, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4875 Ramon P. Peralta, (Libby, McNeill & Libby,) Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
1339 Molencio Peratta (Paralto), 995 Dawsett and King Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (995 Dowsett Lane, Honolulu).
319 Esteban Cicuela Peres, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7727 Jose Perla, 21 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3293 Teborcio Pinas (Teburcio Penos), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
6224 Benigno Pingong, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8104 Mauricio dela Pinia (Pina), Waheawa, Oahu, Hawaii (Wahiawa, Oahu).
1694 Matiar Plomit, Vineyard Street.
698 Jum (Jim) Poe, 1612 Kaliki Road, Kaliki, Oahu, Hawaii.
7281 Viento (Vicento) Polomo, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
6279 Peter P. Pontes (Pachec), Kapahulu Road, Honolulu, Hawaii (Castner Boarding House, Castner, Oahu).
1634 Chin Poy (Yee) (Chin Poy Yee, North King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7948 Candido Preor, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
641 Marian Puentes (Puente), Liliha Street, Honolulu, U. S. A.
2507 William (William) Puiwa, 1862 Kunawai Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8738 Ambrocie Purtodo (Ambrosio Portoda), Iwilei Road, Oahu (784 Iwilei Road, Honolulu).
4237 Julian (Julian) Quehono (Julian Kuyano), 339 Besetavia Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1802 Oscar Quezada (Oscar Quezada Valdenama), Schofield Barracks, Libby, McNeill & Libby, Oahu.
922 Willie F. (Faria) Quinta, Waialua P. O., Oahu., Hawaii.
3859 Lorin Rakin (Rakan), 850 Iwielu, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4477 Jose Ramires, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6603 Timas Rancires (Tumas Ranicres), Castner, Hawaii (Schofield Barracks, Oahu).
6762 Edilberto Rannisea (Rannisez) (Edelberto Ranilsea), Ewa, Hawaii (Ewa, Oahu).
2650 Claudio Rebillo (Claudo Rebillo), Watertown, Hawaii.
5635 Simplicio Rediano, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5720 Lucas Redoble, 468 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
640 George A. Reis, Pearl City, Oahu.
6793 Fritz Reitter, 1842 Naopala Laur (Lane), Honolulu, Hawaii (care of Hawn. Dredging Co., Honolulu).
3808 Julio Relosa (Reiosa), Castner, Hawaii.
7745 Emelio Revera, Alia, Oahu, Hawaii (Emilio Ribera, care of Lord & Young, Pearl Harbor).
535 Fernando M. delos Reyes (Fernando Munoz delos Reyes, F. M. de Reyes), Waipahu, Hawaii.
1978 Paciano de los Reyes (Paciano delos Reyes), Ewa, Hawaii.
1659 Pedro Reyes, Waipahu, Hawaii.
8225 John Nui Rice, 2316 North King, Honolulu, Hawaii (Juneau, Alaska).
890 Catalino Gomes Ridera, Waipahu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
2418 Jose Riego, Waipahu, Hawaii.
8210 Julius Rigoso, Iwelei Road, post office box 745, Honolulu (Iwilei Road, post office box 745).
1828 Helario Risco, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
625 Anarallo (Anasalio) Rita, camp 2, Vineyard, Honolulu.
512 Rufino Rivera, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
5441 Mateo Robero, Dowsett Lane, Palama, Honolulu, Hawaii.
231 Dimes Robin, Pali Camp, Kaneohe, Oahu.
8000 Francisco Roda, Waialua P. O., Oahu, Hawaii.
5577 Matias B. Rodrigues (Rodriques), Robello Lane, King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4408 Eloy Rodriguez (Rodriquez), off 16 Puuhele Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7667 Emilio Rodrigues, Pupukea, Oahu, Hawaii.
4387 Domingo Rodriguss (Rodrigues, Rodriguez), waterfront, ship *Chas. A. Moody*, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3646 Antony Redriques (Rodrigues), corner Liliha and Kukiss, Honolulu, Hawaii (Liliha and Kukui Streets, Honolulu).
2203 Marcelo Romo, Wailua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7303 Roberto Rosaleg (Rosiaes), North 446 King Street (445 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
6997 Mariano Rosario, Honolulu, Hawaii.
72 Earl C. Rosebrough (Rosenborough), formerly Company K, Twenty-fifth.
1342 Rafael Rosete, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
8456 Ilario Rosetti, Aiea, Hawaii.
7249 Leon Rotas, 468 A, Webb Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii (738 Leavenworth Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
5832 Cartano (Kartano) Rubio, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
3095 Marcilo Sabifon (Sabihon, Sabijon), Kahuku, Oahu.
416 Leon Sadriza (Sabriza), Aiea, Oahu.
3177 Eugenio Sagot, Waipahu, Hawaii.
5608 Inocencio Saguban, Waipahu, Hawaii.
7046 Basilio Saha, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5194 Kasaburo Saito (K. Saiti), Aiea, Hawaii.
2287 Isami Sakamoto (Sakamato), Kaliki, Honolulu.
8412 Y. S. Sakata (S. Sakata), Robello Lane, Honolulu, Oahu (Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii).
3591 Jira Sakihara, Hohala, Hawaii, Hawaii (Hohala, Hatwaii).
1649 Taru Sakugawa, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
235 Jantero Sakumoto (Jantero SaRumoto), Wailua, Oahu, Hawaii (Waialua, Oahu).
2059 Jose Salayer, 1224 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3500 Vincente M. Salazar, Fort Shafter Int. Ho. Co., Honolulu.
6046 Andres R. Salbador (Andres Rogue Salbador), Waipahu, Hawaii.
592 Bernardo (Bernaldo) Salbador, box 1331, No. 20 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny, Honolulu, Hawaii).
2569 Lioncio Salem, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7556 Takuichi Samamoto (Sawamoto, Takiuchi Samamoto), Castner, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
3462 Cirpiano Samio (Cipriano Samio, Apriano Samio, C. Samio), 55 Iweilli (55 Iwilei Road), Honoluiu, Hawaii.
8478 Simon Samson, Area, Honolulu, Hawaii (Hon. Plantation, Aiea, Oahu).
1151 Agaton P. Sanchez, Ewa, Hawaii.
3695 Victoriano Sandagar, Kemo, Waiahia.
566 Henry Sanford, 613 Waikanulo, Honolulu.
7466 Sadaki Sanoue, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
510 Pedro Sanson, 17 Austin Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
5202 Eugenio Santiago, 993 Auld Lane, Honoluiu, Hawaii.
2135 Pascual Santiago, Vineyard Street (Vineyard Street, Honolulu).
8422 Demetrio Santos, 1306 Kukui Street, Honolulu (Demetrio, Libbyville, Hawaii).
643 Demetrio Santos, 1301 Kukui Street, Honolulu.
267 Juan Santos, Ah Leong Block, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3182 Roman Santos, Kawailoa Street, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4057 Floricio delos Santos, King and Liliha Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (Floricio de los Santes, King and Vineyard Streets, Honolulu).
4180 Sario de los Santes, Halemano, Hawaii.
6405 Antonio Saplot, 27 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6414 Leoncio Sardual (Sarduce, Sarduul, Sarduof), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii (Ewa, Oahu).
7136 Juan Sasis (Sases), Liliha, Honoluiu, Hawaii.
6844 Bunsaku Sato, Wahiawa Street, Oahu, Hawaii.
?529 Ichiroku Sato, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
2740 Segidor (Segidoc Sato, S. Sato), Waipahu, Oahu.
1619 Claude Schutte, 989 Rebello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2194 Gregorio Sequancio (Seguancio, Siguano), Wahiawa, Hawaii.
2254 Eubenio Sedro, Kukui Street, near Liliha Street, Honolulu.
8162 Ceriaco Segura (Cirioco Gegora, Ciriaco Segura, Giriaco Gegura), Ewa, Hawaii (Ewa, Oahu).
6010 Gabriel Seiebrado, Waipahu, Hawaii.
7769 Leoncio R. Selomonio, Kahalun, Oahu, Hawaii.
5884 Fortunato Senardo (Senarda), Waipahu, Hawaii.
165 Paulino Serana (Sorana), route 16, Watertown, Hawaii.
1729 Francisco Seranza, Ewa, Hawaii.
3523 Eduardo Seredica, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
11 Pasco Sereto (Sereto Piasco (Peasco), Celio Cirilo Tasco (Pasco), Waianae, Oahu, Hawaii.
1951 Matsuke (Matsuhe) Serikawa, Waipahu, Hawaii.
5946 Narciso (Naruso) Serrano, Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
8138 Felix (Filex) Seruffo, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Oahu.
3156 Victoria (Victoriano) Sevilla, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
3010 Riyoichi Shigemori, Castrum, Oahu, Hawaii (O. Okasaki tailor shop, Hotel Street).
7349 Shikichi Shigihara (Sugihara, Sugohora), near Honeae Station, Oahu, Hawaii (Waipahu, Oahu).
3258 Seisuke Shorikane, 95 Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4602 Hiroshi Shishido, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
4542 Goto Sigeki (Shigeki), 962 Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3912 Frank Silim (F. R. Silim), 1359 Liliha Street, Honolulu.
5845 John Silva, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
5825 Laurence A. Silva, Kahalun, Oahu.
1012 Timeteo Simascia, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7860 Manuel Moniz Simas, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
1875 Suritario Simplicio (Simplicio Secretario, Secretaria), Ewa, Hawaii (Ewa, Oahu).
7916 Chung Sin, Aala and Feing Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii (Sin Chung, Chung Siu, Sui Chung, Aala and King Streets, Honolulu).
6913 Lee Duck Sing (Lee Guck Diny), Hotel and Smith Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3521 Ropino Siso, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
8243 Charles N. Smythe, 120 School Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Charles Norman Smythe, Plaza Hotel, Seattle, Wash.).
2998 Tirio (Tirso) Solano (Tirso Solorno), Liliha-Siliha (Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii).
590 Ibaresto Soliot, Honolulu.
6918 Marcelo Solis, 995 Dowsett Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3252 Norbirto Soliba (Soliva), (Waimaka), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Norberta Soliva, (Norbirto Suliba, Norbito Soliva), Waimalu, Aiea, Oahu).
3110 Hak Sun Son, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
207 Pak (Park) Yong Soon, Waimolu-Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii (Waimalu, Aiea, Oahu).
2184 Kinmatsu Soto (Sto), Waipahu, Hawaii (Aiea, Oahu).
958 Gregory Gomes Souza (Gregorio Gomes de Souza), Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
6245 Julio Gomes de Souza, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
3492 Federico Spartinea, 995 North King, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3137 Snocincio Stisnea (Inocincio Hisnea), Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
7056 Roman Suan, Kawailvoa, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii (Kawailoa, Waialua, Oahu).
8666 Anastacio Sueatri (Sukatre), Kalihi, Honolulu, Hawaii (in jail).
7271 Kisao Suewaka, Puma Lane, Honolulu (care of Onomichio Hotel, Honolulu).
5203 Han Wok Suk, Kaliki Hospital, Honolulu, Hawaii.
4751 Lawrence (Lawrensio) Sumaipo, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
8691 Macario Sumile, Camp 2, Kipapa, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
333 Marcos Sumpaipong (Sumaipong), Kahuku, Hawaii.
3717 Kim Pong Sun, Alewa Kright, Honolulu, Hawaii (Alewa Heights, Honolulu).
6078 Kim Young Sun, Palama, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6302 Lee Joo Sun, Aieamanu, Aieo, Oahu, Hawaii (Aieamanu, Aiea, Oahu).
491 Wong Sung, Austin Lane, Honolulu (care of the Liberty News, post-office box 940, Honolulu).
3620 Chil Sing (Sung) Sur, Wahiawa, Hawaii.
7292 In Su Sur, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
573 Masago Suzuki, 1259 Kukui Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1414 Cornelio Tabaconon (Tabocanon), 1359 Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.

6527 Kazuo (Kazuo) Takahayashi, Honmachi, Waipahu, Oahu (Honmachi, Waipahu, Oahu), Hawaii.
2424 Jumaech Takamura (Kuinaech Takemura, Kumaech Takamura), Aiea, Oahu (Aiea, Oahu), Hawaii.
6777 Demitrio Talarok, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
7011 Cleatino Talisayan, North King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
579 Piutaro (Ruitaro) Tamaki, Waialua, Oahu (Waialua, Oahu), Hawaii.
6149 Kuroso (Kurazo) Tanaka, Palama, King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1139 Albert Fong Tam, Smith Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1580 Naojiro (Naojico) Tanaka, Castner, Leilehua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2730 Takutaro Tanaka, 957 Robello Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1966 Jose D. Tanaka, Castner, Hawaii.
7885 Maximo B. (Baladad) Tango, Waipahu, Oahu, Hawaii.
1797 Froilan (Frolian) Taporco, Ewa, Oahu.
3625 Juam (Juan) Taruha, Iwilei, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2218 Fuyamura Teheyozo, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
2864 Sebera Tekson (Severo Tecson, Severo Fecson), 1315 River Street, Honolulu, Hawaii (Hawaii P. P. F. Co.).
7229 Shukei Terasaki, Dayton Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
3291 Victoriano Terason (Victoriano Garcia Terason (Fuason)), Waipahu, Hawaii.
7895 Gingoro Teresta (I. Telushito), Wahiawa, Hawaii.
3147 Agapito Tesiorna, Liliha Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6488 Yip Tin (Fin), Beretania, near Maunakea Street, Honolulu, Oahu.
2040 Gregorio Tinai, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
4623 Albert A. (Akow) Ting, 488c Webb Lane, Honolulu.
2539 Felipe Tingas, Iwilei Road, Honolulu, Oahu (Kohalo, Hawaii).
573 Estivan (Estevan) Tioson, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
645 Flor Alexandroff Tokareff (Takareff, Flor Alex Tokareff), 144 North Berentania Street, Honolulu.
647 Lavrenty Alexandroff Tokareff (Tokareff, Lavrenty Alexandroff Tokareff), 144 North Beretania Street, Honolulu.
1199 Baltasar Tomaroy, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7566 Minoru Tomika (Tomioka), Aala Lane, Honolulu (Aala Lane, Honolulu), Hawaii.
2787 Jose Tominbang (Taminbang), Kahuku, Hawaii.
243 Lau (Lan) Wai Tong, Castner (box 1001, Honolulu, Oahu), Hawaii.
2901 Tim Tong (Tong Tim), 40 Kuikui, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7841 Demevrio (Demetrio, Demeyrio) Tonido, Near Bouzi Saloon on Hotel Street, Honolulu (near Bonzi Saloon on Hotel Street, Honolulu), Hawaii.
1229 Seikichi Tono, Komaya Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii.
370 Manuel Tornea (Tormes), Libbyville, Kahaluu, Oahu, Hawaii.
7126 Antonio Torres, Liliha and Kukui Streets, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2983 Enriques Torres, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
4443 John Torres, Vineyard, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2274 Singu Toyama, Waipahu (Waipahu, Oahu), Hawaii.
294 Takee Toyama, Japanese Hospital, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7076 Gishichi Tsuchiya, Maunawai (Hauula, Oahu; Kahuku, Oahu), Hawaii.
7230 Shohei Tsuji, River near Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2191 Wong Shai Tun, King Street, near Mauncken, Honolulu (King, near Mauna Kea, Honolulu).
4520 Andres Ukso, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2402 Ignacio Ukoso, Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
5786 Ukichi Umesu (U. Umesu), Waihiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
1039 Humberto Uribe, 2 Camp Vineyard Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7544 Matazo Uyeda (Mataga Wayda), 1212 Liliha Street.
1048 Kame Uyehara, Waipahu, Hawaii.
5723 Evaristo Vadal (Vedal, Evaristo Beol), 373 King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
178 Leonard G. Vaguios, Wahiaw. Oahu (Kahaluu), (Wahiawa, Oahu), Hawaii.
2264 Luis Valenciano (Valenciano), Kukui Liliho (Kukui and Liliha Streets), Honolulu, Hawaii.
4501 Francis Van Cantre, Fort Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
645 Belarmino Velarmino, Ala Lane (Aala Lane), Honolulu, Hawaii.
3342 Alfonso Vellanoiho (Vellanoiha), King Palama, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1937 Nipino Vidal (Vidai Nipino), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
2585 Jose Viarjis (Birgis), Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
4786 Felipe Vigtasen, Waipahu, Hawaii.
5767 Erenio Vilar (Eranico Vilar), Waheawa (Wahiawa), Oahu, Hawaii.
5145 Basilio Villaga, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4598 Fermini Villamor, 1412 Kaulawela Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6557 Jahn Villanueba, Liliha above King (Liliha Street), Honolulu, Hawaii.
7152 Placido Villarajo (Villarojo), Waipahu, Hawaii.
7845 Eduardo Villarta, Ewa, Oahu, Hawaii.
5955 Locio Villarta (Villarte), 6 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii (848 Kearney Street, San Francisco, Calif.).
605 Leonardo Villarmossa (Leunardo Villahermoosa), Waialua, Oahu, Hawaii.
7302 Dionicio Villaron (Dianicaio Vallamar), Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii.
2022 Leon Volaz (Vilaz, Vilas, Vilar), Waipahu Plantation, Honolulu (Oahu), Hawaii.
1610 Chas. Walters, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.
1341 Torasaburo Watanabe, Waialua Post Office, Oahu, Hawaii.
1350 Kee Man Whang, Ewa, Hawaii.
601 Soon Bak (Bok) Whang, Ewa, Oahu.
5689 Sung Tack Whang, 2441 Liliha, Honolulu, Hawaii.
2467 Sung Won, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
4314 Nelsee Wong (Nai See Wong), 1007 Maunakea, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1888 Bernaldo (Bernardo) Yabo, Wailuo (Waialua), Oahu, Hawaii.
6991 Shie Yaga, Wahiawa, Oahu, Hawaii.
3097 Matsu Yamamoto, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6031 Tadesuke Yamamoto, Kamanuwai Lane, Honolulu, Oahu.
4912 Dinsuke Yamato, Waipahu, Hawaii.
709 Mantaro Yamashin, Wahiawa, Kanai (Oahu), Hawaii.
4500 Sushiko Yasuda (Suckiko Yasada), Kahuku (Oahu), Hawaii.
2572 Jutsuzo (Jitsuzo) Yasunaga, 1820a Nuuanu Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
6841 Wong Tin Yau (Wang Tin Yan), Wahiawa, Hawaii.
3028 Juanito Ybania, South Liliha Street (Libby, McNeil & Libby, Kalihi), Honolulu, Hawaii.
5714 Hung (Hong) Yee, corner King and Aala (7 Aala Park), Honolulu, Hawaii.
7677 Lee Yee, Hotel and Smith Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
1755 Nishida Gehi (Gehi, Gehi Nishida), Pua Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
53 Lum Tuk Yen, Auld Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
7672 Young Sen Yet, Palama Rice Mill (1615 Asylum Road), Honolulu, Hawaii.
5439 Kim Sung Yill (Yll, Kim Sung Yel), Aliamanee (Oahu, Aiea, Oaher).
2058 Tsugiji Ymamguchi (Yamaguchi), Ewa, Hawaii.
1741 Juan Gosman Yniego (Juan de Gosman Yniego, Juan G. Yniego), Ewa, Oahu.
4700 Kim Duk Yon, Kamchanch IV (Kim Duk You, Kemehameha Fourth Road), Honolulu, Hawaii.
3993 Cho Yong, Kahama Koolanioo Col., Honolulu, Hawaii.
6995 Hang Byung Yong (Kon Byoung Yong), Kahana Koolanioa, Col., Honolulu, Hawaii.
638 Hideo Yoshimura, Kahuku, Hawaii.
6337 Chang Ah Pui You (Ah Pin Chang Yan, Ah Pui Chang You), Schofield Barracks, Honolulu (Oahu).
5758 Tam You (Yow, Sam You), 423 Kuakinist (423 Kuakini Street), Honolulu.
234 Esteban Yquena, Ewa, Hawaii.
6826 Fong Yuen, Femananai, Honolulu (Castner, Oahu), Hawaii.
4858 Lum Sing Yuen (Nuen), Renckle Lane, Honolulu, Hawaii.
90 Chang Yun (Yun Chang), Waipahu, Hawaii.
6764 Chun Kim Yung (Kim Yung Chun), Honolulu, Hawaii.
203 Caytano Yuosencio (Caytano Guoseuiso, Ynosencio), Kukin Street (296 North Kukui Street), Honolulu.
7377 Jose Zabata (Zabala), Liliha Street near Kukin (Liliha near Kukui Street), Honolulu (Oahu).
7185 Zacarias Juan, Waipohu (Waipahu), Oahu, Hawaii.

LOCAL BOARD FOR COUNTY OF MAUI, TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

1904 Masaye (Masai) Abe, Paia, Hawaii.
2042 Paulino Acbayani, Olowalu, Lahania, Maui, Hawaii.
3752 Narciso Aquino (Narcisco, Narciseo, Aguino), Puuenene, Hawaii.
661 Henry Akino, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii.
1035 Takeshi Alagaki, Nahimu, Maui, Hawaii (Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
52 Olempeo Albindo (Albinda, Olimpio Albinda), Hana, Hawaii.
2441 Makario (Makerio) Alia, Puukolio Camp, Lahania, Hawaii (Puukolie Lahania, Maui, Hawaii).
1459 Isac Arpolia Aliena, Haiku, Maui, Hawaii (Isacc Aripolia, Alisna, Nahiku, Maui, Hawaii).
1602 Sutorino Amacio (Sutornino Amasio, Satornino Amacio), Waihee, Hawaii.
274 Edwardo (Eduardo) Amante, Hana, Hawaii.
2861 Michael Anasken (Anaskan), Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii (McCabe, Hamilton & Renny, Honolulu, Hawaii).
1499 Yama Arakawa, camp 13, Kihei, Hawaii (camp 3, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
3127 Yeizi Arakawa (Arokawa), Puunene, Hawaii.
380 Nese (Neso) Arita (N. Aritos), Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
2640 Benancio Arola (Binancio (Binacio) Ariola), care Puunene, Hawaii (Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
635 Rameso Asaro (Asato), Puunene, Hawaii (Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
1381 Shigen Asato, Paia, Hawaii.
162 Remigio Asencion (Asoncion), Ulumalu, Maui, Hawaii (Ulumalu, Makawao, Maui, Hawaii).
1460 Pedro Atana (Otana), Hamakuapoko, Maui, Hawaii (Manakuapoko, Maui, Hawaii).
343 Buinabentora Bagio, Haiku, Maui, Hawaii.
411 Hapo Bak (Ropo Bok), Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
2978 Agapito Baron, Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii.
224 Bonfacio Barreko, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
537 Eulegio (Eulagio) Berara, Wailuki, Hawaii.
2065 Bacilio Biagton (Biagtan, Basilio Biagtan), Waikapu, Hawaii.
2740 Basilo Biliano (Basilio Viliano), Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii.
1155 Benigno Blas, Kepahulu, Hawaii.
3004 Redaldo (Ripaldo) Cabacas, Kipahulu, Hawaii.
214 Hipolibo Canornayan (Isidoo Canornayan, Isidro Canonayan), Kipahulu, Hawaii.
3051 Crispino (Crespino) Canoy, Kipahulu, Hawaii (Hana, Maui, Hawaii).
454 Fermin Cantalina (Cocntalina, Calatimo), Puukalii camp, Lahaina (Maui, Hawi, No. Kohala, Hawaii).
2810 Casiano Cardino (Caradino), Hamakuapoko, Maui, Hawaii.
1680 Sanzo Chashi, Kahului, Hawaii (Sengo Ohashi, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii).
1695 Damaso Corpas (Corpuz), Keawe camp, Lahaina, Hawaii (Kiawe camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
805 Domingo Costalio (Castalia), Kahului, Hawaii.
2766 Steban Cruz, Mahinahina (Malunaiuna), Lahaina, Hawaii (Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
646 Pedro dela Cruz, Kipahulu, Hawaii.
1487 Primitireo (Primitivo) DelaCruz (Primitibo Dila Cruz), Kipahulu, Hawaii.
3055 Antone Cunnana (Anton Cunanan, Anto Cunanan), Haiku, Hawaii.
2310 Moses Debran (Moseso De Bera, Moses Bebeva), camp 1, Puunene, Hawaii (camp 1, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
2947 Pedro Delogula (Deloyoio), Wahikulu, Lahaina, Hawaii (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1474 Benjamin Denaoto (Denanto, Dananto), Lahaina, Hawaii.
2173 Facarias (Zacarias) Devera, Puunene, Hawaii (Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
92 Seslestino Dison, Ulumalu, Maui, Hawaii.
244 Inasio Duran (Inocsio Duron), Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
1042 John Dymin, Haiku, Maui.
1636 Hichisaburo Ehoki (Enoki), Hamakuapoko, Maui, Hawaii.
268 Julian Ekizarde (Elizarde), Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Hawaii (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1620 Deonicio Elman, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
1305 Jose Erson, Hana, Hawaii.
1835 Juan Espinosa (Espuiosa, Esdoriosa), camp 4, Puunene, Hawaii (Halawa Plantation, Kohala, Hawaii).
2370 Augustin Feliciano (Quiulino Felisano, Quintino Felisando), Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
324 July Belarde Flores, Waikapu, Hawaii.
725 Vadesian Floris (Sisto Flores), Wahikuli, Lahaina, Hawaii.
3680 Nicacio Francisco (Prasisko), Hamaknapoko, Maui, Hawaii.
745 Matsutaro Fugimoto, Mill Camp, Lahaina (Masutaro Fujimoto, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
230 Sander (Sanda, Sancla) Fukuhara, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii.
2083 Julian Gabriel, Waihee, Hawaii.
2904 Donicia (Deonicio, Deonisio) Galapon, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
372 Juan Galina, Waikapu, county of Maui, Hawaii.

531 Epifanio Garcia, Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
2566 Bernebe Geledo, Hana, Maui, Hawaii (Bernabe Galedo, Hana, Maui, Hawaii).
1419 Galino (Gabino) Gil, Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
2621 Gusukuma Giro, Papulei, Paia, Maui, Hawaii (Gusukuma Giro, Pahulei, Paia, Maui, Hawaii).
1074 Pedro Gomahat, Waikapu, Hawaii.
3560 John Pedro Gomes, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii.
1455 Laureano Moniz Gomez (Laureano Moniz Gomez, Leureano Munoz Gomez), Puunene, Hawaii.
2751 Jiro Goya (Gaya), Keshua, Paia, county of Maui, Hawaii (Keahua Camp, Maui, Hawaii).
2820 Faustina (Faustino) Guerrero, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
3437 Eusibo (Eusibio) Guillina, Waikapu, Hawaii (Waikapu, Maui, Hawaii).
2416 Ching Kim Gui, Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii (Kim Chong Yui, Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1889 Shinichi Horishege (Hiroshige, Shinishi Hiroshige), Waiakoa, Maui, Hawaii.
3000 Clemente Heler, Wailuku, Hawaii.
144 Albert (Alberto) Hernandez, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
1192 Polinciano (Potinciano) Homiliz, Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
2976 Alfonso Honeda (Alphonso Honedo, Honeda), Maalua, Maui, Hawaii (Maalaea, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
3077 Dang Wing Hoy, Wailuku, Hawaii.
3308 Jinzuchi Ichikawa (Ishikawa), Yauagi, Yamaguchi, Yamaguchi, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii.
2623 Kujoichi Ikeda, Puunene, Hawaii (Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
421 Gusaku Inafuku, camp 11, Puunene, Hawaii.
2206 Ihlon Inamina (Inamine, Thia Inemine), Puunene, Hawaii.
1039 Aurillo Inere, Olowalu, Lahaina, Maui (Kaanapali, Maui, Hawaii).
3460 Yeitaro (Yeitara, Yeitoro) Kaichi, Paia, Maui (Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
1452 Tsuhako (Tsukako) Kama, Paia, Maui (Ewa Road, Honolulu, Hawaii).
480 Robert W. Kamakahi, Halawa, Molokai, Hawaii (Robert W. Kamakahi, jr., Pukoo, Maui, Hawaii).
775 Toyohimo Kamisata, Wailuku, Hawaii (Toyojiro Kamisato, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
464 Suara Kanagusuku, Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii.
27 Kenjo Kaneshiro, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
2619 Thomas Kaniuhele, Waituhu, Maui, Hawaii (Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
1345 Tolokuma Kawanabe, Hamakupoko, Maui, Hawaii.
626 Kajuro Kito, Pauwela, Maui, Hawaii.
110 Buenon Koma (Bunemon Konno), Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
2351 Genichi Kubo, camp 2, Punnene, Hawaii.
220 Masogo Kumata (Masago Kumate), Lahaina (Maui), Hawaii.
654 Eustaguis (Eusiguio, Eutiquio), Labayton, Puukolii, Lahaina (Pahoa, Plt.), Hawaii.
1443 Mariano Laborada, Lahaina, Hawaii (Wahikuli, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
312 Argifino Lacazadelo (Lacazedele, Lakazadely), Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
3134 Nuacrio Lappatezo (Macario Laporteza, Nucario Lappateza), camp 10, Puuenene (Puunene), Maui, Hawaii.
1202 John Leoro (Leorro), Wahikuli, Lahaina, Hawaii (Wahikuli Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
2795 Leando Lebas, Lahaina, Hawaii.
633 Pau (Pai) Young Lee, Paia, Maui (Waimanalo Plt., Waimanalo), Hawaii.
2983 Macielle Lehera (Marcielo Librie), Waihe (Waihee, Maui), Hawaii.
605 Juan Lopez (Lopes), Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.
1061 Anachito (Anaclito) Lunsaga, Hana, Hawaii.
2005 Santos Magasay, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
283 Cladio (Claudio) Magsalay, camp 2, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii.
1907 Banasio Manaiang (Benasio Manaiand, Denasio Manaiang), Wailuku Jail, county of Maui.
3459 Augustine (Augustin) Marineo, Maalaea, Maui, Hawaii.
1260 Santeze Marianis (Santiago Martines), Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.
131 Meximo Sigas Marres (Maximo Sijas Marres), Waiku, Maui, Hawaii (Libue Plantation, Kauai; Haiku, Maui, Hawaii).
1333 Jamario (Januario, Jamiario, Janogrio) Martins, Wailuku, Hawaii.
2208 Salvador Batero Martins (Salvador Botero Martin, Salvador Martin), camp 1, Puunene (Maui), Hawaii.
2167 Agator (Agaton) Mata, Puunene, Hawaii.
536 Cushi Matsushu (Gushi Matsuzhu), Camp 12 (2), Kibei (Maui), Hawaii.
826 Ignacio Maun, Paia, Hawaii.
2560 John De Mello, Kaliuliu (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui), Hawaii.
2017 Manuel Mercado, Makawao, Maui, Hawaii.
2555 Ceriaco Mereflores (Ceriako Miroflores, Cereako Miraploris), Puukolii Camp (Puukolii), Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii.
608 Relis Mersilias (Pelis Morsilios), Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
116 Francisco Mesagin (Mesahon), Puukolii Camp (Puukolii), Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii.
831 Kichimatsu Miga (Higa), camp 12, Kibei (Puunene, Maui), Hawaii.
1315 Eugenio Misahon (Eugnio Misahon, Eugenio Misayon), Waiku, Maui (American Can Co., Honolulu, Oahu), Hawaii.
2884 Maruzoo Mitsumoto (Masuzoo Matsunioto, Maruzoo Metsumoto), Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
3644 Sakamoto Motoichi, Maui, Lahaina, Hawaii.
2009 Morris (Maurisio) Moresilo (Monisilo, Monselo, Monuselo), Haiku, Maui, Hawaii.
908 Kocho Nakayama, Haiku, Maui, Hawaii.
595 Taimon Nake (Taimorn Nehi), Makawau (Makawao), Maui, Hawaii.
645 Antonio Galhardo (Gallardo) Navarro, Keahua, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
3252 John T. (Joe Galhardo) Navarro, Keahua, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
1704 Modesto Necolos (Necabos), Hana, Maui (dry dock, Watertown, Honolulu), Hawaii.
1037 Mauricio Nonui (Nonol), camp 3, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii.
2794 Estakio Olaibara (Odaihara), Paia, Maui (Ewa plantation, Ewa, Honolulu), Hawaii.
2831 Gingo Okamoto (Kamoto), Nahiku, Maui, Hawaii.
1349 Tsuriki Okamoto, Kahului, Hawaii.
1446 Tsurualo (Tsurolo) Okaola, Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii.
1750 Sorgio (Sergio) Owacan, Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
2338 Hokijei (Hokiyu) Oyakawa (Hokyu Oyakaua), Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii.
155 Herminildo Pagayanan, Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii.
1438 Nildo Nermine Pahis (Hermine Hildo Pahis, Hermenegildo Pahis), Keawe Camp, Lahaina, Hawaii (Kiawe Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
3328 David Pakuhula, Kaheka, Maui, Hawaii.
817 Inosente C. Palaji (Inocentes C. Palaje), Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
3136 Pedro Palakani (Palahani), Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
280 Fortanoto (Fortonato) Parame, Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
2872 Leon Pariali, Keawe Camp, Lahaina, Hawaii (Hawaii Preserving Co., Honolulu, Hawaii).
241 Periya (Perieya) Paro (Teriuja Taro, Taru), camp 6, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii (Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
2471 Chan Ah Pau, Hamaknapoko, Maui, Hawaii (Pan Chan Oh, Hamakuapoko, Maui, Hawaii).
2437 Jose Pelayo, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
479 Julian Perez, Kipahulu, Maui, Hawaii (Hawaii Preserving Co., Wahiawa, Hawaii).
1182 Narciso (Narcisso) Perez, Wailuku, Hawaii.
997 Modesto B. P. Plaza (Modisto Plaza Baldomiro Plaza, Modesto Plaza), Wahee, Wailuku, Hawaii (Waihee, Maui, Hawaii).
2767 Francisco Ragga, Haiku, Maui, Hawaii.
173 Ceberu Ramidio, Wailuku Jail, Wailuku, Hawaii.
2608 Miguel Reyes, Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1427 Jose Rocinio (Racimo), Waikapu, Wailuku, Hawaii (Waikapu, Maui, Hawaii).
3089 Juan Roguel (Raguel, Raquel), Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii (Puukolii, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1203 Seikichi Sakuhara (Sakihara), Puunene, Hawaii.
3069 Ichiki Sakanashi, mill camp, Lahaina, Hawaii (Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
986 Jose Samillo, Wailuku, Hawaii.
711 Cho Duck San (Sam), Camp 2, Puuenene, Hawaii (Cho Duk Sam, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
478 Balesiano Perez Sanches, camp 1, Puunene, Hawaii (Bolesiano Peres Sanches, Balesiano Peres Sanchi, Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
2847 Krispin Sapinig (Krispin Lapinig, Crisfin Lapinig), Waikapu, Hawaii (Waikapu, Maui, Hawaii).
3472 Matives Sardoraldo (Matires Sordoraldo), Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
2204 Delmasio Sebasa (Dalmaico Sbasa), Puukalii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
1198 Bectoriano Sevan (Betorano Sowan), Hana, Maui, Hawaii (Wahiawa, Oahu).
2685 Ding Wing Shiang (Ding Wing Sheang, Dang Wing Sheang), Wailuku, Hawaii (Wailuku, Maui, Hawaii).
177 Cisihi Shorno (Gisifu Shoyo, Gishiku Shojo), Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
3606 Kame Shimabukuro (Shimahuiaro), Puunene, Hawaii.
265 Antonio Simson (Simeon), Haiku, Maui (Haiku, Maui, Hawaii).
3571 Tatsuzo Sonoda, Waikee, Hawaii.
2855 Yamashiro Soome, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
2925 Sai Song Soon (Soi Sang Soon, Sai Sang Soon), Olowalu, Lahaina, Hawaii (Olowalu, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1694 Megildo Soquitan (Ernemegildo Soquitan (Soguitan), Kapahulu, Maui, Hawaii.
2039 Victor Sudoska (Sudosta), Puunene, Hawaii (Hawi, Hawaii).
3074 Tamagushiku Sunda (Sanda), Keheka, Paia, Hawaii (Kaheka Camp, Paia, Maui, Hawaii).
97 Chun Taikun, Pauwela, Maui, Hawaii.
62 Kame Takasa (Takara), Haiku, Hawaii.
1742 Toyotaro (Toyotoro) Tamura, camp 1, Puunene, Hawaii (Waikiki Inn, Maui, Hawaii).
355 Hermongenes (Hermogenes) Tabilon, Wailuku, county of Maui, Hawaii.
450 Kahachi (Kohachi) Tanabe, Hana, Maui, Hawaii.
3123 Sunda Tangan (Tengan), Konopowai Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii (Honokowai Camp, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii).
1205 Marcelo Tanio, Puukolii Camp, Lahaina, Maui.
1798 Tokugi (Tokuji) Tsubone, Paia, Maui, Hawaii.
392 Tasuchi (Toshichi, Toshuchi) Urabe, Paia, Hawaii (Paia, Maui, Hawaii).
1932 Augustin Vera Cruz (Augustin Veracruz), Keawe Camp, Lahaina, Hawaii.
2679 Filis Vienes, Kipahulu, Hawaii.
3628 Faustino Villamel (Villarnel), Puukolii, Lahaina, Hawaii.
143 Doroteo Villigas (Velligas), Hana, Hawaii (Hana, Maui, Hawaii).
1744 Jiro Yamashita, Puunene, Hawaii.
1215 Taro Yananino (Yananine), Haiku, Maui, Hawaii (Puunene, Maui, Hawaii).
2674 Kim Kong Youk (Youk), Olowalu, Lahaina, Maui, Hawaii (Olowalu, Lahaina).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

751. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of the manner in which the appropriation "Miscellaneous expenses, Department of Agriculture, 1922," has been expended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

752. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed report showing the names of all persons employed, their designations, and rates of pay, in the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the suppression of contagious, infectious, or communicable diseases of domestic animals, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

753. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of "the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased and the date of purchase," under the appropriation "Purchase

and distribution of valuable seeds, 1922"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

754. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed report of all typewriters, computing, addressing, and duplicating machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year 1922 in part payment for new machines; to the Committee on Appropriations.

755. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing the cost of maintenance, operation, and repair of all motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles and motor boats owned by the department and operated outside of the city of Washington during the fiscal year 1922. There were no motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles or motor boats purchased by the department during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

756. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a detailed statement of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

757. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a statement showing in detail the travel from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia performed by officers and employees (other than special agents, inspectors, and employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) of the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

758. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting combined statement of receipts and disbursements, balances, etc., of the Government during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922 (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

759. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of compensation or expenses paid to officers or other persons employed by State, county, or municipal governments; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

760. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of disposition of useless papers in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

761. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting report of contributions on account of cooperative work with the Forest Service, and amount refunded from national forests fund, excess deposits; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture.

762. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting data relative to the number of employees of the Washington office of the Panama Canal receiving increased compensation through $240 bonus; to the Committee on Appropriations.

763. A letter from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting statement of travel performed by the officers and employees of the United States Shipping Board during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

764. A letter from the Secretary of War, chairman of Federal Power Commission, transmitting reports on publications issued, travel performed by officers, and statement showing permits issued under the Federal water power act during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

765. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting detailed statement of the refunds of customs duties for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, together with volumes 39, 40, and 41 of the Treasury Decisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

766. A letter from the chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the sixth annual report of the United States Tariff Commission (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

767. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of receipts from Indian tribal funds, expenditures recommended, and estimates of amounts required to be expended; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

768. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report from Surgeon General Public Health Service on expenditures under "Preventing the spread of epidemic diseases," year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

769. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of receipts from sales of old material, condemned stores, supplies, etc., fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

770. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of expenditures of the Coast Guard, fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

771. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation for defraying expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; to the Committee on Appropriations.

772. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report of the public property in the Post Office Department on December 1, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

773. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting information regarding typewriting machines exchanged by Post Office Department, fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

774. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of travel performed by officers and employees of the General Accounting Office during fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

775. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States (H. Doc. No. 482), transmitting the annual report of the General Accounting Office for the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FULLER: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 12887. A bill granting a pension to Jacob F. Rosenberger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13156) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13157) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 13158) to amend the law regarding assessment of real and personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 13159) granting an increase of pension to certain survivors of various Indian wars and campaigns and to certain widows of veterans of said wars and campaigns; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES: A bill (H. R. 13160) to amend the interstate commerce act, being an act to regulate commerce, by providing for regional commissions, and defining their powers and duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13161) to amend the interstate commerce act, being "an act to regulate commerce," as amended July 29, 1906; April 13, 1908; June 18, 1910; February 17, 1917; March 2, 1917; May 29, 1917; August 10, 1917; and February 28, 1920, by providing a more adequate system of regulation for the railroads of the United States through an extension of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the creation of seven regional commissions to cooperate with and assist the Interstate Commerce Commission in the performance of its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 13162) increasing the compensation of the register and of the assistant register of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13163) to increase the pay of retired enlisted men who served as commissioned officers in the United States Army during the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 13164) to repeal paragraph 401 of Title I of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13165) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 74) regarding the treatment of the Christian people in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 13166) granting a pension to William Preston Hinton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 13167) granting a pension to John R. Ligon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13168) granting a pension to Lottie Kyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 13169) granting a pension to Werner Snow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 13170) for the relief of Ephraim E. Page; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13171) for the relief of L. P. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. J. M. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 13172) granting a pension to Margaret Corr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13173) for the relief of Randolph Foster Williamson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13174) authorizing the President to appoint Richard Raymond Notter to the position and rank of lieutenant of Cavalry in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13175) for the relief of Contes Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13176) granting a pension to Henry Dyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13177) granting a pension to Charles Burch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to John Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13179) granting a pension to Samira E. Cooprider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6514. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of sundry citizens of De Kalb, Kendall, and La Salle Counties, Ill., protesting against a tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6515. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6516. Also, petition of the Greater Boston Chapter, Military Order of the World War, of Boston, Mass., urging Congress to enact without delay legislation which will maintain an efficient and well-trained Army of 13,000 officers and 150,000 enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6517. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill., urging the loan limit of the Federal land banks to be increased to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6518. By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of various citizens of Wilmington, Del., protesting against the passage of H. R. 4388; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6519. By Mr. RAINEY of Illinois: Petition of the city council of the city of Chicago, Ill., urging Congress to appropriate immediately the money necessary for the construction of a new post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6520. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Placer County Farm Bureau, of Auburn, Calif., the Yuba County Farm Bureau, of Marysville, Calif., and Imperial Valley Camp, No. 62, United Spanish War Veterans, of Imperial Valley, Calif., indorsing the passage of H. R. 11449, providing for the construction of the Boulder Canyon Dam; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

6521. Also, petition of the San Francisco Chapter of the American Association of Engineers, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the unmerger of the Southern Pacific and Central Pacific Railroad systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6522. Also, petition of the Shasta County Farm Bureau, of Redding, Calif., and the El Dorado County Farm Bureau, of Placerville, Calif., indorsing and recommending acceptance of the Henry Ford proposition for Muscle Shoals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6523. Also, petition of the Stauffer Chemical Co., of San Francisco, Calif., and C. F. Weber & Co., of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the Kelly bill, to reduce second-class mail rates, and urging they be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6524. Also, petition of the city council of the city of Berkeley, Calif., and the city council of the city of Sacramento, Calif., indorsing H. R. 10212, by Congressman BACHARACH; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6525. Also, petition of the Maydwell Co., of San Francisco, Calif., and R. R. Rogers, of San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the Kelly bill, to repeal 50 per cent of zone advance in mail rates of second-class mail; also, the Globe Grain & Milling Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., and Harry J. Reidsma, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the Kelly bill, to reduce second-class mail rates, and urging that they be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6526. By Mr. SWING: Petition of various citizens of California, protesting against the passage of H. R. 9753; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we approach this morning Thy throne of grace in the all-prevailing Name, and while we recognize the mercies vouchsafed we still confess our need of Thee. Without Thee we can not live properly, and we can not fulfill the high responsibilities of duty as in Thy fear. Be pleased to visit each heart and life, and grant a continuance of Thy favor through all the experiences of daily toil and engagements. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

L. HEISLER BALL, a Senator from the State of Delaware; DAVIS ELKINS, a Senator from the State of West Virginia; JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; J. W. HARRELD, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma; GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire; MILES POINDEXTER, a Senator from the State of Washington; ATLEE POMERENE and FRANK B. WILLIS, Senators from the State of Ohio; ELLISON D. SMITH, a Senator from the State of South Carolina; and JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in their seats to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McKellar	Shields
Borah	Gooding	McLean	Shortridge
Brandegee	Hale	McNary	Smith
Brookhart	Harreld	Nelson	Smoot
Broussard	Harris	New	Spencer
Calder	Harrison	Nicholson	Sterling
Capper	Heflin	Norbeck	Sutherland
Caraway	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Underwood
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Ladd	Pittman	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Pomerene	Weller
Fernald	Lenroot	Ransdell	Willis
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

TRAVEL OF WAR DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing traveling expenses of officers and employees on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, president of the National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

EXPENDITURES OF UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMINISTRATION OF WAR MINERALS RELIEF ACT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, making a report covering administration of what is known as war minerals relief act to and including November 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of the commission for the fiscal year 1921-22, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONDEMNED PROPERTY REPORT OF SERGEANT AT ARMS (S. DOC. NO. 269).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate on the sale since December 5, 1921, of property condemned in accordance with law, and deposit of the proceeds thereof with the financial clerk of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual reports of the Librarian of Congress and the superintendent of the Library Building and grounds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

EXCHANGE OF TYPEWRITERS, ETC., FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a statement from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission showing the number of typewriters, adding machines, and other similar labor-saving devices exchanged by the commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the National Aeronautic Association of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution on "National policy for air" unanimously adopted by the Second National Aero Congress at Detroit, Mich., October 14, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution adopted by Perry Center Grange, No. 1690, of Allen County, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of legislation granting subsidies to any shipping or other corporations, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Perry Center Grange, No. 1690, of Allen County, Ohio, protesting against a modification of the so-called Volstead prohibition enforcement law and favoring the strict enforcement thereof, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Central Federation of Labor, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring the enactment of legislation dispensing with mail deliveries on Saturday afternoon, so as to provide a half holiday for mail carriers, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Franklin County (Ohio) Farm Bureau, favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted by the Local Federation of Shop Crafts, of New Rockford, N. Dak., favoring prompt action by the Federal Government to remedy faulty condition of railroad operating equipment, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Herman Quamme and 27 others of Balfour; E. S. Keniston and 27 others of Dickinson; Paul Jungnitsch and 9 others of Page; Jacob Brown and 7 others of Wirde; Alexander Flegel and 7 others of Forbes; Mrs. P. F. Erb and 35 others of Ryder; Sam Kylmanen and 15 others of Kintyre; Mrs. Ray Bryant of Donnybrook and 20 others of Carpio, Greene, and Tolley; Fred Gehres and 6 others of Cando; Ed. McCarroll and 8 others of Sherwood; W. O. Gerelle and 9 others of Fessenden; James Allen and 9 others of Tioga; A. B. Thompson and 16 others of Grafton; Henry Spier and 38 others of Zap; Gotfred Ratke and 24 others of Jud; M. N. Olen and 20 others of Bowdon; A. Brusseau and 124 others of Walhalla; C. J. Stensland and 7 others of Edinburg; James D. Swartz and 8 others of Lankin; O. Sivertson and 20 others of Zahl, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. McLEAN presented a resolution of the Connecticut League of Women Voters, of Hartford, Conn., favoring the enactment of legislation transferring the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to the Department of Justice, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution of the Connecticut League of Women Voters, of Hartford, Conn., favoring an amendment of the Constitution relative to the regulation of child labor, etc., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented communications in the nature of petitions of the Westville Methodist Church, of New Haven, and the Anti-lynching Crusaders, of Stamford, both in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of the so-called Dyer anti-lynching bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lakeville and Sharon, both in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an adequate rural credit system, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented communications in the nature of petitions of the Westville Methodist Church, the New Haven Woman's Club, (Inc.), the Edgewood Civic Association, the Men's Club of Calvary Baptist Church, the Woman's Board of Missions of the Congregational Churches, and sundry citizens, all of New Haven, Conn., praying for the granting of relief to the suffering peoples of the Near East, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented communications in the nature of petitions of sundry citizens of Middletown, Hartford, Kent, Morris Cove, New Britain, Essex, Centerbrook, and Watertown, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the granting of relief to the suffering peoples of the Near East, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST OFFICE AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7658) to amend the act approved August 25, 1919, entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4101) to amend the copyright law in order to permit the United States to enter the International Copyright Union; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4102) granting a pension to John Mundy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 4103) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to amend the Federal reserve act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 4104) granting a pension to Sue Myrina Rector; and

A bill (S. 4105) granting a pension to Christena Coey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4106) granting a pension to Jane W. Smith (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 4107) to amend and supplement an act entitled "An act relating to bills of lading in interstate and foreign commerce," approved August 29, 1916; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

RETIRED PAY OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7864) providing for sundry matters affecting the Naval Establishment, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SALARY AND MILEAGE OF HON. CHARLES A. RAWSON.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 375), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Hon. CHARLES A. RAWSON $493.15, salary from November 8, 1922, to December 1, 1922, both dates inclusive, and $459.20, mileage for attendance at the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, said sums being due him as a Senator from the State of Iowa.

ROY H. RANKIN AND EDNA T. VOGEL.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 376), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Roy H. Rankin $152.67 and to Edna T. Vogel $122.67, for clerical services rendered the Hon. CHARLES A. RAWSON, a Senator from the State of Iowa, from November 8, 1922, to December 1, 1922, both dates inclusive.

ANNA CLAUDE HOWARD.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, yesterday while the calendar was under consideration the bill (S. 1883) granting a pension to Anna Claude Howard was passed by the Senate. The substance of the bill was included in the omnibus pension bill (H. R. 5214), as agreed to in conference, and was passed at the second session of the present Congress. I therefore move that the votes by which Senate bill 1883 was ordered to a third reading and passed be reconsidered.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I now move the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, some of us did not hear the statement made by the Senator from Utah. Will he kindly repeat it?

Mr. SMOOT. The bill granting a pension to Anna Claude Howard was passed by the Senate on yesterday. The substance of the bill was included in the omnibus pension bill (H. R. 5214) passed in the second session of this Congress and was agreed to in conference. I moved a reconsideration of the vote by which the bill passed the Senate on yesterday, which has been agreed to, and I have moved the indefinite postponement of the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well; I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah to indefinitely postpone the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

SARAH ORR.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 374. It provides for the payment of the salary of the clerk of Mrs. Felton, late a Senator from Georgia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be reported for the information of the Senate.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 374) submitted yesterday by Mr. HARRIS, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Sarah Orr the sum of $372.94 for services as clerk from October 3, 1922, to November 21, 1922, rendered the Hon. Rebecca Latimer Felton, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have previously expressed my views about this matter, but I do not want to have the resolution acted upon without some consideration of it by the Senate. I think it is the wrong way to dispose of the matter. I took the position that Mrs. Felton was legally entitled to her seat as a Member of this body and that she ought to be paid, just as every Senator is paid, out of the regular appropriation for the officers of the legislative, judiciary, and executive branches of the Government. I can not understand how anyone can conceive that this is a proper charge against the fund which is set aside for the doing of the work which is imposed upon the United States Senate, for the expense of investigations and other matters of that character to be conducted by the Senate. It seems to me that in some way or other it carries the implication that Mrs. Felton stands in some position other than that of the ordinary Member of this body.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. CALDER. This resolution does not provide for Mrs. Felton's pay; she was paid by a resolution which was adopted by the Senate on Monday last in the last hours of the extraordinary session. This is for the pay of her clerk.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But that involves exactly the same principle.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, it does not. Senator Felton's clerk was not assigned to any committee of the Senate, and appropriations are made for the payment of the salaries of certain clerks to committees. There is no way in which Senator Felton's clerk may be paid except as proposed in the pending resolution.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, I appreciate that there is no other way in which the clerk may be paid, but provision ought to be made by some appropriation bill to take care of such items of expenditure just the same as the items for the payment of Senators' clerks ordinarily.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I desire to say I agree with what he has said about the salary of the appointed Senator from Georgia [Mrs. Felton]. I think undoubtedly Mrs. Felton was either a Member of the Senate, or she was not; and I think she was. If she was, she was entitled to be paid out of the regular appropriations which are made for the payment of Senators; but as to the ad interim clerks of an appointed or an elected Senator, they have never been paid out of the regular appropriations, but have always been taken care of by the passage of a special resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say further to the Senator from Montana that the appropriation for the payment of Senators was made and there would not have been any deficiency in the appropriation if Senator Felton had been paid regularly as other Senators are paid. The full amount for the payment of 96 Senators is appropriated by Congress every year, and there would have been no deficiency if the salary of Mrs. Felton had been paid from that fund. However, I agree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] so far as the payment of Mrs. Felton's clerk is concerned. The manner proposed in the resolution is the only way in which that clerk may be paid.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

SUPPLY OF WHITE ARSENIC IN THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and I ask for its immediate consideration. I present this resolution because, after consultation with certain officials of the Government, I find that great difficulty is being encountered in ascertaining certain facts concerning which information is desired. The resolution is presented in accordance with suggestions which have been made to me by those officials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For the information of the Senate, the resolution will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 377), as follows:

Whereas there is an emergency confronting the agricultural interests of the country in view of the difficulty in obtaining arsenical insecticides for alleviating the ravages of insect pests, and especially the great need for calcium arsenate for the control of the boll weevil: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Entomology, in cooperation with the Department of the Interior, through the United States Geological Survey, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the supply of white arsenic in the United States and the possible development of additional sources of supply and to report the same to Congress at the earliest possible time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

ACCOUNT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Assistant Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 378), as follows:

Resolved, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, requested and directed to reexamine and restate the account of the State of New York, for which appropriation was made by the act of Congress approved February 27, 1906, on the basis of like claims of Pennsylvania and Delaware, with the same force and effect as though appropriation therefor had not been made and accepted by said State, and report to the Senate the result of such statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

MERGER OF MEAT-PACKING COMPANIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Resolutions coming over from a previous day are in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to call up Senate Resolution 364, which is now on the table. I ask that the resolution may now be read as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution as requested.

The Assistant Secretary read, as modified, the resolution (S. Res. 364) submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE November 22, 1922, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and hereby is, directed to report immediately to the Senate all information now in his possession relating to any proposed merger or mergers of large meat-packing companies, accompanying said report with a statement of the number of animals annually slaughtered under Federal inspection, tabulated by fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1918, and the proportion slaughtered by each of the five principal packers, with their subsidiary and affiliated companies; also, to report as to any application for the privilege of merger, by whom made, and what action, if any, he has taken or contemplates taking in reference to such proposed merger.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offered this resolution calling for information from the Secretary of Agriculture some days ago. The resolution as originally presented will be found in the RECORD of Wednesday, November 22. I have modified it as it is presented to the Senate this morning. I am very anxious to have the consideration of the resolution completed in time to secure action upon it by the Senate this morning, if possible, but I wish to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to present the reasons which to me seem important that the resolution should be passed at this time.

I have no information regarding the proposed merger, except as I have obtained it from what has appeared in the press from time to time. Statements appearing in the press during the last few days are so direct and positive, and some of them so obviously inspired at the White House, as to leave no doubt that such merger is in contemplation. I will read just one of these newspaper notices and select the one appearing in the New York World of November 15, 1922, which reads as follows:

NO BAR TO ARMOUR PLAN, HARDING SAYS—PRESIDENT INCLINED TO APPROVE MERGER OF TWO BIG PACKING FIRMS—DECISION NOT YET MADE—SECRETARY WALLACE'S OPINION WILL BE SOUGHT BEFORE HE ACTS.

[Special to the World.]

WASHINGTON, November 15.—President Harding evidently looks favorably on the proposal of J. Ogden Armour, president of the meat-packing firm of Armour & Co., that his concern be permitted to purchase the physical assets of Morris & Co., a rival.

Mr. Harding has made no formal decision, and before he does he will call on Secretary of Agriculture Wallace for an opinion and the results of an investigation. But it was made clear at the White House to-day the President is not adverse to the merger on principle.

Financial difficulties of the packers are back of the proposal, it was said at the White House. Mr. Armour went over the question with the President yesterday, contending, it was said, the consolidation of the two was essential to financial salvation and would mean a saving of $10,000,000 annually, which would benefit live-stock producers and the consuming public.

This article, Mr. President, does not fortify that last statement with any facts as to whether the chief beneficiaries of the saving of $10,000,000, which it is supposed will result from the merger, would not be the packers themselves. I read further from this dispatch:

SEES NO LEGAL OBSTACLE.

The White House spokesman said the Executive feels there is no legal obstacle preventing one packer from buying out another, inasmuch as the packing industry is already under Federal control. The President believes, however, it would be imprudent for a packer to make such a deal without first receiving some assurance as to the law and the attitude of the public.

The White House takes the position the Government can not give assurance of immunity from antitrust or other laws that might subsequently be transgressed. The Federal Trade Commission has nothing to do with the matter, in the opinion of the President.

Mr. Armour's presentation of the proposal resulted from the extension of Federal control over the packing industry by the present Congress, whipped on by the farm bloc. "The contention of the packers," the White House said, "is that the purchase of the rival firm would not eliminate competition as it exists and was in no manner contemplated for that purpose.

MUST CUT OVERHEAD IS PLEA.

Advocates of the merger informed the President both they and the live-stock producers have suffered heavy losses in the last 18 months. They see no solution to their troubles unless they are allowed to cut overhead by merging, it is said. The packers disclaim responsibility for the high retail costs of meats.

President Harding called Mr. Armour's attention to the fact that at one time dressed meats were selling in Washington at 57 cents a pound for the cheapest and 75 cents for the choice cuts when the animal price was only 15½ cents a pound. Mr. Armour replied that this wide margin could not be attributed to the packers. He added he did not believe the retailers could be justly accused of profiteering. The modern method of middlemen and special service are chiefly to blame, so Mr. Armour contended.

The stock producers came up for consideration during the conference. The packers, it was said, hold that the day the producer gets his stock to market governs the matter of whether he will make a profit.

Much the same form of article has recently appeared in the press quite generally and has never been in any way contradicted or denied. It seems reasonably certain, therefore, that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have under consideration Mr. Armour's application to absorb one of the other four great meat-packing concerns of the country.

I believe the proposed merger to be contrary to law and contrary to public policy and the interests of the people of this country, and that the Senate should therefore be in possession of the information called for in this resolution at the earliest possible date. I ought to say, Mr. President, that for many days I have endeavored to get this resolution before the Senate for consideration, but the condition of the business did not admit of its being taken up until this morning.

I shall not attempt to review at this time the history of the efforts heretofore made to regulate the great meat-packing corporations. It is a shameful history of defiance of the law and of the courts on the part of the packers and is a warning of the length to which corporate greed will go in robbing the public, oppressing its employees, and defying the laws of the land. I shall not stop even to recall any of that history now, but I come directly to the purpose of my resolution.

The latest attempt by Congress to regulate the meat packers is contained in the act generally cited as the packers and stockyards act, 1921, and approved August 15, 1921. That act, as you will recall, places the meat packers directly under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture and confers upon that official many of the powers and imposes upon him many of the duties theretofore devolved upon the Federal Trade Commission by the Federal Trade Commission act of 1914.

The packers and stockyards act in section 202, among other things, provides:

It shall be unlawful for any packer to:

* * * * * * *

(e) Engage in any course of business or do any act for the purpose or with the effect of manipulating or controlling prices in commerce, or of creating a monopoly in the acquisition of, buying, selling, or dealing in any article in commerce, or of restraining commerce.

By subsequent sections, any arrangement to do any of the prohibited things is made unlawful. By section 203 of the act it is made the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture, if he has reason to believe that any of the provisions of the act is being violated, to serve a complaint upon the packers, stating the charges, and to proceed in due form to a hearing thereon. After the hearings the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make an appropriate order in the premises, and the proceedings are similar to those taken by the Federal Trade Commission in other cases.

The "packers and stockyards act" also provides that nothing therein contained shall be construed to prevent or interfere with the enforcement of the interstate commerce law or any of the antitrust or antimonopoly laws of the country.

You do not, however, in my opinion, have to go beyond the section of the "packers and stockyards act," which I have just read, to see that this proposed merger is unlawful. The mandate of the act is that no packer shall do any act for the purpose, or which has the effect of manipulating or controlling prices in commerce, or of creating a monopoly, or of restraining commerce.

Now, just exactly what does this proposed merger accomplish? Why, it simply eliminates from the meat-packing industry one of the five great concerns which now so largely control that industry and combines that concern with the principal one of the others.

In looking over a chart published by the Federal Trade Commission in June, 1919, in its report on the meat-packing industry, I find that at that time there were a considerable number of cities in this country in which, of the five great meat packers, only Armour and Morris had branch houses. In other words, such competition as existed in these cities existed only between Armour and Morris. Let Armour swallow up Morris, as this merger proposes, and, of course, your competition in all of those cities is gone, if there be at the present time any competition whatever between them, and if they be not already engaged in a combination that is unlawful.

I have not undertaken to determine just how many such cities there were at the time of the Federal Trade Commission report, but a glance at the Federal Trade Commission map shows that included among them were such cities as Kingston, Auburn, and Poughkeepsie, of New York; Altoona, Pa.; Helena, Ark.; Decatur and Danville, Ill., and others.

Not only did the competitive condition I have mentioned exist in the cities referred to but it necessarily existed outside of the large cities in considerable portions of the country covered by the auto truck routes and "peddler" refrigerator cars of the five great packers.

Now, nothing can be more certain than that as to these sections of the country the effect of the proposed merger is to place the whole matter of prices and of buying and selling in the hands of Armour, so far as the large packing concerns are concerned. That, of course, is the purpose, or at least one of the purposes, of the proposed merger.

It may be said that these concerns do not compete, anyway. I do not profess to know about that, sir, but I know that they have sworn over and over again that they did compete, and that there was the fiercest kind of competition between them. For example, Mr. Armour, testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in January, 1919, pages 518 and 519 of the hearings, said:

I desire to say with all of the emphasis that words can convey that Armour & Co. are not now, and have not been for many years, a party in the most remote degree to any pool, arrangement, agreement, or combination of any kind whatever for the control, regulation, limitation, or restriction of the purchase of live stock or the sale of any of the products or by-products thereof.

Mr. Edward Morris, in the same hearings, testified, page 1877:

I want to say, just as positively as the English language will permit, that Morris & Co. is not in any agreement to control the price to be paid for the live meat animal or the price to be obtained for fresh meats or meat food products.

I quote just a few lines from the testimony of Mr. J. Ogden Armour in the hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry January 27, 1919:

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Gore). Do you compete with Swift and Morris in selling meats?
Mr. ARMOUR. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Is the competition pretty decided?
Mr. ARMOUR. Yes, sir; I think so.

Now, Mr. President, there is nothing plainer than that this competition between Armour and Morris will be absolutely wiped out by this merger; and the competition between these two concerns is all the competition there is at the points mentioned between the Big Five, or, at least, was at the time the Federal Trade Commission report was published, together with the maps to which I have referred. What the conditions are to-day is one of the things upon which I am seeking information.

Note well the language of the inspired White House article which I have quoted:

The White House spokesman said the Executive feels there is no legal obstacle preventing one packer from buying out another, inasmuch as the packing industry is already under Federal control.

I commend this language particularly to the farm bloc and the other Senators who believed that by means of the "packers' and stockyards act" a more complete control would be obtained of the packers' combine. It seems that this act, so far from being the means of more efficiently curbing these trusts, is to be made the excuse and reason for letting them proceed with their unlawful combinations and conspiracies. It is not true that the "packers and stockyards act" contains anything authorizing or justifying this merger. On the contrary, it prohibits it in the plainest possible language. But if the "White House spokesman" correctly represents the views of the White House this act, which was offered and urged as a means of relieving the people from packers' control, is to be put forward as the reason why such control, even as it previously existed, is to be abandoned.

One other matter, Mr. President, requires consideration at this point. Why are the great packing houses frankly bargaining with Government officials for permission to do an unlawful act? The answer is that the great packers are in financial difficulties. That is the answer they make themselves. I quote again from the World article:

Financial difficulties of the packers are back of the proposal, it was said at the White House. Mr. Armour went over the question with the President yesterday, contending, it was said, the consolidation of the two was essential to financial salvation and would mean a saving of $10,000,000 annually, which would benefit live-stock producers and the consuming public.

Whenever it is necessary to put over a job, no matter how barefaced may be the robbery of the people it involves, it is always explained as a measure for the benefit of the public.

But why are the great packers in financial difficulties, if they are? I believe the answer to that question can be found in the testimony of the packers themselves. J. Ogden Armour, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on January 21, 1919, testified:

Mr. ARMOUR. There are a great many independent packers in the field, and they all make more money than we do.
The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sims). At one time, when the five great packers began the war on each other as to volume of business, or, I mean, if at any time the five great packers were to begin a war on each other as to volume, and that war should lead to sharp competition, then the little fellows have got to get close to the shore, haven't they?
Mr. ARMOUR. Not necessarily; because the expenses of the big packers are a great deal more in proportion to his size than the little packer.
The CHAIRMAN. A great deal more as to the unit of profits?
Mr. ARMOUR. No; in size.
The CHAIRMAN. The unit of profit is what you make your money on, is it not?
Mr. ARMOUR. Yes; and in the volume or size of business. But the little packer doesn't have the expense of the big packers. The little packer to-day will make more money in proportion than the big packer will make. I do not think there is a little packer in the room now who wouldn't say that.
The CHAIRMAN. Then you gentlemen ought to split up, and then you could do better than you do now.
Mr. ARMOUR. No; while there is a greater percentage, it is not so large in the aggregate as the big packer will make.
The CHAIRMAN. The overhead of the small packer, if he hasn't cars of his own, would add a great deal more to his unit of profit.
Mr. ARMOUR. No, sir; I don't think so.
The CHAIRMAN. You large packers, then, are not doing your business economically if you can not conduct it at as little cost as anybody else.
Mr. ARMOUR. No; I think in any business that the small man's overhead up to a certain point is always smaller than that of the big man. When the small man goes past that point, of course, it rises.
The CHAIRMAN. Then the fact that the public, inasmuch as it has to procure from the large packers a very large percentage of their purchases of such meat as they handle, have to pay you that much more therefor; and if the big packers can not serve the public as economically as the little packers can, it is a very good reason why in the public interest they should cease to exist.
Mr. ARMOUR. That does not exist only up to a certain point. It can not exist beyond a certain point where the little man gets big.
The CHAIRMAN. With the fierce competition that you say exists between the big packers, say Swift & Co., and the others, in every respect—and it is not competition unless it is real and genuine—I can not see how the little packer without the established trade that you have and the capital that you have can possibly make more money per unit of product out of his investment than you can.
Mr. ARMOUR. They do.
The CHAIRMAN. Then the public is interested in having the cheapest production?
Mr. ARMOUR. Well, but you understand that only goes to a certain point, as I say, and when you pass that point you can not do it.

Again Mr. Armour, testifying January 27, 1919, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture, said:

The CHAIRMAN (Senator Gore). You stated the other day that the small packing houses paid better than the big ones?
Mr. ARMOUR. In a percentage way; yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. That is the best test, I take it. In a percentage way?
Mr. ARMOUR. Yes, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding these economies and efficiency brought about by the big packing establishments, still the small packing establishments realize a better profit on their investment?
Mr. ARMOUR. Yes, sir.

Herbert Hoover, in a letter to the President regarding control of the big meat packers released to the newspapers by the United States Food Administration, Washington, February 10, 1919, among other things, said:

The problem we have to consider, however, is the ultimate social result of this expanding domination, and whether it can be replaced by a system of better social character and of equal economic efficiency for the present and of greater promise for the future. It is certain, to my mind, that these businesses have been economically efficient in their period of competitive upgrowth, but, as time goes on, this efficiency can not fail to diminish and, like all monopolies, begin to defend itself by repression rather than by efficiency. The worst social result of this whole growth in domination of trades is the undermining of the initiative and the equal opportunity of our people and the tyranny which necessarily follows in the commercial world.

Mr. Hoover's letter strikingly emphasizes the same point which the packers unwittingly made against themselves, namely, that they have already grown so big, they have extended themselves so greatly, they have taken up so many lines of enterprise, that they have reached the point where they must defend themselves from outside competition "by repression rather than by efficiency."

This proposed merger simply seeks to carry one step further this mad scheme of creating greater and ever greater monopoly in the packing industry. By the confessions of the packers themselves they have reached the point where their great organizations are uneconomic. If their testimony is true, they have reached the point now where they can not successfully compete with the small independents. J. Ogden Armour, in his report to his stockholders, January 18, 1922, said:

Our business has long since ceased to be one merely of meat packing. In order to distribute risks and to lessen the probability of loss, we have engaged in the further processing of various of our by-products and of cotton-oil products, etc.

There you have a pretty frank statement of what is the matter with the great meat packers. The trouble is that they are meat packers no longer. With the millions that they have

extorted from the people they have reached out into other lines of business, and the losses and the vast overhead connected with these other lines must eventually be paid for by enhancing the price of meat products.

The five great meat-packing concerns were built up largely through (1) railroad rates and special privileges, which gave them unfair advantage over competitors; (2) unfair methods of competition, whereby they used their unfairly acquired power to crush out independent competitors; and (3) combinations between themselves which enabled them to control and manipulate prices to their own advantage.

Deprived by legislation, to some extent at least, of these unfair and unlawful advantages, they now appear to be reaping the inevitable result of their violation of economic laws. What they need is not further combinations and mergers, but they need to dispose of some of their far-flung plants and other lines of business to other individuals and concerns competent to handle that business, thereby increasing healthy and fair competition, instead of attempting to throttle it by further combinations. This, I take it, was the point, in part at least, of the consent decree under which it was agreed they would sell their stockyards. Under that decree they were to dispose of this property on or before February 27, 1922. Whether the decree has yet been complied with or not I do not know.

The Senate will remember that it adopted a resolution calling upon the Department of Justice for information as to what its attitude was toward that consent decree, and what it was doing to carry it out, and whether or not it was actively participating in a proceeding that would defer the execution of the consent decree, and indeed modify it, thereby destroying its effectiveness altogether. I know from inquiries which I have made that the court has granted an extension with regard to the execution of that consent decree, but I have not inquired within a few days about it. So far as I was able to gain any information on the point about a week ago, when I hoped to get the floor to discuss this matter, the whole situation was in statu quo.

Some idea of the extent to which this proposed merger of Armour and Morris would affect the industry may be gathered from the fact that for 1916 the live weight of animals slaughtered was:

	Pounds.
Armour	3,725,000,000
Morris	1,870,000,000
Swift, Wilson, and Cudahy	7,635,000,000
Total of the big five	13,230,000,000
Total of all animals slaughtered under Federal inspection	18,050,000,000

Armour-Morris proportion of the big five, 42 per cent.

Armour-Morris proportion of the total of inspected slaughtered animals slaughtered not only by the big five but by everybody else, so far as the statistics give us any returns, 31 per cent.

These figures were obtained from the Federal Trade Commission meat report of 1919 and relate to the business of 1916, and are the latest available.

I have this memorandum regarding the consent decree, which I think I should have introduced a little earlier.

The latest information available is that contained in hearings on Senate Resolution 211, containing report dated April 8, 1922, of trustees appointed under packer consent decree:

1. Up to date that the packers had disposed of only some minor holdings in small stockyards.

2. They had been unable to dispose of merger holdings in large stockyards.

3. Packers have applied for extension for one year ending March 3, 1923, in which to dispose of holdings. This was opposed by attorneys for governor, who desired to grant only four months' extension, but the court granted extension for full year ending March 3, 1923.

Mr. President, we know something about mergers in the meat-packing industry. The history of that industry is replete with them. These mergers simply mean more fees and commissions for the insiders, more watered stock, more bonds, and eventually more overhead, the carrying charges of which must eventually be paid by the public in increased prices.

The famous memorandum which Louis F. Swift wrote to apprise his brothers—Edward F. and George H.—of the progress of the negotiations to absorb Schwarzschild & Sulzberger by Swift & Armour is worth referring to, and is typical of what occurs in these mergers. I quote from this memorandum as found in the report of the Federal Trade Commission of the Meat-Packing Industry (1919), page 170:

E. B. S.—

Those are the initials of one of the Swifts, I will say by way of explanation—

Want your vote by wire if go any further. Of course, if bankers get it (in) will help our stock to start, but can't tell what will lead to.

L. F. S.

P. S.: Am sure nothing doing unless go to $10 or near it. Forgot to mention Kuhn, Loeb is in pu qui(e)t or (on) bank deal (think it's too much to steal to admit in open) and may get fourth if possible otherwise. Salomon & Halgarten will sign. G. F. Suis seems afraid that four years' audit won't suit bankers; guess books pretty raw; also fears listing stock and making market may fail.

There is much more along the same line, but I will not take up the time of the Senate to read it, but it shows how the expenses are augmented and higher and higher profits distributed among the packers and others. It is the old, old story of graft and commissions and fees and bogus stock to insiders and bankers! That is the school of finance and business where the Big Five learned their lessons. It is fair to presume that the proposed merger is not unlike the previous ones, especially since it is proposed, apparently, to put it through without the investigation which the law contemplates.

One point upon which the Congress will be enlightened if this resolution is adopted is the proportion of business done to-day by each of the Big Five as well as by the independents.

But, Mr. President, aside from the question of legality and the question of public policy involved in this proposed merger, there is a deeper and more fundamental question presented. Under what law does the President of the United States or the Secretary of Agriculture give to the packers an opinion in advance that their action will be legal or illegal? Everyone knows that there is no law which gives to either of these officials any authority or any right to do the thing they are asked to do by Mr. Armour and his associates.

It has not yet reached the point in this country where any law has been passed which authorizes the President to sell indulgences to lawbreakers or to give them away to favorites. If he grants such indulgence or privilege, he must do it without the sanction of law. Everyone knows, of course, that if the President should give the opinion to these packers that their proposed merger was lawful, that such Executive action would be tantamount to promising that the courts would take no proceeding either to prevent the combination or to enforce against it the plain letter of the law once it had been formed. As well, sir, might the gentlemen seeking this merger go before a court and seek to extort from the court a promise that they would not be prosecuted for their violation of the law.

It will be recalled that the recently proposed merger of the Lackawanna group of steel companies was abandoned when the Federal Trade Commission filed a complaint that the combine would result in unfair competition. Unfortunately, as I believe, the Federal Trade Commission has been deprived of all power by the "packers and stockyards act" to interfere to prevent the present merger, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls upon the commission to make an investigation and report. By section 406 of the "packers and stockyards act" the Congress deliberately provided as follows:

On and after the enactment of this act, and so long as it remains in effect, the Federal Trade Commission shall have no power or jurisdiction so far as relating to any matter which by this act is made subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary, except * * * when the Secretary of Agriculture, in the exercise of his duties hereunder, shall request of the said Federal Trade Commission that it make investigations and report in any case.

If this proposed merger could bear investigation, that provision of the "packers and stockyards act" would have been invoked, in my opinion, and the Federal Trade Commission called upon to make an investigation for which it is completely equipped. That commission already has great knowledge of the packing business on account of the studies heretofore made.

Prior to the enactment of that provision it was the duty of the Federal Trade Commission, of their own motion and initiative, under the act of 1914, when they saw such unwarranted and unlawful proceeding under way, to investigate. They were empowered to act, and would have been acting in this contemplated proceeding, I have no doubt, except for the fact that they are barred apparently from lifting a hand to arrest such unlawful action. The Federal Trade Commission could have conducted the investigation, for which it is completely equipped, being the only organization under this Government of ours that I know of that is prepared, with competent experts and able attorneys and the will to execute, to make such an investigation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I gladly yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I interrupt the Senator because I think the point the Senator is now making ought to be emphasized. I

believe attention ought to be called to the fact that the particular provision which the Senator has just read was one of the main differences—I think the greatest difference—in the packer legislation between the Senate bill as it came from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House bill. It was beaten by a majority of only three, and I wish those who voted when we came to a test vote between the two bills to realize now the truth of what the Senator said, that if it had not been and was not now for that provision in the law the Federal Trade Commission, probably without any request from anybody, would have made an investigation that would have prevented the merger which is probably going to take place.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And would have saved the time of the Senate taken up for its consideration and the action of the Senate, which will follow a report from the Secretary of Agriculture if the report warrants it, of conducting a further investigation into the matter.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just a moment, please. We had a superior body of men organized under the law, one of the best laws that has been enacted in many years, in my humble opinion, the law creating the Federal Trade Commission. We had a body of trained men who were doing the most thoroughgoing work and looking into all matters of unfair competition between business organizations in the country. Mr. President, I did not take the time of the Senate to go more fully into it, but I do agree with the Senator from Nebraska that it ought to be emphasized at this time to make the Senate more cautious and Congress more cautious in the future. We struggled for days here over the proposition as to whether the power of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to the packers should be taken away from them or not. It was the subject, this legislation was the subject, of the greatest contention between the Senate and the House, and I hope the time is near at hand when that power, taken from the Federal Trade Commission at that time, will be restored to it. I hope to introduce, possibly before the day is over—if not, then to-morrow—a bill restoring that power to the Federal Trade Commission, and to obtain for it early consideration.

I now yield with great pleasure to the Senator from Oklahoma. I beg his pardon for not yielding before.

Mr. OWEN. I thank the Senator. I wished to call attention, at the moment when I rose, that the time was near at hand when the act could be amended and that it should be amended. I wished to suggest to the Senator and to the Senate that the commission, which has been so grossly abused on this floor for its laborious and faithful report on the Beef Trust, deserves—and the public interest requires—all honor and support by Congress. They reported that the Beef Trust controlled over 700 subsidiary companies, controlling the food products of the country under this gigantic monopoly. It is high time that the powers of the Federal Trade Commission were restored, and that the people of the country were protected from the exactions of the Beef Trust and its subsidiaries. The one great overpowering issue in America is the control of the abuses of monopoly, and the time approaches when genuine control in the public interest is going to be effected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I most emphatically agree with the observations of the Senator from Oklahoma. As I said, I shall introduce a bill within the next 48 hours to bring about that result. It may not pass at the present session because of the condition of business, but it will come early before the Senate for its consideration at a time when I think the situation will be more favorable for it.

If this proposed merger had any legal basis it would not be necessary to avoid all investigation of the subject and take it up with the President. He can not, of course, conduct any investigation at all, but he can effectually restrain the Department of Justice, and through that department the United States district attorneys, from taking any action in the premises, and he can prevent his Secretary of Agriculture from filing a complaint against the combination either after it is organized or to prevent its organization.

Mr. President, one of the most dangerous and wicked practices which has grown up largely in our day is that by which great corporations go either to the President or to the heads of departments and make a bargain in advance for immunity for the crimes they are about to commit.

In the case of this particular proposed merger, sir, it is either (1) plainly lawful or (2) plainly unlawful or (3) its lawfulness or unlawfulness is in doubt. If it is plainly lawful, then, sir, of course, there is not the slightest reason or excuse for bargaining or attempting to bargain with the officials about it in advance. If it is plainly unlawful, then the attempt to secure official sanction for it is nothing less than asking to have the officials agree to compound a crime. If the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the proposed action is such that there may be reasonable doubt about it, then by all means the officials who will have occasion to pass upon the legality of the action ought not to be bound by promises in advance concerning the decision they will make.

The least we can do, Mr. President, is to adopt the resolution so that we may know, and the people of the country may know, something as to the effect the proposed merger would have upon the meat-packing industry, and what steps, if any, officials of the Government are taking to maintain and enforce the laws which have been passed to protect the public from the unlawful practices of the meat packers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

GRADE PERCENTAGES OF ENLISTED MEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The Secretary will state the first bill on the calendar.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, upon yesterday when the calendar was called the last bill on the calendar was reached, being the bill (S. 4037) to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men, as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act as amended, to which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] made objection; not that he was opposed to the bill, but stating that he hoped he might have an opportunity to examine a letter which he had received which he thought related to a proposition which was involved in the bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if we are going on with the consideration of the calendar, Senators ought to be here; and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was about to make the same suggestion, in order that the bill to which I have referred might be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Gooding	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Harreld	Nelson	Spencer
Brandegee	Harris	New	Sterling
Brookhart	Heflin	Norris	Townsend
Broussard	Hitchcock	Overman	Trammell
Calder	Johnson	Owen	Underwood
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Page	Wadsworth
Caraway	Kendrick	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Ladd	Pittman	Warren
Elkins	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson
Ernst	Lodge	Sheppard	Weller
Fernald	McKellar	Shields	Willis
Glass	McNary	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPPER in the chair). Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, upon yesterday, as I have stated, upon the call of the calendar Senate bill 4037, being the last bill on the calendar, was reached. When that bill was called the request was made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that he be permitted until to-day to examine into the matter. Upon that request the bill was put over. I now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of that bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4037) to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act as amended. It proposes that hereafter the respective grade percentages prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, of the total authorized number of enlisted men shall not exceed 0.79 per cent for the first grade, 2.1 per cent for the second grade, 3.4 per cent for the third grade, 9.2 per cent for the fourth grade, 9.5 per cent for the fifth grade, and 25 per cent for the sixth grade; and that the aforementioned section 4b shall be amended accordingly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that the letter to which I referred on yesterday I find does not relate to the matter covered by this bill. I have no objection to the consideration and passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCESSIVE INTEREST RATES OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 335, being the Order of Business No. 859. The resolution was passed over yesterday when reached on the call of the calendar. There should be no objec-

tion to the resolution, and I am anxious to have it passed to-day.

Mr. MOSES. Let the resolution be read for information.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask that the resolution may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Assistant Secretary read Senate Resolution 335, submitted by Mr. HEFLIN August 10, 1922, and reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry without amendment, as follows:

Whereas it has been charged on the floor of the Senate that the amendment to the Federal reserve act authorizing the charging of progressive interest rates had been obtained largely as a result of express and definite assurances given to Members of Congress by W. P. G. Harding, governor of the Federal Reserve Board, that the object and purpose of said legislation was to secure a fairer and more equitable distribution of the funds of the Federal reserve system and was expressly designed to prevent the undue absorption of Federal reserve funds in certain large cities at the expense of the great farming interests in the West and South, and at the expense of the smaller business man throughout the country; and

Whereas the official records show that the said "progressive rates" after the passage of the law were put into effect only in the agricultural sections of the West, South, and Southwest, including the four Federal reserve districts of Atlanta, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Dallas, and were not put into effect in New York and other big money centers, where the funds of the Federal reserve system were principally loaned; and

Whereas the official records show that its country banks were charged unconscionable and wholly indefensible interest rates, and that these inhuman rates were exacted from many banks in the States of Alabama, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and others; and

Whereas the reserve board defeated two resolutions offered by the former Comptroller of the Currency, one designed to limit interest rates to 6 per cent per annum, and when that was defeated another limiting interest rates charged by Federal reserve banks to 10 per cent per annum; and

Whereas the undue concentration of Federal reserve funds to the big cities is illustrated in the fact that in the autumn of 1920 the official records show that the national banks in New York City, in proportion to their total loans and discounts, were being accommodated with three times as large an amount of Federal reserve funds as were the 7,600 "country" national banks throughout the entire United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Reserve Board be requested to obtain from the Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, St. Louis, Dallas, and Kansas City statements showing all cases where interest ranging between 10 per cent and 87½ per cent per annum, both inclusive, was exacted from member banks, giving names of the banks, their capital and surplus, and location, where 10 per cent per annum or more was charged on loans and rediscounts, the rate and amount of interest charged in each instance as expressed in dollars and cents; also let the statement show whether the Federal reserve banks have refunded to each member bank from which such exactions were made the amount of such interest collected in excess of 10 per cent per annum upon each loan upon which such interest was charged.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I presume the Senator will not object to having the preamble stricken from the resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. The preamble is true, but I can understand, of course, that some Senators have not investigated as I have the statements contained therein.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the preamble ought to be stricken out, so that the resolution may merely call for the information desired. The preamble refers, for instance, to "unconscionable rates of interest." That is the Senator's own idea. It may be so; I will not say that it is not; but if we adopt the resolution the preamble, I think, should be stricken out. If that may be done, so that the resolution of the Senator will merely call for the information requested, I shall have no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the information set out in the preamble is absolutely correct. It can be verified by the records; but if Senators who have not had the opportunity to look into the records object to voting for the preamble part of it I am willing to have it stricken out. I am anxious to get the information mentioned through the Federal Reserve Board. If the Senator prefers that the preamble be stricken out I am willing that it be done. The absence of the preamble will in no wise affect the body of the resolution, which directs the Federal Reserve Board to furnish the information requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Alabama consents to striking out the preamble.

Mr. HEFLIN. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The premable will be stricken out. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Alabama, as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the call of the Calendar having been completed, it is in order, is it not, to proceed with the unfinished business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It can be taken up by motion at this time.

Mr. NEW. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1452, the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1452) providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] submitted an amendment which he thought and I think everybody thought had been adopted. Through some inadvertence or misunderstanding that amendment does not appear in the printed bill as having been adopted. I therefore send it to the desk and submit it. In so far as I can do so, I accept it. I think it is all right, and a proper amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was adopted yesterday.

Mr. NEW. The record does not show it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert, at the proper place, the following:

Nothing in this act contained shall be construed as subjecting any lands acquired, held, or used by the United States for military purposes to any of the provisions of this act.

Mr. NEW. I think at the end of section 2, as amended, would be a proper place for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that there is an amendment pending, offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment at this time in order to let this one be acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas withdraws his amendment. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is unnecessary legislation. All matters of this kind ought to be left with the States. There seems to be no end of harassing our people with laws and restrictions. In our business matters we hardly know which way to turn; and now it is proposed to take charge of what little pleasure is left to the people and not allow them to hunt without getting a license from Washington.

It is a little amusing to read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture on this bill. It shows that he knew absolutely nothing about it, because in his concluding paragraph on page 3 he says:

The bill is well drawn and offers a solution of the problem of raising adequate funds for migratory bird protection and for the acquisition of public shooting grounds without the necessity of regular annual appropriations.

It seems that the Secretary is very much in love with the bill. He says it is well drawn. I believe the author of the bill came here yesterday and offered 14 amendments. So it shows that somebody is mistaken about it—either the author of the bill or the Secretary of Agriculture, or perhaps both.

Mr. President, we are making the people of this country dissatisfied with our Government. They have reason to be dissatisfied. We are hampering them, we are restricting them, we are making crimes out of things that are not criminal. Why, under this bill some man who steps out with his shotgun on Saturday afternoon, after he gets through his week's labors, and shoots a migratory bird, is subject to be haled up in the United States court and fined $500 or placed in jail six months, and darkies will have to secure licenses from the Government to hunt rabbits.

That seems to me to be ridiculous, absurd, preposterous, out of place, and uncalled for. It is enough to make Bolsheviks out of our people, and certainly we have enough wrong principles now without making our Government more unpopular. It will not be long until we have to come to Washington to get a license to play marbles in the afternoon, or to go rabbit hunting, or to carry on whatever other little sports we may have.

I am not much of a huntsman myself. I never had much time to give to recreation and pleasure. I have been employed in business matters, trying to make a living; but there are plenty of people who do enjoy a little sport, and I do not want them hampered by any such law as this. There is no occasion for it except to try to create large hunting preserves for people who are able to hunt and who spend their time in no useful occupation. These large preserves had better be cut up into small farms or small tracts, so as to encourage actual settlers thereon to help build up the country, to make a living for the people, and to pay taxes to the Government.

This bill is along the line of many others proposed by our Republican brethren. They seek to go ahead and create offices and tax the people to give dead beats something to do, or some occupation without work, where they will draw a salary from the Government. It will not be long until they will come here and ask for an appropriation to buy marshlands, and then they will need caretakers. Then I presume they will want boats to go around in the little streams to keep trespassers off. Then they will want an Army post to guard the land. Then they will have to have physicians to take care of the soldiers. Then they will have to have automobiles in which to transport the officers, and chauffeurs and mechanics to keep up the automobiles, and an unending line of positions, or at least employ people to do nothing and to draw compensation out of the Treasury.

I consider this about the last extreme to which our Government could go—keeping a man from shooting even a woodpecker. I do not know whether a woodpecker is a migratory bird or not; I am not very much up on the definitions. It seems to me to be the height of folly to put a poor devil in jail for six months at the expense of the Government for shooting a bird that was possibly pulling up his corn or interfering with his wheat or his rye, or something like that.

I do not know where you are going to stop legislation if you keep on with these things. It does seem to me that we have lost all sense of proportion and common sense, and there will be no end to it, and the people will just simply hold up their hands in despair. About all they will be able to do will be to go home and go to bed, maybe, because if they should go outside they might be arrested and put in a Federal prison.

In most of the States of the Union there is no public domain, and here we are trying to create a fund to go and buy one. Then we will ask for more money to finish paying for it; so it does seem to me to be about the height of folly. I sincerely hope that no such legislation as this will be enacted. Certainly it is time to call a halt and to become sane or to show common judgment. There is sufficient law now on the subject of migratory birds.

On page 2, line 14, the tenant of the land is not even allowed to shoot a bird on the land he has rented and is occupying and where he has his home. I move to strike out the word "and" and insert "or." I hope to improve the bill a little bit, so that one who is not fortunate enough to own land shall be allowed to shoot a bird that is flopping around on a place he has rented and is trying to eat up his cherries or his fruit. I hope to improve it that much, anyway.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I call the Senator's attention to the fact that under this bill you could not hunt on your woodland, your wild land, nor could you hunt on your own land unless you lived on it.

Mr. DIAL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CARAWAY. You might own it, but you could not hunt on it unless you lived on it.

Mr. DIAL. So a man in town could not go out on his own plantation and hunt there. Some of us happen to own a little land out in the country that we do not live on. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for bringing that matter to my attention. I own some hillsides myself out in the country, and I could not go out there and take my shotgun along with the little boys and let them shoot a bird unless I should go and live out there; neither could the tenant. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for the suggestion. Under this bill a tenant could not shoot on his own place. So I offer that amendment and I hope it will be adopted, and then I hope the bill will be defeated, because, as I say, it is extreme legislation. It goes away beyond what the Congress of the United States ought to engage in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina restate his amendment?

Mr. DIAL. Yes. On page 2, line 14, between "person" and "occupied," I move to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Before the word "occupied," on line 14, in an amendment already agreed to——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was previously agreed to.

Mr. DIAL. I make that motion, Mr. President. I move to reconsider the vote whereby that amendment was agreed to, with the view of making that amendment to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. NEW. I have not yet understood just exactly what it is that is proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 14, in an amendment already agreed to, before the word "occupied," it is proposed to strike out the word "and" and to insert the word "or," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That such license shall not be required to be procured by any person or by any member of his immediate family for the purpose of hunting, pursuing, shooting, capturing, or killing any such migratory bird on any farm land owned by such person or occupied by him as his place of permanent abode.

Mr. NEW. I do not object to the adoption of the amendment proposed to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was heretofore agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to ascertain whether the Senator from Indiana will accept an amendment to this measure, the so-called migratory bird bill, which would require the procuring of a Federal license to hunt by those people only who want to go upon public game preserves or public shooting grounds. If so, I shall have no objection to this legislation. If the funds which are to be raised by taxes are to be used to maintain public shooting grounds, and only those people who use the grounds for shooting purposes shall pay the license, I have no objection.

I can conceive of no reason, however, why a man owning or living upon a piece of land in Alabama, for instance, who wants to hunt, should be required to pay a license fee, and that money so raised be used in buying a bird preserve in Arkansas, where such a man never would go, and where he could not hunt if he were to go, because the law forbids a nonresident shooting; in other words, requiring him to contribute to a fund to purchase a shooting ground and maintain it where he could not go and which he could not use.

If the people who expect to use these bird preserves, and want them, desire to contribute to a fund to maintain them, I am willing that they shall do so; that a law shall be written which will require them to pay a tax before they may go upon one of these public game preserves for the purpose of hunting. I see nothing unfair about that and am not opposed to it. But I am unalterably opposed to taxing a man in one State, for instance, to hunt in his own local community, where he will never see a public game preserve, never be able to go upon one of these shooting grounds, in order to raise a fund to buy and maintain one in some State where he could not go, because there is a provision in this bill that one shall be subject to all the regulations of the State with reference to hunting, if that regulation is more stringent than this law itself. Besides, Congress could not, if it wanted to, grant to a resident in one State the right to enjoy the privilege of public shooting in another, if the other State by law prohibits it.

Therefore, let us allow the people who are going to enjoy the benefits, who want the legislation, to bear the cost; but let us not tax everybody everywhere in order to purchase a bird preserve at some place where they could not go if they wanted to go, and where they could not enjoy hunting if they wanted to go and enjoy it, because of prohibitions in State laws. If the Senator from Indiana will accept an amendment of that kind, on page 2—the Senator shakes his head?

Mr. NEW. I shook my head in response to a motion made to me by the Senator's colleague.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator, then, was not refusing to accept this amendment?

Mr. NEW. Not at that moment. If the Senator means to put that question now, I will say that I could not accept it.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator means he *would* not. There is nothing to prohibit him.

Mr. NEW. I *would* not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, I want the Senator to say what he means.

Mr. NEW. Very well. The Senator will say what he means, then, and say that he neither could nor would accept that amendment.

Mr. CARAWAY. I rather imagine that before the legislation passes the Senator will find out that he can.

Mr. NEW. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand that if this bill were to become a law, and I should give a hunter a right to hunt deer or wild turkey on my land, he would have to have a Federal license?

Mr. CARAWAY. That would be its effect, and if he did not have such a license the Federal authorities would put him in jail for six months and fine him $500 and revoke the Senator's license, so that he could not hunt after. If the Senator from Indiana had read his bill before he introduced it he would know what was in it. I know there is much in the bill for which the Senator from Indiana would not stand, if he should find out what they were.

Mr. ROBINSON. The provisions of the bill are applicable to all migratory birds, including ducks, geese, snipe, plover, and other migratory birds.

Mr. CARAWAY. The way it was drawn, a part of it applied also to a migratory fish, whatever he might be. You could not shoot a fish in your own fish bucket.

Mr. OVERMAN. Would a man hunting duck on some little pond away up in the interior, away from the coast, have to have a license?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; and if he did not somebody with the bottom of an oyster can pinned on his coat to show he was a deputy marshal would arrest him. Of all foolishness gone to seed, this is the worst. There is nothing on earth in it except an attempt to make everybody pay to help establish shooting preserves for those people who happen to be near enough to them to enable them to go on them and enjoy them. The law was amended, almost over the objection of the Senator from Indiana. It provided that if you rented land you could not go on your own rented land. The bill as it is now proposed provides that if you own land, and you want to hunt upon your own land, it must be farm land. If it were woodland you could not hunt on it. You can hunt migratory game in your cotton patch, but you can not go into your woods lot to do so; and you can hunt fish if you can get an affidavit from the fish that he is not migratory, but if he is a migratory fish, God bless your soul, you stay off him. That is, as the bill was presented.

It goes beyond that. Just to show how absolutely everything that could be absurd and obnoxious was put into the bill—although the Senator from Indiana says he can not accept an amendment to it—if you own land, and it is farm land, and you should not live on it, you can not hunt on it. If you live in an incorporated town and your farm lands happen to be in the country, where farm lands usually are, you can not go upon them without being arrested for trespassing upon your own field. Of course, the writer of the bill did not know that the right of a man to go upon his own property can not be taken away, even by the Senate. All they think is necessary in order to abolish constitutions, State rights, and individual rights is to write a law and give somebody the right to arrest you for exercising an inalienable right. The Supreme Court, over and over again, has said that you can not prohibit a man from going upon land to which he has a right, and in a very well considered case which I recall, growing out of a dispute between the States of Maryland and Virginia about the right to hunt oysters, or something like that—a "migratory" oyster, as my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] suggests—it was declared that if a man has the legal right to the possession of land you can not prevent his taking game upon it. But there is no reason why that should be dragged into the Senate, because the Senator from Indiana can not accept any amendment that will make the law constitutional.

Of course, as I said before, if the people who want to hunt and want game preserves, which I suspect are not bad things, want to pay for them, let them pay for them; but I do protest that it is an outrage to require a boy living in Alabama who wants to shoot a duck on a creek in that State to contribute a dollar, to be taken over to my State or down into Florida, or into Louisiana, and there go to purchase a game preserve on which that boy could not go to save his immortal soul without getting into jail, because the State laws will not permit nonresidents to hunt in those States, and the Congress of the United States can not repeal those police powers which States have to preserve the game within their own boundaries by police regulations. Even migratory oysters might be protected by it.

If Senators want to give the Department of Agriculture the power to say that certain lands would be suitable and appropriate and ought to be preserved as public breeding grounds for birds or public shooting grounds, I have no objection to it, and I have no objection to the Congress writing into the law a provision that every man who hunts, or spears a migratory fish, in that ground or digs up a migratory oyster shall pay a license, if a license is so sacred to the Senator from Indiana. But do not make somebody pay for it who never will see it and could not hunt upon it if he were to go there. It is not right, and I do not believe even the Senator from Indiana would indorse it.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas attempts to be facetious.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; I am awfully serious; my remarks were not intended to be funny.

Mr. NEW. Then the seriousness with which the Senator attacks this proposition is to be commended; but, of course, he misses the point entirely. I said I would not accept that amendment because the acceptance of it would defeat the very point the Senator from Arkansas would so jealously guard. Suppose the amendment were adopted; the bill then would be left in such shape that a man who has not the means to belong to a gun club would have to pay for the privilege of hunting duck, and the man who is rich and can belong to a gun club would be exempt absolutely from the payment of the $1 license. What I hope to do by this bill, Mr. President, is to take the dollar of the man who is fortunate enough to belong to a gun club and make it apply to the purchase or the rental of lands on which the poor devil may go and enjoy what the other man's money gives him the chance to enjoy.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator then accept an amendment that no one shall pay a license fee except he belongs to a gun club?

Mr. NEW. Certainly not.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not think he would.

Mr. NEW. Certainly not. The operation of the whole bill is simple. I would like to make just as brief a statement as I can to show what I conceive to be the operation of the bill and what it proposes to do. It imposes a license fee of $1 on every man who wants to shoot migratory birds. The Senator from Arkansas speaks of the man who does not shoot and who can not reach the hunting grounds and who will never go to the grounds. Very well; he is not required to pay a license fee. There is no charge against that man.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Would not the man who lived in Indiana, and went out to hunt in Indiana, have to pay a license under the provisions of the bill, even though he never saw a bird preserve?

Mr. NEW. Certainly not.

Mr. CARAWAY. If he wanted to hunt?

Mr. NEW. If he hunted migratory birds, he would have to have a license.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course.

Mr. NEW. But he will not have any migratory birds to hunt unless some means are employed to preserve them.

Mr. CARAWAY. How does the pending bill preserve them?

Mr. NEW. By furnishing grounds where they have opportunity to breed, where they may stop and feed unmolested on their way from Canada to Mexico.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let us amend the bill and give the Government power to establish game preserves, which it already has without the suggested amendment, but not require the man in Indiana who never will see one of them to pay a license when he wants to go out to hunt. That is all I am asking.

Mr. NEW. I hope the Senator will permit me to complete my statement.

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall do so.

Mr. NEW. I have no objection to answering any reasonable question.

As I said, Mr. President, the fact I think is obvious to all who know anything whatever about the game supply of the country, and particularly the migratory birds, that unless something is done to establish places where the birds may light on their migrations between the North and South in spring and fall they will soon be destroyed, simply because there is no place for them to go and because in a few places that remain they are shot without regard to the limits imposed by law or the limits imposed by ordinary sportsmanlike instinct. That is the plain fact about it. The bill is intended for the direct benefit of the man who can not afford to belong to a club.

Now, Mr. President, on that point let me say just a further word. I used to shoot along the Kankakee marshes. I have shot over every foot of them from the rise of that river clear to the Illinois. The day was when anybody could go there and find plenty of places to shoot and plenty of birds at which to shoot. To-day all that land that has not been reclaimed for agricultural purposes has been taken over by clubs. The same thing is absolutely true of marshes along the Illinois River, perhaps the greatest refuge in the world for migratory birds on their trips between Canada and the Gulf. Nearly all of

that land has been taken up by clubs. What I want to do is to make the club owners take out a Federal license, costing $1, which is to be paid into the Treasury for the use of the commission in establishing game refuges and preserves.

The bill does not create any salaried commission. The administration of the law is to be under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General, together with two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and two Members of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House, who shall serve during their terms of office only, and without any extra compensation.

The bill will save the Government of the United States about $150,000 a year, because the Government now pays about that much money in an effort, which is not altogether successful because it is inadequate, to enforce the provisions of the migratory-bird treaty which we entered into with Canada some years ago. The fees collected under the provisions of the bill would provide funds sufficient to cover all that expenditure and very considerably more. It is entirely a matter of speculation as to how much money would be collected from the sale of the licenses. There are anywhere from 3,000,000 to 7,000,000 hunting licenses issued in the United States each year. Of course that does not mean that they are all for the shooting of migratory birds, but it is a reasonable presumption that a great number of them are taken out by men who hunt ducks and other migratory birds. The provisions of the bill do not apply to fish and do not apply to anything but migratory birds.

I would like to read one or two excerpts from letters which have been written to me and to the gentlemen who are interested in this bill. I would like especially to read one from Arkansas, the State represented in part by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], who is opposing this measure.

Lee Miles, who is the game commissioner of Arkansas, wrote as follows:

I am very much in favor of this law. I am sure it will meet with the approval of Arkansas sportsmen. I can not understand how a man could be a sportsman and not favor this law.

From Alabama John H. Wallace, now dead, who was one of the very best game commissioners in the country and recognized as such, wrote very enthusiastically in favor of the bill. In fact, he had some voice in drawing the bill.

Representatives of Georgia wrote in the same terms. Both Clyde Matthews, now dead, and Frank Rhodes, who succeeded him, wrote in favor of the passage of the bill.

From Kentucky came this statement:

Let me say that this is exactly the thing we have been looking for down this way, and I hope we can immediately acquire Reel Foot Lake and the wonderful territory adjacent thereto. While the most of Reel Foot Lake is in Tennessee, we feel that we are very much interested in it.

From Maryland Mr. McCormick said:

Of course, you undoubtedly know that I am heartily in favor of this measure.

I am reading now from the South only. From North Carolina Richard H. Lewis, president of the Audubon Society of North Carolina, charged with the enforcement of the game laws there, indorses it enthusiastically.

In Virginia a convention of game wardens adopted the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the Virginia State game wardens in convention assembled, That they heartily sanction the passage of the New-Anthony bill providing for a Federal hunting license to hunt migratory birds.

From West Virginia came the same sort of a statement.

I want to stop here long enough to especially comment on the State of Louisiana. Louisiana adjoins Arkansas. Louisiana did for itself this year what we are trying to do through this bill for the country at large. The State set aside a preserve of 30,000 acres, and I am told by the Senators from Louisiana that it is going to set aside still more, the operation of it is giving such general satisfaction.

Referring to the license, to which the Senator from Arkansas objects, the State of Arkansas right now imposes a license of $1.10 on every man who wants to shoot in Arkansas, whether he wants to shoot migratory birds or whether he wants to shoot migratory rabbits or migratory anything else, and they do not get anything for it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the Senator tell me where he got that wonderful information?

Mr. NEW. I got it as reported to me from the Arkansas statute.

Mr. CARAWAY. As reported to the Senator, it happens to be wrong.

Mr. NEW. I am quite certain that the report is substantially correct.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; it is wrong.

Mr. NEW. They also charge a license fee for fishing. If I, a nonresident of Arkansas, were to go to Arkansas and shoot a migratory bird, I would have to take out a license. The Senator talks about what the citizen of Indiana would have to do to shoot in a public hunting ground. If I as a citizen of Indiana want to shoot duck in Arkansas, the State of Arkansas would charge me $15 for doing it.

Mr. CARAWAY. And in addition to that would put the Senator in jail, because he would not be allowed to do it at all.

Mr. NEW. If an Indiana man went to Arkansas at all, perhaps the Senator feels that they ought to put him in jail anyway. But that is what the Arkansas law provides shall be done to an Indiana man who goes down there to shoot. That is what the State of Arkansas does.

Understand another thing, Senators. The Government, under the provisions of the bill, can not take a single acre of land in Arkansas or in Alabama or in any other State except with the approval of the legislature of that State. No one is going down there to commit any outrage on the State of Arkansas or establish something that the State does not want. If they do not want it, all they have to do is to have their legislature say they do not want it done, and that is the end of it.

Mr. President, I think there are some here who do not take the bill very seriously. I am not one of them. It is a serious matter. It is proposed in good faith. I believe that the general public, not only in this day but in the days that are to come, will derive very great benefit in the form of pleasure, good health, and much that goes to make life enjoyable if we will preserve for them the opportunity to do so. I spoke of what I had seen along the Illinois River and the Kankakee River. I would like to feel that those who are to come after me, a couple of generations behind, are going to have the opportunity to have the same enjoyment out of life that I have had out of mine. That is all there is to it. No bill ever was proposed in better faith than this one, and none with more direct and impartial consideration for the man who can not afford, in a financial way, to put himself in the happy condition where he can enjoy such privileges as nature has provided. That is all there is to it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHIPPS in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana would he consent to an amendment striking out, on page 2, line 13, the word "farm" before the word "land," so as to read "on any land owned by such person." That would enable a man to hunt on his own land. An amendment already agreed to covers the tenant hunting on the land occupied by him, but I am a little fearful that it is not broad enough to cover a man's woodland if he does not live on it. I therefore move, on page 2, in line 13, before the word "land," to strike out the word "farm."

Mr. SMITH. May I suggest to my colleague as now framed the provision reads "killing any such migratory birds on any farm land owned by such person and occupied by him." I suggest that if the word "and" before the word "occupied" were changed to "or" that would meet the objection.

Mr. DIAL. I have proposed that amendment and it has been agreed to.

Mr. NEW. That change has been made.

Mr. DIAL. I now move to strike out the word "farm" before the word "land."

Mr. SMITH. I do not suppose that this bill will pass; I hope it will not in its present form; but, in case it does, I hope that before its passage it may be framed in as harmless a shape as possible.

Mr. NEW. If I understand the amendment now proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], it is designed to permit a man to shoot upon any land which he may own, whether occupied by him or not, and also to permit his tenant the same privilege?

Mr. DIAL. Yes, sir; whether he occupies it or not it would permit him to hunt on it; and it does not restrict the privilege to farm land, but includes any land.

Mr. NEW. I should hesitate very much about accepting such an amendment without a better opportunity to understand just how far it went.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 13, before the word "land," it is proposed to strike out the word "farm," so that it will read:

Provided, That such license shall not be required to be procured by any person or by any member of his immediate family for the purpose of hunting, pursuing, shooting, capturing, or killing any such migratory bird on any land owned by such person or occupied by him as his place of permanent abode.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should regard such an amendment as very dangerous, and I do not think I should desire to accept it. I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina whether his purpose would not be fulfilled by merely striking out the word "farm"?

Mr. DIAL. That is the word I have moved to strike out.

Mr. SPENCER. Personally I see no objection to that amendment.

Mr. DIAL. That is my motion.

Mr. SPENCER. Do I understand the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina also to include changing the word "and" to the word "or," in the next line?

Mr. DIAL. I have proposed that amendment, and it has already been agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. If the word "farm" be stricken out and the word "or" be written in instead of the word "and," it would permit a man to acquire a million acres of land, which might practically be all the hunting land of a State, and the law thereby would be practically nullified so far as establishing game preserves is concerned. It would vitiate the very purposes of the bill.

Mr. DIAL. The object of substituting the word "or" for the word "and" is to allow a man to hunt on land where he is a tenant but which he does not own.

Mr. SPENCER. On any land which a man owns and occupies he ought to be free to hunt.

Mr. DIAL. Exactly; but he ought to be free to hunt on the land if he owns it although he does not occupy it. Likewise, the tenant ought to be allowed to hunt where he occupies it and does not own it. That is the object of my amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. So long as either the owner or the tenant occupies the land, I agree with the Senator from South Carolina, but if it is intended to open the door so that a man may acquire an indefinite number of acres, as would seem to be contemplated by the amendment proposed by the Senator, I can not agree with him.

Mr. DIAL. That is not my object at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the pending measure has already consumed a great deal of time and, inasmuch as I have some engagements which may call me away before its consideration shall have been completed, I desire to make a brief statement relative to the bill.

With the policy of game conservation I am in hearty sympathy. Any fair and well-considered plan, one calculated to accomplish that end, would meet with my approval, as I believe it would meet with the approval of many other Senators who have indicated a purpose to oppose or who have criticized the bill. It is desirable that game refuges be established, and where that is done that laws should be applicable and should be strictly enforced for the conservation of the game.

The purpose which the Senator from Indiana has in mind and every purpose which ought to be carried out in connection with such legislation at this time, in my humble judgment, can be accomplished by the adoption of the amendment proposed by my colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. If it is necessary to secure additional funds, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Indiana that the license fee which the bill imposes might be increased so as to provide a larger aggregate amount. If shooting grounds shall be established by the Federal Government for the benefit of the public, all true sportsmen, all who come within the class comprehended by that term, will be willing to pay a reasonable and probably a liberal license fee. A sportsman who is to have the benefit of a public institution in the nature of a shooting ground would not object to paying double the small charge proposed by this bill.

The objection to the bill lies in the fact, stated in a word, that it is an extension of Federal authority to a new field. Heretofore the privilege to hunt has been exercised and enjoyed by the American people without Federal restriction or interference. Recently, through treaty and statute, the Federal Government extended its jurisdiction to migratory birds. Every lawyer knows the difficulties which have been encountered and which are involved in such legislation. It will not promote in the long run the purpose of true sportsmen to conserve the game of the country, to protect migratory birds against ruthless destruction, shamefully and outrageously practiced in some instances, to impose regulations and restrictions the result of which can only be to invite and promote resentment among a large number of our citizens.

In the older States there are thousands of men who are not sportsmen, but who occasionally, once or twice a year, indulge in the shooting of migratory birds. They never go upon a game preserve, and I suggest to my colleague they never have the opportunity of doing so. This bill would require every man who for any period of time undertakes to indulge in the American pursuit of hunting to pay a license fee to the Federal Government, and, in the event he should fail to do so, he would become liable to a fine of several hundred dollars and to imprisonment for a long period. If such a restriction is imposed the only result will be that the man who hunts one day in the year, the man who is not a sportsman, who has no ambition to be classed in that way, but who does enjoy and take advantage of the ancient privilege of occasionally engaging in the pursuit of game, will either find himself unexpectedly in trouble by some mischance because he has failed to procure a Federal license or he will totally refrain from indulging in the amusement. It will not only render the proposed statute exceedingly unprofitable and accomplish no beneficial purpose but it will make it exceedingly unpopular.

If it is desired to establish shooting grounds for the benefit of men who indulge in the pursuit of game and who call themselves sportsmen a license is proper, but it is not necessary in order to accomplish that to harass and vex and annoy the large number of citizens who are not sportsmen but who occasionally desire to pursue game.

No sportsman would object to paying $2 for the privilege of going upon a shooting preserve established by the Government of the United States; he would just as lief pay $2 in all probability as $1; but whenever the license provision is made applicable to every man who takes a gun and pursues at any time migratory birds or who, pursuing other game, by chance shoots migratory game, and thus becomes liable to a severe penalty, the proposed statute is rendered unpopular in the beginning; it is made difficult of enforcement and nothing has been accomplished that can be in the mind of the men who have the purpose of promoting legitimate sport in shooting.

I think if the Senator from Indiana will take that view of it, accept the amendment of the junior Senator from Arkansas, and increase the charge for the shooting license to persons who go upon preserves to $2 or even more than that he will succeed in passing the proposed legislation and for the time being at least will have accomplished every legitimate purpose.

Mr. NEW obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. NEW. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire to ask a question?

Mr. SMITH. I merely desire to submit some observations along the line of the remarks just made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. NEW. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to reply very briefly to what the Senator from Arkansas has said. If I could exact a different sum from the man who belonged to a club, the rich man, if you please, than from the poor man, I would be very glad indeed to make the club member's license fee $2 or $5 or even more; but the Senator from Arkansas certainly knows that we could not make the license fee of one citizen a certain amount and the license fee of another citizen a different and lower amount. That is not feasible; it is not possible. It is necessary to make the fee uniform; and I have sought to make it just as low as possible in order to bear as lightly as possible on the man of very small means.

Mr. President, the man who shoots at all and undertakes to hunt migratory birds has to equip himself at least with, we will say, a box of 25 shells, and they will cost him 35 cents more than the proposed license fee for a year will cost him. This $1 license fee is the cheapest investment he can possibly make for his entertainment and pleasure, because 90 cents of every dollar is to be expended for the permanent guaranty to him of a place and an opportunity to enjoy the proceeds of that dollar.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Indiana. I have not had an opportunity to examine his bill, but he is familiar with it. He is also familiar with the situation in the State of Ohio. I happen to know that very many of the farmer boys there, especially in the central part of the

State, have for their recreation little hunting trips to the shores of Lake Erie. Under the terms of this bill, are these boys required to take out a license?

Mr. NEW. If they are to hunt migratory birds.

Mr. WILLIS. They go duck hunting.

Mr. NEW. Then they are required to buy a $1 license. They are required to buy a license by the State of Ohio, too.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that.

Mr. NEW. This would call for a $1 license.

Mr. WILLIS. An additional license?

Mr. NEW. Yes; the money derived from which is to be invested by this commission for permanently securing public shooting grounds for the benefit of those men. For the licenses which they buy now from Ohio they get nothing except the privilege of shooting. They get no place guaranteed to them.

Mr. WILLIS. Perhaps the Senator has already covered this in his statement, but what is the provision of the bill touching hunting upon ground owned by the person himself?

Mr. NEW. That is exempt.

Mr. WILLIS. That is exempted?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas has really voiced the sentiment of every man who wants to preserve the game of this country and still keep within the dual form of our Government.

I do not suppose there is a man in this body who has enjoyed hunting, both of migratory birds and those that are local and other game, as I have. In my State they have readily acceded to the terms of the present law and cooperated with the Federal Government under it in closing up and making of short duration what is known as the open season. Especially is that true in reference to the migratory birds, so that the open season for hunting will close before the birds have started their return migration to the North. But the fatal objection to this bill is that you impose a license upon every man who wants to go out and hunt at all in order ultimately to create a preserve where only a few will ever get to hunt.

I agree heartily, as far as I have been able to look into this measure, with the proposition that the Federal Government, if it proposes to exercise any jurisdiction for the preservation of game, ought to acquire domains suitable for the preservation of it and then make such rules and restrictions as they see fit in order to accomplish that purpose.

Down in my State just the other day I took out my annual license for the State—$3 for the State and 10 cents for the party issuing the license—so that our State already is keenly alive to the necessity for the preservation of game birds, both migratory and local. If, in addition to that, for the short period of the open season that I am allowed to hunt I must take out a Federal license in order to shoot migratory birds, it lays a restriction in addition to that already imposed by the State that is going to create confusion, because unless the open season or the time for which the license of the Federal Government applies runs coterminous with that of the State, you will have a man with a license to shoot under certain conditions allowed by the Federal Government and under the laws of his own State not allowed at all.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption? The provisions of this law can not conflict with those of the State law. It so states.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, even though the terms of the bill provide that the State law shall govern the terms of the license under the Federal law, it still remains true that a citizen of the State, for the length of time that he would be permitted the scant opportunity that he has, should not be restricted by the Federal Government in addition to his own local government.

If the Federal Government desires to preserve the game, I think the part of the Senator's bill which provides for obtaining through any legitimate means Government preserves where they can have a perpetual closed season, or where they can have a license fee and limit the bag or limit the number of animals that may be killed, is admirable; but to go into a State and lay down rules by which a man who owns land has to go to the Federal Government in order to exercise the immemorial right of picking up his gun and shooting a wild goose or a duck is to bring the law into such disrepute that you would defeat the very end that is now meeting universal approbation through the cooperation of the State with the Federal Government.

Mr. NEW. Of course, if the Senator will again permit me, the bill does not do anything of the kind. It does not apply to a man shooting on his own ground.

Mr. SMITH. But it requires a Federal license.

Mr. NEW. Not for shooting on his own ground.

Mr. SMITH. I know, but it requires a Federal license for a citizen of the State who happens to be unfortunate enough not to own any land to shoot on my land. He has to get a license to shoot, and then he has to get permission from me to go on my land and shoot; and the consequence is that the landowner is exempted under this bill, and the man who goes on a navigable stream the riparian rights of which may be owned by the State, and it is no man's land—and that is about the only privilege some of them have of ever getting a chance to shoot without asking permission, or going on posted land——

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. NEW. The Senator said, just a moment ago, that the State of South Carolina now charges $3 for a license for any man who wants to shoot in South Carolina, a resident of the State.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. NEW. What does it give him for it?

Mr. SMITH. It gives him the privilege of going out during that time and shooting under certain restrictions.

Mr. NEW. All right. Does it provide any place for him where he can shoot?

Mr. SMITH. It simply creates that fund in order to carry out the provisions of the open season, and the amount of game that may be killed. It is an attempt on the part of my State to conserve the game within the State, and the game wardens necessarily have to be paid, and those who want something to shoot are willing to pay for the preservation of the thing to shoot.

Mr. NEW. All right. This bill charges that man $1, and practically half of that dollar goes for the establishment of a place for game to multiply and on which that man can shoot. You charge him $3 and it is all right. You are against charging him $1 for something that is meant for his direct benefit.

Mr. SMITH. But the thing I am objecting to is the Federal Government undertaking to license a citizen of a State for the purpose of permitting him to enjoy the thing that is his right without the interference of the Federal Government. I think that if the Senator wants to encourage the purchase by the United States Government of domains suitable for the preservation of game, he will find all the cooperation in this body that he desires; but when he goes into the doubtful ground of having a citizen of a State compelled under a statute to go and take out a license before he can shoot within his own State, he will have a rocky road to travel. It is my opinion that the Senator will meet every end by confining himself to the purchase by the Federal Government of domains where it can properly and constitutionally exercise its rights in regulation and limitation.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the difficulty with the statement of the Senator from South Carolina, as I see it, is this: We agree perfectly that if something is not done to preserve the migratory birds of this Nation their number will constantly diminish. There must be places where they can be protected during the closed season, and there must be places where they can live and breed and grow in number. Last year we appropriated $154,900 for that purpose, and with some difficulty. It is absolutely inadequate. If the Federal Government does not do something to provide feeding and breeding places for these birds, and to provide for their protection, they will become more and more nearly extinct. Who better can share in that cost than those who have the direct benefit of shooting and eating those migratory birds?

There are 6,000,000 people in the United States who hunt, as far as the statistics show, who are directly interested in the keenness of the sport of shooting game. What does this bill say? It says that the Federal Government will locate in different parts of the country great safeguarding preserves to take care of these migratory birds, and that they shall be open to any man who has a Government license, and that the fund derived from those Government licenses shall take care of these breeding and safeguarding places. What is the amount of the Government license? It is $1 a year.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will allow me, my observation is that the migratory birds par excellence down in my section are the ducks. For some reason the geese have ceased to come, perhaps for the same reason that the ducks began to get fewer; but my information—and I have given some little study to the matter—is that the thing that is diminishing the flocks is the inroads upon their breeding grounds. They do not breed in the South. They breed up in the Arctic or approximately the frozen regions. There has come to me information as to their eggs being sought for divers commercial purposes, and that they have been destroyed by the millions through that process.

I think that if we would start at this thing right and preserve the breeding grounds inviolate, so far as the number is concerned that may be destroyed through the limited open season that now obtains in almost all the States, we would have a rehabilitation of all of our still living migratory birds; but I do not think you will accomplish anything of consequence by attempting to require the taking out of a license to prevent the shooting of migratory birds under the present condition of the State laws. I am informed, however, that a scientific investigation has been made, and that it is the inroads upon the breeding places that have caused the rapid diminution of the number of our migratory birds, particularly the geese and the ducks. Anything that I could do or that any real sportsman could do to preserve the breeding grounds in the closed season we stand ready to do, or I do, at least; but the open season in most of the States is being so restricted that the number of migratory birds that are destroyed would hardly have any appreciable effect, especially if the breeding places were protected.

Mr. SPENCER. We have a good deal of jurisdiction, but it would be difficult to regulate the breeding places anywhere around the Arctic Ocean. As a matter of fact, the great danger to those birds is when they are shot, not alone in the breeding places, or when their eggs are destroyed—of course any disturbance there is a direct detriment—but the main injury, as I take it from the information I have, is when those birds begin to mate. They mate in the Southland, they mate on their journey north, and the mating birds are shot if there is not a closed season, and it is for the protection of those birds that the closed season is provided and the safeguards are thrown around them by Federal legislation. The Senator and I are quite in accord as to the absolute necessity of preserving these migratory birds. What better things could be done than for the Government to say, "We will establish great central developing places for these birds, and we will call upon those who hunt to cooperate with us"? This would produce a fund estimated at between one and three million dollars a year.

Who is complaining? I am familiar with a good many hunters' organizations, and certainly there is not one in Missouri in which the members are not keen for just such a system of preservation as is indicated by this bill.

The game wardens of every State are for it. They might be said to be interested because it dovetails into their plans, but there is not one of the individual hunter's organizations of the States, made up of the rank and file of men who love to hunt, that is not in favor of it. Why should they not be, in these days when you and I see individual preserves of land, marsh, and swamp being gathered together, into which nobody can come except by invitation of the owner? Why should we not have under Government control great stretches of the swamp land and water land and other land where these migratory birds can come and live and be protected, which shall, in the open season, be available to any man who wants to come? That is one of the very things this bill proposes to accomplish.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will allow me, so far as the feature for the purchase of land to be under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government is concerned, I am in favor of it; but I am opposed to licensing the individual hunters within the States, as interfering with the police power and the sovereignty of the States. In addition to that, you would tax every man who takes up his gun and goes out to hunt for a day or two, as has been pointed out here this afternoon. You would tax them all to create a preserve of which only the regular professional sportsman could ever get the benefit.

Mr. SPENCER. But the birds which are safeguarded in the preserves do not stop there. There may be a comparatively few who could hunt in the preserve to which the Senator refers, but the birds scatter over the whole United States and the hunters everywhere have the advantage of it.

Mr. SMITH. If the Federal Government desires to establish places where it may preserve these migratory birds, I stand ready to cooperate in every way, except by agreeing that the Federal Government may go into my State and dictate that I and the other citizens must get licenses in order to hunt migratory birds within the State.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from South Carolina spoke of the establishment and the preservation of breeding grounds, or refuges, and said that if that was the purpose, he would be in harmony with the bill. That is exactly the purpose.

Mr. President, some years ago the United States and Canada negotiated what is known as the migratory-bird treaty. As is well known, migratory birds for the most part summer in Canada. They breed in the British possessions—some of them in the Northern States of this Union, to be sure—but most of them across the Canadian line.

The obligations which Canada assumed under the migratory-bird treaty was to preserve the birds up there by stopping the wholesale gathering of eggs, which was spoken of by the Senator from South Carolina, by keeping inviolate the breeding grounds which are used by the birds in Canada; and to the credit of our neighbor on the north I want to say that she does what she usually does with reference to a promise—she has kept it—and the breeding grounds there are preserved. The unlawful gathering of eggs has been stopped, and there is no country I know of where the laws regulating all matters of that kind are better enforced than they are right now in Canada.

The Senator said that the number of birds destroyed in any one State here is negligible. There were 2,000,000 ducks killed in the State of Minnesota in one single shooting season three or four years ago. I have forgotten whether it was in 1919 or 1920, but it was about that time. Two million ducks, at a dollar apiece, amount to $2,000,000 worth of a food supply, because ducks are a very valuable food supply, and that many were shot in the single State of Minnesota. While I am not able to speak for the numbers, and can not give them accurately, I venture to say that there are almost as many shot each year in the Senator's own State of South Carolina. I know residents of New York and residents of Indiana who are in his State now shooting migratory birds, men who have bought places there. They are not taxed for the privilege. They are down there shooting the migratory game. I can tell who they are if required to do so; but I simply say I know them, and I know they are there now and have been for some seasons past. They do not pay one cent for the benefit of the man who lives in South Carolina and wants to shoot there. He is kept off of their grounds, and he never will get a chance to shoot on their grounds, because they are privately owned, and they have the same rights of property there that any man enjoys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the amendment.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	George	Moses	Smoot
Ball	Glass	Nelson	Spencer
Bayard	Harreld	New	Sterling
Borah	Harris	Norbeck	Sutherland
Brandegee	Harrison	Norris	Swanson
Brookhart	Heflin	Overman	Townsend
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Page	Trammell
Capper	Kendrick	Pepper	Wadsworth
Caraway	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Ladd	Pittman	Warren
Dial	La Follette	Pomerene	Weller
Dillingham	Lenroot	Ransdell	Williams
Ernst	Lodge	Sheppard	Willis
Fernald	McKellar	Shields	
Fletcher	McNary	Smith	

Mr. FERNALD. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] is absent on official business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Let the amendment to the amendment be reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state it for the information of the Senate.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 13, the Senator from South Carolina proposes to strike out the word "farm," before the word "land," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That such license shall not be required to be procured by any person or by any member of his immediate family for the purpose or hunting, pursuing, shooting, capturing, or killing any such migratory bird on any land owned by such person or occupied by him as his place of permanent abode.

Mr. NEW. So far as I can do so, I am willing to accept the amendment to the amendment. I shall not object to its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The READING CLERK. Add a new section to be known as section 13a, as follows:

SEC. 13a. No public lands shall be withdrawn, set apart, or reserved for or as public shooting grounds or for a bird or game refuge by Executive order or otherwise than by express act of Congress.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, under the provisions of the bill the President of the United States would have authority to withdraw by his own act any amount of public lands for the purposes of the bill. He could withdraw all of the public lands of the West for this purpose. It was found necessary a few years ago for Congress to take away from the Executive the power to withdraw land for forest reserves. It was provided that the forest-reserve lands could only be withdrawn by express act of Congress. That act became necessary by reason of the foolish withdrawal of millions of acres of land for alleged timber purposes.

I am heartily in favor of the purpose of the bill. I want to see game refuges created all over the country or wherever they should be created.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President——

Mr. PITTMAN. But I am unwilling to take a chance on any one man having the power, without the approval of Congress, to withdraw unlimited quantities of public lands in my State.

I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I, of course, have no idea that any President would ever set aside the lands in the manner described and objected to by the Senator from Nevada, but I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment which he has offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be reported.

The READING CLERK. In section 4, page 3, in line 3, after the first word "That," insert:

Annually on June 30 the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay over to each of the States 50 per cent of all moneys received from the sale of such licenses collected within such States, to be covered into the State school fund of the States, respectively, and 50 per cent of—

So as to make the sentence read:

That annually on June 30 the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay over to each of the States 50 per cent of all moneys received from the sale of such licenses collected within such States, to be covered into the State school fund of the States, respectively, and 50 per cent of all moneys received from the sale of such licenses shall be covered into the Treasury—

And so forth.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I think the purpose and object of the amendment is very plain, but I will state that the object is that of the funds collected from licenses 50 per cent shall be appropriated back to the States from which collected. I think it very proper that action should be taken toward the conservation of our game, and I would rather assist than oppose a proper measure to such end. It was a new departure a few years ago when the Federal Government set about to regulate and control the migratory birds. The trend seems to be to progress step by step. First we acted upon the treaty of 1916, when we enacted Federal legislation for the purpose of controlling and regulating migratory birds and giving Federal authority over hunting in the States. It has been amazing and astonishing to see the scope of the definition given the term "migratory birds." No one scarcely knows the magnitude of the definition. It is being extended more and more. I am told that the term now includes doves and robins.

Now another progressive step as proposed by this bill is to make the game proposition a revenue producer to the Federal Government. The plan being adopted is a license tax. That seems to be very largely the object and purpose of the bill. Of course I know it is claimed and contended that it is for the purpose of game conservation, the establishment of hunting grounds and game preserves, and that in order to accomplish this a license tax must be imposed. If we are going to trespass upon State rights by collecting license from every hunter who shoots a migratory bird and thus raise revenue, I think in all justice that part of that fund should be reappropriated to the States. I have offered the amendment providing that 50 per cent of the fund thus collected should be returned to the States and placed in the school funds of the States, respectively, which are entitled to it under such provision.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator explain how this would trespass upon the rights of the States?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The matter of a Federal license for people to hunt within the State is a new departure entirely. They do not hunt at random all over the United States. They are not issued a Federal license allowing them to hunt anywhere, but they are confined within the limits of a State and enjoy the privileges of that State, the police protection of the State. They are under no police protection from the Federal Government. Yet we say if they go hunting within a State the Federal Government will monopolize the privilege of licensing them. This bill means that every man who hunts will be forced to obtain not only a State license but also a United States license.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the Senator's view that the provisions of the bill would enable a nonresident to hunt in a State without a license from the State and without permission from the State?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Oh, no; certainly not. There is nothing I have said that would logically permit any such deduction.

Mr. LENROOT. Then how does it trespass upon any State rights?

Mr. TRAMMELL. It is an interference with a prerogative of the States to raise revenue from this particular source, which has always been left to the States, and also an encroachment upon the police powers of the States.

Mr. LENROOT. The States would still raise revenue from the same source.

Mr. TRAMMELL. But it is evidently an effort to reach around and try to find avenues for revenue in every possible direction.

Mr. LENROOT. But this is not a revenue measure.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It is proposed to tax the people of the State, at least every man who hunts even for a half day or a day, to the extent of $1, and then it is proposed to take a part of that money to build up game preserves and shooting fields upon which the sportsman may hunt. That seems to be the idea and purpose of the bill. What percentage of the average citizen will ever get to hunt on the game preserves or shooting grounds you propose to establish? Not one in five thousand, is my opinion.

Mr. LENROOT. Is it the Senator's view that in the State of Florida he does not desire protection of migratory birds?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have not said or intimated anything of the kind. I have not intimated that I think we should not have game conservation, but have expressed myself to the contrary. But we may adopt different courses by which we can bring about that regulation. I am not in favor of the idea of the Federal Government again reaching out its arms trying to get revenues here, there, and every place. It is proposed now to raise two or three million dollars by taxing the people for hunting.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it the contention of the Senator that the pending measure is intended to be a revenue measure? My understanding of it was that the income from this source was to be used entirely in the establishment of sanctuaries for the protection of migratory game birds.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Take either horn of the dilemma; it does not make any difference. If it is proposed to raise money by a license tax upon everybody who hunts for the purpose of building game preserves and hunting fields for the sportsmen of the country to hunt upon, then it would seem to me to be an effort to save money from general appropriations by raising it in this way to build up the game reserves for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator does not contend that this is intended to be a revenue measure, does he?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not know what it is intended to be. I suppose it is probably intended to be a revenue measure to a certain extent. I would not call it a revenue measure in the nature of a general revenue tax, such as your tariff bill, which taxes everything on the face of the earth. The Senator is not satisfied with what has been exacted under the tariff bill by the imposition of taxes upon the people of the country, but now wants to depart a little further and go into the States

and say, "We will impose a tax upon the man who hunts, additional to that imposed by the State." I think the matter of the regulation of a license tax upon huntsmen should be left to the State. That is my frank and honest opinion in regard to it. The Federal Government, as it has already done, can proceed with the enforcement of its laws relative to migratory birds, but do not go into the States and interfere with the question of hunting licenses. I think that should be left to the States, just as it is at present. The matter of imposing a license regulation and control should be left to the State.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to. If that can not be done, then I say in all justice that the State from which the revenue is to come is entitled to a distribution of at least 50 per cent of it. I have proposed my amendment so that if the bill is enacted into law the State will get back a little part of the revenue which I think should remain in the State instead of being shifted into the Federal Treasury for the purpose of supporting more bureaus, for the purpose of supporting more appointees and employees, and having a lot more people feasting at the public crib. If you are going to have that kind of feasting proposition, send a little of it back to the States from which it came.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President——

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPENCER. May I ask the Senator from Florida why he thinks that any of the tax that is proposed to be levied upon those who shoot ducks should go back to the school fund of a State? The purpose was to get revenue which would protect migratory birds. I can see the logic of a proposition that it should go back to the game protection fund of the State.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It is just as broad as it is long in a way, but the school fund is the best fund of a State, and it was always my policy when a State officer to divert everything possible to the school fund. This is merely following out a habit of mine. When we enacted the game law in our State I advocated that a certain percentage of it should go to the rural-school fund. It was of quite a little assistance to the schools. I do not know of anything better than to place funds of this character, derived in this way, into the State school funds.

Mr. SPENCER. Of course, the Senator will see that that absolutely tends to kill the bill—by a gentle process, it is true, but it kills it just the same—because the purpose of the bill is to provide a fund to increase the number of migratory birds and to safeguard their breeding places and their assembling places. If we take away from that fund the license proposed, which is the sole source of the fund, of course the whole object of the bill would be defeated.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It would only take away 50 per cent of it, and then there would be a million or two million dollars a year with which these bureaus which are to administer it and the officers who are to participate in the expenditure could proceed as they chose and have a good healthy fund to use in developing such preserves.

Mr. SPENCER. But if you cut a man in two his chances of life are not very good.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

Mr. NEW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word with reference to the pending amendment. As the bill now stands there is no purpose in it of raising revenue except as it is incidental to the purpose of the bill, which is the preservation of migratory birds. If the amendment of the Senator from Florida is adopted the bill does clearly become a revenue measure. If his amendment be adopted, the Senator from Florida will kill the bill, because the Senate, as every Senator knows, can not under the Constitution originate revenue measures. Now, will not the Senator from Florida be frank about it and say he wishes to kill the bill by his amendment? Is it not better if we are going to kill the bill to kill it openly and frankly by a vote when we reach that stage in its consideration? I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may, I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin a question. The Senator has properly stated the fact when he has said that the bill is only incidentally for revenue purposes; but there will be a given amount of revenue raised under the bill, and if that is only an incidental purpose, why is that incidental purpose destroyed simply because the fund may be divided in two?

Mr. LENROOT. Because when the fund is divided in two and one-half of the fund is devoted to an object which has no connection with the purpose of the bill, which is the protection of migratory birds, and one-half of the revenue is put into the Treasury for a general purpose, I am sure the Senator from Ohio will agree with me that it becomes a revenue bill. If we say that one-half of the amount derived shall be paid to the States for school purposes, the bill would thereby lose its character as providing revenue purely incidentally to carrying out the purpose of the bill, and would become to that extent a measure for general revenue purposes.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not think the amendment would have the effect as contended at all. We find that in section 4 the bill provides—

> That all moneys received from the sale of such licenses shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund—

And so on. Then the bill provides different methods by which the fund may be disposed of. I merely seek to provide an additional method of disposition of the fund. I do not think that that would make the bill come within the purview of a revenue measure unless it already be a revenue measure. My purpose and object in offering the amendment is entirely sincere, for I feel that if we adopt the policy proposed to be carried forward in the bill certainly the fund should be apportioned in the way which I propose.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where does the Senator find the distinction in the Constitution that if money be used to protect a rabbit it is constitutional, but if it be used to protect a child it is unconstitutional?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I have not discovered that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am curious to know how such a distinction may be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of important business at home.

Mr. CARAWAY (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and let my vote stand.

Mr. SHIELDS. I inquire if the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). He has not.

Mr. SHIELDS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I inquire whether the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. ERNST (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the negative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD] and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—19.

Ashurst	Harris	Pomerene	Swanson
Caraway	Heflin	Ransdell	Trammell
Dial	McKellar	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Overman	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
George	Pittman	Smith	

NAYS—36.

Borah	Harreld	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sterling
Brookhart	Kendrick	New	Sutherland
Calder	Keyes	Nicholson	Townsend
Capper	Ladd	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Curtis	La Follette	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Lenroot	Pepper	Watson
Ernst	Lodge	Phipps	Weller
France	McNary	Smoot	Willis

NOT VOTING—40.

Ball	Fernald	Kellogg	Poindexter
Bayard	Frelinghuysen	King	Reed, Mo.
Broussard	Gerry	McCormick	Reed, Pa.
Bursum	Glass	McCumber	Robinson
Cameron	Gooding	McKinley	Shortridge
Colt	Hale	McLean	Simmons
Culberson	Harrison	Myers	Stanfield
Cummins	Hitchcock	Norris	Stanley
Edge	Johnson	Oddie	Underwood
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Williams

So Mr. TRAMMELL'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the word "person" on line 10, page 2, down to and including the word "abode," in line 15, and to insert the words "except those who shall hunt on a public shooting ground or Government game preserve."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order, as the amendment is to an amendment which has been agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. As I understand, the vote by which the original amendment was agreed to was reconsidered, and that amendment has never been agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] offered an amendment to that amendment a few moments ago, and there has been no vote on agreeing to the amendment as amended. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina was to strike out the word "farm."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recalls putting the motion.

Mr. NEW. That is correct, and the record so shows.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course the Senator from Arkansas may move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment as amended was agreed to for the purpose of offering the amendment I have suggested. I have been discussing an amendment to the amendment and I was positive that the amendment as amended had not been finally disposed of.

Mr. NEW. The record will show that the amendment as amended was adopted.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure that the Senator from Indiana will have no objection to my offering the amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. NEW. If it is another amendment I shall not object.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is another amendment. I am trying to make that clear.

Mr. SMOOT. Does it relate to the word "farm"?

Mr. CARAWAY. It has nothing to do with the word "farm."

Mr. NEW. That amendment was adopted. Why does the Senator want to have the vote reconsidered and have it adopted over again?

Mr. CARAWAY. My amendment has nothing to do with the word "farm." I have given notice that I was going to offer the amendment which I now propose. I have been sitting here all the time, and I do not know when the amendment as amended was agreed to, although I recall when the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina as to the word "farm" was adopted. I am asking now to be permitted to offer this amendment: After the word "person," on line 10, strike out all down to and including the word "abode," on line 15, and insert "except those who shall hunt on a public shooting ground or Government preserve," which would make the sentence read:

That such license shall not be required to be procured by any person except those who shall hunt on a public shooting ground or Government preserve.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate adopted the amendment as amended shall be considered as reconsidered.

Mr. NEW. I shall object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then I will move, Mr. President, to reconsider the amendment, so that I may offer this amendment.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, of course I have no objection to the Senator offering any amendment that he has in mind to offer. I am not seeking to obstruct that. I do not want anything to be done which amounts to undoing what has already been done; that is all. We have made progress. If it is necessary to reconsider this amendment in order to permit the Senator to offer any other amendment, I shall not object.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is very kind of the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; the Senator from Indiana withdrew his objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator withdraw his objection?

Mr. NEW. I withdrew my objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the paragraph as amended was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from Arkansas proposes, on page 2, line 10, to strike out of the amendment heretofore agreed to the following words:

or by any member of his immediate family for the purpose of hunting, pursuing, shooting, capturing, or killing any such migratory bird on any land owned by such person or occupied by him as his place of permanent abode.

And insert the following words:

except those who shall hunt on a public shooting ground or game preserve.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the amendment as offered leaves every provision of the bill with reference to the acquiring and maintaining of hunting preserves and breeding grounds that the bill now contains. It gives them everything that is asked for in the bill except the right to require a license upon the part of those who never will go upon the game preserves for the purpose of hunting.

I want to say to the Senator from Indiana that I shall have no objection to his bill if the amendment shall be adopted. I am perfectly willing that the Government shall have the authority to establish shooting preserves to protect the wild migratory game of this country. In my own State there are some already established. I have no objection to them. There are other grounds that are sought to be converted into bird preserves to care for migratory birds. I am entirely willing that that shall be done. I am only asking that the man who never will go upon one shall not be specially taxed for the purpose of purchasing and maintaining a preserve upon which he never will be permitted to hunt.

It is not sportsmanlike, if I may be permitted to say it—and that has gotten to be a term much used in this debate—to tax a boy, I will say, in Georgia who wants to go out with a single-barreled shotgun and shoot game in Georgia in season under the Government regulations, to create a fund to buy a bird preserve in my State for the sportsmen in my State to hunt migratory birds. Let the man who is to enjoy the benefit of it pay for it.

I have no objection to bird preserves. I have tried to make that exceedingly plain. I have no objection to any provision of the bill except the annoyance incident to it, and the expense of taxing people for a privilege they never enjoy. It is a matter of just common fairness. It is little, but here is what happens: When a question becomes too small to argue about, it is just the kind of a question to become angry about; and it does not seem to me right to tax every man everywhere who may want to enjoy for 15 minutes what heretofore has been considered an American citizen's right to hunt in his own community, and require him first to procure a Federal license, and if he should hunt ignorantly, or should otherwise fail to do it, he may be arrested and fined $500 and be imprisoned in the county jail for six months, or both, for exercising a

right that he believes we got with the very Declaration of Independence.

I want to preserve the wild life of this country, though I am not a hunting man. I am not like the Senator from Indiana, and I am sorry that I am not. He enjoys hunting. I used to hunt, but the time, the opportunity, and the means have been taken from me and I do not hunt. I want to see something of the wild life preserved for our children that are to come after us; but I do not want to perpetrate an injustice and make every man feel that we have perpetrated an injustice upon him by requiring him to contribute to a fund to build up a public shooting ground that he never will see, and that he could not use if he could see it.

I do not question the intention of the Senator from Indiana to be absolutely fair about this matter, because I know he wants to be fair about it. Whatever I said to the contrary a while ago was facetious. I know he wants to be accurate also. I know that somebody has given him a lot of misinformation. For instance, he undertook to say what the hunting law of my own State is, and he is not well informed, but that is no reflection on him. At one time I used to be "persecuting attorney" in that district—that is what they called me—and I got everybody that plead guilty while I was in office. I remember that at one time we had almost every city official from Senator SPENCER'S home city in the toils as nonresident hunters. It was more profitable for the country constables to hunt nonresident hunters than it was to hunt other wild game in that country. I remember that the coroner of St. Louis fell twice into my tender mercies and paid a fine each time.

The State has a right under its police power to regulate the privilege of taking game within the State. Nearly every State has exercised that police power to regulate the taking of wild game. My State has undertaken to do it. Many changes have been made in it from time to time. At one time a few counties permitted nonresidents to hunt provided they pay for a license. Other counties did not permit them to hunt at all; and the Senator said that if a man chased a migratory rabbit in my State he paid for a license for the privilege. Why, every negro in Arkansas knows that is not so, because that is a regular occupation of theirs, and they never on earth paid for a license for it and they never will. No legislature has been quite so silly in my State as to want to tax a negro a dollar for running a rabbit.

The Federal Government is certainly interfering with the rights of a citizen when it goes as far as this. It met with very general condemnation when the treaty between this country and Canada gave to the Congress what it thought was the constitutional power to enact a Federal game law which gave to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to prescribe the times and places under which and where a hunter might hunt migratory birds. It has been to a certain extent accepted, although there is considerable objection to it now, because it frequently happens, and it does now in the rice belt in my own State, that the time when you may hunt a migratory bird is the time when the migratory bird is somewhere else. You have an open season to hunt, but when you are hunting the bird is already in Canada; you do not have much luck gunning for a bird in a rice field in Arkansas when it is already back on the lakes in northern Canada. Now, however, in addition to this, you want to say that every farm boy—and I happen to have been one at one time—shall, before he can hunt in his immediate locality, go to the postmaster and pay a license fee of $1 and get a license to hunt, and after he shall have gotten his license he is then threatened with all kinds of pains and penalties. If his twin brother hunts on his license, both of them are likely to go to jail for six months, and their right to hunt at all is taken away from them. The bill is full of this kind of annoying things.

All I want you to do—and let us be sportsmen if you talk about sportsmen—is to say that the man who gets the right to hunt shall pay for it. If you do not want to go to the Public Treasury and get appropriations to buy outright hunting preserves or preserves where the migratory bird may hatch its young and have its resting places, let us let the man who is going to hunt where the money is to be expended pay for it. That is all I want done in this bill, and if you will accept that amendment I shall offer no objection to the bill being passed.

I want to appeal to the Senators who have the power to vote "yes" or "no" just to say whether it is good sportsmanship to say: "We are going to tax a boy who hunts a few days." You say: "It is only a dollar." I suspect that there are Senators sitting here on the floor who can recall the time when a dollar was a considerable sum to them. I hunted a little once. I am sure that my entire hunting outfit was not worth $1.25. I do not think it cost that much, and yet it was all that I could afford, and if you had added the license fee I should have been denied the privilege. Beyond that, however, is the annoyance, the petty littleness of taxing everybody for this right to hunt in his own locality.

As I said before, when a thing is too small to argue about it is the size to get angry about. There has been more discontent aroused against Governments, more men have destroyed their reputations by doing little things about which people could not argue and could grow angry, than by doing big things. A big question is always a question that people can argue about, but you can not argue about the petty little thing of taking a dollar away from every boy who hopes to have the privilege of hunting, and putting it into a preserve that he never will see and never can see.

The Senator from Indiana says this is a poor man's bill. That may be true, but it is awfully hard to make a man think he has been made rich by taking his money away from him. You never will make anybody follow that logic. I know that it is not sound. I believe, however, that the Senator from Indiana thinks it is.

He talks about the rich man who can belong to a gun club. This does not take away his exclusive right to belong to a hunting club. It does not give the poor man the right, after he has paid his license fee, to go on the rich man's hunting club grounds; it does not give him a single right he does not now have. It just adds an additional burden.

I want to let the bill stand with everyone of its provisions, to establish breeding grounds and bird refuges, resting places when the birds travel from the North to the South and from the South to the North again. Let us have them; but let us either have the Federal Government bear the expense or have the man who is going to hunt upon the preserve bear it.

Many of my friends hunt on a game preserve in my State, and they are willing to pay what would be reasonable for the privilege. I am perfectly willing to commit them in their absence to pay the fee. I am willing to have the Federal license increased, if it is desired, for those who take advantage of the provisions of this bill. But let us not tax the man who can not take advantage of its provisions.

The Senator from Indiana tried to be facetious and said that if he should go to Arkansas they would put him in jail because he was a Republican. I think that would be a good ground for doing it. But they would not imprison him for that cause.

On Big Lake, in Mississippi County, Ark., there is a game preserve. I owned part of the land that lies along that lake. Yet there is no provision in this law, or in any other law, which would let the Senator from Indiana hunt upon it.

Let us be reasonable about this. Let the Senator accept the amendment, that nobody shall pay except one who shall get the benefit, and there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas proceeds upon the theory of the man out West, that there is no good Indian but a dead Indian. He wants to kill this bill by the adoption of an amendment which would just as effectually kill it as a majority vote against it on the final passage. There can be no public hunting grounds until after the license is provided and the money thereby raised paid for the establishment of that hunting ground, and here is an amendment providing that no license need be taken out except by the man who shoots on the public shooting ground, which is equivalent to saying that you can only collect it from the man who goes to some place which does not exist and which will never exist until after money is provided by that means.

That is all there is to the amendment. It simply means the death of the bill. Of course I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. CARAWAY. I should be perfectly willing to support an amendment the Senator might suggest. Of course he did not intend to be mistaken about it, but there is an appropriation of $50,000, is there not, which is to be refunded?

Mr. NEW. That will operate in this way: The Government provides $50,000 to start this thing, which is to be repaid to the Government in 10 annual installments. The $50,000 is not intended for the purchase of land. The $50,000 will go for the printing of licenses and getting the machinery in motion to start this project. The $50,000 is not to go toward the purchase of land.

The Senator speaks with reference to a man having to go to the post office to get his license. The post office is named because I can conceive of no more convenient place for the man to go. There is a post office accessible to practically everybody in the United States, and the man could even get his license through the rural carrier, if he lives off on a rural route, without going to the post office proper. The post office is named because it was thought that would suit the convenience of the man who wants to take the license out.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I did not complain about the provision naming the post office as the place where the license could be procured; but the Senator is in error about anyone getting the license from the rural carrier. Of course, it may be that if a man found a duck on a creek in Indiana he would have time to saddle his mule and go to the post office 20 miles away and get a license and come back and find the duck there. The chances are, however, that the duck would be gone. I am not sure you could charm him, under the joy of being shot by a licensee, to wait until the man could get a license and come back and gun him. I say that because it is just as consistent as what the Senator said—that there is no way to put this into operation. The Senator says the $50,000 is for the printing of licenses. That is not what the bill provides. That is merely a supposition of the Senator from Indiana. But I am perfectly willing to vote for this bill if the Senator will strike out the $50,000 and put in $100,000 or $200,000, or whatever he thinks is a reasonable amount to start his law into operation. However, I suspect he will find that most of the bird preserves that will be established under the bill are on land already Government owned, against which there will be no charge at all. The Senator was in error in saying there are no bird preserves. The only bird preserves I know of are those on lands which were Government lands and which have been set aside for that purpose. There are millions of acres which it is now expected will be used for that purpose. I do not think there is a single acre in contemplation of purchase, because the kind of preserves they want are those lands which are not suitable for cultivation. Wild migratory birds follow watercourses, and therefore the lands are not privately owned, at least not those in my State and in Louisiana and many other places with which I have some little acquaintance. But make your appropriation whatever you think is necessary. It is infinitely fairer to tax everybody, if you are going to levy a tax to protect wild life. It is said that this is not to give the sportsman the joy of hunting but to preserve wild life. It is infinitely better that you should preserve it by a uniform tax than by a little tax, which will annoy everybody.

My amendment would not kill the bill. I hope the bill will die unless the amendment shall prevail.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, there should not be any misunderstanding about the fatal effect of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas if it were to prevail. The Senator from Arkansas makes it perfectly clear that there must be no license exacted of any man except of those who avail themselves of the shooting ground and the public preserves. There are no shooting grounds and there are no public preserves in existence now; therefore there can be no licenses collected. The only way by which the public preserves and the shooting grounds are to be accomplished in the future is out of the money collected from these licenses, and if licenses are issued only to those who occupy or use something which does not exist, obviously there never will be any fund created and there never will be any shooting ground.

The Senator from Arkansas has either sent to jail or fined so many public officials from my own State—and I have no doubt about the fact that they go down into Arkansas precisely as he says—that I would like to ask if that was not because the law of Arkansas provides that any resident of Arkansas who wants to hunt deer, bear, or turkey must pay $1.10, and any nonresident who wants to hunt, irrespective of what he hunts, has to pay $15? I have an idea that our public officials came down there and did not pay the $15, and the Senator from Arkansas punished them for it.

The Senator is also in error about this amendment killing the bill. There are public hunting grounds, though perhaps not of the kind provided here, because Big Lake is a public game preserve. The Senator shakes his head. Does he take issue with that?

I do not know that lake, but I am sure there are no public hunting grounds or game preserves such as are contemplated in this bill, and such as are mentioned in the Senator's amendment, in existence now.

Mr. CARAWAY. They are in existence. This is what I wanted to say to the Senator from Missouri. Of course, the amendment would not kill the bill. Let the Senator write into the bill whatever sized appropriation he thinks is fair and necessary to establish a shooting ground, and then provide that every dollar that shall come from the licensing of hunters who go upon it shall be returned to the Public Treasury to reimburse this fund. It would not kill the bill, and we should not want to pass it by some statement that is not quite accurate. It is not my intention to kill the bill. I say frankly that I should like to see game preserves established. I want to see wild life preserved. I would like to see my State legislature very much restrict the right to kill game in that State, and I hope it will do it. I want to see the wild life preserved for our children who come after us. But let us do it without harassing everybody to death. Make the appropriation whatever is thought fair and reasonable to establish the game preserves, and then provide that every dollar that shall be paid by a licensee who goes upon the preserves shall be used—just as is provided here—for policing the preserve, and building shelters, and that the rest shall go back to the Federal Government. I would be perfectly willing to support that sort of an amendment.

Mr. SPENCER. The bill ought to produce between a million and three million dollars, and obviously an appropriation of that size, even to be reimbursed from the licenses, would be very difficult to secure. I defer very much to the judgment of the Senator from Arkansas on the laws of Arkansas, but I read from the general statutes of Arkansas. This is not applicable to the counties; it applies to the entire State:

> For a resident to hunt deer, bear, or turkey, $1.10; for a nonresident of the State to hunt, $15.

That is the quotation.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to say to the Senator that if he thinks that law will protect him in my county, he will discover he is in error, if he should go down there.

Mr. SPENCER. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the general law; but each county may exempt itself from the general provisions of the law. There is no question about the information of the Senator being accurate as far as it goes, and I am not trying to be critical of the Senator or to leave that impression in his mind. Each county may determine that for itself, and some counties may avail themselves of that right. In some counties you could hunt with a license, and in some you could not. I have no criticism to make of the Senator's statement, and I do not want to kill his bill; but if it is to cost $3,000,000 a year to establish the game preserves, that $3,000,000 will have to come out of somebody's pocket, and $2,500,000 of it will come out of the pockets of the people of this country, usually the farmers, who never will see one of the game preserves.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, as I understand it, the object of the proposed license is not to raise money at all. The real object of the license is to control the shooting of migratory birds. It is a method of control that is used a great deal and in many ways. It is absolutely useless to pass a measure of this kind without giving unlimited authority to some one to make rules and regulations. In this instance that power is given to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General. With the power that is given in the bill over licenses they can, by forfeiting a license, absolutely deny eternally a citizen of the country the right to shoot migratory birds. It is a tremendous power.

The bill does confer power to make rules and regulations. It states that such rules and regulations shall become a part of the license. They can provide that on the violation of any one of the rules, technical or not, insignificant if you please, that from that time on the license is forfeited and never again can that licensee obtain another license. That tremendous power may be necessary to protect the game preserves, the game refuges, and public shooting grounds, but there is no reason for the granting of such tremendous power throughout the entire country and even on private preserves. For that reason I favor the amendment giving unlimited power, as it does in the bill, for making the rules and regulations only with regard to public shooting grounds and game and bird refuges. But I am very much opposed to giving the unlimited power.

If I thought it necessary to raise the money to buy any of the preserves, I would consider very seriously the proposition of a license, but I know it is unnecessary. I know the Government has been establishing game preserves and breeding grounds on its public domain. It has a tremendous lot of that land very eminently proper to be used and entirely fitted for this purpose. It is a matter of fact that it is hardly necessary to purchase much land now for the purpose.

The real point is that the license is wanted so as to have unlimited control over the shooting of migratory birds, and it is the only way it can be had. We have a law to-day which makes it a crime to shoot migratory birds out of season or to shoot them at certain times of the night or after dark. Those provisions are working very successfully, but those who are interested are not satisfied with that power, and are not satisfied with court punishment. What they want is a bureau to have the power to deny a license to the citizens of the country. It may be all right to grant them that power with regard to Government lands and Government preserves, but

it is a tremendous power to grant them with regard to all the lands of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] to the amendment as amended.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARAWAY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. ERNST (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRISON. On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I am unable to obtain a transfer, and therefore withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (after having voted in the affirmative). I have already voted, but I wish to announce that I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my pair and transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—18.

Caraway	Harris	Overman	Shields
Dial	Heflin	Pittman	Smith
Fletcher	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Swanson
George	Kendrick	Ransdell	
Glass	McKellar	Sheppard	

NAYS—32.

Ball	Gooding	Moses	Poindexter
Brandegee	Harreld	Myers	Smoot
Brookhart	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Ladd	New	Sterling
Capper	La Follette	Nicholson	Sutherland
Curtis	Lenroot	Norbeck	Townsend
Dillingham	Lodge	Pepper	Wadsworth
Ernst	McNary	Phipps	Willis

NOT VOTING—45.

Ashhurst	France	McKinley	Stanley
Bayard	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Trammell
Borah	Gerry	Norris	Underwood
Broussard	Hale	Oddie	Walsh, Mass
Bursum	Harrison	Owen	Walsh, Mont.
Cameron	Hitchcock	Page	Warren
Colt	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Culberson	Kellogg	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Cummins	Keyes	Robinson	Williams
Edge	King	Shortridge	
Elkins	McCormick	Simmons	
Fernald	McCumber	Stanfield	

So Mr. CARAWAY's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. NEW. Following the defeat of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas a while ago, was the amendment to which that referred agreed to as amended?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was; and it has just been readopted. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. NEW. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARAWAY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement with reference to my pair and transfer, I vote "nay."

Mr. ERNST (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "yea." If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in reference to the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before in reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on important business. He is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG].

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHIELDS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING];

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] is necessarily absent, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 17, as follows:

YEAS—36.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smoot
Brandegee	Gooding	Nelson	Spencer
Brookhart	Harreld	New	Sterling
Calder	Kendrick	Nicholson	Sutherland
Capper	Ladd	Norbeck	Townsend
Curtis	La Follette	Pepper	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lenroot	Phipps	Warren
Ernst	Lodge	Poindexter	Weller
Fletcher	McNary	Pomerene	Willis

NAYS—17.

Caraway	Heflin	Pittman	Swanson
Dial	Hitchcock	Ransdell	Trammell
George	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	
Glass	McKellar	Shields	
Harris	Overman	Smith	

NOT VOTING—42.

Ashurst	Colt	France	Kellogg
Bayard	Culberson	Gerry	Keyes
Borah	Cummins	Hale	King
Broussard	Edge	Harrison	McCormick
Bursum	Elkins	Johnson	McCumber
Cameron	Fernald	Jones, Wash.	McKinley

McLean	Page	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Myers	Reed, Mo.	Stanfield	Watson
Norris	Reed, Pa.	Stanley	Williams
Oddie	Robinson	Underwood	
Owen	Shortridge	Walsh, Mass.	

So the bill was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 6, 1922.

MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES COAL COMMISSION.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Coal Commission:

John Hays Hammond, of the District of Columbia.
Thomas Riley Marshall, of Indiana.
Samuel Alschuler, of Illinois.
Clark Howell, of Georgia.
George Otis Smith, of Maine.
Edward T. Devine, of New York.
Charles P. Neill, of the District of Columbia.

COMPTROLLERS OF CUSTOMS.

Walter L. Cohen, of New Orleans, La., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La., in place of Albert W. Newlin, resigned.

Clinton O. Richardson, of Baltimore, Md., to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 13, with headquarters at Baltimore, Md., in place of W. Mitchell Digges, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George V. Denny, of Savannah, Ga., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga., in place of David C. Barrow, jr., superseded.

Louis M. Hall, of St. Louis, Mo., to be collector of customs, collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., in place of Fountain Rothwell, whose term of office expired October 31, 1922.

PROMOTION IN THE COAST GUARD.

Cadet Engineer Herman H. Curry to be ensign (engineering) in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from September 30, 1922. Cadet Curry has passed the examination required by law.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The following-named officers in the Public Health Service:

Dr. Octavius M. Spencer to be assistant surgeon, to rank as such from October 5, 1922.

Asst. Surg. Richard B. Norment to be passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 23, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. Robert L. Allen to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 22, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. Ora H. Cox to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 21, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. Marion S. Lombard to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 21, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. Carl Michel to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 22, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. William F. Tanner to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 21, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. William C. Witte to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 22, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. James F. Worley to be surgeon, to rank as such from September 25, 1922.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be majors.

Capt. Herbert Stephens Williams, from November 9, 1922.
Capt. Alfred Lewis Mason, from November 13, 1922.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Jack Glendon Fuller, from November 25, 1922.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. John Dennis Foley, from November 30, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Marion F. Boatwright to be postmaster at Ashville, Ala., in place of B. B. Cather. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Frank F. Crowe to be postmaster at Montevallo, Ala., in place of C. E. Hoskin. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1912.

CALIFORNIA.

Frederick Welk to be postmaster at Glendora, Calif., in place of M. A. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Phyllis V. Henry to be postmaster at King City, Calif., in place of G. H. Winckler, deceased.

GEORGIA.

Afley M. Cherry to be postmaster at Donalsonville, Ga., in place of A. M. Cherry. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

George H. Broome to be postmaster at Pavo, Ga., in place of T. E. Dixon, removed.

Dana M. Lovvorn to be postmaster at Richland, Ga., in place of M. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1921.

Frank H. Moxley to be postmaster at Wadley, Ga., in place of E. A. Speir. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

William L. Black to be postmaster at Allenhurst, Ga. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Lloyd D. Wood to be postmaster at Batavia, Ill., in place of John Geiss. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Benjamin F. Manley to be postmaster at Harvard, Ill., in place of M. F. O'Connor. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Walter A. Leigh to be postmaster at Jerseyville, Ill., in place of J. E. Cory, resigned.

Fred H. Stevens to be postmaster at LaGrange, Ill., in place of F. H. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

William C. Roodhouse to be postmaster at Roodhouse, Ill., in place of F. L. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Evan M. Klock to be postmaster at Sheffield, Ill., in place of C. E. Wescott. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Thomas A. Brown to be postmaster at Sparta, Ill., in place of R. C. Probasco. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Edward S. Bundy to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill., in place of R. A. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Joseph E. Shantz to be postmaster at Wilmette, Ill., in place of W. E. Hess. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

INDIANA.

Stella D. Evans to be postmaster at Russellville, Ind. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

IOWA.

Frank B. Moreland to be postmaster at Ackley, Iowa, in place of G. F. Althouse, resigned.

Anna Reardon to be postmaster at Auburn, Iowa, in place of Anna Reardon. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George C. Lloyd to be postmaster at Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of S. A. Sumner. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Frank P. Rotton to be postmaster at Essex, Iowa, in place of A. T. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George F. Monroe to be postmaster at Fairbank, Iowa, in place of W. M. Higbee. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Guy A. Whitney to be postmaster at Hubbard, Iowa, in place of F. C. Boeke. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Albert Lille to be postmaster at Lake View, Iowa, in place of Albert Lille. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Leona S. Kay to be postmaster at Moville, Iowa, in place of Daniel Fitzpatrick. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Leslie H. Bell to be postmaster at Paullina, Iowa, in place of L. H. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George Sampson to be postmaster at Radcliffe, Iowa, in place of G. W. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Cecil E. Wherry to be postmaster at Wyoming, Iowa, in place of S. H. Brainard. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Robert E. Wright to be postmaster at Satanta, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Ferdinand C. Stuewe to be postmaster at Alma, Kans., in place of R. E. Thoes, resigned.

Philip F. Grout to be postmaster at Almena, Kans., in place of W. T. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Jacob L. Ritter to be postmaster at Bronson, Kans., in place of T. D. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Norman W. Nixon to be postmaster at Downs, Kans., in place of J. H. Rathbun, resigned.

Delle Duncan to be postmaster at Esbon, Kans., in place of Edward Grauerholz, removed.

David A. Nywall to be postmaster at Formoso, Kans., in place of L. M. Crans. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Gordon K. Logan to be postmaster at Kirwin, Kans., in place of J. J. Landes. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Louella M. Holmes to be postmaster at Mound City, Kans., in place of A. M. Markley. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Walter R. Dysart to be postmaster at Parker, Kans., in place of W. C. Dysart. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Bessie W. Brennan to be postmaster at Strong, Kans., in place of W. P. Rettiger. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

William B. Hart to be postmaster at Westmoreland, Kans., in place of J. H. Plummer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Robert B. Waddle to be postmaster at Somerset, Ky., in place of R. L. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1922.

LOUISIANA.

Frank M. Caldwell to be postmaster at Robeline, La., in place of F. M. Caldwell. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

MAINE.

Thomas R. McPhail to be postmaster at Thomaston, Me., in place of F. B. Hills, resigned.

MARYLAND.

Earl H. Ault to be postmaster at Accident, Md. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Howard J. Fehl to be postmaster at Smithsburg, Md., in place of D. O. Pound. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Lora T. Smith to be postmaster at Feeding Hills, Mass. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Alice D. Robbins to be postmaster at Littleton, Mass., in place of C. A. Kimball, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Euretta B. Nelson to be postmaster at Climax, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Claude W. Till to be postmaster at Mears, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Robert Ryan to be postmaster at Bronson, Mich., in place of A. L. Locke. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Benjamin B. Gorman to be postmaster at Coldwater, Mich., in place of Leroy Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

John S. Hamlin to be postmaster at Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of J. H. Gallery. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

Ward B. Schlichter to be postmaster at Gladwin, Mich., in place of C. B. Wilmot. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Martin H. King to be postmaster at Homer, Mich., in place of S. C. Eslow. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

William C. Truman to be postmaster at Luther, Mich., in place of George Cutler. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Norman A. McDonald to be postmaster at Newaygo, Mich., in place of S. D. Bonner. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Harold T. Hill to be postmaster at Pentwater, Mich., in place of W. E. Hodges. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Charles T. Fillmore to be postmaster at Quincy, Mich., in place of Clinton Joseph. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Richard Bolt to be postmaster at Standish, Mich., in place of M. D. Snow, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

Edward R. Bell to be postmaster at Akely, Minn., in place of O. W. Ramsdell. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

John O. Gullander to be postmaster at Belgrade, Minn., in place of W. P. Lemmer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

J. Arthur Johnson to be postmaster at Center City, Minn., in place of C. W. Mobeck, deceased.

Joseph H. Seal to be postmaster at Melrose, Minn., in place of J. H. Seal. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Will G. Mack to be postmaster at Plainview, Minn., in place of H. D. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Mae A. Lovestrom to be postmaster at Stephen, Minn., in place of A. J. Lovestrom, resigned.

Jonas W. Howe to be postmaster at Stewartville, Minn., in place of J. W. Howe. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

MISSISSIPPI.

Amos K. Porter to be postmaster at Boyle, Miss., in place of A. K. Porter. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Sibyl Q. Stratton to be postmaster at Liberty, Miss., in place of S. Q. Stratton. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

MISSOURI.

Clara S. Beck to be postmaster at Norborne, Mo., in place of W. T. Runyan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Elvin L. Renno to be postmaster at St. Charles, Mo., in place of Casper Ehrhard. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

James A. Allison to be postmaster at Waverly, Mo., in place of G. P. Gordon. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1920.

MONTANA.

Clyde C. Richey to be postmaster at Richey, Mont., in place of C. C. Richey. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Mina R. Tweed to be postmaster at Bassett, Nebr., in place of B. B. Tweed, deceased.

NEVADA.

Owen H. Bolt to be postmaster at Mason, Nev. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

Clifford G. Hanks to be postmaster at West Englewood, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

William G. Z. Critchley to be postmaster at Allendale, N. J., in place of J. W. Winter, resigned.

NEW YORK.

George O. Leonard to be postmaster at Stamford, N. Y., in place of E. J. Hager, declined.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Walling D. Vreeland to be postmaster at Fort Bragg (late Camp Bragg), N. C. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Ruley G. Wallace to be postmaster at Carthage, N. C., in place of J. E. Muse. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Joseph K. Mason to be postmaster at Durham, N. C., in place of J. O. Lunsford. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Walter G. Gay to be postmaster at Farmville, N. C., in place of B. F. Skinner. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1922.

Roy F. Shupp to be postmaster at New Bern, N. C., in place of L. G. Daniels. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Joel A. Johnson to be postmaster at Selma, N. C., in place of J. D. Massey, declined.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Charles C. Bohner to be postmaster at Cathay, N. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Paul K. Hanson to be postmaster at Upham, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Joseph W. Mahon to be postmaster at Langdon, N. Dak., in place of A. I. Koehmstedt. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

OHIO.

George R. Warren to be postmaster at Groveport, Ohio, in place of L. W. Carruthers, resigned.

Clarence E. Dowling to be postmaster at Prairie Depot, Ohio, in place of S. D. McDowell. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Martin G. Harrington to be postmaster at Garber, Okla., in place of A. A. Stebbins. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

James H. Sparks to be postmaster at Healdton, Okla., in place of C. A. Smith, declined.

Floyd O. Hibbard to be postmaster at Snyder, Okla., in place of J. H. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

OREGON.

Irwin D. Pike to be postmaster at Grass Valley, Oreg., in place of I. D. Pike. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Rodrick A. Chisholm to be postmaster at Monroe, Oreg., in place of R. A. Chisholm. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Otto G. Schneider to be postmaster at Powers, Oreg., in place of G. W. Starr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Russell H. Sullens to be postmaster at Prairie City, Oreg., in place of R. H. Sullens. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Wilson R. Kulp to be postmaster at Hatfield, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Paul R. Majer to be postmaster at Pocono Pines, Pa. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Walter L. Brinton to be postmaster at Creighton, Pa., in place of W. F. Yost, failed to qualify.

Harold D. Lowing to be postmaster at Linesville, Pa., in place of C. E. Putnam. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

William H. Brosius to be postmaster at Mont Alto, Pa., in place of D. M. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Smith M. McCreight to be postmaster at Reynoldsville, Pa., in place of H. C. Deible. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1919.

Carrie A. Fritz to be postmaster at Rimersburg, Pa., in place of B. B. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Annie H. Washburn to be postmaster at Wyncote, Pa., in place of A. H. Washburn. Incumbeut's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Joseph G. Hart to be postmaster at Doylestown, Pa., in place of A. K. Anders. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Everett C. Rye to be postmaster at Eastover, S. C., in place of J. P. Lowry, deceased.

George S. McCravey to be postmaster at Liberty, S. C., in place of E. Z. McCravey. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Knute T. Kallander to be postmaster at Burke, S. Dak., in place of L. L. Truesdell. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

John H. Wilson to be postmaster at Kingston, Tenn., in place of W. F. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired April 8, 1922.

Blanton W. Burford to be postmaster at Lebanon, Tenn., in place of R. R. Doak. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Joseph R. Mitchell to be postmaster at Mascot, Tenn., in place of A. W. Meek, resigned.

TEXAS.

Stanley F. Labus to be postmaster at Falls City, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Marvin F. Carroll to be postmaster at Bryan, Tex., in place of W. D. Lawrence. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1921.

Jesse D. Starks to be postmaster at Floydada, Tex., in place of F. P. Henry. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Curtis D. Crossman to be postmaster at Garland, Tex., in place of Grace Lemmon. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

John H. Wilson to be postmaster at Jacksboro, Tex., in place of J. W. Gaskin. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

VERMONT.

Flora S. Williams to be postmaster at Charlotte, Vt., in place of W. H. Boardman. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Frank L. Start to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Vt., in place of F. L. Start. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Perley U. Mudgett to be postmaster at Johnson, Vt., in place of R. H. Royce. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Ralph Gaul to be postmaster at North Bennington, Vt., in place of James McGovern. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Cecil K. Hughes to be postmaster at Saxtons River, Vt., in place of P. H. Harty. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

Baxter W. Mock to be postmaster at Damascus, Va., in place of Bert Russell, resigned.

Troy D. Rorrer to be postmaster at Dublin, Va., in place of J. H. Cecil. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1920.

Glenn H. Wheeler to be postmaster at Marion, Va., in place of J. B. Richardson, removed.

Campbell Slemp to be postmaster at Wise, Va., in place of W. H. Lipps, removed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 6, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, in whose wisdom and mercy there is neither variableness nor shadow of turning, consider and hear us. Continue to teach us that duty is the upper road that leads to God and he who fails wrongs his own happiness, his intellect, and his fellow men. To-day give us the rapture of high encouragement and of a great, glowing outlook upon our country. Keep before us the example and the inspiration of Him who is all of Thee that we can ever know. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 13180, Report 1264) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee reserved all points of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions and bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 251. A joint resolution providing for the filling of two vacancies that will occur on January 14, 1923, and March 1, 1923, respectively, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke;

S. 3588. An act granting certain lands to the city of Ogden, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water supply system of said city;

S. 3595. An act to reimburse Rube Allen for losses and damages sustained by him through the negligent dipping of tick-infested cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture;

S. 3791. An act for the relief of William R. Bradley;

S. 107. An act for the relief of Robert Edgar Zeigler;

S. 1600. An act for the relief of Annie McColgan;

S. 1511. An act for the relief of Sophie Caffrey;

S. 3923. An act for the relief of the State of New York;

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the cost of transportation for certain supplies purchased by the Military Establishment;

S. 2390. An act to redistribute the number of officers in the several grades of the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 2371. An act to further amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effective provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916;

S. 3136. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes;

S. 3962. An act to prohibit the sending of threatening letters through the mails, and for other purposes; and

S. 1883. An act granting a pension to Anna Claude Howard.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, had asked a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. FLETCHER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, had asked for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. BURSUM, Mr. MCCUMBER, and Mr. WALSH of Montana as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam;

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone; and

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 8996. An act to amend paragraph 440, section 5211, act of June 3, 1864.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 540. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes; and

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the roll of committees, and when the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was reached—

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10531) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 10531, to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the number of permanent commissioned line officers of the Coast Guard now authorized by law shall be distributed in grades, as follows: 1 commandant, 7 captains, 12 commanders, 35 lieutenant commanders, 37 lieutenants, and 77 lieutenants (junior grade) and ensigns; and the number of permanent commissioned engineer officers now authorized by law shall be distributed in grades, as follows: 1 engineer in chief, 3 captains (engineering), 6 commanders (engineering), 12 lieutenant commanders (engineering), 22 lieutenants (engineering), and 42 lieutenants (junior grade) (engineering) and ensigns (engineering). Promotions to the grades created by this act, namely, captain, captain (engineering), and commander (engineering), shall be made from the next lower grade by seniority: *Provided*, That lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade), both line and engineering, may be promoted, subject to examination as provided by law, without regard to number or length of service in grade, to such grades in the Coast Guard not above lieutenant commander or lieutenant commander (engineering) as correspond to the permanent ranks and grades that may be attained in accordance with law by line officers of the regular Navy of the same length of total commissioned service, and officers thus promoted shall be extra numbers in their respective grades, which extra numbers shall not at any one time exceed the following, respectively: 20 lieutenant commanders, 15 lieutenants, 15 lieutenant commanders (engineering), and 8 lieutenants (engineering), but no officer shall be promoted under this proviso who would thereby be advanced in rank ahead of an officer in the same grade and corps whose name stands above his on the official precedence list: *Provided further*, That captains and captains (engineering) shall have the rank of, and be of corresponding grade to, captains in the Navy, and commanders (engineering) shall have the rank of, and be of corresponding grade to, commanders in the Navy.

SEC. 2. That the title of captain commandant in the Coast Guard is hereby changed to commandant. Hereafter the commandant shall be selected from the active list of line officers not below the grade of commander and shall have, while serving as commandant, the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy: *Provided*, That any officer who shall hereafter serve as commandant shall, when retired, be retired with the rank of commandant and with the pay of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy on the retired list, and that an officer whose term of service as commandant has expired may be appointed a captain and shall be an additional number in that grade; but if not so appointed, he shall take the place on the lineal list in the grade that he would have attained had he not served as commandant and be an additional number in such grade: *Provided further*, That the engineer in chief, while so serving, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain (engineering) in the Coast Guard, and hereafter the engineer in chief shall be selected from the active list of engineer officers not below the grade of lieutenant commander (engineering): *And provided further*, That an officer who shall hereafter serve as engineer in chief shall, when retired, be retired with the rank of engineer in chief and with the pay of a captain (engineering) on the retired list, and that an officer whose term of service as engineer in chief has expired may be appointed a commander (engineering) and shall be an additional number in that grade; but if not so appointed, he shall take the place on the lineal list in the grade that he would have attained had he not served as engineer in chief and be an additional number in such grade: *And provided further*, That a constructor, after 10 years' commissioned service in the Revenue Cutter Service and Coast Guard, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant commander, and after 20 years' commissioned service the rank, pay, and allowances of a commander.

SEC. 3. That hereafter no commissioned officer of the Coast Guard shall be promoted to a higher grade or rank on the active list, except to commandant or to engineer in chief, until his mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform all the duties of such higher grade or rank have been established to the satisfaction of a board of examining officers appointed by the President, and until he has been examined by a board of medical officers and pronounced physically qualified to perform all the duties of such higher grade or rank: *Provided*, That if any commissioned officer shall fail in his physical examination for promotion and be found incapacitated for service by reason of physical disability contracted in the line of duty, he shall be retired with the rank to which his seniority entitled him to be promoted: *Provided further*, That hereafter when a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard who has had 40 years' service shall retire, he shall be placed on the retired list with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by him at the time of retirement; and, in the case of a captain, the rank and retired pay of one grade above shall be the rank of commodore and the pay of a commodore in the Navy on the retired list.

SEC. 4. That an ensign, an ensign (engineering), or a district superintendent with the rank of ensign shall be required to complete three years' service in his grade, after which he shall be eligible for promotion to the next higher grade without regard to the number already in that higher grade.

SEC. 5. That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to reduce the rank, pay, or allowances of any commissioned officer of the Coast Guard as now provided by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules of the House debate on the bill is confined to two hours, one-half to be controlled by those in favor of the bill and one-half by those opposed to the bill, and the debate is to be confined to the merits of the bill.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee that reported the bill I am in favor of it and would like to be recognized to control one-half of the time. At this moment I know of no one opposing it, but I suppose it will be necessary for some one to assert himself if he wants to control the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if no member of the committee is opposed to the bill, I ask for recognition.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is not time, is it, Mr. Chairman, to recognize anyone in opposition to the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not asked for recognition unless there is no member of the committee opposed to the bill. There has been no minority report and there is no information that there is any member of the committee opposed to it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, the senior member of the minority side of the committee will probably be here in a moment and claim the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill as it comes before the committee is not so comprehensive in respect to what it covers and what is necessary to consider in regard to it as it might have been had it not been for the passage of what is known as the pay bill. When our committee first gave attention to this subject the salaries of the commissioned officers of the Coast Guard were quite out of tune with those of the officers of other military branches of the Government whose duties were comparable, so far as they could be, to those of officers of the Coast Guard. By the passage of the pay bill, however, the inequalities which were of considerable concern at the outset have been virtually eliminated and are no longer a matter for consideration.

At the time we began the consideration of the bill and had hearings on it, it would have taken an appropriation amounting to $130,000 to have brought up the pay of the Coast Guard officers covered by the bill to the standard of those of the Army and Navy. By virtue of that pay bill, however, the increase in expense which would follow the passage of this bill will be due merely to the advance of several officers and will amount to only about $13,000. There has been, so far as the chairman of the committee knows, no register of any objection to this bill.

The history of the Coast Guard and its predecessors merged into the Coast Guard a few years ago is perhaps better known than the history of the Army and the Navy. The old Revenue Cutter Service and the Coast Guard Service later performed a part in the early days in our history of this country that has never been equaled in respect of gallantry, in respect of accomplishment, in recognition for achievements, by that of any foreign country. It would be a great pleasure for anyone who has the opportunity to study these subjects and write a thesis and deliver it on the Coast Guard. The record is one of the greatest gallantry, of the greatest accomplishment, and is one so replete with doings and achievements and of such a character that anyone who would pursue the subject in detail would be well repaid.

In view of the fact that there is now so little under consideration in appropriation, which seems to be the great care in these days; in view of the fact that the consideration of the bill has been reduced to a point where there is really not much to think about except the rearrangement of the commissioned officers in such a way as to treat them fairly and at the same time to open up the glut which has interfered with the progress of the organization in respect to proper officers to do their work, to open up the opportunity for advance, there is not much to say. It appears that the glut that has become established in this procession of officers in the department has been so great as to discourage young men from entering the service, and the result will soon be that, without this legislation, the Coast Guard will be badly handicapped and become inefficient.

I would be very glad indeed to make a recital of the Coast Guard and its work, to tell you what it has done and what it is doing, and suggest what its future probably would be. I would like to go into a lot of detail; but, in view of the assumption, at all events, that the subject is pretty well known and that our task here is so limited in its scope, I shall not undertake to make a statement at this time. I shall say a few words more and then reserve my time, in case of need for explanation or otherwise, and for the benefit of those who, other than myself, wish to speak on the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That part of section 3 found on the top of page 5 of the bill provides that when a commissioned officer in the Coast Guard is retired, he shall be retired with a grade higher than that held by him at the time of his retirement. What precedent has the gentleman to offer for that provision?

Mr. WINSLOW. The statement in answer to that is as follows, and I shall read it from the report:

> The act of April 16, 1908 (35 Stats. 61) provides "That any officer who shall hereafter serve as captain commandant shall, when retired, be retired with the rank of captain commandant and with the pay of a colonel in the Army on the retired list." (The pay of a colonel in the Army is the same as that of a captain in the Navy.)
>
> Thus the act of April 16, 1908, allows the officer who has served as commandant, when retired, to be retired with the rank he held as commandant and with the retired pay of that rank. Section 2 of the bill seeks to do precisely the same thing, taking cognizance of the fact that the bill gives the commandant in the future while so serving the rank of a rear admiral of the Navy of the lower half.

In other words, it has been brought into record with the practice in the Navy.

Mr. BLANTON. I am speaking of that part of section 8 found on the top of page 5 of the bill which provides that when any commissioned officer of the Coast Guard is retired he shall be retired at one grade higher than that held at the time of his retirement.

Mr. WINSLOW. That is the Navy provision, and this is made to conform to that.

Mr. BLANTON. As a matter of fact, this bill is merely one of promotion and raise of pay, is it not?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes and no. It is one of promotion to equalize the positions held by the Coast Guard officers as far as possible up to the rank of captain with those of the Navy and the Army. The question of pay, as I stated, does not cut much figure any more, because the pay bill has virtually cared for all of them, except that the passage of this bill will raise enough officers within this service to make a difference of $13,000. Beyond that there is no increase whatever.

Mr. BLANTON. Just one other question. The bill limits the number of officers above the grade of ensign?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But with regard to ensigns, there is no restriction or limitation in the bill. Why should not the number of ensigns be restricted as well as the number of commissioned officers?

Mr. WINSLOW. I shall go round a little bit, but will answer the gentleman fully. This makes no change in the number of officers, including ensigns.

Mr. BLANTON. But it makes no limitation as to the number of ensigns.

Mr. WINSLOW. It does; yes. It provides for 77 lieutenants of the junior grade and ensigns as line officers, and in the engineering department as junior officers it provides for 42 lieutenants of the junior grade and ensigns. They are out of balance, and the reason they were grouped together is that we might use such as we have for the two lines of duty until such time comes when they can automatically, through the application of this legislation, make it possible to have a definite number of lieutenants and ensigns likewise. That is provided for in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think th's is a splendid attempt to take care of these men, and I hope it will be successful. There are 189 officers, as I recall.

Mr. STAFFORD. One hundred and sixty-nine.

Mr. BUTLER. In any event the promotion has been very slow, has it not?

Mr. WINSLOW. It has been worse than dead.

Mr. BUTLER. And the pay has been very small, until the pay bill was passed. Gentlemen have heard what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said about the merits of the Coast Guard. It is semimilitary in its character, is it not?

Mr. WINSLOW. It is. It is subject to call in time of war, and in this last war the navigators of the principal transports, among other ships in the Navy, were frequently from the Coast Guard. They were increased in rank. I would like to illustrate for a moment, if the gentleman will permit?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. WINSLOW. This is one case which is illustrative of many. A man second in command on a transport had about 50 young naval officers under him. He was a lieutenant in the Coast Guard. During the war he was advanced in the Navy to the position of commander or lieutenant commander and was made second officer on the transport. He has now been reduced to a point where every one of these 50 young officers who were under him on the transport expect him to salute them on the street, and not one of the 50 was considered capable of running the transport. There are several cases where the fathers who are officers in the Coast Guard, and have been for thirty-odd years, have sons in the Navy, recently out of the academy, who are up to the grade and in some cases ahead in rank of that of their daddies. The inequalities have been so great that they are entirely out of keeping and dignity.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman state what the abilities of these men amount to? Will the gentleman state their experience and how they have served along with the Navy, and speak of their great ability as navigators? These men on the sea who have piloted these little ships around from place to place have become the equal of a number of great navigators of the United States Navy.

Mr. WINSLOW. Without any desire to cast aspersion upon any other branch of the service—and there is no need for doing any such thing—I think we can safely stand by this little Coast Guard Service with the assurance that they have

no superiors on the pay roll of the United States in any department, engineering or otherwise.

Mr. BUTLER. And heretofore they have had one high grade, that of commodore, only.

Mr. WINSLOW. Commandant.

Mr. BUTLER. Captain commandant.

Mr. WINSLOW. That will be changed under this bill to commandant, taking out the "captain."

Mr. BUTLER. He will get the pay and allowance of a commodore of the Navy, which is that of a rear admiral of the lower grades; is that right?

Mr. WINSLOW. In case of retirement; yes.

Mr. BUTLER. You have not increased the seven captains here.

Mr. WINSLOW. There are no captains in the Coast Guard——

Mr. BUTLER. I thought you had seven.

Mr. WINSLOW. There is a captain commandant. There are no captains now. We provide in this bill——

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the gentleman mistaken in that particular? Does not the act—Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 61—provide for six senior captains with the grade and pay of a lieutenant colonel of the Army?

Mr. WINSLOW. My recollection is to the contrary. If I am wrong, I am sorry.

Mr. BUTLER. They have seven captains.

Mr. STAFFORD. Six under the act.

Mr. WINSLOW. Six commanders.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, I count seven. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman, because he is explaining very fully the bill, but I have devoted some attention to it and was interested.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman allow me to read the statute. There may be a subsequent amendment to this statute, but I call the gentleman's attention, as I stated a moment ago, to United States Statutes at Large, Thirty-fifth, page 61:

> Six senior captains, who shall perform duty in connection with the construction of vessels and the inspection of their armament and crews and such other duties as the Secretary of the Treasury or the President may prescribe.

Mr. WINSLOW. Of course I am not up to the last minute in every detail on this subject. The record I have received from the Coast Guard and testimony presented to the committee shows that they have no captains at the present time except the captain commandant.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If the gentleman will yield, the statute the gentleman just stated has reference to the old Revenue Cutter Service where the commodore had a rank comparable to that of captain in the Army. That, of course, referred to a captain with the comparable rank in the Navy, which is equivalent to that of a colonel in the Army.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is in error, comparable with the rank of a lieutenant colonel in the Army.

Mr. WINSLOW. I think there are no captains in the Coast Guard now.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WINSLOW. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania just remarked, if I understood him, that the commandant you are creating now will have a comparable rank with that of rear admiral in the Navy.

Mr. WINSLOW. Now, may I clear you?

Mr. LITTLE. That is what I am asking you about.

Mr. WINSLOW. He goes back to commodore——

Mr. LITTLE. But there is no such officer as commodore, is there?

Mr. WINSLOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. LITTLE. In the Navy?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. A few left.

Mr. WINSLOW. The title is there just the same.

Mr. LITTLE. That is in dispute.

Mr. BUTLER. And after the passage of the personnel act of 1897 the grade was abolished, but a few officers still have the rank of commodore. There are two grades of rear admiral in the Navy, the upper and the lower. The lower grade is supposed to correspond with that of commodore.

Mr. LITTLE. Can any more commodores be appointed?

Mr. BUTLER. No; there is the grade of upper and lower.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Massachusetts says yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Not in the Navy.

Mr. LITTLE. And the commandant will have the rank of a rear admiral?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. And the commodore business does not enter into it——

Mr. WINSLOW. Only on retirement.

Mr. LITTLE. I think I understand it now. You are retiring the captain——

Mr. WINSLOW. The captain will retire as a commodore.

Mr. LITTLE. I am lost again. Is there a captain going to retire as a commodore under this bill?

Mr. WINSLOW. Well, it would seem so, and if the captain retires he retires as a commodore.

Mr. LITTLE. Is that the provision of the bill?

Mr. WINSLOW. That is the only way to provide for a captain to be retired as of the next upper grade.

Mr. LITTLE. You do not retire him as a rear admiral of the lower grade?

Mr. WINSLOW. You will not have a rear admiral except the commandant.

Mr. OLIVER. I recognize that this bill has merit, but some of its provisions are too liberal in view of the recent pay bill. I think the provision of the bill to which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] has just referred will be the only provision about which there will be any serious objection, and that is in fixing the rank of the retiring superior officers, thereby increasing largely their retired pay, not only under the bill that we passed recently, but also by reason of giving them under this bill advanced rank.

Now I would like to ask the gentleman if he has looked into the question of what effect this bill, if it passes, will have on the provision of the pay bill which excepts from the limitation of $7,200 the pay of the captain in the Coast Guard Service, and entitling him to the maximum pay for that grade, which is about $7,800, including allowances. Would that limitation be removed as to all of the captains that this bill seeks to authorize for the service?

Mr. WINSLOW. If I get your question correctly, my answer would be, whatever pertains to the Navy would pertain to the even rank in the Coast Guard.

Mr. OLIVER. In the Navy a captain is limited to $7,200. Without the limitation of $7,200 his pay, after 30 years' service, would be in the neighborhood of $7,800. The same provision applies to the rank of colonel in the Army, which corresponds, of course, to that of captain in the Navy. However, in the Coast Guard Service, there being but one captain authorized, the committee in preparing the pay bill excepted the captain of this service from any limitation as to pay, and he was allowed to draw the maximum. I was just wondering whether you had any provision in the bill that would protect the Treasury and place any additional captains, authorized in this bill, on the same basis as the Navy and Army as respects the pay limitation.

You see this bill takes out the sole captain to whom the pay bill gave increased pay and makes him now commandant, with the pay and rank of rear admiral in the Navy. Have you considered this?

Mr. WINSLOW. I regret I do not catch the point. If the gentleman will give me the correct question I would like to answer it.

Mr. OLIVER. The pay bill provided a schedule of pay and allowances which, with length of service, gives to a captain of the Navy or colonel of the Army $7,800 maximum pay, but there was a proviso inserted, as follows:

> *Provided, however,* That the base pay, together with all allowances, shall not exceed for these grades $7,200.

Now, that did not apply to the captain's grade in the Coast Guard Service, for the reason that there was at that time but one officer in that grade, and but one officer could hold that grade; so limitation of $7,200 as to the captain of the Coast Guard was omitted, and he was entitled to the full pay of $7,800 if length of service authorized it.

Mr. WINSLOW. I think I can answer that now.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. We inquired very carefully about that, and the conclusion, as I understand, of the commandant and the officers and associates of the Coast Guard was that the limitation as to pay of the seven captains created by the bill would be $7,200. I have not worked it out on the maximum, but I have it worked out on the base pay, and on the base pay it is figured that the captain commandant while serving as suggested would get the same pay as the captain in the Navy.

Mr. OLIVER. I assume that you are trying here, as you stated a few moments ago, to give increased rank to the one captain who is called the commandant of this service?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes; while commandant.

Mr. OLIVER. And that, of course, will increase his pay a small amount?

Mr. WINSLOW. About $300.
Mr. BUTLER. One hundred and eighty-six dollars.
Mr. WINSLOW. It is about $300 for the commandant.
Mr. OLIVER. Now, there is but one captain in this service under existing law, and there can be but one. This bill seeks to make six, as I understand?
Mr. WINSLOW. Seven.
Mr. OLIVER. Does the $7,200 limitation of the pay bill apply to this increased number?
Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. OLIVER. Yes.
Mr. BUTLER. Does not the gentleman think the bill itself would apply the limitation?
Mr. OLIVER. I did not have the pay bill at hand. When I get it I can answer it myself.
Mr. WINSLOW. I will say to all these gentlemen that that matter was discussed many times, and as late as yesterday afternoon we had such a discussion, with the cooperation of officers who are to get the money, and perhaps they are looking at it as keenly as anybody. Under the law grades would be the same.
Mr. OLIVER. That may be clear.
Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.
Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. What about the proportion of officers for the Coast Survey? Is it equal or near that of the many officers?
Mr. WINSLOW. Well, that is a rather remote comparison, I am obliged to say to you, although I do not want to be unhappy about it.
Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. I mean the Coast Guard.
Mr. WINSLOW. It is the Coast Guard that we are talking about.
Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. Are the officers required to have the same preparation, or equal preparation, with that of the naval officers?
Mr. WINSLOW. Well, they have equal preparation; and when it comes to seafaring, it is a good deal more. They have their academy, and their standard is quite as high as that of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.
Mr. BUTLER. The examinations are very rigid.
Mr. WINSLOW. Their cadets can enter at a later age, and so there is the added benefit of greater maturity.
Mr. KLINE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's statement answers my inquiry.
Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. With reference to the inquiry and the colloquy following it between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Wisconsin, chapter 145 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large contains this provision in respect to senior captains:

Six senior captains, who shall perform duty in connection with the construction of vessels and the inspection of their armament and crews, and such other duties as the Secretary of the Treasury or the President may prescribe, with the rank of a lieutenant colonel in the Army and a commander in the Navy.

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.
Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is just what the gentleman said, that under the present apportionment there are six commanders and no captains. The term "senior captains" is one that went out of use with the establishment of the Coast Guard Service.
Mr. WINSLOW. These Coast Guard officers are considered and taken as about two or three ranks below those of officers in the Army and Navy whose responsibilities are comparable, with a view also to length of service.
Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WINSLOW. Certainly.
Mr. STAFFORD. The report was written before the Army Coast Guard pay bill was passed, and so it does not disclose how the increases that the gentleman estimates at $13,000 will result.
Mr. WINSLOW. The gentleman is correct.
Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman that information? I would be interested, and I think the House would be interested, in knowing just how the additional increase will result. I have had difficulty in coming to the same conclusion that the gentleman has reached, in view of the fact that the bill provides for 20 additional lieutenant commanders, 15 lieutenant commanders (engineering), and 8 lieutenants (engineering) more than those now authorized by law. I had made some estimates that would carry the amount much above $13,000.
Mr. WINSLOW. I can tell the gentleman in a general way. The increase in commanders and lieutenant commanders is for the purpose of relieving a glut that there is in the personnel of the officers of the Coast Guard. This bill does not increase by a man the number of commissioned officers, but it does rearrange them. There would be an increase in the number of commanders, because three lieutenants (engineering) would be made commanders with an increase of $965 each. Eight lieutenants (engineering) would be promoted to lieutenant commanders with an increase of $947.75 each. A constructor from the rank of lieutenant commander to the rank of commander would add $1,115, and I think you will find that totals about $13,000.
Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit me—I do not wish to take all of his time—does not the fact that these men are given the higher grades entitle them to the higher ratings for allowances carried in the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard pay bills?
Mr. WINSLOW. I understand that when they are commissioned in the higher rank the pay is established by law for them, and they get whatever allowances go with their rank and service.
Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield there?
Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.
Mr. BLACK. Has the gentleman made any estimate of what the allowances will add to the $13,000 increase that he has mentioned?
Mr. WINSLOW. The committee has been advised that under the provisions of the pay bill which is now a law it will take $13,000 more to run the Coast Guard because of the increased remuneration of all kinds to commissioned officers.
Mr. BLACK. Including the increased allowances?
Mr. WINSLOW. That is what I understand.
Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit me to answer the gentleman from Texas?
Mr. WINSLOW. Certainly.
Mr. BUTLER. I have had an expert in whom I have confidence go carefully over the probable increase in the expense to the Government, and he has reported to me, and I have his report here in writing, that the increased expense will be about $13,000.
Mr. WINSLOW. The gentleman gets that certainly from a different angle than mine.
Mr. BUTLER. Yes; I get it from the Committee on Naval Affairs. I do not know whether it is accurate. I am simply giving you the best I could get.
Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?
Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.
Mr. DENISON. I am afraid that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] may not have understood entirely the facts which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] was attempting to state. The pay bill that has already become a law took into consideration this condition of the Coast Guard, and that bill increased the pay of these men, but it could not provide for changing their rank, because the committee reporting that bill had no jurisdiction over that. Therefore the pay of these men has already been provided for. This bill simply makes a rearrangement in their rank and gives them appropriate rank. This bill will add to the total expense of this service only about $13,000.
Mr. WINSLOW. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I explained that carefully earlier in my remarks, and I think my answer was correct, namely, that we shall increase the expense to the Government of these commissioned officers by $13,000 in consequence of the rearrangement of the number of officers now under commission without increasing the number of the officers. It is the rearrangement from lieutenant to lieutenant commander or lieutenant commander to commander.
Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WINSLOW. I will.
Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. My understanding of the pay bill passed was that the allowance for quarters was not as to rank but period of service, so that under this bill the increased allowance of quarters would practically be nothing.
Mr. WINSLOW. I think that is correct.
Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. But with regard to the cost, it was a fact that at the time the gentleman's committee first began consideration of the bill, their estimate then of the cost was approximately $130,000.
Mr. WINSLOW. That is correct.
Mr. BLANTON. Can the gentleman explain how experts have been able to reduce it from $130,000 to $13,000?
Mr. WINSLOW. Possibly I can, with the statement that it may not be complete. That is a matter that did not come under our committee but came under the jurisdiction of another com-

mittee which made up the pay bill, so called. As I understand it—and I am subject to correction—they began to compare officer by officer of different services, and after establishing a comparable grade they decided on their remuneration. They found there was a great disparity existing between the rank of officers in the Coast Guard and their pay as contrasted with the commission, rank, and the pay of officers in other services. So when they came to work it out on a level of service and length of time and other elements that I can not state now, they brought the pay of the Coast Guard up to a point where they automatically took charge of the $130,000 without any consideration of change in the rank at all on a service and longevity basis.

Now, if the bill goes through and the officers appointed as the bill provides, it will be aiming in a few years to balance the officers from captain to ensign, and in the meantime there will be more or less of a glut and they will have to have a few more of this rank than they did have, or a few more of that, and in the transfer from one rank to another in an effort to come as near a balance as they can they find that the transfer will cost $13,000 more. I think my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], who has been through this matter with reference to the pay bill, can give the details.

Mr. BUTLER. No; but the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] can. But I want to ask the gentleman one question. Is the Coast Guard satisfied with this measure? If it is, it is the only one in the military service that I have ever known about. It does not give them a very great opportunity to promote. It is quite modest.

Mr. WINSLOW. The gentleman's question provides an opportunity to make a statement which I had not intended to make for lack of time, but I do not want to run away from it. The officers of the Coast Guard in my estimation—and I speak for myself alone—have been a complacent, long-suffering line of chumps. [Laughter.] When some other people who have rank in some service or another—and I call no names—have been devoting their time to getting higher rank and more pay, these fellows have been going to sea bringing in all kinds of ships, no matter to what service they belonged, when other services have given them up and commercial wreckers have failed to go. When these other people have gone to sleep in the middle of the night these officers of the Coast Guard have heard the S. O. S. and have gone to the rescue. They have been so busy doing a patriotic duty, doing a sailor's duty, almost an angel's duty, that they have not been bothering about their pay. [Laughter and applause.] But in the last few years affairs in this country have made it necessary even for angels to flap their wings and look for more grease. [Laughter.] These men have found that they must either quit the service which they have stood up for and to which they are as loyal as those in the United States marine service—and the marines are a great lot of boys having a lot of besom pushed into them—but they have nothing on the Coast Guard.

They have had their pay going up all the time, but the Coast Guard have not, and they are being paid worse than the hired men and have been for years. Why in the world somebody has not taken hold of this matter before and pushed it along, I do not know. For six years I think the attention of those on our committee has been automatically turned toward the Coast Guard, but there came a time when this bill came on when we had the opportunity to investigate and see if we could not do something worthy of the cause.

The gentleman asked me if the Coast Guard officers are satisfied with the bill and the pay. I never asked any one of them, but I will say this much. Every man with whom I have talked has had a "Thank you" and a "God bless you" in his tone, and seemed to feel that under all conditions of the present time this help was everything that could be expected. So I say to that extent they are satisfied. If I were one, I would not be.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right; I think the provisions of the bill are modest, and I am surprised that they are satisfied. I am told that they are, and I know a number of them. Now that the gentleman from Massachusetts has thrown around a few bricks, does he recollect the year of 1918, when we did increase the pay?

Mr. WINSLOW. I do.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say that this service has not been overlooked. We took them into the Navy and provided additional pay.

Mr. WINSLOW. But you took it all away when the war was over.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Do I understand that the bill comes before the House with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. WINSLOW. I can not say without looking up the minutes of the meeting whether it is a unanimous report or not. I do not at the moment remember anybody who voted in the negative.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. It seems to have the approval of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WINSLOW. It seems to have everyone's approval.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. And it is fairly satisfactory to the Coast Guard themselves.

Mr. WINSLOW. I did say that. I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] opposed to this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am in favor of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] opposed to this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] opposed to this bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama for one hour.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a dangerous thing to pass this bill unless the committee is given an opportunity to give it further consideration. Since we reported this bill the general officers' pay bill has been reported and passed by the House and Senate, and has finally become a law. Our committee that reported this bill did not consider it with a view to the general pay bill. The committee, as a committee, knows nothing as to the effect that the passage of the general pay bill will have upon this bill. It may be that certain individuals of the committee have investigated the subject and have some opinion upon it, but I can say that the committee as a whole, the general pay bill having been passed, does not know anything whatsoever about what the result of passing this bill will be.

The question then presented is, Do you think it is desirable that legislation be passed in that fashion? Gentlemen should bear in mind that this is one of the most technical of all subjects. With all respect to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], who is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported this bill, let me say this, that there is not a Member of Congress who has any knowledge of the subject of the pay of officers of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard that is worth listening to.

The subject of officers' pay is so technical in its nature as to require the services of a specialist to deal with it, and these gentlemen to whom I have referred in reaching any conclusion about it necessarily rely upon the opinions and statements of high officers in the separate services. To know anything about a naval officer's pay you have got to be at least a commander, and to know anything about an Army officer's pay you have to be at least a colonel. To know anything about the pay of a Coast Guard officer you have to have rank up to the highest. To illustrate, I may say that scarcely an officer in the Army, the Navy, or the Coast Guard knows what any other officer is receiving as pay altogether. With his allowances and his longevity pay and this and that quirk, nobody knows what anybody else is receiving except the Paymaster General who had gone to work and figured out what each particular officer is getting. The subject is one of the most technical that can possibly be considered by Congress, and yet we propose to deal with it without a committee having considered it. So far as the work of our committee is concerned, no member of it can tell just what any officer of the Coast Guard is going to draw after this bill is passed.

Mr. STEVENSON. That being the case, if these gentlemen who have made a study of these questions for 20 years, because some of them have been here that length of time, do not know anything about it and can not find out anything about it, then what is the gentleman's committee expected to do if we do send the bill back to them?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What we would do will be to call Captain Commandant Reynolds before us and ask him what the effect of the bill will be; he will tell us and we will accept what he says. That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] does when he considers the pay of a naval officer. He calls some specialist before him and relies upon his statement.

Mr. BUTLER. I could not do otherwise; and in my defense let me ask the gentleman——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, the gentleman needs no defense so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not always a good thing for us to select some one in whom we have confidence and, until he fools us, accept his judgment?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is absolutely necessary to do so in dealing with a technical subject of this kind. The complaint that I am making about this bill is that it has not been done.

There is one more observation which I desire to make. No military officer ever had as high rank as he thought he should have. No officer or civilian ever had pay as great as he thought he was entitled to. When I say that I do but announce my recognition of human qualities. An officer of the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard daily comes in contact with some officer of higher rank to whose opinions and position he is compelled to pay a deference that has no connection with the relative merits or capacities of the two men. Therefore he is rankled that some man has a higher rank than he and that he must obey some man's order without regard to whether it is right or wrong.

Men never receive large enough salaries, according to their own judgment, because every man who draws a salary arranges his scale of living accordingly, and always arranges it right up to the limit of his salary. Therefore he feels a pressure to raise his scale of living to compete with that of somebody else with whom he is brought in contact. He always needs more money. These are human traits that can not be gotten away from.

Congress is usually quite sympathetic with aspirations for higher rank and more pay, and we have the courage of our convictions along those lines, except when it comes to ourselves. We are willing and have been willing to increase the salaries of every kind of public officer to meet the increase in the cost of living which has come about in the last few years unless that officer happens to be a Congressman. But we have not courage enough to increase our own salaries, although we realize that the old salary of $5,000 a year in the day in which it was paid had a much greater purchasing power than the $7,500 which we receive has to-day when almost every Congressman with a family has a struggle to live on his compensation.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a set of officers who are entirely worthy. Let me say at the outset that the officers of the Coast Guard are just as worthy in every way as any officers in the Army or Navy, and are entitled to as high a place in matter of rank and merit and to just as much pay. It is not with any thought to the contrary that I am speaking on this bill.

But there is this that I would ask you to ponder: The average officer with whom we are dealing in this bill is a higher paid man in the essential aspect than a Member of Congress. I would rather have the lifetime permanent position of one of these officers—with its retirement privileges, its longevity pay, and other financial advantages—than have the salary of a Member of Congress, with its accompanying burdensome obligation to contribute to charities, churches, lodges, and organizations of every kind whatsoever—referring now to purely legitimate calls, and not to the demands of political bums and grafters. Why, we can not even offer to run for Congress without some measly little political committee in our district or State demand of us that we should pay them a price for even the poor privilege of getting our names on the ticket. Congressmen have to run for their jobs every two years, and many of us incur heavy campaign expenses, while our Army, Navy, and Coast Guard officers are sure of their positions. We have heavy expenses for travel and living away from home; and so I say, so far as the purely financial aspect is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt in the world but that the average officer gets more net money for his services than any Member of Congress gets out of his salary.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I preface it by saying that I would rather be here than in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will say this to the gentleman also, that the rate of mortality in the Coast Guard is less than it is in the House.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Political or physical?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Both. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] has not been here long, and there will be enough of political mortality to advise him on that subject very soon. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman a serious question, if he will allow me.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. With pleasure.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman stated awhile ago, if I understood him correctly, that no one can tell—not even members of the committee—how this bill, if it should be enacted into law, may be affected by the provisions of the pay bill. Now, as I understand, this bill was considered before the enactment of the pay bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes. Before the pay bill was reported out of committee.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And such hearings as were held antedated the pay bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman was making the point——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I make the point that we are legislating here without knowing what is going to be the effect of our legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. In support of the gentleman's contention he will notice that the recommendation from Mr. Mellon, found in the report, was sent, as the date shows, before the pay bill was passed and did not take into consideration the bill at the time it was made.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Of course; that is obvious.

Now, gentlemen, let us see what this bill is about. Comment was made upon the fact that the officers of the Coast Guard were complacent and long-suffering. That brought on a suggestion from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they had no reason to be otherwise until they went back to their old pay as of last July.

Now, let me say this: It was in anticipation of going back to the old pay that the agitation arose which has brought this bill forth as its fruit. These men did not want to go back to the old rank and old pay. They had tasted of the advantages of more money and more dignity, and when they found themselves confronted by a return to their original pay and status they were reluctant, and they appealed to our committee. Anybody knows that when you appeal to the great heart of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW] you are going to get some response, so naturally we have this bill before us.

What is the real situation that is aimed at here? It is this: Promotions in the Army, the Navy, and the Coast Guard are in due course and come when vacancies are created. Those vacancies are created only by death or retirement. The normal rates of death and retirement are substantially the same in the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard. Therefore, the normal rate of promotion in the Coast Guard is substantially the same as in the Army or Navy. But that statement applies to normal conditions. We have had abnormal conditions during the last 20 years and we have had a tremendous expansion of the Army and the Navy. The ironclad rule in those services is that the first and best fruits of promotion go always to the fellow who is in. If a vacancy exists caused by an expansion of the service those officers who are already in service get the benefit in the shape of promotion, and those officers who are added to the service come in at the foot of the list.

Now, what has resulted? Due to the tremendous increase in our Army and Navy, and the tremendous number of officers added, we have had promotions with unusual and great celerity. We have had boys just out of the academy run, without experience, right up to the rank of major and corresponding rank in the Navy. Up until recently we had practically no second lieutenants in the Army. They went from the academy right up to first lieutenants and captains.

The emergency condition, the extraordinary condition, which existed, with the resulting tremendous expansion in our Army and Navy, increased the number of officers, increased the promotions in those services, and resulted in men going forward to higher rank and higher pay than by qualifications or experience they ought to receive. We might as well be frank about it. That did not happen in the Coast Guard because it was not expanded. The officers of the Coast Guard have gone forward at their old normal rate and in their old regular line of promotion to vacancies created by retirement and death. Officers of the Army and Navy, of much less experience and of inferior qualifications, have, because of being drawn by the mere vacuum of an increase in numbers, been pulled into higher places than these officers in the Coast Guard after the years of service that they have had. Naturally they are dissatisfied with the situation. They are seeking to have Congress remedy it. They want us to give them

the promotion they would have received had their service had the expansion corresponding to the Army and Navy.

That is what this bill is about. Nobody can dispute it. These men have become dissatisfied with the relatively inferior rank they hold because the great expansion in the Army and Navy has brought promotion to the Army and Navy officers with extraordinary celerity. They want themselves to be put now on an equality with the officers of the Army and Navy in that respect.

Well, what is going to be the future of the Army and Navy? Some gentlemen have one view about it and some have another. Possibly nobody would agree with me in what I would do. If we are not to increase our Navy any further promotions will slow down; indeed, promotions have now slowed down, and an officer in the Navy will stand no better chance to get a promotion than he would if he had entered the Coast Guard. If we do not further increase our Navy after any existing shortage of officers has been filled, if there be any, the rate of promotion in the Navy will be exactly what it is in the Coast Guard, because it will be only to fill vacancies caused by death and retirement.

We are proposing then to give these officers in the Coast Guard promotion by special enactment. That is what it amounts to; promotion of these men who happen now to be in. What about the men who come after them? There will be no opportunity for them to be promoted by special enactment. We are trying to put these men in the same position as that which they would have occupied if we had expanded the Coast Guard commensurately with the expansion in the Army and Navy. Officers may hereafter be appointed in the Coast Guard and remain just as long in the lower ranks as those who will benefit by this bill would have remained.

The statement is made that these intended beneficiaries will quit the service if this legislation is not passed. Let me say this to you in all frankness: I have just as high regard for the officers of the Coast Guard as I have for the officers of the Army and Navy. My belief is that there are few officers of any of these services who are not doing better in the Army and Navy and Coast Guard than they could do outside in civil life. Let them get out, if they desire, and they will find out that fighting for one's self in civil life is not all that they may imagine it to be. I believe there is not 1 per cent of these officers who could step out of the positions where they now are and get a more desirable place in civil life than the places they now hold. They are not going to quit either. They may make their halloo, but they will not quit, and there will be many others to come after them.

Some Members say they can not get boys to go to the Military and Naval Academies. I can get them; fine young fellows from my district. I wish I had the privilege of sending 100 of my boys to the academies. I would have no trouble in finding them. Most young men are following the line of least resistance when they go to the academies; that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I will take a few minutes more.

The whole purpose of this bill is to give certain officers better rank and better pay. That is all there is about it. Had there been no expansion in our Army and Navy the bill would never have been in here, because then they could not have claimed that there was any basis for it.

We need economy. We need to quit increasing salaries. We need to return to some of our previous ideals on this subject. Do not let anybody be afraid that he will not get enough Army and Navy and Coast Guard officers without an increase of salary.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In a moment. I believe in paying every man good wages; I believe in giving him good pay. The statement has been made that this is a hazardous occupation. The rate of fatality and disablement and retirement and casualties of one sort and another that have occurred in the service does not prove it.

It is a long-lived service. These men render honorable service, and I wish to see them get good pay; but we do not have to give men unreasonable compensation just because they wear the uniform of the Army or Navy or Coast Guard. We have men in civil life performing just as onerous duties as these men, and most of them are getting less for it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. It is always desirable in any service to have a number of very worthy applicants. We will agree on that?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I want to say to the gentleman that the prospect of passing this measure has increased the number of applications for this service sixteen times over, because they see some chance in the wide world for promotion by which they can advance from the grade they are in and get a little more pay with their service, a little more compensation than they have received before.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But it is the fellows already in the service who will get the benefit of this legislation.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. An examination will show that very few of these men now in the service will ever reach the higher grades; very few.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I can, out of my own district, from the most worthy and high-class young men, fill the entire Coast Guard academy list within six months.

Mr. BUTLER. But there is not any academy.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, yes; they have an academy. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, they have a place for some instruction, but nothing like the Naval or Military Academy.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is a similar institution, and they appoint cadets to it. The fact is that they do not give the Congressmen a chance to appoint them. They have their own method of filling the cadetships. They do not give a Congressman a chance to name his constituents.

Mr. BUTLER. So far as I am concerned, I would be willing that they should appoint all of them. I do not want them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. There are a great many boys in my district who are entirely worthy, and who are seeking an education and an opportunity in life, and I would like to have the privilege of sending them to this academy. I tell you that they would make good Coast Guard officers.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Alabama that no one ever gets out of this service.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I did not say that.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It appears from the testimony of Lieutenant Commander Billard that in 1921 there were nine resignations from this service.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I did not say that nobody ever got out of it, but that the number of resignations is comparatively small. I want to say that there are very few of those who are in the service who could better themselves by leaving it to enter other occupations. There have been great opportunities in the shipping industry in recent times, but in normal times I doubt very much whether they can better their condition by leaving the service, particularly in view of their assured position, a lifelong occupation, and the retirement privileges in old age when they do not have to do anything for the Government and yet draw down a very handsome salary during the remainder of their lives.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. In view of the statement which the gentleman has made concerning the selection of these cadets, I wish to say that these examinations for cadets are advertised all over the United States. Announcements are sent to every Member of the House and Senate, asking Members to send cadets to take the examinations, and in the examination on April 20, held in different parts of the United States, they got only six cadets.

At the examination in July, 1920, they got only five cadets, and at the examination in December, 1920, they got none at all. In June, 1921, they got one cadet and two cadet engineers, and in December, 1921, they got only five cadets and four cadet engineers. After these men had passed the examination and gone to the academy, one cadet and one cadet engineer resigned because of the poor prospects which they saw ahead of them. In spite of their efforts to fill these vacancies, there are now 45 vacancies in the grade of ensign and 28 in the grade of ensign engineer, or vacancies amounting to 27 per cent in one corps and 32 per cent in the other.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Let me tell the gentleman something that evidently he does not know, that these appointments to cadetships are not based on any particular standard of education. They are based upon competitive examinations, so that a man has to be beyond the need of a reasonable education before he is able to get into the Coast Guard academy by competitive examination. It is the man who gets the highest percentage on an examination. It is not a place where a boy can go and get an education. He must be educated already or he has no chance to get there. The applicants for cadetships must come to Washington for the examinations and must pay their own way, and for the boy with only a high-school training there is no chance that he may get in.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Let me finish, and then the gentleman can get his quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members present—a quorum. The gentleman from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. One thing more in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON]. These are assembled examinations. In order for a boy to take one of these examinations it requires traveling expense and a great deal of other expense. The boys in the country who might enter this service are not acquainted with it. It is not explained to them as to the chance they have to get in. Therefore, even when they happen to hear about the examination they do not choose to go to some remote point to take an examination for something that they feel they have not the remotest chance of getting into. If these appointments were based upon attaining a certain reasonable standard, such as boys must attain in order to enter a first-class college, we would not have any trouble at all in filling the academy. I will agree to fill the academy from my own district, as I said; but it is because it is not done in that way, because it is done in this chimney-corner fashion. That is the reason they do not have the applications. Do not be afraid that we will not get plenty of talent.

Now I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, speaking of conditions in my own district and other sections of the country which I have had the opportunity to visit during the last few months, I have become very well convinced that one of the most fortunate individuals in the country is the man who holds some kind of a Government office with a fixed salary attached, especially if he hold an office in the Army or the Navy or the Coast Guard, where he not only gets the salary attached to his position, but gets an allowance for quarters, light and fuel, and other incidentals of that sort. It seems to me that the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] has made an argument that conclusively establishes that this bill ought not to pass at this time. The chairman of the committee [Mr. WINSLOW] in his opening speech made a statement that Congress had been neglectful of the personnel and commissioned officers of the Coast Guard and had treated them unfairly in refusing for years to give them an increase in pay, but the gentleman corrected his error before the conclusion of his remarks by admitting that in the general pay bill which Congress passed a few months ago the officers and personnel of the Coast Guard were included in the increases just the same as those belonging to the Army and the Navy. I did not vote for the general pay increase bill because I thought it contained some bad provisions, but even though I did not, if these members of the Coast Guard had not been included I would now be willing to include them because they should not be discriminated against. But they were included and they are now receiving the benefits carried by the pay increase bill. These benefits are very liberal and generous and add a heavy enough burden on the shoulders of the taxpayer without adding on any more.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] very properly emphasized that the effect of this bill is simply to create new offices, so as to afford additional opportunity for promotion to bring about an additional increase in pay, an increase in allowance for quarters, fuel, and other incidentals that go with it. I think it is the duty of a Member of Congress to undertake to represent as nearly as he knows how the will of his constituents, and if I am convinced of any one thing better than another, it is that the people of my district are opposed to the creation of any more new offices.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I do not think the gentleman understands. This bill does not create any more additional officers for the Coast Guard.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman permit me to reply to him by asking him a question? As I understand it, under existing law there is one office of captain in the Coast Guard. If this bill is passed, there will be seven offices of captain in the Coast Guard. If I understand correctly, under the present law there are six officers with the designation of commander in the Coast Guard, and if this bill passes there will be 12 officers in the Coast Guard with the designation of commander. Is not that creating new offices and carrying with it an increase in pay and allowance and other incidentals? If it is not, then I do not understand the English language.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The total number of commissioned officers in the Coast Guard is 270, and that has not been increased.

Mr. BLACK. Precisely. But the number of captains and commanders is.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And whereas there have been created six captains and six additional commanders, yet in the pay bill the pay is based not upon rank but upon term of service, years of service, so that with the increase in the number of captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders the increase in the salary will be practically negligible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Minnesota asked his question, because it is identically the same proposition that confronted us when the general Army pay bill was before the House. The gentlemen in charge of that bill, and I am not impugning their good faith, because they were acting upon expert testimony of officers of the Army and the Navy, told us that apparently the law made an increase in pay, but that the practical working out of it would be that there would be no increase in the aggregate of the appropriations. I talked this morning with one of the members of the Committee on Appropriations upon our side of the House, and he told me that the committee now has before it an additional estimate for an increase of $3,000,000 in one branch of the service and $600,000 on another small branch of the service, those two branches aggregating an additional expenditure of $3,600,000.

Mr. BRYNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Did not the gentleman, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, state that there was an increase over the pay bill of 1908, but a decrease below the pay which was given to the officers for the fiscal year 1922, by some called the temporary pay bill and by some called the bonus? There is an increase over the 1908 pay, but a decrease from the so-called bonus.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman stated that it was an increase over the base pay.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Over 1908.

Mr. BLACK. Yes; but the point that I am bringing out is that by the technical provisions of these various bills these several branches of the service are seeking and are succeeding in perpetuating as permanent law all of the increases given during the war period, including the expansion of rank due to the extraordinary expansion of the service. I am opposed to saddling such heavy burdens on the taxpayer and will vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DOWELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were presented by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On November 28, 1922:

H. R. 12859. An act to provide for certain expenses incident to the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress;

H. R. 10144. An act conveying the peninsula of Presque Isle, Erie, Pa., to the State of Pennsylvania, its original owner, for public park purposes; and

H. R. 367. An act for the relief of J. Irving Brooks.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE COMMISSIONED LINE AND ENGINEER OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD GRADES.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these five minutes in order to say just a word in regard to the so-called pay bill. My only hesitancy in supporting this measure very enthusiastically is its possible tendency to again place us in the same condition in which we found ourselves before the pay bill was enacted. This condition was that the discrepancies in the pay and allowances in the various services—the so-called military or quasi-military services of the country—were so great that there was great dissatisfaction, sometimes amounting almost to demoralization, in the personnel of all of

those services. A joint committee of the two houses, of which I was a member, was finally appointed to consider the matter, and which did consider it through long hearings and quite thorough executive consideration. The bill was then brought into this House, was thoroughly considered here, and finally passed. In this bill there was an attempt to equalize all of these discrepancies. A committee was formed from the various services, from the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and from the other services concerned, and these representatives of the several services worked over the matter in connection with the joint committee for months, trying to work out a satisfactory pay schedule.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. For a brief question.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the gentleman able to state to us wherein this bill increases the pay? It increases the places but not the pay.

Mr. TILSON. I have not attempted to show that these are increases, and that is not the purpose for which I rose. My purpose in speaking here is to warn against a return toward the old order of things by again entering upon the practice of separate raises in all the various services, because that is what went on before and brought us into a condition that was intolerable. Army representatives would appear before the Committee on Military Affairs and urge that the Navy had an advantage in this, that, or the other. The committee would lend a sympathetic ear. Then the Navy representatives would go before the committee presided over by the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and would show wherein the Army had gained some slight advantage. Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania would give them a raise, and so on, through all of the different services.

After considerable effort on the part of the committee, whose labors were approved by congressional action, we thought we had brought the pay of all of these various services into line. In this bill compensation was based upon a number of considerations—upon rank, upon length of service to a considerable degree, and upon other elements that entered into the problem.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. Wherein does this bill, as the gentleman sees it, undo or point to the undoing of the pay bill?

Mr. TILSON. In this respect only: At the time the pay bill was considered there was a certain personnel in the Coast Guard supposed to be fairly well balanced. With this well-balanced personnel in mind, the joint committee considered the pay bill and acted, adjusting the scale of pay.

This bill, as I understand it, changes the balance of that personnel. In other words, it raises a larger proportion of the officer personnel to a higher rank than was the case when the pay bill was considered.

Mr. WINSLOW. Had I been wrongly advised, when I was assured by some of those in the conference on the pay bill that the question of inequality of rank of Coast Guard and other officers was a matter of common conversation in the meetings, and regret was expressed by many on that committee that they had not the power to adjust the Coast Guard rank, and that they further expressed the hope that this bill would go through in order that not only the pay might be taken care of, as in the pay bill, and the comparable rank of members of the Coast Guard officers should be raised to put them on a fair equality with the others?

Mr. TILSON. I remember conversations in the committee along that line. It was recognized that the Coast Guard was one of the worst sufferers under then existing conditions; that there was greater inequality and more reason why the bill should be passed to remedy the situation in the Coast Guard than in any other service.

I do not say that this bill does not make a more evenly balanced service; my only point is that it changes the balance at all. The question is whether we ought to again enter upon a series of raises or changes in the various services.

Mr. WINSLOW. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] is a soldier of great repute in New England and the State of Connecticut and country wide, and I would like to ask him as a military man of high rank how he would like a command if he had a colonel under him and no captain, about four first lieutenants, and, as this Coast Guard has to operate, with about 44 second lieutenants, and everything rank in like proportion?

Mr. TILSON. Well, I should not consider that a good balance.

Mr. WINSLOW. What would the gentleman think of a service for which we are paying a lot of money to be allowed to continue under such an inefficient plan as that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. I yield the gentleman two minutes more. I would like to ask the gentleman if as a military man he would feel that the Government of the United States was wise in expending a great sum of money for the operation of a department which was manifestly unbalanced in the way of officers, when by equalizing them they can completely eliminate that and make them efficient?

Mr. TILSON. The question the gentleman asks answers itself. Of course, the service ought to be evenly balanced. It would not be a well-balanced service if there were 44 second lieutenants and no captain.

Mr. WINSLOW. That is illustrative of what we have in the Coast Guard now, and all we want to do is to even up the service.

Mr. TILSON. I hope that the gentleman is accomplishing it in this bill, and I further hope that there will be no further attempt to change it. I hope that this will be permanent, so that we shall not again enter upon an era of proceeding piecemeal in the several services to unbalance them again. I hope that we now have a pay bill that will last and be satisfactory to the several services and that we shall not soon have to go through the same old struggle of attempting to balance them again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that the time is under the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Alabama. Under the rules of the House, by which the time of debate is limited, the Chair does not feel competent to entertain the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to call the attention of the House to a feature in this class of legislation. Some years ago we had rear admirals, commodores, and captains. In England they had rear admirals and captains but no commodores. Our commodores in England or Shanghai invited out to dinner were outranked by the rear admirals. The result was that our poor fellows had to suffer the infliction when they went out to dinner of going in with the captains. That was considered a debasement of their honor and their character. They came here and appealed to us and we abolished the rank of commodore so that they could all go in to dinner together except a few fellows who were allowed to keep their position for life, but when they die there will be no more commodores. In that connection they selected nine commodores and promoted them to admirals. They never equalize by cutting down but always by promotion. We gave them a higher salary and a better place at dinner. Then up rose the old rear admirals and said, "This is a devil of a situation; must we go in to dinner with these commodores?" And so they split them, calling them the first nine and the second nine. You may think that is a joke, but it is not; it is an absolute fact. They settled the question between them, and the rear admirals of the second nine went in to dinner behind the admirals of the first nine. Now the rank of a brigadier was the same as that of a commodore.

No more commodores. So the Army drew its bill which provided that a brigadier general should have the same rank as a rear admiral. The Navy, of course, rose up in arms and the first rear admiral said, "You can not go to dinner with me." And so the Navy put through a law which provided that a rear admiral of the second nine should have the same place at dinner as a brigadier general. That kind of straightened it out you would think, but it did not, and that has been the cause of a desperate fuss between them ever since, and finally the Secretary of the Navy wrote to me—I was connected just then in a way with some of that legislation—and said that the General Staff and War Council and some of the leading men of the Army and Navy had decided to ignore all that; just to drop out. I said:

> If you will give me time and place I will have the whole outfit court-martialed and shot.

That did not settle it, because I declined to accept their dictates, and so they gravely announced that unless we omitted these laws the Army and Navy could not be administered. It was an awful condition; it could not be administered unless we omitted from the proposed Federal code certain laws you made. Now you may think that I am drawing a long bow, but everything I have said is exactly true. You think it is silly and ridiculous, but you do not think it is half as silly and ridicu-

lous as I did, but at Shanghai it was very embarrassing to go to dinner behind some Englishmen. I have seen it happen there myself. It is embarrassing, especially when ladies are present. It was a question of who should have precedence, and that is important—in the Navy—when ashore.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I say to the gentleman that that is exactly the complaint made by some of these officers before the committee; that officers of the Army and Navy, junior in point of years of service, outrank them and treat them with disrespect when they come into contact with them.

Mr. LITTLE. I can not yield any further unless you give me more time. Now, I want to ask your attention—I think I shall vote for this bill, on the whole it is worthy—I want to direct the attention of the Chairman to the awful position in which this new commodore you are going to create is placed.

Mr. WINSLOW. No; commandant.

Mr. LITTLE. He is commandant now, and you are going to make him a commodore.

Mr. WINSLOW. He is a captain commandant by law now.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said he would be a commodore when he is retired.

Mr. WINSLOW. When he is retired.

Mr. LITTLE. Who is going in to dinner with him? [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. Section 1466 of the Revised Statutes provides that—

> The relative rank between officers of the Navy on the active or retired list and officers of the Army shall be as follows, lineal rank only being considered: Vice admiral shall rank with lieutenant general; rear admirals with major generals; commodores with brigadier generals; captains with colonels.

Referring to page 1005 of the Thirtieth Statutes at Large we find that—

> Each rear admiral embraced in the nine lower numbers of that grade shall receive the same pay and allowances as are now allowed a brigadier general in the Army.

On page 411 of the Fortieth Statutes we find that—

> Brigadier generals of the Army shall hereafter rank relatively with rear admirals of the lower half of the grade.

In a letter of March 1, 1921, to the chairman of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws the Secretary of the Navy said:

> The clause in the act of October 6, 1917, was the subject of the fullest consideration by the experts in both the War and Navy Departments, including the General Staff and the War Council, with the result that the two departments agreed that this provision could not be put into effect and concurred in recommendations to Congress that it be repealed. Inasmuch as the said provision could not be put into effect, its repeal would serve no purpose other than to eliminate it from the statutes, thereby preventing confusion which it might cause in the minds of those not familiar with the subject; whether repealed or not, the fact would be that it was not in effect and could not be put into effect, and therefore could not be regarded as a provision of law which was in effect in 1919.

In a letter to the chairman from the said Secretary under date of May 25, 1920, the Secretary had already said of the act of October 6, 1917, which is from the Fortieth Statutes, page 411:

> So much of said act as provides that brigadier generals of the Army shall hereafter rank relatively with rear admirals of the lower half of the grade is defective and it has been impossible to put it in operation. * * * Therefore all reference to relative rank between brigadier generals and rear admirals of the lower half of the grade should be omitted.

Gentlemen of the House, the General Staff and the War Council have decided that a part of your laws are not in effect, and the Secretary of the Navy instructed the chairman of the Revision Committee to omit from H. R. 12, the bill to establish a Federal code, such portions of your laws as the General Staff and War Council found to be not in accord with their views of what laws should be. If they can reach such a conclusion and make it take effect on one law they can on all laws, and the Congress should be abolished and the War Council and the General Staff left in control of the Capitol. Now, what is the dire and awful condition which precipitates such a revolution in our form of government and invests these autocrats with absolute power? The question is simply whether brigadier generals and rear admirals have the same rank. In time of war there might possibly be times when the question might rise to importance, but now there is nothing to it but a question of precedence in dinner parties. The same question is raised when you make a commodore for the Coast Guard. The same question is raised practically every time the Army and Navy begin to father legislation with regard to their respective duties and privileges. To merely present the subject makes it ridiculous the minute your attention is directed to their views, yet since May 25, 1920, when the Secretary of the Navy directed your committee to omit these laws which you made they have maintained and insisted upon having the General Staff and the War Council permitted to abolish your laws. This is the result of having a Judge Advocate General of the Navy who never read a law book and who arrogates to himself the duty of sitting down and deciding the authenticity and legality of the statutes Congress enacts. I stand in awe of the tremendous consequences which may arise if you make a commodore for the Coast Guard. The department long since took the position and openly stated that the Navy could not be administered unless the law of the Fortieth Statutes, page 411, was omitted, and there was not a thing to it except a little matter of precedence of no consequence whatever. In discussing, gentlemen of the House, the problems of relative rank with the Navy and the Army we are called on to legislate for gentlemen with whom rank and precedence are seriously important, just as they are in the few remaining courts of Europe, and with whom titles are of more importance and receive more consideration than great principles and great accomplishments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time now remaining is as follows: Under the control of the gentleman from Massachusetts there are 17 minutes; under the control of the gentleman from Alabama, 11 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. We have only one more speech on this side. I suggest that the gentleman has more than one speech?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman has more than one speech, I suggest that we divide it.

Mr. WINSLOW. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the time, because I prefer to discuss the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WINSLOW. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON].

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, those of us who know the work of the Coast Guard and its service to the country from the time of its organization years ago are proud of its work and proud of its record both in peace and in war. The Coast Guard, as we now know it, was organized in 1915 by combining the then existing Revenue Cutter Service and the Life Saving Service into one organization. The Revenue Cutter Service was organized in the year 1790 and antedates the organization of the Navy. It is true that we had a Continental Navy during the Revolutionary War, but with the end of that conflict this was disbanded, and the new Government organized what we now call the Coast Guard Service before it organized a Navy.

In times of peace its 270 officers and about 4,000 enlisted personnel are kept busy at sea in patroling icebergs, rescuing stranded ships, patroling the seal grounds of Alaska, and in general life-saving work on the coast and on the Great Lakes. Its officers are real navigators.

The original act placed upon this organization the duty of defending the coasts of the country. It has been engaged in every war that this country has ever been engaged in with the exception of the naval war against Tripoli. An examination of its history will show how well it rendered service during the various wars that our country has been engaged in. During the late war the whole organization was immediately transferred for the emergency from the Department of the Treasury and became a part of our naval forces. Some of its officers were in command of our large troop transports. It shared with the Navy in the credit for transporting 2,000,000 of our soldiers overseas with the loss of hardly a man. It was a revenue cutter, the *Tampa*, which, aside from the *Cyclops*, sustained the greatest single naval loss of ours in the war. This ship was engaged in antisubmarine work off the coast of Europe, and after successfully convoying over 300 ships during a period of many months finally became a victim to a submarine attack and went down with its 115 men, but the convoy it was then in charge of was saved. All of its officers and men gave the very best account of themselves during the Great War and lived up to the very highest traditions of the service of this most efficient organization.

It developed during the war that many of these officers holding low rank after many years in the service were outranked by much younger men and with considerably less years of service in the Navy. The Navy needed these Coast Guard officers for the higher positions on account of their years of experience and their ability. Temporary legislation was enacted during the war making possible temporary pro-

motion in the Navy in order to meet this situation. However, with the coming of peace these men went back to their former grades and their former pay. This left a discrimination against the officers of the Coast Guard in both rank and pay. The discrimination in pay was eliminated by the passage of the general pay bill last spring, which based pay upon years of service primarily rather than upon rank and grade. The Coast Guard was included, of course, in this legislation.

This joint committee on pay did not have jurisdiction over this discrimination in rank. Your committee, in the bill before us, has endeavored to correct at least in part this discrimination in rank and grade.

There are something like four or five thousand men in the Coast Guard. Under existing law the commandant has a rank comparable to that of captain in the Navy. In the Navy an officer with that responsibility would have the rank and grade of a rear admiral, lower half. This bill confers upon the commandant that rank. It involves no increase whatever in his pay.

For more efficient administration purposes the Coast Guard has divided the country into districts. Under existing law the officer in charge ranks as a commander. In the Navy an officer with similar responsibilities would rank as a captain. We have therefore provided six captains in order to meet that situation. We then have increased the commanders from 6 to 12 and have increased the number of lieutenant commanders to the number of 4. We have made no increase in the total number of commissioned officers.

Now, this increase in the number of officers of higher rank involves practically no increase in pay. It will run about $13,000 per year, which is practically negligible as compared with the total sum paid for salaries under existing law.

Let me call your attention to this, that the proportion of higher rank officers in the Coast Guard is somewhat lower, considerably lower, than the proportion of higher rank officers in the Navy, the Army, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and in the Marine Corps. In the hearings, on page 38, will be found the percentages. In the Army the total number of officers authorized is 15,000 in round figures. In the Army the percentage of officers above the rank of major, corresponding in the Navy to lieutenant commanders, is 8.9, and in the Coast Guard it is 2.9. In the Navy the percentage is 12 per cent, as against the Coast Guard of 2.9. In the Marine Corps the percentage is 8.1, and in the Coast Guard it is 2.9. In the Public Health Service it is 7.2, as against 2.9 in the Coast Guard, and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey it is 7 per cent, as against 2.9.

Now, then, this bill as we have framed it will not begin to bring that percentage up to what it is in the Army and Navy, and yet the duties performed by these men to whom we are trying to give a rank commensurate with their duties are such that we ought to give it to them.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does this bill increase the pay of any officer over and beyond what the pay bill gives him? Does it not simply give him an opportunity of promotion to the rank and pay that the Congress has already provided?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; exactly. The increase in the pay in this bill is practically negligible.

Mr. BUTLER. I wanted to ask that question of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], but I did not have the opportunity. But the gentleman from Minnesota has now answered it. It does not increase the number of officers or the pay?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. APPLEBY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. APPLEBY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish the chart which has been prepared might be brought here from the lobby. I am sure if the Sergeant at Arms will bring it in it will add to the force of the argument.

In the first place, I wish to say I come from the State of New Jersey, along the seashore, where my district, taking in the coast from Sandy Hook at the entrance of New York Harbor to Barnegat Lighthouse, covers a stretch, I think, of nearly 100 miles of seashore property. I have watched the action of the Coast Guard since I was a boy, and am of the opinion that the acts of bravery done by that gallant body of men can not be surpassed by any acts of bravery in any department of the Army and Navy.

The Coast Guard, to begin with, is the old Life Saving Service, amalgamated with the United States Revenue Cutter Service, as they term it. During all of their service these men, especially the seamen, have been on duty 24 hours practically of each day, because the life-saving men, the crews, live apart from their families in the stations supported by the Government. There is no one living along the shore who will not agree with us that a northeast storm is liable to bring a steamer or a schooner ashore, and it is up to this Life Saving Service to get into communication from the shore by aid of a cannon ball, shooting it across the deck or the mast of the boat, and in that way rigging a breeches buoy, which brings the passengers ashore.

Many times that device is used when the weather is too rough to manage a surfboat. These men never stop to argue the question of whether or not they are to put to sea by boat or to shoot the line and bring the passengers ashore. I have seen many a shipwreck in which hundreds of men and women have been landed safely by these coast guards. Since they were amalgamated they have done still better service, because the Government has fitted up their stations with towers. They can see farther at sea and render still more heroic service. There is no reason, in my opinion, gentlemen, why the coast guards should not be placed on a parity with the Army and Navy. [Applause.]

So far as the officers are concerned and so far as the seamen are concerned, they are a specially trained lot of people. You may talk about recruiting them from the Middle West and elsewhere, but I will say to you that the best men in the Life Saving Service are the men who have been brought up on the ocean front, who as boys have been fishermen and have entered the service early in life. And when they once enter the service they very seldom leave it. Their records of bravery are a matter of history. They have been invaluable in this service to the Government, which should be in favor, it seems to me, of equalizing salaries, especially when the pay increase in question amounts to so little; and it seems almost folly that any man should raise a point against the equalization of rank sought to be accomplished by this bill.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. APPLEBY. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. As a matter of fact, these men are in actual, arduous, dangerous service all the time?

Mr. APPLEBY. Yes; for 24 hours each day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] has 11 minutes.

Mr. WINSLOW. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] if he desires to speak?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not care to speak now. I would like to get in under the five-minute rule.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAWES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard Service is the fire department of the sea. It is busy all the year around. We are talking about an increased merchant marine, increased number of ships, and certainly we are expanding our commerce and intercourse with foreign nations.

After long and careful hearings before our committee, I am quite confident that this bill will not cost the American Government to exceed $15,000 a year. All that these men are seeking is a fair deal, equal treatment with the Navy, some little added dignity, some little insignia that will cause the masters of merchant ships and others to give them more respect in the future than they have in the past. It is simply a square deal to a fine branch of our service, which since its incipiency has been called upon by the Navy and all the forces of our Government for effective service and has responded nobly on every occasion. This bill will cost the Government little, and one of the reasons why the House should give it favorable consideration is the fact that in a committee of 21 men who have considered this matter the voices in favor of the bill are almost unanimous. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back one minute. The gentleman from Massachusetts now has five minutes remaining. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge [Mr. WINSLOW] admitted in his opening statement that the main purpose of the bill is to provide for inequality of payment existing between the various branches of the service, namely, the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, and the like, and that it was considered and reported without regard to the Army pay bill. With the passage of the pay bill, which applies equally to the Coast Guard, there is little warrant for this bill.

I am quite well aware of the insidious attempts that have been made by the Coast Guard Service—formerly the Revenue Cutter Service—to try to put itself on a parity with the Navy. In spite of the good work performed by the Coast Guard, I still believe that in time of peace there is no parity between the two arms of the service. In time of war, when the Coast Guard is called upon, as during the last war, to perform dangerous service, there is a parity; but the special committee of the House and Senate which reported the Army pay bill took that phase of the matter under consideration and provided extra pay and allowances for the officers of the Coast Guard when brought into a war footing.

If the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had considered this bill in connection with the Army pay bill, I feel quite certain that they would not have reported this bill in its present form. The learned gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, asked the question whether this bill will affect salaries. If you pass this bill in its present form, the Army pay bill will raise their salaries. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut has pointed out to this House the danger of considering this bill piecemeal and making some special differentiation and discrimination as between other branches of the service.

What do we find in the Army and Navy and Coast Guard pay bill that specifically relates to the pay of this service? It was put in there with the idea to extend it to the Coast Guard—not a military branch of the service, but a civilian branch, not much more hazardous than the vocation of any man who sails the ocean in calm and storm.

Mr. LAYTON. What does the gentleman know about that?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been through more stress and storm perhaps than the able gentleman and physician who hails from the peaceful groves of Delaware.

Mr. LAYTON. No, you have not.

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 2 of the pay bill there is the following provision which relates specifically to the Coast Guard: "During the existence of a state of war, formally recognized by Congress, officers or grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, and first lieutenant of the Army holding their permanent or temporary positions as such, shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, and second periods, respectively, unless entitled under the foregoing provisions of this section to the pay of a higher period."

Here is a distinct provision which in time of war will, under the increase ranks as provided in the pending bill, increase the pay of all those officers.

In the Army pay bill what was done for this Coast Guard Service? No branch of the service received greater increases of allowances and salary in the Army pay bill than the Coast Guard Service. I have served here, intermittently, it is true, for a long time, and I remember the attempts made by the old Revenue Cutter Service to get a footing on the same level with the Navy. If they are on a par with the Navy, why are they not entirely taken over by the Navy? It is because the services are not the same. The Coast Guard is fundamentally civilian, and not military; it is mainly of the same character as any kind of seamanship. Why, gentlemen, reading from the report of the committee on the pay bill, under the base pay for commissioned officers of the Coast Guard under the old law, they received a total of $1,035,000. Under the 1920 scale they received a pay of $1,296,000. Under the existing Army and Coast Guard pay bill they receive $1,454,000, an increase of $158,000 even over the temporary pay bill that was in force during the war. Of course these amiable gentlemen connected with the Coast Guard Service, realizing that their increase pay under the temporary pay bill was coming to an end on June 30 last, introduced a bill providing for a permanent increase. We can not criticise them for that, but I base my opposition to it on the fact that no member of the committee has stated that he has given this bill any consideration in connection with the existing pay bill that applies to all these services, and every one who has studied that law even casually knows that the allowances for rental and subsistence are based upon grade and that they increase with grade. The base pay of a colonel under the pay bill varies from $3,500 to $4,000, and the allowances for subsistence vary from $960 to $1,440, and for rentals from $219 to $438. Under the base pay bill the number of allowances that are granted is based and determined upon the grade, and these Coast Guard men are making an insidious effort now to increase their grade.

Why, whoever heard of a constructor in the Army or Navy receiving rank and allowances. Why, we have many draftsmen in the service connected with the Army and Navy, and many constructors who have no rank, and no allowances for rent and subsistence, as this bill provides.

Mr. BUTLER. No; not constructors.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where in the Army and Navy do any constructors receive rank and allowances as in this bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The positions of constructor in the Navy are entirely occupied by first-class graduates of the Naval Academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have a civilian who came in years back, as many of these other men did, and by reason of this higher rank and these allowances you are going to dignify this civilian with a rank and give him allowances. I believe, and the chairman of the committee admits, that as this bill was not considered in connection with the pay bill to which it so directly relates, it should be recommitted to that great committee and be considered in connection with that bill. No hearings of any kind have been had, as far as this bill is concerned, since the pay bill was reported or passed by Congress.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. ROACH. The gentleman is discussing the increased cost under this bill. Did not the gentleman hear a statement by the chairman that it will not increase the cost exceeding $15,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. I questioned the chairman of the committee, and he was very kind to give me the best information he had, because there is nothing in the report that relates to increased cost. But when I see in the bill a provision made for additional numbers of commanders and lieutenant commanders—and under the bill a lieutenant commander will have the same status as a major—when I see an increased number of lieutenants and captains I know that when you increase those numbers, and they admit that it is going to provide more captains and commanders, that necessarily under the pay bill it gives them a greater allowance for subsistence and rentals. That accounts for the tremendous increase in the appropriation bill. The bill reported this morning contains an increase of $2,000,000 for pay of commissioned officers in the Coast Guard over that carried by last year's bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Let me call the gentleman's attention to a fact which he seems to have overlooked, that in the pay bill the pay is not based on grade and rank but the period of service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not said it was based on grade. I said, and no man will contradict me, that the allowance for subsistence and rental is based upon grade.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. If the gentleman will refer to section 6 he will find that the allowance for rentals and quarters is based on periods of service and not on grades.

Mr. STAFFORD. I call the gentleman's attention to section 5, which relates to allowances for subsistence, and section 6 relates to allowances for rental and is of the same general nature. I would not take this stand if I had not given this prior consideration. Section 6 the gentleman refers to relates to allowances for rentals.

I call attention to section 5 which says:

> To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to one subsistence allowance, to each officer receiving the base pay of the second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistance allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal of three subsistence allowances.

Section six makes greater differences in allowances for rental than section five as based on rank held by the officer.

By the provisions of this bill they admittedly raise the grade of these officers, civilian officers, in time of peace. Its purpose is to increase rank and increase officers in the higher ranks, and thereby increase their allowances in time of peace and their pay and allowances in time of war.

The Coast Guard was adequately taken care of in the pay bill, but it does not seem to know when to stop in its demands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has five minutes remaining.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, it is quite impossible for me in five minutes to correct the mistakes which have been uttered

by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has just preceded me. He seems to be on the wrong track altogether. I will undertake to reply to as many of his propositions as I can think of in the limited time at my disposal.

In the first place, I have here said not once but several times that the bill in the first instance came to the committee with the consideration involved of pay and rank, and that in the course of time the pay bill had been passed and that took out from our consideration the matter of pay. I said in connection with the discussion that an additional $13,000 would have to be made under the provisions of this bill because of the increase of a few officers—15 to 20—in several grades.

Our committee know about the progress of the pay bill, and we followed it and referred to it, and it was talked of by the members of the Coast Guard, who had to do with the bill while being framed and put in proper order. Nothing could represent more a flight of fancy, weird and lurid imagination, than the statement that this Coast Guard was a pink-tea organization. [Laughter.] Ye gods! When everything else fails and there is no man to be found to go out and tackle a wreck or a derelict or anything of that sort at sea, these fellows go out and it makes no difference what time—day or night, Sundays, or any other time—they throw a line to the ship in distress, hitch onto it, and if it breaks, no matter what kind of a sea, they go back again with another line, go out in small boats and do the work in the nastiest seas, and take more risk in seamanship than the members of the Navy ever do. [Applause.]

I am for the Navy and with the Navy, but that is not a seamanship job in the sense of the hazard that there is in the Coast Guard Service. The latter is a service for saving property and human life. It is an absolutely different job from that of the Navy.

The Navy goes out for the most part under fair skies and conditions, and most of the time they can put in if near the coast and avoid the storm. These Coast Guard fellows in the case of storm have to put out. That is the difference—one goes into it and the other goes away from it. And each has to do his duty according as he conducts himself.

Now, I want to make another suggestion.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Does this service protect the 3-mile limit and the liquor blockade?

Mr. WINSLOW. I assume that that is one of the objections the gentleman from Milwaukee had. Why, there is not a third assistant brew master in a third-class brewery who does not get more money than the best paid officer in the Coast Guard. I do not know but the brewery-wagon driver gets more; but, of course, in one case it is water and in the other it is not. However, that has nothing to do with it.

Here are the duties of the Coast Guard: First of all, to bring it home to every Member, their jurisdiction extends from Alaska down the Pacific, across the Panama Canal—although I may be wrong about that—and up the Atlantic coast, where every few miles there is a life-saving station. Then, of course, they are along the Great Lakes. We all know that. This Coast Guard, with a service of 107 ships, or thereabouts, is all of the time doing the mean, hard, dirty work that has to be done in the saving of property and lives. Then there is the work of the revenue department. If we had any pirates, they would have to chase them. If there is any smuggling in opium and in other things, they have to chase them. They have to maintain our great American fisheries in Alaska and around that point, and they stay up there in the cold of winter among the icebergs. All of the officers, from ensign up, have to do a turn at that service.

It is a hard-working service, and, if I have any judgment in the matter, as a matter of personal opinion I would say that to the ordinary navigator who went from the Coast Guard into the Navy in time of war and ran transports or worked in the Mediterranean, it must have seemed like a summer vacation as compared with the work that he had to do in patrolling and guarding the coast of the United States as a regular job. Of course, in war time, having big ships, they might strike a mine, and perhaps did strike mines; but they are in danger of striking what is the same as mines every time they head toward shore in a storm with a big ship in tow. They are educated men, just as highly educated as any officer of the Navy or any other officer of the Government. They are fine engineers. This talk that was put out here just before I rose about giving rank to a constructor seems ridiculous. As I understand it—and I hope I am not in error—at Annapolis they take the first 10 men of every class, in standing, and make constructors out of them, and they go right up to the rank of admiral, right straight along. Now, because there happens to be a man or two who are constructors in the Coast Guard, requiring equal wit, we have blackguarded the attempt to give them a little rank commensurate with their responsibilities and attainments. The Coast Guard may be a little brother of the Navy; yes; but I am reminded of the comparison that the president of a railroad made who wanted to get a pass over the New York Central. He sent in his name to the president of the New York Central, who said that he did not find the name of the president of this other railroad in Poore's Manual. He said, "I do not know your railroad." The little man said, "Well, what of it?" The president of the New York Central replied, "Why, we are a great big four-track line, and you are asking a pass over that and wanting to give one over yours in return." The little man replied, "You may have four lines of track, but the gauge of none of your track is any wider than that of mine." So it is with respect to this Coast Guard. It may be a little brother, but it is a twin, and it is just as important in the work of the family in carrying on the working of the Government as any other branch of the service. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the number of permanent commissioned line officers of the Coast Guard now authorized by law shall be distributed in grades, as follows: One commandant, 7 captains, 12 commanders, 35 lieutenant commanders, 37 lieutenants, and 77 lieutenants (junior grade) and ensigns; and the number of permanent commissioned engineer officers now authorized by law shall be distributed in grades, as follows: One engineer in chief, 3 captains (engineering), 6 commanders (engineering), 12 lieutenant commanders (engineering), 22 lieutenants (engineering), and 42 lieutenants (junior grade) (engineering) and ensigns (engineering). Promotions to the grades created by this act, namely, captain, captain (engineering), and commander (engineering), shall be made from the next lower grade by seniority: *Provided*, That lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade), both line and engineering, may be promoted, subject to examination as provided by law, without regard to number or length of service in grade, to such grades in the Coast Guard not above lieutenant commander or lieutenant commander (engineering) as correspond to the permanent ranks and grades that may be attained in accordance with law by line officers of the regular Navy of the same length of total commissioned service, and officers thus promoted shall be extra numbers in their respective grades, which extra numbers shall not at any one time exceed the following, respectively: Twenty lieutenant commanders, 15 lieutenants, 15 lieutenant commanders (engineering), and 8 lieutenants (engineering), but no officer shall be promoted under this proviso who would thereby be advanced in rank ahead of an officer in the same grade and corps whose name stands above his on the official precedence list: *Provided further*, That captains and captain (engineering) shall have the rank of, and be of corresponding grade to, captains in the Navy, and commanders (engineering) shall have the rank of, and be of corresponding grade to, commanders in the Navy.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have been asked to relate an experience I once had with the Coast Guard that might throw some light upon the character of work they are doing. In February, 1896, in crossing the Atlantic Ocean on the steamship *St. Paul*, of the American Line, we were in a race with the *Campaignia*, a competing British liner. That this 3,000-mile race continued for six days was not the fault of the passengers. At all events, as we approached New York Harbor we encountered a severe storm and a dense fog. At night we lost our way and also made a mistake in reading the soundings. We found ourselves grounded off the coast of New Jersey. We happened to be near a Coast Guard station. They fired a line across, another line was brought across, and then another, by means of which the captain of the Coast Guard reached our vessel in a breeches buoy, communicated directly with the commander of the vessel, and made arrangements as to what was to be done. They found it impossible by the use of a powerful tug, which was sent down from New York, to move the vessel, to pull her off the bottom. She remained there for two weeks battled by the waves. All during the forenoon of the day that we struck I saw the boys we are talking about here in this bill fight with the treacherous waves trying to get a lifeboat out to our vessel. They would run into the water pushing their boat, fighting the waves, until they were up to their hips, leap into the boat, grab the oars, and fight manfully to propel the boat out to where our vessel was grounded. Time and again they were carried back. Time and again they fought their way and came forward. They kept up the fight for six hours before the storm had quieted enough that they could reach our ship. In the meantime another vessel had been brought down from the city of New York and anchored in deep water, half a mile away. A ladder or stairway was put down on the outside of our vessel, with a little platform at the bottom. The passengers were then sent down that stairway one at a time and stood on the platform while the life-savers by terrific effort brought their boat, fighting the angry waves, under the platform. We were commanded to jump. We jumped into the boat, 8 feet below, and the waves would then carry it 50 or 75 feet away. These men

by heroic efforts would bring the boat back again, and another man would be commanded to jump. One after another we jumped into the boat until they had about 12 of us, and then they fought the waves on out to where the big boat was anchored in deeper water. I said to some one here a moment ago that I thought those waves were running as high as the statue on the Capitol dome. I know they were running as high as the dome itself, because I rode them. When we reached the other boat, it was a case of jump up, while they caught us by our hands and pulled us in. Then the Coast Guard would go back for another load, over and over again, until they had taken off, as I remember it, about 350 passengers. All were saved.

It was an unusual experience for a landlubber to ride ocean waves mountain high in a rowboat, and it has always impressed upon me the importance of the Coast Guard and the character of the work they are doing. I am heartily in favor of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the title of captain commandant in the Coast Guard is hereby changed to commandant. Hereafter the commandant shall be selected from the active list of line officers not below the grade of commander and shall have, while serving as commandant, the rank, pay, and allowances of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy: *Provided*, That any officer who shall hereafter serve as commandant shall, when retired, be retired with the rank of commandant and with the pay of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy on the retired list, and that an officer whose term of service as commandant has expired may be appointed a captain and shall be an additional number in that grade; but if not so appointed, he shall take the place on the lineal list in the grade that he would have attained had he not served as commandant and be an additional number in such grade: *Provided further*, That the engineer in chief, while so serving, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain (engineering) in the Coast Guard, and hereafter the engineer in chief shall be selected from the active list of engineer officers not below the grade of lieutenant commander (engineering): *And provided further*, That an officer who shall hereafter serve as engineer in chief shall, when retired, be retired with the rank of engineer in chief and with the pay of a captain (engineering) on the retired list, and that an officer whose term of service as engineer in chief has expired may be appointed a commander (engineering) and shall be an additional number in that grade; but if not so appointed, he shall take the place on the lineal list in the grade that he would have attained had he not served as engineer in chief and be an additional number in such grade: *And provided further*, That a constructor, after 10 years' commissioned service in the Revenue Cutter Service and Coast Guard, shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant commander, and after 20 years' commissioned service the rank, pay, and allowances of a commander.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 3, line 8, after the word "provided," strike out the word "that" in line 8, and all of lines 9, 10, and 11, down to and including the word "and" in line 12.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the part of the bill to which my amendment is directed provides that when the commandant of the Coast Guard has served in that capacity he shall draw the pay of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy. Immediately following that provision is a proviso that any officer who shall hereafter serve as commandant shall when retired draw the retired pay of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, and this language which I seek to strike out not only means that if he is retired while actually serving as commandant he shall receive this pay of rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy but if at any time he has ever served as commandant of the Coast Guard and shall thereafter be retired he will draw such retirement pay. The language immediately following that proviso provides that after such officer of the Coast Guard has served his term as commandant he shall be eligible for appointment to the grade of captain in the service. Now, I have no quarrel with that provision, because it might be very proper that he continue in the Coast Guard Service, and we all understand that these commandants are appointed by the President and serve for a term of four years. It might be a very proper thing that after four years of service as commandant that he be appointed to the grade of captain, so I do not seek to strike out that provision. If my amendment is adopted it will only strike out that part of the bill which provides for the retirement of these commandants not at their own rank but at the rank of a rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment of the gentleman is adopted it would not automatically preclude any commandant from being appointed to serve as captain, because if they are eligible to be retired upon the expiration of their term as commandant at the pay of a rear admiral then, of course, they would hesitate to go back and assume the rank of captain when if retired as a captain they are retired only on the pay of a captain?

Mr. BLACK. That, of course, might occur, but at the present time the commandant of the Coast Guard, if I remember correctly, is only 45 years of age.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; he has been in the service 44 years.

Mr. BLACK. Perhaps the gentleman is correct. I was just quoting from a hurried reading of the report, and on closer examination I find that it is the engineer in chief, Mr. Q. B. Newman, who is 45 years of age.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President, of course, would appoint as commandant a man in the rank of captain under this new law?

Mr. BLACK. Naturally.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is not one of these men who has not been in the service now for 36 years, so they would be eligible for retirement upon the completion of their term as commandant at the pay of a rear admiral.

Mr. BLACK. Not if my amendment is adopted. But even if it were so that does not present any reason why my amendment should not be adopted. My contention is that when an officer, either in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, is retired he should be retired on the rank and pay of the grade he is then serving and not at a higher rank.

The retirement provisions for Army, Navy, and Coast Guard officers are liberal enough now without adding to them such provisions as the one my amendment seeks to strike from the bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman says he has no quarrel with the clause wherein provision is made for the selection of a commandant with the rank of a rear admiral, but he objects to the retirement provision. Now, in the drawing of the present bill we have followed existing law with reference to the same proposition, which is as follows:

Any officer who shall hereafter serve as captain commandant shall when retired be retired with the rank of captain commandant and with the pay of a colonel in the Army on the retired list.

So the existing law being as it is we changed it only so as to give the commandant the rank of rear admiral, thereby continuing the whole thing in principle and permitting him to retire with the rank of rear admiral.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman says under existing law when a captain commandant is retired he retires with the pay of a retired colonel in the Army. Now, how can that pay correspond with the retired pay of an admiral of the lower grade when the retired pay of an admiral in the lower grade exceeds that of a colonel in the Army?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Of course when this provision of the law of 1908 was passed we then had the 1908 base pay, but since then we have the new pay bill wherein pay is based primarily on years of service. Under the terms of this new pay bill the present commandant with rank as a captain would draw more pay than a rear admiral (lower half). This particular provision would apply then to a man of 40 or more years of service and would not confer upon him any additional allowance than what he would have had he remained and retired as a captain and not as a rear admiral.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not true, under the law that the gentleman read just a moment ago, that the pay of a colonel in the Army at that time corresponded to the pay of a captain commandant?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Exactly.

Mr. BLACK. Is not that the present law?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not a fact that the pay of an admiral in the lower grade is greater than that of a captain commandant and the present provision will——

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. No; under the existing pay bill a rear admiral does not necessarily receive more pay than a captain of 30 or 40 years of service.

Mr. BLACK. Not necessarily; but then it would probably be larger. That is one reason for the language in the law.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Not in the Coast Guard, because of the long term of service of men holding the rank of captain.

Mr. BLACK. If that be true, why write it in the law? If under the provisions of the law without that language the pay would be as great as that of a rear admiral of the lower grade, why write in this bill the language that I have sought to strike out?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The principal object of the whole thing is to permit him to retire with the rank that corresponds to the pay which he receives.

Mr. BLACK. Because he receives a larger pay?

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the new law the captain or commandant corresponds with the rear admiral of the lower grade in the Navy. Under the old law the captain or commandant of the Coast Guard was supposed to correspond with a colonel in the Army.

Mr. BLACK. With the result that they receive a larger amount of retired pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may result in that.

Mr. BLACK. Will it not result in that because the rank of commandant corresponds with the rank of rear admiral of the lower grade?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak in reference to the bill without particular reference to the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to speak in reference to the bill without particular reference to the amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House when section 1 of the pending bill was read. If I had been, I would have made a statement in reference to it. I have a most sympathetic interest for any legislation which seeks to remove some of the injustices that exist under the present law in reference to the Coast Guard Service. The pending bill, however, in my judgment, is too liberal.

In justice to the committee reporting the bill, I recognize when the hearings were had and the bill prepared that the provisions of the joint pay bill had not then been considered. The joint pay bill has now corrected some of the complaints which the Coast Guard Service previously very properly urged against the old law. Let me briefly call attention to one or two provisions of section 1, which I feel are too liberal. I submit the increase in number of captains and commanders is too large when you consider the rule which obtains in reference to officer distribution in the Navy and Marine Corps. In the Navy the following rule obtains: Four captains to every officer above that grade, 7 commanders, 14 lieutenant commanders, 32 senior lieutenants, 43 junior officers.

This bill provides for the Coast Guard twice as many commanders as they now have, which is double the ratio of officer distribution in the Navy. Substantially the same rule of distribution obtains in the Marine Corps as in the Navy. To illustrate, the Marine Corps has now 20,000 enlisted men. The Coast Guard Service, under the bill now pending, will have not exceeding 4,000 enlisted men. In other words, the Marine Corps will have five times the enlisted strength of the Coast Guard, yet the Marine Corps will only have 45 commanders, whereas the Coast Guard under this bill will have 12. If the ratio provided in this bill obtained in the Marine Corps, they should have 60 commanders.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. WINSLOW. The point the gentleman raises is rather an adverse suggestion on account of the higher percentage of officers provided for in this bill, and it strikes me as being a very natural one; and I am led to think so because I studied it over myself. But it did not take long, when I began to look into it, to see why that was so. Now take a field force; it can have its proper proportion of officers that they can pick up in a mathematical order. They can have a quota of privates that come under that formation, a proper proportion so far as the officers go. But when you go into the ship business you must have a commanding officer in order to navigate that ship. The commander of the ship has to have his under officers in accordance with the needs of the ship, and he must have them in the ship.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman from Massachusetts criticises the position I take on the ground that the Marine Corps in peace times is a land force, and for that reason does not require so large a complement of officers as the Coast Guard Service, which is essentially a sea service. In other words, he feels that a service charged with the duty of manning ships is entitled to more officers than a land service.

Mr. WINSLOW. Quite so.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, the Navy is strictly a ship service, and it so happens that the percentage as to officer personnel in the Navy is the same as obtains in the Marine Corps; so the gentleman's criticism of my position can hardly be defended on the ground which he states.

Mr. WINSLOW. The same as the land force?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; the same as a land force, the proportion being 1, 4, 15, 37, 43.

Mr. WINSLOW. I grant that, and I further grant that if we were to put the Coast Guard in a position of proper equipment with respect to privates, as you might call them, or ordinary seamen, to make the relation whole, it would be possible there; but you could not get a Navy man to put to sea in a dory with the chances that these men take when they go out to rescue an ocean liner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the splendid service rendered at all times by the Coast Guard, and it is not my purpose to invite any comparison whatever between the merits of the Navy and the Coast Guard. They are both worthy, efficient, and meritorious. It so happens, however, that there is much hardship service in the Navy on small boats, such as submarines and destroyers; and both the Navy and the Coast Guard are called upon to perform duties in all kinds of weather, which duties often subject the officers and men to many discomforts and dangers. That, however, has nothing to do with the merits of the pending bill. The officers and enlisted personnel in both services are loyal and efficient.

Mr. WINSLOW. Will the gentleman indulge me a moment?

Mr. OLIVER. Let me finish, first, this thought. I have given the percentage ratio that obtains in both Navy and Marine Corps as to the distribution of officers, and I can but feel that it would be safe and proper to largely follow that rule in the distribution of officers in the Coast Guard Service.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. In just a moment. I am glad my friend, Mr. BUTLER, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, is on the floor, because I wish to call his attention to another fault in section 1 of this bill. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree with me that it is a bad idea to write into permanent law an authorization for extra numbers. Section 1, however, undertakes to provide for permanent extra numbers. I recognize that many of the officers now in the Coast Guard Service have been denied promotion in the past because of unusual conditions which obtained in that service under the old law, and some excuse might now be offered for carrying some of the present officer personnel as extra numbers, so as to provide for their promotions. This bill, however, provides permanently for extra numbers in the grades of lieutenant commanders and lieutenants. It also provides for one extra number in the grade of captain when the commander reverts to the status of captain under appointment. In other words, you will have in this service not alone the regular, permanent officer personnel, to wit, 1 admiral, 7 captains, 12 commanders, 35 lieutenant commanders, and 37 first lieutenants, but you will have in addition carried as extra numbers the following: 1 captain, 20 lieutenant commanders, 15 senior lieutenants. I can but feel that this is a bad provision of section 1.

The bill should be drafted in a liberal spirit, the Engineer Corps should be allowed grades of captain and commander, and the number of captains and commanders in the line should be increased; but I see no justification for giving to the service eight times as many captains as they now have, twice as many commanders, 24 additional lieutenant commanders, and 15 additional senior lieutenants.

I wish to call attention to another provision of section 1 which I feel is far-reaching and unjustified. This section authorizes promotion from lieutenant in the junior grade to lieutenant and lieutenant commander, irrespective of length of service, or of other rules and conditions which obtain in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps relative to promotions. In other words, this broad authority to thus promote junior lieutenants will not apply to any of the other services. Why should this authority be given by the pending bill to the Coast Guard Service alone?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that the time of the gentleman from Alabama be again extended. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to explain what I had in my mind when I had my colloquy with the chairman of the committee. We have 86,000 enlisted men in the Navy. Does my friend recall that we have 170 or 180 captains, one for every 500 men? Now there are 4,000 of these men, and how many captains do we get?

Mr. OLIVER. You get seven captains.

Mr. BUTLER. About the same proportion. That is what I had in my mind. I want to say to my friend that I will agree with him that this rule ought not have been set, but it is set for the Navy, and we ought to have some way of varying it. We have 86,000 enlisted men. You all recall the difficulty we had in fixing it at 86,000, and the captains in the Navy have been increased since that time. I think we have one now for every 400 or 500 men. I think it is liberal enough there. I think it is too liberal in the Navy.

Mr. OLIVER. I believe the gentleman's position is that in the Navy the officer strength should be based on the enlisted personnel actually appropriated for.

Mr. BUTLER. I think so.

Mr. OLIVER. And not the authorized strength.

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The old law bases it on the authorized strength of the Navy. In the Coast Guard Service the authorized strength is not fixed by law but is fixed by Congress in the appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. We are adopting the same rule, because Congress fixes the authorized strength of this service, and the same rule in the Navy obtains absolutely.

Mr. BUTLER. That is true.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Let me say that in the Navy the men are dealt with in large units by officers of high rank, whereas in this service the units are very small, and we do not have any use for captains.

Mr. BUTLER. The men who command should have the rank.

Mr. OLIVER. Let me read the language in section 1 which I have called attention to as authorizing liberal promotions from the junior grade:

Provided, That lieutenants and lieutenants junior grade, both line and engineering, may be promoted subject to examination as provided by law without regard to number or length of service in grade to such grades in the Coast Guard not above lieutenant commander or lieutenant commander engineer, to correspond with the permanent rank and grade.

Doubtless the committee's reason for inserting that provision was due to the fact that when they were considering this bill there were many worthy officers in the service who had been denied promotions because, under existing law, there were very few officers authorized in the higher grades. The committee then were considering the pay as well as the commission status of these officers, and in order to reward efficient officers with long service this provision was inserted. The joint pay bill which the gentleman from Minnesota refers to took care of that and was passed after this bill was prepared. It will be recalled that the joint pay bill authorizes an officer, after certain length of service, to draw the pay of the next higher grade, thereby giving to such officer what the committee must have had in mind when they wrote this provision in section 1 of the pending bill.

I feel that the pending bill has not been carefully drawn, and I think the reason why it is now open to criticism is due to the fact that the committee, when they were preparing the bill, were seeking to provide for this service before the joint pay bill was enacted, and that had the joint pay bill been passed before this bill was prepared many of the provisions now contained herein would not have been inserted.

Take the last section. I mention it now, because important committee work will prevent me from being present when that section is reached. You are asked to adopt in section 3 a provision long since repealed as to the other services, and now applying to no service. It has been expressly repealed as to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and what good reason can now be advanced why the last proviso in section 3 should be reenacted for the Coast Guard Service alone?

If you pass the bill in its present form, giving a preferential right to senior and junior lieutenants to be advanced irrespective of length of service, and reviving only for the Coast Guard, as section 3 undertakes to do, a law long since repealed as to all other services, you will unquestionably have the other services later demanding this same legislation.

The main argument in support of the joint pay bill for Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Public Health Service, Geodetic Survey, and Coast Guard was to place all of the services on the same basis. The joint pay bill has been passed and all the services have been placed on the same basis; then why should you now seek to give, by this bill, rights as to promotion and retirement that do not obtain in reference to any of the other services?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask for just one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks that his time be increased one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. This provision in section 3 which seeks to give to officers when retired advanced rank should not be adopted. Certainly the law in reference to promotions and retirements in the services covered by the joint pay bill should be uniform, and I hope that the House, when it comes to consider section 3, will strike out the proviso which gives to officers in the Coast Guard Service retirement rights denied to officers in every other service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That hereafter no commissioned officer of the Coast Guard shall be promoted to a higher grade or rank on the active list, except to commandant or to engineer in chief, until his mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform all the duties of such higher grade or rank have been established to the satisfaction of a board of examining officers appointed by the President, and until he has been examined by a board of medical officers and pronounced physically qualified to perform all the duties of such higher grade or rank: *Provided*, That if any commissioned officer shall fail in his physical examination for promotion and be found incapacitated for service by reason of physical disability contracted in the line of duty, he shall be retired with the rank to which his seniority entitled him to be promoted: *Provided further*, That hereafter when a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard who has had 40 years' service shall retire he shall be placed on the retired list with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by him at the time of retirement; and, in the case of a captain, the rank and retired pay of one grade above shall be the rank of commodore and the pay of a commodore in the Navy on the retired list.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 2, after the word "promoted," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss this amendment at any considerable length, because the question presented has been ably discussed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], who for many years was a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and who had a great deal to do with the framing of the general Army and Navy pay increase bill, some of which he ably and vigorously opposed. I do not believe that we ought at this time to pass a law to retire one particular class of commissioned officers and provide that they shall be placed on the retired list with the rank and retired pay of one grade above that actually held by them at the time of retirement. It may be said in defense of this provision that it only applies to officers who have served 40 years. It is not an unfortunate thing for a man to be attached to a good position for 40 years. I see no calamity in that. It looks to me like good fortune. There are some of us who perhaps would like to have the record of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Uncle JOE CANNON, and serve our district as he has served his district in the House for over 40 years. We would be very glad to do that without any retirement pay.

Now, I think that we are going far enough and are displaying generosity enough when we retire these men at the rank and retirement pay of the grade which they are holding at the time of retirement.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's contention is natural, but, like many another case, he has not gone through with the thought about it. In the Navy, when a man gets to be 56 years old, if he has not reached the rank of a rear admiral, he is retired automatically, and that takes care of him. But he has had a chance to go on and be a rear admiral or a vice admiral or an admiral and get all the attending benefits. But under the arrangement of this bill there is no such opportunity for the Coast Guard officer. No better answer can be made to the gentleman from Texas than a quotation from the report on this bill. I will read it:

Referring to the last proviso of section 3, an officer in the Army or Navy who has had 40 years' service has reached, in a large majority of cases, the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral, and, when retired, will retire with such rank. This bill provides for no rank for officers on the active list of the Coast Guard above that of captain, except in the one case of the commandant. Having in mind the limitation in opportunity for advancement, as compared with that existing in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, that will exist in the Coast Guard even under the terms of this bill, it is thought that a commissioned officer who has served his country faithfully for 40 years should, when retired, have the privilege of retiring in the next higher grade.

The grade next above captain in the Coast Guard will be, under the terms of this bill, that of commandant. A captain of over 40 years' service, but who has never in fact served as commandant, should not have on the retired list the title of commandant; hence such an officer, under the language in section 3, would have the rank of commodore. The pay of a commodore in the Navy on the retired list is the same as that of a rear admiral (lower half) on the retired list.

The point is this: Where, as in the Coast Guard, officers can never get pay, save in the case of commandant, above the

rank of captain, they can serve more years than would retire them in the Navy. They could keep right on to the age of 64 and give perfectly good service, which would make them in the Navy a rear admiral, or in the Army a brigadier general at least. Yet they never get above the rank of captain in the Coast Guard, and the idea here is to do something which will give the Coast Guard officers the benefit accruing from long, faithful, and efficient service with a chance, in that way, to retire one grade up, which, according to the terms of the bill, is with the rank of commodore.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman recognizes that in these retirement laws one branch of the service uses one precedent in order to get legislation for its particular branch of the service. Does not the gentleman believe that if we enact a provision of this kind then the Navy will be coming to Congress asking that when their officers are retired they be retired at the rank and pay just above that they are holding at the time of retirement?

Mr. WINSLOW. It may be that the Navy will be thus coming to Congress.

Mr. BLACK. And does the gentleman think we should set such a precedent?

Mr. WINSLOW. I think they may be coming to Congress, but because they come is no reason for us to grant their request. We are now trying to establish equality between these Coast Guard men and the Navy, as the Navy is to-day. When the Navy wants to come for more, which will put them up again ahead of the general establishment level, it will be the time to deny the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSLOW. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. It is my recollection that below the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy, when an officer is retired he has the advantage of increased rank. Consequently this bill seems to me to be like unto that provision of the Navy, as I recall it.

Mr. WINSLOW. It so follows.

Mr. BUTLER. Very few of these men will ever reach the rank above that of commander, and the rank of commander corresponds to that of major in the Army. The retired pay would not be very great, even after 40 years' service. I have had it all figured out because I feel somewhat economical these days, and I wanted to know what this provision in the bill would cost. Has the gentleman from Massachusetts had it figured out as to how much this will cost additional? The difference in pay by reason of this provision in the case of a commander when he is retired as a captain will be about $187.50 a year more.

Mr. WINSLOW. There are only a few who are likely to retire in the next 10 years.

Mr. BUTLER. It is only a trifle, and the chances are that but few will ever get above the rank of commander. If one does, then he ought to have the chance in his old age to retire with $187.50 more.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of giving expression to my great appreciation of this work. When we understand what the Coast Guard Service means, with tens of thousands of miles of coast to guard which the United States requires, and when we understand the splendid service that has been rendered and is being rendered by this devoted band of men, and when we realize that we have not even rendered ordinary justice to them, I feel that when justice is being done we ought not to hesitate. This service is in many respects the most dangerous and the hardest service done by any single body of men in the service of the United States, and when we take that into consideration I think we might well be excused if we are even a little generous in our treatment of them. I myself have seen something of the work of these men, although I have not had great opportunity to observe it. They have my admiration. I have learned from others what they have done for the country in the hours when such work was most needed. I have learned of their splendid courage, of their fortitude, of their readiness to serve even when it would seem they were not under obligation to serve, when reason seemed to dictate that they should not serve, and I feel I ought to say at least a word in praise of such service and ask this committee to deal with them justly in the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Whenever a change is suggested as to some provision of this bill which sets a bad precedent the only argument that we have against the proposed change is some eulogy of the service of the Coast Guard. All of us admit that the service is first class, the very best that anyone could wish, and what has been said in behalf of the service by a few could be said by all. However, that is no reason, that is no argument for passing this bill with this provision in it, which may set a very dangerous precedent that will hereafter plague us. When this bill was first read and when the distinguished chairman of the committee was explaining its provisions I called attention to this particular provision in the bill now sought to be stricken out by the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BLACK] and I asked the chairman what was the precedent for it. He said that there was a provision giving this same privilege to the naval officers. I understand that has all been done away with. I understand there is no provision now for retirement of any officer of the Government at a grade higher than that which he held at the time of retirement. If that is not the case, I would like to have some one correct me. If there is no law, then, now retiring any officer of this Government at a grade higher than that held by him at the time of his retirement, why begin this precedent over again? Why give the Navy Department an excuse to come back to us and say that we did it for the Coast Guard and should do it for them? Why give the Army an excuse to say that because we did it for the Coast Guard we should do it for them? Why continue this clamor made by these various departments of the Government? I think the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. BLACK] ought to be agreed to by this House and this bad feature of the bill stricken out.

I think we should adopt the suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] that the bill should go back to this committee, to be carefully considered by it, which was also suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], so that the committee may view it with regard to the pay bill. They would then find out exactly what the bill means and what its results will be. It is mere guesswork now, based on the suggestion of one or two parties as to what its provisions may result in in the way of cost. I think the Black amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK) there were—ayes 22, noes 65.

Mr. BLACK. I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That an ensign, an ensign (engineering), or a district superintendent with the rank of ensign, shall be required to complete three years' service in his grade, after which he shall be eligible for promotion to the next higher grade without regard to the number already in that higher grade.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this motion in order to discuss for a few minutes the provisions of the bill and also some of the arguments made during this discussion. One of the objections raised is that the provision in section 1 fixing the number of officers is too liberal. I am not on the committee reporting the bill, but because I served on the special committee that reported the pay bill I have considered the provisions of this bill in connection with the pay bill. I find that the provisions of section 1 merely seek to apply to the Coast Guard the same law that now regulates the commissioned personnel of the Navy. In fact, it is not as liberal as the law governing the Navy. In the Navy the number of line officers is regulated by 4 per cent of the enlisted personnel.

Mr. BUTLER. They have more than 4 per cent now.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman is correct, then the provision in section 1 is not as liberal as that of the Navy. Now, in the staff corps of the Navy there is no limit other than——

Mr. BUTLER. As many as they can get.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Other than the limitation as to the grade of his running mate in the line, with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is more familiar than I am. But in this bill there is a specific limitation, so that the provision is not as liberal as that governing the Navy nor of the Army.

Now the other thing to which I want to refer is this: It was stated that as a result of the pay bill there is an estimate before the Committee on Appropriations of $2,000,000 more than last year for pay for the Coast Guard. Now the fact is that that is incorrect. It is a statement that could easily be made by any gentleman, because he would be deceived by the estimates

submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and by the statistical report of that committee. The fact is that if my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will look at the hearings on the Treasury bill, he will find that of the amount estimated for, $640,000 is to be made immediately available to take care of a deficiency existing this year, and, as a matter of fact, the Coast Guard is the one service that has submitted an estimate to the Committee on Appropriations for pay for the year 1924 that is less than was estimated for when the pay bill was under discussion. [Applause.] They estimated when the pay bill was under discussion that they would need $40,000 more than they now find will be actually needed, which shows they were exceedingly conservative in their estimates, and justifies confidence in their statements.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know what my good friend is referring to. And that is why I do not yield in the few minutes I have. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that if he will look at the estimate, I do not blame him——

Mr. STAFFORD. Look at the report.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. He will be deceived by it because it does not appear there that when the Treasury bill containing the appropriations for the Coast Guard Service passed the Congress last year it was based on the law of 1908, and it did not include the temporary pay or bonus. After that when the Army and Navy bill went through in the latter part of the session there was added in the Senate the additional amount made necessary by the pay bill, but the Coast Guard Service does not have sufficient money for the pay of the officers and the allowances which were provided for in the pay bill. Now they have got to come in and get that money. The Budget Bureau instead of submitting an estimate for a deficiency merely included the $640,000 in the estimate for next year, asking that it may be made immediately available, and that deceived the gentleman from Wisconsin. The actual fact is it is $600,000 more than the 1908 law, and $200,000 less than was appropriated under the act of 1919 for all years since that time.

Mr. BUTLER. I have doubted very much whether that new pay bill was going to result in a saving of money to this Government. They told me it is going to save $28,000,000 in actual money.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It saved you in this year $240,000 for the Coast Guard alone. It is going to save just what was estimated, but not $28,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. I know, but how much more will the Coast Guard cost this next year than two years ago?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It will cost you $200,000 less than it has cost since you passed the temporary pay act or bonus, as you prefer to call it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was making my statement on the report of the gentleman's committee. I thought that was absolutely O. K.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Of course, I am not on the subcommittee on the Treasury which made that report. That was the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The difference between the gentleman and myself was that when I read that statement I saw it was wrong. If you will look at page 232 of the hearings you will find, as I have found, the explanation—that the large increase is due to the $640,000 which is included in the estimate for next year, but will be spent this year, and the amount for rations.

Mr. BUTLER. Now let us fix it in mind once for all. The gentleman has the figures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman tell us how much more the Coast Guard will cost us in the coming year than it cost us prior to the time we put the bonus on?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It will cost you $600,000 more than the old law of 1908.

Mr. BUTLER. Consequently, we shall not have the result of making any saving of $28,000,000 by reason of this pay bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Nobody ever contended at the time the pay bill was under consideration—nobody who was familiar with the bill—that it meant any saving under the law of 1908. It was stated time and time again that it meant an increase over the law of 1908, and the House voted for it because they thought there should be an increase over the law of 1908. That was the purpose of the legislation, to prevent a return to the pay of 1908, which would have demoralized the services. But we did claim there would be a decrease under the bonus act, and there will be.

Mr. BUTLER. It would be 33 per cent?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know the percentage. It is $200,000 less than the pay you provided in your bill in 1918 or 1919, and $600,000 more than the law of 1908. And the saving is $40,000 more than we said at that time would be saved. I feel satisfied the savings estimated at the time of the passage of the pay bill will be made.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. What part of that saving will be from the enlisted personnel?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. A considerable percentage in the Army. There are so many enlisted men as compared with officers that the largest saving must be from the enlisted men. There will also be some saving from the men in the Navy, but not as much. It has in no way affected recruiting, as the service now offers to the enlisted man greater opportunities if he remains in it. As I understand the bill there are 12 men who will receive an increase in compensation. For all the rest of the commissioned personnel there is no increase. It simply gives to these officers the rank to which they are entitled. They already receive the pay, so I see no objection to giving them the rank. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that my good friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], one of the members of the committee who reported the pay bill, is rather sensitive of the progeny that is coming forth as the result of his efforts and those of others on the special committee; but I wish to repeat what I called to the attention of the House in my speech under general debate when I read from the report of the pay bill prepared by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE]. On page 2 of that report we find this estimate, based upon the Budget estimate: Pay of officers of the Coast Guard, if there were no legislation, under the base pay law of 1908, a total of $1,035,925; based on the temporary increased pay law of 1920, $1,296,748, an increase of over $260,000; under the recent pay bill, which has gone into effect, the estimate is $1,454,450, or $418,000 more than what they originally received under the basic pay law prior to the war, a few more than 300 receiving a total increase in pay and allowances of $418,000, more than a thousand dollars to each officer, and yet they are not satisfied.

I have nothing further to submit to the House, because the report on this bill is vapid so far as the expense that will be occasioned by the passage of this bill. I did have a copy of the report of the Committee on Appropriations accompanying the bill introduced this morning, so that I acted in good faith in presenting the figures to the committee, and from the report, on page 14, I called attention, in reference to the Coast Guard, to appropriations for 1923, $6,297,398; estimate for 1924, $8,340,379. Amount recommended in the pending bill, $8,300,000; increase, compared with 1923 appropriation, $2,002,602.

I am not a member of the committee and I have not the benefit of the erudition that comes from membership on the subcomittee reporting that bill, but I rely on the report that was submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], who had charge of the Army and Navy and Coast Guard pay bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Had the gentleman an opportunity to read the hearings?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. I stated that I relied entirely upon the report accompanying the pay bill and on the report accompanying the appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will permit me, I did not question his good faith in making the statement, but I tell him that it does not state in that report from the Treasury that the sum of $393,000 carried for rations is now carried for allowances.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the report of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] it was estimated that the pay of the commissioned officers of the Coast Guard would be $418,000 more than the original base pay—more, according to that estimate, than any other branch of the service received.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that $397,000 heretofore carried in rations for the Coast Guard is now carried in the items contained in the report he has in his hand for pay and allowances, and a corresponding reduction is made in rations.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was not included in the report of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] which accompanied the pay bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that report he stated that the increased pay for officers of the Coast Guard under the new arrangement would be $418,000 more than the original base pay.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I again repeat that the officers of the Coast Guard, under the pay bill, receive greater increases in pay or allowances, which is the same as pay, than any other branch of the service, either Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Public Health Service, or Coast and Geodetic Survey. They never know when they have enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and finished the reading of the bill.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10531) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum of the House is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. WINSLOW. Let us get the previous question ordered.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is too late to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has announced that no quorum is present.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I did not know the Chair had made the announcement.

Mr. WINSLOW. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Edmonds	Kreider	Rodenberg
Ansorge	Fairchild	Kunz	Rose
Anthony	Fenn	Langley	Rosenbloom
Atkeson	Fordney	Larson, Minn.	Rossdale
Benham	Frear	Lazaro	Rucker
Bird	Free	Lee, Ga.	Ryan
Blakeney	Freeman	Lee, N. Y.	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Fulmer	Linthicum	Schall
Bond	Funk	Luce	Sisson
Brand	Gahn	Lubring	Slemp
Brennan	Gallivan	McArthur	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Glynn	McClintic	Stedman
Brooks, Pa.	Gorman	McCormick	Stiness
Brown, Tenn.	Gould	McFadden	Stoll
Browne, Wis.	Griest	McKenzie	Strong, Pa.
Burdick	Hammer	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sullivan
Burke	Hardy, Tex.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Tague
Burroughs	Hays	Maloney	Taylor, Ark.
Campbell, Kans.	Henry	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Herrick	Martin	Taylor, N. J.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hersey	Mead	Thomas
Chandler, Okla.	Hill	Merritt	Thompson
Clark, Fla.	Himes	Michaelson	Tincher
Classon	Hogan	Millspaugh	Tucker
Clouse	Huck	Montoya	Upshaw
Codd	Hukriede	O'Connor	Vare
Collins	Husted	Olpp	Volk
Colton	Ireland	Osborne	Volstead
Connolly, Pa.	James	Overstreet	Walters
Copley	Johnson, Ky.	Park, Ga.	Webster
Coughlin	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Wheeler
Crago	Jones, Pa.	Patterson, Mo.	Williams, Tex.
Cullen	Kahn	Patterson, N. J.	Wise
Darrow	Kelley, Mich.	Perlman	Wood, Ind.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Pringey	Wright
Deal	Kiess	Purnell	Wurzbach
Doughton	Kindred	Rainey, Ala.	Wyant
Drane	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ill.	Yates
Dunbar	Kitchin	Ramseyer	
Dunn	Kleczka	Reber	
Dyer	Knight	Riddick	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 270 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WINSLOW. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WINSLOW. I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on that motion I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on that motion he moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] The Chair has counted 217 and there are many more whom the Chair has not counted. A quorum is present.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for a division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 12, noes 214.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 219, noes 13.

Accordingly the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. WINSLOW, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. DOC. NO. 270).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I submit herewith the eighth annual report of the committee for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

The attention of the Congress is invited to the presentation by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics of a national aeronautical policy at the conclusion of its report. The constructive recommendations therein contained for the advancement of aeronautics deserve the thoughtful consideration of all Members of the Congress.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

VIRGIN ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

PANAMA CANAL.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with paragraph 5, section 2, of the Army appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, I transmit the sixth annual report of the Council of National Defense for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States, approved January 16, 1883, I transmit herewith the thirty-ninth annual report of the United States Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

FRANCHISES GRANTED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 38 of the act approved March 2, 1917 (39 Stat. 951), entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I transmit herewith certified copies of each of 26 franchises granted by the Public Service Commission of Porto Rico. The copies of the franchises inclosed are described in the accompanying letter from the Secretary of War transmitting them to me.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1922.*

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of the cost of transportation for certain supplies purchased by the Military Establishment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution providing for the filling of two vacancies that will occur on January 14, 1923, and March 1, 1923, respectively, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 107. An act for the relief of Robert Edgar Zeigler; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1511. An act for the relief of Sophie Caffrey; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2371. An act to further amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effective provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2390. An act to redistribute the number of officers in the several grades of the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1600. An act for the relief of Annie McColgan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3136. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3588. An act granting certain lands to the city of Ogden, Utah, to protect the watershed of the water-supply system of said city; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3595. An act to reimburse Rube Allen for losses and damages sustained by him through the negligent dipping of tick-infested cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3791. An act for the relief of William R. Bradley, former acting collector of internal revenue for South Carolina; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3928. An act for the relief of the State of New York; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 3962. An act to prohibit the sending of threatening letters through the mails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MCARTHUR (at the request of Mr. HAWLEY), beginning December 4 and continuing during the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. TUCKER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. VOLK (at the request of Mr. SIEGEL), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HAMMER, for five days, on account of sickness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 7, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

776. A letter from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, transmitting report of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

777. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report which covers the administration of what is known as the war minerals relief act to and including November 30, 1922; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

778. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting statement of expenditures made by the Internal Revenue Bureau during the fiscal year 1922 under the appropriation "Refunding taxes illegally collected, claims accrued prior to July 1, 1920"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

779. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Ordnance, inclosing statement of the cost of manufacture at the national armories for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

780. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report covering publications issued by the War Department during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

781. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting statement showing in detail what officers and employees of the War Department have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

782. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

783. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting statement of the expenditures under appropriations for the United States Court of Customs Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

784. A letter from the Librarian of the Library of Congress, transmitting annual report of the superintendent of the Library Building and Grounds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the Library.

785. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting statement showing the number of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12846) granting a pension to Frank Karasewski; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13017) granting an increase of pension to Alexander LeClaire; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 13181) to provide for the manufacture of explosives for the use of the Army and Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13182) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13183) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat, and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 13184) to prevent open conflict between State and Federal officers, and to allay the present unrest of labor in every State of the Union, and to amend the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13185) to extend the insurance and collect-on-delivery service to third-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13186) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Thief River Falls, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13187) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Detroit, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 13188) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Phillipsburg, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13189) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Englewood, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13190) for the erection of a public building at Kaufman, Kaufman County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13191) for the erection of a public building at Mineola, Wood County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13192) for the erection of a public building at Wills Point, Van Zandt County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13193) for the erection of a public building at Athens, Henderson County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 13194) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 13195) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 13196) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to amend the Federal farm loan act, to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 13197) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Lees Summit, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 13198) to amend the third paragraph of paragraph 1506 of the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 13199) to provide for the purchase of additional land for Wahpeton Indian School; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 13200) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 13201) to provide further for the national security and defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 400) to promote peace, and to equalize the burdens and to minify the profits of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 401) authorizing the Secretary of War to detail buglers to American military cemeteries in France in which are buried American soldiers who died in the service during the late war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 402) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Portage Bay and adjacent bays, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 403) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of William Henry Bay, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 404) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Dry Pass, Shakan Bay, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolution (H. Res. 462) calling for an investigation of the activities of the Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan (Inc.) and an investigation of the returns made by this organization to the collector of internal revenue; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 13202) for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 13203) to correct the military record of Jacob Shuey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 13204) granting a pension to Lizzie E. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 13205) for the relief of the American Trust Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13206) granting a pension to Sarah Birch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13207) granting a pension to Nicholas Gross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 13208) for the relief of Charles F. Peirce; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 13209) granting a pension to Bennett D. Haeussler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 13210) granting an increase of pension to Edna M. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 13211) granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13212) granting an increase of pension to Hannah W. Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 13213) granting a pension to Julia A. Pulsifer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13214) providing for the examination and survey of Jones Inlet, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13215) providing for the examination and survey of Manhasset Bay, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 13216) granting a pension to Anna Ganderup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 13217) for the relief of William W. Gillespy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13218) for the relief of George W. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 13219) granting an increase of pension to Roy H. Weaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 13220) for the relief of L. A. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13221) for the relief of George Arthur Holliday; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 13222) granting a pension to Peter Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13223) granting a pension to Samuel Sterling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13224) granting a pension to James E. McAlexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13225) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Winton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13226) granting a pension to William K. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13227) granting a pension to George W. Camp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13228) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. McClure; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 13229) granting a pension to Horace Clive Gray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13230) granting an increase of pension to Blaine Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 13231) granting a pension to August Richards; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6527. By Mr. CRISP: Petition of R. O. Stone and others, favoring the repeal of section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6528. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the Inter-Lake Yachting Association, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the passage of H. R. 10531; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6529. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of James P. Scott and others, of Waverley, Mass., favoring a modification of the immigration laws to permit the immigration of the refugees of the Near East into the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6530. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Federation of Polish Hebrews of America, New York City, N. Y., relative to amending the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6531. Also, petition of the National Bank of Commerce of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., relative to branch banking; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6532. By Mr. A. P. NELSON: Petition of citizens of Spooner, Wis., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms—internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6533. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the congregation of the Barre Center Presbyterian Church, New York, urging legislation empowering the President to take the necessary steps for the protection of the Christian population in the Near East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6534. By Mr. SHREVE: Resolution of Diamond Chapter, No. 120, Order of the Eastern Star, Linesville, Pa., favoring the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill; to the Committee on Education.

6535. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of the local Federation of Shop Craft of New Rockford, N. Dak., protesting against the condition of railroad equipment and asking that steps be taken for the protection of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6536. Also, petition of Mrs. Donald Stewart and 34 others, of Flaxton and Bowbells, N. Dak., urging the passage of legislation for the stabilization of prices of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6537. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Worth Bagley Post, No. 9, National Soldiers' Home, Bath, Me., favoring support of the Chandler bill (H. R. 9198) increasing the rates of pension for survivors of the war with Spain and the Philippine insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, all days are Thine, whether of cloud or sunshine, whether of adversity or prosperity, and we ask Thy help that we may use them as given to us by Thee for our highest welfare, and that we may serve Thee most acceptably. Be with us through this day, and may every duty be assumed with the consciousness of Thy presence and Thy wisdom; and so lead us onward ever to Thy glory. For Christ Jesus' sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a communication from the Governor of Michigan, which I desire to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN, *Executive Office, Lansing.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Michigan, I, Alexander J. Groesbeck, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint JAMES COUZENS a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Truman H. Newberry, is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor, Alexander J. Groesbeck, and our seal hereto affixed at Lansing, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.] ALEX. J. GROESBECK, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

CHAS. J. DELAND, *Secretary of State.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on the files of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. COUZENS is present and ready to take the oath.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator appointed will present himself at the desk and receive the oath of office.

Mr. COUZENS, escorted by Mr. TOWNSEND, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him he took his seat in the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10531) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PENNSYLVANIA SENATORIAL ELECTION RETURNS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Pennsylvania, transmitting, in compliance with State law, official returns of the election held on November 7, 1922, in the several counties of the Commonwealth for the offices of United States Senator for the term ending March 4, 1923; for the term beginning March 4, 1923; and for the term ending March 4, 1927, which was ordered to be placed on file.

TRAVELING EXPENSES, UNITED STATES BOTANIC GARDEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the director of the United States Botanic Garden, made pursuant to law, showing traveling expenses of officials and employees of the Botanic Garden on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirty-sixth annual report of the commission, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of the board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the commission for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1921, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT PUBLICATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report showing publications received and distributed by the Agricultural Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report giving in detail the aggregate number of publications issued by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, together with the cost of preparation, paper, and printing of each publication and the number of each distributed, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS.

Mr. LADD presented petitions of A. E. Anderson and 34 others, of Carrington; Jacob Fjarli and 64 others, of Tunbridge; F. G. Mattoon and 10 others, of Underwood; Ted. B. Horgan and 9 others, of Neche; Alex Dagell and 56 others, of Walhalla; Arthur Johnson and 12 others, of Alexander; And. H. Oksendahl and 22 others, of Tunbridge; Elizabeth Tysver and 9 others, of Hazen; Tom T. Nelson and 22 others, of Lansford; Michael Templien and 8 others, of Kulm; Ole L. Moen and 6 others, of Lisbon; Mrs. P. H. Chase and 6 others, of Eckman; John E. Johnson and 12 others, of Killdeer; Mathies Olstad and 15 others, of Galesburg; John Susak and 9 others, of Minot; Mrs. Donald Stewart and 51 others, of Flaxton; John Fenster and 9 others, of Noonan; Louis C. Ralsoig and 8 others of Arnegard; Ole Hefte and 78 others, of Driscoll; Andrew Gilbertson and 46 others, of Medina, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4108) for the relief of Elizabeth A. Maynard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4109) to authorize the Baptist National Hospital Association (Inc.) to use and occupy certain land in the Hot Springs National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4110) to amend the act of August 15, 1921, entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in live stock, live-stock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HARRELD:

A bill (S. 4111) granting a pension to Augusta Myers; and

A bill (S. 4112) granting a pension to Joseph A. Branstetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 4113) for the relief of Helene M. Layton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4114) for the relief of Bertha N. Rich; to the Committee on Claims.

By. Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 4115) granting a pension to Thomas Gorman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4116) granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 4117) authorizing the closing of certain portions of Grant Road in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4118) to create the Arbitration Commission, United States Shipping Board, and to amend the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 10531) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The bill (S. 214) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. The calendar was called just day before yesterday. Is it advisable to go over it again to-day?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There may be some measures on the calendar that Senators may desire to call up, and an opportunity will be given for those who desire to have a bill considered to move to take it up if we call the calendar in the ordinary way, as I hope it is being called. I have no desire to have the bill just referred to passed over, but I presume it can go over by unanimous consent.

The bill (S. 1467) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1016) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it seems to me if we are going to take up the calendar in this way absent Senators ought to be apprised of the fact. A good many Senators have been busy in committee rooms this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator we went through the calendar only day before yesterday and every bill on the calendar was called. Any bill can be taken up now on motion.

Mr. SMITH. That is exactly the point I had in mind.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If we have not anything else to do, it gives a Senator who desires it an opportunity to test the Senate as to whether it will consider a bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the thought I had in mind.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Smith
Bayard	George	McNary	Smoot
Borah	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Harreld	Nelson	Sterling
Brookhart	Harris	New	Sutherland
Broussard	Harrison	Nicholson	Townsend
Calder	Heflin	Norbeck	Trammell
Capper	Johnson	Norris	Underwood
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Kellogg	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Kendrick	Pepper	Warren
Cummins	Keyes	Pittman	Watson
Curtis	Ladd	Pomerene	Weller
Dial	La Follette	Ransdell	Willis
Ernst	Lenroot	Robinson	
Fernald	Lodge	Sheppard	
Fletcher	McKellar	Shortridge	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

The Secretary will proceed with the call of the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold hearings here or elsewhere and to employ a stenographer to report the same was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let that resolution go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Being objected to, the resolution will go over.

SALARY AND MILEAGE OF HON. CHARLES A. RAWSON.

Mr. CALDER. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report without amendment Senate Resolution 375, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 375) submitted by Mr. CUMMINS on the 6th instant, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Hon. Charles A. Rawson $493.15, salary from November 8, 1922, to December 1, 1922, both dates inclusive, and $450.20, mileage for attendance at the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, said sums being due him as a Senator from the State of Iowa.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to resist the passage of this resolution; in fact, I am very anxious to see former Senator Rawson get his pay, but I am unwilling to let the resolution pass without saying a word. On yesterday I intimated my position on the question involved when the subject came up in reference to another matter. I did not agree with the ruling of the Vice President in the case of former Senator Christie Benet, and I do not agree with it now. It seems to me that the correct rule in reference to these matters is absolutely clear. A man is either a Senator or he is not a Senator. If he is a Senator, then the general law applies. No one, I think, can controvert that proposition. If the general law applies, there is no occasion whatever for providing for the payment of the salary of the Senator out of the contingent fund. If a man is not a Senator, then he is not entitled to be paid out of any fund. I think in such cases these men are Senators.

I did not agree with the Vice President in his ruling in the Benet case for this reason: In the beginning the Constitution of the United States contemplated that the Senate of the United States should hold the balance of power between the States of the Union, be they great or small; that, regardless of population, there should be two Senators on the floor of the Senate in order to protect the rights of the small States as well as the rights of the large ones.

In the beginning the Constitution of the United States provided that Senators should be elected by the legislatures of the States. The Constitution, however, has always provided that a vacancy in the Senate could be filled by appointment.

What was the reason for that? It was that the balance of power in the Senate should not be disturbed for a moment. When the amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators by the people was under consideration here the first proposal did not carry provision for an appointment ad interim by the governor; but Congress in submitting the amendment and the people in ratifying it realized that the balance of power should continue to be held between the States and therefore gave to the governors of the States the right to appoint Senators in the event that the States desired to avail themselves of such right by proper legislation; and all the States of the Union have done so.

Mr. President, it seems to me an absurd proposition to hold that the governor of a State may fill a vacancy existing in the Senate up to election, and that then after election day there must be a vacancy until a certificate of the election of a Senator is filed. It is easy to contemplate a case where an election contest may become so involved that no one can get a certificate of his election as Senator for months after the election; and that during that time such State will have only one representative on the floor of the Senate. If the Senate is going to conform to the ruling heretofore made, I think it will be an absurd proposition. It will not be in accord with the intention of the Constitution as originally framed; it will not be in accord with the intention of the Constitution when the new amendment providing for the election of Senators by the people was adopted. It will force a vacancy in the Senate which was not contemplated at any time by the founders or the framers of this Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield in just a second. I have just about concluded. I therefore think that for the future the question should either be decided by the Chair that the salary of Senators who are appointed ad interim shall come out of the Treasury in the usual form or that a resolution should be offered and sent to the Judiciary Committee and this question settled and settled properly.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to suggest to the Senator that this question arises on account of the act of 1894. I have sent for a copy of that act, but I have not a copy of it before me at this time and have not had opportunity to look at it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of that act here.

Mr. CURTIS. That law provides that the salary of a Senator who was elected shall begin on the day of his election. I have offered a joint resolution to correct that, and it has gone to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have asked the committee to act on it as soon as possible. If they will report the joint resolution out, and action is taken on it by Congress, it will remedy the situation to which the Senator from Alabama calls attention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am very sure it will remedy the situation, so far as paying two salaries is concerned. Two salaries, however, are paid every time there is a contest in the Senate. A Senator who may be unseated draws his salary up to the hour he is unseated, and the Senator who is seated draws his salary back to the beginning of the term. The situation to which the Senator refers, of course, is one that ought to be corrected, but it has nothing to do with the matter which I am arguing. I am discussing a constitutional question, the question of the right of a Senator to take his seat. If he does take his seat, he is a Senator under the law, and he is entitled to draw his pay.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to suggest that it has been the practice of the Senate for many years to permit a Senator who has been appointed or elected to fill a vacancy to serve until his successor appears; and my opinion has been that if we should repeal the statute in reference to salary the evil would be corrected; that then the Senate would continue to permit a Senator to serve, and he would have a right to serve until his successor appeared here with the proper credentials.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that is right. I am making no question about the pending resolution; I am going to allow the resolution to go through in a moment without any objection on my part; but I simply do not want to let the precedent continue so that every time a man presents his credentials here there is a doubt as to how long he remains a Senator. What the Senator from Kansas has just stated is and ought to be the constitutional law of the land. If a man comes here with proper credentials from the governor of his State he is entitled to voice the sentiments of the people of his State until his successor presents his credentials at the Vice President's desk. There should not be any question about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order to correct a slight error which I made yesterday in discussing this same question, I wish to read into the RECORD a provision of the law of 1894, as follows:

> That the salaries of Senators elected or appointed to fill vacancies in the Senate, and of Senators elected for a full term subsequent to the commencement of such term, shall commence on the date of their election or appointment.

That is found in the Twenty-eighth Statute at Large, page 162. In this case that means that if we pay Mr. Rawson from November 8, 1922, to December 1, the day on which the elected Senator was sworn in, there will be the payment of two Senators during that length of time. There is no question about that, but it has been the unbroken practice for 28 years to do that.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that the law should be changed; I think there can be no question as to that; and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] has already stated that he has introduced a joint resolution to bring about that change, but I myself do not think that we ought now to change the precedent which has been followed for 28 years.

I merely wanted the words of the law to go into the RECORD at this time, because, as I have said, I made a statement yesterday, not knowing the law was in force, which conflicts with the law. I desire to be perfectly correct in any statement I ever make in the Senate, and it is for that reason that I take the floor now to make the correction.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Does he say that under the present rules two Senators draw salaries for the same office?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. For instance, Mr. BROOKHART was elected on November 8, 1922. Under the laws of Iowa the governor of that State could not issue the certificate of election until 20 days afterwards, as I remember, or a certain number of days afterwards; but during that whole time Mr. Rawson was serving in this Chamber, and the resolution is to pay him from November 8, 1922, until the certificate of election of Mr. BROOKHART was presented and he was sworn into the Senate. Therefore during that time, if we pass this resolution, the Senator who was appointed will draw a salary as well as the Senator who was elected on November 8, 1922, up until December 1.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, Mr. BROOKHART's salary begins with the date of his election?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. And Mr. Rawson's salary runs until Mr. BROOKHART is sworn in?

Mr. SMOOT. Until he was sworn in.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then both Senators drew salaries for that period?

Mr. SMOOT. For that period of time.

Mr. HEFLIN. That ought not to be, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought so, Mr. President. I spoke of it yesterday, and said it ought to be changed; but that is the law. It was passed in 1894 and is found in Twenty-eighth Statutes at Large, page 162.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, it applies also to the case of Mrs. Felton and Mr. GEORGE.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in my own case I was elected on November 2, 1920, and I drew the salary from that day. The term of Governor Comer, who was appointed to succeed Senator Bankhead, expired on the 2d day of November. My term commenced then. I drew the salary. Governor Comer never drew any salary after the 2d of November. It ought to be made clear that the sitting Member's term, the term for which he was appointed, expires on the day of the election. I think that is what we all meant when we amended the Constitution.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama whether Mr. Comer served on after the 2d day of November?

Mr. HEFLIN. He did not. The Senate was not in session.

Mr. SMITH. But in this case Mr. Rawson served on until Mr. BROOKHART was sworn in, although under the law Mr. BROOKHART's salary started the day he was elected.

Mr. HEFLIN. Why, then, should Mr. Rawson have served a day after Mr. BROOKHART was elected?

Mr. SMOOT. They did not know what day Mr. BROOKHART was elected, and the certificate of election could not be issued until a certain number of days after the election.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the whole difficulty seems to grow out of the statute. The statute directs that the pay of a Senator shall begin at the time of his appointment, if he is appointed, or at the time of his election, if he is elected. Each of those Senators must draw his pay from that time. The financial clerk has nothing else to do but to follow the law. It is the statute that does that. You may pay three people, but you are never without two Senators from each State. The difficulty is under the statute we are probably paying three persons part of the time; but the law is there. There is nothing to do but to change the statute.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. We are unable to hear the Senator, although he is speaking in a very loud voice. There is too much commotion in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped for order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am simply saying, Mr. President, that there is no option on the part of the disbursing officer of the Senate. Under the statute he must pay from the time the Senator is appointed in the case of an appointment, and under the statute he must pay from the date of the election in the case of an election. He is obliged to make those payments, because the statute says so. The whole thing can be remedied by changing the statute, but until you change the statute there is nothing to do but to pay each Senator as long as he is here, whether he is appointed or whether he is elected, from the date of the appointment or from the date of the election.

There may be a case where three persons are paid, as in the Georgia case. There may be in this case. Part of the time three persons are paid, but that is a matter for the Senate to control. At any rate, it is not a question of the Constitution, I take it, but it is entirely a question of the statute, and the proposal of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] ought to correct that. It seems to me the bill ought to be reported out, and if it is reported out the statute would be changed and the whole question would be settled.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Florida that the bill which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections was referred to a subcommittee, who have met and reported back favorably the bill, which provides that the pay of an appointed Senator shall continue until his successor is elected and qualified; and the pay of the successor commences not from the day of his election, under this bill, but commences from the day of his qualification in the Senate.

May I also say that I find in looking up that case that the precedent has not been quite as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] thinks. The unbroken precedent of the Senate has been never to pay three men. The only time three men are paid is when, as in the present resolution, there is taken out of the contingent fund of the Senate an amount of money to pay the appointed Senator for the time that he has actually been here.

As a matter of fact, this has been the precedent of the Senate: When a Senator is appointed his salary commences from the day of his appointment. When the election occurs his salary automatically ends, even though he continues on, as in the case of the Senator from Iowa or as in the case of the Senator from Georgia. His salary automatically ends on the day of election, and the salary of the man who was elected, even though he does not come in and qualify for a week or two, commences, under the present practice, on the day of his election.

I was an illustration of that very principle. I was elected on November 8, perhaps, 1918. I did not take my seat until the 21st of November, but my salary dated back from the 1st of November, and the salary of the appointee whose place I took, Mr. Wilfley, ended upon the day of the election. That has been the unbroken precedent of the Senate, and if the Senator will read the third paragraph of the memorandum he has he will find precisely what I have said.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator misunderstood me if he thought I said anything else than he has stated. This memorandum says:

> In three or four instances during said time the appointee has been paid for a few days for his attendance after election, and such payments have been made, by authority of the Senate, out of the contingent fund.

Nobody has ever claimed that appointees have been paid in any other way than from the contingent fund. They have never been paid out of the regular appropriation that was made for the 96 Senators. I do not think anybody has claimed that.

Mr. SPENCER. Nor have they ever been paid except by a special resolution taking the amount out of the contingent fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly. That is exactly what I stated.

Mr. SPENCER. I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. And that is exactly what this is. This is a resolution to pay the salary out of the contingent fund.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The controversy is not over the proposition of what has been done but over what ought to be done.

Mr. SMOOT. What ought to be done; yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am glad to hear that the Senator is prepared to report a bill to change the law, so that the proper procedure will take place in the future.

Mr. NORRIS and Mr. HARRELD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the important question here is not the payment of the salary, although that might have considerable weight. It is a serious proposition, to my mind. It ought to be settled by the Senate when there is no difficulty before it, and no matter that will either be invalidated or otherwise affected.

The question involved is, Who is Senator from a certain State under certain conditions, or is there any Senator? The question is whether, when a Senator is appointed to fill a vacancy, his term expires on the day his successor is elected. If that is true, then there will be, in effect, a vacancy from that State, no matter how many salaries are paid. The question involved is whether that Senator holds by virtue of his appointment until his successor is qualified. Otherwise you would have a hiatus.

It is a matter that goes away beyond the payment of a salary. There might be a time in the Senate when the fate of important legislation would depend upon one vote, when a bill affecting the entire people was being voted on, when the vote of one Senator would change the result. We can easily imagine cases of that kind that would be of transcendent importance. If a person is here voting who is not a Senator, and that vote changes the result, it is something that affects the entire country. It is a question of construction of the constitutional provision. We had better decide it at some time, at least, even though we decide it as many of us would think would be wrong, rather than not have it decided at all.

I am not trying to affect this resolution. I am perfectly willing that it shall go through until the matter is settled; but if a man who is appointed to fill a vacancy is only entitled to his seat until election day, he is not entitled to vote after that time and between that date and the date when his successor is qualified and sworn in here.

That is the important thing. That may have a great bearing upon the entire country. It seems to me the matter ought to be deliberately passed on by the Senate. Let it be referred first, perhaps, to the proper committee, to the Judiciary Committee, and have a report come in, and then let there be a vote on the question, so as to establish a precedent one way or the other. It is not a matter of statute, but it is a matter of construction of a constitutional provision.

The Senate, it is true, is the judge of the qualifications of its Members, and so forth, and its decision is final. It ought to pass on this matter, not in a haphazard way but after due deliberation, because if that is not done the time may come when this question may upset important legislation in which the entire country is interested.

THE MUSCLE SHOALS PLANT.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the passage of the pending resolution, but I want to say a word while it is before the Senate about another matter.

In the Washington Post of to-day there is an article regarding a bill introduced in the House yesterday by Mr. DICKINSON, of Iowa. It is headed:

> Federal production of fertiliser urged. Farm bloc Member offers bill in House for Government operation of Muscle Shoals.

The article reads:

> A Government-controlled corporation to produce nitrate for war purposes and cheap fertiliser for farmers was proposed yesterday as a solution of the Muscle Shoals question by Representative DICKINSON, Republican, Iowa, a leader of the "farm bloc," who introduced a bill to put his plan into effect.
>
> In a statement Mr. DICKINSON said the Ford offer for Muscle Shoals had been subjected to such "strong criticism" as to endanger the future disposition of the plant, and that he had been "led to the conclusion that some plan of Federal operation is the only solution that will insure early completion" of the work. His bill provides that the "Federal Chemical Corporation," consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secre-

tary of Agriculture, and three members to be appointed by the President, be given power to complete and operate the Muscle Shoals project for the manufacture of nitrate and fertilizer, the latter to be sold to the consumer at cost plus 4½ per cent to provide funds to complete and equip the plants. The corporation also would be authorized to sell excess power to States, municipalities, or private enterprise. The corporation also would be authorized to fix prices for fertilizer charged by private manufacturers who obtained the chemical elements from the Muscle Shoals plant.

Mr. President, in one breath we are urged to keep the Government out of business, to keep the hand of the Federal Government out of private enterprise, and to do that which will encourage enterprise and industry among the citizens. Here is a suggestion to put the Government into the business of manufacturing fertilizer. That should only be done as a matter of last resort.

I know, and I think every other Senator here knows, that the fertilizer concerns of this country are so big and powerful that they are not going to permit those who now control the Government to manufacture fertilizer to be sold in competition with their products. At this time the mere suggestion of that course would seem to mean another effort to postpone favorable action on the Ford offer for Muscle Shoals.

Mr. President, when a Republican committee from the House had recommended that the Muscle Shoals project be abandoned, that the Government should not expend any more money on the project, I suggested that the Senate Committee on Agriculture visit Muscle Shoals and see for ourselves just what the situation was. The Senate by resolution, which was recommended by our committee, authorized us to go. We were accompanied by a House committee, and the members of both committees said that the project should be completed as early as possible, that it was a wonderful project, and the thought of junking it was ridiculous.

Henry Ford, the marvel and wizard of the industrial world, went down there with Thomas A. Edison, and when he looked at that power site and saw that mighty water power going to waste, the Government property standing idle and deteriorating, he said, "I will take charge of this project if the Government will permit me, and use it for the good of millions of people." He said, "I will rescue it from the category of junk material and make it bless and benefit millions of American farmers."

We came back to Congress and started hearings on the subject in the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and Mr. Ford's chief engineer, Mr. Mayo, stated in response to a question from me that it was Mr. Ford's purpose to manufacture commercial fertilizer in abundance, and that he would be able to sell that fertilizer to the farmers of the United States for half the price they pay for it now.

Mr. President, that would be a wonderful help and blessing to our farmers. The fertilizer bill in my State alone in 1920 was $20,000,000. If the purchasers of fertilizer in Alabama could have bought that fertilizer for half that amount, $10,000,000, it would have saved to the farmers of my State on fertilizer in one year $10,000,000. It can be seen from that situation that it would be worth millions to the States that use fertilizer. The day is not far distant when the farmers will have to have fertilizer for their farming land in the West, and here is an opportunity to use the water power on the Tennessee River and make use of the phosphate beds in Tennessee and manufacture cheap fertilizer for our farmers.

Mr. President, this matter has been pending in the Senate and in the House for months. The farmers of the South and West and East and North favor the Ford offer. The laboring men of the whole country are for Henry Ford; and why is it that we can not get this matter up in this body and in the House and pass it?

Now, a suggestion is made in the House that is impossible and impracticable. At this time no majority will vote for a measure of this sort. I do not want to put the Government into competition with private enterprise if I can help it. I want to encourage private individuals to go into every kind of legitimate business. Here is an opportunity to give to the farmers of the United States fertilizer at half price.

Let us accept Ford's offer at this session of Congress. I submit that when certain Senators are moving heaven and earth to pass a ship subsidy bill, which is in the interest, in the main, of the Shipping Trust of the United States, they ought to give some consideration to the demand of the farming mass of the American people and the laboring people of the United States who favor accepting the Ford offer for Muscle Shoals.

Why is it that we can not get action upon a matter of this kind? Is it because certain sinister interests have said we shall not have action upon it at this session?

Mr. President, they are merely postponing the day. If we can not get action in this session of Congress, we will get it after the 4th of March. We are going to have a new order of things after the 4th of March. I believe we will have a majority in this body that will support Henry Ford's offer. I believe we will have a majority in the House that will support the Ford offer after the 4th of March, and I am not sure that a majority in the House would not vote for it now, and I am not entirely sure that we could not obtain a majority in the Senate if you would permit us to vote upon it. I ask the question of the Senate and the country, Why is it that these measures, in which the people generally are interested, are sidestepped and sidetracked, when measures in which special interests are concerned come to the front and are pressed and passed by the party in power?

It is proposed that a Federal chemical corporation shall go out into the business of manufacturing fertilizer and sell electric power to villages and towns. The very moment this thing was started all those interests would come in and say, "You do not want the Government to go into that sort of business," and the development of Muscle Shoals would be postponed for a couple of years more, and maybe longer.

Government management and operation was tried at Muscle Shoals. The project lay there neglected, and your party authority recommended that it be abandoned. A committee of the House went so far as to report that it should be junked. I never have been able to understand just why that committee made such a report. There is not a single scintilla of creditable testimony that would warrant such a report. It has been suggested that that report was made in the interest of the Alabama Power Co.; that the Alabama Power Co. wanted the Government to think it was a worthless project, and had the idea that they could buy it and get control of it for a song after a year or two. We do not intend that it shall be disposed of in that way. Here is a man who has vision and means for completing the great work mapped out in his mind. He will make that section of the country to blossom as the rose. Why should we not permit him to carry out his plan?

It ought to be the desire of this administration and of every other administration to build up, and not to tear down. It ought to be its purpose to give people employment, instead of doing that which will keep them out of employment. What would Henry Ford do if given this project? He would go down there and use that water power to operate those nitrate plants and make fertilizer in time of peace, and sell that fertilizer to the farmers of America at half the price they are paying to-day. What a blessing that would be in the form of millions of dollars saved every year to them.

What else would he do? He would give employment to thousands of men and women.

He would build up an industrial city in the Tennessee Valley at Muscle Shoals.

What else? The completion of that project would make the river navigable for miles and harness and use to splendid purpose this water power, which is now going to waste.

What else would be accomplished? We would save millions of tons of coal each year by the use of this water power for the making of fertilizer. There are so many blessings and benefits to come from this project completed and in the hands of this man Ford, who would literally make things hum at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. President, I just want the Senate and the country to know that in my judgment any movement now to prevent Henry Ford from getting Muscle Shoals is a block in the way of the development of that great and potential project. If these interests are strong enough to keep action from being had here in favor of Ford operating this project, what would they do if Ford should be eliminated, against the Government going into business in competition with them? Everybody knows what would happen.

Nobody is going to be deceived about this thing. The truth of it must be and it shall be known to the country. Mr. President, I had thought that some lessons would be learned from the recent election. The friends of Henry Ford in this development of Muscle Shoals condemned every man who voted against this project in the House before the election, and who stood in the way of its passage, and a good many of them were defeated. Their stand on this matter contributed to their defeat.

So, Mr. President, I want to say again in conclusion: Here is an opportunity to harness and utilize to the great advantage of the people the waters of the mighty Tennessee. The dam is now going on to completion, and here is a man who offers to take it over, lease it for a period of 100 years, pay for its upkeep, and at the end of that time he will have paid back to the Government more money than the whole thing cost at the outset.

What will he have done during that time? He will have operated this plant, furnishing fertilizer to the farmer in time of peace and nitrates to the Government in time of war. The Government can take these plants over at any time it needs to operate them to make nitrates. That is a wonderful thing in itself. In peace time they would manufacture fertilizer, which will increase the productivity of the soil, which will help to supply in abundance food and clothing to people here and in lands beyond the sea.

It will conserve the coal supply and give employment to people who are now idle.

Mr. President, it seems to me this project is worthy of the earliest consideration of the Senate, and that we ought to pass favorably on this proposition and permit Henry Ford to have Muscle Shoals. Such action would bless and benefit more people than any other disposition that can be made of Muscle Shoals.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the American Legion at their New Orleans meeting with regard to the disposal of the Muscle Shoals plant and stating what they believe are the principles that should be the guide in its disposal and utilization for the benefit of all the people. I also ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution passed by American Legion in national convention assembled at New Orleans, La., October 20, 1922, on reclamation and national defense.

Whereas at the beginning of the World War the United States Government was brought to a realization of the fact that it was wholly dependent upon the Chilean nitrate beds and German war-built nitrogen plants for its supply of nitrogen, which is absolutely necessary for the manufacture of high explosives; and

Whereas the said United States Government did thereupon appropriate large sums of money for the erection and operation of nitrate plants Nos. 1 and 2 at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of nitrogen in large quantities by extracting same from the air, which said plants were completed and successfully operated just prior to the armistice, or just after, and are the only air-nitrogen plants in the United States of America; and

Whereas the above-mentioned plants have not only been left inoperative since the war, but have constantly fallen into a state of deterioration, at an expense of many thousands of dollars annually to the taxpayers of this country, while similar air-nitrogen plants in Germany were speedily converted so as to manufacture cheaply nitrogen fertilizers for the enrichment and reclamation of the arid farm lands of Germany, which has proven to be an untold blessing to the people of that country; and

Whereas we believe that the continuance of our dependence upon foreign countries for the necessary supply of nitrogen for fertilizers in time of peace and for explosives in time of war is not only an unspeakable humiliation but is positively perilous from the point of view of the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (1), That we, the American Legion, in national convention assembled, do hereby call upon the Congress of the United States, upon the assembling of same, immediately to take up and act upon the measures pending in Congress or that may be introduced immediately upon the reconvening of same on the subject, and to determine upon a definite fixed policy as to the disposition of same; and

(2) In determining upon the disposition to be made of said properties they be governed by the following principles, which we believe to be fundamental, namely:

(a) No policy or plan should be accepted which does not provide for the operation of said plants in time of peace and the manufacture of fertilizer, and the test for acceptance of any offer should be the amount of fertilizer proposed to be manufactured;

(b) No plan or policy should be adopted which is calculated to introduce Federal operation of the project;

(c) The fertilizer production at Muscle Shoals shall have preferred supply of power in time of peace;

(d) No plan or policy should be adopted which does not assure the Government that a research or experimental department will be maintained and conducted in connection with the plants for the purpose of keeping up with the most approved methods of nitrogen production, and that in the event of military emergency the said plants will be made available to the Government at the call of the Secretary of War for the manufacture of nitrogen for explosives.

(3) That the national legislative committee of the American Legion be directed to use all possible legitimate efforts to the end that the Congress of the United States immediately enact such legislation as aforesaid.

This is to certify that the above resolution on reclamation and national defense was passed by the American Legion in national convention assembled at New Orleans, La., on Friday, October 20, 1922, and is a matter of official record.

[SEAL.] LEMUEL BOLLES,
National Adjutant American Legion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has repeated a statement in regard to fertilizer which he has so often before repeated that it may be almost useless to deny it now. He said several times during his remarks that turning the Muscle Shoals property over to Henry Ford was to put fertilizer in the hands of the farmer at half the cost. There is no such proposition. There is no such promise. I defy the Senator or anybody to put his finger on any provision of the Ford offer that guarantees anything of the kind.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator knows that I made no such statement. I said that Mr. Mayo said they would be able to sell fertilizer to the farmer at half the price the farmer was paying for it now.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Mayo did not say that, even.

Mr. HEFLIN. He said it in hearings in the committee room.

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President. The Senator has left the impression——

Mr. HEFLIN. I assert that he did say it.

Mr. NORRIS. I will take the record for it if the Senator will let it stand that way.

Mr. HEFLIN. I assert that he used practically that language in the hearing, that they intended to sell it to the farmer at about half the price he has to pay for it now.

Mr. NORRIS. No; there is no such guaranty by anybody. If there is such a guaranty, then it must come in Henry Ford's offer. He is not bound by anything but that, and there is no such guaranty that by any construction of the human language can be construed to mean it. I am not complaining because there is not such a guaranty. Of course, Mr. Ford would not make that kind of guaranty, because he does not know, and no other living man knows now, whether they are going to be able to do that or not. I have not any doubt that fertilizer is going to be reduced in price.

If it had not been for the Ford adherents on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we would now have on the calendar of the Senate a bill which would have provided for the greatest investigation and greatest development of the fertilizer proposition that has ever been known in the history of the world. But because of the opposition of the Senator from Alabama and the other Ford adherents, they refused even to consider the bill, and they had enough votes to prevent the committee from taking it up. The bill which the Ford adherents, by combining with those who are opposed to any development, succeeded in temporarily killing would have provided for a fertilizer investigation and development that would have made everything connected with Mr. Ford's proposition "look like 30 cents." As I said before, there never was such a tremendous proposition for the expenditure of money and time and scientific research, for the development of fertilizer for the benefit of the American farmer and the farmers of the world, than was contained in that bill which the Ford people have been fighting.

More than that, they speak of the work that is going on down at Muscle Shoals. It is a historic fact that the Ford people were sufficiently strong in this body and in the House to absolutely prevent the development of that great work down there from the 1st of July until the 1st day of October of this year.

The Senator said that the committee which went down there was impressed with the fact that it ought to be developed, and that is true. There was no dissension, so far as I know, on that proposition. Probably there would have been a difference of opinion if the Government had not already invested considerably over $100,000,000 in its development. There is nothing to hinder Henry Ford from going to any of a dozen places on the Tennessee River or any other river and commencing the development of water power under the general law as it now stands. But he does not want that. He wants to take what the Government has partially developed, where the taxpayers have spent about $125,000,000, and start there with practically a gift from the taxpayers of the United States, and then to get a lease for 100 years, such as has never been granted and can not be granted under the general law to any man or any corporation.

At whose expense is that to be done? The Senator said Ford would build up a city down there. I have no doubt of that, but who is going to pay for that great development? The taxpayers of the United States, not Henry Ford. He is going to develop a great water power down there, true enough. It is partially developed now. But who is going to pay for it under Ford's proposition? The taxpayers of America would pay for it. Ford is going to have a lease for 100 years. He will finish the dam. But who will pay for it? The taxpayers.

The Senator said that Ford is going to contribute a sum of money which, at the end of 100 years, will repay what the Government has put into it. If one would place $100 out at 4 per cent interest and somebody would compound that every six months and add it to the $100 and keep it up for 100 years he would have an amount of money that would scare him to

death if he could live that long to see it. The evidence shows and the computations made by experts show that giving this corporation which Henry Ford proposes to organize credit for every dollar that it pays on the day that it pays it, it would amount to giving him money for 2.85 per cent out of the Federal Treasury for 100 years' time. If the taxpayers of the United States want to do that, then I do not understand them. I do not believe they want to do it.

How old is Henry Ford? Does anybody know? He is 60 or perhaps a little more. He is going to organize a corporation with a capital stock of $10,000,000. It is that corporation and not Henry Ford with which the Government deals. He binds himself, his heirs and executors, to what he has agreed to do in the contract, and that is to organize that corporation. When he organizes it with a capital of $10,000,000 he has complied with his proposition. He is not liable any further. Giving him credit for all of the good qualities that are claimed for him by anybody, I have never yet heard anyone claim that he is such a superhuman being that God is going to let him live 100 years to control his corporation.

When the farmers of America understand the iniquity of this Ford proposition they will rise en masse and condemn it, and they will condemn any man who stands for it. Ford's proposition to develop this waterway, to finish the dam at public expense, on which the Government is working now, gives to him, outside of the water power necessary to operate nitrate plant No. 2, absolute fee to all property there in the shape of power that he would develop. By the payment of $5,000,000 he is to be given fee title to all property down there, to two towns paid for by the taxpayers of America, property that cost us more than $100,000,000, with macadamized streets, electric lights, waterworks, sewage disposal, and modern houses—two towns in absolute fee simple—and then he is to be given another town with a lot of land connected with it for 100 years without the payment of a cent, without the payment of a dollar. That power will belong to the corporation.

I have no doubt they will build up a city there, but there is no guaranty that even that city which springs up right there will be able to get one kilowatt of electric power from the water that is running downhill in plain sight and plain hearing of the town itself. It will belong to the corporation. There is no secret about it that it is going to be utilized by the corporation for its own benefit in manufacturing purposes. That great power is there if developed properly, but the bill which the Ford adherents helped to kill temporarily was a bill which provided that the power should be developed; that storage reservoirs should be built clear to the source of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, making the most complete development of water power on a stream ever undertaken by anybody or any government anywhere in the world. The secondary power would have been converted into primary power. It would have made the stream navigable. It would have controlled to a great extent the flood waters of the Mississippi River farther down. All that was involved in the bill which the Ford people are fighting. All that, Mr. President, was involved in the bill which would have given navigation, flood control, development of power, to all of the people instead of giving the two dams, which are only a partial development, to one corporation without any regulation by either State or national authority. There is a difference between the two propositions.

Mr. President, I can not understand how anyone who wants to help the navigability of the Tennessee River, how anyone who is interested lower down in the control of the flood waters of the Mississippi River, how anyone who wants to develop the power of our navigable streams, can fight a proposition of that kind. The power development then, instead of being given to one corporation with one city located at Muscle Shoals, would be distributed over a dozen different States of the Union. South Carolina would get some of it, as would Mississippi and Alabama. New Orleans would be supplied with power from that source. It would be the most wonderful supply depot of electric power anywhere on earth. On the other hand, it is said that Ford will complete the two dams. His corporation has not even made a proposition that they will ever build a dam for flood control, that they will ever build another dam anywhere to help make the flow of the stream the same at all times of the year. They have no such broad comprehensive scheme. They are to construct the two dams at Muscle Shoals but we are to pay for the construction.

I repeat, if we shall give Mr. Ford credit for every dollar that he pays it will return to the taxpayers of America less than 3 per cent on the money which has been expended and is to be expended from the Federal Treasury. There is the difference between the two propositions. If the bill is defeated, if that wonderful development of the Tennessee River is prevented, it is going to be because the Ford adherents in the Senate and in the other House are determined to defeat it.

I have never said that Ford would not be able to cheapen fertilizer. With 2½ per cent money, in 100 years he ought to be able to do so; when we are turning over to him $125,000,000 worth of property for $5,000,000, he ought to be able to do it.

What are we going to turn over to him? One nitrate plant, as complete as any in the world, which cost between eighty million and ninety million dollars—indeed, I think a little over $90,000,000—stands down there now complete. We constructed it as a war measure. If we ever become involved in another war we should require it, or we should require something like it somewhere else. Even that would not be enough to supply our Army. Now, when the war clouds have passed away, why shall we turn over this plant for a song to a corporation? The Senator says that in case of war we should get it back. That is true enough; but we should not get it back for $5,000,000, the price it is proposed that he shall pay for it. If the proposition even contained a provision that in case the Government desired to take it back it could take it back at what the Government let him have it for, it would be very different; but in such a case we shall not only have to pay the corporation the full value of the plant but we shall have to pay them damages for interfering with their business, if we ever do take it back.

Mr. President, I should not have been advocating in this Congress the wonderful development which I have advocated in the Tennessee River if it had not been for the fact that the Government has already expended so much money on it. We made that expenditure as a war measure, as we would in the construction of a battleship, but in this case the plant has a peacetime usefulness as well as a war-time usefulness. It is better in that respect than a battleship, because during peace times we can use it for the purpose of manufacturing fertilizer, or at least we think there is a fair chance of being able so to operate it that fertilizer may be more economically produced. Not a single scientific man, however, has staked his reputation on the proposition that we shall be able thereby to cut the price of producing fertilizer in two; it is still a question of experiment to a great extent.

Now, let me tell Senators of another thing which is down there. Nitrate Plant No. 1 cost the Government six million or seven million dollars; it was erected for the purpose of getting nitrate out of the air by what is known as the Haber process. That was a failure, but the building is there, the engines are there, the machinery is there. Much of that machinery will have to be scrapped; but the plant affords the greatest opportunity and the greatest opening, scientific men will agree with me, which is presented to mankind anywhere in the world for experimentation and development of the process of getting nitrate from the air by what is known as the Haber process. If the bill which the Ford people have succeeded in blocking had been passed, under it the Government would have taken that plant which it now owns, taken the old machinery out of it, and put into it machinery which it is now known will enable nitrates to be obtained from the air by the Haber process. It would have afforded one of the greatest experimental propositions that has ever been known to man. It may be a failure; we can not promise that it will be a success; but an adequate supply of fertilizer is one of the most important questions now before the American people or, for that matter, before the civilized world; and it is going to be more important year after year. There are millions and millions of tons of fertilizer in the air which we breathe, and the question is, will human ingenuity be such that we shall be able to get it out of the air at a reasonable price? We must spend money in order to ascertain that. Nobody now knows for a certainty whether the experiment will be a success. We know, however, that we can obtain it; we know that we can get nitrates from the air in large quantities; and in case of war we should not care so much for the cost. We know also that at the present time the cost would not be so reduced that the present price of fertilizer would be greatly lowered, but we hope to lessen the cost of its production. Whoever does the work expects to improve the process; and I have sufficient faith in the ingenuity of the human mind, in the American scientific men who I believe are going to do the work, to be sanguine of its success. It is a work of vast magnitude; something in which all the people regardless of where they may live or what their station in life may be are interested; for the time is fast approaching when we must have fertilizer or the necessary production of food in order to enable human beings to live will be seriously crippled.

I believe we are going to meet the difficulty by the proper investigation and experimentation; but I would not be so reckless as to say to the Senate and to the American people that even if the bill to which I have been referring be passed we shall be

able to accomplish that object; that is a matter which is yet in the unknown future; but if there is such a thing as getting the benefit from having made the development it will not come from the Ford proposition but from the passage of the other bill. That bill will do a thousand times more in the way of investigation than Ford's proposition contemplates.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HARRELD. I should like to ask, Is it not a fact that Mr. Ford's proposition limits the quantity of fertilizer that he will make to the capacity of plant No. 2?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is all. He could make more if he wanted to, but he has not guaranteed to make any more.

Mr. HARRELD. Does not this proposition limit his obligation to that amount?

Mr. NORRIS. His obligation is limited to that quantity.

Mr. HARRELD. He would not have to use any of the power that is generated by either of these dams to make fertilizer in excess of the capacity of plant No. 2?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. President, if we are fair, I think we can all agree with each other that we are anxious to promote the production of fertilizer. The bill of which I have spoken puts fertilizer, navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power all together; they are interlocked; they help each other. The dam that holds back the flood waters and prevents damage in the Mississippi also equalizes the flow over all the dams that are below that dam and converts secondary power into primary power. When that can be done it is a wonderful thing. Not only does it do that, however, but the same dams, with a little extra expense, will have locks in them which will provide for the navigation of the stream. The two dams that are proposed to be built by Ford will extend navigation to some extent, but, compared with the other scheme, the result attained will be but a drop in the bucket.

Mr. President, I had not expected to speak on this subject; I did not know that the Senator from Alabama was going to repeat what, in my judgment, are statements that are not borne out by the Ford proposal; I do not care to take the question up now; but I could not remain silent and permit these statements to go without a reply. It seems to me, Mr. President, if the great South wants to develop her resources, as I want to see them developed, she ought to lend her assistance to a proposition that will develop the entire Tennessee River to its maximum for power, for navigation, and for flood control, and that the power so developed should not be turned over to one corporation without any regulation, but it ought to be distributed over as wide an expanse of country as possible.

I have often heard from one of the advocates who is supposed to represent one of the farm organizations of the country the statement made that if the Government will turn the Muscle Shoals project over to Ford and pay him for building the dam it will help the washerwoman, that she will get cheap power to run her washing machine. Absolutely the reverse is true; there is no chance for the poor anywhere to get the benefit; but the power will go to enrich a corporation. There will not be a kilowatt unless that corporation consents to it that will ever light a street lamp, that will ever turn an electric washing machine, that will ever turn an electric wringer, that will ever toast a piece of bread, that will ever do anything for the benefit of anybody except that corporation. It will turn their wheels; will do everything that will bring in money to them; and it will be absolutely unregulated. Nowhere, from any source whatever, if that contract is agreed to by the Congress of the United States, will there be any regulations upon the corporation.

So, in the first place, the public will not get any of the power, but it will all go to one corporation and to one locality. There will be a city there, I think, and there ought to be. I do not know how large it will be, but it will not be nearly so large as the real estate speculators think it will be. They have already started a town extending some 8 miles in some directions and are offering the lots for sale now. The project when completed should develop to a great extent all that section of the country. If the river is canalized, and the dams constructed, there is not any doubt that it will do so, but, in order to develop it properly and to have from public property the power of navigable streams distributed over just as wide a scope of the country as possible, in order to give everybody, rich and poor alike, the benefit of it, we will have to reject the Ford offer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I never make on the floor of the Senate a statement which I think is a fact without knowing what I am talking about. I was stating from memory what Mr. Mayo had said. I had asked him a question, and his answer warranted me in saying what I did a moment ago. I asked Mr. Mayo and I am now going to read from the hearings. I said to Mr. Mayo:

> I understand it is the purpose of Mr. Ford to manufacture fertilizers cheaper, so that the farmer will be able to buy fertilizers cheaper than he can buy them now under the trust's control. Is not that the purpose?
>
> Mr. MAYO. Well, offhand, we think we could make fertilizer at about half the price it is sold for to-day.

That is the statement I made. The Senator from Nebraska said that there was no foundation for a statement of that sort. I am sure that he had forgotten the testimony when he made that statement.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am sure the Senator has forgotten the testimony. What he has read does not bear out the Senator's statement in any degree. The Senator might have misspoken himself, and probably did, but if he will read the testimony which was taken down by a reporter he will find a much broader statement was made than he has indicated. What he has read does not contradict what I said. That is not Ford's contract; nobody will claim that Ford or any proposed corporation is bound by that testimony. There is nothing of that kind in his proposition.

Mr. HEFLIN. I never once said that it was in the Ford contract. I said that his chief engineer, Mr. Mayo, was explaining to us what they intended to do. There is Mr. Mayo's statement in the printed hearings that they thought they could make fertilizer for half the price it was selling for to-day. That was my statement to the Senate. That is the statement that I stand upon.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is in distress because he fears that the Government is about to give something to Henry Ford. He complains that Ford would be getting the use of the money invested at Muscle Shoals for about 2½ per cent. I want to remind the Senator from Nebraska that the ship subsidy bill that has just passed the House will, if it is enacted into law, permit the Ship Trust to borrow money from the Government for 2 per cent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. NORRIS. I am opposed to ship subsidy. I suppose, from the way the Senator is backing up Ford to get money at 2½ per cent, that he is in favor of ship subsidy.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all; but I am just reminding the Senator——

Mr. NORRIS. Why does the Senator favor a subsidy to Ford's corporation, not to Ford, and oppose it by way of ship subsidy?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reminding the Senator that gigantic operations are going on before his very eyes and all around him, and I have not heard him open his mouth against this ship-subsidy plan so far. When they are undertaking to squander a merchant fleet that cost the Government $3,000,000,000 and turn it over to the Ship Trust for $200,000,000, it is high time the Senator was using some of his eloquence and brilliancy in combating such a measure as that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator can not put me in the attitude of supporting ship subsidy, either now or at any other time. He says I have not opened my mouth. I have many times opened my mouth, but my mouth is not so big and so the Senator did not see it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am talking about the opening of the Senator's mouth on this subject recently.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that from the figures he has just given as to the ships that are going to be turned over in the ship-subsidy proposition, the ship men are paying a larger per cent to the Government of the United States in proportion to what the Government paid than the Ford corporation is paying for the property it gets down at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. HEFLIN. No, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes. Just let the Senator figure it out, and he will find that it works out that way.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all. The Senator is absolutely wrong.

Mr. President, the ship subsidy will benefit a few shipowners. The people of the United States are to be taxed to put money into the pockets of the Ship Trust. The Government ships are to be squandered to the Ship Trust, and the Government then is to pay the Ship Trust to operate them. Then the Government is to loan money to the Ship Trust, if it wants it, at 2 per cent. All this is to be done in the interest of the Shipping Trust of the United States; but when we come to the millions of farmers in the West, the great agricultural army of the Nation, the wage earners, amounting to millions, their call in behalf of Henry Ford is to be ignored.

Here is a project down by the Tennessee River, with nitrate plants constructed when the war was at high tide, constructed at considerable cost, it is true. These plants were standing on the riverside idle, and a dam nearing completion was there, and the whole thing was about to be abandoned upon the recommendation of a committee going down from the Republican House of Representatives to inspect a place that the Senator now says is so valuable. Who inspired that report against Muscle Shoals? What sinister interest in Wall Street or elsewhere expected the Government to come away from Muscle Shoals, and, after two or three years' time, say: "Here is a report that says it is junk; we will give you a million dollars for it, or two millions, and take the project off your hands"? Some things about that need to be explained.

Here comes a man, when he reads that report, who says in substance: "From what I can hear of Muscle Shoals, such a course would be an outrage on decency and a travesty on justice. I will go down there and take with me a man in whose judgment the whole people have great confidence"; and he takes the wizard of the electrical world, Thomas A. Edison. They go down and look at it, and marvel at what they see—this water singing the song of wasted strength as it winds its way to the sea because of maltreatment and neglect on the part of the Republican Party. This man Ford says: "I have the money. If they seek to junk this thing, I will not permit it to be done if I can help it. I will give $5,000,000 for these two plants, standing idle, and one of them out of commission. I will take it over, and if the Government will complete this dam"—it ought to; it has gone on until it is nearing completion—"and make this river navigable for miles, I will take it over, and I will build on the banks of this river an industrial city, and I will bring people here that they may earn a livelihood in this great Tennessee Valley, and I will give labor to people who are walking the streets in your industrial cities, half clad and hungry." Senators, is not a purpose so worthy entitled to our enthusiastic support?

These in substance were the purposes that he had in mind. He said: "I will harness that river, and I will make fertilizers, and I will relieve the downtrodden farmers of America from the high prices they now have to pay." I know that the Senator from Nebraska sympathizes with them, but I never saw his judgment so much at fault in my life as it is upon this particular project, where the interest of the farmers is involved. They are being held up now on every hand. Money sufficient to carry on their business is denied them. Credits are exceedingly difficult to obtain. They are forced in many instances to sell their products below the cost of production. They are handicapped and hand tied; and here, on the Ford offer, they are held up by the fertilizer concerns of the country.

Ford promises cheap fertilizer to the farmer in time of peace and nitrates to the Government in time of war, and yet the Senator from Nebraska seems to see no good in the Ford offer!

Mr. President, we are going to fight this thing to a finish. The people are going to know the truth. I know—and we are getting up some of the facts on it now—what big concerns are trying to throttle action upon this measure in this body and in the other body, too. No half-hammered measure, seeking to deceive people, is going to be permitted to deceive or mislead them. This issue has to be fought out in the open, and we are going to have the votes to do it. Why not let us do it now?

I did not attend the progressive conference the other day. I got the impression from some of the newspaper notices that it was in the interest of a third-party movement. I have no sympathy with a third-party movement. I am a Democrat, an enthusiastic, and I believe that the Democratic Party holds in its concept of constitutional government a right solution for all the questions that vex the people of this country.

I believe in its principles, and I believe that the Democratic Party, when properly supported by progressives, can work out these problems to the good of all the people. We have done it; we can do it again; but I want to say to those who do favor progressive legislation that I will support all just and helpful progressive measures. I will do that. It makes no difference who introduces the bill, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican. I am for all measures that seek to deal fairly and enforce the laws of justice.

I probably made the first suggestion on this floor that led to the formation of a farm bloc in the Senate when I said that the Republicans from the West, by joining with the Democrats from the South, could help us to revive the War Finance Corporation. After that suggestion Senator Kenyon came over and discussed the matter with me, and he called the first meeting of our forces, and I said at one or more of those meetings: "There is no politics in this. It is a matter of business. The South is in distress, pillaged and plundered by deflationists. The West is in distress, pillaged and plundered by the same band of plundering marauders. We ought to put our strength together, give deliverance to these people, and revive the War Finance Corporation. We can do it, and we ought to do it." So we cooperated, and we brought about results, and that legislation did a great deal of good to the South and the West. It raised the price of the farmers' cotton 10 cents a pound.

I am in favor of voting in the future for measures that will do things like that, and this Henry Ford measure is one of them. It ought to be the intense desire of every man who is a progressive, who has any of the instincts of the progressive in him, to put his shoulder to the wheel and see that this matter is driven through. Good will come of it, not only to Henry Ford, as the Senator says, but to all the people of the country.

The Senator says nobody will be benefited but Henry Ford. Why, Mr. President, Henry Ford is a very wealthy man now. He is a very rich man. He wants to do good with his wealth. There are, as I said here once before, a few men like that in the world. He is not in politics, and you can not attack his motives. He brought down the price of the Ford car within reach of the common man; and there are thousands of men and women riding in the rural districts of America and in the villages and towns in cheap Ford cars who otherwise never would have known what it was to ride in a vehicle of that kind. The other automobile makers scolded and criticized Henry Ford; they denounced him because he brought the price of automobiles down. They said: "You can sell them for $1,500 or $2,000 and make more money"; but he said, "I want to put them within the reach of the plain people. I want them to enjoy some of the comforts and conveniences of life." So Henry Ford expended his millions to reach this class, pillaged and plundered so long by sinister interests, and thousands of them kept in the ne'er-do-well class. They would not let them have enough money or sufficient credits to carry on business to make that business prosperous. Under Democratic rule we unloosed those instrumentalities, and the people having money with which to do business commenced to get on their feet. They got a little money, and Henry Ford brought down the price of Ford cars so that they could buy them and ride in them. Now he is moved by the same motive to free the farmers from the clutches of the fertilizer concerns of the country.

The Senator from Nebraska went so far as to try to defend the Fertilizer Trust, saying there was no trust, and he said they had a man over there before the committee who was supposed to be the head of it, and that I did not ask him any questions.

Mr. NORRIS. Was not that true? The Senator did not ask him a question. I got him there on purpose so that the Senator could develop the fact if there was a Fertilizer Trust. I did not say there was none; I said, "I do not know." The Senator has said there was so often that I gave him an opportunity to produce the evidence, and he did not do it. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the farmers around the country say there is a Fertilizer Trust. They pass resolutions in the South, and some in the West, denouncing the Fertilizer Trust and the treatment of the farmers by the Fertilizer Trust, and the Senator says now that he wanted me to develop the case against the trust by the testimony of the individual at the head of it. Now, think of that—a trust magnate, the fellow who engineers the thing that sucks the lifeblood of the farmers of the country and makes him millions of dollars—expecting him to tell how it was done and to plead guilty to engaging in crooked conduct.

Mr. President, I remember now the witness he mentioned. He was not on the witness stand long. I knew that he would not tell anything against himself and his trust. And if he had said until he was black in the face that there was no trust I

would not have believed him. The farmers say there is a trust. Why is it that fertilizers are kept up at sky-high prices? Why is it the farmers are bound up in these mortgages and waive notes, so that there is no escape from the pains and penalties of these oppressive prices? Of course there is a Fertilizer Trust. We may not be able to get after it during this administration, but thank God the time is just two years off when we will get after it. We started in that direction the last election, and we are going to finish the job two years from now.

Mr. NORRIS. If there ever was a Fertilizer Trust, it was in operation for a great many years, and why was nothing done about it during the Wilson administration?

Mr. HEFLIN. We broke up a good many trusts. The Republican Party had been in power almost 50 years when we came in, and it took the Democratic Party a long time to undo the deviliment the Republicans had done. We did much, but could not do it all in eight years' time; but you fooled the people, and they said they wanted a change.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not blame them.

Mr. HEFLIN. A great big husky farmer out in the Senator's State was one of them. They had a picture of him on a placard and represented him as saying, "We want a change, and we are going to have it." Then, after the Republican Party had been in power about a year and a half, they had a picture on the other side of the placard of the same fellow, with his features all distorted and twisted, saying, "A change! We got it—too much." [Laughter.] That is what happened. They got the change, and got it too much.

What does Ford propose to do? He offers to sell fertilizer to the farmers at 8 per cent profit on the cost of production. Mr. President, I am satisfied that to-day there are fertilizer concerns in this country that make 50 and 75 per cent profit on the farmer. God only knows how much profit some of them do make. Here is Ford specifically setting out that he will make a profit of not over 8 per cent. That is a fair proposition. His chief engineer says that in his opinion they can make fertilizers at half the price the farmer now pays for them. Mr. President, I submit that that makes out a good case for Ford and a good case for the farmers, for it will free the farmers from the combination of fertilizer concerns in the country.

The Senator said that we are not going to use that water power to help the washerwoman who lives away from Muscle Shoals. I submit to the Senator, while he is giving so much serious concern now to a washerwoman away out there somewhere in the meadows of his imagination, I would like to have him come down to a concrete proposition and have some sympathy for the millions of farmers and farmers' wives and children in my section who are held up and robbed every year by the fertilizer concerns of the country. I submit to the Senator that if Ford is permitted to use this power at Muscle Shoals to make fertilizer, the Alabama Power Co. and other power companies can use their power in serving the purposes that he discussed awhile ago.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say a word?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will devote his energies and his eloquence to getting the Ford people to support the bill I have tried to get through, we will help the Alabama farmer ten thousand times more than the Ford proposition if carried out would help him. We will furnish him fertilizer at a price which does not include even an 8 per cent profit.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator can tell that to the marines. [Laughter.] Of course, the Senator thinks that. I am sure that he thinks that, but I am not responsible for that. It is as absurd and ridiculous as it would be for a man to undertake to bounce from the sidewalk of Washington without wings and fly to the moon. The idea of giving fertilizer to the farmers under his plan is at least amusing. Nothing will come out of his plan; I might just as well be frank about it. I believe, and I do not think the Senator knows it, probably, that there are interests encouraging his bill now which, the minute the Ford proposition was out of the way, would choke his bill to death.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator, with his Ford men, will come to my relief, I know we will have a majority in this body. They can be counted up without even putting the names on paper. The Senator knows that that is true. Everybody knows that it is true. It is because of the Ford opposition that we can not get it through.

Mr. HEFLIN. Oh, no, Mr. President; I do not think the Senator could pass his bill if we did not have the Ford bill here. I believe there are combinations and special interests enough in this country, effective with the Republican powers that now be, that would fight his bill and kill it. We had men before the committee in the hearings, and I asked them some questions along this line, "Why are you advocating a course like that, when you have heretofore opposed the Government going into business of this kind?" They said they hated to see a private individual get hold of a big thing like the Muscle Shoals project; that we ought not to permit it—this great and wonderful project was greatly concerning them then. But let us pull the curtain aside and look at that group of Republican Members of Congress who went down there and when they came back recommended that this whole thing be junked.

Who brought this great project back from the junk pile to public consideration? Why, it was Henry Ford. Who kept it from being bartered for a song to sinister interests? Henry Ford. Who offered to use it for the benefit of millions of people? Henry Ford. Who pledged himself to build an industrial city and give people a place to live and a place to work? It was Henry Ford.

Nobody else has offered to do anything, and this stalking horse the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is following is a subterfuge. He thinks his measure might accomplish something, but whenever the opponents of Ford see him rise here and earnestly contend for the passage of that measure they laugh and say, "Everything is working all right."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the Government is in control of it to-day, and it is being rented by the Alabama Power Co. at a nominal sum, is it not?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; Dam No. 2 is being rented to the Alabama Power Co. at a very nominal sum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Next to owning it themselves, I suppose they prefer to rent it from the Government at a nominal figure.

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly. They just sit back in their luxurious surroundings and say, "Hurrah for the Norris bill."

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska made a speech in the Senate last fall on this very subject. I was having something to say upon it at that time, and the Senator from Nebraska came to the rescue of his bill and whatever there is back of it. That speech of his was widely circulated, and I do not know who did it. I had letters from people all over my country saying that the Norris speech, which attacked the Ford offer and which they thought was not a fair presentation of the Ford plan and purpose, was being circulated through the country. Who circulated that speech? I must confess I do not know. I suppose the Senator from Nebraska, sitting in front of me, knows who had his speech printed, whether he had it done or who had it put in pamphlet form. That is a matter I think the Senate and the country are entitled to know about.

Mr. President, the Senator mournfully said Henry Ford is about 60 years old. All of these Senators who are getting up in the Senator's class resent the mournful measure which suggests that 60 years even suggest old age. I heard considerable complaint in whispers here awhile ago when it was intimated that a fellow was about ready to pass off when he was 60 years of age.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not look at me when he says that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no reference to my young and brilliant and handsome friend from Tennessee. He is young now and a friend of the people and will remain young until he is 90 years old. But the Senator from Nebraska said that Ford may not live long, that he would operate the Muscle Shoals project while he lives. He agrees to that. But he said that Ford will not live always, and manifests great concern as to what we are going to do when Ford finally goes away. Oh, Mr. President, it is really interesting and pathetic, in a way, to see this intensely sympathetic consideration that they seem to have for Henry Ford, and what might become of the Muscle Shoals project when he is gone. It is really touching. They seem to fear that the Muscle Shoals project would not be properly looked after when Henry Ford passes away.

I suggested in the hearings, in the Senator's presence in the committee room, that Ben Franklin, who established the Saturday Evening Post, provided that the Saturday Evening Post should always be sold at 5 cents, and that is being done to-day. What is to hinder Henry Ford from saying in his will, or in the contract that he would enter into, that fertilizer should be sold to the farmer as long as this corporation has this thing leased, at not above 8 per cent profit. That can be done; of course, it can be done. If Ben Franklin could provide that the Saturday Evening Post should be sold always at 5 cents, Henry Ford can arrange for a certain price for fertilizer, and we will have it arranged to the satisfaction of my good friend from Nebraska, I trust, who has one of the most vivid imaginations that I have ever seen in operation in senatorial debate.

Mr. President, the Senator said that Ford wants a gift. I submit it would be better to give it to him and let him operate it, if he would give human beings employment and make fertilizer cheaper to the farmers than it is at present, and furnish nitrates to the Government in time of war. I submit it would be under such a situation a good thing for the Government just to give it to him outright. That would be better than the course recommended by certain Republicans, when they suggested in the House that it be abandoned, junked, thrown away.

Ford comes here and says, "I will give you $5,000,000 for these abandoned plants, and you will still own the dam. You complete it and make your river navigable, and I will put up so much money for the upkeep of the dam. At the end of the hundred years the dam will still belong to you and you can do then what you want to do with it. My lease will be out, and in the meantime I will have operated it and furnished fertilizer to the farmers for a century." How much money would that save them? It would save them many billions of dollars in fertilizer alone.

If the Government should become embroiled in war with a foreign country, how delightful it would be to have these two nitrate plants turned over to the Government, away down on the Tennessee River, to manufacture munitions of war. How good a thing it would be to be free from dependence on Chile, and instead of paying Chile each year in time of peace for fertilizers forty-odd million dollars that money would be kept at home. I submit to the Senator from Nebraska that that is quite a good item to consider. It is a patriotic consideration.

In case of war we would be absolutely independent for our nitrate supply of all the nations of the earth. Ford offers to aid the Government in case of war. But to hear the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] speak you would think nobody was to be benefited but Henry Ford and his corporate concern; that they were going down there to feed and fatten upon the substance of the Government at Muscle Shoals, when the fact is he proposes to bless and benefit the agricultural sections. That is what he offers to do, and charge a profit of only 8 per cent on the fertilizer made.

The Government has no more idea of operating that plant and manufacturing fertilizer than it has of flying across the ocean, and I regret to see the Senator from Nebraska standing in the way of the Ford offer with a bill that has no chance of ever passing and being put in working form. I would like to have him put his bill out of the way and help us to put through the Senate the Ladd bill, which contains the Ford offer. This will be of benefit to the people.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to say that I in this last statement simply wanted to call to the attention of the Senate Mr. Mayo's statement supporting what I said regarding the matter of selling fertilizer to the farmer at half the price he paid when Mayo testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture in April.

For that reason I want to urge upon the Senate and the Congress to take favorable action, and let this man who has done so much in the industrial world go down to Muscle Shoals and operate that great plant.

Who is it that is fighting Henry Ford to the death and does not want him to go to Muscle Shoals? It is the Wall Street interests. Do you know why? He went up there once to borrow $100,000,000, I understand, from Wall Street, and he talked to them about it, and they asked him about his property. They said, "All right, Mr. Ford. We can let you have the money." Finally they brought in a man, so the story goes, and introduced him to Mr. Ford, and said to him, "This man will be your treasurer." Ford said, "Treasurer for what?" "To take charge of your business and to handle all the cash that comes in and goes out." Ford said, "Handle whose cash?" "Handle your cash." "Why," he said, "I will do nothing of the kind. I do not have to get this money from you. You can go to a climate that is a good deal hotter than this" [laughter], and he walked out of Wall Street. That is why Wall Street hates him. Any man who rises up in spite of the special governmental-privileged gang in America and so establishes himself that he can raise $100,000,000 without bowing and crawling on his knees to Wall Street is hated by Wall Street, and before they would let him have hold of a project like Muscle Shoals they would use every power at their command to prevent it. But we have beaten Wall Street. Ford is already well established in Michigan, and if he should go down into Alabama and build a great industrial city in the Tennessee Valley along the lordly Tennessee they would fear him in the industrial world; they would fear him in the financial world. They do not want that sort of thing to happen, and they are reaching out in every way they can to nip it in the bud and to destroy every possible chance of Henry Ford getting Muscle Shoals. But they are not going to succeed. I believe that four-fifths of the people of the United States are in favor of the Ford offer on Muscle Shoals, and they intend to see to it that their will is written into law.

SALARY AND MILEAGE OF HON. CHARLES A. RAWSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 375.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Hon. Charles A. Rawson $493.15, salary from November 8, 1922, to December 1, 1922, both dates inclusive, and $459.20, mileage for attendance at the third session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, said sums being due him as a Senator from the State of Iowa.

ROY H. RANKIN AND EDNA T. VOGEL.

Mr. CALDER, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate Resolution 376, submitted yesterday by Mr. CUMMINS, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the Senate to Roy H. Rankin $182.67 and to Edna T. Vogel $122.67, for clerical services rendered the Hon. Charles A. Rawson, a Senator from the State of Iowa, from November 8, 1922, to December 1, 1922, both dates inclusive.

THE DIRECT PRIMARY SYSTEM.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in 8-point type an editorial from the Philadelphia North American entitled "The war on the primary."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

THE WAR ON THE PRIMARY.

[From the Philadelphia North American, December 6, 1922.]

In the revolutions which have made and unmade the political structures of nations during the last half century there has been one dominating impulse—the unquenchable desire of mankind for self-government. Democracy is the universal goal. Even among the backward peoples of the distant east, where from the dawn of history slavish obedience to despotic authority has been an instinct, there is a growing ferment that threatens the existence of native and foreign absolutism. The advance of humanity toward democracy is a movement as resistless as the tides.

Lincoln's definition of democracy as "government of the people by the people for the people" has been embedded in the American political creed. The founders of the Republic held no such conception of government, for they limited the right of franchise to owners of property. A proposal to confer it upon men without property, not to speak of negroes and women, would not have received a moment's consideration. Yet the ideal democracy portrayed in Lincoln's memorable utterance inevitably will be the consummation of the great experiment which the founders inaugurated.

During the century and a half that has elapsed since then the franchise has been greatly extended, and at the same time the election laws have been broadened, all with a view of making government more representative. For the right of voting means nothing unless those who possess it can freely and effectually exercise it. Keeping pace with the extension of the franchise, therefore, was a demand for election laws safeguarding the rights and increasing the influence of the voter.

After growth of population had made unworkable the old New England town-meeting method of selecting public officers, the political leaders of that day arrogated to themselves the right to choose the candidates to represent different parties and policies. But this autocratic control by a small group was not long tolerated by the increasing number of enfranchised citizens. Under pressure it gave way to the somewhat more representative system of the caucus, under which a larger number of leaders and politicians participated in the selection of candidates.

This change, however, did not end but rather intensified the arbitrary control by a few. Determined opposition to the rule of "King Caucus" forced the politicians to give way again. They conceded that the party voters might name delegates to represent them in nominating conventions; but in practice the local organizations picked the delegates and the bigger bosses voted them in bunches when the convention met.

After years of experience had shown that the new method was not producing representative democracy but continued the concentration of power in the hands of a few party leaders and professional politicians, nation-wide sentiment forced further liberalization. In many States there were passed laws

regulating the primary elections; though of varying effectiveness, the essential aim of all was to decentralize power, taking it from the bosses and returning it to the party voters. Gradually control of the rules governing the primaries was taken from the leaders, strong safeguards were thrown around these elections, and the choosing of delegates was put in the hands of the voters. Eventually States took over the task of conducting the primaries, compelling all parties to participate and to make their nominations on the same day; not infrequently the requirements are more stringent than for the general elections. In many States the direct primary method extends to the selection of national delegates.

While the system of State-controlled direct primaries was being slowly evolved, a nation-wide movement for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, based upon the same principle, was in progress. The election of these important officials by the legislatures of the various States, as provided by the Federal Constitution, had not only made the Senate a stronghold of reaction and privilege, but had produced scandals which brought American Government into disrepute. To revolutionize the system it was necessary to amend the Constitution and have the change ratified by 36 of the legislatures whose prerogative it was to abolish. Only a powerful and insistent public demand could have brought about such a result.

Zealous advocates of the primary laws had believed that immediately following their enactment good government would be achieved; in this, of course, they were disappointed. The politicians, on the other hand, were agreeably surprised to find that their powers had not been drastically curtailed; indeed, it was demonstrated that by their superior industry and their grip of the organizations they could turn the new method to their advantage. Yet it was not strange that the results should be inconclusive. The most liberal and carefully devised election laws can not automatically produce good government. All they can do is to provide the people with opportunity to express and enforce their demands. The rights of democracy are nullified when they are neglected, but when exercised they are irresistible.

Ten years ago the opposition of the bosses to the direct primary had virtually subsided; they still were against it as a matter of consistency, but accepted it wherever the demand was sufficiently strong. In 1912, however, events changed from acquiescence to hostility the politicians and predatory interests which then controlled the Republican Party. Their choice for the presidential nomination was President Taft, who had been elected four years before, against the wishes of the old guard, as an exponent of the Roosevelt policies, but who had surrendered to the reactionaries and deserted the cause he was elected to serve. In response to a great popular demand, Theodore Roosevelt took the field as an opposing candidate.

Virtually all the States which were under old guard domination and had not adopted the direct primary sent Taft delegates to the convention; these, together with colored delegations from the South, comprised his entire strength. In all States having the direct primary Roosevelt submitted his candidacy to the Republican voters, and was overwhelmingly chosen over Taft in every contest save one, which resulted in an even division. The Roosevelt forces entered the convention with a clear majority of the legally elected delegates. His nomination, however, would have been a fatal blow to the old guard leaders. To prevent it, therefore, they set up fraudulent contests and unseated nearly 100 Roosevelt delegates, replacing them with hand-picked Taft delegates.

Upon Taft's acceptance of the nomination thus stolen, the Progressive Party came into being, and at the election Roosevelt received such an overwhelming majority of the Republican vote that Taft carried only Vermont and Utah, with eight electoral votes. The party bosses and old guard leaders everywhere laid their defeat to the direct primary; and it is undeniable that if that means of expression had not been open to the party voters, Roosevelt would not have elected 20 per cent of the national delegates.

Since 1912 the bosses and the dwindling old guard have bided their time for a chance to destroy the direct primary or impair its effectiveness. So long as they represented only a minority of the party membership they worked cautiously, but after nominating their chosen candidate in 1916 they began organizing to wipe out the primary system. Their defeat at that election, and the warning of Roosevelt's increasing prestige, foreshadowing his nomination in 1920, caused them to defer open attacks, but following his death their propaganda became active.

A new factor of the greatest importance then came into the situation—the impending enfranchisement of women. These prospective new voters could not be classified as machine followers but were naturally independent. Virtually all the bosses had opposed equal suffrage, and they knew that women are instinctively against their evil methods. Adoption of the eighteenth amendment had also arrayed against the primary system the liquor interests, likewise fearful of the women. And these forces, unable to prevent the enfranchisement of women, deliberately sought to nullify their voting privilege by depriving them of the direct primary system.

Iowa bosses made a start by putting through a law requiring a candidate to poll 35 per cent of the vote cast in order to gain a nomination; then they put up five candidates for the Senate, believing the vote would be so split that the choice would rest with a convention. The answer was the nomination, and later the election, of the man they most feared. Efforts were made to repeal the primary law in Indiana, but A. J. Beveridge aroused the women voters and the whole State, and the plan was blocked. Idaho enemies of Senator BORAH are striving to break down the system there. New York Republican leaders are against it. The nation-wide drive for its abolition was boldly revealed a few weeks ago in a hostile address by Secretary Weeks, who echoed the known views of President Harding. Meantime there is an incessant newspaper propaganda of deprecation.

In the face of this vicious campaign it is fortunate that Pennsylvania stands forth as a competent witness to both the deficiencies and benefits of the direct primary. Until 15 years ago the convention system enabled the State bosses to make a mockery of popular government. Adoption of the uniform primary for a long time made hardly a perceptible change, for the powerfully organized machine was able to pervert the system to its own use. But the time came when the voters made use of their right, and the result was the nomination of Gifford Pinchot for governor and of GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER and DAVID A. REED for the United States Senate. No rational person would seriously contend that under the old system three such men could have been elected to the highest offices in the State.

Election day is the outstanding symbol and triumph of democracy. On that day the Government is passed back to the people; theirs is then the absolute power to declare who shall conduct its affairs and how. Primary day is no less vital; indeed, in States where one party is dominant, it is at the primary that public officers are really selected. The voters do not always make full use of the system, but they are thoroughly aware of its supreme value as a factor in self-government, and those benighted public men and politicians who think they can snatch this weapon of civil liberty from the American people might as well undertake to abolish the ballot.

Nothing is more certain than that the party or the leadership that persistently makes war upon the direct primary will meet merited disaster. The movement toward full self-government is irresistible. There is only one surer way of starting a revolution than by resisting an impelling demand for popular rights, and that is by attempting to wrest from the people fundamental rights they have once enjoyed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 8, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 7, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, whose guardian care extends over us to protect, to guide, and to nourish, Thou hast never left alone one human heart that came to Thee for help. Truly Thy all-embracing love gathers within its circle the world of men. O let Thy word of wisdom and Thy word of knowledge weave themselves into all hearts and may they serve as an inspiration to all right living. Aid us to put forth our own energies, and these efforts shall lift us to a higher plane. Be gracious to come to us, and may Thy instruction be childlike, simple, and human. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1452. An act providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them; and

S. 4037. An act to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act, as amended.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIII, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4037. An act to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1452. An act providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Speaker appoint the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3275, a pension bill, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and appoint the conferees. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois what are the points of difference between the Senate and the House?

Mr. FULLER. The bill as passed by the House is virtually a substitute for the Senate bill. It made no change in the rates proposed, but there is some difference in the phraseology. There is simply the one amendment on the part of the House, and that is virtually a substitute for the original Senate bill.

Mr. GARNER. But that does not tell us what is the difference between the two Houses.

Mr. FULLER. The difference in one respect is that the Senate fixed the age of a widow at 62 years before she would be entitled to receive an increase, and that has been left out in the House amendment. Another provision in the Senate bill extended the period of the Civil War down to some time in August, 1866, which would permit a man who enlisted even a year after the surrender of Lee to be entitled to a pension if he served 90 days after that time. The House struck that out.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, the Senate bill, as I recall, provided for a $50 pension to the widow of a soldier without regard to the time of marriage.

Mr. FULLER. Yes. They wiped out the marriage limit entirely, and provided that if she was married before the passage of the act she should be entitled to a pension. We changed that, fixing the limitation at June 27, 1915, or, if married after that date, that she must have lived with the soldier not less than two years, and until he died.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the House bill is a very liberal bill. I think we should have some idea of the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House before the bill goes to conference. If there is a disposition upon the part of the House conferees to give way to the Senate, we will have some hesitancy, some of us at least, in sending the bill to conference.

The bill as it passed the House was just as liberal, in my opinion, as the sentiment of the House justifies. As a matter of fact, there were a good many in the House who were not altogether happy about some of the provisions as it passed the House and who would be entirely against some of the Senate provisions. I should like to know something about the attitude of the House conferees in the matter.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I fully agree, so far as I am personally concerned, with what the gentleman from Wyoming says. I think the bill as it passed the House is a very fair and liberal measure, and I would not, under any consideration, agree to the provision that a widow who married an old soldier on his deathbed should be entitled the next day to a pension for life. Under no circumstances would I agree to that. I can assure the gentleman that the conferees on the part of the House will insist on the House amendment.

Mr. GARNER. But you come pretty nearly doing it in the House bill in any event. I do not think any defense can be made of that provision in the House bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that we are now considering the House bill for the first time. The bill went through the House without any discussion, and now on the matter of a conference report we are discussing the respective merits of the House and the Senate bills.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What is the marriageable date now, under the law?

Mr. FULLER. June 27, 1905.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What was the idea in extending that date?

Mr. FULLER. One idea was to prevent the great flood of special bills coming in all of the time, some of them very pitiful cases, asking for special pensions, where they were married after the date fixed by the present law. One of the great merits of the present bill as it passed the House, in my opinion, is that it will do away very largely with this flood of special bills.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman think that the date he fixed is much improvement on the Senate bill?

Mr. FULLER. I think it is.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the House bill is as liberal in all respects as the bill ought to be, and the bill should not go to conference unless we can have some assurance of the outcome.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I can not coincide with the position taken by our distinguished leader upon this matter. It seems to me that the Senate bill is a good, fair, liberal bill. These old fellows are dying off every moment; thousands of them are passing beyond. Let anyone go through a soldiers' home, as I did recently in Quincy, and he will realize that practically all of them are in the hospital, but a little way from the graveyards. Why should we be impecunious and stingy?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no difference between the House and the Senate bill in respect to the pensions for the old soldiers. We are all agreed on that. There are other provisions in the Senate bill the House objected to.

Mr. KING. I do not agree with the gentleman's position. He is not leading this proposition in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Both bills pension the soldiers at the same rate and under practically the same conditions. But there are other provisions in the bill which have nothing to do with the men who fought in the Civil War. The House has gone quite as far in regard to those matters as it is justified in doing until we have further knowledge of the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. FULLER. The gentleman may have that information now. There is no question but what the conferees will insist upon the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, with that assurance, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

STATE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a report from the Committee on Appropriations which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13232; Rept. 1265) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order, and it is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REGENT, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in place of Mr. Padgett, deceased, Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing two of the printed statements issued by the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman be a little more specific?

Mr. WINGO. One is dated September 30, 1922, and the other December 4, the ordinary general statements which the Treasury issues. There is special reason why the public ought to have that in the RECORD and available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The statements are as follows:

Statement of the public debt of the United States September 30, 1922.

Detail.	Amount issued.	Amount retired.	Amount outstanding.		
INTEREST-BEARING DEBT.					
Bonds:					
2% consols of 1930	$646,250,150.00	$46,526,100.00		$599,724,050.00	
4% loan of 1925	162,315,400.00	43,825,500.00		118,489,900.00	
2% Panamas of 1916-36	54,631,980.00	5,677,800.00		48,954,180.00	
2% Panamas of 1918-38	30,000,000.00	4,052,600.00		25,947,400.00	
3% Panamas of 1961	50,000,000.00			50,000,000.00	
3% conversion bonds of 1946-47	28,894,500.00			28,894,500.00	
2½% postal savings bonds (1st to 23d series)	11,851,000.00			11,851,000.00	
					$883,861,030.00
First Liberty loan	1,989,455,550.00	37,615,200.00			
3½% bonds of 1932-47			$1,410,001,050.00		
Converted 4% bonds of 1932-47			11,776,300.00		
Converted 4½% bonds of 1932-47			526,570,850.00		
Second converted 4½% bonds of 1932-47			3,492,150.00		
				1,951,840,350.00	
Second Liberty loan	3,807,865,000.00	506,143,750.00			
4% bonds of 1927-42			50,803,050.00		
Converted 4½% bonds of 1927-42			3,250,915,200.00		
				3,301,721,250.00	
Third Liberty loan—					
4½% bonds of 1928	4,175,650,050.00	703,122,650.00		3,472,527,400.00	
Fourth Liberty loan—					
4¼% bonds of 1933-38	6,964,581,100.00	619,373,550.00		6,345,207,550.00	
					15,071,290,550.00
Notes:					
Victory liberty loan	4,495,373,000.00	[1] 2,689,372,800.00			
4¼% notes of 1922-23, called for redemption Dec. 15, 1922				872,879,550.00	
4¼% notes of 1922-23, maturing May 20, 1923				933,120,650.00	
					1,806,000,200.00
Treasury notes—					
Series A-1924	311,191,600.00			311,191,600.00	
Series B-1924	390,706,100.00			390,706,100.00	
Series A-1925	601,599,500.00			601,599,500.00	
Series B-1925	335,128,200.00			335,128,200.00	
Series A-1926	617,769,700.00			617,769,700.00	
Series B-1926	486,924,100.00			486,924,100.00	
					2,743,319,200.00
Certificates of indebtedness:					
Tax—					
Series TD-1922	243,544,000.00	4,000,000.00	239,544,000.00		
Series TM-1923	266,250,000.00		266,250,000.00		
Series TD 2-1922	200,000,000.00	18,334,500.00	181,665,500.00		
Series TJ-1923	273,000,000.00		273,000,000.00		
Series TS-1923	227,000,000.00		227,000,000.00		
				1,187,459,500.00	
Loan—					
Series D-1922	150,000,000.00	38,662,500.00		111,337,500.00	
Pittman Act	259,375,000.00	211,375,000.00		48,000,000.00	
					1,346,797,000.00
Treasury (war) savings securities: [2]					
Treasury (war) savings certificates, series 1918	1,022,110,263.58	511,301,721.44		510,808,542.14	
Treasury (war) savings certificates, series 1919	102,682,356.21	49,331,454.92		53,350,901.29	
Treasury (war) savings certificates, series 1920	43,685,401.98	19,455,746.27		24,229,655.71	
Treasury (war) savings certificates, series 1921	22,686,458.56	7,578,445.89		15,108,012.67	
Treasury savings certificates, series 1921, issue of Dec. 15, 1921	2,193,574.05	199,259.40		1,994,314.65	
Treasury savings certificates, series 1922, issue of Dec. 15, 1921	103,678,265.67	3,374,510.20		100,303,755.47	
Thrift and Treasury savings stamps, unclassified sales etc	8,159,293.36	792,280.25		7,367,013.11	
					713,142,195.04
Total interest-bearing debt outstanding					22,564,410,175.04
MATURED DEBT ON WHICH INTEREST HAS CEASED.					
(Payable on presentation.)					
Funded loan of 1891, continued at 2%, called for redemption May 18, 1900, interest ceased Aug. 18, 1900				1,000.00	
Funded loan of 1891, matured Sept. 2, 1891				19,500.00	
Loan of 1904, matured Feb. 2, 1904				13,050.00	
Funded loan of 1907, matured July 2, 1907				374,600.00	
Refunding certificates, matured July 1, 1907				10,200.00	
Old debt matured at various dates prior to Jan. 1, 1891, and other items of debt matured at various dates subsequent to Jan. 1, 1891				894,160.26	
Certificates of indebtedness, at various interest rates, matured				10,625,500.00	
Loan of 1908-18				317,880.00	
3½% Victory loan of 1922-23				5,856,950.00	
Total matured debt outstanding on which interest has ceased					18,113,140.26
DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST.					
(Payable on presentation.)					
Obligations required to be reissued when redeemed:					
United States notes			346,681,016.00		
Less gold reserve			152,979,025.63		
				193,701,990.37	
Obligations that will be retired on presentation:					
Old demand notes				53,012.50	
National bank notes and Federal reserve bank notes assumed by the United States on deposit of lawful money for their retirement				40,142,126.50	
Fractional currency				1,998,368.50	
Total debt bearing no interest outstanding					235,895,497.87
Total gross debt [3]					22,818,424,813.17

[1] Includes $5,856,950 Victory 3½% notes shown under "Matured debt on which interest has ceased."

[2] Amounts issued of Treasury (war) savings certificates of the series of 1918, 1919, 1920, and 1921 are on basis of reports of sales. Amount issued of Treasury savings certificates, series of 1921, issue of Dec. 15, 1921, includes accrued discount, and the amount outstanding represents the net redemption value. Amount issued of the series of 1922, issue of Dec. 15, 1921, is on basis of cash receipts by Treasurer, United States, plus accrued discount, and includes receipts from sales of Treasury savings stamps; amount outstanding is the net redemption value.

[3] The total gross debt Sept. 30, 1922, on the basis of daily Treasury statements was $22,812,407,791.30, and the net amount of public debt redemptions and receipts in transit, etc., was $6,017,021.87.

Statement of the public debt of the United States September 30, 1922—Continued.

Detail.	Amount outstanding.		
DEBT BEARING NO INTEREST—continued.			
Matured interest obligations, etc.:			
Matured interest obligations outstanding		$68,942,533.01	
Discount accrued (partly estimated) on war savings securities, series of 1918 [4]		122,730,374.01	
Discount accrued (partly estimated) on war savings securities, series of 1919 [4]		9,532,365.31	
Discount accrued (partly estimated) on war savings securities, series of 1920 [4]		3,055,894.78	
Discount accrued (partly estimated) on war savings securities, series of 1921 [4]		997,005.72	
Treasury warrants and checks outstanding		3,351,057.69	
Disbursing officers' checks outstanding		74,395,491.83	
			$283,034,582.35
			23,101,459,395.52
Balance held by the Treasurer of the United States as per daily Treasury statement for Sept. 30, 1922		256,939,729.44	
Add:			
Net excess of receipts over disbursements in September reports subsequently received		999,741.05	
			257,929,470.49
Net debt, including matured interest obligations, etc.[5]			22,843,629,925.03

[4] Accrued discount calculated on basis of exact accrual at rate of 4 per cent per annum compounded quarterly, with due allowance for cash redemptions to date.
[5] No deduction is made on account of obligations of foreign governments or other investments.
Issues of soldiers and sailors' civil relief bonds not included in the above: Total issue to Sept. 30, 1922, was $195,500, of which $144,800 has been retired.

Detail of outstanding interest-bearing issues as shown above, September 30, 1922.

Title.	Authorizing act.	Rate of interest.	Date of issue.	When redeemable or payable.	Interest payable.
		Per cent.			
Pre-war loans:					
Consols of 1930	Mar. 14, 1900	2	Apr. 1, 1900	Payable after Apr. 1, 1930	Jan. 1, Apr. 1, July 1, Oct. 1.
Loan of 1925	Jan. 14, 1875	4	Feb. 1, 1895	Payable after Feb. 1, 1925	Feb. 1, May 1, Aug. 1, Nov. 1.
Panama Canal loan:					
1930	June 28, 1902, and Dec. 21, 1905.	2	Aug. 1, 1906	Redeemable after Aug. 1, 1916. Payable Aug. 1, 1936	Do.
1938	do	2	Nov. 1, 1908	Redeemable after Nov. 1, 1918. Payable Nov. 1, 1938	Do.
1961	Aug. 5, 1909, Feb. 4, 1910, and Mar. 2, 1911.	3	June 1, 1911	Payable June 1, 1961	Mar. 1, June 1, Sept. 1, Dec. 1.
Conversion bonds	Dec. 23, 1913	3	Jan. 1, 1916–17	Payable 30 years from date of issue.	Jan. 1, Apr. 1, July 1, Oct. 1.
Postal savings bonds (first to twenty-third series).	June 25, 1910	2½	Jan. 1, July 1, 1911–1922	Redeemable 1 year from date of issue. Payable 20 years from date of issue.	Jan. 1, July 1.
War loans:					
First Liberty loan—					
3½ per cent bonds of 1932–1947	Apr. 24, 1917	3½	June 15, 1917	Redeemable on or after June 15, 1932. Payable June 15, 1947	June 15, Dec. 15.
Conversion 4 per cent bonds of 1932–1947.	Apr. 24, 1917, Sept. 24, 1917.	4	Nov. 15, 1917	do	Do.
Conversion 4¼ per cent bonds of 1932–1947.	Apr. 24, 1917, Sept. 24, 1917, as amended.	4¼	May 9, 1918	do	Do.
Second conversion 4¼ per cent bonds of 1932–1947.	do	4¼	Oct. 24, 1918	do	Do.
Second Liberty loan—					
4 per cent bonds of 1927–1942	Sept. 24, 1917	4	Nov. 15, 1917	Redeemable on or after Nov. 15, 1927. Payable Nov. 15, 1942	May 15, Nov. 15.
Conversion 4¼ per cent bonds of 1927–1942.	Sept. 24, 1917, as amended	4¼	May 9, 1918	do	Do.
Third Liberty loan—4¼ per cent bonds of 1928.	do	4¼	do	Payable Sept. 15, 1928	Mar. 15, Sept. 15.
Fourth Liberty loan—4¼ per cent bonds of 1933–1938.	do	4¼	Oct. 24, 1918	Redeemable on or after Oct. 15, 1933. Payable Oct. 15, 1938	Apr. 15, Oct. 15.
Victory Liberty loan, 4¼ per cent Victory notes of 1922–23.	do	4¼	May 20, 1919	Notes with serial letters A, B, C, D, E, or F called for redemption Dec. 15, 1922; others maturing May 20, 1923.	Dec. 15; May 20, 1923.
Treasury notes:					
Series A–1924	do	5½	June 15, 1921	June 15, 1924	June 15, Dec. 15.
Series B–1924	do	5½	Sept. 15, 1921	Sept. 15, 1924	Mar. 15, Sept. 15.
Series A–1925	do	4½	Feb. 1, 1922	Mar. 15, 1925	Do.
Series B–1925	do	4½	June 15, 1922	Dec. 15, 1925	June 15, Dec. 15.
Series A–1926	do	4½	Mar. 15, 1922	Mar. 15, 1926	Mar. 15, Sept. 15.
Series B–1926	do	4¼	Aug. 1, 1922	Sept. 15, 1926	Do.
Certificates of indebtedness:					
Tax—					
Series TD–1922	do	4½	Dec. 15, 1921	Dec. 15, 1922	June 15, Dec. 15.
Series TM–1923	do	4½	Mar. 15, 1922	Mar. 15, 1923	Mar. 15, Sept. 15.
Series TD 2–1922	do	3½	June 1, 1922	Dec. 15, 1922	At maturity.
Series TJ–1923	do	3½	June 15, 1922	June 15, 1923	June 15, Dec. 15.
Series TS–1923	do	3½	Sept. 15, 1922	Sept. 15, 1923	Mar. 15, Sept. 15.
Loan, series D–1923	do	3½	Apr. 15, 1923	Oct. 16, 1922	At maturity.
Pittman Act	Sept. 24, 1917, as amended Apr. 23, 1918	2	Various dates, 1918–19	One year from date of issue or renewal.	Jan. 1, July 1.
Treasury (war) savings securities	Sept. 24, 1917, as amended	[1] 4	Jan. 2, 1918	Payable Jan. 1, 1926	At maturity or redemption.
			Jan. 2, 1919	Payable Jan. 1, 1924	
			Jan. 2, 1920	Payable Jan. 1, 1925	
			Jan. 3, 1921	Payable Jan. 1, 1926	
Treasury savings certificates, issue of Dec. 15, 1921.	do	[2] 4½	Various dates from Dec. 15, 1921.	Five years from date of issue.	Do.
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief bonds	Mar. 8, 1918	3½	July 1, 1919	Mature July 1, 1926; may be called 1 year after termination of war.	Jan. 1, July 1.

[1] If held to maturity, war savings securities yield interest at rate 4 per cent per annum, compounded quarterly, for the average period to maturity on the average issue price. Thrift stamps and Treasury savings stamps do not bear interest.
[2] Treasury savings certificates of the issue dated Dec. 15, 1921, yield interest at about 4½ per cent per annum, compounded semiannually, if held to maturity, but may be redeemed before maturity; o yield about 3½ per cent per annum, compounded semiannually. This issue was withdrawn from sale Sept. 30, 1922, in favor of an issue dated Sept. 30, 1922, which yields interest at about [illegible] per cent per annum, compounded semiannually, if held to maturity, but may be redeemed before maturity to yield about 3 per cent per annum, simple interest. These certificates all mature 5 years from date of issue.

Securities owned by the United States Government.

[Compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury, September 30, 1922.]

Obligations of foreign governments, under authority of acts approved Apr. 24, 1917, and Sept. 24, 1917, as amended (on basis of cash advances, less repayments of principal):[1]		
Belgium	$347,251,013.40	
Cuba	7,740,500.00	
Czechoslovakia	61,974,041.10	
France	2,933,405,070.15	
Great Britain	4,135,818,358.44	
Greece	15,000,000.00	
Italy	1,648,034,050.90	
Liberia	26,000.00	
Rumania	23,205,819.52	
Russia	187,729,750.00	
Serbia	26,126,574.59	
Total		$9,386,311,178.10
Foreign obligations received from the Secretary of War on account of sale of surplus war supplies:[1]		
Belgium	29,872,732.54	
Czechoslovakia	20,612,300.11	
Esthonia	12,213,377.88	
France	407,341,145.01	
Latvia	2,521,869.32	
Lithuania	4,159,491.96	
Nicaragua	170,585.35	
Poland	57,411,894.41	
Rumania	12,922,675.42	
Russia	406,082.30	
Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes	24,978,020.99	
Total		572,610,175.29
Foreign obligations received from the Secretary of the Navy on account of sale of surplus war supplies:[1]		
Poland		2,266,709.66
Foreign obligations received from the American Relief Administration on account of relief, pursuant to act approved Feb. 25, 1919:[1]		
Armenia	8,028,412.15	
Czechoslovakia	6,428,089.19	
Esthonia	1,785,767.72	
Finland	8,281,926.17	
Latvia	2,610,417.82	
Lithuania	822,136.07	
Poland	51,671,749.36	
Russia	4,465,465.07	
Total		84,093,963.55
Capital stock of war emergency corporations:		
Capital stock of the Emergency Fleet Corporation	50,000,000.00	
Offset by cash deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the corporation	66,962,980.66	
Capital stock of the Hoboken Manufacturers Railroad Co.		400,000.00
Capital stock of United States Housing Corporation, issued	70,000,000.00	
Less amount retired plus cash deposits covered into Treasury under act approved July 11, 1919	16,826,911.24	
		53,173,088.76
Capital stock of United States Sugar Equalization Board (Inc.)	5,000,000.00	
Offset by cash deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to credit of the corporation	15,279,636.52	
Capital stock of the United States Grain Corporation, authorized and issued	500,000,000.00	
Less amount retired	475,000,000.00	
		25,000,000.00
Capital stock of the United States Spruce Production Corporation	10,000,000.00	
Less cash deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the corporation	3,951,525.15	
		6,048,474.85
Capital stock of the War Finance Corporation, authorized and issued	500,000,000.00	
Less cash deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to credit of War Finance Corporation	335,557,650.04	
		164,442,349.96
Obligations of carriers acquired under sec. 7 of the Federal control act, approved Mar. 21, 1918, as amended:[1]		
Boston & Maine R. R	26,114,000.00	
Minneapolis & St. Louis R. R. Co	750,000.00	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas Ry. of Texas, receiver of the	52,000.00	
New York Central R. R. Co	6,500,000.00	
Pennsylvania R. R. Co	20,000,000.00	
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie R. R. Co	500,000.00	
Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co	1,850,000.00	
Washington, Brandywine & Point Lookout R. R. Co	50,000.00	
Total		55,816,000.00

[1] The figures do not include interest accrued and unpaid.

[2] This amount does not include securities purchased by the Director General of Railroads under the provisions of sec. 12 of the Federal control act, approved Mar. 21, 1918.

Equipment trust 6 per cent gold notes acquired by Director General of Railroads pursuant to Federal control act of Mar. 21, 1918, as amended, and act approved Nov. 19, 1919, to provide for the reimbursement of the United States for motive power, cars, and other equipment ordered for carriers under Federal control:[2]		
Ann Arbor R. R. Co	$228,800	
Atlanta, Birmingham & Atlantic Ry. Co	917,000	
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co	5,142,800	
Boston & Maine R. R	1,978,600	
Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Ry	1,794,000	
Charleston & Western Carolina Ry. Co	227,500	
Chicago & Alton R. R. Co	525,200	
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co	213,200	
Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Ry. Co	300,300	
Chicago Great Western R. R. Co	188,500	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co	4,751,500	
Chicago & Western Indiana R. R. Co	80,600	
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line R. R. Co	144,300	
Erie R. R. Co	1,301,300	
Grand Trunk Ry. of Canada	258,700	
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co	894,400	
Hocking Valley Ry. Co	819,000	
Kansas City Southern Ry. Co	275,600	
Maine Central R. R. Co	347,100	
Minneapolis & St. Louis R. R. Co	436,800	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas Ry. Co	365,300	
Missouri Pacific R. R. Co	3,008,200	
Mobile & Ohio R. R. Co	175,500	
Morgantown & Kingwood R. R. Co	751,400	
New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R. Co.	1,285,700	
Norfolk Southern R. R. Co	114,400	
Pere Marquette Ry. Co	2,918,500	
Rutland R. R. Co	107,900	
Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co	477,100	
Spokane, Portland & Seattle Ry. Co	253,500	
St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co	4,166,100	
Texas & Pacific Ry. Co	691,600	
Toledo, St. Louis & Western R. R. Co	341,900	
Wabash R. R. Co	3,273,400	
Western Maryland Ry. Co	248,300	
Wheeling & Lake Erie Ry. Co	1,326,000	
Total		$40,320,000.00
Obligations of carriers acquired pursuant to sec. 207 of the transportation act, approved Feb. 28, 1920, as amended:		
Ann Arbor R. R. Co	570,000.00	
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co	9,000,000.00	
Bangor & Aroostook R. R. Co	325,000.00	
Boston & Maine R. R	1,030,000.00	
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co	3,425,000.00	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co	20,000,000.00	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co	8,000,000.00	
Erie R. R. Co	8,250,000.00	
Gulf, Mobile & Northern R. R. Co	490,000.00	
International & Great Northern Ry. Co	2,400,000.00	
Maine Central R. R. Co	750,000.00	
Missouri Pacific R. R. Co	3,000,000.00	
New York, Chicago & St. Louis R. R. Co	1,000,000.00	
New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R. Co.	64,316,500.00	
St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co	3,000,000.00	
Wabash Ry. Co	1,500,000.00	
Western Maryland Ry. Co	2,000,000.00	
Wheeling & Lake Erie Ry. Co	900,000.00	
Total		120,926,500.00
Obligations of carriers acquired pursuant to sec. 210 of the transportation act, approved Feb. 28, 1920, as amended:		
Akron, Canton & Youngstown Ry. Co	212,000.00	
Alabama, Tennessee & Northern R. R. Corporation	475,250.00	
Alabama & Vicksburg Ry. Co	1,394,000.00	
Ann Arbor R. R. Co	530,000.00	
Aransas Harbor Terminal Ry	50,000.00	
Atlanta, Birmingham & Atlantic Ry. Co	180,000.00	
Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co	3,000,000.00	
Bangor & Aroostook R. R. Co	184,000.00	
Birmingham & Northwestern Ry. Co	75,000.00	
Boston & Maine R. R	14,705,479.00	
Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Ry. Co	1,000,000.00	
Carolina, Clinchfield & Ohio Ry	8,000,000.00	
Central of Georgia R. R. Co	222,040.00	
Central New England Ry. Co	300,000.00	
Central Vermont Ry. Co	180,000.00	
Charles City Western Ry. Co	140,000.00	
Chesapeake & Ohio Ry. Co	8,073,023.97	
Chicago & Eastern Illinois R. R. Co., receiver of	785,000.00	
Chicago Great Western R. R. Co	2,445,373.00	
Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Ry. Co	155,000.00	
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Ry. Co	35,000,000.00	
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co	9,862,000.00	
Chicago & Western Indiana R. R. Co	7,817,000.00	
Cisco & Northeastern Ry. Co	208,588.00	
Cowlitz, Chehalis & Cascade Ry. Co	45,000.00	
Cumberland & Manchester R. R. Co	375,000.00	
Des Moines & Central Iowa R. R., formerly the Inter-Urban Ry. Co	633,500.00	
Erie R. R. Co	11,574,450.00	
Evansville, Indianapolis & Terre Haute Ry. Co	400,000.00	
Fernwood, Columbia & Gulf R. R. Co	33,000.00	
Flemingsburg & Northern R. R. Co	7,250.00	
Fort Dodge, Des Moines & Southern R. R. Co	200,000.00	

[2] The notes are in series, which mature, respectively, on the 15th day of January in various years up to 1935.

Obligations of carriers acquired pursuant to sec. 210 of the transportation act, etc.—Continued.		
Fort Smith & Western R. R. Co., receiver of the	$156,000.00	
Gainesville & Northwestern R. R. Co	75,000.00	
Georgia & Florida Ry., receivers of	792,000.00	
Great Northern Ry. Co	1,876,000.00	
Greene County R. R. Co	54,000.00	
Gulf, Mobile & Northern R. R. Co	1,433,500.00	
Hocking Valley Ry. Co	1,665,000.00	
Illinois Central R. R. Co	4,144,000.00	
Indiana Harbor Belt R. R. Co	414,000.00	
International & Great Northern Ry. Co., receiver of	155,440.00	
Kansas City, Mexico & Orient R. R. Co., receiver of the	2,500,000.00	
Kansas City Terminal Ry. Co	580,000.00	
Lake Erie, Franklin & Clarion R. R. Co	22,500.00	
Long Island R. R. Co	800,000.00	
Louisville & Jeffersonville Bridge & R. R. Co.	162,000.00	
Maine Central R. R. Co	2,373,000.00	
Minneapolis & St. Louis R. R. Co	1,382,000.00	
Missouri, Kansas & Texas Ry. Co. of Texas, receiver of the	420,000.00	
Missouri & North Arkansas Ry. Co	3,500,000.00	
Missouri Pacific R. R. Co	5,629,760.00	
National Railway Service Corporation	10,825,289.93	
New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Ry. Co	234,000.00	
New York Central R. R. Co	23,735,000.00	
New York, New Haven & Hartford R. R. Co.	19,430,000.00	
Norfolk Southern R. R. Co	1,299,900.00	
Pennsylvania R. R. Co	12,480,000.00	
Peoria & Pekin Union Ry. Co	1,797,000.00	
Rutland R. R. Co	61,000.00	
Salt Lake & Utah R. R. Co	904,000.00	
Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co	8,698,400.00	
Seabord Bay Line Co	3,300,000.00	
Shearwood Ry. Co	20,000.00	
Tampa Northern R. R. Co	100,000.00	
Tennessee Central Ry. Co	563,000.00	
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis	519,175.00	
Toledo, St. Louis & Western R. R. Co., receiver of	646,000.00	
Trans-Mississippi Terminal R. R. Co	1,000,000.00	
Virginia Blue Ridge Ry. Co	106,000.00	
Virginian Ry. Co	2,000,000.00	
Virginia Southern R. R. Co	38,000.00	
Waterloo, Cedar Falls & Northern Ry. Co	1,260,000.00	
Western Maryland Ry. Co	3,322,800.00	
Wheeling & Lake Erie Ry. Co	2,960,000.00	
Obligations of carriers acquired pursuant to sec. 210 of the transportation act, etc.—Continued.		
Wichita Falls & Northwestern Ry. Co	$381,750.00	
Wilmington, Brunswick & Southern R. R. Co.	90,000.00	
Total		$231,876,468.90
Capital stock of the Panama R. R. Co		7,000,000.00
Capital stock of Federal land banks, on basis of purchases, less repayments to date:		
Springfield, Mass	689,985.00	
Baltimore, Md	630,035.00	
Columbia, S. C	429,510.00	
Louisville, Ky	325,435.00	
New Orleans, La	410,465.00	
St. Louis, Mo	321,635.00	
St. Paul, Minn	150,965.00	
Omaha, Nebr	44,740.00	
Wichita, Kans	356,035.00	
Houston, Tex	177,885.00	
Berkeley, Calif	601,110.00	
Spokane, Wash	127,080.00	
Total		4,264,880.00
Federal farm loan bonds, acquired pursuant to act approved Jan. 18, 1918: Federal farm loan 4½ per cent bonds		136,885,000.00
Securities received by the Secretary of War on account of sales of surplus war supplies		32,677,120.85
Securities received by the Secretary of the Navy on account of sales of surplus property		9,639,244.34
Securities received by the United States Shipping Board on account of sales of ships, etc		42,946,014.61
Grand total		10,985,687,168.87
Amount due the United States from the central branch of the Union Pacific R. R. on account of bonds issued (Pacific Railroad aid bonds, acts approved July 1, 1862, July 2, 1864, and May 7, 1878):		
Principal		1,600,000.00
Interest		1,940,373.55
Total		3,540,373.55

NOTE.—This statement is made up on the basis of the face value of the securities therein described as received by the United States, with due regard for repayments. To the extent that the securities are not held in the custody of the Treasury, the statement is made up from reports received from other Government departments and establishments. The statement does not include securities which the United States holds as collateral, or as the result of the investment of trust funds (as, for example, securities held for account of the Alien Property Custodian, the United tates Government life-insurance fund, and other similar trust funds).

Daily statement of the United States Treasury, compiled from latest proved reports from Treasury offices and depositaries, December 4, 1922.

CURRENT ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.

GOLD.

Assets:		Liabilities:	
Gold coin	$321,122,110.72	Gold certificates outstanding	$700,076,160.00
Gold bullion	2,949,350,418.14	Gold fund, Federal Reserve Board (act of Dec. 23, 1913, as amended June 21, 1917)	2,180,699,514.65
		Gold reserve	152,979,025.63
		NOTE.—Reserved against $346,681,016 of United States notes and $1,490,223 of Treasury notes of 1890 outstanding. Treasury notes of 1890 are also secured by silver dollars in the Treasury.	
		Gold in general fund	236,717,819.58
Total	3,270,472,528.86	Total	3,270,472,528.86

SILVER DOLLARS.

Assets:		Liabilities:	
Silver dollars	$362,278,481.00	Silver certificates outstanding	$333,190,608.00
		Treasury notes of 1890 outstanding	1,490,223.00
		Silver dollars in general fund	27,597,650.00
Total	362,278,481.00	Total	362,278,481.00

GENERAL FUND.

Assets:		Liabilities:	
Gold (see above)	$236,717,819.58	Treasurer's checks outstanding	$1,101,083.90
Silver dollars (see above)	27,597,650.00	Deposits of Government officers—	
United States notes	2,581,646.00	Post Office Department	10,017,538.90
Federal reserve notes	1,666,265.50	Board of trustees, Postal Savings System—	
Federal reserve bank notes	1,077,592.00	5 per cent reserve, lawful money	6,069,623.05
National-bank notes	18,248,545.77	Other deposits	281,150.20
Subsidiary silver coin	14,859,282.82	Comptroller of the Currency, agent for creditors of insolvent banks	2,003,813.90
Minor coin	3,383,594.01	Postmasters, clerks of courts, disbursing officers, etc	28,679,035.52
Silver bullion	33,639,058.72	Deposits for—	
Unclassified (unsorted currency, etc.)	2,643,297.01	Redemption of Federal reserve notes (5 per cent fund, gold)	220,159,280.49
Deposits in Federal reserve banks	92,836,586.31	Redemption of Federal reserve bank notes (5 per cent fund, lawful money)	2,865,002.55
Deposits in special depositaries account of sales of Treasury bonds	210,189,000.00	Redemption of national-bank notes (5 per cent fund, lawful money)	30,556,214.77
Deposits in foreign depositaries—		Retirement of additional circulating notes, act May 30, 1908	25,130.00
To credit of Treasurer United States	89,230.09	Exchanges of currency, coin, etc	5,546,123.51
To credit of other Government officers	247,159.29		307,964,505.97
Deposits in national banks—			
To credit of Treasurer United States	7,588,276.14		
To credit of other Government officers	19,541,544.20		
Deposits in Philippine treasury—			
To credit of Treasurer United States	1,286,584.11	Net balance	366,258,546.18
Total	674,223,052.15	Total	674,223,052.15

Daily statement of the United States Treasury, compiled from latest proved reports from Treasury offices and depositaries, December 4, 1923—Con.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES THIS DAY.

Customs receipts	$2,213,892.91	General expenditures	$10,277,612.61
Internal-revenue receipts:		Interest on public debt	1,628,157.16
Income and profits tax	1,203,982.72	Postal deficiency	
Miscellaneous internal revenue	10,277,700.64	Operations in special accounts	[2] 1,566,285.05
Miscellaneous receipts [1]	28,202,863.48	Loans to railroads	
		Investment of trust funds	
		Other ordinary	158,951.93
Total ordinary receipts	41,898,439.75	Total ordinary expenditures	10,498,436.68
Public debt receipts	399,654.69	Public debt expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts	876,750.00
Balance previous day	336,043,074.93	Other public debt expenditures	707,443.51
		Balance to-day	366,258,545.13
Total	378,341,179.37	Total	378,341,179.37

[1] Includes receipts from miscellaneous sources credited direct to appropriations. [2] Excess of credits.

NOTE.—The amount to the credit of disbursing officers and agencies to-day was $758,679,781.06. Book credits for which obligations of foreign governments are held by the United States amount to $33,236,629.05.

Under the acts of July 14, 1890, and Dec. 23, 1913, deposits of lawful money for the retirement of outstanding national-bank and Federal reserve bank notes are paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and these obligations are made under the acts mentioned a part of the public debt. The amount of such obligations to-day was $48,400,676.50.

$626,522 in Federal reserve notes, $978,092 in Federal reserve bank notes, and $17,706,502 in national-bank notes are in the Treasury in process of redemption and are charges against the deposits for the respective 5 per cent redemption funds.

Comparative analysis of receipts and expenditures.

	This month.	Corresponding period last year.	Fiscal year 1923.[1]	Corresponding period fiscal year 1922.[1]
RECEIPTS—ORDINARY.				
Customs	$5,110,684.90	$4,186,968.44	$217,532,029.37	$125,040,178.39
Internal revenue:				
Income and profits tax	2,630,110.98	2,225,905.81	390,438,824.93	717,068,195.96
Miscellaneous internal revenue	16,420,734.98	23,440,410.39	444,514,162.66	605,452,833.32
Miscellaneous receipts:				
Proceeds Government-owned securities—				
Foreign obligations—				
Principal			517,878.04	450,500.00
Interest			115,004,755.43	13,174,634.64
Railroad securities	23,265,634.47		69,646,737.60	
All others		14,406.56	30,302,899.19	25,437,673.20
Trust fund receipts (reappropriated for investment)			11,302,936.83	16,815,130.29
Proceeds sale of surplus property	174,686.18	62,534.80	31,844,104.43	35,532,020.95
Panama Canal tolls, etc		229,727.24	5,706,777.49	5,375,823.10
Receipts from miscellaneous sources credited direct to appropriations	506,714.13		33,958,383.33	
Other miscellaneous	5,951,740.35	1,460,856.06	103,062,764.33	60,843,970.43
Total ordinary	55,158,705.99	31,620,709.30	1,450,935,162.63	1,605,790,965.28
Excess of ordinary receipts over total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts	29,877,047.06	4,385,490.78		
Excess of total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts over ordinary receipts			79,661,267.10	115,872,885.18
EXPENDITURES—ORDINARY.				
(Checks and warrants paid, etc.)				
General expenditures	20,847,451.45	16,357,175.37	847,518,000.66	987,473,529.19
Interest on public debt	4,338,779.72	4,348,006.25	378,663,043.49	368,416,824.87
Refunds of receipts:				
Customs	123,673.01		20,201,116.19	13,521,849.44
Internal revenue	351,502.55		46,061,681.42	10,479,565.40
Postal deficiency			22,203,989.35	32,115,802.61
Panama Canal	134,911.63	95,740.29	1,462,205.01	1,836,605.09
Operations in special accounts:				
Railroads	243,326.59	[2] 3,660,213.37	54,935,090.73	26,057,415.76
War Finance Corporation	[2] 2,351,990.93	3,864,496.70	[2] 57,559,830.80	3,457,561.78
Shipping Board	[2] 385,850.00	894,234.26	22,601,219.70	72,082,922.56
Alien property funds	18,004.91	17,429.02	661,291.12	[2] 108,836.53
Grain Corporation				25,000,000.00
Sugar Equalization Board				
Purchase of obligations of foreign governments				
Loans to railroads			3,783,587.00	
Investment of trust funds:				
Government life insurance fund			11,242,396.66	8,466,862.94
Civil-service retirement fund			9,775,099.03	283,274.11
District of Columbia teachers' retirement fund			60,540.17	64,993.24
Total ordinary	23,319,808.93	21,916,868.52	1,361,606,529.73	1,530,058,550.46
Public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts:				
Sinking fund	1,834,250.00	5,172,000.00	176,347,050.00	180,416,600.00
Purchases from foreign repayments			587,400.00	532,500.00
Received for estate taxes	127,100.00	146,350.00	1,061,650.00	10,639,800.00
Purchases from franchise tax receipts (Federal reserve banks)				
Forfeitures, gifts, etc	500.00		13,300.00	17,000.00
Total	1,961,850.00	5,318,350.00	177,969,000.00	191,605,900.00
Total expenditures chargeable against ordinary receipts	25,281,658.93	27,235,218.52	1,539,596,429.73	1,721,663,850.46

[1] Receipts and expenditures for June reaching the Treasury in July are included. [2] Excess of credits.

NOTE.—The analysis of receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923 is on the same basis as the Budget, with necessary adjustments to cover receipts credited to appropriations, including particularly proceeds of railroad securities. The analysis for the fiscal year 1922 is on the Budget basis, without adjustment. The figures given for operations in special accounts are net figures and make allowance for receipts and deposits credited to the account concerned.

Comparative analysis of public-debt receipts and expenditures.

	This month.	Corresponding period last year.	Fiscal year 1923.[1]	Corresponding period fiscal year 1922.[1]
RECEIPTS.				
Certificates of indebtedness			$709,500,000.00	$1,452,393,000.00
Treasury notes	$300.00		496,744,950.00	390,706,100.00
Treasury bonds	53,500.00		763,716,800.00	
Treasury savings securities	888,988.47	$144,995.38	63,876,097.80	6,447,549.93
Liberty bonds and Victory notes				[2] 1,300.00
Postal savings bonds			20,560.00	55,780.00
Deposits for retirement of national-bank notes and Federal reserve bank notes (acts of July 14, 1890, and Dec. 23, 1913)	125,000.00	1,700,000.00	53,300,575.00	70,640,102.50
Total	1,067,788.47	1,844,995.38	2,087,158,982.89	1,920,241,232.43
EXPENDITURES. (Including public debt retirements chargeable against ordinary receipts—see above.)				
Certificates of indebtedness	1,557,000.00	2,430,000.00	1,538,305,500.00	1,867,383,050.00
Treasury notes			25,000,000.00	
War savings securities	643,183.88	913,100.66	12,771,000.19	44,379,953.44
Treasury savings securities	88,515.55		3,920,942.05	
First Liberty bonds	500.00	1,200.00	13,900.00	114,250.00
Second Liberty bonds	19,400.00	38,900.00	41,176,550.00	2,884,600.00
Third Liberty bonds	47,600.00	10,400.00	18,176,050.00	2,989,050.00
Fourth Liberty bonds	59,800.00	92,850.00	8,004,800.00	4,818,900.00
Victory notes	2,474,400.00	5,175,000.00	407,014,600.00	310,798,500.00
Old debt items	20.00		11,900.00	15,900.94
National-bank notes and Federal reserve bank notes	668,000.00	1,574,950.00	36,939,250.00	53,612,420.00
Total	5,558,419.43	10,236,460.66	2,091,334,582.24	2,286,997,534.38

[1] Receipts and expenditures for June reaching the Treasury in July are included. [2] Counterentry (deduct).

Outstanding Federal reserve notes, Federal reserve bank notes, and national-bank notes.

	Total amount outstanding.	Amount in the Treasury in process of redemption.	Amount in circulation.	Amount in Treasury cash (not including amount in process of redemption).	Amount in circulation outside the Treasury.
Federal reserve notes[1]	$2,718,471,000	$926,522	$2,717,844,478	$1,039,743	$2,716,804,735
Federal reserve bank notes[2]	48,204,663	978,092	47,225,571	99,500	47,127,071
National-bank notes[2]	761,903,182	17,706,502	744,196,680	542,043	743,654,637

[1] Against which $867,688,000 in commercial paper is held by Federal reserve agents and $2,048,084,000 in gold held jointly by Federal reserve banks and agents.
[2] Secured by United States bonds and other securities held by the Treasurer.

Transactions affecting the circulation of Federal reserve notes, Federal reserve bank notes, and national-bank notes.

	This month.	Corresponding period last year.	Fiscal year 1923.	Corresponding period fiscal year 1922.
Federal reserve notes:				
Issued (from weekly reports)			$860,732,000	$913,604,000
Retired (from weekly reports)			679,748,000	1,215,954,000
Received for redemption by Treasurer United States	$522,000	$781,142	23,716,790	33,453,750
Federal reserve bank notes:				
Issued		60,000	5,360,000	50,688,000
Received for redemption by Treasurer United States	762,601	1,074,273	37,329,819	83,039,625
National-bank notes:				
Issued	6,900,150	6,421,710	216,247,310	274,621,430
Received for redemption by Treasurer United States	5,022,544	5,542,354	214,819,029	273,900,493
Additional national-bank notes retired[1]		300	5,950	22,910

[1] For retirement of regular issues of national-bank and Federal reserve bank notes, see above.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation.

The Clerk read as follows:

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *December 5, 1922.*

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SPEAKER: I have tendered to Gov. A. M. Hyde my resignation as Representative in Congress from the first district of Missouri, effective December 5, 1922.

It is with extreme regret that I sever my official connection with the House, and I desire to take this opportunity to express to you and to the Members of the House my sincere thanks for the many courtesies extended to me and to utter my appreciation of the delightful associations it has been my pleasure to enjoy during my service there.

With renewed assurances of my best personal wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

FRANK C. MILLSPAUGH.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] whether we can agree on time for general debate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think so. How much time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. MADDEN. I would suggest two and a half hours.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is an hour and a quarter to a side.

Mr. MADDEN. Or it might be that we could get through quicker.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will agree on three hours, an hour and a half to a side.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that general debate continue for three hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate continue for three hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee and one-half by himself. Is there objection? [After a

pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion of the gentleman.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be able to announce to the House that the Committee on Appropriations has five bills practically ready for presentation to the House. This bill is the first bill taken up for consideration. We hope to be able to present all the bills making appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 not later than the middle of next month. [Applause.]

I wish to talk to you a little about the effectiveness of the Budget and the detail of its operation. The Budget, as you will realize, places the responsibility on the President of the United States of stating a program which he proposes to enter upon this next year and indicate the cost. The President has accepted the responsibility that is placed upon him by the law, and he has exercised that responsibility in a remarkable way. [Applause.] For the first time in the history of the country, I think, a President of the United States has really paid great attention to the cost of government. President Harding has, and he has done so very systematically, and he deserves the commendation of the Congress for his activity in this direction and the thanks of the American people for the results of his activity.

There are 22 statements printed in the Budget that I would like every Member of the House to read. I shall not have time to go into them, but they are very important; they are illuminating; they are interesting; they show the painstaking care which has been applied to the preparation of the Budget, and any person who is interested in the finances of the United States will be well repaid for the time he may take in studying this Budget system.

The estimates for 1924 request appropriations amounting to $3,669,000,000, in round figures. That includes the Postal Service. The estimate for the Postal Service is submitted as $590,000,000. Exclusive of the Postal Service, the recommendation of appropriations for all the other activities of the Government amounts to $3,079,000,000, which is $150,000,000 less than the like estimates in the Budget for 1923, submitted a year ago. The appropriations for 1923 in round figures were $3,838,000,000, including the Postal Service.

The Postal Service appropriations amount to $564,000,000, or, exclusive of the Postal Service, the entire appropriations for 1923 amount to $3,274,000,000, making the estimates for 1924, exclusive of the Postal Service, $195,000,000 less than the appropriations for 1923. Included in the $195,000,000 of reduction is $125,000,000 of interest accumulated on the war-savings certificates issued in 1918. These war-savings certificates then issued had a face value of about $825,000,000. They were sold at a discount. The amount received for them was about $500,000,000. The interest accumulated is over the five-year period, and this $125,000,000 really is chargeable from 1918 up to the present time, and only a portion of it could under any circumstances be attributed to the expense of the fiscal year 1924.

Then, we have $38,000,000 reduction on account of the $240 bonus, which is not estimated in the Budget for 1924. It never has been estimated for by the executive branch of the Government. For neither of these items is there a corresponding item in 1924. The $163,000,000 compressed in the two items to which I have alluded leave a net reduction in all other items of $32,000,000. The bonus has never been submitted to the Congress by the executive branch, as I said. It has always been by congressional action, and it is fair to assume that the Budget has been prepared in this instance with the expectation that the bonus will be continued, because no recommendations have been made through the Budget for any general increase in compensation to persons in the Government service.

The estimates for the Postal Service for 1924 show an increase of $26,000,000 over 1923. This is due to the constantly increasing volume of business done by the Postal Department.

There is a reduction of $50,000,000 in the estimates for the Shipping Board, due to the fact that the amount then appropriated for 1923 for payment of claims is not being repeated for 1924. And I may say here in this connection that the Shipping Board, out of the $50,000,000 appropriated for the payment of claims, advises me that they have settled all the claims that were then pending, and they expect to pay into the Treasury of the United States about $20,000,000 of the $50,000,000 that was set aside for that purpose, and that the claims will be settled by the balance. [Applause.]

They are not asking anything for next year for that purpose. [Applause.] They will ask, of course, for money to operate; but I wish to say that under Mr. Lasker's management they have made good the promises which he made. When he came before the Committee on Appropriations more than a year ago he found the treasury of the Shipping Board with a $17,000,000 deficit. To-day the treasury of the Shipping Board has $138,000,000 in fact, and not more than $38,000,000 of that will be drawn against, while I think the other $100,000,000 will be carried to the general fund of the Treasury for general purposes. [Applause.]

I am very proud to be able to make this statement, because I believed that Mr. Lasker would make good when he came in, and I am gratified to know the extent to which he has made good since he came in.

There is a net increase of $22,000,000 in the estimates for the Veterans' Bureau. There is a decrease in the item for military and naval compensation of $42,000,000. There is a decrease in the medical and hospital item of $12,000,000, and a decrease of $22,000,000 in the vocational training item.

A new item appears under the Veterans' Bureau calling for $90,000,000 to supplement the military and naval insurance fund in the insurance of the World War veterans. This is due to the fact that the premium collections are estimated to be $90,000,000 less than the payments which are estimated to be required to be made on account of losses on the insurance in force. There is about $2,000,000,000 of insurance in force on 216,000 policies.

There is a new item of $33,000,000 not appearing in the 1923 appropriation in the present Budget, due to the contract obligations under the authorization of $65,000,000 carried in the road bill, which was passed at the last session of Congress. Any funds required by the States for 1923 under the roads authorization will probably be submitted in a deficiency bill a little later during this session.

The estimates for military and naval force for 1924 are practically the same as those for 1923, and for the existing personnel, so that we come before you in advance of the report of the military and naval bills with the information, stated in a general way, that you need not expect any increase in the amount to be paid for the Army or the Navy or in the number of men to be enlisted or the number of officers to be retained.

The estimated deficit on the basis of actual receipts and expenditures at the beginning of the fiscal year 1922 was $759,000,000. At the close of 1922 there was an actual surplus of $314,000,000, which showed the efficiency with which the administrative side of the Government, coupled with the economies enforced by the Congress, has functioned. To take a $759,000,000 deficit at the beginning of the year and change it into a $314,000,000 surplus at the end of the year was no mean achievement. [Applause.] I think the people of the United States ought to know what was done. The indicated deficit for 1923 was $697,000,000 on the basis of preliminary figures submitted by the departments on July 1 last. The increase in estimated receipts and the decrease in estimated expenditures have reduced the apparent 1923 deficit to $274,000,000 as of this date. I said last July that it was not as bad as it looked. There are obligations to be met during 1923 due to the Federal control of railroads of about $211,000,000. If it were not for this, a war-period obligation, the amount of the deficit for 1923 would be reduced to $63,000,000.

The 1924 estimates of receipts and expenditures show an indicated surplus of $181,000,000. If we take the 1922 surplus of $314,000,000 and the 1924 estimated surplus of $181,000,000, you will find they aggregate $495,000,000, and if the indicated deficit of $274,000,000 for 1923 is deducted from the aggregate surplus of 1922 and 1924 you will see that we have in the three years of Mr. Harding's administration a net estimated surplus of approximately $220,000,000. [Applause].

I am not worried about these so-called indicated deficits that appear when the bureaus make their preliminary esti-

mates of expenses of the Government and receipts a year in advance. We have fixed policies not only of economy but of systematic conduct of the business of the Government. The President of the United States has not only invited his Cabinet into his confidential councils in the matter of instituting economy in Government but he has also invited and directed every bureau chief to appear before the tribunal of the Chief Magistrate of the Nation, and they have all been told that they must economize in the work under their jurisdiction. The result has been marvelous. The President is entitled to the thanks of the American people for the fidelity with which he has administered the affairs of the Nation. [Applause.]

And when we consider that all this has been accomplished in the face of constantly decreasing revenues, the record is a remarkable achievement. We ought to be proud of it, and I am sure that when the American people realize the complications, the perplexing problems that have confronted us, they will be happy to give credit where credit is due.

The postal deficit for 1922 is $64,000,000. The estimated deficit for 1923 is $31,500,000; but the estimated surplus for 1924 is in the neighborhood of $1,000,000.

Reorganization in the Postal Service is taking place every day. New economies are being introduced, better business methods employed, all leading to a better performance in this wonderful service. Some of the offices have been reorganized, and where they have been reorganized great economies have resulted. Some effort was made by Members in another body during the consideration of the last Post Office appropriation bill to add a number of places to the service in the department here; but the conferees who were Members of this House refused to concur. We believed then, as we ascertained later to be the fact, that a great reduction could be made in the forces that then existed, and shortly after we refused to allow the increased number of people there we were advised that 149 of the existing employees were dismissed as no longer necessary.

The public debt is being gradually reduced and is now more than $1,000,000,000 less than it was at the beginning of the fiscal year 1922.

It is increasingly important, gentlemen, that economy be practiced in all the branches of the Government. The fact that there is an indicated surplus for 1924 of $181,000,000 should not be an invitation to anybody to get extravagant notions or to urge legislation that might lead to extravagant expenditures.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. MADDEN. In just a moment. The fact that there is an indicated surplus of $181,000,000 for 1924 should be no excuse for extravagance, but every dollar of surplus should be used to reduce the public debt and to stop the payment of interest.

Mr. LONDON. How was the decrease of the public debt accomplished?

Mr. MADDEN. It was accomplished partly by the use of the surplus of $313,000,000, partly by the use of the sinking fund and other public-debt retirement receipts, and partly by a reduction in the net balance in the general fund of the Treasury.

Now I get to the bill. The regular annual appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1923 for the Treasury Department aggregated $118,844,828. The permanent and indefinite appropriations aggregated $1,336,146,910, or a total of $1,454,739,044.

The total of the estimates for the appropriations of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1924, exclusive of any amount for increased compensation, is $11,005,877.16 less than the appropriations for 1923. This reduction consists of a decrease of $1,011,059.94 in the estimates of regular annual appropriations and $9,994,817 in the estimates of permanent and indefinite appropriations. The amount recommended to be appropriated in the accompanying bill is $115,000,000 in round numbers, and is $3,725,018.44 less than the total of 1923 regular annual appropriations, and $2,713,958.50 less than the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1924.

The appropriations for the public-debt service show a reduction from $3,700,000 to $3,250,000, or a decrease of $450,000, and that is due to the fact that we are dispensing with the services of several hundred people in that branch of the service.

Next I come to the customs service. An increase was requested in the Budget for collecting revenue from customs from $11,300,000 to $12,250,000. Of the additional $950,000 the sum of $500,000 was requested to be made immediately available for the remainder of the fiscal year 1923, and $450,000 for the fiscal year 1924.

The committee recommends a total of $11,950,000, an increase over the current appropriation of $650,000, and of this amount $200,000 is suggested to be made immediately available.

The amount allowed will provide for an additional personnel of approximately 300 people, and makes provision for laboratory facilities in connection with work on imported dyes. The additional personnel will bring the total number employed up to approximately 7,400 people in the customs service. But even that number will be 900 less than the service had employed in 1912.

The committee feels justified in recommending this increase because of the tremendous increase in customs business and because of the additional administrative duties placed upon the service by the recent tariff act.

The revenue collected from customs during the month of October, 1922, which was the first full month after the new act went into effect, was $40,000,000. The amount collected during the month of November exceeded $41,500,000. It is estimated that the revenues from this service during the fiscal year 1923 will be $450,000,000. The largest collections from customs in any prior fiscal year is that for the fiscal year 1922, which amounted to $356,000,000, and the 1922 collections were $23,000,000 higher than any other previous year.

The customs service is not able to handle the volume of business coming to our ports with its present force. Congestion exists on the docks and in the appraisers' warehouses. Much of the imported goods is not handled as efficiently as it should be handled due to the shortage of help, and the chief of the division stated to the committee that in his judgment additional revenue, approximating $25,000,000 annually, could be collected with a more adequate personnel.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What the gentleman has just said would seem to prove that the present tariff law is not prohibitive.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the present tariff law has proved its own case and the wisdom of the gentleman from Ohio and other gentlemen associated with him. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman has just made a statement that an extra $25,000,000 could be collected. Can the gentleman give the reason for that?

Mr. MADDEN. The reason why they say they can collect $25,000,000 more is that with the present inadequate force they are unable to make personal investigation of the value of the goods that come in, and they must take the value stated in the invoice.

Mr. SNELL. Is there an additional appropriation for that purpose in this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. What does it amount to?

Mr. MADDEN. It amounts to $650,000.

Mr. SNELL. And by the expenditure of an additional $650,000 the gentleman hopes to collect an additional $25,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it may be $50,000,000, but we place it at the lowest figure. The committee is of the opinion that the amount recommended should be approved by the House in order that the Government may receive the full amount of revenue to which it is entitled under the law, and that importers of merchandise may be able promptly to have their goods examined, appraised, and passed.

Now, I would like to use a little time in reference to the Internal Revenue Service. The appropriations for the Internal Revenue Service are decreased from $60,628,380 for the current year to $57,060,290 for the next year. The sum allowed is $3,568,090 less than the current appropriation and $1,608,400 less than the amount requested in the Budget.

The decreases in the appropriations are mainly due to three causes—the declaration by the Supreme Court of the United States of the unconstitutionality of the child labor law, a decrease because of the transfer of the printing and binding allotment to the general departmental appropriation for that purpose, and a decrease in the force engaged in the audit of the personal-tax return. The committee has cut the amount allowed by the Budget for collecting and assessing taxes by $1,500,000. It is believed from the rate of expenditure during the first quarter of the fiscal year and making allowances for such additions to the force in the audit of corporation returns as may be made during this year, that the amount allowed will be sufficient to maintain the service during the next fiscal year.

The collections of internal revenue decreased from $4,595,357,061.95 for the fiscal year 1921 to $3,197,451,083 for the fiscal year 1922, or approximately 30 per cent. The estimated collections for the fiscal year 1923 show a further reduction to $2,400,000,000. The number of income-tax returns filed shows a decrease from 8,716,072 for the calendar year 1921 to 7,568,222 for the calendar year 1922. The disposal of the arrearage of

work in the examination of returns for previous years shows a substantial gain.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman any information as to the cause of the large falling off in the revenue?

Mr. MADDEN. My judgment is that many people who showed large profits previously, and where the largest number of returns were made, showed losses, and that they also employed means by which they avoided the payment of taxes on account of the large surtax.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the gentleman think that it can be accounted for in large measure by the enormous amount of money that has been invested in tax-exempt securities?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. They avoid the payment of taxes in all ways that they can. They do not invest their money in business enterprises that would give employment to men and women, but they invest the surplus in nontaxable securities.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Has the gentleman any accurate information as to the amount of nontaxable securities outstanding?

Mr. MADDEN. We did not go into that, and I do not know.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I noticed by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury that the amount is increasing to the extent of a billion dollars a year. An estimate says that there is at least $15,000,000,000 now outstanding which of course escapes taxation altogether.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for me to ask a question of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the department undertake to collect statistics in connection with income-tax returns that tend to show to what extent investments are now represented by tax-exempt securities?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think they undertake to do that, but the fact is that a number of very rich men in the last few years have been investing in municipal bonds and other tax-exempt securities.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It seems to me that it might be possible for the Treasury Department to gather statistics along that line which might prove very important. I had an inquiry the other day from my own State to which I was obliged to reply by saying that I did not believe such statistics are now available.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think they are available, and I do not think the Treasury Department has any machinery to get them accurately.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe in the income-tax returns of the last year there was a question which called for an answer as to the amount of money invested in various bonds, and that should have supplied the information.

Mr. LONGWORTH. There was a suggestion made by some gentlemen in the Treasury Department as to the possibility of providing in the revenue law a different method of taxation for income derived from municipal bonds, but it has never gone any further than that, so far as I know.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. The Secretary of the Treasury, or at least those in the department, have stated to our committee that they had no basis for fixing that sum, but Doctor Seligman, who was before our committee, made the statement that at least $20,000,000,000 were subject to investment by those who desire to so invest.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The $20,000,000 000 did not represent merely the amount of municipal securities, but also Liberty bonds, and so forth.

Mr. FREAR. All securities that would escape taxation.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman advise the House how many are employed in the Internal Revenue Department?

Mr. MADDEN. I think about 22,000, of whom 3,900 are in the prohibition unit.

I have only a few minutes of time left, and I do want to state some things that I think the House would be interested in. Since 1917 it may be interesting for the House and the country to know that the Government has collected in taxes through the Internal Revenue Department the sum of $21,558,531,640.48. It is also interesting to note that there was assessed and collected as a result of these audits, audits on returns submitted by taxpayers, the sum of $1,230,209,618. That amount has been collected on underpaid schedules. That is to say, the taxpayer filed a schedule, and the audit showed that his figures were not sufficient to meet his obligation to the Government, and a new assessment was made, and upon the assessments since 1917, up to the present time, resulting from these audits over $1,320,000,000 have been collected. On overpaid schedules there have been claims by the taxpayers for refunds, and the audits made up to the time they have the information show that the payments amounting to $102,547,448.39 had been paid. I think this is a remarkable showing. Out of $21,000,000,000 less than one-half of 1 per cent has been returned so far because of overpayment. It is true that all of the audits have not been made. We are still auditing the consolidated returns for 1917, and the force is being concentrated on the audit of the 1917 consolidated returns because the statute of limitations runs by the 4th of March next, and it is hoped that all of these returns will be audited and all assessments made for any underpayments before the statute runs.

Mr. CRISP. Is it the policy of the Treasury Department when this audit has been filed, if the taxpayer has overpaid, for the Government to notify the taxpayer?

Mr. MADDEN. It is. They have now so completed the system that when they discover a taxpayer has overpaid, they send a certificate of credit for the amount of the overpayment to the internal-revenue collector of the district in which the man resides, with a request that the collector look up the record of the taxpayer's obligations to the Government, if any, and if he owes the Government anything in that particular district he deducts the credit from what he owes.

Mr. CRISP. I asked the question because we have all had cases where our constituents have been writing to attorneys here in Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. They have now a very perfect system, and they do not approve of any overpayment or credit until after it has been sent to the local internal-revenue collector and he checks it up and it comes back again with his O. K. The matter goes through three or four or five processes before the record is completed.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I understand that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, there were about 20,000 unadjusted claims for refund of taxes paid in excess, and the statement of the commissioner showed that he was running behind about 20,000 each year, and that every two years he would run behind one year in the adjustment of those claims.

Mr. MADDEN. The record shows that they are making an advance.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. How many years will it take them to get up to date?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course they are auditing on the consolidated returns for 1917 now, and nobody could tell how long it would take, but on the personal income taxes under the 1040 form, as I understand, they are nearly current.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The report I have from the commissioner over his own signature would show he is running behind one year in two, and according to that rate he never would catch up.

Mr. MADDEN. This is where we are getting to, but still——

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. FESS. I have a great many inquiries asking in reference to the audit of 1917, 1918, 1920, and up to the present time, and I have reported that the audit will be given of 1918, and our friends ask why can they not have all at once. I do not know how to answer them.

Mr. MADDEN. They are working on the consolidated return of 1917, because they want to complete that work before the statute of limitations runs.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. What is a consolidated return?

Mr. MADDEN. A consolidated return is a return made by a corporation like the United States Steel Company, where there is a parent corporation and a number of subsidiary corporations and an ascertainment of taxes due from each corporation connected with the parent corporation—that is the one thing that makes the difficulty of auditing.

Mr. FESS. How shall I reply to business friends in my State asking why these audits can not be made for the full term instead of in one year?

Mr. MADDEN. The reason that they can not be made for the full term is that they can not complete the work in time without running counter to the statute of limitations. That is the reason.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman makes provision for payment of refund of income taxes?

Mr. MADDEN. We make provision for $12,000,000, which, of course, is a bagatelle. We have same before us; in fact, it is a matter already in our committee under a request for $42,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That will be in the form of a deficit?

Mr. MADDEN. That will come in a deficiency bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. When will that be passed?

Mr. MADDEN. We hope to bring it in as soon as possible. We will not delay it.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to finish this one statement, and then I will answer any questions anybody wants, if I have the time. I promised time to a number of gentlemen; and if I do not give it to them, they will feel hurt about it. I want to talk a little about the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. For nearly 40 years the utilization of the most improved type of machinery in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has been a disputed and contested question. The legislation on the subject for the most part has been a restriction upon the most efficient administration of the plant. As early as 1886 there appeared a limitation on the appropriation to the effect that no part of the sum should be used for the purchase or operation of any new improved plate-printing presses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to notify the gentleman from Illinois that he has used 45 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall take 10 minutes additional. This was followed from time to time by restrictive legislative provisions, among them being the prohibition against the repair or construction of steam plate-printing presses, and later a prohibition against the increase in the number of steam plate-printing presses. Still later a law was enacted requiring that all bonds, notes, and checks should be printed on hand-roller presses. In 1912 the permanent law now affecting the bureau was enacted. It provided, in effect, that the Secretary of the Treasury might utilize power presses for printing the backs—mind you, backs of paper money—and bonds and the fronts and backs of checks. The law also provided that in printing the backs of paper money that four subject plates should be used. It also provided that in the execution of any year's work on power presses not more than one-fifth of the hand presses should be displaced in one year. It left the printing of the faces of all paper money on hand presses from four subject plates. In 1917, after the outbreak of the war, when it was seen that the war work of the Government could not be turned out with part modern and part antiquated equipment, a law was enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to utilize whatever printing presses or power presses he might desire, so long as he was able to retain in the service the same number of qualified plate printers as were engaged in the work. That is to say, it did not make any difference how much modern machinery you put in, you could not put any man out. This authority was for the period of the war with Germany.

In 1919 this authority was extended during the period of the emergency growing out of the war with Germany, with the same stipulation that in the utilization of power presses and the adoption of any improved style of printing the Secretary of the Treasury must be governed by the restriction that he must still retain the same number of permanent plate printers. So to-day we are brought face to face with the situation where the bureau is unable to proceed any further with the installation of power presses. The emergency has come to an end, and the Treasury Department will be forced to operate under the provisions of 1912, which is a permanent law. There are in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at the present time 242 power presses and 246 hand presses. A power press can produce from three to four times more work in a day than a hand press.

A hand press requires a plate printer and one assistant, and a power press requires a plate printer and two assistants. The labor cost of printing a thousand sheets from eight-subject plates on a power press is $7.95 for the faces of the notes and $6.60 for the backs. The same labor cost per thousand sheets from four-subject plates on a hand press is $15.70 for the faces. This shows a difference of $7.22 in favor of the power press and the eight-subject plate over the hand press and the four-subject plate.

Now, there is no difference in the quality of the work performed, as the best experts in the land testify.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I can not yield until I finish this. I have not much time. I am stating the facts. If gentlemen want to be guided by the facts, they have them here.

The counterfeiting of a power-press note is no easier than of a hand-press note, so the Chief of the Secret Service testified. Most of the counterfeits are being made by photographic processes. The sole question involved here, gentlemen, is whether the Government should retain the hand presses and give employment to a larger number of plate printers and their assistants than would be used in the operation of the power presses. The installation of 58 power presses will do away with the utilization of 196 hand presses. Two employees to each of the 196 hand presses requires 392 employees; 3 employees to each of the 58 power presses requires 174 employees. The difference between 392 and 174 gives a reduction of 218 persons under the power-press plan. But it will be even more than that. The committee has recommended the installation of 58 power presses and the displacement of 196 hand presses. In order that the power presses may be fully utilized it also recommends authority to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to utilize the printing plates that carry more than four subjects each.

At the present time under the temporary law only 40 power presses are engaged in printing the backs of the United States currency from eight-subject plates and 23 presses are engaged in printing the faces on the eight-subject plates. All the remainder of the 175 power presses are printing from four-subject plates, notwithstanding the fact that 80 per cent more work can be produced in a day on an eight-subject plate press than is produced on a four-subject plate press.

There is no difference in the quality of the work produced from the eight-subject plates and the four-subject plates. The utilization of eight-subject plates will further reduce the number of employees below the 218 stated in the bill. The plan which the committee recommends shows an immediate economy in its operation.

There has been provided in the bill the sum of $355,000 for the purchase and installation of 58 power presses. It is expected that this will be accomplished by June 30, 1923, if the item is included in the bill. There have been reductions on account of the plan recommended as follows: From the appropriation for pay of plate printers and assistants we recommend the reduction of $746,555, and from the appropriation for pay of other employees $50,000, or a total reduction of $796,555. Then we add $355,000 for the purchase of presses. We deduct that from the other sum, and it leaves you a net reduction of $441,000. While the net reduction shown here is only a little more than $400,000 for 1924 it will be seen that in the ensuing years, after the presses have been paid for, there will be anywhere from $800,000 to $1,000,000 annual saving in the conduct of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed the allotted time.

Mr. MADDEN. I will take five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman takes five minutes more.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if the provision which the committee recommends is not retained in the bill I shall be compelled to offer amendments restoring to the bill the amounts above stated, because the reductions have only been made on the condition that the provision in the bill is to be adopted.

The committee does not present any new, untried plan. Half of the presses of the bureau are now power presses. Their capacity and efficiency have been long tried and established. Much of the Government's money in the past few years has been printed, front and back, from eight-subject plates. This method of printing has been proven efficient. The sole question in what the committee proposes, stripped of all other considerations, is whether or not the House is willing to place the Bureau of Engraving and Printing upon a basis that will permit it to operate at an annual cost of anywhere from $800,000 to $1,000,000 less than it is now costing. Even though it may mean the elimination from the pay roll of that bureau of several hundred worthy employees, should there be any hesitation about the proper thing to do in the interest of the taxpayers of the country?

I do not think so, and I would consider myself criminally negligent if I knew the facts that I have stated to you and did not present the case to the House for its consideration. [Applause.] I know it is not popular, but I do not care whether it is popular or unpopular in any department of the Government [applause], or whether I am here one day or one year. [Applause.] Wherever I find anything in a department, any practice that ought not to exist and for which the taxpayers of the Nation are paying without justification, I will present the case to you for your decision. That is what I am doing here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the evidence on page 323 shows that this one item alone ultimately is going to save $1,377,000 a year.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is right.

Now, as I said, the whole subject that is with us here is, Should there be any hesitation about the proper thing to do in the interest of the taxpayers of the country, who are insisting that the Government business should be placed upon the most efficient basis? To say to the Secretary of the Treasury that he shall operate half the power presses and half the hand presses is about equivalent to saying to the head of any other department, "Mr. Secretary, you must operate half of your forces making your reports in longhand writing, while the other half is to be employed in operating typewriters."

That is what it means. Gentlemen, the responsibility is ours. We may hurt somebody in dispensing with their services, and I am the last man in the world who would try to do an injury to any man; but we have an obligation here. We are under oath to do our duty, and our duty is clear. [Applause.]

We do not hesitate to put the employees out of other departments. We are demanding a reduction in the forces everywhere. Now, the question arises, What is there peculiarly holy about this particular department that justifies the continuation of a practice there that exists nowhere else? If there is anybody here who wants to assume the responsibility of keeping the present antiquated methods in vogue, I have done my duty when I present the case to you. It is now in your hands. I leave it in your keeping. You can do your duty as you see it. I have done mine as I conceived it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to enter at this time upon any discussion of the pending bill. I shall probably have something to say about some of its provisions when we read it under the five-minute rule. I do want to submit very briefly some remarks with reference to the Budget that has been presented to Congress by the President for the year 1924. I shall do so in a very general way at this time because, frankly, I have not had an opportunity to analyze closely the many thousand items and the various details and provisions contained in this immense Budget. I was away from the House and from Washington on Monday when it was sent to Congress, being absent on a mission of the House, and I only secured a copy of it within the last 36 hours, and on account of other official duties have not had opportunity to closely analyze it, as I expect to do later. What I shall say will not be said in a partisan spirit. The Budget law was not a partisan bill. It was favored by both Republicans and Democrats and was put through Congress practically unanimously.

Everyone in the House, of course, wishes to see the Budget system perfected and to see it accomplish what it was intended to accomplish in the way of a great saving and economy to the people. Constructive criticism will prove helpful in its administration and should be welcomed by those who wish for its fullest success. I have no criticism of the new Director of the Budget, Gen. H. M. Lord, who, in my judgment, is one of the most efficient and clever gentlemen it has been my good fortune to know. He is a man of wide experience and great energy, and has undoubtedly devoted his untiring time and attention to the preparation of this Budget. Of course, General Lord is under limitations, because he acts only as the business representative or business agent, so to speak, of the President. He can initiate no independent policies of his own, but must carry out, as he should, the policies of the President, who appointed him.

Neither would I detract from the President of the United States, whom the chairman of the committee [Mr. MADDEN] declared to be the first President who has ever given any time or attention or study to Budget details. In view of some of the statements contained in his message transmitting the Budget, I have wondered just how much time he gave to the study of its details. I submit that he is the first President upon whom was ever devolved specifically by law the plain duty to give attention to the details of the Budget. Before the Budget law was passed there was no responsibility whatsoever resting upon the President of the United States with reference to it, and gentlemen who were here and voted for that law will recall that that was the chief argument in its support; that is, that it imposed a personal responsibility upon the President of the United States in the transmission of the estimates for appropriations. I submit, gentlemen, that a very cursory analysis of this Budget will show that when you eliminate those appropriations which were made for this fiscal year 1923 for activities which everyone knew would not be required next year, the estimates for appropriations for 1924 exceed the appropriations for 1923, and the same is true of the estimated expenditures for 1923–24, and it is my purpose to demonstrate the truth of this statement by an actual citation of the figures.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Before the gentleman does that may I interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take pleasure in yielding to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I approved the enactment of the Budget law and voted for it, just as I think the gentleman did. But my attention is called to this fact, that ordinarily the Budget estimates are reduced by the Committee on Appropriations, and I think the action of the committee is generally followed by Congress. Now, that being true, what does the gentleman think is the practical value of the operation of the Budget system? If there were no Bureau of the Budget sending in estimates, does the gentleman think that the Committee on Appropriations would do differently from what it now commonly does in reaching its conclusions and reporting the appropriation bills? Or does the work of the Bureau of the Budget serve in some very valuable way to guide or direct the action of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I think it does. General Lord in a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations this morning stated, if I am correct in my recollection, that the Budget Bureau had reduced the estimates submitted to him as director in the sum of $180,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Three hundred million dollars from the first or preliminary estimates and $180,000,000 from the last.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Three hundred million dollars from the first or preliminary estimates and $180,000,000 when they were finally made up and transmitted to Congress, and the gentleman from Virginia can readily see that that has not only saved the committee a great deal of work in the effort to eliminate that immense sum of money and to get at an actual proper basis for appropriations, but that possibly Congress might have overlooked some of the reductions that General Lord with his large force was enabled to make.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Was or was not the Committee on Appropriations usually in the habit of cutting the departmental estimates just about in the same way in which the Bureau of the Budget now cuts those estimates before it transmits them to Congress?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, and an examination of the appropriations during all of the past years will show that. There may be a question raised by some as to whether it was done as scientifically as it is done by the Budget Bureau, because the gentleman will appreciate the fact that naturally the Bureau of the Budget, with a force costing $150,000 a year and with numerous experts and accountants who are continually on this service from month to month through the entire fiscal year, is better able to scientifically eliminate excessive appropriations where there is a disposition to eliminate them than a committee which sits here and must depend upon sending for bureau heads and other officials connected with the Government for the information sought. And right in that connection I want to refer to the President's message on the Budget and to this particular language. He says:

> We now come to the estimates of appropriations for 1924, amounting to $3,078,940,331.69. This is $195,298,359.14 less than the appropriations already made for the current fiscal year, 1923. Early in July I called together in open meeting for the third time the executives constituting the business establishment of the Government and at that time further emphasized the need of more rigid economy in the expenditure of public funds. I stated that the estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1924 would not permit so liberal appropriations for that year as had been made for the current fiscal year, 1923. The preparation of the estimates of appropriations as they appear in the Budget was controlled by this policy.

Now, listen:

> While it may be possible to make a small reduction in an item here and there, any material reduction will necessitate a change in the administrative policy upon which estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 are based.

I do not know whether the President intended by that language to say to Congress that it should not reduce these estimates or not. I do know that many of the eastern papers construed it as a declaration on the part of the President to Congress that the administration would very earnestly disapprove any action of Congress in reducing the estimates submitted by him to Congress. If that was the purpose of the President, I think acquiescence in it would be most unfortunate. Even this bill has reduced the estimates over $3,000,000, and I take it that other bills, where it will be possible to make larger reductions, where charges are not fixed, as they are in this bill,

will make greater reductions. If we ever get to the point where Congress, on account of the passage of this Budget law, permits the President, through the Director of the Budget, to make up the appropriations for Congress and the country, it will prove to be very unfortunate that the Budget system was ever adopted. And I say this as one who was a member of the select committee which framed the Budget law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Apropos to what the gentleman is saying, what did the Budget say or recommend as to the change in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing? Did they recommend this change?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That was done by the committee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was done by the committee. Let me say that I was not here when the hearings on this bill were had, having been detained at home by illness in my family, but I do not think there was any recommendation by the Budget Bureau on that point.

Now, I stated a moment ago that, if you eliminate from the 1923 appropriations those appropriations which everyone knew would not be necessary to carry for 1924, the appropriations asked for 1924 will exceed those of 1923.

I wish to say again that I am only making this statement for the purpose of giving to the country what I believe to be the facts. I think the time has come when we should quit camouflaging on appropriations made by Congress. The Director of the Budget and Congress camouflaged for the past two years in the effort to make the people believe that some real economy was being effected, but I think we ought to tell the country the real truth. The people are entitled to the facts about the appropriations and the administration, and Congress ought to quit hedging in the effort to cover them up.

What are the facts? The President commented with some degree of pride on the fact that the estimates for 1924 are $195,298,359.14 less than the appropriations for 1923, and he made the statement that this was made possible by economies and savings brought about by him. Let us see if that is true. That excludes the Postal Service. If you include the Postal Service, it will make a difference of $169,656,934.14. I wish to say here that although it has been the custom of Congress, both Democratic and Republican, for years, I have never been able to understand why in submitting the estimates and discussing the appropriations the Postal Service is always excluded. I know that we derive the revenue that is spent for the Postal Service from that service. But it has always seemed to me that there ought to be estimates made to Congress of the entire money necessary to run the Government, and that the cost of the Postal Service should be included, the money derived therefrom being at the same time counted as a part of the general receipts instead of balancing the expenditures off with the receipts.

I want to call attention to the fact that in the estimates submitted it is stated that in 1924 the Government will expend $12,250,000 for reclamation purposes, as against $14,800,000 which was appropriated in the fiscal year 1923. That is a difference of $2,550,000. Yet the Budget, instead of estimating the full amount of $12,250,000, deducted from that sum $7,500,000, which it is estimated will be secured from rentals, and so forth, and only estimates for $4,750,000, thus creating a false balance in its favor for 1924 over 1923 of $10,050,000.

In addition to that, in the Navy authority is asked to use $23,200,000 in the naval supply account fund for the purchase of materials and as cash, and that should have been included in the estimates in order to show the full facts. These two items if allowed aggregate $33,250,000, which should have been added to the estimate and which would have brought the above figures down to $162,000,000, or, including the Postal Service, down to $136,000,000.

But I want to call attention to the further fact that the estimates for the year 1924 do not include $150,000,000 interest appropriated in 1923. In other words, we appropriated for 1923 $1,100,000 to take care of the interest on the public debt and $125,000,000 accrued discount on war-savings certificates. This year we are asked to appropriate only $950,000,000. So, as a matter of fact, we are asked to appropriate for 1924 $150,000,000 less in interest, and certainly the administration and the Budget Bureau is not entitled to take credit for that as a saving to the people of the United States. And yet that sum of $150,000,000 is included in the statement that the President made, that it was $195,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1923.

But that is not all of the story. The appropriations for 1923 carry increased compensation or what is commonly called the bonus, which it is estimated will cost $38,000,000, that is not estimated for in 1924. I do not know whether Congress will allow it or not, but certainly it should be taken into consideration when you compare the estimates of 1924 with the appropriations for 1923. I have heard it stated that the bonus will be passed for the next fiscal year unless the reclassification bill goes through the Senate, and that seems unlikely, in the opinion of some. Whether it was left out of the estimates because there is no statute for it, or whether it was left out with the idea that Congress would appropriate it anyway, and therefore it was not necessary to include it in the estimate, I do not know. I can see how its omission has helped to swell the figures which are claimed to show reduction in ordinary expenditures.

When you add that $38,000,000 to the $150,000,000 you have $188,000,000. But that is not all. The estimates for 1924 reduced the 1923 appropriations for military and naval compensation by forty-two million and odd dollars. Certainly the administration is not entitled to credit for the $42,000,000 as a saving to the people of the United States. It is due to a reduction in the Army and the fact that we are getting further away from the war, and not to any saving on the part of the President or the Bureau of the Budget or the Congress or any other governmental agency.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course the attitude of the administration was one of intense opposition to the reduction in the size of the Army?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. At the time when Congress forced the reduction?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. For which now credit seems to be sought.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is clearly correct. If the administration had had its way with reference to the size of the Army and the Navy, we would not have had any such reduction as they are now taking credit for, as the gentleman from Tennessee so well suggests. So when you analyze the estimates submitted for 1924, even in this cursory way, you will find that eliminating only those three appropriations for 1923, for which the administration can take no credit, the estimates for 1924 exceeded the appropriations made for 1923 by $94,000,000. A close analysis of the Budget will show other items which will add to this sum.

In addition to that, I call attention to the fact that this bill makes immediately available certain sums—for instance, $200,000 for the customs service—and the Budget Director has submitted several provisions making the funds appropriated for 1924 immediately available upon the passage of the act. I think something like $24,000,000 are made immediately available for the Pension Bureau. I think that is a bad precedent. I think it is bad policy, and I so stated to the director this morning in a hearing which we had. The passage of the Budget law—the division of all these appropriations by departments—was intended to give the people of the country an exact picture of the appropriations made, and if there are to be deficiencies for 1923 of $24,000,000 in the Pension Bureau, if there are to be deficiencies of $200,000 in the customs service, if there are to be deficiencies in the Coast Guard they ought not to be taken care of by making the appropriations for 1924 immediately available, but they ought to be appropriated for in a direct way through a deficiency bill, so that every Member of Congress and the people of the country will know what is being done, because when you make a 1924 appropriation immediately available for expenses in 1923, necessarily you will have to make a still larger appropriation in 1925 for 1924 unless you swell the appropriations for 1924 beyond their proper level.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman would admit, however, that a case like that on page 85, of an appropriation for power presses should be made immediately available? In fact, is it not necessary that they may be installed in time to effect the savings?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There might be some justification for that, but there is no reason why a deficiency bill could not be proposed and passed carrying an appropriation for that purpose. There can certainly be no sort of justification for making

immediately available a fund in the Pension Bureau or in the Customs Service or in the Coast Guard and other services.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. I understood the gentleman to say that the payment of interest was $150,000,000 less, or will be that much less for 1924.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I said the appropriation would be $150,000,000 less.

Mr. LONDON. For the payment of interest?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. The public debt has been reduced only $1,000,0000,000. How does the statement of $150,000,000 saved in interest accord with that statement?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That includes the accrued discounts on war-savings certificates issued in 1918.

Mr. LONDON. That is a part of the public debt.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true; but they became payable on January 1 of this year. I think they were sold originally for $4.20, but they will be cashed on the 1st of January for $5, and it will take $125,000,000 to pay them.

Mr. LONDON. But the $125,000,000 will go to the payment of principal indebtedness.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; on January 1.

Mr. LONDON. So that $150,000,000 does not represent interest alone?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it represents interest and a part of the debt. I have discussed the question of Budget estimates, and I want now to hurry along.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, right there, before the gentleman leaves that question, can he tell us, if he knows, whether or not it was known to this department and its heads that this deficit of $24,000,000 existed several months ago, and that he would require an appropriation in a deficiency?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean in the Pension Bureau?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know just when it was discovered.

Mr. BLANTON. It has been known for some time, has it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The estimates were required to be placed in the hands of the Budget Director on October 1.

Mr. BLANTON. And he knew that he would run short at least $24,000,000 unless it were allowed in the deficiency?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I assume that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. Should not that have been included?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He knows it now, at any rate, and, of course, we will be in session for three months, and an estimate could be submitted as a deficiency in time between now and March to take care of it.

Mr. BLANTON. I am with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] on the proposed saving of at least $750,000 on this power-press item, but I am wondering whether or not the gentleman had the consent of the Chief Executive in that proposition, or whether it might be later denominated a "fiasco," as was the gentleman's other amendment on the shipping bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not inform the gentleman as to the position of the President on the proposition. Now, just a word as to the estimated expenditures for 1923 as compared with 1924. The President estimates total expenditures for 1923 at $3,703,801,671. The total expenditures for 1924 are $3,190,843,234. This, you will bear in mind, excludes the Postal Service. If you add the Postal Service, then the expenditures for 1923 are estimated to be $4,232,205,942, while those for 1924 are $3,765,496,386. The ordinary expenditures for 1923 are $2,240,329,871, while those for 1924 are $1,849,129,234. That is exclusive of the Postal Service and permanent appropriations. The difference between the expenditures of 1923 and 1924, exclusive of the Postal Service, is estimated to be $322,958,487, while if you include the Postal Service the difference is $466,709,566, and that is claimed to have been brought about by a saving or economy upon the part of the administration under the Budget system. Let us see if this is true. The excess of expenditures in 1923 over 1924 in the Federal control of railroads, the payment of standard contracts made with the railroads during the war, is $116,000,000. Certainly the administration and no other official is entitled to take credit for this difference of $116,000,000 as a saving or an economy in departmental policies. It simply means that these contracts, having been settled in 1923, will not be a charge on the Government in 1924. In the transportation act, in the payment of guaranties, and so forth, there will be paid this year $51,548,447 more than will be paid in 1924. In military and naval compensation, $5,000,000 more in 1923 than 1924. In vocational rehabilitation, $20,000,000 more in 1923 than 1924. We know, of course, that as we get further from the war the expense of vocational rehabilitation will decrease, not by reason of any economy effected by the Government, but by reason of the less number of persons who are to be rehabilitated.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. LONDON. What are the guaranties under the transportation act to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Of the 6 per cent guaranteed to the railroads and allowances.

Mr. LONDON. That is the provision?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In the Esch-Cummins law.

Mr. LONDON. In existing law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; the Esch-Cummins law, which is now on the statute books.

Mr. LONDON. I understand no guaranties are being paid now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This sum is to be paid this year, I will say to the gentleman, and includes advances, guaranties, and reimbursements. No such payments are required in 1924. Hospital facilities, $1,000,000 excess this year over next year; hospital service, $18,960,171. Naturally, as we will be further from the war there will be a less number of patients in the hospitals next year than this year and it will cost less money. The expenditures for Army pensions in 1923 will exceed those of 1924 by $25,000,000, due, of course, to the fact that the pension roll is decreasing on account of death, and not to any saving or economy on the part of the administration. Alaskan Railroad, they will spend $1,300,000 more in 1923 than 1924, when I understand it is to be completed. Navy public works, $9,509,500 more will be spent in 1923 than 1924 on work which will be completed. I am not referring to new projects estimated in the Budget, but I am talking about work under way. In addition to that, customs drawbacks, they estimate, will be $15,000,000 less in 1924 than in 1923. Refund of taxes, $87,112,000 more this year than will be expended in 1924. Public works, post offices, and hospitals, $11,133,250 more in 1923 than 1924. Loans to railroads—we will loan this year, according to the estimates, $23,000,000; nothing next year. Increased compensation this year will be $38,000,000. Whether Congress will make an appropriation for 1924 I do not know.

If you add to these sums the interest of $150,000,000 spent this year in excess of the amount required in 1924 you have a total of $572,558,768, as against a difference of expenditure exclusive of Postal Service in 1923–24 of $522,958,487, or a total expenditure of $466,000,000, and I repeat when you eliminate from this Budget those items which are necessarily eliminated, because we are either further from the war or because they are activities which cease during this year, there are not only no such saving and no such reduction as was indicated in the figures submitted by the President, but there is an actual increase by many millions in the expenditures of 1924 as compared with 1923. I wish to say again that the administration and Congress ought to quit this camouflaging in the effort to mislead the people into the belief that great savings are being made. They should be frank with the people and let them know the full truth in regard to the expenditure of their money.

Now, in conclusion I want to call attention to another fact. The Budget Bureau and the President in their desire to reduce the estimates have reduced the estimates for rivers and harbors from the appropriation made in 1923 by $15,000,000.

That is carried in the War Department bill. In other words, the Budget Bureau has increased the estimated expenditures of military activities in the War Department in the sum of $10,134,123. They propose to spend that much more money for strictly military purposes in 1924 than in 1923, but at the same time, in the same department, they have reduced the nonmilitary activities, including the improvement of waterways and the harbors of the country. Likewise they have reduced the estimates for road improvements to $30,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that Congress authorized the expenditure of $65,000,000 in 1924. When it comes to serving the taxpayer and giving the taxpayers who pay the money into the Treasury some benefit from the appropriations we find that the estimates for appropriations to be made in the interest of the business of the country and the taxpayers of the country have been reduced, whereas those not strictly in their interest have been increased.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. It seems to be the continual contention of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that the estimates made by the Budget can not be reduced by Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BLANTON. Does he contend they should be reduced?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. On the contrary, simply that they are reduced.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the time will never come when Congress will not keep its hands on them.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood here in the debates from time to time that the gentleman from Virginia held that the Congress should not attempt to reduce the estimates made by the Budget.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No. I will say to the gentleman that there have been items considered here where proposed reductions were made in the estimates sent down by the Budget Bureau, and for reasons based on facts that appeared to me I contended that those reductions should not be made; but I would not for a moment lay down a general rule.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad the gentleman puts it that way, because I have always thought it should be the rule for the Budget to establish a maximum beyond which Congress could not go, but that Congress might hew below that maximum as much as possible.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Congress has never intended to take—and I hope it never will take—its hands off the Budget or permit the Budget Bureau or any other department of the Government to lay down its estimates and have Congress accept them without question.

Mr. BLANTON. Otherwise we would be simply "passing the buck"?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Gentlemen, as I have been showing, there must be a considerable reduction in the expenses of the Government to permit a reduction of taxation, which the people expect——

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. When the gentleman finds that they have cut below, as in the case of waterways, does he not believe their figures should be increased?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think Congress should have the right to increase as well as to reduce; but in most cases the interests of the people would be best subserved by reduction.

Mr. LAZARO. But in certain cases the interests of the people will be served by going above the estimates of the Budget. For instance, in the improvement of the waterways we have gone above once before, and I hope we shall go above this time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I heartily approve what the President has said in his message, that Congress must be more careful in the passage of legislation which will involve extra expenditures of money. If it is not, then we can never expect to see a reduction in the cost of government.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I would like to have the gentleman's view, as representing the views of the minority, on this Bureau of Engraving and Printing matter. Does the gentleman agree with the chairman of the committee [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I speak not for the minority, but for myself alone.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Do you personally agree with him?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was not present at the hearings, owing to illness in my family, but I understand that what is involved in that proposition is simply the question of whether or not the Government will dispense with 218 employees who are not needed or whether it will retain them at an expense of between $750,000 and $800,000, and perhaps more, every year.

And certainly it seems to me that when the proposition is viewed in the interest of the taxpayers and an overburdened Treasury, no Member of Congress can afford not to subscribe to the action of the committee in this matter. Heretofore objections have been made to it, and Members possibly voted against it on the theory and on the ground that the printing of the notes by power presses would give rise to increased counterfeiting and make counterfeiting easy. But when experts come before Congress, when the Chief of the Secret Service, who has charge of the enforcement of the law against counterfeiting, tells the Congress and the committee that it will not have that effect, that it will not make counterfeiting any easier, then, of course, those who oppose the proposition are robbed of the reason, which has been pleaded so effectively heretofore. The only proposition now is whether or not we will dispense with 218 employees who, the department says, are not needed, and save to the taxpayers $800,000 annually. It seems to me there can be but one answer to the question. We read in the newspapers a few days ago that several thousand typewriters and stenographers and other employees were to be dispensed with in the Veterans' Bureau shortly. I think that appeared in the morning papers a few days ago. What reason can be advanced——

Mr. MADDEN. Under this bill the services of over 500 people in the Public Debt Service are dispensed with.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. This bill, as the gentleman from Illinois correctly says, dispenses with the services of more than 500 employees in the Public Debt Service.

Now, how can a man be consistent in voting to dispense with their services and at the same time decline to vote to dispense with the services of employees in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, or of any other department of this Government, when it is made clear to everyone that their services can be dispensed with without injury to the Government?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Personally I do not think you can decline, if their work is just as good.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We must take the word of those in charge of the work. The director and everybody who has testified has stated that the work can be done just as effectively.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I understand the gentleman to say that the net saving would be $800,000 a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is stated that it will be $800,000 a year at least.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. It will be that after you have marked off the cost of the presses?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, yes. The presses are provided for in this bill. They cost $5,000 apiece; 58 presses. That will be the initial cost. That will be about $300,000. If you save $800,000 a year, you will save $500,000 of that sum the first year and have the presses for future use.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question for information?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. I have heard it said that if this change is made there will be more danger of the country being flooded with counterfeit money. Has the gentleman given any thought to that matter?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was not present at the hearing and did not get the opportunity to go into it fully myself, but that was gone into by the subcommittee that had charge of the hearing; and the Chief of the Secret Service, Mr. Moran, stated that it would not make counterfeiting any easier; that as a matter of fact counterfeiting is now done by photography; and that it is as easy to photograph a note or bill printed on a hand press as it is one printed on a power press; that it will not affect the number of counterfeits in the least. That is the opinion of the expert who for years has had charge of the enforcement of the law against counterfeiting in the United States, and I have full confidence in him and his opinion.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know whether hand presses are used in the printing of money in any other country or by any commercial firm?

Mr. MADDEN. The American Bank Note Co. uses power presses, and that company uses power presses for printing jobs that require many more than eight subjects, the largest number required in the printing of our paper currency.

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. They print money for a great many different countries.

Mr. MADDEN. For a great many other countries in the world, and I will say to the gentleman that they have applied for the privilege of bidding on the printing of the Federal reserve notes, and the Treasury has the power to let the contract to them, and if by any chance they should get the contract because we are not able to meet the prices that they can make, that one thing alone would throw 1,100 people out of employment in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. So they had better let us modernize the place and keep the people that we can keep there and not have some outside concern come in and close up the shop.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Has the gentleman heard that the American Bankers' Association, representing 11,500 bankers, at their annual convention a few weeks ago passed a resolution asking that we return to the method of production or our currency in use prior to the war? Is it not a fact that the bankers of the country are vitally interested in this question

because bankers, more than any other class of business men, are the persons who detect the counterfeit issues put in circulation?

Does the gentleman know whether or not in good faith the bankers' association passed such a resolution, are they experts as to paper money, and are they qualified to testify as to what is necessary in keeping up the quality of the currency of the country, and thus protecting the people from loss through the activities of counterfeiters?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not heard of the action of the bankers' association, but during the war, as the gentleman knows, we were using cotton as the material for our paper money because we could not get linen. Cotton is objectionable for many reasons, but now we are using three-quarters linen, I think. Is not that correct?

Mr. MADDEN. Three-quarters linen.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And it is expected that in a very short while we will be using practically all linen as the material for our paper money. I have not heard of the action of the bankers' association. But if the gentleman refers to a fear that this money may be more easily counterfeited, I will say to him as I have said a couple of times heretofore that the man who is in charge of the enforcement of the law against counterfeiting states positively that it will make no difference whatsoever.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I have a copy of their resolution.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Without being an expert on the subject, I should think it is much more easy to counterfeit money made out of cotton material than it is money made out of linen material.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Then it seems to be the opinion of my colleague that the resolution of the bankers' association was directed more to the quality of the paper than the methods of engraving and printing?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, yes; because there has been no change up to this time in the method of printing or engraving currency. That matter is being corrected just as rapidly as possible, because, as I said to the gentleman a while ago, during the war the Government was necessarily compelled to make its money out of cotton material. Now it is returning to the linen and is already using three-fourths linen. So I think the objections or criticisms, or whatever you choose to call them, of the bankers' association are being met by the Government.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Did the committee give an opportunity to those interested in the question to present fully the facts as to whether or not the hand presses cause the production of a more sharply printed surface, which makes counterfeiting more easily detected than when the flat surface given by the power press is used?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was not present at the hearings, on account of illness in my family, but I know that very full hearings were had, and that everybody who wanted to appear before the committee was permitted to do so, as they always are permitted to appear. Nobody, I feel sure, was shut out or prevented from making any statement which he desired to make.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Is it not a fact that the opinion of the head of our Secret Service is based upon a very wide experience, and that any counterfeiting that took place would finally be reported to him? Therefore can we get any higher authority to advise us in this matter than the head of the Secret Service?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there is any better authority, and for my part I am willing to accept his judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have got in front of these contrivances, because I think they are a consummate nuisance in the House. [Applause.] In talking out of doors to people several blocks away they are probably all right, but here in the pit of the Hall of the House, in this famous forum, where men look each other in the face when engaged in bitter and partisan debate, I like to hear the voice as nature created it, unfalsettoed by mechanical devices. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill carries an appropriation of $9,000,000 for the enforcement of prohibition, $250,000 less than the appropriation for this fiscal year. My brief remarks will raise only one point—the rights of the people under the eighteenth amendment. Existing conditions are so intolerable, disrespect, defiance, and violation of law so prevalent and insistent, so threatening to our institutions, so endangering to the perpetuity of the Republic, that I feel it my duty to express my views. I have always stood for temperance and against intemperance. I hold no brief for "drys" or "wets." I hold a brief only for my country.

I am sworn to uphold and enforce the Constitution and the laws of the United States, and while I remain a Member of the House, regardless of my personal views, I will faithfully live up to my oath of office. During my years of service in the House I have voted at every opportunity to give to the people their full constitutional rights, and while I remain a Member of the House I shall continue to do so.

Those favoring the eighteenth amendment contended that it was necessary to amend the Federal Constitution to bring about and to enforce prohibition in this country. When the amendment was adopted the Congress proceeded to attempt to enforce prohibition through legislative action, disregardful of the letter and the spirit of the amendment. The flat of the Congress was substituted for the authority of the Constitution.

The enforcement act is practically bone dry. The eighteenth amendment is not. The amendment, amongst other things, prohibits "the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within * * * the United States * * * for beverage purposes." It is apparent that the people are entitled to a beverage containing any alcoholic content that is reasonably nonintoxicating. The law should be based upon reason, and reason should also prevail in permitting the use of alcohol for scientific and business purposes and in permitting the use of liquors under prescription from physicians. I think that the Judiciary Committee of the House, and I refer to that great committee only because under the rules of the House it has jurisdiction in the premises, should reasonably determine upon competent and expert evidence the maximum alcoholic content permitted under the amendment and make available the evidence sustaining its finding in order that Members of the House not on the Judiciary Committee may be able to determine for themselves the reasonableness thereof. This finding of fact is solely the duty of the Congress.

I have examined the opinions of the Supreme Court upon matters arising from prohibition legislation and I find nothing therein contrary to this view. It is not to be presumed that this great tribunal would disturb such a finding of fact honestly, conscientiously, and reasonably found by the Congress and based upon competent and sufficient evidence to sustain the same. Of course, the power of the Congress in this respect is not unlimited. A finding of fact not based upon sufficient evidence might well be held to raise a question of law. In Two hundred and fifty-first United States, 220, the court said: "We can not say, as a matter of law, that a beverage containing not more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol is intoxicating."

In determining the maximum we must bear in mind that there exists for our consideration not a war-time power involving the defense and preservation of the Nation, but a constitutional power involving the rights of the people in time of peace. Then, I think, the Congress should provide that each State may determine in its own way, by legislative action or by referendum, what alcoholic content not exceeding such maximum a beverage manufactured and sold within the State may contain. If Minnesota wants cold water, let her have it. [Applause.] If New York wants the maximum, no other sovereign State could reasonably object. [Applause.] This would be not only reasonable but just and equitable, inasmuch as the eighteenth amendment gives to the several States concurrent power to enforce prohibition. We can render no better service than to do all that lies within our power to command respect for and obedience to the Federal Government, the bulwark of our institutions.

The phrase "beer and light wines," while seductive, is meaningless under the Constitution. The question is purely one of alcoholic content. The Congress has no power and should not attempt to nullify the Constitution. The manufacture and sale of beer and light wines, or either, must be incidental to the maximum alcoholic content permissible under the eighteenth amendment.

Two objections are frequently made against liberalizing the enforcement act. One objection is that it will mean the restoration of the saloon. The answer is the elimination of the saloon through Federal enactment. The other is that it will mean an entering wedge for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment. This objection lacks force. As thirteen States can block repeal, it can reasonably be presumed that the eighteenth amendment is in the Constitution to stay. However, any excuse for denying to the people their constitutional rights is untenable and indefensible.

The granting of such rights would probably result in a beverage, at a reasonable price, manufactured from pure ingredients under governmental inspection, and sold only in the places and in the manner prescribed by the Government; in greatly reduced appropriations for the enforcement of prohibition; in increased Treasury receipts of more than a half billion dollars a year, not exacted from overburdened taxpayers but cheerfully paid by citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights; in the elimination of the production and consumption of poisonous and deadly concoctions; and, above and beyond all, in the restoration of a wholesome respect for law and the Constitution and in public cooperation in the upholding and enforcement thereof.

Let us have the courage, the courage that knows no fear, the courage that obliterates self, the courage of the men who have made this Nation great, to grant unto the people the rights guaranteed to them under their Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I think it a source of regret that such a competent, able, likable Member as our friend from Texas gives such a presentation as he does once in a while, and it is a rather difficult thing for us to maintain our equilibrium and our respect for him when he speaks as he has just spoken. While he amuses himself about our situation at Lausanne he ought not to overlook the fact that the United States is leading that conference just now, and the one person to whom the world listens more than to anyone else over there is the American representative, because he speaks his country's judgment, unhindered by any commitment by European decision. But that is not what I intended to say. I wish that the membership of the House would take time to examine the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury with special reference to certain facts—the refund of the debt, on pages 3 to 9; the economy in Government expenditure, pages 10 to 11; the argument on the tax-exempt securities, on page 13; the domestic-credit situation, which, in my judgment, is a very wonderful statement of a remarkable achievement, on page 32; the War Finance Corporation and its operations, on page 37; the agricultural credit situation, on page 40. Those are some of the leading items of interest to the country just now, and they are wonderfully set out.

When the historian details the after-war problems and their solution, special commendation will be made of the brilliant financing of the Government obligations. Measured by the size of the problem, its complications, its possible dire results, its difficulties to overcome, the success of the Treasury Department, while not spectacular, is the most brilliant since the days of Alexander Hamilton.

The present Secretary of the Treasury found a public debt of February 28, 1921, $24,049,527,788.58. Of this amount nearly three billion was unfunded or floating, representing borrowings from banks on short term. Here were liquid assets representing at least seven billion commercial credit, tied up by a Government policy of financing from hand to mouth; credits frozen and prevented from flowing into productive industry, the results of which was industrial depression from want of liquid capital.

The first step of the present policy was to thaw out these credits, release the assets of the banks for commercial purposes by inviting the investing public to absorb the credits rather than compelling the banks to take the obligation. Interest rates were ranging high, rediscount rates reached 7 per cent, and Liberty bonds had gone, some of them, as low as $81.7. When first offered the rates were 5½. To-day these obligations cost the Government only 4¼, saving to the Government 1¼ per cent. Money thus became easier, interest rates to the public began to fall, investments increased, industry at once revived, and unemployment began to disappear. An examination shows that call money fell from 6 to 4 per cent, and bankers' acceptances of 60 to 90 days fell as low as 3 per cent June of this year. Rediscount rates fell from 7 to 4 per cent, or almost 50 per cent.

The general effect of this financing brought the Government's credit from the low point to par, and in several cases to a premium. It is estimated that here alone the appreciation amounts to not less than $2,500,000,000 to the holders.

This remarkable showing was due to the employment of sound business financing in which the Treasury made possible the disposition of securities on an investment basis with a view of their distribution among real investors rather than the banks. By this method the Treasury has been able to undertake the most stupendous refunding operation to handle the seven billions of Government obligations due in 1923.

On June 30, 1921, there were at least $7,000,000,000 due within two years, including $4,000,000,000 in Victory notes, $2,500,000,000 Treasury certificates, and $656,000,000 war-savings stamps. During the fiscal year at least $1,000,000,000 were retired or paid off. To refund the $6,000,000,000 remaining without business disturbance was the problem.

To-day all this enormous amount except $1,658,000,000 have been refunded, and within a short time this amount will be reduced to $715,000,000. All this has been accomplished so successfully in a way that business has not felt the strain, and only those who watch the current of Government financing were aware of the achievement. The obligations were so placed as to avoid embarrassing industry and permitting the Government to meet them when due without further strain either of the taxing power or the money market.

The danger of a deficit of $650,000,000, not including the $125,000,000 interest on war-savings stamps, will fade if the policy of economy continues. With the receipts of $225,000,000 interest on foreign debts, $300,000,000 of back taxes collected, $125,000,000 from the liquidation of the War Finance Corporation, and $115,000,000 estimated additional customs revenue from the Fordney Tariff Act the deficit will be most probably wiped out.

This Nation has balanced its budget, reduced its public debt by over $1,231,102,975.41, financed its loans, thawed out its frozen credits, released its assets for industry, made banking easier, lowered rates of interest and rediscounts, revived business, banished unemployment, and brought the Government credit back to par. This achievement will challenge the record for an equal performance in the history of finance. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. May I have some more time?

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry I have no more time left.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the balance of this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Unless the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] objects, I will yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if I may have five minutes if necessary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have a clipping, taken from the Associated Press, which shows that Secretary Mellon denounces a statement made by Governor Blaine, of Wisconsin, that he—Mr. Mellon—is not enforcing the law. In the statement Mr. Mellon refers to a number of letters that he has "written to Representative FREAR" on the subject. This is the statement carried by the Associated Press:

MELLON DENOUNCES BLAINE STATEMENT—DECLARES THERE IS NO BASIS OF TRUTH IN CHARGES MADE BY WISCONSIN GOVERNOR—TAX LAW ENFORCED, HE SAYS—SPEECH MADE TO PROGRESSIVES CALLED BY TREASURY HEAD APPEAL TO CLASS PREJUDICE.

[By the Associated Press.]

Replying yesterday to the address by Governor Blaine, of Wisconsin, before the meeting of progressives Saturday, Secretary Mellon declared the Wisconsin governor "distorts my statement and endeavors to portray an injurious situation which does not exist" with reference to the collection of incomes and surtaxes on excess profits.

"Criticism of public officials and of their administration," said Secretary Mellon, "is commendable and useful to the people where there is laxity and ineffective service in the conduct of office, but when wholly unjustifiable and without any basis of truth, it is harmful, as in this instance, and can only be understood as an appeal to class prejudice in a selfish effort to obtain some political capital."

The Internal Revenue Bureau is administering the revenue law impartially, Mr. Mellon asserted, and is applying it to large corporations and wealthy individuals, as well as to others. The Secretary referred to the letters he had written to Representative FREAR, of Wisconsin, some weeks ago, and declared they had definitely explained the question of taxation as applied to stock dividends and corporation surpluses, to which Governor Blaine particularly referred in his speech.

"The taxes imposed by existing law are being completely enforced to the fullest extent which the law prescribes," the Secretary added, "and any further action in this respect would have to be in the nature of the taxes levied by Congress."

Mr. Chairman, I have no brief from Governor Blaine, nor have I directly or indirectly discussed Mr. Mellon or tax matters with him. I do not know on what evidence Governor Blaine made his charges when discussing taxation before the progressive conference. I do know that all the letters written

by Secretary Mellon to me, and found in the RECORD of November 28, contain nothing but general denials or assertions, and avoid specific charges I have made in letters to him.

Let me courteously, but frankly and publicly, put questions to Mr. Mellon that he has thus far refused to answer.

Have you, Mr. Mellon, imposed a single penalty under section 220 or prior law which requires you to do so whenever accumulated surpluses of corporations are held in order to avoid payment of individual surtaxes? This section was a continuance of authority contained in prior laws cited you in my letter of October 23, 1922.

In this connection, I call your attention to Standard Oil of New Jersey's statement of 775 per cent net profit in 10 years, or 77½ per cent net profit annually, of which over 400 per cent is alleged to be held in surplus for stock dividends. Also Atlantic Standard Oil, with 900 per cent stock dividends recently declared; Vacuum Oil, with 300 per cent stock dividends, and many other companies quoted in the press. Have you made any demands on such companies for the facts or have you imposed any penalties?

I repeat a press statement previously quoted in my letters to you, which says you have not, and based on such statement and your failure to answer I allege you have not.

Did you, Mr. Mellon, begin the stock dividend melon cutting with a 200 per cent dividend for Gulf Oil, your own company? Did Standard Oil only follow your lead? Did you fail to penalize yourself or that company? Again, on information in my hands I charge these to be the facts.

Stock dividends from corporation surplus declared within the last three months are estimated at nearly $2,000,000,000 in addition to former cash dividends, which in case of Standard Oil, United States Steel, and many other companies represent extortionate prices charged the general public. What cases, if any, have you penalized to check the merry riot now filling the financial columns of the press?

You say in your letters these are secret records, under your control as such. That is what Governor Blaine, I understand, has condemned.

You state in the press dispatch that you are enforcing the law impartially. I can not set forth the facts in my possession but I am informed that an organized coterie of agents has existed for pressing tax refunds and tax contests on the Treasury. These statements have been made to me by several men.

I now ask a direct question that an investigation will disclose. Is it true that due to legal evasions possible under existing law, disclosed by the secret records of your office, that Mr. Rockefeller, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Mellon, and others of great wealth are not paying one-fifth of the income tax they are popularly supposed to pay under the law based on their wealth, due to investments in tax-free securities, stock dividends, trusts, stock and bond exchanges, and other forms of tax avoidance? I gather this is so from your official report, issued to-day.

These are matters that Congress has permitted to remain secret for no logical reason, apparently, and I am hoping your answers will be specific, so that the necessity for full publicity of Treasury records can be determined by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have written Secretary Mellon to that effect and here repeat the statements in substance. * * *

As the amount of penalties and taxes alleged to be involved reaches many millions of dollars, I submit the facts presented in the correspondence offered on November 25 contained in the RECORD of November 28 warrants such action on his part, and I invite his aid to that end.

Mr. Chairman, any review of cases that amounts to more than a whitewash of the Government's tax administration must have presidential permission to inspect departmental records. Such records ought to be made public by law.

I have briefly charged that upwards of $2,000,000,000 in corporation-accumulated surpluses are disclosed to be given out as stock dividends. That Secretary Mellon's own Gulf Oil Co. started the wild melon-cutting race. That one purpose of sudden disclosures of huge profits is due to fear by great interests that tax laws by future Congresses may reach the enormous excess profits and tax dodging now practiced under Secretary Mellon's régime. That the tax administration of the internal-revenue office is still influenced by a small group of men in and out of the office whose activities have become a public scandal and that millions of dollars in penalties and surtaxes can be collected if the law is enforced affecting surpluses.

Mr. Chairman, the report of Secretary Mellon given to the press to-day makes confession of a shameful condition disclosed in the Treasury taxing machinery.

He devotes an entire page of his report in describing tax-dodging, tax-evading, tax-escaping methods employed by men of large wealth. It is the most serious indictment of great financiers ever given to the public.

After a miserable confession of assumed weakness of present laws and of a tax administration that "permits" this situation to exist, he proposes a complete surrender to tax dodging by reducing surtaxes from 50 per cent on incomes over $200,000 to 25 per cent, thus placing a premium on tax dodging which he fails to reach.

Knowing Secretary Mellon's great wealth, his personal interest, his associates, and his opposition to surtaxes, excess profits taxes on undistributed profits, inheritance, and other tax legislation passed by Congress, is it not time for the financial adviser of the administration to put forth his own efforts to stop accumulated surplus tax fraud evasions that reach many millions of dollars of lost income to the Government, due to his failure to enforce existing law? Is it not time the Treasury records were made public, when Secretary Mellon permits the man of large wealth to escape because that man knows how to dodge the law but holds the small taxpayer down to the limit? That is new doctrine in this country, and reviewing his proposal we may well say of his report "Verily the mountain has labored hard to bring forth a mouse." Is it not strange and significant that no recommendations for curative laws whereby tax evasions can be restricted are found in the report. No proposal to reduce the surtax will meet the situation. All we need to do is to enforce the law and pass such additional laws as may be found necessary to protect the Treasury from tax evasions. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I believe Secretary Mellon is personally a man of high integrity but I believe he has failed to enforce the law because of his environment, and, judging from the recorded statements before our committee, he has no understanding of the importance of it. I could pick out a dozen men before me whom I believe, if placed in that position, would enforce the law and recover the penalties, and with them the surtaxes that would be released, reaching hundreds of millions of dollars.

But a situation confronts us, and I am placing it before the House without any personal feeling or partisanship. It makes no difference who the individual is. I have the highest respect for Mr. Mellon personally, but I say we can not close our eyes as a Congress to the fact that this law is here, and that he makes no recommendation for any law to cure conditions except by virtue of a long-distance constitutional amendment. Doctor Seligman says there are $20,000,000,000 worth of these securities out to-day. It is useless to try to pass a constitutional amendment to prevent their issue when $20,000,000,000 of tax-free securities are open for investment. What we need is enforcement of existing law and real curative tax legislation that I have proposed in the Mellon correspondence. I shall submit the "Mellon correspondence" with this discussion for information of those who are interested.

I repeat that in my opinion Secretary Mellon should impose the 25 per cent penalty provided by section 220 on the enormous accumulated surpluses of corporations not needed in the business, leaving it for the corporation wherever possible to do so to justify its acts. In this I believe one of his own companies by declaring a 200 per cent stock dividend served to invite others to follow until 900 per cent stock dividends and even 1,600 per cent stock dividends have been among the surpluses that are reported and will thus avoid payment of personal surtaxes.

For this reason, if these accumulations are to be reached a retroactive tax on undistributed profits should be enacted by Congress to reach personal tax evasions on such part of $2,000,000,000 or more paid in stock dividends as may seem proper to reach. It would also seem proper in view of enormous profits disclosed after the repeal of the law that the excess-profits tax law be reenacted affecting profits over 8 per cent or other reasonable exemption, and in order to reach unconscionable profits now exorted by corporations that fix prices without fear of competition.

Other legislation I submit calls for publicity of all Treasury tax records, for inheritance and gift tax laws or amendments, and other matters disclosed by the Macomber Supreme Court stock dividend decision.

Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the Associated Press article contributed by Secretary Mellon's statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, whenever any question is before this House affecting immediately or remotely the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, the great majority of this House on that question is subjected to a lecture for lack of statesmanship and sincerity by gentlemen from Baltimore and New York, and I for one am getting a little tired of it. [Applause.] Why the "famous statesman from Baltimore" should feel called upon to thus reflect upon the motives and intelligence of his colleagues I am not aware, but for the gentlemen from New York, their right must not be questioned. After all, is not it known as Greater New York? Is not it a fact that a majority of its population are foreign born? I hasten to withdraw such a plebian expression. I should have said, did they not come from abroad, or to use a commercial term, are they not imported? Is it not a fact that within this sacred citadel is located the great palladium of learning and virtue, the Bowery? But it is not why the gentlemen from New York are so superior, suffice it that the fact exists. They have intimated it on the floor, and, if consulted in private, I have no doubt would admit it themselves.

Whenever you attend a cheap show in this city you are inflicted with a disgusting abuse of the prohibition laws. The cheaper the show the more disgusting the abuse. In fact, so similar are many thrusts that we hear there to those we hear here in the House that we are led to suspicion a common inspiration.

If there is any policy of this Government in the framing of which I had a small part and of which I am proud and in which I was sincere it is its policy to rid itself of the liquor traffic. This traffic thrived upon the misery it created and fattened upon the miseries of other vices that it encouraged. Even in villages it would sell its drunk-making concoctions in the front room, foster gambling in the back room, and encourage prostitution upstairs.

The wonder is not that the decent people of this country choked this serpent but that they endured its slime at all. Working together in this effort stood the women and children, the church and the school, while opposed to it stood equally as united the gambler, thug, and the prostitute. When did sincerity, enlightenment, and other virtues leave this first class and take up its abode in the second? So earnest and sincere were those advocating this reform that they did not stop until they had written their achievement upon the Nation's sacred scroll, the Constitution of the United States. So determined and vindictive yet is the small minority opposing that they do not bow in humble submission but stand out in open defiance of the Constitution itself.

Yet those familiar with its history need not be surprised. When this country was young and the immortal Washington was its great President, the first rebellion against its authority—mind you, in open arms—was the whisky rebellion. As it was its first, so it is now its last. In every community when the local government sought in any way its regulation or improvement this traffic immediately plotted its overthrow. It is at this hour scheming and devising its own resurrection. It is backed by influential friends and great resources. There are those Members of this House giving it aid and comfort. The final repeal of the eighteenth amendment is its known aim, though I have not heard its advocates on this floor have the sincerity to confess it.

It has been asserted that the number of crimes against the United States has increased and that the expense of enforcing the prohibition law is great. That the crimes against the United States are increasing is natural, because an entire field of State jurisdiction has been delegated to the Federal Government, and while crimes against the United States have increased, all other crimes which flourished during the liquor traffic and cognizable only in State courts have in a much greater proportion decreased. I speak from knowledge when I say that the doors to the county jails in my district, jails that were often crowded, now frequently stand open. Men in my county who led in the forces of the wets are now embarrassed when reminded of it. What matters it to the people who pay the bills if their taxes are increased to suppress Federal crimes if their State taxes are still further decreased by lack of local crimes? Violations of the liquor laws are now carried on by organized criminals, and their violation is not the minor matter as is the violation of other crimes, but savors of treason itself. This Government can not exist unless it can vindicate its power to enforce every law. The greater the expense now incurred, the more vigorous the prosecutions now inaugurated, the sooner will the power of this Nation be vindicated and the least expense result in the end.

We, the residents of the small towns and the great rural districts, see the benefit of these laws and, frankly, we intend to enforce them regardless of the jibes of the cheap vaudeville monologists, in spite of the reflections of the "all-wise" statesmen from the great metropolis where vice best thrives, and in spite of the antics of the distinguished "horseman from Maryland." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much has the gentleman from Tennessee?

The CHAIRMAN. Four minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] yielded back two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has four minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] use some time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I promised the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] that I would yield to him.

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield to him my time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. HILL. Eight minutes, Mr. Chairman. There were four minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that there is just six minutes left.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank both sides of the House for this expression of confidence in yielding me this time. [Applause.] I might say that in the next House of Representatives, on the bases of the votes cast for me in the recent election, I shall be about 50 per cent Democrat and 50 per cent Republican. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain to the House in brief these amendments, which I consider perfecting amendments, which I propose to offer on page 27 of the bill H. R. 13180, which is the pending Treasury appropriation bill.

I do not think any of my colleagues here will be surprised to know that the section to which these amendments are directed is the section appropriating $9,000,000 for the use of the prohibition enforcement unit in the Treasury Department.

As a preliminary to a discussion of certain elements of this bill I desire to put in the RECORD the provisions of this section, which are very short. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

Mr. HILL. I have not the time to read the section which the gentleman has prevented me putting in the RECORD by his objection, but the sum of $9,000,000 is appropriated for the prohibition unit. I have six amendments here which I propose to offer at the proper time.

The first amendment strikes out any appropriation for Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes's personal press-bureau publicity.

The second amendment strikes out an appropriation of $130,000 to $150,000 for the violation of the Volstead Act itself and of the State prohibition laws by permitting agents of the Federal prohibition unit to purchase liquor which they claim they want for evidence purposes, in violation of law.

The third amendment is one which will save a great deal of money to the country. It provides that none of the money appropriated shall be used to pay the expenses for stump speeches before private organizations made by the Federal prohibition commissioner or his assistants. If I have the time I want to discuss that.

The next amendment is a provision which strikes out of the appropriation bill the appropriation for legal advisers, assistant counsel, special counsel, attorneys, or law clerks to the prohibition commissioner, on the ground that they can not interpret the law as it exists, and are therefore useless. I have the evidence for that. For months I have tried to get from the prohibition office a definition of what "nonintoxicating" means in title 2, section 29, of the Volstead Act.

Mr. LINDBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Briefly.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I suppose the object of all this is to make the law absolutely inoperative.

Mr. HILL. No; the object is to have an effective way of preventing the sending all over the United States of what I might call bootleg grapes from the gentleman's State. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman admits that his amendments would make the law absolutely inoperative?

Mr. HILL. No. I also propose that law enforcement be transferred from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, which the gentleman and those whom he represents oppose.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I suppose the gentleman is an authority on all this?

Mr. HILL. No; the gentleman is not an authority, but he was United States attorney for five years, and has had some experience in honest law enforcement; that is all.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Some experience.

Mr. HILL. Some experience.

The next amendment which I propose to offer is an amendment providing that none of the money so appropriated shall be used for propaganda issued by the prohibition enforcement unit to defeat Members of Congress because of their votes in Congress. I have the evidence that Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes has so expended funds of the unit.

The next amendment provides for ultimate transfer of law enforcement to the Department of Justice, where it belongs, and where I for one can not understand why the Anti-Saloon League will not permit it to go. I introduced a bill for this purpose in April, 1921.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. How much more time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes and a half remaining.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Are all of these amendments which the gentleman proposes intended to strengthen the Volstead Act?

Mr. HILL. All of these amendments are made for the purpose of attempting to obtain honest law enforcement. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. No; I can not yield unless the gentleman will get me more time.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman may have all the time he wants as far as I am concerned.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman try to get me more time?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I am very glad the gentleman from Washington asked me that question, because I have here Bouvier's Law Dictionary and I want to read to you the definition of lynch law.

Lynch law: A common phrase used to express the vengeance of a mob inflicting injury and committing an outrage upon a person suspected of some offense.

I want to say to you as a premise to what I wish I had the time to say in full to this House, that no unit of the United States Government which quotes with approval lawless violence by the Ku-Klux Klan should receive a $9,000,000 appropriation from this Government.

I hold in my hand one of the daily newspaper publicity prints issued by the Federal prohibition commissioner, and I want to read to you part of it. I hope I will have time to read the specific language that I object to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Will you get me some more time?

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is fixed by the House.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his effort.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is in favor of the return of the saloon, as I understand? [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. No; I am not in favor of the return of the saloon, and if the gentleman had paid any attention to the speeches I have made he would know it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. But the gentleman's speeches argue for the saloon and not against it.

Mr. HILL. That shows that the gentleman is not a lawyer.

Now I wish to read this statement issued by the Federal prohibition commissioner:

"Release afternoon papers."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the House.

Mr. HILL. I want only to read this one thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries: Secretary of the Treasury, $12,000; Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $7,500 per annum and shall perform such duties in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law, and under the provisions of section 177, Revised Statutes, in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease, $7,500; 3 Assistant Secretaries, at $5,000 each; clerk to the Secretary, $3,000; executive clerk, $2,400; stenographer, $1,800; 3 private secretaries, one to each Assistant Secretary, at $1,800 each; Government actuary, under control of the Treasury, $4,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 3 of class 3, 2 of class 2, 1 of class 1; chief messenger, $1,100; 2 assistant chief messengers, at $1,000 each; messengers—3 at $900 each, 4 at $840 each; messenger boy, $600; in all, $75,260.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. Before the gentleman does that I wish to make a point of order against the provision in this paragraph for an Undersecretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The position of Undersecretary of the Treasury is not authorized by law, and it is legislation upon an appropriation bill in violation of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I can only say that there is no basic law authorizing an Undersecretary. It was created in an appropriation bill at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury two years ago and passed by the House. The House voted on it by roll call, and the salary at the beginning was fixed at $10,000. The Appropriations Committee cut it down to $7,500. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In the beginning we had one Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. We had five during the war.

Mr. BLANTON. But that was temporary. Now, in addition to an Undersecretary, we have three Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. MADDEN. That was so before the war.

Mr. BLANTON. I am speaking about what we already have. Three Assistant Secretaries, and this Undersecretary is an entirely new position.

Mr. MADDEN. No; not entirely new.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. After I read this extract.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the amendments that he is to offer should be known and classified as dry or wet amendments?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the question is not in order. I insist that the debate be confined to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CLERK.

Salaries: Chief clerk, including $300 as superintendent of Treasury Building, who shall be the chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, Undersecretary, and Assistant Secretaries of the department, $4,000; assistant chief clerk, $3,000; assistant superintendent of Treasury Building, $2,500; administrative clerk, $2,000; clerks—1 $2,000, 4 of class 4, 1 of class 3, 1 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 1 $1,000; operator of photographic copying machine, $800; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 2 assistant messengers, at $720 each; messenger boy, $420; storekeeper, $1,200; telegraphers—1 $1,400; 1 $1,200; telephone and telegraph operator, $1,200; 4 telephone switchboard operators, at $720 each; mechanical superintendent, $2,250; chief engineer, $1,400; 4 assistant engineers, at $1,000 each (including 1 for outside buildings); 8 elevator conductors, at $720 each, and the use of laborers as relief elevator conductors during rush hours is authorized; 8 firemen, at $720 each; coal passer, $600; chief electrician, $1,600; locksmith and electrician, $1,400; captain of the watch, $1,400; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at $900 each; 65 watchmen, at $720 each; foreman of laborers, $1,200; assistant foreman of la-

borers, $840; 8 chauffeurs, at $720 each; 4 automobile truck laborers, at $660 each; skilled laborer—1, $840; 2, at $720 each; 2 electricians, at $1,200 each; wireman, $900; 39 laborers, at $660 each; plumber, at $1,100; painter, $1,100; plumber's assistant, $780; attendant for emergency relief room, $660; head of char force, $720; 85 charwomen, at $240 each; 2 carpenters, at $1,000 each. Winder Building and annex: Engineer, $1,000; 3 firemen, at $720 each; elevator conductor, $720; 4 watchmen, at $720 each; 3 laborers (one of whom, when necessary, shall assist and relieve the elevator conductor), at $660 each; forewoman of char force, $480; 12 charwomen, at $240 each; female laborer for ladies' toilets, $660. Cox Building, 1709 New York Avenue: Two watchmen, at $720 each; laborer, $660. Auditor's Building: Forewoman of char force, $480; 25 charwomen, at $240 each; 2 elevator conductors, at $720 each; 7 laborers (one of whom, when necessary, shall assist and relieve the elevator conductor), at $660 each; female laborer, $660; skilled laborer, $840; in all, $217,310.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order to that part of the second paragraph that refers to the Undersecretary—that provision at the top of page 3 in lines 2 and 3.

Mr. MADDEN. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Treasury Department Annex, Fourteenth and B Streets NW.: Carpenter, $1,200; plumber, $1,200; electrician, $1,200; two mechanics, at $900 each; captain of the watch, $1,400; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at $900 each; 21 watchmen, at $720 each; janitor, $1,200; head of char force, $660; 2 assistant heads of char force, at $480 each; 70 charwomen, at $240 each; 8 male laborers, at $660 each; 4 female laborers, at $660 each; in all, $51,260.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what policy has been adopted in this department, if he knows, with regard to granting an extra half holiday a week to employees.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think any policy except granting a half holiday in the summer season. I am opposed to any holiday except in the summer season.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to find out about the authority of the department to do that without coming to Congress. I want to know if they have authority to arbitrarily grant holidays. It is given out in the press that the Post Office Department is to give a half holiday a week, that is to begin in January, next month. It is to be made permanent throughout the year. Has that been authorized?

Mr. MADDEN. I only know from what I have seen in the newspapers.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Illinois has had considerable to do with the Post Office Department.

Mr. MADDEN. I propose to look into it. I am opposed to it except during the hot summer months.

Mr. BLANTON. In the hot summer months no one objects to it, but that applies to all departments. If the Post Office Department gives arbitrarily a half holiday to its employees and requires them to work only five and a half days a week, besides giving them all of the holidays allowed by law, every other department of the Government is going to follow suit.

Mr. MADDEN. That will not be permitted if I have anything to say about it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is going to take it up with the Post Office Department?

Mr. MADDEN. They are not acting now, but considering the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. They have not been to see the committee about it?

Mr. MADDEN. No; but when they do come, if they do not come voluntarily, we will send for them. We will have a hearing, but we do not propose to inaugurate any such policy.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For washing and hemming towels, purchase of awnings and fixtures, window shades and fixtures, alcohol, bensine, turpentine, varnish, baskets, belting, bellows, bowls, brooms, buckets, brushes, canvas, crash, cloth, chamois skins, cotton waste, door and window fasteners, dusters; flower-garden, street, and engine hose; lace leather, lye, nails, oils, plants, picks, pitchers, powders, stencil plates, hand stamps and repairs of same, spittoons, soap, matches, match safes, sponges, tacks, traps, thermometers, toilet paper, tools, towels, towel racks, tumblers, wire, zinc, and for blacksmithing, repairs of machinery, removal of rubbish, sharpening tools, street car fares not exceeding $300, advertising for proposals, and for sales at public auction in the District of Columbia, of condemned property belonging to the Treasury Department, payment of auctioneer fees, and purchase of other absolutely necessary articles, $15,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on page 7, line 4, I move to strike out the word "alcohol."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 4, strike out the word "alcohol."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what use they have for alcohol.

Mr. MADDEN. It is used for cleaning purposes. We can put in the word "denatured" if the gentleman has any doubts about it.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that they have benzine, and that is for cleaning purposes also.

Mr. MADDEN. They need them both.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not know what amount of alcohol they have been purchasing which was not denatured.

Mr. MADDEN. Very little.

Mr. BLANTON. Then they have been purchasing alcohol not denatured.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know that they have.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the law which permits certain Government institutions to withdraw alcohol without paying the tax there has been a number of institutions withdrawing alcohol without paying the tax. I doubt very seriously whether it is used for proper purposes in many instances.

Mr. MADDEN. As far as I am concerned I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is willing to have an amendment inserting the word "denatured" in front of the word "alcohol."

Mr. MADDEN. I think so.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. I want to suggest that I think it is not fair to bring up the question of alcohol in the absence of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from Maryland is around here somewhere. You could not get him far away from the Chamber while this bill is under consideration. Mr. Chairman, my attention having been directed to the gentleman from Maryland, I call attention to the fact that he said that in the next House he would be here under a 50–50 vote of Republicans and Democrats, and as his whole argument has been, from the time he first came to this House until the present day, directed against the eighteenth amendment, I call his attention to the fact that the eighteenth amendment was adopted by the legislatures of 46 States, Democratic legislatures, Republican legislatures, just as strongly Republican as he has ever been, and just as strongly Democratic as he can ever claim to be in the next House. It little behooves him to strike at that amendment when two of the smallest States alone refused to adopt it. It is the fixed policy of the Government, and however much he seeks to camouflage his six amendments, however much he seeks to throw smoke screens around them, I am sure that the genial rider of the great white charger from Baltimore must admit that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS] was correct when he stated that the object and purpose of it all is to get rid of the prohibition laws and to bring back places—he may not call them saloons—but dives where even now in the city of Baltimore you can go in and get your beer and whisky.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I ask the gentleman, for my own private use, if he will not give me a list of the places in Baltimore where he may get beer?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I do not want to give the gentleman an opportunity of knowing more places than he probably has access to at the present time; but I have heard that there are places there, as there are in St. Louis and in Chicago and in New York, where men of prominence, who have had five years experience as United States district attorneys, or where men of wealth can go and get what they want, by paying for it.

Mr. HILL. Does the gentleman believe in popular government?

Mr. BLANTON. I believe in the Government of the United States and in the Constitution of the United States, which provides a means for altering it whenever the people get ready to change it.

This eighteenth amendment was provided for in a lawful way. The Congress by an overwhelming vote submitted it to the various States and 46 out of 48 legislatures of States elected by the people approved that law, and it has become the fundamental law of the land, and neither the gentleman from Maryland, I repeat, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] said, nor any other man in this House will have the power to do away with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and to modify it by inserting in front of the word "alcohol" the word "denatured."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment and modify it. Is there objection?

Mr. LONDON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course, the amendment made by the gentleman from Texas to strike out the word "alcohol" was formal. Nevertheless, in a way it is characteristic of the fanaticism of this whole liquor question, of this whole prohibition business. I need not tell you that I am a believer in temperance. I certainly practice it. I never in my life took a drink unless I wanted it. [Laughter.] And that is the real definition of a temperance man, because the intemperate man drinks when he does not want it, when it hurts him. When I voted against the constitutional prohibition amendment I cast what I then believed, and believe now, to be a logical and a consistent vote. If there is any justification for a Constitution, it is because it is intended to protect the individual against the invasion of his rights by the State, against the oppression of minorities by temporary majorities. Constitutions are adopted for the protection of the individual, not for the purpose of checking or curtailing his rights; and for the same reason that I voted for the woman suffrage amendment I voted against the prohibition amendment. The former amendment enlarges human rights, the latter diminishes them.

Of course, I am not a friend of the saloon. The saloon is the worst enemy of democracy. The saloon is the only university that the politician attends. It is the rendezvous of the vilest elements. I am really saddened by the flagrant violation of prohibition law, not only in New York but everywhere. As you enter the smoking room of a parlor car you always notice that somebody is hiding something, and the feeling overcomes you that you are embarrassing a gentleman. If you are a lawyer you immediately take refuge in the legal presumption that the holder of the bottle has it not in violation of law but by virtue of a prescription, and that he is taking it medicinally.

One is called upon continually to witness the violation of a law which is universally disregarded. Those who are interested in temperance, those who are interested in maintaining respect for law, should make a study of the question to determine to what extent we should go as a legislature in liberalizing the eighteenth amendment. Do not force upon the people a law which they can not stomach. Do not assume that you are wiser or better than the great mass of the people. It is the inalienable privilege of a democracy to be wicked if it so chooses, or to be stupid, as it so often exercises that right in voting for Democrats and Republicans, instead of voting for us.

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman be consistent and advocate the repeal of the excessive speed laws and of the laws against reckless driving, because they are universally violated?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, there is a world of difference between the two.

Mr. GILBERT. I understand; but the gentleman was basing his argument upon the ground that the prohibition laws are so frequently violated.

Mr. LONDON. I want you to make a study of the question. I want you to see to what extent it is necessary to liberalize the law so as to adapt yourselves to the real sentiment of the people.

Mr. GILBERT. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is not nearly as universally violated as the speed laws by automobiles.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. During the war somebody proposed that the name of the Pacific Ocean be changed because the name was too suggestive of pacifism. The gentleman's objection to the word "alcohol" is in line with that policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. Just preceding the word "alcohol," line 4, insert the word "denatured."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, line 4, preceding the word "alcohol," insert the word "denatured."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a substitute amendment. Substitute the word "nonbeverage."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Insert the word "nonbeverage" before the word "alcohol," line 4, page 7.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 11, noes 28.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC DEBT SERVICE.

For necessary expenses connected with the administration of any public debt issues and United States paper currency issues with which the Secretary of the Treasury is charged, including rent in the District of Columbia, and including the salaries of the Commissioner of the Public Debt at $6,000, Deputy Commissioner of the Public Debt at $4,000, Chief of the Division of Loans and Currency at $3,500, two Assistant Chiefs of the Division of Loans and Currency at $3,000 each, Register of the Treasury at $4,000, Assistant Register of the Treasury at $2,500, Chief Clerk Office of the Register of the Treasury at $3,000, Chief of the Division of Public Debt Accounts and Audit at $3,000, Chief of the Division of Paper Custody at $3,000, and the salaries of such assistants, accountants, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary, $3,250,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum except as above provided and except the following: One at not exceeding $4,500, 1 at not exceeding $3,500, 8 at not exceeding $3,000, 4 at not exceeding $2,700, 23 at not exceeding $2,500, 1 at not exceeding $2,400, 5 at not exceeding $2,250, 26 at not exceeding $2,200, and 48 at not exceeding $2,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may allot such amount of this appropriation as in his judgment may be necessary, not exceeding $85,000, for expenditure in the Post Office Department in connection with the distribution, sale, and keeping of accounts of Treasury savings securities, as provided in the deficiency appropriation act approved November 4, 1918, and no person shall be employed under such allotment at a rate of compensation exceeding $2,500 per annum, and only one person shall be employed at a rate exceeding $1,800 per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order in order to ask a question or two. This paragraph beginning on page 13, headed "public debt service," and ending on top of page 15, is all legislation that is not authorized by law, and it provides quite a number of positions——

Mr. MADDEN. All of the activities in the paragraph are authorized by law.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the committee understands I do not intend to make a point of order against the paragraph even though it is subject to a point of order if any part of it is necessary, but if there is any one of these positions unnecessary I think it ought to come out of the bill, and I want to get some information about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me tell the gentleman what we have done. The expense of these activities for 1922 was $4,500,000; for 1923 by the consolidation it has been cut down to $3,700,000. For 1924 we propose to cut it down to $3,250,000, and without this consolidation that could not have been done.

Mr. BLANTON. When did it first become necessary to have a commissioner of public debt at $6,000?

Mr. MADDEN. We have had him right along when the debt was increased from a billion to twenty-three billion dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. If we can continue to reduce it, as the gentleman indicated this morning when he said that the $670,000,000 deficit had been wiped out until we now had a $170,000,000 surplus, we will not need this commissioner of debt?

Mr. MADDEN. We are reducing it. We have reduced it from $4,500,000 in 1922 down to $3,700,000 in 1923 and we are reducing it in this bill to $3,250,000, and we are going down every year with it, and we hope soon to be able to eliminate five or six hundred more people there.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman believe that all of the employees who are provided for in this paragraph are absolutely necessary?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, they are engaged in the most important work the Government has. We have gone into this thing very thoroughly—and I give you my word there is no more important thing and nothing has been more seriously investigated than this—and nothing was cut in like proportion to this.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION.

For expenses of the World War Foreign Debt Commission, including personal services in the District of Columbia, and printing and binding, $20,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. Is this the first appropriation made for this activity?

Mr. MADDEN. This is the second. We had an appropriation last year—made after an investigation of the law author-

izing the appointment of the commission—for a like amount. It was made under the State Department and was transferred.

Mr. SNELL. This is the first one in this regular bill?

Mr. MADDEN. It was transferred from the State Department to the Treasury Department, where it properly belongs.

Mr. SNELL. So the commission is functioning?

Mr. MADDEN. It is functioning, but they have not any employees. They have not hired a man to perform any work. They are doing their own work. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury is acting secretary of the commission, but later on they will have to have some people, but they do not know how many. I hope they will not have to employ many, but we do not know exactly just what that will be. This is about the only thing in the bill we do not know any of the details about.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting the revenue from customs, including not exceeding $300,000 for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, $11,950,000, of which $200,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I am informed that the officials of the Customs Service asked for quite a substantial sum more than is given here.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the recommendation for the appropriation for the current year was $11,300,000. They asked for $12,250,000, which was $950,000 more than the appropriation of the current year. The committee recommends $650,000, which is $300,000 less than they asked for.

The reason why we made this reduction was that in asking for $950,000 they set apart $450,000 of the $950,000 for the fiscal year 1924 and $500,000 of it for 1923—for the remaining part of 1923—on the assumption that this bill would not become a law before the 4th of March. It was manifest that $500,000 could not be used in three months to do the work for which $450,000 was asked for the entire year, and the customs officials who appeared before the committee themselves admitted that the proper proportion of the $500,000 which they asked for the fiscal year 1923 would be on the basis of $450,000 for a full year, but if it was for four months it would be $150,000. Then, they had a laboratory in which they wanted to test dyes, the cost of which they said would be $65,000—$150,000 and $65,000 together would be $215,000. It was also clear to the committee that they could not spend the $65,000 for the remainder of the fiscal year 1923 to complete the laboratory, so that the committee took out what we believed they could not spend and made the total for 1923 $200,000, which we asked to be immediately available.

Mr. LONGWORTH. They asked for certain other sums, did they not?

Mr. MADDEN. They asked for $40,000 for other work.

Mr. LONGWORTH. To be expended in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; for which we did not think there was any justification. The gentleman who came down and testified before the committee was very anxious to get all he could get. I think he is very patriotic and very anxious to perform all the functions that are to be performed. We had to bring him back three different times before we could nail him to any specific fact, but when we got down to specific facts it was clear to the chairman of the committee that made the investigation that his request was not justified.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman entirely confident that this sum will be sufficient for the collection of customs? I understand that under the present favorable circumstances they have developed a larger revenue than was ever before received in the history of this country.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask the gentleman from Ohio this question: If $450,000 was all they need for 1924 to do the same work which they proposed to do in 1923, and that $450,000 was sufficient for an entire year, does he think they could use $500,000 in four months in 1923?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would not care to express an opinion, but I would think not. My only concern was that after we had found that we were deriving a very much larger monthly return from the customs revenue than ever before in history, and with the large amount of imports coming into the country, which are being delayed in the customhouses, as I understand——

Mr. MADDEN. They are being delayed because they have not the means now, but they will not be delayed when they have this $200,000.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is unfortunate that they should be short.

Mr. MADDEN. The Committee on Appropriations, having complete jurisdiction for the reporting of all appropriations, has the same power to report and make the sums immediately available as they have to recommend a deficiency.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask the gentleman, have the imports increased?

Mr. MADDEN. The revenues have increased. The revenues up to October were the highest for any year, $356,000,000. That was about $30,000,000 more than ever before. The revenues for the month of October were $40,000,000, and the revenues for the first 18 days of November were $27,000,000. I am told that the total revenue for the month of November amounts to $41,500,000, and it is estimated that the annual revenue to be derived through the tariff act will run not less than $445,000,000 and may go to $506,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. Then, so far the Fordney tariff bill has not proved to be a stone wall against imports?

Mr. MADDEN. No. The revenues are coming in very satisfactorily, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LINEBERGER rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield to the gentleman from California if he desires.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I wish to ask of the gentleman from Illinois this question: Does he consider this $200,000 which is being made immediately available to be sufficient to take care of the situation all over the country?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is the intention.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I ask that for this reason: The port of Los Angeles, in which I happen to be interested, has increased its tonnage from 200,000 to 1,000,000 tons a month in the last 18 months, and we are requiring at the present time 21 additional assistants, mostly appraisers. Some of our shippers are paying $1,000 demurrage on cargoes now. If that situation is general throughout the ports of the country, it seems to me this $200,000 is very small.

Mr. MADDEN. We have gone very carefully into this. We considered it for more than three days and went over it very carefully indeed. As I stated to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], they asked us for $950,000, of which $450,000 was asked for 1924, not for 1923. They proposed to do exactly the same thing for 1924 that they are doing with $450,000 in 1923, and $200,000 for the balance of the year 1923 will be on the same basis.

Mr. LINEBERGER. For how many months will that be?

Mr. MADDEN. Four months. It will be exactly on the same basis as the $450,000 would be for the entire fiscal year.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I want to ask the gentleman one more question.

Mr. MADDEN. Go ahead.

Mr. LINEBERGER. In the matter of the facilities for inspecting ships, is it possible under this appropriation for the Customs Service to acquire, from other departments of the Government, certain vessels required by the collector of customs, or do they have to purchase them outright?

Mr. MADDEN. I think the Navy Department has a lot of ships that we ought to be able to get turned over, if they are the kind of ships that could be used for that purpose. So has the Shipping Board a large number of ships.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does the gentleman know why that transfer can not be made without putting it in an appropriation bill?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no reason in the world, and there is nothing in this appropriation bill that provides for that. This is for collections.

Mr. LINEBERGER. We have been attempting that for four months and have been unable to secure any results whatever.

Mr. MADDEN. The President ought to be able to help it along. He ought to be able to direct the transfer of one of those tramps from one bureau to another.

Mr. SNELL. The Shipping Board ought to be able to supply the necessary vessels.

Mr. MADDEN. There are plenty of ships owned by the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. With regard to this $200,000, it is merely a deficiency in this department for the fiscal year 1923, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. That is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And during this Congress we have already passed four deficiency bills?

Mr. MADDEN. Not for this work.
Mr. BLANTON. But in this Congress?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. For the Sixty-seventh Congress the committee of which the gentleman is chairman has already secured the passage of four deficiency bills.
Mr. MADDEN. Three or four.
Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman indicated in his speech this morning that we would have another one very shortly?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman indicated that just one item in it would be $42,000,000 for the Treasury Department to cover claims for overpaid income taxes.
Mr. MADDEN. To cover overpayments.
Mr. BLANTON. That $42,000,000 is a deficiency, is it not?
Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not think so.
Mr. BLANTON. The question I want to ask the gentleman is this: In taking the position before the country now as the gentleman and his committee and his administration do that they have reduced expenses for the fiscal year 1924 below those of the present fiscal year, 1923, ought not the gentleman at the same time to bring to the attention of the country all of these various deficiencies, which ought to be added to the expenses for the fiscal year 1923?
Mr. MADDEN. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the deficiencies to which he is calling our attention now are not deficiencies for current business transactions. They are deficiencies that have come down to us over the years, and they run back to 1918, 1917, 1916, and 1915.
Mr. BLANTON. But they are 1923 deficiencies.
Mr. MADDEN. They come to us in this fiscal year.
Mr. BLANTON. They are expenses that are coming in during this fiscal year.
Mr. MADDEN. They are expenses coming in this year, but they are not expenses incurred during this year.
Mr. BLANTON. This $200,000 is an expenditure for this fiscal year.
Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that is under the tariff act.
Mr. BLANTON. Under the ruling made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] that under the new rule the Committee on Appropriations have the right to bring in deficiency appropriations on an appropriation bill, I withdraw the point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. In this paragraph at the bottom of page 18 there was proposed by the Budget, was there not, $40,000 additional?
Mr. MADDEN. There was.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That was for the purpose of being used in the District of Columbia?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman please inform the committee why that was stricken out?
Mr. MADDEN. I did that a moment ago when the gentleman was not in the Hall of the House.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I was not here.
Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.
Mr. FESS. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. MADDEN] a question. As I recall, the receipts under the former revenue bill during the last year of its enforcement amounted to about $837,000,000?
Mr. MADDEN. The amount was $356,000,000.
Mr. FESS. And under the present revenue bill you have a prospect of how much the first year?
Mr. MADDEN. We figure on not less than $445,000,000, and perhaps as high as $506,000,000.
Mr. FESS. In other words, the present tariff bill from a revenue standpoint will augment the revenues of the Government probably $100,000,000 in the first year?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think it will be only reasonable to estimate that it will be very much more than that. The first month after the new tariff law went into force it was raising revenue on an average of more than $480,000,000 a year. Now, there had not been for many years such a great amount of imports in volume as there were during the last three months of the old Underwood law. That was rather natural, because people were trying to discount the operation of the new law. But even in the face of that, immediately after the passage of the new tariff law, the rates of which were higher than those of the former tariff law, during the months of October and November revenue has come in at a rate never before known.
Mr. FESS. As I recall the statement on the floor, the committee thought probably we would have $70,000,000 additional over the old law.
Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the committee very greatly underestimated the revenue.
Mr. FESS. From the standpoint of revenue it is a tremendous success?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct about that. It is a remarkable success—an unprecedented success. At the time the bill was passed I estimated the amount of revenue that would be collected at about $450,000,000, but as I recollect the Treasury statistician put it at about $405,000,000. Now I would like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that this great increase that has just been mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is over the former tariff as amended by the emergency act. The Underwood tariff in a time of peace before the war only produced a little over two hundred millions.
Mr. LONGWORTH. Two hundred and thirty millions or two hundred and forty millions.
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. When making a comparison between a Republican tariff bill and a Democratic tariff bill for revenue the comparison should be made with the amount of revenue received before the war under the Underwood bill in order to make it just. With reference to the imports, I will say that they are even larger than I anticipated, although I predicted that impoverished Europe would sell at any price that could be obtained.
The imports for the month since the new tariff bill has been in operation are almost double what they were in the preceding year for the corresponding period, but when it passed gentlemen on the other side said it would prove an embargo and return little revenue.
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is not an abnormal condition which the gentleman has described, but in view of that fact does it not form a basis for the President to exercise his authority for reducing the revenue so as to take the burden off of the people?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is not an abnormal condition, but the usual prosperity that attends the passage of a Republican tariff bill. Business is improving everywhere.
Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does it not form a basis for the President to exercise his authority to reduce some of the duties?
Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not so far as the revenue is concerned. We need the money, and I know of no other way in which it can be so easily raised.
Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Would it not be possible in order to take care of an emergency to make this sum of $200,000 that is made available a little larger? It would not increase the total amount of the appropriation.
Mr. MADDEN. No; it would not increase the total amount of the appropriation but it would do this: It would take the money away from the places that are already occupied.
Mr. SNELL. Granting that is so, the people can not now get all the goods through the customhouse without paying demurrage. In Los Angeles they need 24 men, which would cost about $4,000 a month.
Mr. MADDEN. This is providing for 300 men, and that is what they said they needed.
Mr. SNELL. They can now use 300 men?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is what they want. This will give them all that they need. If you give them any more money, you take it away from the appropriation to pay the men already employed.
Mr. SNELL. I am not in favor of giving them any more money than they need, but I do think we should give them money enough to take care of the existing conditions in these ports that are now congested.
Mr. MADDEN. We think we have exhausted every avenue of information in the customs service and we have reached the conclusion that nobody could easily controvert and we could not justify doing anything else than what we have done. We have no disposition to curtail activities, but on the other hand we want to give them every dollar that they need.
Mr. SNELL. And the gentleman is positive that this can be done with this appropriation?
Mr. MADDEN. With the information they have given us, if that is correct, and we base it on their information, we have no doubt that it can be done.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. If I have the floor.
Mr. ROACH. Is this all that they asked for?
Mr. MADDEN. No; they asked for $500,000.
The Clerk read as follows:

Scales for customs service: For construction and installation of special automatic and recording scales for weighing merchandise, etc., in connection with imports at the various ports of entry under direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, $100,000.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In regard to these special automatic scales, we all remember that when they were introduced for the weighing of sugar we expended something like $100,000 a year on the installation of these automatic scales. How far along have they got, and will there be any end to it?

Mr. MADDEN. There will be no end as long as we carry out this program; you will have to start building the first scales that were built over again.

Mr. TILSON. Then are we not losing a great deal by fraudulent weight, and ought we not to appropriate a larger sum and have it all done and stop the program?

Mr. MADDEN. You can not stop the program because the requirements of the scales are endless; you can not build scales any faster than certain limited facilities which are not there to enable them to build them faster. You have to go along at a certain rate of speed. It is not essential that this class of scale should be used in all the weighing. It is essential that they should be used to weigh sugar and some things like that. They are not necessary for the weighing of other things. They have to have scales that they can move from a place where the trucks are and weigh the stock. These scales are stationary, and the reason they are used on high revenue-bearing imports like sugar is that they want a record made so that it will be clear and plain and nobody can change it. They do not weigh much of the smaller revenue-bearing commodities on that class of scales.

It is a very important thing how long it would take to complete this, and I asked the man in charge of the scales that question. He said that he did not know how long it would take. Then I asked him when he got the plans completed what would happen, and he replied that they would have to begin over again, that the scales first completed would be worn out at that time so that they would have to go on through the program and back again. It is like the man who was running for alderman. He said there were 250 saloons in his district and he was making a saloon campaign. When he got to the last saloon the first one was against him, so that he had to go around again.

Mr. TILSON. My inquiry was aroused by reason of the language—

special automatic and recording scales, for weighing merchandise.

If it is important that we should have this particular kind of scale, it seems to me that we ought to have them——

Mr. MADDEN. We have.

Mr. TILSON. And not be getting a few of them each year, so that the first ones will be worn out before the last ones are installed. It seems to me that we are not getting the most efficient service.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if the alderman's district to which he just referred is in Baltimore?

Mr. MADDEN. I would not wonder. For the information of the committee I want now to read a moment from the testimony of Mr. Gast, who testified in respect to these scales:

The CHAIRMAN. In what ports have you already installed the scales?
Mr. GAST. We have these scales at the ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Savannah, and New Orleans.
The CHAIRMAN. How nearly complete are they at any point?
Mr. GAST. At New York we have 39 scales complete, and there are 8 scales in course of installation at the present time. I should say we have over 300 scales of various types at the port of New York now. At Boston we have 11 of these scales installed. At Philadelphia we have 23; at Baltimore we have 4; at Savannah we have 6; and at New Orleans we have 10.
The CHAIRMAN. What is the life of these scales?
Mr. GAST. It is hard to say, but I should say it would be about the same as any other substantially constructed piece of machinery, about 12 years, although, I should say, the first scales which were installed in 1910 had the automatic mechanism replaced with a newer modern type of mechanism, and we remodeled the steelwork and the levers, so those scales are as good to-day as they were when they were installed.
The CHAIRMAN. Is there much cost of upkeep on these scales?
Mr. GAST. It runs about $100 per scale per year. That includes the repair parts as well as the cost of the labor (mechanician) employed.

NUMBER OF SCALES PROPOSED TO BUILD.

The CHAIRMAN. How many scales do you expect to build out of the $100,000, and where?
Mr. GAST. I have estimated for eight 5,000-pound scales and two 30,000-pound scales at New York; one additional 5,000-pound scale at Savannah, and one more at Baltimore. That makes exactly $100,000, at the average cost per scale that we are paying at the present time.
The CHAIRMAN. How much is the average cost of the 5,000-pound scale?
Mr. GAST. It will average about $7,000 per scale.
The CHAIRMAN. What about the 30,000-pound scale?
Mr. GAST. For the last one we paid $15,000. That was four years ago. I am hoping to get additional ones at the same price, or possibly for less.
The CHAIRMAN. Does the Government build these scales?
Mr. GAST. No, sir.
The CHAIRMAN. You contract for them?
Mr. GAST. We contract for them. I write the specifications, advertise for bids, and then the lowest bidder gets the work.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. BUTLER. What is an automatic scale?
Mr. MADDEN. It is a scale that makes a record of the work that it does.
Mr. BUTLER. But all scales do that.
Mr. MADDEN. This makes it without any human touch on a tape, and the tape is not red.
Mr. BUTLER. And it has no music charms connected with it?
Mr. MADDEN. There may be a liberty bell on it.
The Clerk read as follows:

In all, Federal Farm Loan Bureau, $301,720.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, before we get away from the farm loan business, I move to strike out the last word, because I think it is only fair for me to state for the information of the House that most of the farm loan banks are making money. They have about $4,000,000 surplus, and many of them are paying dividends at the rate of from 6 to 10 per cent. The unfortunate thing that I have discovered in the investigation which I have made is that while the dividends are intended to be paid to the stockholders, or the borrowers, in many cases more than 50 per cent of the dividends goes to the man in charge of the local association, the man who organized the association in the community. There ought to be something done to prevent this. Our committee has no legislative jurisdiction. If we had we would have reported some legislation upon this particular bill to remedy this evil. I think the country should understand, particularly that part of the country which is affected by this action, that when the farm loan banks in any region pay dividends those dividends, of course, are sent through the local association for distribution to the borrowers, and the intention of the law was that the dividends should be paid and to the extent that they were paid they would reduce the interest cost of the money borrowed; but if the money that is paid in dividends is all to be absorbed by the so-called secretary-treasurer, then I think there must be some law to prevent that in the future. In one case in Texas, and I do not remember the location of the local association, the secretary-treasurer of the association absorbed to himself more than 50 per cent of the amount paid by the Federal reserve bank in dividends to the borrowers of that association.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. TEMPLE. By what process does he absorb it?
Mr. MADDEN. He pays his salary; he pays his expenses with it. He is the Pooh-Bah. The secretary-treasurer is the man who organizes it.
Mr. TEMPLE. He does not fix his own salary, does he?
Mr. MADDEN. He does. He just takes it.
Mr. BUTLER. And there is no way in this bill by which that amount of money can be reduced. This money does not come out of the Treasury, but it comes out of a fund raised by another bill.
Mr. MADDEN. That is correct.
Mr. BUTLER. And in this committee we have no power over it whatever.
Mr. MADDEN. We have no power to remedy the evil. I have called this to the attention of the House so that some of the gentlemen who are on the Banking and Currency Committee may learn of it and introduce legislation which will provide a remedy to cure the evils to which I have alluded.
Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MADDEN. Yes.
Mr. TILSON. I note that the total amount for the Federal Farm Loan Bureau is very much increased, apparently. It is 25 per cent over what it was last year.
Mr. MADDEN. There is an increase of only $9,000. Thirty-five thousand dollars was in a deficiency act, and it was to carry out the provisions of the law. This is permanent law.
Mr. TILSON. Will this be paid back?
Mr. MADDEN. That part of it is reimbursable.
Mr. TILSON. Just the $35,000?
Mr. MADDEN. That is all.

Mr. TILSON. Otherwise the increase has been about $9,000 only.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I notice elsewhere in this bill, wherever traveling expenses are provided for, it is specified that it should be when the person receiving the expenses is traveling on official business. Twenty thousand dollars is provided here in one part of the paragraph for the traveling expenses of the members of the board. There is no restriction upon it whatever. It simply says for traveling expenses. In other words, in addition to the $10,000 salary, whenever any member of the board or an employee wants to take a trip, he can do so.

Mr. MADDEN. The reason why we did not carry that language is that the law itself provides that the traveling must be on official business. We do not repeat all the language of the law.

Mr. BLANTON. Elsewhere in the bill it is repeated. In providing for traveling expenses you provide that it shall be on official business.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no objection to that being put in here.

Mr. BLANTON. But it is safeguarded in the law?

Mr. MADDEN. It is; absolutely.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words just to make one observation. Members will recall that in the last session we passed two laws in the form of amendments, one to appreciate the interest paid on the bonds from 5 to 5½ per cent in order to make them marketable, so they would be taken by the public. The other was to increase the amount of money in the sum total that might be loaned for the relief of the farmer. I think it might be of value to the Members here to note that while the 5½ per cent is allowed under the law, under the present Treasury administration it is not required; but the last sale was at the rate of 4.2, which means a saving to the Government of 1.3 per cent. I have mentioned that to indicate the success of the financing of the Government under the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs to canceling and cutting machines in the office of the Treasurer of the United States, $200.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman about the force employed in redeeming the Federal reserve and national currency, if that is not paid——

Mr. MADDEN. That is all paid by the banks. They have a redemption fund on deposit in the Treasury of 5 per cent of the amount in circulation, and when they send in the money for redemption the cost is taken out of this fund.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. I want to ask if the salaries that are given to these people for doing this important work for the banks are in any way in harmony with the salaries the banks pay their people for doing these things?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what they are paying their clerks. But they are not doing such important work; it is counting money——

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Do they have clerks counting money in a dingy place where daylight never enters at $900 a year? Does the gentleman think the Federal reserve banks have clerks doing important work at a salary like that?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; lots of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is not acquainted with the salaries being paid by private establishments, otherwise he would not rise here and criticize these salaries.

Mr. MADDEN. And the gentleman must also remember they are getting $240 on top of the $900.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The Federal land banks have been called to our attention where some of the officials are absorbing practically all in salaries.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is mistaken, I did not make such a statement——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is, the joint-stock land banks.

Mr. MADDEN. No; these are not officials of the land banks. I want to get that out of the gentleman's head. They are officials of the local associations, members of the local associations; the banks themselves are doing no such thing.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. If the private banks are paying their people higher for doing similar work, does not the gentleman think these salaries should be in harmony with what they are paying?

Mr. MADDEN. The salaries are in harmony with what other people on the pay roll are getting. Why should we make them a special class as far as the banks are concerned? We could not do it. There is a law under which they are paid.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. But they were fixed in 1875.

Mr. MADDEN. And there is a reclassification act pending in the Senate. I wish the gentleman would get his two Senators to vote for it.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Passed in 1875, and their work has increased ten times since that time.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

Comptroller, $5,000; deputy comptrollers—1 $3,500, 1 $3,000; chief clerk, $2,500; chiefs of divisions—1 $2,500, 2 at $2,200 each; general bookkeeper, $2,000; assistant bookkeeper, $2,000; vault clerk, $2,000; clerks—4 at $2,000 each, 15 of class 4, additional to bond clerk, $200, 21 of class 3, 23 of class 2, 27 of class 1, 14 at $1,000 each, 7 at $900 each; stenographer, $1,600; multigraph operators—1 $1,400, 1, $1,200; clerk-counters—2 at $1,400 each, 4 at $1,200 each; 6 counters, at $840 each; 3 messengers, at $840 each; 5 assistant messengers, at $720 each; 3 laborers, at $660 each; messenger boys—1 $480, 1 $420; in all, $206,440.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman the following question: Can the salaries provided in this bill be increased so as to comply with the reclassification provision which we adopted when we passed that bill?

Mr. MADDEN. When the reclassification act is passed by the Senate and becomes a law, then we should revise the salaries in a special bill and cover that.

Mr. LONDON. But we can not increase the salaries now?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. LONDON. That would be subject to a point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. That would be legislation.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he is familiar with the procedure under which the Comptroller of the Currency appears to authorize the establishment of branch banks throughout the country? Was that matter brought up in the hearings?

Mr. MADDEN. No, it was not; and I do not think there is any law anywhere that authorizes branch banks, is there?

Mr. BRIGGS. That is the question I have up before me and which seems to be a subject of complaint. I am getting letters constantly now complaining that the Comptroller of the Currency is apparently authorizing branch banks, or offices as they are called, and I wanted to know under what authority of law he is authorized to grant the establishment of such branch banks.

Mr. MADDEN. I really do not know.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman refer to banks in the District of Columbia or elsewhere?

Mr. BRIGGS. Both.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The branch banks that are being established here in the District of Columbia are under an act fathered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLSPAUGH], reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and passed by the last Congress.

Mr. BRIGGS. This is under alleged general authority operating throughout the United States, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think there is any authority in law for them.

Mr. STAFFORD. If my colleague will permit, the present Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Crissinger, takes the position that the existing law gives him authority to establish offices. There is a division of opinion among the bankers of the country as to whether the national banking act should be amended so as to authorize national banks to establish offices in States where the State banking institutions are privileged to establish branch banks; but at the last meeting of the National Bankers' Association in New York, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRIGGS] is well aware, that association passed overwhelmingly a resolution protesting against the establishment of a system of branch banks. Fundamentally, for my part, I am opposed to the establishment of a system of branch banks from seeing its actual effects in Canada, which I had occasion to observe in seasons when I have been out of Congress.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman know under what authority of law the comptroller acts in authorizing the establishment of these offices? They are simply nothing but banking offices, where banking is carried on just as it is carried on in the larger institutions.

Mr. STAFFORD. No Comptroller of the Currency prior to the present official ever assumed that he had that authority. From time to time in the consideration of the Federal reserve act there have been provisions authorizing the establishment of branch banks, but those provisions have gone out, either in conference or in the House.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman's committee took no action on that?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; because it is not within our legislative power.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For special examinations of national banks and bank plates, keeping macerator in Treasury Building in repair, and for other incidental expenses attending the working of the macerator, and for procuring information relative to banks other than national, $2,250.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. REED of New York, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Katherine L. Cushing (H. R. 13316, 65th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOCH, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURTON, for two days, on account of official business elsewhere.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 8, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

786. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting 651 reports of inspections of disbursements and transfers by officers of the Army received in the office of the Inspector General during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

787. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting statement of disbursements during the period from December 1, 1921, to November 30, 1922, from contingent expenses, Department of Commerce, and general expenses, Bureau of Standards; statement of expenditures under all appropriations for the support of the Bureau of Fisheries during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; statement of typewriters and other labor-saving devices exchanged during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; and statement of travel performed by officers and employees from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce.

788. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the thirty-sixth annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

789. A letter from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting the sixth annual report of the United States Shipping Board, covering the period June 30, 1921, to and including June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

790. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the contingent expenses of the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

791. A letter from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the original papers relating to the pension claim of Carl Olsen, certificate No. 1175146; to the Committee on Pensions.

792. A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, transmitting a report of the official proceedings of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1921, and also the balance sheets and other financial and statistical data of the several public utilities for the year ended December 31, 1921; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

793. A letter from the Director of the United States Botanic Garden, transmitting a report relative to travel performed on official business from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

794. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report giving the aggregate number of publications issued by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

795. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the publications received and distributed by the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

796. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement of publications issued by the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

797. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting statement showing what officers or employees have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

798. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting annual report of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (S. 408) for the relief of Louise St. Gez, executrix of Auguste Ferré, deceased, surviving partner of Lapene & Ferré; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (S. 404) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Alphonse Desmare, deceased, and others; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 13233) to amend section 5 of the United States cotton futures act, approved August 11, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13234) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 13235) to amend the Indian appropriation act of February 14, 1920 (41 Stats. p. 413), in so far as the same relates to the collection of fees for determining the heirs and approval of wills of deceased Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 13236) to provide for a site and public building at Winter Haven, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 13237) authorizing the closing of certain portions of Grant Road, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13238) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure, purchase, manufacture, or construct additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEEDY: A bill (H. R. 13239) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the town of Kittery, Me., for park purposes, all right and title now vested in the United States to

the entire Government reservation known as Fort McClary, in said Kittery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 13240) granting an increase of pension to William H. Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 13241) granting a pension to Banner Chandley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHALMERS: A bill (H. R. 13242) granting an increase of pension to Clarissa Nehiser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 13243) for the relief of Nancy Engle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13244) granting a pension to Carrie A. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 13245) for the relief of the legal representatives of Donnelly and Egan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 13246) for the examination and survey of the intracoastal canal from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 13247) for the relief of the Awbrey Coal & Coke Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 13248) granting an increase of pension to Mary Marley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 13249) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAYTON: A bill (H. R. 13250) for the relief of Helene M. Layton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 13251) for the relief of Mary A. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 13252) granting a pension to Anna A. Randall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13253) granting a pension to Allie W. Seeber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13254) granting a pension to Edith M. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSEN: A bill (H. R. 13255) for the relief of Charles J. Eisenhauer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13256) granting an increase of pension to Harry Elkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 13257) granting a pension to Ray Dugger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 13258) granting an increase of pension to George W. Searcy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13259) for the relief of J. E. Benton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 13260) granting an increase of pension to Emma Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13261) granting a pension to Robert McAfee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13262) granting a pension to Carl D. Watters; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13263) granting a pension to Oliver L. Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13264) granting a pension to Albert Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13265) granting a pension to William Garnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13266) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Chadick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13267) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6538. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Quaker City Chapter, No. 162, representing 353 members, Order of Eastern Star of Pennsylvania, and citizens of Pennsylvania, asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6539. By Mr. BRIGGS: Communication and petition from E. L. Long, Alvin, Tex., for recognition, through increased appropriations, of pink bollworm claims; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6540. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of citizens of the city of New York, relating to the brutal murder and torture of Irish men and Irish women; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6541. By Mr. CRISP: Petition of R. H. French and others, of Virginia, to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6542. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Fire Marshals' Association of North America, for legislation to prohibit the transportation of inflammable films in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6543. Also, petition of the Federation of Polish Hebrews of America, favoring amendment of the immigration laws to permit the entry of all married women whose husbands are already in America, and their children, regardless of the quota allowed for the country where they reside; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6544. Also, petition of the Naval Post of Chicago, No. 372, Department of Illinois, American Legion, favoring maintaining the Great Lakes Naval Training Station and making the necessary appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6545. Also, memorial of the city council of the city of Chicago, for a new post-office building at Chicago; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6546. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Thomas E. Houghton and 20 other citizens of Flint, Mich., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6547. By Mr. KIESS: Petition of Knights of Malta, Renovo, Pa., favoring the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill to create a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6548. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Safe River Committee of 100, New Orleans, La., relative to flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

6549. By Mr. ROACH: Petition of the Ministerial Alliance of Boonville, Mo., protesting against recent Turkish atrocities and requesting that the United States of America voice its emphatic protest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6550. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of residents of Washington County, Pa., in support of House bill 7, for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6551. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of A. G. Smith and others, of Velva, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6552. Also, petition of Evenson & Peterson Co., Litchville, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6553. Also, petition of Mr. Haut and others, of Gackle, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 8, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, along the track of our history we have abundant evidences of Thy great goodness. Thou hast been with us as a people in many of the great emergencies which confronted us. We believe Thou art the same God, the God of our fathers, and our God, too. We humbly ask that Thy help may be had in the perplexing problems of this hour, and so lead us onward that in every department of service Thine approval may be realized. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY, a Senator from the State of Illinois, and A. OWSLEY STANLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, appeared in their seats to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Calder	Couzens	Dial
Bayard	Capper	Culberson	Dillingham
Brookhart	Caraway	Cummins	Fernald
Broussard	Colt	Curtis	Fletcher

George	Ladd	Norris	Sutherland
Gooding	La Follette	Phipps	Townsend
Harreld	Lenroot	Poindexter	Trammell
Harris	Lodge	Pomerene	Underwood
Harrison	McCumber	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Heflin	McKellar	Reed, Pa.	Walsh, Mass.
Hitchcock	McKinley	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
Johnson	McLean	Shortridge	Warren
Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Smith	Watson
Jones, Wash.	Moses	Smoot	Weller
Kellogg	Nelson	Spencer	Williams
Kendrick	New	Stanley	Willis
Keyes	Norbeck	Sterling	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Reresentatives by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to House Concurrent Resolution 75, providing for a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on this day at 12.30 p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. MOORE of Virginia a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in place of Mr. Padgett, deceased.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the concurrent resolution of the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 75, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 8, 1922.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Friday, the 8th day of December, 1922, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR LA FOLLETTE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Wisconsin, certifying to the election of ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Executive Department.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wisconsin a Senator from said State, to represent said State in the Senate of the United States, for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the capitol in the city of Madison, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1922.

[SEAL.]

JOHN J. BLAINE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

ELMER S. HALL,
Secretary of State.

NAVAL MANEUVERS IN BAY OF PANAMA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, which will be read:

The reading clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 7, 1922.

SIR: The United States Fleet composed of the combined forces on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts will be engaged in tactical exercises in the Bay of Panama from the 12th to the 23d of March, and a part of this force will conduct certain important gunnery experiments in the same locality between the 26th and 30th of March, which it is felt certain Members of Congress may wish to see.

The Navy transport *Henderson*, which is regularly employed in transporting naval personnel and freight between the United States and ports in the West Indies, is scheduled to sail for those ports on or about the 4th of March.

With very little difficulty, and with a minimum of expense involved, the schedule of the *Henderson* could be so modified as to permit her going from the West Indies to Panama Bay. Should the Congress, particularly those Members composing the Naval Affairs Committees and the naval subcommittees of the Appropriation Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and representatives of the Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations Committees, express the desire to witness the above exercises, I should be pleased to have reserved for their use the available accommodations on the *Henderson*.

In addition to the opportunity which this affords to witness our fleet in maneuvers, I might add that this trip will give such Members of Congress as can take advantage of it an opportunity to inspect our naval stations in the Canal Zone, our island possessions of St. Thomas, the administration of Santo Domingo, the military government of Port au Prince, and our naval station at Guantanamo.

The schedule of this trip of the *Henderson* can be so arranged as to enable the Members to embark after the adjournment of Congress, March 4, 1923, and to return to Washington by April 13.

It now appears that there will be accommodations approximately for 60 passengers over and above those belonging to the Navy. The only cost to such Members as are able to take the prospective trip will be $1.50 per day for subsistence and 15 cents per day for laundry.

An early determination of the wishes of Congress is desired in order that plans may be formulated.

Respectfully,

EDWIN DENBY.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

(Copy to the Speaker of the House.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table for the information of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the Attorney General of the United States for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the House of Representatives, which will be read:

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 7, 1922.

The Speaker appointed Mr. MOORE of Virginia as member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution in place of Mr. Padgett.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KENDRICK presented a resolution of the Fremont County (Wyo.) Woolgrowers' Association, favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by General Teamsters and Chauffeurs Local Union No. 307, of Cheyenne, Wyo., protesting against any modification of the immigration laws permitting the entrance of a larger number of immigrants into the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Shoshone Project Water Users' Association, of Powell, Wyo., favoring relief from difficulties arising out of economic conditions which have impaired the ability of the settlers to meet their obligations to the Government, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Fordville, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hold in my hand a bill authorizing the erection in the city of Washington of a monument to the memory of the faithful colored mammies of the South during the war between the States, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4119) authorizing the erection in the city of Washington of a monument in memory of the faithful colored mammies of the South; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GOODING:

A bill (S. 4120) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4121) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4122) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Toll Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River, between Montague County, Tex., and Jefferson County, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 4123) granting a pension to Benjamin H. Sellers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW (for Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN):

A bill (S. 4124) granting a pension to Amelia A. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4125) granting an increase of pension to Max Liedtke;

A bill (S. 4126) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. James;

A bill (S. 4127) granting an increase of pension to William E. Minshall;

A bill (S. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Sarah C. Peterson (with accompanyng papers); and

A bill (S. 4129) granting a pension to Charles Green (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 254) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. CURTIS, it was—

Ordered, That the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS] be assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Mines and Mining, and the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXCESS EARNINGS OF RAILROADS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution calling for certain information from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I ask that it may lie on the table to be called up at a later day.

The resolution (S. Res. 379) was read, ordered to be printed and to lie on the table, as follows:

Whereas by the section numbered 15a of the interstate commerce act, which was added by the Cummins-Esch Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission, after the termination of Federal control, was required to group the railroads of the country, and to adjust rates so that an aggregate fixed percentage return, specified in said section, should be earned upon the aggregate value of all such railroads; and

Whereas it was stated in said section 15a that the rate making provisions therein contained would enable some carriers "to receive a net railway operating income substantially and unreasonably in excess of a fair return upon the value of their railway property"; and

Whereas with the purpose of recovering a part of such unreasonable excess, and of securing the use of the same for the benefit of the public in the promotion of interstate commerce, it was provided in said section that any road that should receive such excess income should hold one-half of the excess above 6 per cent upon the value of its railway property "as trustee for the United States," and that the amount so held in trust should "within the first four months following the close of the period for which such computation is made be recoverable by and paid to the commission for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a general railroad contingent fund"; and

Whereas it is now almost three years since the termination of Federal control, and it is reported that many railroads, under the rates which have been fixed through the application of the provisions of said section 15a, have earned in excess of 6 per cent upon the value of their railway property, but have failed to make report of the same to the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to pay over one-half of such excess to said commission, and in disregard of the trust created by said section, have devoted all of said excess to their own uses; and that 13 great railroad systems will increase their dividends this year; and

Whereas it is reported that none of the railroads have paid over to the commission any excess earnings under said section 15a, and that in fact all the railroads of the country which have received earnings in excess of 6 per cent have, with few exceptions, failed to pay over one-half thereof, or any part thereof, to the commission for the uses and purposes provided by said section: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to report to the Senate the following information:

1. The "rules and regulations for the determination and recovery of the excess income," payable under section 15a, which have been prescribed by the commission.

2. The Class I railroads which have made reports to the commission as to their earnings in excess of 6 per cent; the value of its railway property claimed by each; the excess earnings admitted by each; the value of the railway property of each as found by the commission under section 15a, in each case where a tentative or a final valuation of the same has been made, and in each case where no such valuation has been made, the nearest approximation to the value which can be readily reported, according to the rules and regulations applicable for the determination thereof, prescribed by the commission; the excess earnings of each such railroad computed according to the value so found or determined; and the amount of excess earnings paid to the commission by each such carrier.

3. All other Class I railroads which, from any reports made by the same to the commission, annually, monthly, or otherwise, appear to have received in excess of 6 per cent upon the value of their railway property; the value of such property of each, found or approximately determined as aforesaid; and the excess earnings of each computed according to such value, or the nearest approximate estimate of the same which can be readily reported.

4. Each railroad other than a Class I railroad that has reported any excess earnings to the commission under section 15a; the value of the railway property of each, as claimed by it; the excess earnings admitted by it; the value of the railway property of each such railroad as found or determined by the commission as aforesaid; the excess earnings of each such railroad as computed on such value so found or determined by the commission; and the amount of excess earnings paid by each such railroad to the commission.

5. The aggregate of excess earnings which remain payable to the commission from all railroads, according to the provisions of said section 15a, as computed by the commission, or the nearest approximation or estimate thereof, which the commission can readily report; and the items which make up the aggregate, to the extent that the same have been separately computed or estimated.

6. Whether any railroad which has failed or refused to make any report as to excess earnings required by such rules or regulations as the commission may have prescribed, or to pay over one-half of such excess earnings in accordance with the provisions of said section 15a, has made any statement of its grounds or reasons for such failure or refusal; and, if so, the name of each such railroad, with a copy of such portion of such statement as sets out such grounds or reasons.

7. As to any railroad or railroads appearing to have received in trust for the United States excess earnings which remain payable to the commission, according to the provisions of said section 15a, the steps or proceedings taken or begun by the commission to enforce payment of the public moneys so unlawfully retained; and be it further

Resolved, That the commission be requested to make report of the information called for by the foregoing resolution not later than January 1, 1923, if the same can with reasonable diligence be prepared for transmittal before that date; and if the same can not all be so prepared by that date, that it then make report of all information which can be at that time transmitted, and that it make a supplemental report as soon thereafter as may be practicable, completing the information called for.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, before morning business is closed I wish to call attention to the fact that on Wednesday, December 6 last, the Vice President laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Forest Reservation Commission, but through inadvertence the usual provision for the printing of the report as a Senate document was not made. I now move that the report, with its accompanying illustrations, be printed as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to; and the order was reduced to writing as follows:

Ordered, That the letter of the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the National Forest Reservation Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on the 6th instant, be printed as a Senate document, including the illustrations accompanying the same.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar under Rule VIII is now in order.

The bill (S. 214) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as first in order on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1467) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1016) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Being objected to, the bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold hearings here or elsewhere and to employ a stenographer to report the same was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 491) to provide, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 7) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real-estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask that the bill may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Being objected to, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2391) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill can not be considered this morning, and I therefore ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2228) to amend certain sections of the Judicial Code relating to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8331) to amend the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let this bill be passed over.

The resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing transportation for dependents of Army field clerks and field clerks, Quartermaster Corps, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2718) to provide for leasing of the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La., was announced as next in order.

Mr. CALDER. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Being objected to, the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 2589) to amend section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 67) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

WATSON B. DICKERMAN, ADMINISTRATOR.

The bill (S. 1539) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order, and was read.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], who introduced the bill, make a short statement as to what effect the passage of the bill will have upon perhaps hundreds of similar cases. It grows out, I presume, of a claim on account of leakage allowed under existing law, but I am quite sure that there are hundreds and hundreds of such cases, and I am wondering whether the Senator can not in a brief statement explain why this bill should pass.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this bill has been introduced a number of times; it has been reported from the Committee on Claims of the Senate at least a half a dozen times, and it has passed the Senate twice. It is true that claims for leakage may be made by other corporations or individuals who have withdrawn liquor from bond, but if the Senator will examine page 5 of the report he will find that in a number of cases cited there legislation of a similar nature has been enacted for the relief of others.

There is no doubt, Mr. President, that the record will show that the claimant is entitled to the refund. He paid the money in good faith, believing at the time he paid it that he was paying an excess, but he was compelled to pay it in order to get his goods from the warehouse, where they were stored. It seems to me, while it is a very late day, it is a very meritorious measure and ought to be passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my attention was distracted for a moment. Will the Senator state what the bill is which he desires to have passed?

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that this claim grows out of an overpayment on the withdrawal of liquor from bond. The overpayment was due to the fault of the revenue officer. This case has been repeatedly recommended for favorable action by the department, and there are many precedents for it. If the Senator will look on his calendar of bills he will find a report upon this bill from the department, and on page 5 a number of precedents are cited.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES.

Mr. LODGE (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.). Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess in order that it may fulfill the terms of the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, in which the Senate has concurred, and now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered, and the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon the Senate, preceded by its Sergeant at Arms and by the President pro tempore and the Secretary, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

[The address of the President of the United States this day delivered at a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress will be found in the proceedings of the House of Representatives, page 212.]

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m., and the President pro tempore resumed the chair.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 9, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 8, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Thomas H. Milton, Trenton.

KANSAS.

Ferdinand C. Stuewe, Alma.
Philip F. Grout, Almena.
Jacob L. Ritter, Bronson.
Norman W. Nixon, Downs.
Delle Duncan, Esbon.
David A. Nywall, Formoso.
Charles O. Bollinger, Iola.
Gordon K. Logan, Kirwin.
Gilbert E. Goodson, La Cygne.
Louella M. Holmes, Mound City.
Walter R. Dysart, Parker.
Robert E. Wright, Satanta.
Bessie W. Brennan, Strong.
William B. Hart, Westmoreland.
Elmer Alban, Westphalia.

MICHIGAN.

Edna M. Park, Alden.
Robert Ryan, Bronson.
Byron L. Page, Clifford.
Euretta B. Nelson, Climax.
Benjamin B. Gorman, Coldwater.
John S. Hamlin, Eaton Rapids.
Ward B. Schlichter, Gladwin.
Martin H. King, Homer.
William C. Truman, Luther.
Claude W. Till, Mears.
Fred W. Holmes, Milford.
Norman A. McDonald, Newaygo.
Harold T. Hill, Pentwater.
Ida L. Sherman, Pullman.
Charles T. Fillmore, Quincy.
Richard Bolt, Standish.
Fred Lutz, Warren.

MISSISSIPPI.

Amos K. Porter, Boyle.
Sibyl Q. Stratton, Liberty.

MISSOURI.

James O. Erwin, Mokane.
Clara S. Beck, Norborne.
Elvin L. Renno, St. Charles.
Alfred O. Lowman, Smithville.
James A. Allison, Waverly.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 8, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, may the marvel of creation, the wonder of redemption, and the strangeness of our preservation stir our gratitude and thanksgiving day by day. Lead us to think how dependent we are upon Thee and to appreciate the clear manifestations of an all-merciful God. May we know Thee, whom to know is eternal life. Be Thou with our President, his fireside, and all who are associated with him in authority. Bless our Nation and ever keep over it a pure and undefiled repro-

sentative government. That we may have the best and avoid the worst, may all citizens understand that Christian character and high intelligence must be the dominant notes in the progress of the Republic. Blessed Lord, endow us more and more with clean conscience, clear vision, and broad understanding. And Thine shall be the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT SESSION.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 75.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Friday, the 8th day of December, 1922, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its chief clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following concurrent resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution 75.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Friday, the 8th day of December, 1922, at 12.30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

VESSELS OF WAR THAT HAVE BEEN SCRAPPED.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged report from the Committee on Naval Affairs on House Resolution 457.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 457.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the House of Representatives full information touching the number of vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of by the United States and other powers who were participants in the Conference on Limitation of Armament, since the adjournment of that conference, and including vessels of war whether defined by any treaty signed at that conference or not.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, this is unanimously reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FROTHINGHAM], who introduced the resolution, was present at the time we considered it and is entirely satisfied with it. Therefore I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BUTLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

HOLIDAY RECESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, quite a number of Members have made inquiries as to the probable length of the holiday recess of the House.

In view of the importance of disposing of the program of appropriations and the legislative program before the House, I think there is a general agreement among the Members that there should not be a long recess during the holidays. What I now have in mind is at the proper time to ask unanimous consent that when we adjourn on Saturday, December 23, we adjourn until Wednesday, December 27, giving us a recess of two days, Christmas and the day following.

I have not discussed with Members the matter of the recess over New Year's to any considerable extent, but my present thought is that the New Year's recess should be over New Year's Day only, or possibly the day following; but as matters now stand in the legislative program it would not seem wise to have a longer recess than over Monday, New Year's Day.

I shall not make these requests now, as I desire to discuss the matter further with gentlemen of the minority and some Members on this side; but my understanding is that the arrangement I have suggested will be fairly satisfactory to the membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

JOINT SESSION OF SENATE AND HOUSE.

At 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m. the members of the President's Cabinet entered the Hall and took seats on the left of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the Senate.

The Senate, preceded by their President pro tempore and their Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee on behalf of the House to wait upon the President and escort him to the Chamber the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On behalf of the Senate the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER].

At 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House, was announced by the Doorkeeper, and stood at the Clerk's desk amid applause on the floor and in the galleries.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of the Congress: So many problems are calling for solution that a recital of all of them, in the face of the known limitations of a short session of Congress, would seem to lack sincerity of purpose. It is four years since the World War ended, but the inevitable readjustment of the social and economic order is not more than barely begun. There is no acceptance of pre-war conditions anywhere in the world. In a very general way humanity harbors individual wishes to go on with war-time compensations for production, with pre-war requirements in expenditure. In short, everyone, speaking broadly, craves readjustment for everybody except himself, while there can be no just and permanent readjustment except when all participate.

The civilization which measured its strength of genius and the power of science and the resources of industries, in addition to testing the limits of man power and the endurance and heroism of men and women—that same civilization is brought to its severest test in restoring a tranquil order and committing humanity to the stable ways of peace.

If the sober and deliberate appraisal of pre-war civilization makes it seem a worth-while inheritance, then with patience and good courage it will be preserved. There never again will be precisely the old order; indeed, I know of no one who thinks it to be desirable. For out of the old order came the war itself, and the new order, established and made secure, never will permit its recurrence.

It is no figure of speech to say we have come to the test of our civilization. The world has been passing—is to-day passing—through a great crisis. The conduct of war itself is not more difficult than the solution of the problems which necessarily follow. I am not speaking at this moment of the problem in its wider aspect of world rehabilitation or of international relationships. The reference is to our own social, financial, and economic problems at home. These things are not to be considered solely as problems apart from all international relationship, but every nation must be able to carry on for itself, else its international relationship will have scant importance.

Doubtless our own people have emerged from the World War tumult less impaired than most belligerent powers; probably we have made larger progress toward reconstruction. Surely we have been fortunate in diminishing unemployment, and our industrial and business activities, which are the life-blood of our material existence, have been restored as in no other reconstruction period of like length in the history of the world. Had we escaped the coal and railway strikes, which had no excuse for their beginning and less justification

for their delayed settlement, we should have done infinitely better. But labor was insistent on holding to the war heights, and heedless forces of reaction sought the pre-war levels, and both were wrong. In the folly of conflict our progress was hindered, and the heavy cost has not yet been fully estimated. There can be neither adjustment nor the penalty of the failure to readjust in which all do not somehow participate.

The railway strike accentuated the difficulty of the American farmer. The first distress of readjustment came to the farmer, and it will not be a readjustment fit to abide until he is relieved. The distress brought to the farmer does not affect him alone. Agricultural ill fortune is a national ill fortune. That one-fourth of our population which produces the food of the Republic and adds so largely to our export commerce must participate in the good fortunes of the Nation, else there is none worth retaining.

Agriculture is a vital activity in our national life. In it we had our beginning, and its westward march with the star of the empire has reflected the growth of the Republic. It has its vicissitudes which no legislation will prevent, its hardships for which no law can provide escape. But the Congress can make available to the farmer the financial facilities which have been built up under Government aid and supervision for other commercial and industrial enterprises. [Applause.] It may be done on the same solid fundamentals and make the vitally important agricultural industry more secure, and it must be done. [Applause.]

This Congress already has taken cognizance of the misfortune which precipitate deflation brought to American agriculture. Your means of relief and the reduction of the Federal reserve discount rate undoubtedly saved the country from widespread disaster. The very proof of helpfulness already given is the strongest argument for the permanent establishment of widened credits, heretofore temporarily extended through the War Finance Corporation.

The Farm Loan Bureau, which already has proven its usefulness through the Federal land banks, may well have its powers enlarged to provide ample farm production credits as well as enlarged land credits. It is entirely practical to create a division in the Federal land banks to deal with production credits, with the limitations of time so adjusted to the farm turnover as the Federal reserve system provides for the turnover in the manufacturing and mercantile world. Special provision must be made for live-stock production credits, and the limit of land loans may be safely enlarged. Various measures are pending before you, and the best judgment of Congress ought to be expressed in a prompt enactment at the present session. [Applause.]

But American agriculture needs more than added credit facilities. The credits will help to solve the pressing problems growing out of war-inflated land values and the drastic deflation of three years ago, but permanent and deserved agricultural good fortune depends on better and cheaper transportation. [Applause.]

Here is an outstanding problem demanding the most rigorous consideration of the Congress and the country. It has to do with more than agriculture. It provides the channel for the flow of the country's commerce. But the farmer is particularly hard hit. His market, so affected by the world consumption, does not admit of the price adjustment to meet carrying charges. In the last half of the year now closing the railways, broken in carrying capacity because of motive power and rolling stock out of order, though insistently declaring to the contrary, embargoed his shipments or denied him cars when fortunate markets were calling. Too frequently transportation failed, while perishable products were turning from possible profit to losses counted in tens of millions.

I know of no problem exceeding in importance this one of transportation. In our complex and interdependent modern life transportation is essential to our very existence. Let us pass for the moment the menace in the possible paralysis of such service as we have and note the failure, for whatever reason, to expand our transportation to meet the Nation's needs.

The census of 1880 recorded a population of 50,000,000. In two decades more we may reasonably expect to count thrice that number. In the three decades ending in 1920 the country's freight by rail increased from 631,000,000 tons to 2,234,000,000 tons; that is to say, while our population was increasing less than 70 per cent, the freight movement increased over 250 per cent.

We have built 40 per cent of the world's railroad mileage, and yet find it inadequate to our present requirements. When we contemplate the inadequacy of to-day it is easy to believe that the next few decades will witness the paralysis of our transportation-using social scheme or a complete reorganization on some new basis. Mindful of the tremendous costs of betterments, extensions, and expansions, and mindful of the staggering debts of the world to-day, the difficulty is magnified. Here is a problem demanding wide vision and the avoidance of mere makeshifts. No matter what the errors of the past, no matter how we acclaimed construction and then condemned operations in the past, we have the transportation and the honest investment in the transportation which sped us on to what we are, and we face conditions which reflect its inadequacy to-day, its greater inadequacy to-morrow, and we contemplate transportation costs which much of the traffic can not and will not continue to pay.

Manifestly, we have need to begin on plans to coordinate all transportation facilities. We should more effectively connect up our rail lines with our carriers by sea. [Applause.] We ought to reap some benefit from the hundreds of millions expended on inland waterways, proving our capacity to utilize as well as expend. We ought to turn the motor truck into a railway feeder and distributor instead of a destroying competitor.

It would be folly to ignore that we live in a motor age. The motor car reflects our standard of living and gauges the speed of our present-day life. It long ago ran down Simple Living, and never halted to inquire about the prostrate figure which fell as its victim. With full recognition of motor-car transportation we must turn it to the most practical use. It can not supersede the railway lines, no matter how generously we afford it highways out of the Public Treasury. If freight traffic by motor were charged with its proper and proportionate share of highway construction, we should find much of it wasteful and more costly than like service by rail. Yet we have paralleled the railways, a most natural line of construction, and thereby taken away from the agency of expected service much of its profitable traffic, for which the taxpayers have been providing the highways, whose cost of maintenance is not yet realized.

The Federal Government has a right to inquire into the wisdom of this policy, because the National Treasury is contributing largely to this highway construction. Costly highways ought to be made to serve as feeders rather than competitors of the railroads, and the motor truck should become a coordinate factor in our great distributing system.

This transportation problem can not be waived aside. The demand for lowered costs on farm products and basic materials can not be ignored. Rates horizontally increased, to meet increased wage outlays during the war inflation, are not easily reduced. When some very moderate wage reductions were effected last summer there was a 5 per cent horizontal reduction in rates. I sought at that time, in a very informal way, to have the railway managers go before the Interstate Commerce Commission and agree to a heavier reduction on farm products and coal and other basic commodities, and leave unchanged the freight tariffs which a very large portion of the traffic was able to bear. Neither the managers nor the commission saw fit to adopt the suggestion, so we had the horizontal reduction, too slight to be felt by the higher-class cargoes and too little to benefit the heavy tonnage calling most loudly for relief.

Railways are not to be expected to render the most essential service in our social organization without a fair return on capital invested, but the Government has gone so far in the regulation of rates and rules of operation that it has the responsibility of pointing the way to the reduced freight costs so essential to our national welfare. [Applause.]

Government operation does not afford the cure. It was Government operation which brought us to the very order of things against which we now rebel, and we are still liquidating the costs of that supreme folly.

Surely the genius of the railway builders has not become extinct among the railway managers. New economies, new efficiencies in cooperation must be found. The fact that labor takes 50 to 60 per cent of total railway earnings makes limitations within which to effect economies very difficult, but the demand is no less insistent on that account.

Clearly the managers are without that intercarrier, cooperative relationship so highly essential to the best and most economical operation. They could not function in harmony when the strike threatened the paralysis of all railway transportation. The relationship of the service to public welfare, so intimately affected by State and Federal regulation, demands the effective correlation and a concerted drive to meet an insistent and justified public demand.

The merger of lines into systems, a facilitated interchange of freight cars, the economic use of terminals, and the consolidation of facilities are suggested ways of economy and efficiency.

I remind you that Congress provided a Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry which made an exhaustive investigation of car service and transportation, and unanimously recommended in its report of October 15, 1921, the pooling of freight cars under a central agency. This report well deserves your serious consideration. I think well of the central agency, which shall be a creation of the railways themselves, to provide, under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the means for financing equipment for carriers which are otherwise unable to provide their proportion of car equipment adequate to transportation needs. This same agency ought to point the way to every possible economy in maintained equipment and the necessary interchanges in railway commerce.

In a previous address to the Congress I called to your attention the insufficiency of power to enforce the decisions of the Railroad Labor Board. Carriers have ignored its decisions, on the one hand; railway workmen have challenged its decisions by a strike, on the other hand.

The intent of Congress to establish a tribunal to which railway labor and managers may appeal respecting questions of wages and working conditions can not be too strongly commended. It is vitally important that some such agency should be a guaranty against suspended operation. The public must be spared even the threat of discontinued service.

Sponsoring the railroads as we do, it is an obligation that labor shall be assured the highest justice and every proper consideration of wage and working conditions, but it is an equal obligation to see that no concerted action in forcing demands shall deprive the public of the transportation service essential to its very existence. [Applause.] It is now impossible to safeguard public interest, because the decrees of the board are unenforceable against either employer or employee.

The Labor Board itself is not so constituted as best to serve the public interest. With six partisan members on a board of nine, three partisans nominated by the employees and three by the railway managers, it is inevitable that the partisan viewpoint is maintained throughout hearings and in decisions handed down. Indeed, the few exceptions to a strictly partisan expression in decisions thus far rendered have been followed by accusations of betrayal of the partisan interests represented. Only the public group of three is free to function in unbiased decisions. Therefore the partisan membership may well be abolished, and decisions should be made by an impartial tribunal. [Applause.]

I am well convinced that the functions of this tribunal could be much better carried on here in Washington. Even were it to be continued as a separate tribunal, there ought to be contact with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has supreme authority in the rate making, to which wage cost bears an indissoluble relationship. Theoretically, a fair and living wage must be determined quite apart from the employer's earning capacity, but in practice, in the railway service, they are inseparable. The record of advanced rates to meet increased wages, both determined by the Government, is proof enough.

The substitution of a labor division in the Interstate Commerce Commission, made up from its membership, to hear and decide disputes relating to wages and working conditions which have failed of adjustment by proper committees created by the railways and their employees, offers a more effective plan. [Applause.]

It need not be surprising that there is dissatisfaction over delayed hearings and decisions by the present board when every trivial dispute is carried to that tribunal. The law should require the railroads and their employees to institute means and methods to negotiate between themselves their constantly arising differences, limiting appeals to the Government tribunal to disputes of such character as are likely to affect the public welfare. [Applause.]

This suggested substitution will involve a necessary increase in the membership of the commission, probably four, to constitute the labor division. If the suggestion appeals to the Congress, it will be well to specify that the labor division shall be constituted of representatives of the four rate-making territories, thereby assuring a tribunal conversant with the conditions which obtain in the different rate-making sections of the country.

I wish I could bring to you the precise recommendation for the prevention of strikes which threaten the welfare of the people and menace public safety. It is an impotent civilization and an inadequate government which lacks the genius and the courage to guard against such a menace to public welfare as we experienced last summer. [Applause.] You were aware of the Government's great concern and its futile attempt to aid in an adjustment. It will reveal the inexcusable obstinacy which was responsible for so much distress to the country to recall now that, though all disputes are not yet adjusted, the many settlements which have been made were on the terms which the Government proposed in mediation.

Public interest demands that ample power shall be conferred upon the labor tribunal, whether it is the present board or the suggested substitute, to require its rulings to be accepted by both parties to a disputed question.

Let there be no confusion about the purpose of the suggested conferment of power to make decisions effective. There can be no denial of constitutional rights of either railway workmen or railway managers. No man can be denied his right to labor when and how he chooses, or cease to labor when he so elects, but, since the Government assumes to safeguard his interests while employed in an essential public service, the security of society itself demands his retirement from the service shall not be so timed and related as to effect the destruction of that service. [Applause.] This vitally essential public transportation service, demanding so much of brain and brawn, so much for efficiency and security, ought to offer the most attractive working conditions and the highest wages paid to workmen in any employment.

In essentially every branch, from track repairer to the man at the locomotive throttle, the railroad worker is responsible for the safety of human lives and the care of vast property. His high responsibility might well rate high his pay within the limits the traffic will bear; but the same responsibility, plus governmental protection, may justly deny him and his associates a withdrawal from service without a warning or under circumstances which involve the paralysis of necessary transportation. We have assumed so great a responsibility in necessary regulation that we unconsciously have assumed the responsibility for maintained service; therefore the lawful power for the enforcement of decisions is necessary to sustain the majesty of government and to administer to the public welfare. [Applause.]

During its longer session the present Congress enacted a new tariff law. The protection of the American standards of living demanded the insurance it provides against the distorted conditions of world commerce. The framers of the law made provision for a certain flexibility of customs duties, whereby it is possible to readjust them as developing conditions may require. The enactment has imposed a large responsibility upon the Executive, but that responsibility will be discharged with a broad mindfulness of the whole business situation. The provision itself admits either the possible fallibility of rates or their unsuitableness to changing conditions. I believe the grant of authority may be promptly and discreetly exercised, ever mindful of the intent and purpose to safeguard American industrial activity, and at the same time prevent the exploitation of the American consumer and keep open the paths of such liberal exchanges as do not endanger our own productivity.

No one contemplates commercial aloofness nor any other aloofness contradictory to the best American traditions or loftiest human purposes. Our fortunate capacity for comparative self-containment affords the firm foundation on which to build for our own security, and a like foundation on which to build for a future of influence and importance in world commerce. Our trade expansion must come of capacity and of policies of righteousness and reasonableness in all our commercial relations.

Let no one assume that our provision for maintained good fortune at home, and our unwillingness to assume the correction of all the ills of the world, means a reluctance to cooperate with other peoples or to assume every just obligation to promote human advancement anywhere in the world.

War made us a creditor Nation. We did not seek an excess possession of the world's gold, and we have neither desire to profit unduly by its possession nor to permanently retain it. We do not seek to become an international dictator because of its power.

The voice of the United States has a respectful hearing in international councils, because we have convinced the world that we have no selfish ends to serve, no old grievances to avenge, no territorial or other greed to satisfy. [Applause.] But the voice being heard is that of good counsel, not of dictation. It is the voice of sympathy and fraternity and helpfulness, seeking to assist but not to assume for the United States burdens which nations must bear for themselves. We would

rejoice to help rehabilitate currency systems and facilitate all commerce which does not drag us to the very levels of those we seek to lift up.

While I have everlasting faith in our Republic, it would be folly, indeed, to blind ourselves to our problems at home. Abusing the hospitality of our shores are the advocates of revolution, finding their deluded followers among those who take on the habiliments of an American without knowing an American soul. There is the recrudescence of hyphenated Americanism which we thought to have been stamped out when we committed the Nation, life and soul, to the World War.

There is a call to make the alien respect our institutions while he accepts our hospitality. [Applause.] There is need to magnify the American viewpoint to the alien who seeks a citizenship among us. There is need to magnify the national viewpoint to Americans throughout the land. [Applause.] More, there is a demand for every living being in the United States to respect and abide by the laws of the Republic. [Applause.] Let men who are rending the moral fiber of the Republic through easy contempt for the prohibition law, because they think it restricts their personal liberty, remember that they set the example and breed a contempt for law which will ultimately destroy the Republic. [Applause.]

Constitutional prohibition has been adopted by the Nation. It is the supreme law of the land. In plain speaking, there are conditions relating to its enforcement which savor of nation-wide scandal. It is the most demoralizing factor in our public life.

Most of our people assumed that the adoption of the eighteenth amendment meant the elimination of the question from our politics. On the contrary, it has been so intensified as an issue that many voters are disposed to make all political decisions with reference to this single question. It is distracting the public mind and prejudicing the judgment of the electorate.

The day is unlikely to come when the eighteenth amendment will be repealed. The fact may as well be recognized and our course adapted accordingly. If the statutory provisions for its enforcement are contrary to deliberate public opinion, which I do not believe, the rigorous and literal enforcement will concentrate public attention on any requisite modification. [Applause.] Such a course conforms with the law and saves the humiliation of the Government and the humiliation of our people before the world, and challenges the destructive forces engaged in widespread violation, official corruption, and individual demoralization.

The eighteenth amendment involves the concurrent authority of State and Federal Governments for the enforcement of the policy it defines. A certain lack of definiteness, through division of responsibility, is thus introduced. In order to bring about a full understanding of duties and responsibilities as thus distributed, I purpose to invite the governors of the States and Territories, at an early opportunity, to a conference with the Federal Executive authority. Out of the full and free considerations which will thus be possible, it is confidently believed, will emerge a more adequate comprehension of the whole problem and definite policies of National and State cooperation in administering the laws.

There are pending bills for the registration of the alien who has come to our shores. I wish the passage of such an act might be expedited. Life amid American opportunities is worth the cost of registration if it is worth the seeking, and the Nation has the right to know who are citizens in the making or who live among us and share our advantages while seeking to undermine our cherished institutions. [Applause.] This provision will enable us to guard against the abuses in immigration, checking the undesirable whose irregular coming is his first violation of our laws. More, it will facilitate the needed Americanizing of those who mean to enroll as fellow citizens.

Before enlarging the immigration quotas we had better provide registration for aliens, those now here or continually pressing for admission, and establish our examination boards abroad, to make sure of desirables only. By the examination abroad we could end the pathos at our ports, when men and women find our doors closed, after long voyages and wasted savings, because they are unfit for admission. It would be kindlier and safer to tell them before they embark.

Our program of admission and treatment of immigrants is very intimately related to the educational policy of the Republic. With illiteracy estimated at from two-tenths of 1 per cent to less than 2 per cent in 10 of the foremost nations of Europe, it rivets our attention to a serious problem when we are reminded of a 6 per cent illiteracy in the United States. The figures are based on the test which defines an illiterate as one having no schooling whatever. Remembering the wide freedom of our public schools, with compulsory attendance in many States in the Union, one is convinced that much of our excessive illiteracy comes to us from abroad, and the education of the immigrant becomes a requisite to his Americanization. It must be done if he is fittingly to exercise the duties as well as enjoy the privileges of American citizenship. Here is revealed the special field for Federal cooperation in furthering education.

From the very beginning public education has been left mainly in the hands of the States. So far as schooling youth is concerned the policy has been justified, because no responsibility can be so effective as that of the local community alive to its task. I believe in the cooperation of the national authority to stimulate, encourage, and broaden the work of the local authorities. But it is the especial obligation of the Federal Government to devise means and effectively assist in the education of the newcomer from foreign lands, so that the level of American education may be made the highest that is humanly possible.

Closely related to this problem of education is the abolition of child labor. Twice Congress has attempted the correction of the evils incident to child employment. The decision of the Supreme Court has put this problem outside the proper domain of Federal regulation until the Constitution is so amended as to give the Congress indubitable authority. I recommend the submission of such an amendment. [Applause.]

We have two schools of thought relating to amendment of the Constitution. One need not be committed to the belief that amendment is weakening the fundamental law, or that excessive amendment is essential to meet every ephemeral whim. We ought to amend to meet the demands of the people when sanctioned by deliberate public opinion.

One year ago I suggested the submission of an amendment so that we may lawfully restrict the issues of tax-exempt securities, and I renew that recommendation now. Tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation, and they are encouraging unproductive and extravagant expenditures by States and municipalities. There is more than the menace in mounting public debt; there is the dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. The proposed amendment will place the State and Federal Governments and all political subdivisions on an exact equality, and will tend to correct the growing menace of public borrowing, which if left unchecked may soon threaten the stability of our institutions.

We are so vast and so varied in our national interests that scores of problems are pressing for attention. I must not risk the wearying of your patience with detailed reference.

Reclamation and irrigation projects, where waste land may be made available for settlement and productivity, are worthy of your favorable consideration.

When it is realized that we are consuming our timber four times as rapidly as we are growing it, we must encourage the greatest possible cooperation between the Federal Government, the various States, and the owners of forest lands, to the end that protection from fire shall be made more effective and replanting encouraged.

The fuel problem is under study now by a very capable fact-finding commission, and any attempt to deal with the coal problem, of such deep concern to the entire Nation, must await the report of the commission.

There are necessary studies of great problems which Congress might well initiate. The wide spread between production costs and prices which consumers pay concerns every citizen of the Republic. It contributes very largely to the unrest in agriculture and must stand sponsor for much against which we inveigh in that familiar term—the high cost of living.

No one doubts the excess is traceable to the levy of the middleman, but it would be unfair to charge him with all responsibility before we appraise what is exacted of him by our modernly complex life. We have attacked the problem on one side by the promotion of cooperative marketing, and we might well inquire into the benefits of cooperative buying. Admittedly, the consumer is much to blame himself, because of his prodigal expenditure and his exaction of service, but Government might well serve to point the way of narrowing the spread of price, especially between the production of food and its consumption.

A superpower survey of the eastern industrial region has recently been completed, looking to unification of steam, water, and electric powers, and to a unified scheme of power distribution. The survey proved that vast economies in tonnage movement of freights, and in the efficiency of the railroads, would be effected if the superpower program were adopted. I am convinced that constructive measures calculated to promote such an industrial development—I am tempted to say, such an industrial revolution—would be well worthy the careful attention and fostering interest of the National Government.

The proposed survey of a plan to draft all the resources of the Republic, human and material, for national defense may well have your approval. I commended such a program in case of future war, in the inaugural address of March 4, 1921, and every experience in the adjustment and liquidation of war claims and the settlement of war obligations persuades me we ought to be prepared for such universal call to armed defense. [Applause.]

I bring you no apprehension of war. The world is abhorrent of it, and our own relations are not only free from every threatening cloud, but we have contributed our larger influence toward making armed conflict less likely. [Applause.]

Those who assume that we played our part in the World War and later took ourselves aloof and apart, unmindful of world obligations, give scant credit to the helpful part we assume in international relationships.

Whether all nations signatory ratify all the treaties growing out of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament or some withhold approval, the underlying policy of limiting naval armament has the sanction of the larger naval powers, and naval competition is suspended. [Applause.] Of course, unanimous ratification is much to be desired.

The four-power pact, which abolishes every probability of war on the Pacific, has brought new confidence in a maintained peace, and I can well believe it might be made a model for like assurances wherever in the world any common interests are concerned.

We have had expressed the hostility of the American people to a supergovernment or to any commitment where either a council or an assembly of leagued powers may chart our course. Treaties of armed alliance can have no likelihood of American sanction, but we believe in respecting the rights of nations, in the value of conference and consultation, in the effectiveness of leaders of nations looking each other in the face before resorting to the arbitrament of arms.

It has been our fortune both to preach and promote international understanding. The influence of the United States in bringing near the settlement of an ancient dispute between South American nations is added proof of the glow of peace in ample understanding. In Washington to-day are met the delegates of the Central American nations, gathered at the table of international understanding, to stabilize their Republics and remove every vestige of disagreement. They are met here by our invitation, not in our aloofness, and they accept our hospitality because they have faith in our unselfishness and believe in our helpfulness. Perhaps we are selfish in craving their confidence and friendship, but such a selfishness we proclaim to the world, regardless of hemisphere or seas dividing. [Applause.]

I would like the Congress and the people of the Nation to believe that in a firm and considerate way we are insistent on American rights wherever they may be questioned, and deny no rights of others in the assertion of our own. Moreover, we are cognizant of the world's struggles for full readjustment and rehabilitation, and we have shirked no duty which comes of sympathy, or fraternity, or highest fellowship among nations. Every obligation consonant with American ideals and sanctioned under our form of government is willingly met. When we can not support we do not demand. Our constitutional limitations do not forbid the exercise of a moral influence, the measure of which is not less than the high purposes we have sought to serve.

After all there is less difference about the part this great Republic shall play in furthering peace and advancing humanity than in the manner of playing it. We ask no one to assume responsibility for us; we assume no responsibility which others must bear for themselves, unless nationality is to be hopelessly swallowed up in internationalism. [Applause.]

At 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m. the President and the members of his Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House.

The SPEAKER. The joint session of the two Houses is now dissolved.

At 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m. the Senate returned to their Chamber.

At 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m. the House resumed its session.

REFERENCE OF THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and that it be printed as a public document.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the President's message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and printed as a public document.

The motion was agreed to.

TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Tax Simplification Board: For expenses of the Tax Simplification Board established in the Treasury Department under the provisions of section 1327 of the revenue act of 1921, approved November 23, 1921, as authorized under paragraph 2 (e) of said act and section, $7,500, to be available for personal and other services and expenses in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of asking a question with reference to the activities of the Tax Simplification Board. I have had a good many complaints, and I am sure other Members have, about the length of time it takes the income-tax department to finally dispose of reports of individual income taxes. I have had complaints and heard a good many when I was at home the last time to the effect that after a report is filed and the books are thrown open to the agents of the Government, they send round at two or three different times different men who check up; and one will make an assessment perhaps and say the books are all right. At the end of six months or a year or two years another man comes around, checks up again and makes some further changes in the report, until the man who renders the report can never tell if his taxes are finally disposed of.

Now, it seems to me, except in cases of fraud and concealment, the Government ought to be able to dispose finally of a review of all income taxes within a year from the time the report is filed. It seems to me the revenue law should be amended so as to make it unnecessary for any review to be made and checking up the report in the absence of fraud and concealment, where the books are thrown open and the Government makes a review within a period of one year.

I know there are some instances in particular—and I am sure all gentlemen of the House have knowledge of them—where the taxes of 1917 have been reviewed by three or four different agents of the department, and they are coming back this year and checking up and levying additional assessments. I have wondered if the Tax Simplification Board is engaged in the work of straightening that out. In some instances they came back after three or four years and changed the report and made additional assessments until the taxpayer can never have assurance that he is finished with any year's payment. I have wondered whether the appropriation made in the next paragraph following the one we are considering is sufficient to enable these men to check up and review the reports within a year.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not quite sure that I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am talking about these tax men coming around one, two, and four years after the report is filed in individual income taxes. Of course, the Government should have ample time for thorough review but it seems to me that full auditing and review could be had within a year.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman refers to the Tax Simplification Board; that has nothing to do with the assessment of taxes. The Tax Simplification Board is a board appointed by the President by authority of law to try to simplify the form of the returns made by the taxpayer.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; I have merely referred to that, but I am speaking of these agents that come around one, two, three, or four years after the books have been thrown open to the agents of the Government.

Mr. MADDEN. The Tax Simplification Board has made a report, and I think they filed their report yesterday with the Senate, at the request of the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I did not ask with particular reference to the Tax Simplification Board. The paragraph following this provides for the assessing and collecting of the revenue taxes, and it comes within the limit of what I am talking about, and it seems to me that provision ought to be made by the department.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what the regulations are, but I think this process is gone through with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask that the gentleman have three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. The individual states his own case. You incorporate your income and expenses, and you deduct such expenses as you may think proper, including the reduction of inventoried stock. You make the return of what you honestly believe to be the case. When the audit is made they discover that you have claimed credits you are not entitled to. There may be some doubt about certain credits, and they send men out to examine your books; they may send one man to examine your factory. They may not be satisfied with the report these men make from information which they have in the office. They send another man out, which is proper, until they finally find facts upon which they base the deduction in the case. I do not think it improper for the Government to send out these men to get at the facts.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It seems to me it would not be much more expensive to send them all out in one year so as to enable a man to know some time, somewhere, what his exact tax is.

Mr. MADDEN. The trouble in this particular has been that they have not been able to get an audit of the returns within a year. In the first place, there were no claims audited until 1921, as far back as 1917, so that the Treasury Department has been charged with the responsibility of auditing all those returns. They are now auditing returns for 1917, and they will not get through with them until the 4th of March, and then they will begin auditing the returns for 1918. There are certain classes of returns which have been audited for 1920 and 1921.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Are they catching up, and is there any assurance that they will ever catch up?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; they are catching up. The personal returns are up to 1920. The consolidated corporation returns are not completed for 1917.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have offered an amendment to the income tax law because of the confusion, uncertainty, and consequent hardship occasioned by assessments that are made two, three, four, and five years after taxes become due and payable.

I have provided that except in cases of fraud and concealment returns must be reviewed and any additional assessment made within one year after the filing of the return. This will give the Government ample time to make any corrections that may be necessary.

As the measure is administered now it frequently happens that a Government agent has assured a man that his return was correctly made out and a year or two later another Government man has come along and levied an additional assessment and still another at a later time.

Sometime, somewhere, the taxpayer should have assurance that his taxes for any particular year are fully paid. The uncertainty of never knowing when the matter is disposed of has in some cases been worse than the payment of the taxes.

I can see no good reason why when a taxpayer makes a full and complete report and permits the examination of his books the Government should not take final action within a year. It frequently happens that a person would be able to pay his taxes at the time, but relying on payment having been made business conditions may be such at the end of three or four years that it frequently means ruin to pay additional assessments.

The amendment I have offered protects the Government in case of fraud.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Why is it that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has not been able, or rather why has he not brought this matter more nearly up to date with the force that he now has. In 1913 there were 4,000 people in the Internal Revenue Bureau, including the Washington office and field service. In 1922 there were over 20,000 in the service. It was costing $4,000,000 in 1913, and it is now costing more than $35,000,000. Now, with this extension of the force and this increase of expenditure, why this delay? Is it the lack of system, is it the lack of an arrangement of business methods, or what is it? I would like to have some information from the chairman of the committee in response to these inquiries.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the answer to that question ought to be very simple. In 1913 we had no income-tax returns, and the total collection, if I recollect right, though I do not pretend to say accurately, was about $218,000,000. We have collected since that time $21,580,000,000.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. That may mean something and it may mean nothing.

Mr. MADDEN. It does mean something, because we had no income-tax returns then, and we have 7,000,000 now to take care of. These income-tax returns have been accumulating long since before these people here were responsible for them.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, let me call attention to this fact: When we were considering here a short time ago a bill proposing to increase the internal-revenue districts by 10, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue submitted a report to the Committee on Ways and Means, and through it assumed that there had been no increase of the force from 1913 to 1922, and on that basis they had absolutely ignored the fact that from 1913 to 1920 the force had been increased from 4,000 to over 20,000 and that the expense had been increased from $4,000,000 to over $35,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and as a result of the employment of a large part of that force they have been collecting $35,000,000 a month on back taxes, on underpaid schedules.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Why did they not audit those schedules long ago? They have the men.

Mr. MADDEN. They have not the men. The schedules were not audited because they could not reach them. I am sure that the gentleman would not misstate the case. Let us take a consolidated return schedule. The gentleman knows there are several wagonloads of papers connected with some of those schedules.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Yes; and they let them accumulate while they loiter about and curse the Government because their salaries are not increased almost monthly.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I do.

Mr. MADDEN. We have no control over that.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. We ought to put something into operation that would bring about a change.

Mr. MADDEN. We are doing the best we can to cut the expenses and increase the revenues.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. But what have the gentleman and his committee done to prevent these inexcusable duplications and the unwarranted delay in refunding the excess payments made by taxpayers? It is useless to brush these matters aside as though they were of no consequence. Is not it important to prevent the illegal disbursement of money from the National Treasury by means of these duplicate payments?

Is it not also important—in fact, is it not the imperative duty of the Bureau of Internal Revenue—to refund to the taxpayers without undue delay the amounts illegally paid in excess of their legal requirements?

Let us consider a few examples which may be traced out by those in the department to establish beyond dispute the matter of duplicate payments. I cite a few instances:

In March, 1920, Morris Strain, of San Antonio, Tex., paid his taxes and afterwards submitted an application for refund, which was not passed upon by the Bureau of Internal Revenue until July, 1921. Payment was made in September, 1921, by warrant No. 15020 for $1,411.60. Upon receipt of that warrant Mr. Strain discovered that it was a duplicate payment and returned to the department his personal check No. 237 in repayment of that amount, for which he had, as authorized, taken credit in the payment of his tax for 1920.

W. D. Cleveland, jr., of Houston, Tex., paid taxes in March, 1920, and the commissioner allowed a refund in July, 1921, which was audited and paid in August, 1921, by warrant No. 13250, for $1,952.87. He likewise returned the warrant, as he had already taken credit for that amount in payment of his taxes for 1920.

The Northern Trust Co., of Chicago, Ill., paid taxes in May, 1917. The excess payments thereof were allowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, partly in November, 1920, and partly in April, 1921. The company was paid by warrant No. 57463 for $3,188.73. Upon its receipt the company discovered a duplicate payment, and repaid the amount to the Government by its check No. 8142, because credit had been taken in payment of taxes for a previous year.

The Debevoise-Anderson Co. (Inc.), of 56 Liberty Street, New York City, paid taxes in June, 1918; excess payment allowed by the commissioner on schedule income tax No. 260, in August, 1921. Immediately after that allowance the claim was audited and paid by warrant No. 16442 for $11,133.22. That warrant was returned to the Government by the company because only a very small amount, about $52.86, was due them.

The Mulberry Coal Co., of Pittsburg, Kans., paid taxes in March, 1918, on schedule No. 253; the commissioner allowed a

refund in June, 1921, which was audited and paid in August, 1921, upon warrant No. 11217 for $3,427.92. Upon receipt of the warrant the company found that it had already taken credit in its tax return for 1920, and accordingly repaid the allowance by personal check No. 1612.

Examples of this character could be cited almost indefinitely to show the laxness and inefficiency on the part of those handling the details of this business in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In 1922 official inquiry was made to ascertain how many refund claims for excess payment of taxes had been filed during the fiscal year 1921. The replies from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in response show that about 55,000 claims were filed in his bureau and that 35,000 were adjusted during that year. Thus it appears that 20,000 were delinquent or remained unsettled at the end of that year. With equal receipts and adjustments from year to year the bureau is running behind 20,000 settlements each year and in two years these will accumulate to 40,000 unadjusted refund claims for taxes in excess.

At this rate, when can we expect the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to bring the business of his bureau up to date? With an expenditure of over $35,000,000 a year for his force of over 20,000 people on the rolls, why does he allow this large delinquency to accumulate from year to year?

The taxpayers are entitled to a prompt return of their money and it is the duty of Congress to continue in the future as it has in the past to supply the commissioner with an adequate force. He has that force and he should be required by some means to bring the business of his office up to date.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses of assessing and collecting the internal-revenue taxes, including the employment of the necessary officers, attorneys, experts, agents, accountants, inspectors, deputy collectors, clerks, janitors, and messengers in the District of Columbia and the several collection districts, to be appointed as provided by law, telegraph and telephone service, rental of quarters outside the District of Columbia, postage, freight, express, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, furniture, mechanical devices, stationery, law books and books of reference, and such other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia and the several collection districts, $31,200,000: *Provided*, That not more than $100,000 of the total amount appropriated herein may be expended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal-revenue laws or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violation.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to inquire of the chairman if the employees under this paragraph are permanent employees of the department?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; they are permanent.

Mr. DOWELL. Why are these not under the same rule as those provided in the paragraph on page 23, the employees of the department?

Mr. MADDEN. We are reducing this force all of the time. You could not have a statutory force, because the emergency work requires a larger number of people than we would want to put on the statutory roll. We can dismiss these people the very minute that their services are not needed, and you can not always do that when the employees are on the statutory roll.

Mr. DOWELL. As a matter of fact, they are not being dismissed, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes, they are. They have been reduced by the amount of $3,000,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Thirty-one million two hundred thousand dollars is a large amount.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a large amount.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman believe that the Members of the House should have a more itemized statement of just how this is expended?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will find an absolutely itemized statement of the whole thing in the Budget.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand, but this does not precisely follow the Budget.

Mr. MADDEN. It cuts out some of the recommendations. If we carried an itemized statement of all of the appropriations, we would have a bill here of five or six hundred pages. We are just carrying out the law.

Mr. DOWELL. That is true, but you can itemize the number of employees. You can give the different items for which the money is to be expended. It seems to me that ought to be done instead of putting in a lump sum of $31,200,000.

Mr. MADDEN. If we did that, we would have to appropriate more money than we do now.

Mr. DOWELL. Under what theory would it cost more money?

Mr. MADDEN. Under the theory that when you have a man at a fixed salary for a fixed period, he is there. They interchange, and we put men on under this provision temporarily and we are able, by reason of the right to use these funds, to employ a certain number of men to-day and less to-morrow, and this saves a lot of money.

Mr. DOWELL. At what salary are these being employed?

Mr. MADDEN. They are all under the statutory salaries, every one of them.

Mr. DOWELL. But with no limit as to the number?

Mr. MADDEN. You can not limit the number, because you do not know how many they want to-day. They may want 200 to-day and only 100 to-morrow. They put them on only when they need them.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the gentleman investigated to ascertain that no one is being employed except those absolutely necessary?

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the fund appropriated last year all been expended for that purpose?

Mr. MADDEN. There have been only four or five months of this year up to this time.

Mr. DOWELL. My notion is that this is not a very good way to appropriate for these departments.

Mr. MADDEN. After a thorough investigation I have reached the conclusion that this is the way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of making an inquiry. Perhaps this does not pertain particularly to this bill, but a number of Members have spoken about these dislike instruments which have been placed upon several of the desks here in the Hall of the Chamber—I believe they are called amplifiers, though they seem to me, and to many others who have spoken about it, to be nothing less than buzz wheels. Does the gentleman from Illinois know who is responsible for the placing of these in the Chamber?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Or out of what fund they are to be paid for? If this is an experiment, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States ought not to be used for experimental purposes. To anyone who has paid attention to it, it is quite true that they seem to amplify the noise, but to very effectually destroy the enunciation, so that it is impossible many times, though sitting only a short way from the speaker, to understand exactly what he is saying. Is this to be followed by some moving-picture device, or is it contemplated that after a time our speeches shall be set to music?

Mr. MADDEN. I can assure the gentleman that they have not been placed in the Chamber at my request.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It makes the voice sound, at least on the floor here, as though one were talking into a barrel, and perhaps it might be an improvement to carry the overtones musically. Actually they seem to give the voice of the speaker the accents of a funeral director and the tone of an old-fashioned phonograph.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry, but I can not give the gentleman any further information than I have given, though I find it hard sometimes to hear myself.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses to enforce the provisions of the national prohibition act and the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon, all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1914, as amended by the revenue act of 1918, including the employment of executive officers, agents, inspectors, chemists, assistant chemists, supervisors, clerks, and messengers in the field and in the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia, to be appointed as authorized by law; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts, and for the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, laboratory supplies, books, and such other expenditures as may be necessary in the District of Columbia and several field offices, and for rental of necessary quarters, $9,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $750,000 of the foregoing sum shall be expended for enforcement of the provisions of the said act of December 17, 1914: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $25,000 of the total amount appropriated shall be available for advances to be made by special disbursing agents when authorized by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 27, line 22, after the word "expenditures," insert: "(not authorizing, however, any expenditures for the alleged publicity or information bureau now conducted under the supervision of one Sherman A. Cuneo, or for any similar bureau)."

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the hearings on this bill before the Appropriations Committee on pages 498 and 500 show the purposes of my amendment and the situation as to this publicity department of Prohibition Commissioner Haynes. I have here a large number of documents of the style which are daily issued, and all I wish to do is to call attention to some of them which are typical. Here is one.

[Release afternoon papers date indicated.]

WASHINGTON, April —.—Federal Prohibition Director McClenahan, of Colorado, reports that children are being used in that State also to protect moonshining. A still was found in a Denver home, where in an adjoining room 10 children occupied two beds. The parents on being arrested said that they obtained the still from a woman and mortgaged a cow to make the purchase. They set up the defense of providing support for the children.

—

WASHINGTON, April —.—Federal Prohibition Director Daily, of Mississippi, reports that the new State law that makes it compulsory for any individual caught with more than a quart of whisky in his possession to serve not less than 30 days in jail, with the privilege of suspension by a justice of the peace or circuit judge denied, is likely to land a number of those caught in the raids behind the bars. Their only escape from serving a jail sentence is said to be a pardon from the governor.

—

WASHINGTON, April —.—Federal Prohibition Director Morris, of Texas, reports 29 arrests in the Carrizozo enforcement area, among the number being a deputy sheriff of Lincoln County, whose 40-gallon still was raided and 14 gallons of liquor seized. The deputy sheriff had his badge on at the time, and Sheriff Harris assisted in the arrest.

Here is one I want to call to the attention of the committee. This is against law enforcement. It is one which no Government bureau should ever possibly issue to the American people.

WASHINGTON, April —.—Federal Prohibition Director Rowden, of Arkansas, reports that the Ku-Klux Klan has inaugurated a campaign against moonshiners. A dozen men, sheeted and masked, deposited a fully equipped whisky still on the sidewalk of a prominent corner of Texarkana shortly after midnight, with a quantity of mash and corn whisky. One of the men then wrote on the sidewalk with a piece of chalk. "Bootleggers, beware," and "Captured by the Ku-Klux Klan." Another went to the office of a newspaper and told the editor that the still had been captured by the klan at a point about 6 miles south of town. All of the party then got back into automobiles and quickly disappeared.

Mr. Chairman, I agreed with the President of the United States when he said in this hall a few moments ago that we need a strict law enforcement, and any bureau of the Government which sends out stuff of this kind which encourages lynch law should not be given funds with which to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order that the amendment of the gentleman is not in order, because it is in direct opposition to the purpose of this appropriation. One of the purposes of the appropriation of $9,000,000 is to enforce the national prohibition act. That requires many administrative functions. One of these administrative functions is the one to which the gentleman now directs attention.

The CHAIRMAN. What rule of the House does it violate?

Mr. BLANTON. Well, it is not germane. It is not a limitation. All of the authorities hold that any limitation which is authorized under the rules must be germane to the purposes of the bill. This is not germane, but it is a limitation that is directly opposed to the fundamental purposes of this appropriation, and I make the point of order.

Mr. HILL. Does the Chair care to hear me on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, here is a provision of the Treasury act appropriating $9,000,000 for the enforcement of the Volstead Act. My amendment is a limitation upon that appropriation in order to prevent any portion of that $9,000,000 being wasted on a personal publicity campaign or in issuing propaganda that appears to applaud the use of lynch law with the approval of Federal Prohibition Commissioner Haynes. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to speak to the point of order?

Mr. TINCHER. I do not care to discuss the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. HICKS. No. I thought that no point of order had been reserved, and I was going to make the point of order that the point had been raised too late, but I understand it was reserved.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I make this additional point of order. It seems to me the amendment in certain respects is too vague and indefinite and imposes an impossible task upon the comptroller. It names certain work and then says "and other work of a similar character." It occurs to me that the language would be so indefinite as it might make it impossible of enforcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The question of vagueness or indefiniteness is not the question before the Chair. It occurs to the Chair this is a limitation on the appropriation and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in keeping with the attitude and general demeanor of those who are attempting to defeat the enforcement of national prohibition and hope to bring about the repeal of the national prohibition law. Every department of our Government I know anything about, in order to save time, has a habit of giving publicity for the newspaper reporters in some kind of a systematic way and the opposition, as I understand the gentleman from Maryland has to prohibition enforcement, is that in one interview they gave out they quoted some man in Arkansas who said that the Ku-Klux Klan had destroyed some moonshine liquor.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Not just now. If I get out of order I will have to yield. [Laughter.] I do not know for sure what objection the gentleman from Maryland would have to anyone destroying moonshine liquor. As a matter of fact I do not know anything much about Maryland. I understand there is a city in Maryland named Baltimore, but I never was there. I guess I have been there. I guess the train that I came to Washington on came under the city of Baltimore, but what I means is, I never had occasion to look out of the window as we came through. This amendment and the other amendments suggested by the gentleman from Baltimore last night are in direct opposition to the message of the President this morning. But there is nothing to be surprised at in that, because yesterday he announced that from now on he was going to be half Democrat and half Republican in his votes, and I suppose these amendments that he is offering are as a Democrat, being offered on the part of his Democratic half, for surely he would not come here but a few minutes after his own Executive has left the floor, asking that we do nothing to hinder, but on the other hand get behind the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead law and get behind this work. This amendment should not receive a large vote, but I do not know of any way to prevent the gentleman from Baltimore from voting for it. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this is the first of a series of six amendments to be offered to this section by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL]. In the consideration of all these amendments the House should remember, particularly in the light of the splendid appeal for Americanism and law observance which our President has just offered in this Chamber, that the gentleman from Maryland speaks on this floor on this question as the authorized, duly credentialed minister plenipotentiary and envoy most extraordinary of the Association Opposed to the Prohibition Amendment [laughter], and that when the gentleman offers here an amendment to the item carrying the proposed fund for the enforcement of that law, carrying into effect one of the provisions of our Constitution, in that act he represents an organization that is known by all of its propaganda as being opposed to the eighteenth amendment, an organization which has no idea of ever securing its repeal but desires to nullify that part of the Constitution by hamstringing and defeating its enforcement. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman is sure that I can get three or four minutes additional time, I will yield.

Mr. HILL. I want to say to the gentleman that President Harding——

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I can not yield to a speech from the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Let me make but a minute speech. Answering the gentleman's question, the President said in the Senate of the United States four years ago that it was the right of the American people to repeal any constitutional amendment or any law they wanted to, and the association to which the gentleman refers—I have not consulted them about this, but I think they will agree with it—I will say to you that we have in this country the right to repeal an objectionable law.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, I will resume my part of my speech. [Laughter.] The gentleman, or any other American, or any association in America, has the right to attempt to repeal any

provision of the Constitution; but so long as that constitutional provision remains in effect it is the duty of every patriotic American to try to make it effective. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I can not yield further now. No citizen has the right to say, "This part of the Constitution I will support, and this part I do not like and I will oppose," and the only purpose entertained by the association opposed to prohibition and their 29 coworkers in a most immoral vineyard is not to repeal it—because, as the President said, it never will be repealed—but they hope to defeat its purpose and make it ineffective. They hope to hamstring and destroy it by indirection and nullification. [Applause.]

Now, if the gentleman will permit, this country is not in sympathy with any such policy. The recent election has been heralded by the press of this country as a mark of the reaction of the country from its stand for prohibition. We have been given to understand that the loss of seats on the Republican side was due to prohibition enforcement. What is the truth about it? We have no right, no one has any right, to try to make prohibition and temperance a scapegoat for the serious loss suffered by the Republican Party in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. May I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will yield for a question I will have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield to another question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Directing the gentleman's attention to the particular amendment pending before the House, does the gentleman approve of the law enforcement by the Ku-Klux Klan?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not anything to do with that proposition, and I do not wonder that the gentleman wishes to divert me at this particular time. I want to give the information that the country needs, and that is this: We lost 80 seats; the Republican Party lost 80 seats in the last election. Now of those 80 seats where Republicans went out and Democrats or others came in, how many of them were dry Republicans succeeded by wet Democrats? If you can answer that, then you can measure how much prohibition and the splendid stand of the Republican Party for law enforcement had to do with our difficulties in the last election. I will tell you. Of those 80 seats we suffered a net loss of only 9, and if the Republican Party had lost only 9 seats in the last election we never would have noticed it at all. That is the situation. Generally speaking, the country is not in harmony with the gentleman's program. In my own State——

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Briefly.

Mr. FESS. Where the issue was straight on wet or dry, as in Ohio, it went 200,000 for dry.

Mr. CRAMTON. Ohio went 200,000 dry, California went dry, and nearly every other place in the country where the issue was squarely drawn in the congressional contest the dry Member retained his seat. Further, in my own State, the gentleman's association——

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not contend that New Jersey or New York went dry?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, those States never were dry. But if either one of those States could go back to the old days of the saloon for a year they would after that be dry, too.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was not the issue in this fight.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are only three ways of selling booze, as the gentleman knows. One is to sell it from a saloon. I do not care what its name is. If the place serves liquor, it is a saloon. Another is to sell it for use only in the home, with no opportunity for legal regulation. The third is to continue the policy of bootlegging. Which does the gentleman want?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will see that he gets more time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman any information as to the number of illicit stills in his district or his State?

Mr. CRAMTON. I know that there are only two or three States in this Union where more money went into the Treasury this year from the enforcement of the law than in Michigan, which means a splendid attempt at enforcement, situated as we are upon the Canadian border.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know. I have never looked for one. I do not know where there is even one.

Mr. KNUTSON. Did the gentleman hear any statements being made during his campaign this fall as to the number of stills?

Mr. CRAMTON. I did the best I could to make this question an issue in my campaign in the primaries. The other gentleman started in to make it an issue, but he got cold feet and tried to ride both horses before he got through. I was especially pleased by the indorsement I received from my district, and I will say that in the November election the association opposed to the enforcement of prohibition, represented on this floor by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], broadcasted in the State of Michigan the announcement that two Republican candidates there especially ought to be defeated for their position on this question. What was the result, or what followed? One of them, with a total vote of less than 50,000, received a majority of 22,000, the largest majority given to any contested candidate for Congress in the State this year. The other one, a former State Anti-Saloon League superintendent, in a district where the vote was much larger, a district having the industrial cities of Highland Park, Flint, Pontiac, and Lansing, received a majority of 17,000; and a third one, coming from the Upper Peninsula, a mining district having a large labor vote that it might be claimed would be wet, was triumphantly reelected notwithstanding his consistent support of prohibition, by a vote of 26,228 to 6,784. That was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES].

The country expects Congress to stand for the Constitution, and such statements as come from the association opposed to prohibition should be taken at their real value and as intended to destroy enforcement, as they are. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORPE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on this amendment. I feel that I am qualified to speak on this subject.

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE.

I have had considerable experience along these lines, covering a period of more than 35 years, since I left my home in Indiana to enter the business world when I was a boy only 13 years of age.

In these years I have had many experiences; some of them I would like to forget; some of them I remember with pleasure; but I am going to confess to some things that I am really ashamed of in my first attempt at addressing this House. I would hesitate to refer to my own unfortunate experience if it were not for the fact that certain distinguished gentlemen are attempting to raise an issue here that forces me to muster all the weapons at my command to help defeat their nefarious schemes.

TRUE TO MY CONSTITUENCY.

I would not be true to my constituency, to my family, my country, and my sense of honor if I did not raise my voice against this amendment, which will nullify and render inactive every purpose and intent of the Volstead Act. This amendment is nothing more nor less than a smoothly worded camouflage, a smoke screen, behind which is very strongly intrenched unlimited wealth and a great array of able men who hope to destroy this act and once more return the liquor traffic to its former power.

POISON PROPAGANDA.

Ever since the passage of this act they have been spreading a poison propaganda among the people of the various States, under the guise of personal liberty, demanding the return of light wines and beer, which is nothing less than the opening wedge for the complete overthrow of the national prohibition act. They have appealed to the very lowest depravity of human nature, they have enlisted in their ranks the worst alien population of foreign lands who have come to our shores, preying on their prejudice and ignorance of our laws and claiming that they are representing the wishes of the ma-

jority of the people. These hordes of newcomers have no knowledge of the fundamental principles of our Government, and it is safe to say that a large percentage are not naturalized, and whose only idea of liberty is their power to abuse it; and, on the other hand, there are a very large number of apparently respectable people striving for the complete overthrow of this act for the sole purpose of great financial gain.

MOST DANGEROUS CLASS.

This is the most dangerous element the friends of prohibition and law enforcement have to contend with to-day, because from their standing in the business world they give their methods an air of apparent respectability.

A POSTGRADUATE.

I claim to have had considerable experience upon the subject of the liquor traffic in these 35 years of contact with humanity. I have traveled in every State in the Union except one. I have had every opportunity to study this question among all classes of our citizenship. For the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Baltimore [Mr. HILL] I would like to say that I have passed through the elementary school of light wines and beer, and I claim to be a postgraduate of the university of old king alcohol. [Laughter.]

And I hereby declare from this floor that for this education I have paid the price in sorrows, disappointments, and heartaches, such as this distinguished gentleman [Mr. HILL] in his apparently innocent attitude would force upon the present and unborn generations by the nullification of this act.

I am here for the purpose of opposing this amendment, and all other amendments which may come from the floor of this House attempting to nullify any amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which I know to be the most sacred document of our American history. [Applause.]

THE ISSUE INVOLVED.

The only issue to be considered here by this able body of men is the great moral principle involved. Shall we take a backward step at this time before the eyes of the civilized world and permit ourselves to be defeated by all the evil influences which will be mustered against law and order and the welfare of society? No, gentlemen of this House, we will not permit this to be done.

I was commissioned by the people of my district to come down here and support the provisions of the Volstead Act. I am glad to have this opportunity to voice my sentiments on this great moral question.

I have great admiration for the distinguished gentleman from the city of Baltimore [Mr. HILL]. I admire his stately form. [Laughter.] I recognize that he, no doubt, has a great judicial mind and that he is a man of wonderful learning, but I want to say to you, gentlemen of this House, that under the present conditions, as indicated by the will of the American people, and from the standpoint of civilization and Christianity, which ever strives to uplift mankind, "the gentleman's heart is wrong"; and I wish that some time in the near future he would come out beyond the placid waters of the old Missouri and become inoculated with some of the spirit of true freedom and love for law and order. Then I believe he would gladly come back here and follow the wise counsel of President Harding, that great leader, who just spoke to us a few minutes ago advocating the strict enforcement of this act.

TURKEY BANISHED ALCOHOL.

It is also pleasing to note, on the very day President Harding made his eloquent appeal, that far-away Turkey, one of the most criticized and troublesome nations of the present time, had put into effect the most drastic prohibition law of any nation in the world, and had forever banished alcoholic liquors from its boundaries, and the white ribbon was hoisted up beside the crescent as Mohammedan Turkey joined the few other nations of the world which now ban intoxicating liquors.

ALCOHOLISM A DISEASE.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, alcoholism is not only a curse, but it is a deadly disease; I have learned this from scientific men who have made this subject a life study. One of the authorities of one of the State insane asylums in the State of Iowa told me a number of years ago that more than 82 per cent of the inmates, confined there at that time, were victims of the ravages of alcohol, either directly or indirectly; I was also informed that 87 per cent of the insane patients of the State of Wisconsin were brought to their deplorable condition, either directly or indirectly, by this deadly disease.

This Government has spent millions to eradicate the yellow fever from the Southland; it has spent millions to stop the deadly ravages of smallpox, influenza, tuberculosis, and other kindred contagious diseases; it has also spent millions to destroy the deadly toll of cholera in hogs.

Tuberculosis in cattle and the foot-and-mouth disease in sheep and all of these diseases shrink into insignificance in comparison to the deadly ravages of the unrestricted use of alcohol to the human race. Its toll has been countless millions since the beginning of our Christian civilization, and if it were possible to rehabilitate these victims of this deadly disease in human form as they once existed, and march them in spectral array through the streets of Washington and permit any one of them to tell their story from the floor of this House it would be harrowing in the extreme, and no Member could reconcile it with his conscience to cast his vote against the appropriation to insure the enforcement of this act.

THE HISTORY OF MY ANCESTORS.

I come of Revolutionary stock; my ancestry dates back to the siege of Yorktown, where my great-great-grandfather gave his life in the defense of this Republic.

To me the Constitution of these United States is one of the most sacred documents of modern time. I believe in upholding it and in its strictest enforcement. It is the eternal foundation of all our liberties, not only to our own people but to the people of every land.

I may never have an opportunity to address this House again as my term of office is short, but I wish to be recorded here in defense of this law. [Applause.]

I want this message to go forth to my constituency, and to all the people throughout this land, that the greatest pleasure that came to me in the short time I was here was to record my vote for God and home and native land, and for the upbuilding and upholding of an outshining record for the strict enforcement of the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.]

NO SANE ARGUMENT CAN BE PRODUCED.

Yes, gentlemen of this House, there can be no sane argument used in its favor; alcoholism in any form is not only a deadly disease but a menace to society and good government. Degradation, sorrow, poverty, shame, crime, insanity, and untold suffering ever follow in its wake. With exceeding pleasure I shall vote to uphold the dignity of this law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HILL) there were—ayes 2, noes 98.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 28, line 8, after the word "standing," strike out the period, insert a colon, and then insert the following: "*And provided further*, That no part of this $9,000,000 shall be paid in salary or expenses to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who willfully fails or refuses to perform his duties connected with the enforcement of the laws mentioned in this paragraph."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment. I do not think anybody can justify it.

Mr. BLANTON. It is merely a limitation.

Mr. MADDEN. That is already covered in the law itself. The law provides that men who fill these places are under oath to enforce the law, and where a man willfully refuses to do that, of course the remedy is to put him out of office. If he willfully violates the law and commits a crime by so doing he ought to be prosecuted. I do not think this is a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this amendment is simply a limitation. Whether it is desirable or not is for the committee, and not the Chair, to decide.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am with the President of the United States in the message which he delivered here an hour ago on the enforcement of the prohibition laws. He called attention to the fact that their enforcement is lax and that this laxness must stop; that the law must be enforced if people are to continue having proper respect for this Government. Here we are spending $9,000,000 in this bill for the enforcement of this law and it is not enforced; but my amendment will help enforcement, and when we come to the salaries of the district attorneys and the judges in the judicial appropriation bill, who are called upon to enforce the law, I expect to offer just such an amendment. They ought not, any of them, to receive a cent of the money of the people unless they are going to do their duty. The reason why 80 Members on the Republican side lost their seats in this House at the recent election was not, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] suggests, because of the prohibition question. It was because of other things, one of which, I might mention, was the long delay by the President of the United States in submitting to

the Congress the question of aid to farmers, which he, for the first time, submitted an hour ago. Why was not that question submitted two years ago in his inaugural address? Was not the need of the farmers of the country just as dire and necessitous then as it is now? Why should not he, before the lessons of the recent election, have brought that question to the Congress? Everyone knows it was the dissatisfaction of the farmers of this country, above everything else, that caused the loss of many of the 80 Republican seats. All I have to do is to refer the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] to the record of our distinguished friend Doctor FESS, from Ohio. Where would Doctor FESS be if it had not been for his strong, determined, unflinching attitude on this question of enforcing the prohibition law? He goes to the United States Senate because of that stand. The good people of Ohio stood up in his behalf and behind him on prohibition to the exclusion of every other question. I want to say that when the time comes, when we take up the judicial appropriation bill, I am going to offer just such an amendment in respect to the district attorneys and the district judges. There are too many district attorneys and district judges where men come in and plead guilty to a violation of the prohibition law and are fined 1 cent or $1, where the fines are not commensurate with the offense committed, and where there is no jail sentence whatever. Enforcement is left entirely to the State administration in many States. I do not think a man in the department ought to receive a dollar of this $9,000,000 fund where he willfully fails to perform his duty. Every day you take up a newspaper and read where a guard of some burglarized warehouse has failed to do his duty and hundreds of gallons of whisky are taken away, barrels of whisky stolen and taken away by wagon loads, because some official or employee of the Government has failed to do his duty. That must stop. These employees must understand, every one of them, not only that they will lose their position, but they will not get a single dollar of the people's money unless they perform their duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt about the good intentions of the gentleman from Texas in offering this amendment. But it is wholly unnecessary. The law of the land provides for the punishment of men who violate their oath of office and how they should be dealt with. If the amendment of the gentleman from Texas should prevail it would place the Comptroller General of the United States in the position of having to pass upon the question whether a man on a given pay roll somewhere in the Government employ had performed his duty, and whether he could be paid, because there was some doubt as to whether he had performed that duty. This is an accounting question, the question of dealing with the men in the Government service. If men fail to perform their duties, no amendment of this sort will make them do it. It does not seem to me that we ought to complicate the situation by making it necessary for the Comptroller General to pass upon the eligibility of a man on the Government pay roll to receive his pay. If he violates the law he ought to be punished. If he does not perform his duty he ought to be dismissed. The law ought to be enforced, whatever the law may be. I am in favor of law enforcement and of doing everything possible to see that the law is enforced, no matter whether I believed in the law before it was passed or not.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that under this amendment the man who receives his pay performs his duty, and would not the adoption of this amendment complicate it?

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I have said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question. What was the amount carried in the first appropriation bill after the enactment of Federal prohibition?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it was $2,000,000. I am not quite sure. Then I think a million was appropriated in a deficiency bill, which made $3,000,000, and later on there was further appropriations which made it $9,200,000, and now it is $9,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. What was the total the first year?

Mr. MADDEN. Three million dollars.

Mr. KNUTSON. What was the total amount the second year?

Mr. MADDEN. Five million five hundred thousand dollars, including a deficiency.

Mr. KNUTSON. The information I have is that as the cost of enforcing prohibition goes up the price of whisky is coming down. When we passed the prohibition act and the lid was put on, my information is that whisky cost $10 and $12 a bottle. Now it is said one can get home-brew whisky for $8 a gallon.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What evidence does the gentleman base his statement upon that the price of whisky is coming down?

Mr. KNUTSON. Not only from what I have read, but I will say to the gentleman that in certain parts of the country price lists are being circulated freely.

Mr. CRAMTON. As time goes on the gentleman from Minnesota will become more expert in locating suitable sources of supply. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, the gentleman from Michigan, who is an expert, holds out some ray of hope. [Laughter.] I voted for the prohibition amendment to the Constitution and also for the Volstead Act. It is not working out as I had hoped. [Applause.] There are in this country to-day thousands and tens of thousands of illicit stills. Every day boys and girls in many localities are coming home from school paralyzed drunk and sick.

Mr. MURPHY. That is all bunk.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is absolutely true. I visited a home in my own city about a month ago, and the mother told me that her 14-year-old boy had come home from high school the day before so drunk and sick that she thought he was going to die. She asked him the next day where he had procured it, and the boy said that nearly all the boys in the school were carrying it on their hips.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I can not. I have only five minutes. How much money is necessary to enforce prohibition? I am willing to vote every dollar necessary to enforce the laws of the land. If prohibition can not be enforced, as some contend, then I might vote for a modification, as I am not willing to see remain on the statute books of the Nation a law that can not be enforced, for that only breeds contempt for law; neither am I willing to continue by my vote a condition that is ruining the boyhood and girlhood of the Nation. This is a question that must be solved by hard-headed reasoning and not by sentimentality. I would not for a moment favor going back to the old-fashioned saloon. For that institution I have not the least love or concern, but I am deeply concerned about the welfare of our boys and girls, who are the hope of the Republic. In God's name, let us take hold of this great question fearlessly and boldly and do that which we conceive to be for the best interests of the Nation.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does the gentleman think the open saloon would prevent the condition of which he complains?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have already stated that I am opposed to a return to the open saloon. We have a flaunting of the law that is sad and tragic. My friends, let us do something. Either stamp out the moonshining and bootlegging or come out fearlessly and admit that the law can not be enforced.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Similar statements to those made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] are found in certain papers of the country. When you come to investigate the majority of them you find that it is something that Smith told Brown that Jones told Smith and Smith told somebody else. Personal observation and experience demonstrate the fact that nothing that has occurred in the last 25 years has done so much for American manhood and womanhood, has advanced the young man and the young woman of our Nation so much, as has the eighteenth amendment and the enforcement of that law. I have heard men say that you can buy liquor wherever you want it. Two years ago, last year, and even this summer I traveled thousands of miles through the mining country, where, necessarily, it used to be found. You could obtain it any place prior to the eighteenth amendment. There were from 5 to 10 to 15 saloons in every town of any size, all over the Western States. Go there to-day and you can not find liquor. You hear men say that you can obtain it, but go there and you will find that it is not obtainable, and you find that people are not drinking; you find that the men who used to drink have bank accounts; that they are sending their children to school; that they are well dressed and provided for; and that the community is prosperous as it never prospered before.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Just one moment. I want to tell a story. Two years ago I was in San Francisco with a man I knew very well. He said, "John, why is it that you voted for the constitutional amendment and these laws?" I said, "You know why; you have seen the results of liquor." He then told me that he could get it whenever he wanted it in San Francisco; you could get liquor at any place. I said very well, and invited him to go and have a drink. He then said, "It will cost you a dollar." But I replied that I did not care, that it would not cost him anything, that I would give $2, and that he could take his drink and I would let them have mine. I said, "Come on, now, and show us." He then replied, "Oh, they will know you, and they will not furnish it to you." That is the same old story you find wherever you go. You find men willing to state what can be had and where it can be had, but when you come to a showdown and ask them they are unable to produce.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman remember the provisions of the Volstead Act that to buy liquor and to furnish it to another is a violation of law? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. I do not quite get the question.

Mr. BUTLER. I am asking my friend whether, when he invited his friend in San Francisco to take a drink, he realized that he was violating the law?

Mr. RAKER. Oh, I realized the position of the law; I knew it well, but I knew that my friend could not get it. His was just like the stories that are told elsewhere. They read well, they sell the newspapers, they make good articles in the magazines. People like to talk about them. People like to talk about something that brings down humanity instead of uplifting it.

Mr. BUTLER. What would my friend have done if the liquor had been furnished? Would he have run away from it?

Mr. RAKER. I would have had to do it; yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, for 40 years I have had to run away from it. Gentlemen know what that means when you live in a community such as used to abound in the western country. If you did not go out with the boys, they would make you go. We all know what it means. No man can honestly say, if he thinks anything of his word and of his conscience, but that the eighteenth amendment and the law placed on the statute books to enforce it have done more to advance America and its cause than all of the laws that have been placed there for the last 15 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 8, add a new provision, as follows: "*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of the salary of any employee who shall not have been appointed, after competitive examination and certification, by the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment upon the grounds that this is not a limitation but is a change of law. Section 38 of the prohibition enforcement law is as follows:

SEC. 38. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Attorney General of the United States are hereby respectively authorized to appoint and employ such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, and to purchase such supplies and equipment as they may deem necessary for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, but such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, except such executive officers as may be appointed by the commissioner or the Attorney General to have immediate direction of the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and persons authorized to issue permits, and agents and inspectors in the field service, shall be appointed under the rules and regulations prescribed by the civil service act.

That is the act under which we are operating. The gentleman from Massachusetts is trying to amend that act, and I submit that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and under the rules of the House it is not in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. There is discretionary authority in the public officials to pay these men whether they are under the civil service or not?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Then it is a clear violation of the rules of the House to take that discretion away from the appointing power.

Mr. TINKHAM. I desire to refer to section 825 of the Constitution Manual and Digest and Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives, page 368, where it says in reference to section 2 of Rule XXI, under which the point of order has been made—

Although the rule forbids on any general appropriation bill a provision "changing existing law," which is construed to mean legislation generally, the House's practice has established the principle that certain "limitations" may be admitted. It being established that the House under its rules may decline to appropriate for a purpose authorized by law, so it may by limitation prohibit the use of the money for part of the purpose while appropriating for the remainder of it (IV, 3936). The language of the limitation provides that no part of the appropriation under consideration shall be used for certain designated purpose (IV, 3917–3926). And this designated purpose may reach the question of qualifications, for while it is not in order to legislate as to the qualifications of the recipients of an appropriation the House may specify that no part of the appropriation shall go to recipients lacking certain qualifications (IV, 3942–3952).

All references under this statement are to Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, and if the Chair will read the cases cited in Volume IV, 3942 to 3952, the Chair will see that the limitation is completely supported by these decisions.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman starts out very properly with a limitation by the language of his amendment, but he winds the amendment up with a direction which is legislation changing the law on the subject and is not in order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I will.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does not the amendment seek to establish a method of ascertaining qualifications rather than an ascertainment of qualifications, and on that ground it would be new legislation setting aside the legislation mentioned by the chairman of the committee a moment ago and adopting an entirely new method for the ascertainment of qualifications?

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will consult Hinds' Precedents, Volume IV, 3917 to 3926, as well as the former cases I have cited, he will find that the limitation I have offered is an amendment and limitation and is entirely within the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] desire to be heard?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of the salary of any employee who shall not have been appointed after competitive examination and certification by the Civil Service Commission.

The Committee on Appropriations, of course, have no legislative powers except such as are prescribed by the rules, and an amendment can not be offered which proposes legislation unless it comes within the rules. However, there is a very long line of decisions which permits limitations upon appropriations. An amendment may be offered which provides that no part of this appropriation shall be paid to any certain class of employees, and the Chair knows of no reason why an amendment which provides that no part of this appropriation shall be paid to employees unless they have certain qualifications is not a proper limitation. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, who has just finished his annual address to Congress, has referred specifically to conditions relating to the enforcement of prohibition which savor of Nation-wide scandal, and said that this scandal is a most demoralizing factor in our public life. He also specifically referred to official corruption and individual demoralization in relation to this subject. If this committee is honest in its opinion and expressed desire to enforce the eighteenth amendment and the statutes which lie under it, its duty is to withdraw the enforcing arm of the Government as represented by the prohibition enforcement Federal service from partisan politics and its present atrocious misuse for personal and corrupt ends. The limitation I have offered will establish rules that have been established in nearly every department of this Government in order to protect the department from partisan manipulation and to best obtain results from work honestly and efficiently done. What are some of the admitted facts in relation to the present scandalous conditions? You will find upon page 493 of the hearings before the subcommittee on the Treasury Department appropriation bill now before us, held within 30 days, the following:

The CHAIRMAN. How many men are there employed altogether in the service?

Mr. HAYNES. We have 380 men on the general agents' force, and 3,518 will be the total under this estimate.

Mr. JONES. That is what we estimate for, 3,518, Mr. Chairman. We have now about 3,800, but this estimate that you now have under consideration contemplates a reduced appropriation.

Mr. HAYNES. You see, Mr. Chairman, we had built up to the maximum provided for with the $9,250,000, which will now have to be somewhat readjusted and which we are already anticipating on the basis of a reduced appropriation.

Mr. MAGEE. Do I understand there is a reduction of 300 in the force, from 3,800 to 3,500?

Mr. JONES. The estimates are for 3,518. The work under prohibition enforcement is more or less spasmodic, and sometimes you have to have a larger number than at other times, and right now we have about 3,800.

In other words, they have now 3,800 men. Now, on page 509 of the same report appears the following colloquy:

Mr. GALLIVAN. Also please include a statement showing how many of your agents or employees have been arrested during each of those years.

Mr. JONES. I might state that during last year about 6 per cent of the agents were dropped for delinquency or misconduct. That might give you some idea of it.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I am not talking about anybody being dropped, but I am talking about those who have been arrested and prosecuted.

The CHAIRMAN. Arrested by State authorities or Federal authorities?

Mr. GALLIVAN. By any authorities.

Mr. JONES. You want a statement of the number of agents arrested and prosecuted during what time?

The CHAIRMAN. During each year since the act has been in force.

(Statement referred to follows:)

"I am submitting to you herewith for inclusion in the hearings on the Treasury appropriation bill (after the eighteenth line, on page 593, of the transcript of the stenographic report) such data as are contained in our files regarding arrests and prosecutions of prohibition agents during the fiscal years 1920, 1921, 1922, and from July 1, 1922, to date.

"Very truly yours, JAMES E. JONES,
"Acting Prohibition Commissioner."

Arrests and prosecutions of prohibition agents.

Fiscal year 1920	0
Fiscal year 1921	4
Fiscal year 1922	22
July 1, 1922, to date	9

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. TINKHAM) there were—ayes 7, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 19, after the word "securing," insert "without violating the national prohibition act or the laws of any of the several States."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. That the amendment is in violation of the Constitution and in direct——

The CHAIRMAN. That is not ground for a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to suggest that I used that as a preface for making the point of order. It is not germane to the purposes of this bill or to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 27, line 24, after the word $9,000,000, insert: "*Provided*, That none of the money so appropriated shall be used for the payment of travel or other expenses of any person engaged upon a speaking trip to address private or nongovernmental organizations."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 27, line 19, after the word "law," insert: "None such employees, however, to include legal advisers, counsel, assistant counsel, special counsel, attorneys, or law clerks."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 2, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the RECORD disclose the instances where, when there was a division on the Hill amendment, the vote was one for and the opposition all the rest?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that I am glad to have it shown.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 27, line 24, after the figures "$9,000,000," insert: "*Provided*, That none of the money so appropriated shall be expended for political propaganda intended to defeat Members of Congress."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment, that it is not germane to the proposition, and also that it involves a conclusion or construction on the part of the Chair that is not a part of the functions of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HILL: Page 27, line 6, after the word "violation" strike out the following paragraph, beginning line 7, page 27, and terminating with line 8, page 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the appropriations made herein for the Internal Revenue Service shall be used to increase the compensation of any class or grade of officers or employees.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks before the recent election a letter was sent out by a noted magazine requesting expressions on the part of certain Members of Congress as to the Volstead law and the eighteenth amendment. In my answer was included a statement that this prohibition legislation, instead of being "put over" on the country, was the deliberate conviction of the Nation, with the largest majority ever known in the history of America. I stated that in the Continental Congress, in 1777, a resolution was passed calling upon the States for the enactment of laws prohibiting the distillation of alcohol from grain.

Later I had a letter from a benighted being in the black belt of Baltimore saying my statement was untrue. He declared he had gone through every page of the records of the Continental Congress, and no such resolution was ever passed.

I went through those records the other day to refresh my memory, and here is what I find:

Thursday, February 27, 1777.—Journals of Continental Congress, Volume VII, page 165:

Resolved, That it be recommended to the several legislatures of the United States immediately to pass laws the most effectual for putting an immediate stop to the pernicious practice of distilling grain, by which the most extensive evils are likely to be derived if not quickly prevented.

Thus we see that 145 years ago the Continental Congress, the predecessor of the Congress of the United States, in the midst of a revolutionary struggle for its very existence, passed a bone-dry law, the most effective within its power.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of the "black belt" in Baltimore. That is an entirely different one from the one that uses "white horses," is it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes. This is the black belt of ignorance in Baltimore, which never mounts. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Without expressing any opinion on the question, but in order that we may have the history accurately stated, is it not a fact that Thomas Jefferson in a published document deplored the fact that people were consuming so much spirits and recommended that they use malt liquors? Is not that correct?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have heard it so stated. I know that Dr. Benjamin Rush, of Pennsylvania, a Member of the Continental Congress and chairman of the independence committee, published a book in which he cited the evils of

alcohol and condemned its use either as a spirituous or malt beverage. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: On page 28, line 9, strike out the paragraph ending with line 11.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have offered an amendment to strike out the paragraph, lines 9, 10, and 11.

I feel that this provision in the bill is particularly an injustice to the deputy collector branch of the service. During the previous administration deputy collectors were enjoying lucrative salaries, ranging from $2,000 to $2,500. When the new administration went into power the new collectors started their employees at $1,500 as a base salary. If this provision is left in the bill, the collectors can not promote these men, except in case of vacancies, and there are no vacancies. There will be a great many vacancies, however, if this provision continues in the bill, because good men will be forced to resign. That is the situation in Tennessee. I have conferred with the collector in my State and he tells me that a number of men there have signified their intention to resign unless some provision is made for their promotion.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman made the statement that in the previous administration deputy collectors were enjoying big salaries and that those salaries have been greatly reduced. I would like to know the basis for that statement.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I can state from my own personal observation that they were drawing $2,200 to $2,500 in the Knoxville office.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There has been no action by Congress reducing their salaries.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. That was done by the collector's office. Under the previous law they were allowed to advance their salaries, but the collector for Tennessee started his men at $1,500 with a bonus of $240, and if this provision is left in the bill the collector will be powerless to promote these men, and, of course, good and capable men can not be retained for that compensation. The Knoxville, Tenn., office consists of a chief and four deputies. Each of these deputies draw a salary of $1,500 per annum. Before they could be appointed it was necessary for them to show that they had had experience in bookkeeping or in auditing work. Of course, men who possess such qualifications should receive more compensation than $1,500 per year, and unless they do receive it they will naturally find employment elsewhere. I am in favor of economy just as much as anyone, but I contend that a campaign of economy that looses the Government capable employees is very poor economy indeed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will allow me, of course, everybody knows that this administration is practicing economy.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The provision which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] seeks to strike out is one that I am responsible for having put in the law. It provides—

That no part of the appropriation shall be used for the purpose of increasing compensation.

That does not apply to increasing compensation where a promotion can be made legitimately.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. In a moment. For example, if a man goes into the service at $1,500 and there is a vacancy in a higher grade there is nothing to prevent the man in charge of the department from promoting him up to that higher salary; but it is not a $1,500 salary. It is a $1,740 salary that these men are getting. If you did not have this limitation in the law they would be paying them up to $2,500 and $3,000. And it would not be a question of merit. It would be a question of favoritism.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The gentleman understands that before the collector could promote them it would be necessary that a recommendation be made, and that would have to be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I understand that, but just as soon as anybody with any influence wanted to get a deputy collector promoted, he would get the recommendation of the local collector to the Internal Revenue Commissioner, and from the Internal Revenue Commissioner to the Secretary of the Treasury, and they would act on the recommendation.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the system as provided now by this paragraph there are different salaries paid.

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; and men doing the same character of work are being paid different salaries. The man taken in now is taken in at $1,500 salary. He is working side by side with a man who is receiving $2,000 salary. There is no provision here for equalizing those salaries. Consequently the very thing the gentleman desires to stop, namely, favoritism, is now being practiced all the time and can be because there is that difference.

Mr. MADDEN. No; there are certain grades through which men can be promoted when there are vacancies in a grade, but there are no men working side by side doing the same class of work and receiving different pay. The pay is $1,500 with a bonus of $240.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman certainly is mistaken. These men are not all drawing the same pay under this provision.

Mr. MADDEN. They are getting $1,500 and the $240 bonus.

Mr. DOWELL. Some of them are receiving more than that.

Mr. MADDEN. True, there are men in higher grades who have been longer in the service who may be getting more, and there is nothing in this act to prevent the promotion of a man from the lowest grade to the next grade. But there is a provision here to prevent the indiscriminate promotion of men regardless of the justification for the promotion, and that is why the provision is in the bill. I hope it will remain there.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is great variation in the salaries paid to State prohibition directors. In some States they get $4,000 and in others $3,000.

Mr. MADDEN. And in some $5,000.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is manifestly unfair.

Mr. MADDEN. Depending on the importance and volume of the work.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Even if the work increases, the salaries could not be increased under this provision.

Mr. MADDEN. You can not do it where there are 300,000 people in one State and there are 8,000,000 in another State.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Suppose the population is approximately the same and there is a difference in the salary of $1,000. The director in Idaho receives $3,000 while the director in Nevada, Wyoming, and Utah receives $3,500 and in Montana he receives $4,000 per annum.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. Is there any objection to placing these employees under the classified civil service and let them be promoted as civil-service employees are promoted?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all; no reason in the world, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. TILSON. Ought not that to be done?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. There will be pressure for their promotion and increase of compensation until you take it out of politics.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman what class of employees does this refer to. I want to say that I am in favor of this provision.

Mr. MADDEN. Internal-revenue collectors and all others under the Internal Revenue Department.

Mr. BUTLER. Classified employees?

Mr. MADDEN. All kinds.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand the salary is fixed according to the grade, and how can the administration official raise the salary of a man when he is graded and must act accordingly?

Mr. MADDEN. He can not as long as this provision remains in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, how can he do it now?

Mr. MADDEN. If he has a lump-sum appropriation he can pay anybody what he wants to, and it is for the purpose of stopping them from doing that that this provision is put in the bill. It is in the interest of the taxpayers. I want to say that I have no places in any department of the Government, so I am not pressing for any increase in compensation.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KETCHAM. Reserving the right to object, to what extent, by inserting material?

Mr. TINKHAM. By the insertion of material and also several remarks. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection.

Mr. DOWELL. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to refund money covered into the Treasury as internal-revenue collections under the provisions of the act approved May 27, 1908, $250,000.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to read a communication from E. C. Yellowley, chief general prohibition agent, dated April 13, 1922.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois). The Chair has not the benefit of what the gentleman is about to read, but the Chair will suggest to the gentleman that he may proceed in order.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a question on page 28, and the gentleman is about to discuss something entirely different.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the committee that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for two minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed out of order for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. I will read the letter of Mr. E. C. Yellowley, chief general prohibition agent, as I understand, to all State directors or employing agencies of the Government, dated April 13, 1922, in relation to prohibition employees:

APRIL 13, 1922.

You will no doubt receive a large number of applications for positions, some of the applicants being qualified for the work, while others will not reach the educational qualifications or have the experience to make efficient officers.

Upon receiving applications it is suggested that you carefully review them, and if you find that a man is not qualified for the place that you settle the matter immediately by advising him to this effect. In such cases do not forward the applications to this office, as we are receiving them by the hundreds. If, however, a man who has the necessary experience and educational qualifications applies to you for a position it is desired that you make a thorough investigation as to his ability, character, etc., and suggest that he secure congressional indorsements, indorsements of the Anti-Saloon League, and other indorsements that he may be able to obtain to accompany his application, which should be executed in duplicate with photographs attached, and forward to this office with your report for consideration.

Even in such cases it is not desired that you give applicant too much encouragement or lead him to believe his application will be approved, for you well know that there are many delays in making appointments.

In the event that members of the Federal prohibition director's force apply to you to be transferred to the general agents' force it is desired that you make a general investigation as to their character, ability, efficiency, etc., and if you find that they would not make efficient and trustworthy officers for our force so advise the agent in order to eliminate correspondence with this office. If, on the other hand, you find that such agents have all of the qualifications necessary and are trustworthy and reliable suggest to the applicant that he secure a letter signed by his Federal prohibition director approving the transfer. Also have him execute Form 1401 in duplicate, with his photograph attached, and forward to this office with your report and recommendations.

I wish to impress upon you the importance of making the proper selection and recommendations for appointments to the position of general prohibition agent. It is desired that this force be kept up to the highest standard possible, and all appointees must have had at least a high-school education and considerable experience to qualify them for the position.

Very truly yours,

E. C. YELLOWLEY,
Chief, General Prohibition Agents.

(During the reading of the letter the following occurred:)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I, with unanimous consent, be allowed to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the remainder of this letter?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the remainder of the letter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

For refunding taxes illegally collected under the provisions of sections 3220 and 3689, Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of February 24, 1919, including the payment of prior year claims, $12,000,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress of the disbursements hereunder as required by the act of February 24, 1919.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that in this paragraph there is appropriated $12,000,000 for refunding taxes illegally collected. What is the limitation of that provision, three years?

Mr. MADDEN. It is for any years that the taxes may have been illegally collected.

Mr. WATSON. There is a new ruling that where taxes are illegally collected the amount is deducted from the next tax. Why does it need this great amount of money?

Mr. MADDEN. They need a lot of money for these schedules where they have discovered an illegal collection of taxes.

Mr. WATSON. Do they deduct it from the next assessment of taxes?

Mr. MADDEN. Here is what they do: When they ascertain that a man has overpaid—this is a new innovation—they send a credit slip to the collector of the district in which the taxpayer resides. Then the collector must ascertain whether or not the taxpayer owes any taxes. If he owes any, instead of paying the taxpayer the cash they apply the credit to what he owes.

Mr. WATSON. That is for three years?

Mr. MADDEN. We have paid out $102,000,000 since 1917 on the overpaid tax schedules. There is now pending in the Appropriations Committee a recommendation for an appropriation of $42,000,000 more for this very same purpose. Now, let me say that every time we order the payment of a dollar on the overpaid schedules we collect $12 on the underpaid schedules. Of course nothing comes before the House to show what is collected on the underpaid schedules.

It shows only what we pay, because we must legislate in order to authorize the payments, and as a matter of fact we are not only paying on overpaid schedules but we are collecting on underpaid schedules. We are collecting about $300,000,000 a year on underpaid schedules and paying out perhaps $100,000,000, or will be in the next year, on overpaid schedules, so that we will have a net credit of $200,000,000 to the Treasury between the two proposals. This $12,000,000 does not mean much of anything. It simply means that we are providing for the payment to the extent that it will apply.

Mr. WATSON. Does the new ruling work out satisfactorily?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I shall take the floor in my own right.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman from Illinois made mention of the fact that there is about $42,000,000 yet to be provided, for the return of overpaid taxes.

Mr. MADDEN. There is a recommendation before our committee for legislation to that effect.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman's committee is expected to act upon that at an early date?

Mr. MADDEN. Some time between now and Christmas.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will that money when provided, if it should be recommended by the gentleman's committee, become immediately available for the payment of those sums?

Mr. MADDEN. It will.

Mr. HAWLEY. And what interest is allowed to those who have overpaid their taxes?

Mr. MADDEN. Six per cent from the date of the approval of the claims. We try to report the appropriations as rapidly as possible for these payments, because we do not want the Government to have to pay any interest, and we are also anxious to pay those to whom money is due.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers, cadets and cadet engineers, warrant officers, petty officers, and other enlisted men, active and retired, temporary cooks and surfmen, substitute surfmen, and one civilian instructor, $8,300,000, of which $640,000 shall be immediately available, and not to exceed $397,000 of the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1923 for "Rations, or commutation thereof," is hereby transferred and made immediately available for expenditures for "Pay and allowances."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to the fact that this paragraph contains an item making $640,000 of the appropriation proposed for 1924 available for expenditures during the present fiscal year of 1923. Yesterday I took occasion to call attention to what I believe to be a very bad practice into which the Bureau of the Budget is falling in recommending to Congress appropriations to be made immediately available. Gentlemen will recall that yesterday we passed a paragraph which made $200,000 in the customs service immediately available. That with this makes $840,000 which has been added to the appropriations for 1923; and I dare say that after this bill is passed, if any Member of Congress should undertake to go back and investigate in order to determine just how much has been appropriated for these two services for 1923 he would overlook these two items, certainly, unless he took the pains to go through every appropriation bill passed at this session.

This is not the only case in which the President and the Bureau of the Budget have made such a recommendation. As I said yesterday, the President has recommended—and I take it that the committee will so report—an item in the Department of the Interior bill making something over $20,000,000 immediately available in the Pension Bureau for expenditures during this year. Gentlemen will recall one of the reasons advanced for the passage of the Budget law was to prevent this practice. The practice had grown up during previous years in every appropriation bill of making funds appropriated for the succeeding fiscal year immediately available for expenses during the year in which those bills were passed. The result was that it was absolutely impossible for anyone, without an immense amount of work and without reading numerous appropriation bills, to ever satisfy himself as to just how much had been appropriated for different services in any particular fiscal year.

I had hoped that the Bureau of the Budget would not fall into that practice, and I had particularly hoped that the present very efficient Director of the Bureau of the Budget would realize what a bad practice it is to adopt that sort of thing, so severely condemned in the past, and that we should have a deficiency bill instead of the practice of making funds immediately available. This is nothing more nor less than a deficiency, and there is no reason why an estimate should not have been submitted to the Congress asking for a deficiency of $640,000 and have it appropriated in a deficiency bill, so that Members of Congress would know just what is being appropriated.

This paragraph appropriates $8,300,000 for this particular service of the Government during the fiscal year 1924. We must assume that the committee reported that sum because it thought that sum was necessary for the year 1924. If it is not necessary, then the committee ought to have reduced it; but we are here in the same paragraph taking from the sum of $8,300,000 which the committee says is necessary for 1924 the sum of $640,000 for use during this year. Then when we come to pass the appropriation bill for 1925 we will under this practice have to take care of this sum for 1924, and so on during the years following. The result will be that no one will ever be able to know just what is being appropriated for a particular service during any given year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think this is a very bad practice, and I have called attention to it in this public way so that it may be brought to the attention of the Director of the Budget with the hope that hereafter when he submits his estimates he will submit them for the purpose stated and will not ask Congress to make deficiency appropriations in this indirect and improper way.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Are any of these amounts referred to due to legislation passed by the Congress subsequent to the enactment of the last appropriation bill, or are they deficiencies pure and simple?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This is for commissioned officers, and due to legislation, but I submit to the gentleman that that does not remove the objection that I make, because it would be a very proper item for a deficiency bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. Is the $20,000,000 item to which the gentleman has referred, to be asked for by the Interior Department, due to legislation passed since the last appropriation bill was enacted?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether legislation was passed since the last appropriation bill was passed or not, but whether it was or not there is no reason why it should not have been submitted in a regular way as a deficiency and presented to the Congress, so that the Members would know exactly what they were appropriating. When you hide items as they are hidden here in this paragraph and the one preceding, Members of Congress are unable to determine just what is being appropriated from year to year for particular services. That is the point of my objection.

Mr. THORPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rebuilding and repairing stations and houses of refuge, temporary leases, rent, and improvements of property for Coast Guard purposes, including use of additional land where necessary, $250,000.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, with reference to this Coast Guard appropriation, what consideration did the committee give to a further appropriation which may be made necessary by the bill which the House was considering the other day?

Mr. MADDEN. None at all.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman have any information as to whether any additional amount will be required?

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that the gentleman's committee chairman said that the cost of the bill would be $13,000. If that is what it amounts to we need not take it into consideration in this bill, because they will undoubtedly have unexpended balances here.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I notice that. Of course, I was not in harmony with the bill myself.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course we could not take that into account now. We do not take anything into account until it is submitted to us by the Budget Director.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. And up to this time the gentleman has no official notice that there will be a deficiency asked?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make just a few remarks on the same subject as that upon which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has spoken. It would seem to me that we ought to try in every way to simplify our appropriation laws. It has been one of the chief evils of rider legislation that all sorts of legislation when enacted must be looked for in all sorts of places; in other words, it adds greatly to the difficulty of locating the law. When it comes to appropriations it is equally an evil. We have deficiency appropriations passed every year, and the word "deficiency" does not mean necessarily that there has been a failure on the part of the Committee on Appropriations properly to estimate expenditures for that particular purpose for that year, but deficiency in a parliamentary sense means simply an appropriation to be expended during the current or a prior fiscal year. There is no discredit in bringing in a deficiency item, if legislation has been enacted during the current year which creates the deficiency. In such cases, of course, the Committee on Appropriations can have no possible knowledge as to what appropriation the legislation will call for.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TILSON. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. But where it is known for months that there are deficiencies like the $24,000,000 for the pension department and the $42,000,000 for the internal revenue department that must be brought here right away in a deficiency bill, in commenting upon probable expenditures of the Government that should be properly taken into consideration.

Mr. TILSON. They will be in the end. I am speaking now only for a simplification of our appropriation acts. All such appropriations are eventually rounded up and brought together, but it entails a lot of work, and there is apt to be confusion in the minds of people in attempting to arrive at the aggregate of annual appropriations. In my judgment it ought not to be in order, if anyone makes the point of order against it, to make an appropriation immediately available. The subject of the appropriations in this bill, for instance, is "Appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1924," and any appropriation for a different department or for any other period than the fiscal year 1924 should not be in order.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The practice was, as I think my colleague will remember, that estimates would be brought in and denied in the amount which was asked, and then they proceeded on the basis as if they had gotten them, and when they had spent the amount of money they got, the deficiency would come in. Is that practice still continuing?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know how far that practice has been eradicated, but it ought to be, root and branch. I think we ought, in the interest of economy and good government, to confine appropriations in any particular bill to the particular objects and the particular period for which it purports to appropriate.

I think it was a great advance when we adopted the present scheme of appropriations by departments. I think it a very great advance, because the same department would come to a half dozen different appropriating committees and get a little or big appropriation, if they could, from each one, and no committee would know exactly what the other committee had done. I think that we should go one step further, so that no appropriation would be in order except for the fiscal year for which the bill purports to appropriate. The point of order would then lie if the appropriation is made immediately available. I hope that the Director of the Budget will take this view of it in presenting the Budget hereafter.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad to have these gentlemen offer their criticisms. I feel exactly as they do about this proposition. Here we have two very important things that seem to be pressing that justified a departure from the ordinary practice. We had just passed the tariff act. They wanted money. They can not take the commodities off the docks and have them passed upon by the experts with their present force. It will take some time to pass a deficiency bill. It was thought that by making the money immediately available in this bill they would get the money a little sooner. Then came this other meritorious question of the Coast Guard, to whose membership everybody's heart goes out. An act was passed increasing their pay last June. They were not able, of course, to get that increased pay. They are all poor men and need the money, and yet we can not pass a deficiency bill for some time to come. I do not favor the practice and would not. I have refused, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to grant requests made for appropriations to be made immediately available in many other cases.

It may be that occasionally we will think that the justice of the case makes it of sufficient importance to act, but wherever it can be avoided it should be. Unless there is some great hardship caused by the delay, I intend to follow out the suggestion made by my friends here on the floor, because, after all, I recognize myself as a servant of the House, and I shall tell the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in the future that we do not want any recommendations of the sort that appears in this bill.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. You say the Coast Guard personnel would not receive the increase that was granted them by law?

Mr. MADDEN. They received the increase, but they did not get the money.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. It will be retroactive and go back?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; it will go back to the time it was authorized. We are now appropriating the money.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. They will get it absolutely? It will go back?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. There is no question about that. They will look after that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think, after the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the parliamentary situation ought to be recited in the RECORD. The gentleman from Connecticut was instrumental in following at one time, when he was Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, a very noted decision made by Mr. Speaker Carlisle, who, as is known, was a distinguished parliamentarian, when he held that the membership of the House have the right, when they are called upon here in the committee to consider an appropriation bill, to depend upon the fact, first, that there is no matter of legislation in the bill, and, secondly, that there is no deficiency item in that bill. They have a right to depend upon that, and when the Committee on Appropriations brings in an appropriation bill, neither the chairman himself nor any member of it has any more right than anyone else to offer an amendment on the floor of an item that is either a deficiency or an item of legislation.

That was the ruling of Mr. Speaker Carlisle, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who is one of the greatest parliamentarians in the present House, followed the decision of Mr. Speaker Carlisle, and it remained the decision of this committee for many months and years, and only lately, since the reorganization scheme was adopted in regard to appropriation bills, has that ruling been changed. The question then came up while the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] was in the chair, and upon reviewing the question he overruled the decision of the gentleman from Connecticut, and held that inasmuch as under the reorganization of the Committee on Appropriations it has the general power to bring in all appropriation bills, it has the right to put a deficiency item upon an appropriation bill.

There is the parliamentary situation. I think we ought to go back to the decision of the gentleman from Connecticut and the decision of Mr. Speaker Carlisle on that proposition, because if we give this Committee on Appropriations, already having most of the powers of the House, the extra power of bringing in here on every single appropriation bill items of legislation or items involving a deficiency, we shall get into the confusion that has been referred to. There has not been a single appropriation bill brought in by this committee since that rule was changed that did not contain some item making appropriations immediately available; not in separate deficiency bills, where the membership can expect them, but on an appropriation bill; and I hope the committee will wake up some day and overrule the decision of the gentleman from Ohio and go back to the decision of the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs to Coast Guard cutters, $375,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, how many cutters are there in the service?

Mr. MADDEN. Seventy-five vessels.

Mr. WATSON. Are they under the control of the Internal Revenue Bureau?

Mr. MADDEN. No; of the Coast Guard.

Mr. WATSON. Is this $375,000 appropriated to the Internal Revenue Bureau to take care of the Coast Guard?

Mr. MADDEN. This is not under the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Mr. WATSON. It is under the internal revenue section.

Mr. MADDEN. No; it is a new section.

Mr. WATSON. The internal revenue has nothing to do with it?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all.

Mr. WATSON. Are not those vessels all very old?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all. They have some very new vessels.

Mr. WATSON. The testimony before the committee some time ago was to the effect that they were old and unfit.

Mr. MADDEN. No. Some of the vessels are old. They used to go up to the Arctic regions. They are trying to rebuild them, but we did not authorize them to be rebuilt or repaired.

Mr. WATSON. They got some more recently?

Mr. MADDEN. They got some from the Shipping Board and repaired some old ones, and now all of them are in a good state of repair.

Mr. WATSON. What vessels are used to look after bootleggers on the high seas? Do these have that work to do?

Mr. MADDEN. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. WATSON. What department looks after the bootlegging? I did not know but that the coast line vessels are also in that service.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all done by the Prohibition Enforcement Bureau.

Mr. WATSON. Where do they get the boats from?

Mr. MADDEN. They have boats of their own, or they may get the use of them from the customs service. They cooperate

with the customs service. The customs service has boats in all the ports.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total Coast Guard, exclusive of commandant's office, $11,328,100.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, quite a number of gentlemen, some opposed and some in favor of the provision of the bill embraced in the item for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, wanted to go away this afternoon, some to hear Monsieur Clemenceau and some for other purposes. Before they left they asked me if I would try to get consent to pass over the item for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing until to-morrow. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to do that and to proceed with the balance of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to pass over the Bureau of Engraving and Printing item, to be called up later, and proceed with the reading of the bill, beginning on page 35, Secret Service. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. From line 21, on page 31, to line 12, on page 35.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Will that come up to-morrow?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It will not come up this evening?

Mr. MADDEN. No; to-morrow.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if it is his intention to bring this up immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow?

Mr. MADDEN. Immediately after the reading of the Journal, and I think it is only fair to say that if the Members want considerable time in which to discuss it I will have no objection to that.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes: For expenses incurred under the authority or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury in detecting, arresting, and delivering into the custody of the United States marshal having jurisdiction dealers and pretended dealers in counterfeit money and persons engaged in counterfeiting, forging, and altering United States notes, bonds, national-bank notes, Federal reserve notes, Federal reserve bank notes, and other obligations and securities of the United States and of foreign Governments, as well as the coins of the United States and of foreign Governments, and other crimes against the laws of the United States relating to the Treasury Department and the several branches of the public service under its control; hire and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; per diem in lieu of subsistence, when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for no other purpose whatever, except in the protection of the person of the President and the members of his immediate family and of the person chosen to be President of the United States, $415,000: *Provided*, That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any person subpœnaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a compensation greater than that allowed by law, except not exceeding three persons, who may be paid not exceeding $12 per day.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee concerning this appropriation of $415,000 for the Secret Service. How does that sum compare with the appropriations for that service for the last five years?

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is about $10,000 one way or the other, either $10,000 under or $10,000 over the last appropriation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have seen statements made that it is a considerably larger amount than was appropriated formerly.

Mr. MADDEN. For 1922 we had $400,000 and for 1923 $390,000.

Mr KELLY of Pennsylvania. But go back to 1917.

Mr. MADDEN. In 1917 it was $200,000; in 1918, $275,000; in 1919, $300,000; in 1920, $325,000; in 1921, $400,000, and so on.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In 1917 it was $200,000. Here is an increase since that time of $215,000. There are various published reasons for that great growth. One is that which was called to the attention of the American Bankers' Association, a convention of 11,000 bankers meeting in October, that the increase in counterfeiting is due to poorer materials and workmanship in turning out securities, notes, bills, and so forth. The bankers' convention, as I understand it, went on record asking Congress to order a return to the methods of manufacture in use prior to 1917. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether in his estimation that resolution was justified?

Mr. MADDEN. Before the war all the paper money used in the United States was made from linen. During the war we had to go to all cotton. Of course, cotton does not make very good paper money. After the war we were able, first, to go to 25 per cent linen and 75 per cent cotton; then last year we went to 50 per cent linen and 50 per cent cotton. This year we are getting 75 per cent linen and 25 per cent cotton, and next year they hope to go back to all linen. They used cotton because they could not get the linen. Now, if there were any defects it was due to the kind of material of which the paper was made. That is what they tell us. The information which I have received from experts is that the quality of the printing depends mostly on the quality of the engraving of the plate. If the engraving is poor, of course the printing will be poor. If they have a high-class printer he can make a better job of printing from a poor plate than a poor printer would, but as a rule where there is defective printing it is due to the imperfect plates.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Then, in the gentleman's opinion, this $215,000 increase in the appropriation is due to defects in the material?

Mr. MADDEN. No. The gentleman is referring now to counterfeiting?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am referring to the money spent for detecting counterfeiting.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say that the great amount of counterfeiting that has taken place is not due to defective printing but is due to the greater perfection of the art of photography than has heretofore existed. They say there is no danger whatever of counterfeiting the money made on any of these plates as far as defects in the printing is concerned, but it is because of the development in the art of photography that counterfeiting has become more prevalent than it was in the past.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This increase of $215,000 to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers is not made solely on account of the increase in counterfeiting?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is made on account of the increased duties of the Secret Service. They have many other duties besides the enforcement of the law against counterfeiting.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understood that a great part of it was due to the increase in counterfeiting.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I dare say some of it was due to that; but not all of it by any means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to have one minute more in order to answer more fully the questions asked by the gentleman. We had Mr. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service, before our committee, and in the course of his examination Mr. MAGEE asked him this question:

What I had in mind was that ordinarily a man who counterfeits is skillful in the work and he imposes on some innocent person for value received, while in this case, of course, he passes counterfeit money to a violator of the law.

We were talking about prohibition. Mr. Moran made this answer:

With reference to the skillfulness a large percentage of the counterfeit issues of to-day are clearly the work of amateurs. They are not to be compared with the output of the old counterfeiter who hand engraved. The grade is very much cheapened. To-day they do not resort to the old hand-engraved work. You do not find in circulation to-day a hand-engraved piece of work. It is all of the mechanical process.

Mr. MAGEE. And they are counterfeit notes which are more easily detected?

Mr. MORAN. They should be; but for some reason they obtain a ready circulation. I have stated there were two reasons for it, ignorance and carelessness. That practically sums it up.

It is not the engraving which causes the increase in counterfeiting, but the greater perfection in the art of photography.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Of course, thousands of innocent persons are being victimized, and should be protected if we can do it.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but the plate printing has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Since the chairman of the committee made his speech yesterday and called attention to the fact, just as he has done now, that counterfeiting does not follow the use of the power presses, and that as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he and his committee were going to put the public interest above the interest of any organization

employed in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and preluding the President's speech of this morning when he said the same thing, that he was going to put the interest of the public above the interest of any particular organization, we find in to-day's press the following:

ZIHLMAN TO FIGHT ENGRAVING CHANGE—CHAIRMAN OF LABOR COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE SUBSTITUTING POWER FOR HAND PRESSES—PRINTERS ATTACK PROPOSAL—DECLARE TREASURY PLAN WOULD TEND TO INCREASE THE POSSIBILITIES OF COUNTERFEITING.

[Washington Post, Friday, December 8, 1922.]

Lines were drawn for a battle in the House over the provision of the Treasury Department appropriation bill which proposes to substitute power presses for hand presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, thereby reducing the plate printing force by 220 workers.

* * * * * * *

Andrew J. Fallon, president of the plate printers union, and Frank J. Coleman, editor of the Plate Printer, were at the Capitol yesterday urging Members to have the controverted provision referred to the Committee on Printing, so that public hearings may be held.

Then they go on to say the question of preventing counterfeiting and economy is why they want this matter changed. We are not going to be able to escape the real question to-morrow morning when this matter comes up. The paper says that they have our friend from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] prepared to make a point of order against the provision. I do not blame the gentleman from Maryland; he represents their interests. He is their spokesman, carrying out their ideas in asking that this be stricken from the bill. I do not blame him at all. He is doing what they and some of his constituents expect of him.

But I want to say that you can not do it on account of economy. You can not do it on the assertion that it is going to produce more counterfeiting, because the chairman has exploded that idea. He showed yesterday and in his remarks a few minutes ago that Chief Moran, of the Secret Service, and others testified before the committee that the use of power presses could have no effect whatever on the question of counterfeiting. So if we take that action of continuing the use of hand instead of power presses as the representative of these two unions employed in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving have desired, if we do it in accordance with their desire to strike this section out of the bill we are not only making it cost the people of the United States $750,000 more, and ultimately $1,377,000 more annually, as testified before the committee, but we will be doing it simply on the demands of the union as against the interest of the people.

I am a loyal Democrat, I am a partisan Democrat, but I am with the Republican President of the United States in what he said this morning as to the interest of the whole people being paramount to that of any class. These little union bodies down in the bureau have dictated to Congress long enough, and the membership of this Congress ought to rise up and follow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and his committee in adopting the provision in this bill. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For medical examinations, including the amount necessary for the medical inspection of aliens, as required by section 16 of the act of February 5, 1917, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for beneficiaries (other than patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau) of the Public Health Service, and persons detained under the immigration laws and regulations at Ellis Island Immigration Station, including necessary personnel, regular and reserve commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, maintenance, minor repairs, equipment, leases, fuel, lights, water, freight, transportation and travel, maintenance and operation of motor trucks and passenger motor vehicles, transportation, care, maintenance, and treatment of lepers, court costs, and other expenses incident to proceedings heretofore or hereafter taken for commitment of mentally incompetent persons to hospitals for the care and treatment of the insane, and reasonable burial expenses (not exceeding $100 for any patient dying in hospital), $4,869,925: *Provided*, That the Immigration Service shall permit the Public Health Service to use the hospitals at Ellis Island Immigration Station for the care of Public Health Service patients, free of expense for physical upkeep, but with a charge of actual cost for fuel, light, water, telephone, and similar supplies and services, to be covered into the proper Immigration Service appropriations; and moneys collected by the Immigration Service on account of hospital expenses of persons detained under the immigration laws and regulations at Ellis Island Immigration Station shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used for the quarantine service, the prevention of epidemics, or scientific work of the character provided for under the appropriations which follow.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois about this new language, the proviso beginning at line 23 at the bottom of page 38. Will the gentleman explain what the reason is for this legislation?

Mr. MADDEN. We carried this provision in the deficiency bill for 1923, and we did that because when the Veterans' Bureau was transferred to the Public Health Service—that is, the hospital that had been conducted by the Veterans' Bureau—under the order of the President there was a question whether the Public Health Service could use the hospital on Ellis Island. We had then reached the point where we had to decide the question, because by the end of June the Public Health Service would have the responsibility of doing something and they would have no place in which to do it. That is all this does, it gives them the right to use the hospital. They have been doing it all the time. The comptroller decided that they had no right to do it under the law, and we corrected the decision of the comptroller by giving them the right under the law.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman think it ought to be permanent law?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it will be permanent law.

Mr. TILSON. I do not so read it here.

Mr. MADDEN. We did not put such a provision in the bill because we had no authority to do so.

Mr. TILSON. It would be all right unless some one made the point of order against it.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, we can try that next year.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

ELLIS ISLAND.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, press reports from London carry the story that Roland McNeill, undersecretary of foreign affairs, on Wednesday of this week in the House of Commons protested against the treatment of English immigrants at Ellis Island. The statement, in part, reads:

McNeill said conditions there were evidently adapted for persons of a very low standard of living.

Mr. McNeill's chief objection, as I read from the press reports, was based on the fact that the United States Government fails to furnish English immigrants with "separate rooms and bath." It would be well for Mr. McNeill to study with purpose of improvement their own immigrant hotels.

I know that the immigrant station at Ellis Island is ideal in location and general arrangements and sanitation and for its solicitation of the welfare of immigrants.

It might also be well for Mr. McNeill and Great Britain, in their solicitude for their subjects, to see whether or not the British steamship companies separate the British subjects from other foreigners on their way over; whether or not, as is commonly being reported, steamship companies are selling first and second class tickets to immigrants and bringing them over third class. There seems to be no protest of McNeill against these practices, and yet relatives of immigrants complain of this state of affairs.

I can not understand how these particular people can travel from 7 to 14 days in steerage accommodations on the steamships, and do so willingly, and then suddenly develop the most acute culture and sensibilities as soon as the Statue of Liberty comes in view; how they will travel across the ocean with foreigners of all nations and develop the greatest hostility to them on Ellis Island; how they accept the table accommodations and food on the steamship, but object as soon as they enter the well-ventilated, sanitary, and clean dining room at Ellis Island; how they obey willingly the orders shouted at and to them by steamship employees and as soon as they step their foot on Ellis Island become exponents of freedom and resent America's right to make laws for herself and for the protection of American citizens; how, finding the economic conditions so unfavorable in their own country, particularly the million or more unemployed in Great Britain, that they are willing to sell all they possess and come to America and seek to take advantage of our free education, the opportunity to escape class distinction, and immediately, even before permitted to enter this country, begin to abuse it by claiming rights superior to the nationals of other countries.

Congress passed laws to permit them at Ellis Island to apply for admission. The right of admission is determined by showing proper qualifications at Ellis Island, and these qualifications must be determined from an American, not an English, standpoint. Their admissibility should be solved for the benefit of America, not for Europe, or for the foreigners who flock here and whose coming will eventually result in forming, to a great extent, America's policies. The immigration problem is one of the first problems of America.

The effectiveness of the work at Ellis Island is one of the chief factors in determining our country's future. The admission of mentally, morally, or physically unfit into this country, even in small numbers, would, in the future, weaken our Nation and place a huge burden upon generations to come. Millions of dollars each year must now be raised by the various States for the maintenance of foreigners heretofore admitted and now confined in State institutions. The United States must of necessity have a force of intelligent, well-paid, efficient employees at Ellis Island.

I was privileged to visit Ellis Island last week and study the conditions there. Am proud to report that the commissioner of immigration there is Robert E. Tod, who was persuaded through patriotism to accept that position. He is a college graduate, a retired business man. He was enrolled in the United States Navy in March, 1917, and has a war record of which he can be justly proud. He was first appointed naval port officer of Brest, France, and later appointed public works officer for the Navy for the whole of France, and for his service during the war was recommended by General Harries and awarded the Army distinguished-service medal. Mr. Tod received a citation signed by General Pershing for his services to the Army.

Admiral Wilson recommended him for the Navy distinguished-service medal and he was awarded the Navy cross.

Mr. Tod also received the chevalier of the Legion of Honor from the French Government, and also the officier of the Legion of Honor from the French ambassador in Washington. He held the rank of commander on being retired to inactive duty.

I mention this to show the class of man who now is commissioner of Ellis Island. The same spirit of patriotism that caused Mr. Tod to join the Navy during the war also induced him to accept the present position he now holds. Upon accepting the appointment, at his own expense, he went abroad and studied the immigration conditions in Europe, and from investigation I made at Ellis Island I find there is no one devoting so much work and effort for the good of the service at Ellis Island. His assistant, Mr. Landis, is a highly qualified and capable man.

The Public Health Service at Ellis Island is represented by Dr. William C. Billings, who has served for about 25 years as a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service and now holds the rank of major. Assisting him is Doctor Corput, also an experienced physician and surgeon, who has charge of line inspection. The Public Health Service maintains one of the largest and best-equipped hospitals for the benefit of the immigrants and for the protection of the American people at Ellis Island. The hospital is well equipped, maintaining a high standard of professional care and treatment.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. I will yield.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that the accommodations for immigrants at Ellis Island are first class?

Mr. CABLE. Ellis Island, so far as I have ascertained, is the best equipped of any immigration station in the world. Great Britain would do well to use it as a model.

Two steamships came into port at 12.01 the morning of December 1 in order to have their passengers come within the December quota. I was on the island that day. The immigrants were loaded onto barges and transferred to Ellis Island. Here they receive their physical and mental examination through the officials of the Public Health Service and the immigration department. I might add that these officials are all loyal, serving at too low a compensation, but have the interest of the work and of the American people at heart.

Am glad to report that because of the 3 per cent law a more effective and careful examination of these immigrants is now made. Prior to the war their admission to the United States in some years averaged 100,000 a month. The examination was chiefly that of line inspection by the Public Health Service. If the appearance of the immigrant was good, he was given but little further examination. However, the Public Health Service now makes a separate and careful examination of the immigrants seeking admission because the number coming to the island each month is greatly reduced. If the immigrant passed the physical examination, the literacy test, and other requirements, and comes within the quota, he is permitted to land. On the other hand, if the immigrant is held for further examination every facility possible is offered him. For example, there are 17 different organizations represented on Ellis Island, with offices in the buildings there, that look after his needs. Many of the racial groups are represented by individual societies, such as the Italians, Irish, and Hebrew; and by societies representing no racial group, as the National Welfare Catholic Council, which represents the Catholics of every race; the Y. M. C. A.; the Y. W. C. A.; the W. C. T. U.; the Presbyterian Board of Missions; the Congregational Board; the city missions; Bible societies; D. A. R.; and others. These organizations are doing splendid work and the spirit of their cooperation was manifest.

If an immigrant appears to be "clearly and beyond doubt" entitled to admission he passes over to the discharging quarters, where he is turned over to the agent of the authorized transport company or recognized representative. If, on the other hand, the alien does not appear to be clearly entitled to be admitted, he must appear before one of the several boards of special inquiry, which goes into his case deliberately and thoroughly, giving him the right to appear and produce witnesses and testimony in his behalf. If the board of special inquiry holds against him, he then has the right of appeal from the decision of the board, in cases provided by the statute, to the Secretary of Labor, whose decision is final.

America to-day is no longer the melting pot of the world. In the earlier history of our country people of northern Europe came here because there was free land and homesteads upon which they could settle and remain as citizens of this country. Gradually, as this free land became exhausted, the class of immigration changed, larger numbers coming from southern Europe, congregating in the large cities and where the population was dense. They did not forget their old customs or language or their country itself. Of the 14,000,000 foreign born in the United States less than half are now American citizens. Seven hundred newspapers and magazines are to-day printed in foreign languages and being read by hundreds of thousands of these people. What America needs to-day is not additional immigration so much as that those who are now here, being protected by our laws and obtaining the privileges and benefits of our country, should themselves become American citizens.

Immigration to the United States should not be based upon numbers, but rather quality—and quality can not be determined entirely by the 3 per cent restrictive immigration law. The law permits a more thorough examination of those within the quota, however. The quality of the immigrant can best be determined by the intelligence test, now applied by the Public Health Service at Ellis Island in a limited number of cases. This test is not a theory; neither is it a new proposition. It was used by our Army in the recent war. Robert M. Yerkes, lieutenant colonel, United States Army, and one of the world's foremost psychologists, had charge of these examinations. They were given to our soldiers to determine their qualifications for various duties during the World War. The results were accurate and in agreement with the experiences of the officers. Thus the men were placed in positions where they were best qualified to serve. The tests were given to the soldiers in groups and consumed not to exceed an hour or two of time. The commanding officers were given the results, which would have taken six months to learn in ordinary routine of drills. So also by these intelligence tests were the officers selected from the various training camps of our country. The intelligence rating was useful in indicating the man's probable value in the service, and the records of many of these soldiers and officers during the war substantiate the accuracy of the tests.

If the intelligence test could be applied to all foreign born, either abroad or when they reach this country, the undesirable would not be able to pass our inspectors and could be detected and debarred. If these tests were made in the Army with results that were confirmed by actual record, why, with restricted immigration, can not these tests be applied to those who seek to enter this country? A broad line of demarcation could be established between those who should be debarred and those who should be admitted to this country. It is my firm belief that such intelligence tests will provide the only remedy toward the elimination of the criminal and the undesirable from the ranks of the immigrants seeking admission into the United States, and that it is the true rule of determining what additional immigrants should come here.

The immigration problem is one of vital interest to the American people. The United States stands for what, in its judgment, is the highest and best civilization in the world. Surely the United States Congress, rather than the British Parliament, has the right to determine who shall be admitted and the method and manner of such admissions to our country.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field investigations: For investigations of diseases of man and conditions influencing the propagation and spread thereof, including sanitation and sewage, and the pollution of navigable streams and lakes of the United States, including personal service, $279,480.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question with respect to the pollution of waters. There has been a great deal of pollution of the waters in my district from ships that are carrying oil either as cargo or as fuel, and also because of the cleaning out of their engine rooms. Does the appropriation here include investigation of that sort of pollution of waters, or does it apply only to the pollution due to sewage and matters directly pertaining to the public health?

Mr. MADDEN. This applies to all waters used for human purposes. It applies to waters used on trains and to waters in rivers that may be polluted by sewage where the public health may be affected.

Mr. HICKS. I do not know whether or not the dumping of oil into a navigable stream would be considered detrimental to health, but it is detrimental to property. Does this investigation apply only to matters appertaining to health?

Mr. MADDEN. To health only, and the question about which the gentleman speaks is under consideration by the Engineer Corps of the Army.

Mr. HICKS. And entirely separate from this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural sanitation: For special studies of and demonstration work in rural sanitation, including personal services, and including not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $50,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for demonstration work in rural sanitation in any community unless the State, county, or municipality in which the community is located agrees to pay one-half the expenses of such demonstration work.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROACH: Page 40, line 21, after the word "vehicles," strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the committee to the importance of rural sanitation, where it has been carried on under the appropriations heretofore made, and to express my belief that the appropriation carried in this bill is wholly inadequate to successfully carry on the splendid work which has been done during the past several years under this heading. Is it not true that the Department of Health and the Treasury Department concurred in the recommendation for this item of $150,000, I will ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. MADDEN. The Budget recommended $50,000 to the committee.

Mr. ROACH. I am not asking about the Budget.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not know about anything except that which comes to us.

Mr. ROACH. It has been my information, since the chairman of the committee does not seem inclined to answer the question——

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no; I want to answer the question. I simply say that we do not know anything about anything except that which comes to us.

Mr. ROACH. It is my information that the Health and the Treasury Departments have agreed on the recommendation of $150,000 for carrying on the rural sanitation work; that they conceived that to be the irreducible minimum to effectively and successfully carry on the work under way, and that estimate has been reduced by the Budget to the amount carried in this bill of $50,000. I invite the attention of the committee to the fact that in a large number of States this work has been economically and satisfactorily carried on. It will be observed that this bill has a limitation that the appropriation is available only to States which match it with a similar appropriation. I want to refer particularly to my own State of Missouri. The State legislature and the municipalities, together with other ways of raising revenue, not only matched the appropriation last year but cooperated on an average of 10 to 1 or more. Calling attention to the specific figures, the Federal appropriation for the State of Missouri was $7,245, while we raised $16,301.31, and I believe if gentlemen will refer to the table summitted by the Health Department, on page 426 of the hearings, they will find that their States generally averaged about the same. In the limited time I have, I have not time to discuss the value of this work, but I want to emphasize it and express the hope that the many States now engaged in this particular work, taking the benefits of this Federal appropriation, will assist in raising this appropriation up to the irreducible minimum called for by the Health Department. My amendment proposes to increase the amount to $100,000. I appreciate that there are some reductions being made in this bill, but I am not willing to have it all taken off the rural sanitation appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROACH] is a very attractive talker, and I am sure that he is very deeply interested in the subject of rural sanitation. I think his State displayed a very great deal of activity, and certainly a lot of influence, if it succeeded in getting seven thousand and odd dollars out of the $50,000 appropriated for rural sanitation last year.

Mr. ROACH. But that is less than the amount that a number of States obtained; for instance, Illinois, the gentleman's own State.

Mr. MADDEN. You could not get very much out of $50,000. That is all there was for the whole country, and this appropriation is not made to be allotted to the States, and it is not allotted to the States. The limitation placed on the appropriation is to the effect that the demonstration work made by the Public Health Service in any particular case shall not be made except where the community pays half the expense of the demonstration. There is no allotment. It has never been intended that the Public Health Service should do all of this rural sanitation work, because that is a local function. What the Health Service does is, as far as it can, to educate by circular, demonstration, and in other ways the local communities as to what is best to be done. Let me give an example. In Virginia not long since in one of the counties where the sanitation was not very good there was a good deal of typhoid. One of the young doctors of the department went down there and met the people in the township where the typhoid existed. He delivered a lecture and they were very much pleased with the lecture. He then told the people of the community that he was going before the board of supervisors to ask them to make an appropriation to cover the needs of the community, and asked them to appear there on that day. He made his speech before the board of supervisors and thought he had convinced them.

The people who came from the district where he had made the speech two or three nights before antagonized the work that the Public Health Service man was proposing, because they said they did not want these dudes coming down from the Public Health Service telling them how they should spend their money. After the meeting was all over he persuaded them to have another meeting with him and let him make a few demonstrations. They held the meeting and he proved to them what could be done, and at the end of the year he was able, through their own efforts under his direction, to almost eradicate the typhoid. But there was not any money of any consequence spent out of the Federal Treasury for that purpose. That was spent by the local community. The $50,000 is all the money we need for the kind of work to be done in respect to rural sanitation through the Public Health Service. The Public Health Service is not proposing to spend the money for sanitation. They are really writing circulars in most cases and delivering lectures in others.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not advised as to the particular kind of work done by the Public Health Service under this appropriation, but it strikes me that there must be duplication along these lines and similar lines.

For many years there have been appropriations carried in agricultural bills to enable the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture to advise and suggest along these very lines.

Mr. MADDEN. These, of course, are scientific—that is, they are doctors—and they know a little more about certain things on certain lines.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is supposed men who go out from any department are competent to speak of the work they are sent out to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hope that members of the committee who are present will give their serious and favorable consideration to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Missouri to increase this appropriation from $50,000 to $100,000. I happen to be in a position where I can testify to the invaluable services which are being rendered to the rural populations of the country by the activities of this rural sanitation division of the Public Health Service. I represent, I believe, a rather typical agricultural country in the South, with a number of mining communities that have no adequate health facilities, and a few years ago in the operation of these activities the department sent a number of its staff down there, some three or four physicians, experts on sanitation, and they made a thorough and complete survey of the entire county in which I reside. The mortality of that county, on account of the ravages of typhoid fever and other preventable diseases, had been very heavy. After this survey and actual consideration by these representatives of the rural sanitation division the mortality from these same complaints the succeeding year after their visit was reduced to a negligible ratio. And we, of course, naturally attributed that fine result purely and solely to the activities of those representatives. It is a rather amazing thing to me that we will sit here and deliberately vote millions and tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars for purposes of destruction in certain events for our Army and Navy, but when it comes to the question of undertaking to conserve the lives of the people of America, especially those who need it

most—those sections where they are deprived of the benefits of active medical societies and eleemosynary institutions for the prevention of those diseases—that we cut the appropriation to the very lowest minimum.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Why are the people in those communities depriving themselves of this kind of service? Do they have no interest in regard to the appropriation of money to look after their own people?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, I know that is an old argument of the gentleman from Michigan; but I tell him that the purpose for which this service is established, as justified by the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the committee, is not to undertake the performance of a purely local function in relation to the conservation of health, but that the Federal Government should occupy the position of stimulation and leadership as far as possible with a reasonable degree of expenditure, not only by literature and lectures but by the personal visitation of these experts themselves, and that is where the actual benefit comes in. The gentleman talks about why should the Government take charge of these activities, and he is a member of the Committee on Agriculture. Why is it we appropriate money for farm demonstration work? That is on a parity with this same proposition.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman make that statement on the theory that this is a cut?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do it on the theory that you have not given these people as much money as they need.

Mr. MADDEN. All they asked.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Oh, no; you have not. That is where the distinguished gentleman is in error. He gives what the Budget said they ought to have; that is all.

Mr. MADDEN. We had these very people before us.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman assert that the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and the Chief of the Bureau of Rural Sanitation have only recommended an appropriation of $50,000?

Mr. MADDEN. They have not asked us for any more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did you have a hearing, and did they appear?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is not my information. My information is that in their report made to the Director of the Budget—the information which comes to me and what I rely upon is from an absolutely and entirely reliable source—they say they ought to have at least $200,000 as a minimum.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman believe in giving every bureau just exactly what they ask?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not, and I have voted consistently to slash a great many appropriations, but I am very confident that this one ought to be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 12, noes 22.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and contingent expenses, $1,000.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMSON: Page 45, after line 2, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., ASSAY OFFICE.

Salaries: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,800; assistant assayer, $1,200; in all, $3,000.
For wages of workmen and other employees, $1,000.
For incidental expenses, $300.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes if necessary. I think I can finish in less time than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I am inclined to think that the Deadwood assay office was left out of the Treasury appropriation bill now under consideration by the Appropriations Committee by reason of their not realizing fully the importance of maintaining this office. I observe from the hearings in connection with the Deadwood assay office that the only testimony with reference to whether it should or should not be retained is that offered by Miss O'Reilly, who, I understand, is an employee in the office of the Director of the Mint, in which she testified that only 10 deposits had been made during the past year in the Deadwood office. The truth of the matter is that this has very little to do with the question of whether an office should or should not be retained. The value of the office is to be measured by the services which it renders to the community in which it is located.

The Black Hills section is one of the richest mining regions in the United States, the production of gold alone during the past 20 years averaging close to $7,000,000 annually. The production of silver, while not large, amounts on an average to at least $100,000 a year. Various other metals and ores are also mined in the hills. There are a good many prospectors and small mining companies to whom the assay office is very essential in order to permit them to conduct their operations in any satisfactory manner. The prospectors can ill afford to send their samples away for assaying, and to discontinue this office is to discourage the revival of mining, which is now taking place in the Black Hills.

The income of the office, while not large, is greater than that of a number of the offices which are being retained in the bill, so there is no justification on that score for discontinuing the office. The value and utility of the office should be measured primarily by the number of assays made during the year, which, in the case of the Deadwood office for the year 1922, was 1,194 for the precious metals and 136 for the base metals, making a total of 1,330.

As the Members of the House know, the Black Hills region in South Dakota is one of the most important mining regions in the United States. The bullion produced within 6 miles of the Deadwood office amounts to around $8,000,000 annually. It is the only commercial assay office in that territory, and if it is discontinued prospectors will have to send their ores to Denver, Colo., many hundred miles away, causing great inconvenience, expense, and delay.

For the information of the membership permit me to read a telegram, under date of December 6, which was sent to me by the assayer in charge in response to an inquiry which I made for data:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., *December 6, 1922.*

Hon. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Bullion valued at $8,000,000 originating within 6 miles of this office is diverted by operation of Pittman Act. No commercial assay office nearer than Denver serving this territory if Deadwood office is closed. Deadwood office made during fiscal year 1922, 1,194 precious-metal and 136 base-metal assays. Mining industry here hard hit by present high cost of supplies, but one new property now started operating and two buildings insure double activity. While office does not directly show profit, it is big advantage to community at large. Appropriation less than for current year would be inadequate.

H. H. STEWART, *Assayer in Charge.*

The importance of the Deadwood assay office is not necessarily determined by the number of deposits received. At this office, according to the testimony, there were only 10 deposits of bullion made during the year 1922. If correct, this, of course, is a small number, but the fact of the matter is that the Pittman Act has diverted the silver and other bullion to the mints at Denver, New York, and elsewhere by reason of the fact that the local office can only pay the market price for silver, which at the present time is only 65 cents on the dollar, while the mints are authorized to pay $1 an ounce for the silver.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman has made reference to the Pittman Act as affecting this office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. I desire to ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the Pittman Act will expire in the near future by reason of its own provisions?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes. I called up the Director of the Mint this morning and he said that the act would expire by virtue of its own provisions in about 15 months, perhaps less. By the end of that time, at the present rate of purchase, all the silver bullion permissible under its terms will have been bought.

Mr. RHODES. Well, if that is true, then will the amount of work to be done by this office be necessarily increased or diminished?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is not any question but that it will be greatly increased, as it will then resume the purchase of silver upon the same terms as the mints. Being more accessible, the smaller operators will naturally patronize it.

Another thing to which I want to direct the attention of the House is the fact that there has been a considerable revival of mining activities in that region in the past year, and it is stated by those who are in position to know that the work of this office will be at least doubled during the next fiscal year. I think that in fairness to that district and for the encouragement of mining this office ought to be maintained.

Let me read another telegram here, from the Gold Feather Mining Co., which I received on November 7. It says:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., *December 7, 1922.*

Representative WM. WILLIAMSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

We have invested a large amount of money in mine, and need mill in the Black Hills, which we are operating. It would work hardship on us and other mining companies to have the United States assay office abolished as it is the only assay office in this part of the country.

GOLD FEATHER MINING CO.

I have the same sort of a telegram, somewhat longer, from the Cutting Mining Co., which is as follows:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., *December 6, 1922.*

Hon. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Mining industry, which is again coming to front, needs the Deadwood assay office. No commercial assay office closer than Denver. New mining companies now starting will increase business of this office several times. Closing of the office would be a severe blow to the mining industry, which has been so hard hit during the past few years and now just getting back on its feet. Our company now building oil flotation mill on property adjoining Homestake mine and on which we have spent $175,000.

CUTTING MINING CO.,
BURT ROGERS,
General Manager.

Other telegrams received read as follows:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., *December 6, 1922.*

Hon. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

It is felt in view of the fact that mining activities are reviving in this section the Deadwood assay office should be retained. To close it at this time would be discouraging to the revival of the mining industry.

DEADWOOD BUSINESS CLUB.

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., *December 6, 1922.*

Hon. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Strongly urge Deadwood assay office be retained. Is only commercial assay office nearer than Denver. Its loss would work hardship properties now operating and new ones starting. Estimated next year's business double this. While Deadwood office may show loss, this more than offset by benefit to mining industry, which bound to come back again here if every encouragement given.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK.

I hope the chairman will not oppose the reinstatement of this appropriation in the appropriation bill this year.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending the elimination of this office was based on the statement of the Director of the Mint. It was said that there were only 10 deposits in this assay office; that the value of the gold and silver was only $3,286; the income of the office was only $566, and the expenses $5,557.

Now, of course, $8,000,000 of the silver bullion from the Homestead mine goes to other places, on account of the price of silver, under the Pittman Act. The Pittman Act expires, however, in about another year.

I asked the representative of the mint who appeared before the committee if there was any likelihood of any improvement in the value of the office, and she said "No." I asked if she thought the office ought to be abolished, and she said the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that. I asked her if she thought there was any sense in keeping the office open, and she said she did not want to say that. I said, "Put it any way you like," and she finally said, "I think the business of the Deadwood office has diminished considerably." Then I said, "You know that, do you not? Do you recommend the continuation of the office in the face of the fact that there were only 10 deposits? I realise that you do not control the policy, but your judgment is good." She said, "I would recommend the closing of the office, but I think I am in a rather awkward position in recommending the closing of the office." I said, "If this is closed up, where would these deposits go?" She said, "They would probably be diverted to Denver or New York." Then I asked her what the amount of business was there? Then I asked:

What is the cause of the diminution of the business there?

The reply was:

The Homestake Mining Co., which previously supplied a large part of the business to this office, gave it most of its business, is now sending its deposits directly to New York—

And so on.

Mr. LONDON. What deposits are referred to?

Mr. MADDEN. Deposits of ore—minerals.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether or not the business done by the other mints showed any falling off during the past year as compared with former years? And I wish to supplement that question by asking, further, if it is not also a fact that there has been considerable inactivity in the mining business generally throughout the country during the past two or three years because of the general depression of business?

Mr. MADDEN. The Philadelphia Mint had 28,331 deposits; San Francisco, 23,449; Denver, 14,095; New York, 18,748; New Orleans, 456; Carson City, 241; Boise, 527; Helena, 357; Deadwood, 10; Seattle, 1,302; Salt Lake, 106. I do not know how the number compares with the previous year.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does not the gentleman recognize the fact that the value of an assay office is not to be measured necessarily by the number of deposits? They simply deposit the bullion for sale and purchase; but the fact of the matter is that the value of an assay office lies in the assays made.

The usefulness of the office is in making assays for prospectors and miners. They have made over 1,300 assays during the past year, and the income of the office is larger than that of any other office which was mentioned.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Larger than any other outside of Philadelphia.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say that the income has nothing to do with the value of the office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. That is true.

Mr. MADDEN. My attitude toward this is not based on the income, because the Director of the Mint says the income has nothing whatever to do with the importance of the office, and he says the assay offices are not organized for the purpose of making revenue, but they are organized in order to accommodate the mining interests of the community, and that whatever assaying they do in the way of commercial work for which they charge is aside from the importance of the office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I do not think the deposits from bullion there for sale are of any importance at all. At least that has been my experience, and I have lived in a mining region most of my life.

Mr. MADDEN. I would not want to do any injustice to the people out there.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The value of the office lies in the fact that it takes care of the small prospectors and miners.

Mr. MADDEN. If we have made any mistake I would be very sorry, because I do not want to injure the community.

Mr. TILSON. Is it not a fact that the deposits of bullion are small because of the provision that when the bullion is brought to the mint it may be coined and the amount of coin returned to the owner of the bullion?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes; that is exactly why it has been diverted.

Mr. TILSON. Whereas if it was for sale it would have to be sold for its intrinsic value?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMSON) there were—ayes 9, noes 10.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I call for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota demands tellers.

Tellers were refused, not a sufficient number rising to second the demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Remodeling, etc., public buildings: For remodeling, enlarging, and extending completed and occupied public buildings, including any necessary and incidental additions to or changes in mechanical equipment thereof, so as to provide or make available additional space in emergent cases, not to exceed an aggregate of $20,000 at any one building, $375,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the amount asked by the Treasury for this purpose was $500,000 and that the amount was cut to $375,000 by the Bureau of the Budget. The hearing is at page 576. The Chairman of the committee is very familiar, probably as familiar as anybody in the House or almost anybody in the United States, with the conditions in reference to this matter.

The post-office buildings of the United States were not built with a view to carrying on the parcel-post business. They were constructed before we took on the parcel-post business, and they are inadequate and have not sufficient space. It is estimated that a given number of feet should be allowed to each employee, but in almost all of the cities which have grown to any considerable extent the buildings have a very much smaller amount of space than is considered necessary for the health of the employees and for the proper dispatch of business. In the case of any city that has grown the parcel-post business to-day is larger than all of the other postal business combined and takes more space. It is not simply a question of lack of space, but the buildings were not constructed with reference to the doing of a parcel-post business. They have not the facilities of equipment to do the business efficiently. Some of the post offices with which I am familiar attempt to do their parcel-post business by bringing the parcels in and letting them down to the basement, then elevating them back to the first floor and doing the business piecemeal in that way, by several operations, where it could be done by one operation if it were possible to make the building adequate and proper for the transaction of the business.

Take the business at the city of Niagara Falls in my district. That city has grown within a very short time from 3,000 people to 60,000 people. The postal facilities are absolutely inadequate, and it is costing two or three times what it would cost to do the business if they could have an enlargement of the building. The Treasury Department has been promising us throughout the past year that they would enlarge the building and remodel it so that that business could be done expeditiously and economically, but we are not reached because they say that the appropriation is so small, and they have so many listed ahead of us that it is utterly impossible for them to do the remodeling which is absolutely necessary.

The same condition applies in a very much larger way in the city of Buffalo. The same condition applies in the city of Lockport.

Take another instance. In the city of Niagara Falls, which, as I say, has grown from 3,000 people to 60,000 people, we have a very large customhouse business. When the new post office was built we transferred the customhouse from the customhouse building to the post office.

The old customhouse building was discontinued, and now the post office is utterly unable to accommodate its own business, and much less can it furnish facilities for the transaction of the customhouse business. It is absolutely necessary that the old customhouse should be remodeled, and yet there are no funds with which to do it, and the Treasury Department says there are 40 buildings ahead of us and we can not hope to be reached until all of the prior demands have been met.

Take another instance in my own district. At Buffalo we have the old post office that was occupied before the new one was built. The old post office has not been used for many years. It could be utilized for the parcel-post business. The building itself, the new building, needs to be remodeled, and yet we are unable to get anything done. There are four instances of the need of remodeling and enlarging in one congressional district.

If the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations please, I want to be in accord with him on all of these matters as far as I can, but it does seem to me that the Government will save money, will save two or three dollars to each dollar of business done if the appropriation is made adequate so that the buildings may be remodeled and meet the parcel-post business which has sprung up and grown to such a splendid magnitude that it has become the most important branch of the post-office business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that we should recognize the fact that these public buildings were constructed without any idea at all of the doing of this parcel-post business. The business has come into existence since they were planned; they were planned only with reference to the business that existed at the time they were constructed. Now they are utterly inadequate for this greatly increased business.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman see where that would land us? Instead of attempting to make over every post office, does not he think we ought to enter on a different policy and go to the center, the railroad center, to the union station if there is one, and there acquire quarters for the parcel-post business and separate it from the strictly postal matters. Would not that be a better policy than to enlarge all the post offices to accommodate the parcel-post business? If you started on a policy of enlarging all the post offices to accommodate the parcel-post business, there is no telling what the magnitude of this public building bill would be.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I appreciate the importance and the practical effect of the gentleman's suggestion, and I think we should do both. Take the two offices that I have already referred to, that of Niagara Falls and at Lockport, and I know from practical observation the business they are doing and how they are doing it. The increased business could be accommodated by a slight change costing $20,000 or $25,000. It would be unnecessary to go to the railroad and acquire new quarters and spend $125,000 or $150,000. On the other hand, take the city of Buffalo, which is partly in my district. There the gentleman's suggestion would be a proper suggestion and a thing that should be done. But because this should be done in the way the gentleman suggests in the large centers, we should not make it impossible to supply the great need of the small post offices in the small centers, which can be done, and that is contemplated by just the kind of appropriation that we now have under consideration. This appropriation was designed for the remodeling necessary in all the small places. It was designed for remodeling on a small scale in larger places also. But that would not answer in the large and congested centers. But because the increase of this appropriation would not answer every place in the United States, because it would not answer the largest cities, is no reason why we should not increase it to a reasonable amount, so that in the smaller centers, where it can be utilized and bring relief, the relief should be extended. As I say, if the gentleman has any small towns in his district where they absolutely need the relief, and if he has any small towns he will find they do need it, to remodel and increase the facilities and make it economical as well as expeditious in handling the parcel-post matters, he will find that he can not get it done now, and the only way to see that it is done is to have this appropriation greatly increased.

Mr. ROACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. ROACH. The same conditions relating to the larger post offices in the gentleman's district prevail in a large number of smaller post offices in my district.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It prevails in all the post offices of the United States where they do any considerable parcel-post business.

Mr. ROACH. That is true.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman goes to the Treasury Department, he will find not only that the appropriation is inadequate but he will find that the appropriation is so small that they do not have enough draftsmen, they do not have enough architects, they do not have enough men to prepare the plans so that any adequate amount of work can be done in a given year.

Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk an amendment to page 48, line 11, to strike out "$375,000" and insert "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. DEMPSEY: Page 48, line 11, strike out "$375,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] desires to increase this fund in order to add to post offices which are already in existence where the people have had some measure of relief, whereas we are denied the opportunity to get any post-office buildings, at least up to this time and for many years, where we need them and have not any at all. In the town of Lancaster, for instance, in my district, provision was made for a post office in 1913. In 1915 they acquired the site, the appropriation having been made. It is there, a blank site to-day. In 1916 they undertook to get the building constructed and to let the contract. On account of the increased cost of everything, resultant from war conditions, the appropriation

lacked $19,000 of being enough to get the post office constructed. Therefore they could not let the contract, because the lowest bid exceeded the appropriation. It has stood in that way up to this time. The Supervising Architect of the Treasury has recommended the appropriation of the $19,000 necessary every time there has been a public building bill before the Public Building Committee, and it has been put in every bill reported by that committee, but no bill has been allowed to pass, and there are about 100 towns in the same fix as Lancaster. To now increase the appropriations for the extension of these buildings where they already have them is an injustice, and I am in favor of holding everybody down tight until the roseate promises of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] a short time before election, that they were going to give all of us a public building, that there would be a post office in every primary town in the United States, are fulfilled to a certain extent, and some of us who have nothing will get something.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman know whether any effort has been made since 1916 to get a bid at Lancaster?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. They have asked for bids within the last 12 months, and still they do not get a bid that will come within the appropriation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But the cost is less now than then.

Mr. STEVENSON. That may be possible, but I do not think so. The Supervising Architect informs me, on the other hand, that things are swinging up instead of down.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The people in the smaller cities, I take it, have ceased to expect the same kind of service and treatment that the people receive in the larger cities. In that connection let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in his cities and in mine the Post Office Department will not deliver mail unless people put out boxes, but in the city of Washington the people get their mail whether they put up the boxes or not.

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not want to get off this subject, and that is the subject that these people who already have post offices, in so far as I am concerned, are going to have to get along with them as they are until some effort is made to give the people who have no post office and who have been promised one, and for which legislation has been enacted providing for them, the necessary appropriations to build them. I think it is high time that this committee should be sustained, and we should put every check we can on the increase of this appropriation and hold it down to the very limit of that repair which is necessary for the efficient administration of the affairs of the post office where it is absolutely necessary to do it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up much time, but it would be folly, it seems to me, to make a larger appropriation than we propose for this work. In order to make an intelligent appropriation to cover the needs of the country we would have to make a very careful investigation. That investigation would require the time of a lot of experts. When we reported the parcel post act to the House I was a member of the committee who made the report, and I said then that if this activity were going to be entered upon by a private concern it would first provide the facilities, but inasmuch as it was going to be entered upon by the Government the Government would start the business first and then take its chances on the facilities later. The Government has been taking its chances on them for some time and has not gotten them yet. This appropriation here ought not to be increased at this time. To do the things that are required to be done throughout the country, such as those alluded to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], it would take $10,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think it would.

Mr. MADDEN. Ninety-eight buildings have been remodeled out of this appropriation during the last year.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Does this involve the extension or enlargement of a building?

Mr. MADDEN. It would authorize them to enlarge or remodel.

Mr. BOX. Can that be done without legislative authorization?

Mr. MADDEN. This authority has existed for a long time, but it ought not to be made on any very extensive scale, and so we do not appropriate money except to do the urgent, needful thing, and anything other than the urgent, needful thing for the time being should be authorized by law.

Mr. BOX. Would it not be a possible thing under the system of appropriation such as this to carry forward an extensive line of building at larger places where——

Mr. MADDEN. It would not be justified.

Mr. BOX. But where it is possible.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. In Amarillo, Tex., they built a mail shed that cost thirty-one hundred and odd dollars, and at Appleton, Wis., they built a mezzanine floor that cost $1,817. That is the kind of work they do. At Atlanta they built a mezzanine floor and storehouse for $2,856, and at Baltimore a mezzanine floor for $1,198, and so forth, and new partitions to provide rooms for the courts—a few things like that. That is what this appropriation is intended to do.

Mr. BOX. There is legislative authority for it?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; and it ought not to be extended beyond that.

Mr. STEVENSON. I see it is limited to $20,000 in any one building.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Can the gentleman add anything to the information which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] gave us in the last session touching the passage of a public building bill?

Mr. MADDEN. The latest information I have on the subject is an interview purporting to have come from the President, in one of the newspapers, and it would seem from that interview that he is very much opposed to what the gentleman from Kentucky wants.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would say in answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] that at Niagara Falls they propose to utilize what is now an open veranda, cover it in, and make it a room for the parcel-post business. That is an illustration of the kind of work they do.

And at Lockport they propose to fix up the basement so it will be a proper and adequate place in which to handle the parcel-post business.

Mr. BOX. What does the gentleman have in mind when he offers an amendment to enlarge and make additions?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It will not make additions on a larger scale, as the gentleman from Illinois well says. We would probably need at least $10,000,000 to do this work. The amount suggested in the bill is $375,000 and the amount asked for in the amendment is $500,000, and it is simply a small addition, so that the crying needs, where the work is the most congested, where it is hardest for the post-office employees, where it is costing two or three dollars for everyone because of the inconvenience, things like that are proposed to be met.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope there will not be anything added to the committee recommendation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It seems to me we ought to have a reasonable number here to vote on a question of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words for the purpose of asking a question or two. There are two or three items here in which I am greatly interested. For instance, Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, extension of lookout system, $15,000; Buffalo, N. Y., post office, for extension of lookout system, $3,500; Philadelphia, Pa., and Pottsville, Pa., for extension of lookout system. From the gentleman's experience not only as a member of the Committee on Appropriations but from his long experience in connection with postal affairs I would just like a brief discussion——

Mr. MADDEN. A lookout system——

Mr. KETCHAM. I know what they are, but I wanted to know whether or not as a general policy he favors them.

Mr. MADDEN. In some of the buildings they have built mezzanine floors, some of those I referred to a few moments ago. In building mezzanine floors they shut the outlook away so that the inspector can not see the employees.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The employees can not see the inspector; it is just the other way.

Mr. MADDEN. No; they have shut out by the construction of the mezzanine floors all opportunity for the utilization of the lookouts.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I see what the gentleman had in mind.

Mr. MADDEN. Now they have to build lookouts, and it is very important.

Mr. KETCHAM. I understand, of course, the use of the lookout system; but what I wanted the gentleman's judgment upon was whether or not, in this day of advancement and en-

lightenment, as a general policy he thinks this ought to be inaugurated in public buildings, and whether or not they are absolutely essential as a part——

Mr. MADDEN. They only caught 56 people at one time who were stealing the mails.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is not the result of the lookout.

Mr. MADDEN. It was; 56 of them, and 50 pleaded guilty and signed a confession after they caught them, and that was only one case. You have got to have them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think I know the circumstances to which the gentleman from Illinois refers, and I am quite satisfied if there had been the lookout system there it never would have happened. A number of young men who never before had been charged with any crime had got into loose ways and got to think that no attention was being paid to what they were doing, and they got into serious trouble, which, in my judgment, never would have happened if there had been lookouts there.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public buildings, repairs, equipment, and general expenses.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois does not expect to finish the bill to-night?

Mr. MADDEN. I want to finish the reading and have nothing left except the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will there be anything else taken up to-morrow except this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know what the plans are.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection to running on.

Mr. MADDEN. If there is anything, it will be debate on the Departments of State and Justice bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There is no objection on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that where changes have been made by amendments the Clerk will be authorized to change the totals to conform therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13180 had come to no resolution thereon.

CONSOLIDATING THE WORK OF COLLECTING STATISTICS, ETC.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday we passed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar the bill S. 3295, an act to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and so forth, statistics of foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

Since then the House has been advised that the Senate has disagreed to the amendments of the House and asked for a conference. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from Iowa conferred with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] touching this matter?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not with reference to this request, but I feel quite sure that he would have no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I shall be very glad if the gentleman will withhold it until the morning.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. No; I withdraw that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. CULLEN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for an indefinite period, on account of sickness in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the amendments I offered to the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman going after the President?

Mr. KETCHAM. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 9, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

799. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

800. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, documents, etc., now in the files of this office which are not needed in the transaction of public business; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

801. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of channel from Old Point to Newport News, Va., with a view to securing increased width and depth (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

802. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal years 1921 and 1922, amounting in all to $1,417,788.08 (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

803. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a draft of proposed legislation extending and making available until December 31, 1923, the appropriation of $150,000 contained in the first deficiency appropriation act, fiscal year 1922, approved December 15, 1921, for the prevention of loss of timber from infestations on public lands in Oregon and California (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

804. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for settlement of claims for damages in favor of certain steamship companies occasioned by collisions for which the vessels of the Lighthouse Service are responsible, payment of which is authorized under section 4 of the act of June 17, 1910 (36 Stat., 537), $653.16 (H. Doc. No. 489); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

805. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for the acquisition of real estate as authorized by the act approved September 22, 1922, $769,000 (H. Doc. No. 490); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

806. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for the payment of the balance due on the award resulting from the condemnation by the Government of additional land for the National Zoological Park under the provisions of certain acts of Congress, $3,096.34 (H. Doc. No. 491); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

807. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for improving the United States Botanic Garden, $39,400 (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11930) granting a pension to James J. Healy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. A. P. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 13268) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense, and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war; to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war; and to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13269) to permit the admission into the United States of refugees from Turkish territories; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 13270) to provide rural credits facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURTNESS: A bill (H. R. 13271) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 13272) granting a license to the city of Miami Beach, Fla., to construct a drain for sewage across certain Government lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HICKS: A resolution (H. Res. 463) for the immediate consideration of H. R. 13238, for the construction of additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13273) granting a pension to Etta E. Divine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13274) granting a pension to John W. Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13275) granting a pension to Rhoda M. Edmondson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 13276) granting a pension to William J. Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13277) granting a pension to Lucretia Bernard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: A bill (H. R. 13278) granting a pension to Herman F. E. Schroer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 13279) granting a pension to Charles Howard Pinckney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 13280) granting a pension to Joseph D. Emerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13281) granting an increase of pension to Julia Esther Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 13282) granting a pension to Elizabeth Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13283) granting a pension to Jennie F. Cruise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13284) granting a pension to Pearl Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13285) granting a pension to William M. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R 13286) granting a pension to George W. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13287) granting an increase of pension to William F. Gross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13288) granting a pension to Lillie Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13289) granting a pension to James H. Buckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 13290) granting a pension to Arthur R. Blakeslee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 13291) granting an increase of pension to James R. Burroughs; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6554. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the American Indian Rights Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the Bursum Indian land bill; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6555. Also, petition of the city council of Pittsburgh, Pa., asking for the regulation of the price of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6556. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Religious Liberty Association, 239 citizens, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6557. By Mr. OGDEN: Petition of J. Temple Robinson and others, of Louisville, Ky., favoring removal of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *December 9, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. May it be hallowed in our thoughts, in our speech, in our action. Grant unto us such a consciousness of duty that it may be with the realization of Thy presence and oversight in the performance of every act of service. And so help us, our Father, to live for Thee, for the best interests of our land, and to the glory of Thy name. Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

FURNIFOLD M. SIMMONS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, appeared in his seat to-day.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary, George A. Sanderson, read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1922.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GEORGE H. MOSES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MOSES thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR LODGE.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a communication from the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certifying to the election of HENRY CABOT LODGE as a Senator of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1923.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The credentials will be received and placed on file.

The credentials were ordered to be filed, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the President of the Senate of the United States, Greeting:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1922, HENRY CABOT LODGE was duly chosen by the qualified voters of said Commonwealth a Senator, to represent said Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years commencing on the 4th day of March, A. D., 1923.

Witness, his excellency, Channing H. Cox, our governor, and our great seal, hereunto affixed, at Boston, this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-seventh.

[SEAL.] CHANNING H. COX, *Governor.*

By his excellency, the Governor:

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department, not needed in the conduct of business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALL and Mr. TRAMMELL members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the eighteenth annual convention of the National Farmers' Union, protesting against the proposed merger of meat packing corporations in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Woodson County Pomona Grange, of Gridley; the fifty-sixth annual convention of the National Grange, at Wichita; and Nikkleton Grange, No. 1722, of Vernon, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11040) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916, reported it without amendment.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 935) thereon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question? The bill goes to the calendar of course to-day, but I would like to know what his plans are in reference to its consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is my purpose to call it up at the first opportunity on Monday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator expects to bring it before the Senate on Monday for consideration?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to submit the views of the minority, in connection with the majority report presented by the Senator from Washington, and I ask that they be printed with the report of the majority.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I think it would be well to have the minority and majority reports printed as one document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

LANDS IN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3593) to authorize the exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Glacier National Park, and I submit a report (No. 934) thereon. Mr. President, I ask leave to be heard for a moment in regard to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Montana will proceed.

Mr. MYERS. There are still a few holdings of private lands in Glacier National Park in Montana, and it is desired by both the owners of those lands and the Government that exchanges be made. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept those properties when good title is shown and to convey in return like land of equivalent value elsewhere in the State of Montana. With certain amendments which were approved by the committee, the bill is formally recommended by the Department of the Interior.

As this is a Senate bill there will not be a particle of chance to get it through the House unless we have action upon it at once. I therefore ask that the bill be read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The committee is unanimously in favor of it, the Interior Department approves it, and prompt action is very necessary if we are going to do anything with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill which he has just reported.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 11, to strike out the words "an equal area of" and insert the word "like"; in the same line to strike out the word "Government" before the word "land"; and before the word "value" to strike out the word "like" and insert the word "equal"; on line 12 to strike out the words "elsewhere in the United States" and insert the words "in the State of Montana, after due notice of the proposed exchange has been given by publication for not less than 30 days in the counties where the lands proposed to be exchanged or taken in exchange are located"; and in section 2, page 2, line 11, to strike out the words "to become" and insert the words "be and remain," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, for the purpose of eliminating private holdings of land within the Glacier National Park, is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to obtain for the United States the complete title to any or all of the lands held in private ownership within the boundaries of said park by accepting from the owners of such privately owned lands complete relinquishment thereof and by granting and patenting to such owners, in exchange therefor, in each instance, like public land of equal value situate in the State of Montana, after due notice of the proposed exchange has been given by publication for not less than 30 days in the counties where the lands proposed to be exchanged or taken in exchange are located.

SEC. 2. That the value of all patented lands within said park, including the timber thereon, offered for exchange, and the value of other lands of the United States elsewhere situate, to be given in exchange therefor, shall be ascertained in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct; and the owners of such privately owned lands within said park shall, before any exchange is effective, furnish the Secretary of the Interior evidence satisfactory to him of title to the patented lands offered in exchange; and lands conveyed to the Government under this act shall be and remain a part of the Glacier National Park.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to ask the Senator from Montana why this can not be done under the general law we passed just a short while ago?

Mr. MYERS. The general law, I understand, does not apply to national parks, but applies only to forest reserves.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is not a forest reserve?

Mr. MYERS. It is a national park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 4130) to amend sections 3, 4, 6, 9, 12, and 15 of the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 4131) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point 2¼ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 90, range 48, Union County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4132) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense, and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war; to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war; and to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1918, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 4133) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4134) granting a pension to Thomas A. Short (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODING:

A bill (S. 4135) to amend section 4 of the interstate commerce act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4136) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4137) to authorize the transfer of certain vessels from the Navy to the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 4138) granting a pension to J. S. Taylor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 4139) for the relief of Nancy Stubbs Swanson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4140) granting a pension to Reuben Edward Hunting; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4141) for the relief of Andrew C. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 4142) to amend the war risk insurance act and the rehabilitation act with amendments prior to the passage of this act, extending all of the provisions of this act to all disabled veterans of all wars of the United States and to their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4143) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to install mail chutes in the post-office building at Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 4144) authorizing the erection of a Federal building at Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McNARY submitted sundry amendments intend to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. CAPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 380), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 442, agreed to March 3, 1921, being a resolution authorizing the Committee on Claims to employ an assistant clerk during the Sixty-seventh Congress, at the rate of $2,200 per annum, said compensation to be paid out of the miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate, be, and the same is hereby, further extended in full force and effect until the end of the Sixty-eighth Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, disagreed to by the Senate, agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. GARNER, and Mr. COLLIER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor;

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire;

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 540. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher;

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam;

H. R. 8062. An act amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act; and

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Mr. LODGE. We have so recently been over the calendar that nothing remains on it which can be disposed of this morning. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 9, 1922.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

John C. Rose, of Maryland, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit. (An additional position created by act of Congress approved September 14, 1922.)

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Alexander Lindsay, jr., of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, vice William S. Edings, whose term has expired.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Oscar E. Dahley, of Duluth, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., in place of Harris Bennett, whose term of office expires December 31, 1922.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Joseph W. Tolbert, of South Carolina, to be United States marshal, western district of South Carolina, vice C. J. Lyon, removed.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Under the provisions of the acts of Congress approved June 30 and September 14, 1922, the officers herein named, who are now majors in the Regular Army, to be captains in the Regular Army in the branches of service in which they now hold commissions or appointments, to take rank in that grade, as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1922:

Maj. Richard Bolles Paddock, Field Artillery.
Maj. Carl Spatz, Air Service.
Maj. Harold Roe Bull, Infantry.
Maj. James Byron Haskell, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Charles Morton Milliken, Signal Corps.
Maj. James Fred Byrom, Infantry.
Maj. Woodfin Grady Jones, Infantry.
Maj. James Patrick Hogan, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Paul Clarence Paschal, Infantry.
Maj. John Leo Parkinson, Infantry.
Maj. Rudolph Gwinn Whitten, Infantry.
Maj. Louis Thomas Byrne, Infantry.
Maj. Gooding Packard, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Glenn Preston Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Walter Cyrus Gullion, Adjutant General's Department.
Maj. Francis Marion Brannan, Infantry.
Maj. Vincente Lim, Philippine Scouts.
Maj. Adam Empie Potts, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. William Rutledge Orton, Infantry.
Maj. Rufus Sumter Bratton, Infantry.
Maj. Thomas George Lanphier, Air Service.
Maj. Sylvester DeWitt Downs, jr., Field Artillery.
Maj. Orlando Ward, Field Artillery.
Maj. Benjamin Grant Weir, Air Service.
Maj. Ralph Royce, Air Service.
Maj. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Infantry.
Maj. Roger Burnett Harrison, Infantry.
Maj. Benjamin Fiery Hoge, Cavalry.
Maj. Frederick Herr, Cavalry.
Maj. Clifford James Mathews, Infantry.
Maj. Frank William Milburn, Infantry.
Maj. George Horton Steel, Quartermaster Corps.
Maj. Harold William James, Infantry.
Maj. Donald Henley, Infantry.
Maj. John Hamilton Chew Williams, Air Service.
Maj. Richard William Cooksey, Cavalry.
Maj. James deBarth Walbach, Coast Artillery Corps.

Under the provisions of the acts of Congress approved June 30 and September 14, 1922, the officers herein named, who are now captains in the Regular Army, to be first lieutenants in the Regular Army in the branches of service in which they now hold commissions or appointments, to take rank in that grade as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1922:

Capt. Overton Walsh, Field Artillery.
Capt. Clarence Harvey Bragg, Infantry.
Capt. Paul Rutherford Knight, Infantry.

Capt. DeWitt Clinton Smith, jr., Infantry.
Capt. John Curtis Newton, Infantry.
Capt. Vaughan Morris Cannon, Cavalry.
Capt. Wilson Stuart Zimmerman, Field Artillery.
Capt. Graeme Gordon Parks, Infantry.
Capt. Edwin Paull Ketchum, Corps of Engineers.
Capt. Frank Lee McCoy, Infantry.
Capt. Cyril Clifton Chandler, Infantry.
Capt. Fred Harold Norris, Infantry.
Capt. James Francis Clark Hyde, Corps of Engineers.
Capt. Robert James Kirk, jr., Infantry.
Capt. James Edward Mendenhall, Infantry.
Capt. Leo Alexander Bessette, Infantry.
Capt. Kent Clayton Mead, Infantry.
Capt. James Wellington Younger, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Amory Vivian Eliot, Infantry.
Capt. James Clarence Reed, Infantry.
Capt. John Matthew Clarke, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Charles Oliver Wolfe, Infantry.

Under the provisions of the acts of Congress approved June 30 and September 14, 1922, the officers herein named, who are now first lieutenants in the Regular Army, to be second lieutenants in the Regular Army in the branches of service in which they now hold commissions or appointments, to take rank in that grade as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1922:

First Lieut. John Creel Hamilton, Cavalry.
First Lieut. John Joseph Breen, Ordnance Department.
First Lieut. Mark Rhoads, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward Arthur Dolph, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph Kittredge Baker, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Charles William Leng, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward Ward Hendrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick Pearson, Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles Frederick Colson, Infantry.
First Lieut. Albert Walker Johnson, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Donald Frederic Carroll, Infantry.
First Lieut. Bernard Wellington Slifer, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Willard Ames Holbrook, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Auston Monroe Wilson, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Samuel Powell Walker, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Robert Alwin Schow, Infantry.
First Lieut. John Harrison Stokes, jr., Infantry.
First Lieut. Jesse Ellis Graham, Infantry.
First Lieut. Carlyle West Graybeal, Air Service.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Montgomery M. Taylor to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1922.

Capt. Carl T. Vogelgesang to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 15th day of October, 1922.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Robert L. Berry.
William R. Sayles, jr.
Edwin H. Dodd.

Commander Louis Shane, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922.

Commander John G. Church to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1922.

Commander Herbert C. Cocke to be a captain in the Navy from the 15th day of October, 1922.

Lieut. Commander Leigh M. Stewart to be a commander in the Navy from the 21st day of May, 1922.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Francis M. Robinson.	John W. W. Cumming.
Robert W. Cabaniss.	Horace T. Dyer.
Weyman P. Beehler.	Russell S. Crenshaw.
Joseph S. Evans.	Herbert S. Babbitt.
Charles A. Dunn.	Randall Jacobs.
Damon E. Cummings.	Richard S. Edwards.
Warren G. Child.	Clyde R. Robinson.
Bryson Bruce.	Irving H. Mayfield.
Vaughn V. Woodward.	Harvey W. McCormack.
Robert T. S. Lowell.	Philip H. Hammond.
Archibald G. Stirling.	John M. Schelling.
David A. Scott.	Bert B. Taylor.
Lemuel M. Stevens.	

Lieut. Commander William O. Wallace to be a commander in the Navy from the 7th day of July, 1922.

Lieut. Commander William S. Farber to be a commander in the Navy from the 15th day of October, 1922.

Lieut. Commander George M. Ravenscroft to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of November, 1922.

Lieut. Ralph E. Sampson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1921.

Lieut. John R. Peterson, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921.

Lieut. Joseph McE. Smith to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1922.

Lieut. George J. McMillin to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1922.

Lieut. William H. O'Brien, jr., to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1922.

Lieut. Howard F. Kingman to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 17th day of May, 1922.

Lieut. James G. B. Gromer to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 21st day of May, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

William M. Quigley.	Lunsford L. Hunter.
Calvin H. Cobb.	Forrest U. Lake.
Norman Scott.	Elliott Buckmaster.
Richard P. Myers.	Walter S. DeLany.
Howard D. Bode.	Clarence Gulbranson.
Robert M. Doyle, jr.	Donald F. Patterson.
Morton L. Deyo.	Herbert G. Gates, jr.
Robert M. Hinckley.	Louis E. Denfeld.
Charles H. McMorris.	Nathan B. Chase.
John H. Holt, jr.	Alexander W. Loder.
Rivers J. Carstarphen.	Howard H. Good.
Lee C. Carey.	Carleton H. Wright.
Conrad Ridgely.	Herman E. Fischer.
Webb C. Hayes.	James A. Saunders.
Harold E. Snow.	Andrew C. Bennett.
Richard H. Booth.	Oliver W. Bagby.
Harold T. Bartlett.	James C. Clark.
Ralph S. Parr.	Carl G. Gilliland.
Virgil C. Griffin, jr.	Warren A. Shaw.
William A. Corley.	Guy C. Hitchcock.
Benjamin Perlman.	Ralph S. Wentworth.
Ernest G. Small.	Mahlon S. Tisdale.
Robertson J. Weeks.	Davis De Treville.
Harry G. Patrick.	Raymond E. Kerr.
Alfred E. Montgomery.	George H. Fort.
Eugene P. A. Simpson.	Ernest W. Broadbent.
Lawrence P. Bischoff.	Robert R. Thompson.
James C. Monfort.	Nelson W. Hibbs.
Harold Dodd.	Emory P. Eldredge.
Robert A. Hall.	Wentworth H. Osgood.
Anton B. Anderson.	Donald W. Hamilton.
George L. Woodruff.	Heister Hoogewerff.
Fred Welden.	George W. D. Dashiell.
Robert S. Haggart.	George W. La Mountain.
Philip Van Horn Weems.	William S. Hogg, jr.

Lieut. Stephan B. Robinson to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 12th day of July, 1922.

Lieut. William G. Greenman to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 23d day of August, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lewis H. McDonald to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1920.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920:

Marcus C. Miller.
Samuel H. Hurt.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921:

William B. Stork.	John J. Clausey.
Ralph G. Moody.	Frederick Petry.
William F. Schlegel.	Sol Shaw.
Asa Van R. Watson.	Wilmer W. Weber.
Ludwig W. Gumz.	Raymond C. McDuffie.
Henry A. Stuart.	William J. Graham.
Walter B. Buchanan.	Clyde Morrison.
Elmer B. Robinson.	Elijah E. Tompkins.
Doile Greenwell.	Arthur L. Karns.
Marcus L. Kurtz.	John F. W. Gray.
Homer B. Davis.	Edwin Nelson.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1922:

Percival W. Buzby.	Arthur E. Bartlett.
Carl Hupp.	Stonewall B. Stadtler.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Stephen E. Haddon to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 2d day of January, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank A. Brandecker to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 8th day of January, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William E. McClendon to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of February, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 11th day of February, 1922:

Henry C. Flanagan.
Frank A. Saunders.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Jesse G. McFarland to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 2d day of March, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William Wakefield to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th day of March, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard C. Bartlett to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James D. Barner to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1922.

Lieutenant (Junior Grade) Clyde L. Lewis to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 17th day of May, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Malcolm F. Schoeffel to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of May, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas G. W. Settle to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 26th day of May, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ralph A. Ofstie to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 27th day of May, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Rex L. Hicks.
Matthias B. Gardner.
Creighton C. Carmine.
Ernest E. Herrmann.
Hugh W. Olds.
Hobart A. Sailor.
Adolph O. Gieselmann.
Jeffrey C. Metzel.
Russell M. Ihrig.
Ralph H. Roberts.
Eugene L. Kell.
William C. Vose.
Robert P. Briscoe.
James B. Sykes.
Clarence H. Schildhauer.
Franz O. Willenbucher.
William H. Ferguson.
Morton T. Seligman.
John O. Huse.
Herbert M. Scull.
Howard W. Fitch.
Gordon M. Jackson.
William E. Hilbert.
Albert T. Sprague 3d.
Thomas P. Jeter.
David H. Clark.
Festus F. Foster.
James J. Graham.
Valentine H. Schaeffer.
John W. Roper.
Harry B. Slocum.
Harry R. Thurber.
Lyle N. Morgan.
Cuthbert A. Griffiths.
Harry M. Jones.
Ernest H. von Helmburg.
Douglas A. Powell.
Charles J. Palmer.
Arthur P. Thurston.
Scott G. Lamb.
John H. Cassady.
Henry R. Herbst.
Henry D. Baggett.
Ralph W. Hungerford.
James D. Lowry, jr.
Eric M. Grimsley.
Charles L. Andrews, jr.
Alonzo B. Alexander.
Charles J. Rend.
Henry C. Fengar.
Marshall R. Greer.
Harry A. Rochester.
Carl K. Fink.
Walter C. Ansel.
Miles P. Duval, jr.
Elmer R. Runquist.
Norman B. Millar.
Raymond E. Daniels.
Lawrence S. Tichenor.
Spencer H. Warner.
Robert F. MacNally.
Arthur F. Folz.
Truman E. Ayers.
Daniel M. McGurl.
Stephen K. Hall.
Robert B. Crichton.
James L. Holloway, jr.
John B. McDonald, jr.
Paul D. Dingwell.
Frank V. Aler, jr.
Francis H. Gilmer.
Charles R. Smith.
Dixie Kiefer.
John L. Reynolds.
Ross A. Dierdorff.
George H. Mills.
Logan C. Ramsey.
William E. Clayton.
Julian B. Noble.
Elmer R. Hill.
Bayard H. Colyear.
Charles B. Hunt.
Albert P. Burleigh.
John B. Griggs, jr.
Eliot H. Bryant.
David S. Crawford.
Robert L. Boller.
Ten Eyck DeWitt Veeder, jr.
Philip P. Welch.
James J. Hughes.
John J. Patterson, 3d.
Adrian O. Rule, jr.
Walther G. Maser.
Walton R. Read.
William E. Tarbutton.
Robert M. Smith, jr.
Paul H. Talbot.
Fred W. Beltz.
John G. Crawford.
James G. Atkins.
Cyril K. Wildman.
Carleton McGauly.
Giles E. Short.
Harold M. Martin.
John R. Redman.
Herbert S. Woodman.
Desmond J. Sinnott.
John C. Williams.
Dorrance K. Day.
Samuel B. Ogden.
Charles S. Seely.
William E. Phillips.
Earl B. Brix.
Henry L. Pitts.
Edward J. Lysaught.
Edward B. Peterson.
Joseph S. Ives.
Caleb R. Crandall.
Raymond E. Farnsworth.
Charles F. Waters.
Percy A. Decker.
Charles R. Jeffs.
DeForest L. Trautman.
Walter E. Andrews.
John E. Dingwell.
Leslie E. Gehres.
Raymond G. Deewall.
Charles M. Johnson.
Leo L. Waite.
Hermann P. Knickerbocker.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frederick W. Ickes to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of June, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles F. Grisham to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Howard R. Shaw to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1922.

Ensign Samuel H. Hurt to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 29th day of June, 1920.

Ensign Orrin R. Hewitt to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921:

Thomas Macklin.
Robert G. Greenleaf.
Michael J. Conlon.
Frank Schultz.
August Logan.
Norman McL. McDonald.
John P. Millon.
Alfred Doucet.
George D. Samonski.
Ernest W. Dobie.
William D. Dadd.
David F. Mead.
George W. Waldo.
William T. Shaw.
James D. Brown.
James M. MacDonnell.
Everest A. Whited.
George T. Campbell.
Warwick M. Tinsley.
John F. Piotrowski.
William K. Johnstone.
Clarence H. Fogg.
Abram L. Broughton.
William Klaus.
Harold F. MacHugh.
Loar Mansbach.
William J. Russell.
Clarence A. Hawkins.
William J. Poland.
Emil H. Petri.
Harold Bye.
George H. Turner.
Percy S. Hogarth.
John L. Graham.
Ralph M. Gerth.
Stockard R. Hickey.
Benjamin J. Shinn.
Howard E. Haynes.
Frederick J. Silvernail.
Andrew Simmons.
Charles W. Van Horn.
Philip L. Emerson.
Lawrence K. Beaver.
Charlie E. East.
John E. Canoose.
William M. McDade.
John C. Redman.
Elery A. Zehner.
Elmer J. McCluen.
Francis P. Brewer.
Ralph A. Scott.
Emmette F. Gumm.
Frank V. Shepard.
Harry F. Gray.
John F. P. Miller.
Albert R. Colwell.
Glenn O. Twiss.
William P. Turner.
Alfred R. Bolleau.
Thomas Fertner.
Carter E. Parker.
Joe S. Wier.
Carl I. Ostrom.
Brady J. Dayton.
Arthur D. Murray.
Joseph A. Clark.
Thom H. Williamson.
George H. Toepfer.
Harry A. Wentworth.
Edward Danielson.
Ira W. Truitt.
Arthur Brown.
John B. McGovern.
Philip H. Taft.
Thomas J. Eggleston.
Rudolph Oeser.
Robert H. Barnes.
Ewell K. Jett.
Rudolph P. Bielka.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1922:

William R. Dolan.
Maxemillian B. De Leshe.
Thomas O. Brandon.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1922:

Roger K. Hodsdon.
Terence W. Greene.
Ernest V. Abrams.
Lloyd K. Cleveland.
Rodney H. Dobson.
William N. Thornton.
Burton E. Rokes.
Donald R. Comstock.
Edgar V. Carrithers.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of February, 1922:

Dennis B. Boykin.
Martin Nyburg.
William F. Skyles.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of March, 1922:

Ashton B. Smith.
George Walker.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 22d day of April, 1922:

George L. Bright.
William G. Dow.
Floyd J. Nuber.
Edwin C. Millhouse.
Charles R. Will.
Robert K. Madsen, jr.
Harold W. Alden.
Arthur W. Peterson.
Harold B. Herty.
Samuel S. Fried.
Otto F. Johanns.
John F. Wegforth.
Frederick L. Farell.
John A. Paulson.
Albert R. Buehler.
Thomas F. Hayes.

George E. Twining.
Charles C. Ferrenz.
James B. Bliss.
Robert W. Boughter.
George E. Kenyon.
Benton B. Baker.
Clifford B. Schiano.
Charles R. Price.
Thomas J. Bay.
Edgar L. Adams.
Paul L. Mather.
Charles H. Ross.
George K. G. Reilly.
Paul G. Wrenn.
James S. Warner.
William M. M. Lobrano.
Alan F. Winslow.
Russell D. Bell.
Henry L. Naff.
Clyde A. Coggins.
Herbert Loewy.
Robert F. Stockin.
Florentin P. Wencker.
Charles D. Hickox.
Malcolm D. MacGregor.
John D. Murphy.
Robert E. Permut.
Harold B. Corwin.
John A. Pierson.
William B. Coleman.
Elder P. Johnson.
Benjamin C. Purrington.
Harold J. Walker.
Arthur H. Small.
Ralph W. Bowers.
Anton L. Mare.
Le Roy A. Nelson.
Louis C. De Rochemont.
Edward R. J. Griffin.
Emanuel Taylor.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 2d day of May, 1922:

Laurence Bennett.
Albert M. Van Eaton.
Harold J. Bellingham.
John E. Gabrielson.
George C. Weldin.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 10th day of May, 1922:

Sumner C. Cheever.
Albert E. Conlon.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1922:

Emmet P. Forrestel.
George M. Dusinberre.
William Sinton.
Abel C. J. Sabalot.
Virgil E. Korns.
William E. A. Mullan.
Frank Rorschach, jr.
George H. Dana.
Kendall S. Reed.
Donald T. Whitmer.
Ernest W. Litch.
Burton L. Hunter, jr.
Sam L. LaHache.
John W. Marts, jr.
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter.
Clarence J. Ballreich.
George F. Prestwich.
Mark H. Harrington.
Asel B. Kerr.
William I. Leahy.
Allen P. Mullinnix.
William B. Goggins.
Charles B. Momsen.
Roger Brooks.
Morton B. Sterling.
Marion E. Crist.
Alva J. Spriggs.
Donald R. Osborn, jr.
Benton W. Decker.
John P. Curtis.
Warner W. Angerer.
Richard S. Morse.
Charles S. Beightler.
William W. Fife.
Herbert Finebaum.
Mead S. Pearson.
Harold R. Parker.
Clarence F. Swanson.
Lewis Corman.
Edwin F. Conway.
Horace Burrough, 3d.
Kenneth E. Brimmer.
Herbert G. Hopwood.
Henry G. Chalkley, jr.
James B. Donnelly.
Robert H. Smith.
John F. Gilion.
Rockwell J. Townsend.
Russell Keith.
William G. Tomlinson.
John P. Graff.
Richard C. Wiestling.
Harvey Wilson.
Robert C. Warrack.
Douglass P. Johnson.
Charles C. Hartman.
Alf O. R. Bergesen.
Barnett T. Talbott.
Robert P. Erdman.
Charles R. Skinner.
George F. Burdick.
Ellsworth D. McEathron.
Allen Hobbs.
John C. Webb.
John E. Shoemaker.
Earl R. DeLong.
Theodore G. Haff.
William J. Strother, jr.
Morris B. Myers.
LaRue C. Lawbaugh.
Edward E. Pare.
William A. P. Martin, jr.
Richard Highleyman.
Walter H. Roberts.
John Perry.
Oberlin C. Laird.
Thomas S. Combs.
Frederick V. Barker.
George P. Kraker.
Robert E. Melling.
Michael D. Dearth.
George E. Rosenberry.
Charles B. Gary.
Carroll L. Tyler.
Samuel W. Canan.
John P. Vetter.
Harold C. Fitz.
Fridthjof W. Londahl.
Henry N. Mergen.
Olin R. Miner.
Lyman S. Perry.
Frank C. L. Dettmann.
Carleton C. Champion, jr.
Merrill F. Sproul.
Drayton Harrison.
Maurice E. Curts.
William H. Buracker.
Eugene F. Burkett.
Charles T. Wooten.
Clyde W. Smith.
Dixwell Ketcham.
Cato D. Glover, jr.
Francis B. Stoddert.
John W. Higley.
Francis P. Old.
Norman B. Hopkins.
Orin S. Haskell.
Maurice E. Hatch.
Edmond P. Speight.
Raleigh B. Miller.
William H. Wallace.
Melvin H. Bassett.
William B. Broadhurst.
Benjamin P. Ward.
Milton D. Goldsmith.
Robert P. Cunningham.
William A. P. Thompson.
Jesse B. Goode.
Clarence McM. Head.
John M. Thornton.
William D. Fletcher.
Howard C. Rule, jr.
Thomas S. Thorne.
George H. Gregory.
Maurice Montgomery.
John B. Lyon.
Neill D. Brantly.
Harton I. Booker.
George B. Cunningham.
Edwin C. Bain.
Norman S. Ives.
Chester A. Swafford.
Clayton S. Isgrig.
Harold Coldwell.
James H. McKay.
Frank H. Conant, 2d.
Frederick R. Buse.
Hugh P. Kirby.
Charles M. Huntington.
Oliver W. Gaines.
Harry H. Hill.
Edwin L. Brashears.
James M. Plaskitt.
Paul W. Steinhagen.
Vilas R. Knope.
Charles C. Anderson.
Ericson Lewis.
James L. Wyatt.
Frederick W. Roberts.
Harry D. Power.
Gordon A. Patterson.
Austin K. Doyle.
Ralph Humphreys.
Thomas C. Scaffe.
Harold R. Brookman.
James H. Doyle.
Charles D. Murphey.
Sumner T. Scott.
Solomon S. Isquith.
Armon D. A. Crawford
Bailey Connelly.
Gyle D. Conrad.
John A. McDonnell.
Benjamin N. Ward.
Ferguson B. Bryan.
William G. Livingstone.
Harley F. Cope.
James D. Haselden, jr.
Jewett P. Moncure.
Amariah B. Cartwright.
Thomas T. Craven.
Khem W. Palmer.
Elmer Kiehl.
Wade DeWeese.
Allan D. Blackledge.
Charles A. Collins.
Justin D. Hartford.
Hilyer F. Gearing.
Francis W. Beard.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 15th day of June, 1922:

Jesse G. Johnson.
Joseph J. Rocheforth.
William J. Medusky.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of August, 1922:

Cecil E. Godkin.
Herbert C. Behner.
Roland E. Krause.

Ensign John H. Hykes to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of September 1922.

The following-named midshipmen to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

William F. Jennings.
Corydon H. Kimball.

Surg. Richard A. Warner to be a medical inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 28th day of August, 1922.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Ruskin M. Lhamon.
Carleton I. Wood.
William H. Michael.
Clarence W. Ross.
Roscoe M. Waterhouse.
Talmadge Wilson.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 6th day of December, 1920:

Francis C. Hertzog.
Deane H. Vance.

Asst. Surg. Hilliard L. Weer to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Asst. Surg. Jerome Braun to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of July, 1922.

Asst. Surg. David B. Peters to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 9th day of August, 1922.

Passed Asst. Surg. Nathaniel C. Rubinsky, of the United States Naval Reserve Force, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 14th day of September, 1922.

Acting Asst. Surg. Earl B. Erskine to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 19th day of September, 1922.

James F. Finnegan, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 3d day of November, 1922.

Asst. Dental Surg. Joseph W. Baker, jr., to be a passed assistant dental surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 2d day of October, 1922.

Pay Inspector David V. Chadwick to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 26th day of August, 1922.

Pay Inspector David M. Addison to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 2d day of November, 1922.

Pay Inspector Victor S. Jackson to be a pay director in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 12th day of November, 1922.

Paymaster William N. Hughes to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 26th day of August, 1922.

Paymaster Harold W. Browning to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 2d day of November, 1922.

Paymaster Emory D. Stanley to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 12th day of November, 1922.

Asst. Paymaster Dillon F. Zimmerman to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 31st day of December, 1921.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Alexander Riggin.	William E. McCain.
Frederick Schwab.	Theodore M. Stock.
Robert J. Monteith.	Stanford G. Chapman.
Harold R. Lehmann.	Alexander W. Urquhart.
Myron W. Willard.	Howard N. Hill.
John H. Gallion.	Cornelius A. Brinkmann.
Hugh A. Phares.	Jacob H. Kyger.
James E. Brennen.	Marvin McCray.
Robert G. Robeson.	George P. Smallman.
Raphael Gering.	Chris J. Norstad.
Fillmore S. C. Layman.	George L. Thomas.
Leon I. Smith.	John C. Poshepny.
Archie A. Antrim.	Harry F. Hake.
Harold E. Humphreys.	Percival F. Patten.
Percy W. McCord.	Grandison J. Tyler.
Tipton F. Woodward.	Chester B. Peake.
Mason E. Mitchell.	Hugh J. McManus.
George E. Duffy.	John J. Carroll.
Charles A. Cook.	Leo V. Flavell.
Samuel L. Bates.	Albert W. Eldred.
Gordon S. Bower.	Joseph T. Lareau.
Harry G. Kinnard.	Roy L. Koester.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 16th day of June, 1922:

Clarence E. Kastenbein.	James H. Stevens.
George Scratchley.	Ellsworth F. Sparks.
Charles B. Forrest.	John P. Killeen.
Orville F. Byrd.	Charles H. Gillilan.
Daniel L. McCarthy.	Leon Dancer.
Harry A. Miller.	Joseph W. Cavanagh.
Harvey R. Dye.	Verny Carroll.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 4th day of July, 1922:

Ervine R. Brown.	George W. Davis.
Ray E. Snedaker.	Guild Bruda.
William W. Wise.	Alvin S. Reid.
Don M. Robinson.	Robert R. Blaisdell.
Robert H. Lenson.	Edward F. Ney.
Charles Schaef.	

Asst. Paymaster Walter Guerry to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 9th day of August, 1922.

Chaplain Edmund A. Brodman to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 6th day of November, 1920.

Chaplain Le Roy N. Taylor to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of captain from the 22d day of November, 1921.

Chaplain Thomas B. Thompson to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 28th day of July, 1921.

Chaplain John J. Brady to be a chaplain in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 23d day of November, 1921.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensigns, from the 6th day of February, 1921:

William E. Benson.
Fred C. A. Plagemann.

Boatswain Wildon A. Ott to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 16th day of December, 1921.

Machinist John A. Silva to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 28th day of December, 1920.

Pay Clerk Merle W. Shumate to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 6th day of July, 1922.

Lieut. Commander Alfred W. Atkins to be a commander in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Allen H. Guthrie.
Carroll M. Hall.

Lieut. Harold H. Little to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 5th day of September, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry B. Broadfoot to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1920.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Vaughn Bailey to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1921.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ratcliffe C. Welles to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Arthur Wrightson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of January, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Laurence E. Myers to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 7th day of February, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) John P. Dix to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of March, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Robert E. Davenport to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 23d day of March, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1922:

Winfield A. Brooks.	Ralph B. Netting.
Harold L. Challenger.	George M. O'Rear.
William H. Mays.	George Kirkland.
Joseph R. Lannom.	Russell S. Barrett.
Stuart S. Murray.	Leonard C. Parker.
Gustave H. Bowman.	Niffel G. Rhoton.
Jack C. Richardson.	Perle M. Lund.
Palmer M. Gunnell.	Arthur F. Peterson.
William M. Callaghan.	

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Scott E. Peck to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 27th day of June, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas E. Renaker to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 16th day of July, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Malcolm R. Jameson to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 9th day of August, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 16th day of August, 1922:

Arthur C. Smith.
Harry J. Lang.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William J. Slattery to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 23d day of August, 1922.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Earle P. McKellar to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1922.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 2d day of September, 1922:

Grover B. Turner.
Charles A. Kirtley.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James A. Martin to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 9th day of October, 1922.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1921:

Frederick J. Legere.	Thomas Southall.
Kenneth F. Horne.	Walter C. Haight.
William A. Lynch.	Joseph A. Ouellet.
Myron T. Grubham.	Ira D. Spoonemore.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1922:

Alfred G. Scott.
Raymond St. C. Beckel.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) from the 22d day of April, 1922:

Herbert H. Taylor.	Lynn G. Bricker.
Howard W. Bradbury.	James H. Foskett.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of June, 1922:

Joseph E. Jackson.	Bernhard H. Wolter.
William W. Behrens.	Nullet F. Schneider.
Forrest A. Rhoads.	Raymond A. McClellan.
Russell C. Bartman.	Gordon T. House.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of June, 1922:

Earl LeR. Sackett.	Edmund T. Wooldridge.
Elwood M. Tillson.	Charles H. Murphy.
Peter F. Hunt.	Raymond D. Sollars.
Stephen C. Dougherty.	Joseph T. Talbert, 2d.
Beverly A. Hartt.	Hugh W. Turney.
Myron A. Baber.	Paul R. Sterling.
Charles L. Hutton.	William F. Moran.
John A. Dillon.	Perley E. Pendleton.
Walton W. Smith.	Charles S. Boarman.

Ensign Samuel Gregory to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1922.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1922:

Frank A. Davis.
Joseph H. Gowan.
Homer N. Wilkinson.

Gilbert E. Gayler, a citizen of Massachusetts, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 25th day of November, 1922.

Frank K. Soukup, a citizen of Ohio, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) from the 29th day of November, 1922.

Paymaster John N. Jordan to be a pay inspector in the Navy with the rank of commander from the 11th day of October, 1922.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant from the 3d day of June, 1922:

James M. Thomas.	James E. Hunt.
Julius J. Mifflitt.	Nicholas A. Brown.
Leo A. Ketterer.	Charles A. Cameron.
Edward Mixon.	

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 16th day of June, 1922:

William G. Conrad.	James D. G. Wognum.
Louis A. Puckett.	Charles H. Titt.
Karl S. Farnum.	

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 4th day of July, 1922:

Charles Musil.
Ray W. Byrns.

Asst. Paymaster Walter E. Scott to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 1st day of August, 1922.

The following-named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 16th day of August, 1922:

Webster Gross.
William R. Calvert.

Gunner Fayette Myers to be a chief gunner in the Navy to rank with but after ensign, from the 27th day of March, 1922.

Pay Clerk Thomas J. Bolan to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 22d day of June, 1917.

MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Walter S. Gaspar to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. William K. MacNulty to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 14th day of July, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. Alfred Dickerson to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of August, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. Thomas R. Shearer to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of September, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. Jacob M. Pearce to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of October, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Capt. Charles C. Gill to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of November, 1921, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

First Lieut. John F. McVey to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 28th day of March, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Edward F. Hopkins to be postmaster at Arroyo Grande, Calif., in place of Cleon Kyte. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

COLORADO.

Frederick H. Leach to be postmaster at Idaho Springs, Colo., in place of O. N. Maripugh. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Luther W. Vickery to be postmaster at Lavonia, Ga., in place of H. T. Sewell. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

IDAHO.

Caleb W. Berry to be postmaster at Craigmont, Idaho, in place of S. J. Linder, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

Guy W. Astell to be postmaster at Broadlands, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Edwin R. Erickson to be postmaster at Media, Ill. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Laura M. Gleseking to be postmaster at Altamont, Ill., in place of Henrietta Rehwald. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Edgar H. Chadwick to be postmaster at Ashton, Ill., in place of J. A. Roesler. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Frithjof T. E. Kallum to be postmaster at Blue Island, Ill., in place of J. A. Lentz. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

John Mackler to be postmaster at Chicago Heights, Ill., in place of W. H. Stolte, resigned.

James E. Seabert to be postmaster at Dwight, Ill., in place of A. I. Graves. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Evan Harris to be postmaster at Gillespie, Ill., in place of M. P. Bergen, resigned.

Bertha Gray to be postmaster at Griggsville, Ill., in place of William Sargent, resigned.

Thomas J. Jordan to be postmaster at St. Charles, Ill., in place of A. B. Fagan. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Hugh R. Henderson to be postmaster at Fulton, Ind., in place of C. R. Sparks, declined.

IOWA.

Arthur P. Hoskins to be postmaster at Milton, Iowa, in place of W. D. Kennedy, deceased.

Harry McCall to be postmaster at Washington, Iowa, in place of A. R. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George W. Kennedy to be postmaster at Montrose, Iowa, in place of R. B. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Albert H. Herman to be postmaster at Hiawatha, Kans., in place of F. M. Pearl. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Wiley Caves to be postmaster at Inman, Kans., in place of V. H. Hoefer, resigned.

David D. McIntosh to be postmaster at Marion, Kans., in place of E. J. Buckley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

John F. Oliver to be postmaster at Oxford, Kans., in place of Claud Alley, resigned.

KENTUCKY.

Mabel K. Kipping to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ky., in place of H. H. Grobmyer. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1922.

LOUISIANA.

Howard S. Allen to be postmaster at Dubach, La., in place of C. R. Kelley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MARYLAND.

James W. Friend to be postmaster at Friendsville, Md. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Elias N. McAllister to be postmaster at Vienna, Md. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

H. Vincent Flook to be postmaster at Boonsboro, Md., in place of Webster Wade, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George A. Wilder to be postmaster at Townsend, Mass., in place of John Dobson. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

MICHIGAN.

Edna Donohue to be postmaster at Gregory, Mich. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Fred E. Bomeraning to be postmaster at Trenton, Mich., in place of W. R. Teifer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Enoch J Andrus to be postmaster at Utica, Mich., in place of C. E. Adair. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Odin D. Krogen to be postmaster at Fountain, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Gunstein D. Aakhus to be postmaster at Erskine, Minn., in place of G. D. Aakhus. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

John P. Grothe to be postmaster at Roseau, Minn., in place of Aasold Waag. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Ferdinand J. Reimers to be postmaster at Stewart, Minn., in place of F. J. Reimers. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Alfred Anderson to be postmaster at Twin Valley, Minn., in place of J. J. Meighen, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Catherine A. McSwiney to be postmaster at Normandy, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Benonia F. Hardin to be postmaster at Albany, Mo., in place of J. F. Patton, deceased.

Robert W. Raines to be postmaster at Glasgow, Mo., in place of W. A. Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MONTANA.

Franklin R. Whaley to be postmaster at Fairview, Mont., in place of W. A. Leo. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Malcolm K. Kedzie to be postmaster at Libby, Mont., in place of J. P. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Louis R. Eby to be postmaster at Hartington, Nebr., in place of S. C. Lynde, resigned.

NEVADA.

Anna L. Fleming to be postmaster at Jarbidge, Nev. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

George L. Whorton to be postmaster at Yerington, Nev., in place of G. T. Nugent, removed.

NEW JERSEY.

Ralph D. Childs to be postmaster at Rochelle Park, N. J. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Luther S. Van Fleet to be postmaster at Three Bridges, N. J. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Alfred O. Kossow to be postmaster at Cedargrove, N. J., in place of A. W. L. Cowie, resigned.

Caroline A. Cowan to be postmaster at Haworth, N. J., in place of W. H. Grenelle, resigned.

NEW MEXICO.

Maud W. Lenfesty to be postmaster at Aztec, N. Mex., in place of E. B. Taylor, resigned.

James A. Shipley to be postmaster at Silver City, N. Mex., in place of E. M. Brumback. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Donald A. Scott to be postmaster at Caledonia, N. Y., in place of F. D. Ball. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Ralph J. Borden to be postmaster at McGraw, N. Y., in place of C. P. Geer. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Walter J. Burke to be postmaster at Mineville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. McLean to be postmaster at Rowland, N. C., in place of V. G. Pleasants. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Nellie Ribb to be postmaster at Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of Sophie Sherman. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

OHIO.

John M. McGough to be postmaster at Harrod, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Annie Turvey to be postmaster at Amsterdam, Ohio, in place of A. M. S. Allensworth, resigned.

Berman K. Smith to be postmaster at Arcanum, Ohio, in place of C. R. Musson. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Gertrude Stormont to be postmaster at Cedarville, Ohio, in place of W. A. Turnbull. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

John T. Daniels to be postmaster at Greenfield, Ohio, in place of J. L. Strange. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Owen E. Reed to be postmaster at Hiram, Ohio, in place of O. E. Reed. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

William E. Thomas to be postmaster at Wellston, Ohio, in place of E. T. Dando. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

John W. Rackley to be postmaster at Cherokee, Okla., in place of J. H. Blythe, declined.

James L. Lane to be postmaster at Kiowa, Okla., in place of I. H. Culbertson. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

OREGON.

Adam H. Knight to be postmaster at Canby, Oreg., in place of C. N. Wait. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lawrence S. McConnell to be postmaster at Sherwood, Oreg., in place of M. M. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Lena E. Gould to be postmaster at McClellandtown, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

William E. Crowe to be postmaster at Dunbar, Pa., in place of R. J. McGee. Incumbent's commission expired August 7, 1921.

John W. Howes to be postmaster at Fayette City, Pa., in place of Joseph Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Effie P. Corts to be postmaster at Karns City, Pa., in place of C. E. Adams, resigned.

Charles H. Howard to be postmaster at Masontown, Pa., in place of I. S. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 27, 1922.

RHODE ISLAND.

James H. Riley to be postmaster at Harrisville, R. I., in place of John Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Parnell Meehan to be postmaster at Chesterfield, S. C., in place of J. E. Meehan. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Horace M. Watkins to be postmaster at Ridge Spring, S. C., in place of H. M. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Alfred M. Agee to be postmaster at Lafollette, Tenn., in place of J. P. Miller, removed.

TEXAS.

John K. Ford to be postmaster at Bogata, Tex., in place of B. H. Prichard. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Evan S. Howell to be postmaster at Stephenville, Tex., in place of G. P. Knight. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

UTAH.

John E. Chadwick to be postmaster at American Fork, Utah, in place of J. H. Clarke. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Herschel E. Calderwood to be postmaster at Coalville, Utah, in place of G. W. Young. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Jesse M. French to be postmaster at Greenriver, Utah, in place of J. M. French. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

Porter A. Clark to be postmaster at Parowan, Utah, in place of W. L. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Arza C. Page to be postmaster at Payson, Utah, in place of A. K. Huish. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

Sidney W. Elswood to be postmaster at Tremonton, Utah, in place of Abraham Binkele. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

VERMONT.

Orrin H. Jones to be postmaster at Wilmington, Vt., in place of H. D. Allen. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

Anton Schiesl to be postmaster at Laona, Wis., in place of Anton Schiesl. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Albert Liebl to be postmaster at Luxembourg, Wis., in place of Albert Liebl. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

WYOMING.

Harold T. Duffy to be postmaster at Wheatland, Wyo., in place of W. E. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 9, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

David P. Saunders, Brush.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Russel B. Henchman, East Jaffrey.
Carlton E. Sparhawk, Walpole.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Knute T. Kallander, Burke.
Gunnell M. Gorder, Frederick.
Alice M. Lane, Hecla.

VERMONT.

Flora S. Williams, Charlotte.
Frank L. Start, Jeffersonville.
Perley U. Mudgett, Johnson.
Ralph Gaul, North Bennington.
Cecil K. Hughes, Saxtons River.

WYOMING.

Ora Sonners, Cody.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 9, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters; He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, last Monday the House passed the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce. Since then we have been advised by the Senate that they have disagreed to the amendments that the House put on the bill and we have also been advised that the Senate have asked for a conference. I now ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. GARNER. I did not understand just what the gentleman said the action of the Senate was.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. They simply disagreed to our amendments. They did not put on any amendments themselves. The gentleman remembers that this is a Senate bill.

Mr. GARNER. And they simply disagreed to the House amendments and asked for a conference?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a Senate bill, which the Clerk will report by title, and that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. GARNER, and Mr. COLLIER.

TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Treasury appropriation bill, H. R. 13180.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Inasmuch as there is to be a fight made on one of the most important provisions of this bill, a provision that is going to save the Government $1,000,000 a year, does not the gentleman think we ought to have a quorum here?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. I think we can get on if we simply go into the Committee of the Whole in the usual way.

Mr. BLANTON. The membership will not know what is under consideration unless they are called in.

Mr. KING. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. I object to the vote, because there is no quorum present, and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members. As many as favor the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union will, as their names are called, vote "yea," those opposed "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 266, nays 0, not voting 164, as follows:

YEAS—266.

Abernethy	Coughlin	Hadley	McClintic
Almon	Crago	Hardy, Colo.	McDuffie
Anderson	Cramton	Hardy, Tex.	McKenzie
Andrew, Mass.	Crisp	Harrison	McLaughlin, Mich.
Andrews, Nebr.	Crowther	Haugen	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Anthony	Cullen	Hawes	McPherson
Appleby	Curry	Hawley	McSwain
Aswell	Dale	Hayden	MacLafferty
Atkeson	Dallinger	Hersey	Madden
Bacharach	Darrow	Hickey	Magee
Bankhead	Davis, Tenn.	Hooker	Mansfield
Barbour	Dempsey	Huck	Mapes
Barkley	Denison	Huddleston	Merritt
Beck	Dowell	Hudspeth	Michener
Beedy	Driver	Hukriede	Miller
Begg	Dupré	Hull	Mondell
Benham	Echols	Humphrey, Nebr.	Montoya
Bixler	Elliott	Humphreys, Miss.	Moore, Ohio
Black	Ellis	Jacoway	Moore, Va.
Bland, Va.	Evans	Jeffers, Ala.	Moores, Ind.
Blanton	Fairfield	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morgan
Boies	Faust	Johnson, Wash.	Mott
Bowling	Favrot	Jones, Tex.	Mudd
Box	Fess	Kahn	Murphy
Briggs	Fields	Kearns	Nelson, Me.
Browne, Wis.	Fish	Kelly, Pa.	Nelson, A. P.
Buchanan	Fisher	Ketcham	Nelson, J. M.
Bulwinkle	Fitzgerald	Kincheloe	Newton, Minn.
Burdick	Fordney	King	O'Connor
Burtness	Foster	Kissel	Ogden
Byrnes, S. C.	Frear	Kline, N. Y.	Oldfield
Byrns, Tenn.	French	Kline, Pa.	Oliver
Cable	Frothingham	Knutson	Paige
Campbell, Pa.	Fuller	Kopp	Parker, N. J.
Cannon	Fulmer	Kraus	Parks, Ark.
Carter	Funk	Lampert	Patterson, Mo.
Chalmers	Gahn	Lanham	Porter
Chindblom	Garner	Lankford	Pringey
Christopherson	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Quin
Clarke, N. Y.	Gensman	Larson, Minn.	Raker
Clouse	Gernerd	Lawrence	Rankin
Cole, Iowa	Gifford	Layton	Rayburn
Cole, Ohio	Gilbert	Lazaro	Reece
Collier	Glynn	Lea, Calif.	Reed, N. Y.
Collins	Goodykoontz	Leatherwood	Reed, W. Va.
Colton	Graham, Ill.	Lehlbach	Rhodes
Connally, Tex.	Green, Iowa	Little	Richetts
Cooper, Ohio	Greene, Mass.	Lowrey	Roach
Cooper, Wis.	Greene, Vt.	Lyon	Robsion
Copley	Griffin	McArthur	Rogers

Rose	Sproul	Timberlake	Weaver
Rouse	Stafford	Tincher	Webster
Rucker	Steagall	Tinkham	Wheeler
Sanders, Ind.	Stedman	Towner	White, Kans.
Sanders, N. Y.	Steenerson	Treadway	Williams, Ill.
Sanders, Tex.	Stephens	Turner	Wilson
Sandlin	Stevenson	Tyson	Wingo
Scott, Tenn.	Strong, Kans.	Underhill	Woodruff
Sears	Summers, Wash.	Valle	Woods, Va.
Shelton	Sumners, Tex.	Vestal	Wright
Shreve	Swank	Vinson	Wurzbach
Sinclair	Taylor, Colo.	Voigt	Wyant
Sinnott	Taylor, Tenn.	Volstead	Yates
Sisson	Temple	Walters	Young
Smith, Idaho	Ten Eyck	Ward, N. C.	Zihlman
Smithwick	Thomas	Wason	
Speaks	Tilson	Watson	

NOT VOTING—164.

Ackerman	Fairchild	Langley	Reber
Ansorge	Fenn	Lee, Ga.	Riddick
Arentz	Focht	Lee, N. Y.	Riordan
Bell	Free	Lineberger	Robertson
Bird	Freeman	Linthicum	Rodenberg
Blakeney	Gallivan	Logan	Rosenbloom
Bland, Ind.	Garrett, Tex.	London	Rossdale
Bond	Goldsborough	Longworth	Ryan
Bowers	Gorman	Luce	Sabath
Brand	Gould	Luhring	Schall
Brennan	Graham, Pa.	McCormick	Scott, Mich.
Britten	Griest	McFadden	Shaw
Brooks, Ill.	Hammer	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Brooks, Pa.	Hays	MacGregor	Slemp
Brown, Tenn.	Henry	Maloney	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Herrick	Martin	Snell
Burroughs	Hicks	Mead	Snyder
Burton	Hill	Michaelson	Stiness
Butler	Himes	Mills	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Hoch	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Cantrill	Hogan	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Carew	Husted	Morin	Sweet
Chandler, N. Y.	Hutchinson	Newton, Mo.	Swing
Chandler, Okla.	Ireland	Norton	Tague
Clague	James	O'Brien	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Olpp	Taylor, N. J.
Classon	Johnson, Ky.	Osborne	Thompson
Cockran	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Thorpe
Codd	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Tillman
Connolly, Pa.	Keller	Parker, N. Y.	Tucker
Davis, Minn.	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, N. J.	Upshaw
Deal	Kendall	Perkins	Vare
Dickinson	Kennedy	Perlman	Volk
Dominick	Kiess	Petersen	Ward, N. Y.
Doughton	Kindred	Pou	White, Me.
Drane	Kirkpatrick	Purnell	Williams, Tex.
Drewry	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Williamson
Dunbar	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Winslow
Dunn	Knight	Rainey, Ill.	Wise
Dyer	Kreider	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kunz	Ransley	Woodyard

So the motion was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Radcliffe with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Upshaw.

Mr. Hill with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Britten with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.

Mr. Longworth with Mr. Gallivan.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Hogan with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Cockran.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Pou.

Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. McFadden with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. Ackerman with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Free with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Ransley with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Thompson with Mr. Logan.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Deal.

Mr. Purnell with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Griest with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Burroughs with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

Mr. Henry with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Brennan with Mr. Goldsborough.

Mr. Fenn with Mr. London.

Mr. Keller with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.

Mr. Morin with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Perlman with Mr. Overstreet.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on House Joint Resolution 400.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a few minutes of the time of this House to explain in a general way House Joint Resolution 400, introduced by me on December 6, 1922, which reads as follows:

Joint resolution to promote peace and to equalize the burdens and to minify the profits of war.

Whereas it is the duty of Congress to require that the burdens and benefits of war shall be justly and fairly distributed; and

Whereas it is the duty of all citizens to contribute to our Nation's success in war according to their several capacities and resources; and

Whereas modern warfare rests increasingly upon scientific knowledge and industrial resources and must be carried on by the Nation as a whole and not merely by the young men in arms; and

Whereas to take the profits out of war and to require equal service for all, and deny special profits to any, will be conducive to peace (which is our traditional policy); and

Whereas we should employ the experience of recent wars to work out and enact into law, while we are yet at peace, such provisions and policies to be pursued when war shall come as shall empower the President immediately to mobilize all the resources of the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created to draft and report to the President of the United States, who in turn shall transmit the same, with or without his approval, to Congress not later than the first Monday in December, 1923, proposed legislation to accomplish in fact the principles and policies expressed in this resolution.

That said commission shall be bipartisan and nonpolitical and shall be composed of four members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and two members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Commerce, and three other persons not holding official or governmental position whatever, and selected with a view to represent in a general sense the views of labor, industry, and capital, respectively.

Within 30 days after the approval of this resolution the President shall appoint and announce the members of said commission and shall direct the same to meet in the city of Washington, D. C., as soon thereafter as may be practicable, and shall supply from the War Department all necessary office and clerical assistance.

When said commission shall meet it shall organize by electing one of its number as chairman, and another as vice chairman, and shall appoint a secretary and proceed to draft proposed legislation to accomplish the aims and purposes of this resolution; and such proposed legislation, with any comment upon same deemed desirable, shall be transmitted to the President not later than November 1, 1923, and the President shall direct that there shall be printed not exceeding 5,000 copies thereof for the use of Congress.

That the guiding principle to control the labors of said commission is that true preparedness demands our calm and careful adoption in advance of another war of a nation-wide policy of service for all citizens to the end that, while young men are laying down for their country the comforts and joys of home and family, their health, their strength and time, their blood, bodies, and life itself, others not required to make these greater sacrifices may be required to lay down equitably and fairly some of their material resources and wealth, to the great end that victory for the Nation's ideals may speedily come, and that after victory there be no need for any adjustment of compensation, and no mighty war debt piled up to sap the strength of the producing activities of the people for scores of years.

That no compensation shall be paid any member of said commission, and no expenses shall be incurred by them except the actual cost of maintenance and travel to the three members of the commission not already holding an official position.

Now, Mr. Chairman, naturally I was greatly gratified to find that the President again championed this manifestly fair and just principle of service in time of war, as evidenced by the following language extracted from his address delivered on December 8, 1922:

The proposed survey of a plan to draft all the resources of the Republic, human and material, for national defense may well have your approval. I commended such a program in case of future war, in the inaugural address of March 4, 1921, and every experience in the adjustment and liquidation of war claims and settlement of war obligations persuades me we ought to be prepared for such universal call to armed defense.

Mr. Chairman, we are very proud of the position that the American Republic has taken since the beginning of its history in promoting world peace. This has manifested itself

so far in three different ways: First, in the establishment of a Democratic form of government resting upon the will of the people, whereby war may be declared only by the action of the representatives of the people in Congress assembled; second, by declaring and acting accordingly that it is the American policy not to wage war for the purpose of acquiring territory, nor to aggrandize political power; third, the leadership of America in promoting some form of international agreement whereby the forces making for peace may find a voice when war is threatened, as, for instance, the initiative taken by America in promoting the covenant for the League of Nations, and later in calling and promoting the conference for the Limitation of Armaments. I might also mention in addition that as a corollary to the Republican form of government, the instigation and prosecution of war for the personal glory of some such war hero as Cæsar, Napoleon, or Kaiser is impossible.

However, there is another motive that lurks and has lurked in our Nation, and presumably exists in every nation, and it is the desire by certain institutions and groups to take advantage of the disturbances and necessities of war itself to make immense profits by supplying the Government with materials and by preying upon the needs of the people. I may therefore say frankly that the purpose of the proposition now advanced by the American Legion is "to take the profit out of war." We know that it is a historical fact that many huge fortunes were piled up in the North during the War between the States, and those fortunes have been the foundations upon which many of the immense and vast family fortunes now rest. Before 1860 there were none of those huge fortunes in the hands of individuals and families such as have since existed. Many individuals, firms, and corporations multiplied their holdings many times during the Spanish-American War, and many of these same concerns, with thousands of others, used the opportunities furnished by the conditions prevailing during the World War to swell their fortunes to the tune of thousands of millions. It has been variously estimated that the total of the profits made upon supplies furnished to the Government will aggregate from five thousand million to ten thousand million dollars of the war debt. It is altogether probable that an equal sum was made by exorbitant profits exacted from the civilian population during the stress and trial of war.

Last winter I introduced a bill in Congress to punish as a felon any person, firm, or corporation which should demand and receive from the Government in time of war any price for war matériel that may be necessary for the use of the Government in conducting war, if the profit thus exacted were excessive and unreasonable under all the circumstances of the case. I have sympathized with all the efforts that have been made to bring to trial those persons who during war committed frauds upon the Government, and I have assisted in every way in my power as a minority member the splendid efforts to that end made by the Hon. ROYAL C. JOHNSON of South Dakota and the Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan. I think that not only the ex-service men but the rank and file of the American citizens who worked and sacrificed and prayed for the success of the allied arms against the menace to humanity and civilization believe that these guilty crooks should wear stripes. We do not care how high they have been nor what financial positions they have held. If they have been trusted officers of the Government, they are all the more guilty. The man who assists in robbing his Government in time of war is worse than an enemy, and is, in fact, a traitor, because he stabs his own country in the back.

It may be asked by some, "Why agitate this question relating to war and the conduct of war at this time?" My answer is, "That in times of peace we must prepare for war." We must not only prepare by maintaining an adequate Navy and a suitable framework for an Army, but we must use the experience of the recent war and of all former wars for outlining a military policy for the whole Nation. In former times wars were conducted by that fraction of the Nation actually enlisted in the Army, but now the conduct of war is a matter for the whole population and all of the industries, commercial agencies, and agricultural resources. The entire Nation must be coordinated and organized into a great team with the Army at the front and with the lines of communication running back into every branch of industry and business. When we contemplate the staggering debt entailed upon us by the recent World War, amounting to more than $200 per head for every man, woman, and child in the Nation, and when we further contemplate that about 93 per cent of the annual expenditures of the Federal Government, aggregating more than $4,000,000,000, is expended either in paying off the obligations of the past wars, or in making preparations for future wars, it appears that the principal business of the Federal Government so far as the money is concerned is making war. And yet our Nation is the most peaceful nation on earth and has had the most powerful influence in preserving world peace. If our Federal Government spends 93 per cent of this enormous revenue for war purposes, what must be the expenditures for the same purposes by those nations that are really warlike and militaristic in policy?

The purpose of the proposed legislation, which is recommended by the American Legion, is "to take the profit out of war." We believe that if there be no prospect to make huge profits out of a war, such as have been made out of past wars, then the great interests that control the mighty metropolitan newspapers will not be disposed to use the columns of those periodicals to fan the public passions into the flame of war. In fact, if those mighty financial interests so largely controlling those great news agencies realized in advance that they were going to have to pay their part of the war expenses as the war progressed, and to contribute their material resources toward conducting the war, without being able to profiteer upon the Government and without the expectation of collecting interest upon enormous bonded debts for all future times, then in such event they would be very cautious and very slow to encourage war. In fact, we can confidently believe that with such a policy formally fixed upon our statute books we might rest assured that any war for the future would surely be a righteous war, such a war that men and women would gladly give their time, their wealth, their services, their blood, and their lives in order to carry on. And to such a war, those too old and infirm to personally participate would be willing to contribute directly without compensation and without hope of return necessary parts of their fortunes.

Mr. Chairman, it is universally accepted as a sound principle of government under republican institutions that there should be "equal rights to all and special privileges to none." This is a rule of government to prevail in time of peace, but obviously it can not control governmental action in time of war, because such persons as commissioned officers must be allowed to exercise special authority and unusual power in order to accomplish military ends. We now submit as an equally sound principle of government to control in time of war the following maxim, "Equal service for all and special profits to none." Equal service is based upon the fundamental truth that all persons are equally under obligations to their Government to obey in time of peace and to serve in time of war. However, all can not serve in the uniform, and yet those too old or infirm to bear arms should do what they can from the same motive and for the same compensation, whether it be digging ditches and building roads in camp, or building cantonments, or building ships, or building railroads and running trains, or furnishing sawmills, blast furnaces, machine shops, factories, and railroads, and, last of all, money, in order to carry on war. Accumulated wealth would be dissipated by an unsuccessful war and tribute would be levied upon the Nation, and that tribute would have to be paid largely by wealthy people. Therefore those with wealth and unable to bear arms or to contribute by personal service to the making of munitions or to building of cantonments or the construction of ships or any other services in aid of actual military operations should contribute directly of their money, and in a ratio to be fixed in advance by law, and to be operated under a universal drafting system. We might as well speak plainly and understand each other now. It will take at least 100 years for the people of this country to pay the $23,000,000,000 of war debts still remaining unpaid with the interest on it amounting to about $1,000,000,000 a year. This principal and interest is paid by the fruits of the labors of those who actually fought or were prepared to fight the battles of this country, and certainly their children and grandchildren must finish the payment. The result is that to a very substantial extent those who bore the arms of the country in her defense must also pay the war debt of the Nation. We respectfully submit that such is unfair. Under the standards prevailing during the recent World War the man who bought Liberty bonds and Victory bonds was discharging a patriotic duty, and we gladly record the ready response of the civilian population in subscribing to the several war loans. But the Nation is paying interest on these loans and must ultimately pay back the principal. On the contrary, the man who spent one year or two years of his life in the Army has given something for which he can never be fully compensated. When we apply the sound maxim of "equal service" to all, then every man will contribute according to his powers and capacities, and if he has physical strength and youth he will give to the uttermost, and if he has neither but has wealth he will contribute of that, so that when the war is over there will be no debts to pay and there will be no adjust-

ment of compensation to make, and the Nation will resume its productive activities just where they were left off when war commenced, and there will be no privileged few that have made enormous profits out of war activities.

TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed, as soon as possible after the approval of this act and not later than September 30, 1923, to dispense with the use of not less than 196 hand plate-printing presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and to substitute therefor not more than 55 power plate-printing presses, and hereafter he is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each upon power presses the fronts and backs of any paper money, bonds, or other printed matter now or hereafter authorized to be executed at such bureau; and the Secretary shall in the performance of the duty and exercise of the authority placed upon him by this paragraph reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the paragraph just read on the ground that it is not germane to the subject matter of the bill and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I base my point of order as to the germaneness of this paragraph on a decision made by Mr. Fitzgerald, of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union in the second session of the Sixty-third Congress. It will be found on page 482 of the Manual, second paragraph on that page, paragraph 951. Chairman Fitzgerald in this decision said:

That an amendment to be germane means that it must be akin to or relevant to the subject matter of the bill. It must be an amendment that would appropriately be considered in connection with the bill. The object of the rule requiring amendments to be germane—and such a rule has been adopted practically by every legislative body in the United States—is in the interest of orderly legislation. Its purpose is to prevent hasty and ill-considered legislation, to prevent propositions being presented for the consideration of the body which might not reasonably be anticipated and for which the body might not properly be prepared.

Now, this paragraph of the bill on page 32, just read, seeks to repeal existing law. It is in substance the subject matter of a bill that is now pending before the Committee on Printing. The Committee on Printing has considered this bill, which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but has taken no action thereon, and it is brought in as a rider on an appropriation bill. This bill provides for the appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year, and in this paragraph it is proposed to repeal existing law, and would cause the removal of the hand presses from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, substituting power presses therefor.

As to the subject matter of this paragraph being legislation on an appropriation bill, I call the Chair's attention to the decision of Chairman GARRETT, page 508 of the Manual, section 959, in which he says:

The Chair is of the opinion that the Committee on Appropriations may not, under this rule, bring in as an integral part of an appropriation bill substantive legislation that if introduced in the ordinary way in the House—that is, by bill or joint resolution presented by a Member—would go to another standing committee of the House for consideration and action; nor does the Chair think that any Member of the House may offer from his place on the floor any amendment carrying such substantive legislation, even though that legislation would retrench expenditures, unless that Member offer it as the report of a committee or as a member of a joint commission which would have jurisdiction of the subject matter under the rules of the House. In other words, the scope is limited and the outposts are fixed by the rule to which the Committee on Appropriations may go or the individual to which a Member may go.

On the next page of the Manual there is a ruling by Chairman Hull of Tennessee, which says that under clause 2 of rule 21 new legislation proposed to be in order as an amendment on a general appropriation bill must come officially from the committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter.

On the next page it states that the same amendment was later offered by authority of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which had jurisdiction of the subject matter under consideration in the bill before the House at that time, and the Chairman ruled that the amendment was in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman states that it is his contention that this changes existing law. As a matter of fact, is the existing law such that it requires the work should be done by hand presses?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. That is my understanding of existing law.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Maryland yield on that point?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call his attention to the fact that until the law was changed in 1912 by a rider on an appropriation bill there was no more restriction on this department than there was by law on any other department as to the kind of machinery they might use for the transaction of their business. But after 1912, when there was a rider—not a proposition brought in from a legislative committee, but a rider—placed on an appropriation bill which restricted and hampered this particular bureau from using power presses. That is not legislation such as the gentleman would indicate. It was merely a rider on an appropriation bill, and it has remained on various other appropriation bills with respect to this department.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say for the information of the gentleman from Texas that many important statutes have been enacted by riders on appropriation bills, but Congress has been seeking to get away from that method of legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. But they are not substantive law, and can be changed by any other appropriation bill.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I particularly call attention to the ruling of Speaker Crisp, which will be found on page 509 of the Manual, the last paragraph, which states:

As before stated, however, the Chair is not required to pass upon that, for the Chair is clearly of the opinion that any amendment that reduces expenditures, as authorized by the proviso of clause 2 of Rule XXI, to be in order under said Holman rule must come from a committee having jurisdiction of the legislative subject. The Committee on Appropriations in this instance not being a legislative committee was without authority to insert section 6 in the bill, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the very grave danger of allowing the Committee on Appropriations to bring in legislative riders on appropriation bills. A few years ago the House, in conformity with a very widespread sentiment throughout the country, concentrated all of the power of making appropriations into the hands of the 35 Members comprising the Committee on Appropriations. The right and the power to make appropriations were taken away from the Committee on Military Affairs, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and various other committees of the House that theretofore had the power to make and report appropriations. It was stated at the time, and it was so stated repeatedly, that the power to legislate was to be reserved to committees having legislative functions. If this provision is held to be in order, it would be just as consistent for this Committee on Appropriations to bring in a provision abolishing the War College in the War Department and substituting therefor civilian or National Guard officers, or some other class of citizens, in their stead under the guise that it reduces appropriations or that there is a retrenchment of expenditures in the proposition. I think this paragraph comes clearly within the rule that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the only way in which the Chair could possibly hold it to be in order is to hold that under the Holman rule there is a retrenchment of expenditures and a reduction in the number of employees. It is not enough for the Chair to merely assume that there is a reduction of employees involved in this proposed change in existing law. I remember last year this same committee brought in a proposition to concentrate all of the liquor held throughout the United States in the various bonded warehouses, and stated that there would be a great reduction in the cost of keeping the liquor in the concentrated warehouses. The scholarly and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] rose in his place on this floor in the presence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and paid him a glowing tribute for his sagacity and foresight and for his statesmanship in proposing to concentrate in a few warehouses of the country all of the liquor then held in the various bonded warehouses. The gentleman from Illinois did not deny the pleasant statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but we find here a year later that we are appropriating for another fiscal year, and, according to the hearings held before the committee, not a single drop of liquor held in the bonded warehouses of the United States has ever been concentrated in any warehouse.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I know the gentleman wants to state the facts, and I know that he is not stating the facts. The number of warehouses has been reduced and liquor has been transported from the warehouses that formerly existed to the concentrated warehouses, and most of the concentration has taken place and is taking place every day.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. As I read the hearings, the concentration has never reached a point beyond designating the warehouses.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, the liquor has been transported and concentrated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In connection with the point of order, has not a bill proposing something similar to what is expressed in the paragraph on page 32 been introduced, and is not that bill now pending before the Committee on Printing, and has not that committee promised that hearings would be held upon the bill?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. My information is that such a bill has been introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that it is pending before the Committee on Printing, that the Committee on Printing has held at least one hearing on that bill.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I think the House is establishing a very dangerous precedent when it allows a piece of legislation of this nature to come before it as a rider on an appropriation bill, especially in view of the fact that the chairman of the committee himself has introduced substantially the same bill, which is now pending before one of the legislative committees of the House and which committee has been considering that legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there are two very good reasons why the gentleman's point of order is not well taken. In the first place, the restriction which has been followed since 1912 is not a matter of substantive law. That restriction on this particular bureau preventing it from using power presses is the result of riders placed upon various appropriation bills since 1912 and is not substantive law.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why not?

Mr. BLANTON. Because it has never been passed in a legislative bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If that be true, does not this paragraph, then, make legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. BLANTON. No; for this reason. This particular bureau is no different in its powers from any other department of the Government. The Government Printing Office, without any law, had the right to inaugurate improved linotype machines in preference to the old hand setting type machines. It had a right to inaugurate the use of any improved machinery. It is a matter of discretion which any department can exercise. The departments can pick out a particular kind of typewriter that is better than an old kind, it can pick out a particular kind of adding machine that is an improvement on the older kind. None of the departments, except this one bureau, is restricted in the use of this discretion, but this particular bureau since 1912—and I am sorry to say it continued all during the administration of my own party—has worked under this restriction preventing it from the use of improved machinery which would save this Government at least $1,377,000 a year. That is the first reason why the point of order is not well taken.

The other reason is this. Suppose it is a change of law; suppose there is substantive legislation for it, that it did not result merely from riders on appropriation bills, then it would still be in order under the Holman rule. Under this provision this bureau must by next September get rid of at least 218 employees, cut them off the pay roll of the Government, thereby stopping large expense to the taxpayers of the country. Clearly, it comes within the Holman rule. It is an annual saving of $1,377,000 ultimately, and for this year it would save nearly half a million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, the whole trouble, though it may be outside of the point of order, is that the Chair will find on each side of the clock in the gallery fronting him now a bevy of plate printers from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing who are not at their work to-day but are now up in the gallery trying to force this provision out of this bill. They are causing all this trouble here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please confine himself to the point of order. The Chair would ask him a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman says that this retrenches expenditures by requiring the discharge of employees.

Mr. BLANTON. Two hundred and eighteen of them at least, and possibly three hundred. This will save for the taxpayers annually at least $1,377,000 following the change in system.

The CHAIRMAN. In expressed language. Is there anything in the paragraph that requires an addition in expenditures?

Mr. BLANTON. No; not expressed; but, as a matter of fact, yes. In order to save $1,377,000 a year expenditures this year must be made of approximately $300,000. It is merely a mathematical calculation which the Chair can easily make, or any other mathematician can make, and the Chair is a good mathematician; but the computation must be made from the hearings, not the bill. It is the saving ultimately of $1,377,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Texas indicate to the Chair where in the bill there is indicated just what expenses would be attached to this?

Mr. BLANTON. There is no provision in the bill indicating that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman gets that in the hearings?

Mr. BLANTON. You get that in the hearings. The provision shows they can discharge from the pay roll of this Government at least 218 employees, and their salaries stopped, and the people's taxes cease to be paid for that amount of money.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from West Virginia desires to ask a question.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. If this bill is thrashed out in the proper committee in a proper way, and it is found it is proper legislation, and then is brought in here in a proper way, would it not reduce expenses?

Mr. BLANTON. I will gladly answer the question because it is a pertinent one. There should be a reduction of war employees on the roll in Washington. There are about thirty odd thousand surplus on the pay roll now who ought to be sent home, and it is more within the province of the Committee on Appropriations rather than any other committee to stop that useless expenditure of the people's money, and I am glad to see that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is standing up here like a rock-ribbed wall in that behalf in this instance.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The gentleman admits that if this law is passed it will not accomplish any more than a law properly and orderly considered and passed.

Mr. BLANTON. This committee has sufficient authority. There has been such a proposed legislative measure pending before the Committee on Printing for the past seven months with no affirmative action taken thereon. If it would be a good measure when presented by the Committee on Printing, why is it not equally a good measure when presented by the Committee on Appropriations, inasmuch as it comes within the provisions of the Holman rule in that it removes 218 employees from the public pay rolls and retrenches expenditures to the large sum of $1,377,000 a year?

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, after all the very handsome compliments paid me by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on yesterday as a parliamentarian I regret very much at so early a day to take issue with him on a parliamentary matter. It is, however, largely as to the facts in the case rather than as to what ruling the Chair should make that I fail to agree with him.

There is no question as to the legislation which it is here sought to change being permanent legislation. The first act on the subject was a proviso carried in the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1899, approved July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. L., p. 604). The language is very clear. I read the proviso:

Provided further, That hereafter—

which means for all time hereafter until changed—

That hereafter all bonds, notes, and checks shall be printed from hand roller presses.

There have been several changes made in the law. In the sundry civil appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913, approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 430), additional restrictions were imposed in the following language:

Hereafter the proviso of the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. L., p. 604), directing that all bonds, notes, and checks shall be printed on hand-roller presses shall not apply to checks, the backs and tints of all United States bonds, the backs and tints of all United States paper money, the backs and tints of bonds and paper money issued by any of the insular possessions of the United States, any or all of which shall be printed from intaglio plates and on such plate-printing presses as may be directed by the Secretary of the Treasury, said presses to be operated by plate printers, except that checks and tints may be printed by any desired process: *Provided*, That the backs of all United States paper money shall be printed from four-subject plates, and the faces of all internal-revenue stamps now printed from intaglio plates on hand-roller or power plate printing presses shall continue to be printed from intaglio plates on hand-roller or power plate-printing presses, as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine, said presses to be operated by plate printers: *Provided further*, That should the Secretary of the Treasury decide to print on the aforesaid power plate-printing presses any of the classes of work hereinbefore permitted to be printed on such presses, not more than one-fifth of the total number of hand-roller presses required to produce the estimated quantity of such work in any fiscal year shall be displaced in such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, apply motors to hand-roller presses that are now, or may hereafter be, operated in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, but such presses, if equipped with motors, shall be regarded as hand-roller presses within the meaning of this act.

Again in 1917, during the war, a modification was made so as to enable the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to use power presses during that critical time. It was carried in the urgent deficiency appropriation act for the fiscal year 1918, approved October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. L., p. 349), and reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, during the continuance of the war with Germany, to have all bonds, notes, checks, or other printed papers, now or hereafter authorized to be executed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department, printed in such manner and by whatever process and on any style of presses that he may consider suitable for the issue of such securities and other papers in the form that will properly safeguard the interests of the Government, except that such presses as are used in printing from intaglio plates shall be operated by plate printers: *Provided*, That in the execution of such work only such part of it shall be transferred from the present method of executing it as will permit of the retention in the service of such permanent plate printers as are now engaged in the execution of such work, or such temporary plate printers, similarly employed and who can qualify under civil-service regulations for permanent appointment, and all acts or parts of acts heretofore enacted relative to the use of power and hand presses in the printing of securities of the Government are hereby suspended and declared to be not in effect during the continuance of said war, and at the termination of the war such acts or parts of acts shall be in effect and force as heretofore.

In 1919 it was found necessary to extend the modification of the restrictions so as to permit during the emergency following the war the use of power presses. This extension was carried in the third deficiency appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1919, approved July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. L., pt. 2, p. 44), and is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, during the emergency growing out of the war with Germany, to have all bonds, notes, checks, or other printed papers now or hereafter authorized to be executed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing of the Treasury Department printed in such manner and by whatever plate-printing process and on any style of plate-printing presses that he may consider suitable for the issue of such securities and other papers in the form that will properly safeguard the interests of the Government, and that such presses as are used in printing from intaglio plates shall be operated by plate printers except on such work as is now being done by other processes and any similar work that may be necessary hereafter: *Provided*, That in the execution of such work only such part of it shall be transferred from the present method of executing it as will permit of the retention in the service of such permanent plate printers as are now engaged in the execution of such work, or such temporary plate printers similarly employed and who can qualify under civil-service regulations for permanent appointments; and all acts or parts of acts heretofore enacted relative to the use of power and hand presses in the printing of securities of the Government are hereby suspended and declared not in effect until that time, and at the termination of said emergency such acts or parts of acts as shall be in effect and force as prior to the act of October 6, 1917.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. In all of these instances mentioned by the gentleman from Connecticut they were riders placed upon an appropriation bill that came from the Committee on Appropriations, were they not?

Mr. TILSON. That is all true, and it is also just as much substantive law as if passed in any other way. The contention of the gentleman seems to be that the bill as here presented, or the paragraph in the bill to which a point of order is made, is only a rider on an appropriation bill and therefore is not legislation. It is clearly legislation. It was intended to be legislation and it will not accomplish the purpose if it is not legislation.

The real contention here is that under the rules of the House legislation is in order on an appropriation bill under certain circumstances. What are the circumstances that will bring it under the rule? In paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, familiarly known as the Holman rule, it is provided:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except as being germane to the subject matter of the bill—

I believe that there can be no contest here as to this being germane to the subject matter of the bill—

except such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures—

How?—

by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States—

And so forth.

We need not go any further than this, because in this paragraph of the bill it is specifically stated that the number of employees must be reduced by a certain specified number.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman does admit that it comes within the Holman rule?

Mr. TILSON. I certainly do; but I do not base it on the points raised by the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I still think the gentleman from Connecticut is a very distinguished parliamentarian. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman; but I must stick to my original statement, that while I agree with the gentleman as to what the ruling should be I do not agree with him upon the grounds stated by the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is so clear that this paragraph of the bill does retrench expenditures and that it does specifically reduce the number of employees that the Chair can not do otherwise than overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this paragraph provides for the purchase of power printing presses?

Mr. TILSON. It requires the substitution of 58 new power presses for a certain number of hand presses.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman agree with the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that this involves an expenditure of a large sum of money as well as accomplishes a retrenchment of expenditures?

Mr. TILSON. It does not appear that there will be any expenditure, but if so the expenditure is already authorized by existing law. The bill shows that there is a total reduction in the amount of money required to perform the work that is here provided for, and there is a saving on the face of the bill of something like $400,000, as I recall, for the first year, and more than double this amount thereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. Where on the face of the bill does it show the amount of expenditure for the power presses?

Mr. TILSON. It does not show it except in the total of the appropriations carried for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Connecticut will permit me, I think that is at the top of page 35, $355,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That is only by inference. There is nothing in that language to show that that sum of money is to be paid out of the Treasury. Will the gentleman from Connecticut answer further? Since this paragraph involves an expenditure of an amount of money which is indefinite and is not ascertainable on the face of the bill, and also involves actual expenditures, does the gentleman think the Chair can ascertain the actual expenditures?

Mr. TILSON. I do not believe that the Chair is required to do so. This committee has the right to appropriate for new printing presses. This has all been provided for in existing law which authorizes the purchase of all the machinery necessary. It needs only an appropriation, and such an appropriation is clearly in order without reference to the Holman rule. The Chair will find that there is already a sufficient authorization for the purchase of presses, so that it need not be carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. But this law directs the substitution of the presses, and in order to accomplish the alleged retrenchment there must be an expenditure for presses?

Mr. TILSON. I have already called the attention of the Chair to the fact that in the sum total required to do the work heretofore done there is a saving of $400,000 in addition to and notwithstanding the purchase of the presses.

Mr. BLANTON. And it specifically provides for the discharge of 218 men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And it is contemplated that instead of the number of men discharged as hand plate printers, another set of men will have to be employed to run the power presses. Personally I am favorably inclined toward the introduction of new machinery, but I do not think we should destroy the Committee on Printing or other legislative committees. A bill similar to this was introduced and referred to the Committee on Printing which has power to report that bill, if it so desires.

We find ourselves confronted here now with a doubtful proposition. No one can say, unless it be the all-powerful Committee on Appropriations, that 58 plate printing presses are what you need. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union has stated it exactly. It is an apparent economy in the employment of men, but it involves a certain expense in the purchase of presses. It is simply a matter, in my opinion, for the committee that has the power to report legislation to the House, and not within the province of an appropriating committee composed of 35 members, such as the Committee on Appropriations, to bring this into the House. If you keep up this process the Committee on Printing and other committees will fade away.

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BEEDY. How long has this bill been before the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not able to say.

Mr. BEEDY. Say, roughly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing. I imagine six or seven months, part of the time when Congress was not in session.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations included this paragraph in the bill in the firm belief that it comes strictly within the provisions of the Holman rule. The Holman rule provides as follows:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures—

First—

by the reduction of the number and the salary of the officers of the United States—

And second—

by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The provision in the bill, I want the Chair to note, is mandatory. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to take the action outlined in the paragraph.

What is the direction to the Secretary of the Treasury? It is that he shall replace hand presses, 196 in number, with power presses, 58 in number. There is not any discretion placed, mark you, Mr. Chairman, in the Secretary of the Treasury in this matter. The legislation specifically states that he shall do it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question there, right on that point?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. In that one transaction now there is no retrenchment?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we will show that there is a reduction of expense on its face.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. There is nothing in that paragraph that would put the Chairman on notice that the Secretary of the Treasury will have to buy these presses. He only gets that information from the hearings and the statement of the chairman. They may have these presses now in the basement of the building which they may substitute, because from time to time they have had unused power presses on hand.

Mr. DOWELL. That sounds like a foolish argument on this question.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me make my statement, so that it can be understood. I expressly ask the attention of the Chairman to the last sentence in the paragraph, which reads as follows:

And the Secretary shall in the performance of the duty and the exercise of the authority placed upon him by this paragraph reduce—

Mark you, reduce—

the number of the persons employed in the operation of plate printing presses by not less than 218.

Now, there is no discretion in the Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he shall reduce the number or not. He must reduce them, and I claim that we come strictly within the Holman rule when we do reduce. It can not be argued that you can reduce the force in a given department without reducing the expense. Here we have a specific direction to the Secretary of the Treasury that he shall reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate printing presses by not less than 218.

I contend that comes within the Holman rule and does specifically show on the face of the bill that we are retrenching expenditures. Now, the paragraph does not leave it open to the Secretary of the Treasury to make a reduction in the number of persons of all classes employed in the bureau, but directs him to make the reduction from among those engaged in the operation of plate printing presses, which subjects this paragraph specifically to the rule. I hope I make this clear. In this connection we have a specific compliance with the first clause of the rule which provides that legislation, to be in order on an appropriation bill, must be germane. That is the first requirement, and this paragraph is germane; and it must reduce expenditures by first reducing the number and salary of the officers of the United States. We have a strict compliance with that stipulation. There is a mandatory duty upon the Secretary to eliminate not less than 218 persons. What could be plainer? I will state the direction again so that it may be thoroughly understood:

He shall, in the performance of the duty and the exercise of the authority placed upon him by this paragraph, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate printing presses by not less than 218.

Is that clear?

Mr. DOWELL. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I want to make my argument on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that it is clear that there is a reduction in the number of employees.

Mr. MADDEN. There are precedents for the paragraph recommended in this bill.

In March, 1922, while the House was considering the bill making appropriations for the War Department, a point of order was directed to a paragraph providing for a reduction in the commissioned personnel of the Army. The provision did not state specifically, as this one in this bill does, that there should be a specific reduction of a certain number of officers. It provided for a less number of officers than had theretofore been provided for.

A point of order was raised against the provision. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. LONGWORTH, in holding the provision in order, said:

The present occupant of the chair has been called to rule quite a number of times on the Holman rule, and he is one of those who believes that it should be construed strictly. In other words, the present occupant of the chair must see to his satisfaction that the provisions in the bill actually and evidently on their face do reduce expenditures in either of the three ways provided under the Holman rule.

Now what are the three ways? One way is that you must reduce the number of persons employed. Another way is that you must reduce the compensation of the persons employed. Another way is that you must, on the face of the bill, show that you have reduced the amount of the bill.

I quote further from the ruling of Mr. LONGWORTH:

It seems to the Chair entirely clear that this provision does reduce the expenditures of the Government by a reduction of the number of officers and by the amount carried in the bill. The Chair thinks that this provision is in order and therefore overrules the point of order.

In March, 1916, Chairman CRISP, of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, ruled upon an amendment proposed to the legislative appropriation bill then pending, which amendment in effect provided that the number of persons in the classified service in the executive branch of the Government should be reduced by one-tenth on or before the 30th day of June, 1917. Coupled with this reduction there was legislation directing the heads of departments to increase the hours of labor so as to require not less than eight hours a day instead of seven, in order to effect the reduction of 10 per cent in the number.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If this provision goes out of the bill on the point of order, how much will require to be added to the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Seven hundred and forty-six thousand dollars.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And how much will be taken out of the bill at another place?

Mr. MADDEN. Three hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars on account of the machines, or a net saving of $441,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think that is the question in the mind of the Chair.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the first year, and after that anywhere from $800,000 to more than $1,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to ask the gentleman a question right in that connection. I think it might clarify the situation to some of us.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no doubt in the world about the correctness of the gentleman's proposition if this involves only the discharge of these men. But I apprehend the difficulty with which the Chair is confronted is that in addition to discharging these men it also provides for the purchase of additional machinery. Now, the rule is that it must show absolutely on its face that it means a reduction without any construction on the part of the Chair.

Mr. MADDEN. I will come to that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does this paragraph show that on the whole by necessary construction it reduces the amount of the appropriation? Does the gentleman contend that?

Mr. MADDEN. I will argue that a little later. Mr. Chairman CRISP, in holding this provision in order, said:

Now, what does the amendment in question do? It provides that one-tenth of the employees of the various executive departments shall be discharged or reduced. The legislative part of the amendment provides that when this reduction is made the remaining clerks shall work eight hours instead of seven. The Chair can not escape the conclusion that if you reduce the number of clerks the business of the Government will require those remaining in the service to work longer hours. The Chair thinks the legislation naturally and logically follows the provision reducing the number of clerks.

Now, the Chair, as before stated, believes the Holman rule is intended to have a beneficial effect upon the Treasury of the United States. If the Chair is in doubt about whether or not an amendment is in order, he believes it is his duty to resolve that doubt against the point of order, for by so doing the Chair works no hardship upon anyone, but submits to the committee itself the privilege of passing upon the amendment. If the committee favor it, a majority can adopt it. If they are opposed to it, a majority can reject it.

The Chair believes the amendment in question comes clearly within the spirit of the Holman rule, and therefore the Chair, without any reference whatever to the merits of the proposition, overrules the point of order and holds the amendment in order.

Now, one more case. Here is a precedent on all fours with what the committee recommends. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to reduce the number of persons by not less than 218, and in order to do this it directs him to substitute power presses, 58 in number, for hand presses, 196 in number, and authorizes him to utilize those power presses by giving him the authority to print from plates containing more than four subjects each, instead of restricting him to hand presses, as the permanent law provides. There is no conjecture upon the face of the provision recommended as to what will happen, no conjecture whatever. There will be a reduction of not less than 218 persons. Nobody will deny that. That is mandatory.

The second clause of the Holman rule does not enter into the question very materially, namely, that the provision may be in order if it reduces the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States. The third clause of the rule says that the provision changing existing law may be in order if it reduces the amount of money covered in the bill. This provision does not. No one will deny that, and if we do show that we reduce the amount of money covered in the bill in the paragraph before us, we come clearly within the Holman rule.

Now, what are the facts? The Chair, upon examination of the Treasury Department appropriation act for 1923—and I hope he will examine it—will find that the appropriation for compensation of other employees has been reduced from $2,512,140 to $2,454,400. The appropriation for the compensation of plate printers and their assistants has been reduced from $2,016,795 to $1,230,420. I maintain that that is a reduction in the charge against the Treasury and justifies the action that we propose. In fact, all these reductions have been made on account of the incorporation of this paragraph in the bill.

It is true that the appropriation for the purchase of materials is increased by $301,000, but the Chair will note that the net reduction in all the 1923 appropriations for this bureau as affected by this bill is $540,480. So there is a reduction of the amount of money covered by the bill as compared with current law.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Has any question been raised as to whether the Committee on Appropriations has the power under existing law to authorize the purchase of these machines?

Mr. MADDEN. None at all.

Mr. TINCHER. Then how does that come into the point of order? Why connect it up if you have the authority?

Mr. MADDEN. Gentlemen making the point of order have argued it.

Mr. TINCHER. Oh yes; they argue a lot. But here is a bill which the gentleman introduced in 1922 and which was referred to the Printing Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; the reason we took it up was because they have paid no attention to it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to stress this point, that if the provisions of the Holman rule are to be applied to the strict interpretation of the rule in its application to the paragraph in this bill, then that paragraph on its face shows a reduction, very concretely, in the number of persons required in the plate-printing portion of the bill. If the third part of the rule, namely, the amount of money required by the bill, is deemed to be conjectural, then it should follow that the purchase of the new presses and their cost is also conjectural. I think that is not true, as a matter of fact, and should not be considered by the Chair as a reason for his ruling on the point of order. But if the Chair deems there is an element of conjecture in the purchase of the new presses which may affect the economies claimed on the face of the paragraph, I submit to the Chair that he should then admit for consideration as an offset the reductions in the 1923 appropriations on this bill.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the temporary war legislation governing the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. There were two acts, one in 1919 and one in 1917, authorizing the Treasurer to disregard the permanent law governing the use of hand-power presses and permit him to use his judgment in the printing of money from power presses, from larger plates than permitted by the permanent law of 1912. There was a restriction upon this authority to him, however, and that restriction was that it required him, under the authority to disregard the permanent law of 1912, to utilize power presses and larger plates, he must give employment to the same number of permanent plate printers and temporary plate printers who could qualify as were employed in the bureau. So the law in effect said it does not matter how modern the machinery may be, what the machinery is qualified to do, the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to employ, regardless of the need, the number of plate printers in the service. That is what has been done.

The law ties the hands of the Secretary and he can not reduce the number of plate printers under the present law. It does not matter whether he needs them or not; he must employ them. Even in the emergency of war he must be governed by the requirements that he must keep a certain number of men employed. The paragraph in this bill unties his hands. That is all it does. It does what you would do or anybody else would do in his business. It places the business on a basis of economic justice. Is there a man in the world who would say that you could carry on a successful business anywhere if you are compelled to hire three men to do the work of one? There is no place except in the Government where that would be tolerated a minute.

Now, I have no grudge against anybody; I am here to perform my duty and I propose to perform it to the best of my ability, regardless of what anybody may think about it, and I leave it with you gentlemen to decide for yourselves. [Applause.]

Even after the emergency of the war I say these men had to be employed. The paragraph in this bill unties the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury. It directs him to reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218. It is admitted on every hand that they are not needed, and why should they be employed? We are discharging people in every department of the Government. There are 500 dismissals provided for from another division of the Treasury Department, in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose, instead of providing for the discharge of not less than 218 employees, the bill had provided for the discharge of not less than 15 employees. Does the gentleman think the point of order would then lie?

Mr. MADDEN. It depends upon whether that reduced the cost of the Government in doing what we do. I think the point of order ought not to lie if we reduce the expenses of the Government. We are entitled under the Holman rule to submit the legislation, and I contend that it would be in order if we reduced the cost. The Secretary can make larger reductions, if he is able to, but under this specific plan, under the mandatory, inescapable language, he must eliminate 218. I maintain that he will eliminate more than that. It seems to me that we have placed a paragraph in the bill which, strictly construed, eliminating all elements of conjecture of facts, taken upon its face, is in complete harmony with the letter and spirit of the Holman rule. If the Chair be in doubt, then that doubt should be resolved in favor of the Treasury, and the resolving of that doubt in favor of the Treasury will but give the Committee of the Whole an opportunity to pass upon the paragraph. We ask no undue advantage. I am here presenting the case. If the Chair rules the paragraph to be in order, it is still before the House for its decision. No rights can be lost. I maintain that under every precedent, under every right of justice, the paragraph is in order and should be sustained by the Chair. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing as a matter of fact on the face of the bill which shows the amount of expenditures which will have to be made for these power presses.

Mr. MADDEN. There is nothing on the face of the bill showing that there will be any expenditure. It may well be that there will be no expenditures.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Is it not true that these printing presses will be set up as an asset of the Government, so that in one sense it is not a total expenditure—a loss of money?

Mr. MADDEN. It would not be any loss of money if the appropriation were made and the money expended. It would not be a loss because within three months after they are installed they will have paid for themselves. There is nothing on the face of the paragraph to show that we are spending any money.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. There being no limitation on the committee depriving it of the right to appropriate money to purchase these presses, the only legislation, as I understand it, that is in this bill is legislation directing the Secretary of the Treasury to discharge certain employees.

Mr. MADDEN. That is practically all.

Mr. TINCHER. And the gentleman thinks that that comes within the Holman rule?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Does the reduction of 218 employees take into consideration the number of other employees required to run the 58 power presses?

Mr. MADDEN. It does.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say does not indicate how I shall vote on the main proposition, if the Chair holds it to be in order, because I do not know the facts, and I have an open mind in the matter. This is rather an important matter from the standpoint of construction and precedent. I call the attention of the Chair, and I am sure he is familiar with it, to the principle that in construing the Holman rule with reference to whether or not there is an actual reduction proposed on the face of the bill, this rule has uniform approval in the consideration of that question:

The reduction of expenditures must appear as a necessary result in order to bring the amendment or provision within the exception to the rule. It is not sufficient that such reduction would probably or would in the opinion of the Chair result therefrom.

If the Chair will refer to volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents he will find a number of decisions. I remember one especially, a very learned decision, by our late colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Saunders. I imagine that the difficulty which confronts the Chair ruling on this question has been suggested by one or two questions that he has asked Members on the floor who have been discussing it. While it is undoubtedly true that the last paragraph of the section does come within the provisions of the Holman rule, inasmuch as it specifically provides for the discharge of a certain number of employees that would necessarily involve a retrenchment in expenditures, and the amount carried in the bill, yet at the same time in the body of the text of the provision itself we find the provision wherein the Secretary is directed to dispense with the use of not less than 198 hand-printing presses and to substitute therefor not more than 58 power plate-printing presses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And further, to print the fronts and the backs of the notes, and that is a complete change of law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am discussing it only from the standpoint of retrenchment.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I not suggest to the gentleman that the very point that he has just made differentiates this case from the precedents cited.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Absolutely, so that in view of this uniform rule of construction I do not think the precedent cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the decision of Chairman CRISP, will stand up under proper analysis. The precedents hold that the text of the provision itself must be so clear and unambiguous that no other possible or logical conclusion may be ultimately drawn by the Chair in construing it except that it means absolute retrenchment. While the language provides on the one hand for the discharge of a certain number of men and a certain number of instrumentalities, at the same time in the same paragraph there is provision for the installation of other instrumentalities, which, for aught appearing, as far as the construction of the Chair is concerned, might cost infinitely more than the amount of the retrenchment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman, I think, in his statement assumed that it would cost money to transpose the work from the hand presses to the power presses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, now let me answer that.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman read that into his statement, I think.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is rather a violent assumption upon the part of this committee to want the Chair to infer that the acquisition by the United States Government of 58 additional power presses can be acquired without the expenditure of any money. And, gentlemen, I do not believe the gentleman from Illinois would intend the Chair to put that character of construction upon his language.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the clause in question consists of four distinct provisions. The first provision is this: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to dispense with 198 hand plate-printing presses. The second provision is to substitute therefor 58 power plate-printing presses. The third provision is as to the manner of printing, and the fourth provision is as to the reduction of employees. Now, it is important that this section contains these four provisions because of this fact. The only exception to the general rule embodied in paragraph 2 of Rule XXI, upon which the committee relies to escape the rule that they can not legislate, is contained in the second sentence:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order except as being germane to the subject matter of the bill, and shall retrench—

And so forth.

Now, the precedents hold this first, that every provision in a subject which is being considered must be within the rules, and it is not sufficient to say that the fourth provision of this paragraph does retrench. Let us for a moment concede that is true, which I do not concede at all; but let us for a moment concede that that is true. That does not make this a proper subject of legislation. It does not exempt from the provisions of the general rule forbidding this committee to legislate, and I read on this subject the following:

To a clause appropriating for the foreign mail service an amendment reducing the appropriation, and in addition repealing the act known as the "subsidy act," was held not in order because the repealing of this act was not germane to the appropriation bill, and to be in order both branches of the amendment must be germane to the bill.

Now, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his argument says that the third provision, directing as to the manner of printing, changes existing law, and that must be within the Holman rule as well as the provision reducing the number of employees. It is also provided that they shall not use existing plates but substitute new plates, and those two things change the existing laws. So there can be nothing except the fourth provision of this paragraph that is within the Holman rule. Let us come, secondly, to the question of retrenchment. The rule is not that it is the duty of the Chairman to see if he can find that the provision results in economizing, because he is convinced of the merits of the proposition, and to compute and add and subtract and use mathematics to demonstrate that there is retrenchment. That is not the rule at all. You are not considering the merits of the question. You are considering simply and solely the question of parliamentary law, and you have no right to consider or deal with the question of the merits of the case that is before you.

We do not know what the merits are. They have not been discussed; and the rule is plain—simply that the Chairman must find, not as a matter of deduction but of necessity, that there is a retrenchment. Let us take the question of retrenchment as argued by the chairman of the committee. He does not claim there is anything within the bill which shows that there will be a retrenchment. He says that reducing the number of employees will result in the reduction of expenditures. He does not say what the expenditures for the new power machines will amount to, and it does not appear upon the face of the bill. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that he can turn to the estimates in two different years and contrast the estimates of last year with the appropriations of this year, seeking the result in that way. Of course that is absurd. Of course the expenses of the Treasury may be totally different one year from another year. Of course that would not be any light by which to guide you to your decision at all. Of course you can not consider that. You can consider only this bill which is before you. You must reach a decision that it would necessarily and plainly, upon its face, reduce expenditures. So it seems to me that, first, because the first three provisions of this bill are legislation and are not included within the Holman rule, and are entirely distinct from and not a part of the fourth provision, the point of order is well taken. And, secondly, because it does not appear on the face of the bill that a reduction will be made, the point of order must be sustained also. As was said by the gentleman from Alabama, I do not intend to indicate at all my position upon the merits of this question, which, as well said, is not before the House, but I am simply speaking to the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I judge from the arguments which have been made by those in favor of the point of order that they are basing their argument wholly on the fact that

the paragraph in question provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to substitute for the hand presses that are to be dispensed with not more than 58 power plate-printing presses. The argument is that notwithstanding the actual and definite reduction in the number of officers of the Government, employees of the Government, coming properly within that term, that there is a probable expenditure involved in executing the provision for power presses, and that therefore it does not appear clearly and definitely from the paragraph that there is to be a reduction in expenditures. Gentlemen have evidently lost sight of the fact that there is nothing in this provision that authorizes the purchase of any power presses.

If this paragraph were adopted there is no possible way without subsequent action whereby the Treasury could be charged with a single penny of expenditure on account of power presses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You get that on page 35 of the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; but we are discussing this paragraph, and the gentlemen who have been arguing in behalf of the point of order have been insisting that this must appear upon the face of the bill. I agree with them as to that to a certain extent. They now shift their position. We are assuming their position on the basis of the argument they advance their contention is not sound. There is nothing in this paragraph that authorizes an additional expenditure. Everything contained in the paragraph is a reduction, a definite reduction by the number of persons, and the paragraph that has been so frequently referred to is simply a part of the change of law. It is a part of the new legislation that this paragraph seeks to put into effect authorizing the use of power presses, but it does not provide for the purchase of any power presses, and the Congress might not provide for the purchase of power presses. As some one has suggested, the Government may be in possession of power presses now. The power presses might be secured in exchange for hand presses. One might indulge in all sorts of speculation along that line, but the Chair is not justified in indulging in any speculation in the matter at all. No expenditure is authorized and therefore speculation as to expenditure is not justified.

That provision has been emphasized by everyone who has spoken in favor of the point of order. It does not provide for expenditure. None is provided for in this paragraph.

Now, there is no question in the mind of anyone, I imagine, who is familiar with the rule but that the last three lines of this paragraph bring it clearly within the Holman rule.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment; and there is nothing else in the paragraph that in any way modifies that clear and definite provision that there shall be a reduction in the expenditures by the reduction in the number of employees.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman how many of these plate printers are employed now?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state it to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. What has been the reduction in the number of plate printers in the past year? This bill proposes to reduce them by 218.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that is a pertinent question.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will say to the gentleman that about 100 were reduced this past year.

Mr. MONDELL. I am discussing the point of order, not the merits of the proposition.

The point of order is that this paragraph does not come under the Holman rule, and does not come under the Holman rule because, among other things, they say it authorizes the use of certain machines. That does not necessarily involve any expenditure. It will involve no expenditure unless later the committee may see fit to make provision for it; and I insist, as the gentlemen who have discussed the matter heretofore on the other side have insisted, that the Chair shall not speculate as to what the Committee or the House may do later.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I notice the words "substitute therefor." I have been much interested in the argument of the gentleman. Does the gentleman believe that the language to substitute one machine for another would justify the director, if he found he did not have the machine, in going out in the market and buying it?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is a question.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, not at all. I think that if the gentleman from Illinois will reflect a moment he will agree with me that that would not justify the purchase of a machine without an appropriation. That is simply authority. If the Secretary has the machines, if he can secure the machines, if Congress gives him the machines, he may substitute them. That is simply authority to substitute. That is a part of the change of existing law, authorized and justified under the Holman rule, by the provision in this paragraph that reduces the number of plate printers.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Well, if the director, it seems to me, can go out and buy machines under this authority, that would be one thing; but if he can not, and this is merely a substitution of machines that he already has, that would be another thing and this would not apply.

Mr. MONDELL. He can not do that without authority, without an appropriation. Every discussion of the Holman rule that we have had emphasizes the importance of a liberal construction of the rule, and the construction of the rule has invariably been liberal; so liberal that I have been inclined to take the other side in one or two cases that have been referred to here. Occupants of the chair have invariably held that there must be a liberal construction of the rule. That liberality of construction has gone to the extent of holding in order provisions repealing important statutes by the reduction of an appropriation in the sum of $1. The construction of the rule has been invariably a liberal one.

Further, gentlemen on the other side are not entirely accurate when they say that the reduction must be clearly evidenced in the provision itself. That is true in a certain sense, but there was a decision—for instance, one of the early decisions under the Holman rule—under which a provision was held to be in order that did not in any way on its face indicate a reduction. It limited the number of pensioners under the pension law, and the chairman was charged with the responsibility of knowing the provisions of the act amended, and it was necessary for him to consult those provisions in order to decide whether the amendment was in order.

But the Chair is not in this case called upon to speculate or make inquiries. The matter is plain on its face. In a case decided by Chairman Saunders, of Virginia, where a reduction in the number of cavalry regiments was to be effected, the argument was made that there would necessarily be some incidental increases in expenditure along with the probable decreases, and the Chair did take that into consideration and said that while it is true there might be some increase of expenditure along certain lines, there would unquestionably be a net reduction in expenditures. In some of these cases the Chair has been called upon to be informed in regard to the provisions of other acts and in other cases to balance as between probable expenditures and probable retrenchment. But in this case the Chair is not called upon to exercise his judgment in the matter of probable increase and probable decrease or to inform himself in regard to matters outside the bill.

He may confine himself to the provisions of the paragraph directly before him; and he will find there is not a provision in the paragraph that necessarily and of itself increases by a single penny the Federal expenditure. On the other hand, there is a clear, definite, unquestioned reduction of expenditures resulting from a very large reduction of the officers or employees of the Government.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Rule, rule!

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations, under the heading of Bureau of Engraving and Printing, has this paragraph:

The Secretary of the Treasury is directed, as soon as possible after the approval of this act and not later than September 30, 1923, to dispense with the use of not less than 196 hand plate-printing presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and to substitute therefor not more than 58 power plate-printing presses, and hereafter he is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each upon power presses the fronts and backs of any paper money, bonds, or other printed matter now or hereafter authorized to be executed at such bureau; and the Secretary shall in the performance of the duty and exercise of the authority placed upon him by this paragraph, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218.

To that paragraph the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ZIHLMAN] makes the point of order that it changes existing law and violates the provision of clause 2 of Rule XXI, which says:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the

reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Then there is an additional proviso which is not involved. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] does not dispute the proposition that the proviso changes existing law, but seeks to justify the paragraph upon the ground that it shows upon its face that it is a retrenchment in expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of the amounts of money covered by the bill.

The Chair in passing on this rule is governed by the face of the bill and the law and the rule.

The rule laid down by Speaker Kerr in this respect was as follows:

In considering the question whether an amendment operates to retrench expenditures, the Chair can look only to what is properly of record before him—that is, the pending bill, the specific section under consideration, the law of the land, so far as it is applicable, and the parliamentary rules and practice of the House; and beyond these he is not permitted to go in deciding the question.

The Chair takes it that no one will seriously contend that that is not the rule. The point of order is directed to the whole paragraph. Of course, if there is any part of the paragraph that is not in order, the paragraph must go out. It is all involved in one proposition, which is obviously an attempt at "retrenching expenditures" under the rule.

You will note by the language of the rule that it is not enough that the measure reduces the number and salary of the officers of the United States or reduces the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury. It must "retrench expenditures" by doing that. The many rulings on this question are fairly uniform. They all hold that when, on the face of the bill, the proposed new legislation retrenches expenditures in one of these three ways the point of order should be overruled, and the rule is generally laid down that the construction should be liberal in favor of retrenchment of governmental expenditures.

The noted parliamentarian, the late Mr. Mann, in arguing this question in a case which has not been cited here, but which the Chair thinks is very much in point, laid down what seems to me the rules governing the decision on this point of order.

There was an amendment offered which provided for a vast expenditure for an asphalt machine, and also provided in the same amendment that there should be a decrease in the expense of doing asphalt work. In discussing the different phases of the matter Mr. Mann made this statement:

The original Holman rule provided—

"Except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures."

We put a limitation on that. It must retrench expenditures in certain ways now. It is not sufficient to say now that a proposition shall retrench expenditures or must retrench expenditures by the reduction of the amount of the salary of an officer, by the reduction of the compensation, or by the reduction of the amounts of money covered by the bill. I am not referring to the proviso yet. So, if an amendment was out of order under the original Holman rule, it is out of order under this provision, because this is a mere limitation upon the original Holman rule.

While it is not necessary at this time to discuss the proviso in the Holman rule, because that question is not presented, I take it that there the same rule applies as to the retrenchment of expenditure under the original Holman rule, because now a committee is authorized, which has jurisdiction of the subject matter, to offer an amendment on an appropriation bill which shall retrench expenditures. But the basic ruling of all has been that of Speaker Kerr, that the retrenchment of expenditures could not be a matter of argument. It is not a matter for the Chair to determine whether the transfer of the Indian Office to the War Department is a retrenchment of expenditure. It is not for the Chair to determine whether the construction of an asphalt plant is a retrenchment of expenditure. That is an argument pure and simple. People may differ about that. The Chair can only act upon the proposition which is presented on the face of that proposition.

Now, coming to this provision, to which the point of order is directed: It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to substitute 58 power plate-printing presses for 196 hand plate-printing presses, and also to discharge not less than 218 employees. Of course it is admitted that it is going to require the expenditure of money to purchase the presses, but following the ingenious argument that the Government may already have the printing presses on hand, it seems to the Chair that the Chair is unable to determine as a matter of law that that will effect retrenchment of expenditures, so far as the face of the bill is concerned. It certainly may require the expenditure of a vast sum of money to buy printing presses. It may not, but it may require it. They are to be substituted for the others. There is going to be a change in the cost of the overhead with reference to printing presses. That is clear. The amount of that cost is entirely conjectural, is subject to argument, and depends upon extraneous matters not in the record. I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if there were 15 men discharged whether it would be subject to a point of order. I think if 5 men were to be discharged it clearly would not be, and the Chair is unable to go up to the point where he can say what number of employees to be discharged makes the provision in order. It would require the Chair to go out and try the question of fact, which depends on statements which might vary, and require the Chair to determine questions of fact, weigh evidence, and search the record in the hearing, which would be a dangerous precedent. Where one paragraph containing new legislation provides in one part for a discharge of employees, which will mean a retrenchment, and to bring about this particular retrenchment substantial expenditures will with reasonable certainty be made and the amount of those expenditures is not capable of definite ascertainment, the Chair is unable to hold that the net result will retrench expenditures. The Chair is of the opinion that this paragraph is subject to the point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with great respect for the Chair I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman from Illinois has an amendment that may obviate that, and I withdraw the appeal.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, after line 10, insert: "Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each upon power presses the fronts and backs of any paper money, bonds, or other printed matter, now or hereafter authorized to be executed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and the Secretary shall, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this paragraph, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218."

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that this is legislation and repealing existing law, and not in order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I submit the question without any argument.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair wishes, I will read the existing law which appropriates for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing——

The CHAIRMAN. There is no doubt about its changing existing law. If the gentleman wishes to argue the point of order, the Chair will hear him.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, according to the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, they now have or have had an average of 588 men as the maximum number of plate printers in the bureau. I am informed by men who are employed in that bureau that there has been a gradual reduction since the close of the Great War—an average reduction of about 100 men per annum. So the amendment which provides that there should be a reduction of 218 men does not show that there is any retrenchment of expenses, because, Mr. Chairman, if during the past year there has been a reduction of 100 men in the bureau employed as plate printers, it is certainly not clear that during the coming year, by resignation, death, and otherwise, there will not be a reduction of fully the number mentioned in this amendment.

I wish to call the Chair's attention to the fact that there has been no substantive proof offered that there will be any reduction in the expenditures by this amendment. The testimony before the committee of the director was that it would result in a saving. But I call the Chair's attention further to the fact that during the past few years there has been an increase in the appropriation provided for the detection of counterfeit money of fully 300 per cent. One of the safeguards that has been provided by Congress is in having the front and back of money engraved, and it has minimized to a large extent successful passing of counterfeit money. Notwithstanding that fact there has been an increase during the past few years of 300 per cent in the amount of money appropriated for the detection of counterfeits. There has been nothing here to show that this amendment will result in the reduction of expenses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this last amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is practically the same as the provision in the bill. It authorizes them to print on power presses. That implies the getting of the presses to replace the hand presses. They cut that out in this amendment, but it is as much implied as it was before. The amendment is therefore subject to the same point of order.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the point of order. The proposition now is to cut out the first two provi-

sions of the paragraph and to leave the third and fourth provisions. The third and fourth provisions are entirely distinct. The third provision is that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print in a certain way, and the fourth provision is for the number of employees.

Now, it seems to me that the case as now presented has been precisely determined, and that is this:

To a clause appropriating for the Foreign Mail Service an amendment reducing the appropriation, and in addition repealing the act known as the "subsidy act," was held not in order, because the repealing of this act was not germane to the appropriation bill; and that to be in order both branches of the amendment must be germane to the bill.

Now, let us assume for the purpose of the argument that the fourth provision is germane and that it does effect a reduction or retrenchment, to use the exact language. The third provision is an entirely different thing. As in the case I have stated, it repeals substantive law, it is entirely distinct from, it is not inseparably connected with, and it in fact has no relation to the fourth provision. It must stand on its own basis. It has no reference to the exception of paragraph 2, Rule XXI. It nakedly and solely repeals substantive law, and being so, it is clearly within the citation. The burden is upon the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee must show that they are within the exception. The burden is not on the one who raises the point of order. They must show that they have the right to legislate—that they can repeal the legislation. Because there are two distinct provisions, one reducing expenditure and one repealing legislation, and the one which repeals the legislation is distinct and can not stand, and because there is this vice in the paragraph, it follows that as part of the provision is vicious the whole paragraph fails, and therefore the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] reads as follows:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each upon power presses the fronts and backs of any paper money, bonds, or other printed matter, now or hereafter authorized to be executed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and the Secretary shall, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this paragraph, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218.

The Chair is of opinion that the amendment comes within the ruling of Chairman CRISP, which holds that where the retrenchment is apparent upon its face the amendment is in order. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard upon the amendment. The subject matter in the proposed amendment may be the proper method of printing the bank notes in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, providing, as it does, for the substitution of power presses for hand presses; but this is certainly not the proper method of enacting this legislation or any other legislation.

The House has concentrated in the hands of the Appropriations Committee the very great power and responsibility of making all the appropriations for all the departments, and it has reserved to the legislative committees of the House the function of considering and presenting to the House bills dealing with legislative matters.

In conformity with this practice, the Committee on Printing has repeatedly considered bills providing for the proper method of printing the Federal currency and protecting the public against fraud and counterfeiting.

In permanent law it has provided that the backs of the bank notes should be printed on power presses and that the front of the note should be printed on hand presses, from plates made by skilled engravers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I have only five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I want to ask a question.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I would like to make a brief statement if the gentleman will excuse me. This matter, as I have stated, has been repeatedly before the Committee on Printing, and in 1912 they reported to the House and the House adopted the present law providing for the methods of printing bank notes.

On last January the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN, himself introduced a bill providing for the discontinuance of hand presses and for the purchase of power presses. The Printing Committee held hearings on that bill, but no action was taken thereon.

We now find the measure brought in as a paragraph in an appropriation bill making provision for the expenses of the Treasury Department during the ensuing fiscal year.

No one, except the Director of the Bureau, appeared in support of the proposition, and those who are opposed to it were given no opportunity to be heard, notwithstanding the fact that a great convention of bankers sitting in the city of New York a few weeks ago passed resolutions calling upon Congress and the Federal authorities to resume the same high quality of material and of mechanical production of paper money that obtained prior to the war, in order to provide the largest possible protection against counterfeiting.

This resolution, adopted on October 4, 1922, is as follows:

Whereas recent reports show unusual activity in the making and circulating of counterfeit money: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the convention requests the Secretary of the Treasury to resume the same high quality of materials and of mechanical production of paper money that obtained prior to the war, in order to provide the largest possible protection against counterfeiting; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

Resolution adopted by the National Bank Division of the American Bankers' Association, Tuesday, October 4, 1922.

Resolution adopted by the entire American Bankers' Association, Wednesday, October 5, 1922.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. That is what I wanted to ask the gentleman about—to have him point out in what way this affects it. It would have a whole lot to do with my vote.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I shall proceed in my own way and will come to that in a moment. This is a matter of transcendent importance, and it should receive the proper consideration of the legislative committee of Congress authorized to deal with this question, and it should receive the proper consideration of the House. I contend that it is impossible to do it in the way that this subject matter is brought before this body, without any evidence other than the bureau's testimony before the committee and without careful inquiry into the methods used in the production of currency, and as it now has a bill before it dealing with this proposition, it should not be brought in as a rider on an appropriation bill.

The director of the bureau testified before this committee that there was a daily average of 588 plate printers employed in the bureau, and I am reliably informed by men who are employed in this bureau that this number has been reduced to the number of about 100 a year, so that this matter is working itself out, and that if this is the proper method of printing bank notes it will be brought before the House in a proper way in due time.

I call the attention of the committee to the publication I hold in my hand, known as the National Counterfeit Detector, a journal for bankers and merchants in the United States and Canada, published by Grant, Bushnell & Co., publishers, of New York City, which is accepted by the Treasury Department as an authority on matters of counterfeiting.

It calls attention to three new counterfeit notes which have been discovered and are being circulated freely.

The first is a $5 Indian-head silver certificate, check letter "D," faceplate No. 22. The second is a $10 national-bank note on the First National Bank of Ozone Park, N. Y., series of 1902, portrait of former President McKinley, and the third is a $20 national-bank note on the Grand Rapids City National Bank, of Grand Rapids, Mich., with a portrait of McCullough. It calls attention to the fact that the backs of the above three notes are of light green, giving them a washed appearance, and that they are very dangerous counterfeits.

I call attention to the fact that the backs of the notes are printed on power presses. They also call attention to a Federal reserve note on the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, Ga., check letter "H," faceplate No. 83, and call attention that this is printed on genuine paper, and that the genuine paper is obtained by bleaching all print from a bill of smaller denomination, possibly a one-dollar note, so that the statement made by the chairman of the committee that the Government could depend on the quality of the paper for protection against counterfeiting is shown to give no security.

I also call attention to this supplement, giving a list of the counterfeit notes in circulation throughout the United States.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Where are those power presses manufactured, and what do they cost?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. It is provided later in the bill that about 60 of them shall cost $355,000.

Mr. LAZARO. Where are they manufactured?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not know who manufactures them or who proposes to sell them to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. If this is good legislation, if it is protection for the Government, if it is to be acted on here to-day in the appropriation bill, I think that the members of the committee, chairman, and the ranking minority member should be fair with the House in presenting to it the statements made to them before the committee. The chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], stated on the floor that the Chief of the Secret Service had testified before his committee that the counterfeiting of a power-press note is no easier than that of a hand press, and I quote his statement herewith:

The counterfeiting of a power-press note is no easier than of a hand-press note, so the Chief of the Secret Service testified. Most of the counterfeits are being made by photographic processes.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] substantiated the statement made by the chairman of the committee; and I have the hearings containing the statement of Mr. W. H. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service of the Treasury Department, and there is not a single word in his testimony that shows that he ever made any such statement. On the contrary, he stated there was a great increase in the counterfeiting of bank notes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Moran did testify to that. He testified to it outside of the record. I did not make any misstatement, and neither did the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If he testified outside of the record, it is not a matter to be reported here, and I make the point of order against the statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read my remarks he will find that I never made any statement to the effect that the Chief of the Secret Service had so testified before the committee. I made the statement that he had stated, and I repeat it upon the best of authority, that the use of the power press would not make counterfeiting of currency any easier.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I do not know anything about what the Chief of the Secret Service stated outside of the hearings, but in the hearings he stated that counterfeiting and forgery were unusually large.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has made a statement with respect to a statement that I made which puts me in a false position. I made no such statement on the floor of the House. I did not say that he so stated in the hearings, and I think I am entitled to a correction on the part of the gentleman.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Just a moment. I am trying to get the gentleman's language. If I misquoted him, I withdraw the statement. I do reiterate the statement that the chief of the bureau who testified before this committee stated that there had been an increase in counterfeiting, and I quote the language of the chairman of the committee to the Chief of the Secret Service when he asked him this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any increase in the work of your bureau in lines other than counterfeiting?

Showing clearly in the mind of the chairman when he asked this question that there had been an increase in counterfeiting and had so been presented to the committee.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Did this relate to counterfeiting of money or labels for bottles?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The counterfeiting of money.

Mr. MADDEN. Counterfeiting of checks and forgeries of every kind.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I notice that Mr. Moran, Chief of the Secret Service, testified at considerable length before the committee. But I find nothing at all in his testimony bearing upon the particular matter we are discussing, the matter of substituting power presses for hand presses. Of course, I do not dispute the statement of the gentleman from Illinois and my friend from Tennessee that Mr. Moran may have made some statement outside of the hearings, but he certainly made none before the committee that afford any basis for any action we may take. The only statement was by Mr. Hill, supplemented by Mr. Clark, who, I believe, is one of his subordinates. My difficulty is that the case has been very casually and insufficiently considered.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. This legislation will reduce the quality and high standards of Government currency and securities, which has been protected by law as far back as 1887, and when power presses were first introduced.

On August 24, 1912, after years of consideration Congress decided to print the back—or green—of all paper money on power presses, realizing that in retaining the printing of the face of currency by the better method of hand presses they were providing a certain measure of security against counterfeiting.

The World War, with its excessive demands on all resources of Government activities, had a corresponding effect on the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and the enormous demands for Liberty bonds, in addition to the current demands of the Treasury Department, made quantity production of paramount issue rather than quality, it being contended that the short-term bonds could be replaced by a higher quality of security that would baffle the skill of the expert counterfeiters.

As has been pointed out, the comparison of the currency situation in Europe to-day with the printing presses working over time and the admitted flood of paper money and the ease with which it may be imitated should be a warning against this at this time, and which may lead to such conditions in this country. Surely the American Bankers' Association should be the best judge of this, when they adopted the resolution heretofore referred to at a great convention held in New York City.

I insert here the statement of Mr. W. H. Moran, Chief of the United States Secret Service, on November 13, 1922, before the Subcommittee on Appropriations:

Mr. MORAN. The service is primarily charged with the suppression of counterfeiting and the protection of the obligations and the securities of the Government. In addition to that we are charged with the protection of the President, his immediate family, and the President elect. The work of the service has increased in the last three or four years to a greater extent, probably, than ever in its history. Counterfeiters and forgers, I suppose, in common with the other criminals along other lines, are unusually active. We have had more different counterfeit issues in the last year than in two years previously, and while the quality of those counterfeits is not as good as in years past, they are sufficiently deceptive to pass on unsuspecting storekeepers in the hurry of business. We do not hope to wholly suppress their activities, of course; the best we can do is to reduce to a minimum the output of counterfeit money.

I again reiterate what I have previously stated, that this matter should be dealt with with deliberation and investigation, and should be brought before this House by the proper legislative committee, and I hope that the amendment proposed by the chairman of the committee will not be adopted.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, in discussing and voting on this amendment we had better let our minds wander back home to our constituents, to the neglected and despised taxpayer, including the farmer, the laboring man, the professional man, the school-teacher, and all of those people of our land in whom we profess to have such an abiding faith and interest. If we vote right on this proposition, perhaps those various groups will accumulate more of the products of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing than they would if we did not keep a surplus number of employees on the public pay roll; for when it comes to the last analysis of the bill—we need not delude ourselves with any idea that we are going to prevent counterfeiting or are going to improve the service—it is simply for the purpose of keeping 218 or more unnecessary employees—consumers, if you will—on the roll, keep them in Government employ, at the expense of the people, or whether we are going to let them go into the ranks of the producers and amount to something in the building up of the country and its industries.

Mr. Chairman, this thing has been a disgrace to the country and an injustice to the people for at least 10 years. All over the country, wherever you go, you are constantly asked why are not modern business methods introduced in carrying on the Government, and in the inaugural of our President he said that one of the chief desires he had in mind was to have more business in Government and less Government in business. I think we can subscribe on both sides of this House to that sentiment. How can we have more business in Government if we are going to refuse to adopt the methods and machinery used in private business? In order to give employment to the maximum number and properly pad the pay rolls let us abandon the typewriter and write all our letters in long hand, cut the telephone and telegraph wires and send all our communications by messenger, set all our type by hand, scrap the automobiles and railroads and travel by stagecoach, restrict production and block the path of progress and invention, so the favored Government employee may hold his or her job. It would be better, if there were not one single dollar of saving under this amendment, to get rid of these men.

I do not call them loafers, that would not be the right designation, but they are unnecessary and unfairly employed at the expense of other people and an economic loss to production. In my district 3,500 men have been discharged from employment in the Charlestown Navy Yard. Why should these men

without a job support 218 men who can go out and get another job probably somewhere in the vicinity of Washington, if not in Washington itself, when they themselves are in serious need of employment. Why should the farmers in the gentleman's district, who have been complaining about the readjustment burdens they have had to carry, why should they carry on their backs 218 surplus employees?

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman allow me to answer that right now?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I would rather contine my argument before I yield. I want to present for your consideration a cartoon which appeared in one of the daily papers not so long ago. It was a pyramid of men, one standing upon the shoulders of the other. The fourth and top figure was that of a soldier, and his motto was, "I fight for all." He stood on the shoulders of the bishop, and the bishop's motto was, "I pray for all." And he in turn stood upon the shoulders of the justice, and the justice said, "I plead for all," and down at the bottom of the heap, with sweat pouring down his face into the dust at his feet was the laboring men, the backbone of this Republic of ours, and his motto was "I pay for all." Gentlemen, I want you to consider this proposition. You have no right to keep men in the employment of the Government unnecessarily while the man at the bottom of the heap is paying for all. Before you vote for this amendment let us think of the poor, despised, neglected taxpayers who, in the last analysis, be the consumers and workers of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am in opposition to this amendment which has been offered in lieu of the matter ruled out upon a point of order. This substitute is to all intents and purposes the same as the paragraph that went out, and yet by the change of a few words it escapes. In effect it says that "hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print from plates," meaning print Treasury notes on both sides. The "hereafter" makes it permanent legislation and a substitute for the legislation of 1912. Then it says, "and the Secretary of the Treasury is to reduce the number of plate printers by 218."

That is the small part of it, but that is what lets the thing in under the Holman rule. Two hundred hand-press note printers will step out under this legislation on an appropriation bill, and a large number of power-press plate printers will be employed in place of them. We will buy the presses, we will eliminate a few places, perhaps 50, and after it is all done we shall have on both sides of your highly sensitized, silk-threaded, high-priced paper common printing-press money. That may be all right, but where is there any discussion of both sides? When was any notice given to anyone?

What plate printer has been heard on this proposition? What becomes of the Printing Committee's promise to hear them after the distinguished chairman of the grand committee should have been heard?

But more important than whether the United States shall go into the printing-press money business, along with several of the countries of Europe, is the fact that the all-powerful Committee on Appropriations sees fit to usurp the rights of still one more of the small committees. I have protested; I continue to protest. Every subcommittee of the grand Appropriations Committee takes a crack at will at some poor little third-rate committee, knocks it cold, and leaves it gasping for breath. If the Holman rule does not serve the purpose, then the words are changed, but not the intent.

New Members are cajoled into believing that they are given desirable places when they are placed on these minor committees, and yet when these committees try to perform they find their public bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar—usually so far down the list that they can not be reached in the lifetime of an ordinary session—or given the privilege of being called up on some Calendar Wednesday, which said Calendar Wednesday comes around about as often as the 29th of February, owing to the disposition of the leaders to dispense with it as if it were a stench in the nostrils of regular procedure.

Mr. Chairman, how long are Members going to sit here in their places and permit one grand committee to usurp the rights of all the others? Must every well-taken point of order be beaten by the clever jockeying of words? To-day it is your little Committee on Printing that gets a smash on the nose. When that committee called a meeting to consider the bill embracing this plate-printing matter the proponent of the bill did not appear. Your Committee on Printing is called upon freely enough to do all of the little undesirable odds and ends. Only to-day we had before us a calendar containing 200 items. All had to be gone over carefully. Occasionally a member of that committee is privileged to rise in his seat and move, Mr. Chairman, that a President's message be made a public document. Then, as a reward, we may sit here and see put over in an appropriation bill an item which is three-fourths legislation and one-fourth Holman rule—an item that brings us to the use of printing-press Government notes in the interest of petty economy, that discharges 218 men and forces the hiring of perhaps 175 different men, probably at a higher pay. You call it "Holman economy."

You wonder why you are called "a cowardly Congress" when you sit here supinely from day to day and see your rights slipping away. You were promised that under the Budget plan, if you consented to a grand Appropriations Committee of 35 members, all legislation on appropriation bills would cease. You were promised that all other committees would be fully protected. And have they been? No. Half of your committees have been stripped until the few members who attend the meetings sit around and twirl their thumbs waiting for quorums to appear. And if you attend the sessions of the subcommittees of the grand Appropriations Committee you find two and perhaps three members representing both parties doing the whole work. The departments are there in force, and the words of their representatives are reported and considered, but if you want a single item considered in any subcommittee's bill you have to be either an extra strong or an extra plausible member, and the chances are that even then you will not get far. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, until 1912 the Bureau of Engraving and Printing had the very right that we are now seeking to restore. It was taken away from it in 1912, and repeatedly since then for just one purpose, and that is to comply with union demands and keep three times as many employees on the pay roll as are necessary to do this particular work.

Now, I am going to bring you right down to the very keynote of the whole proposition. In the hearings Mr. MADDEN asked, on page 335, how much this amendment would save, and in reply Mr. Clark, a bureau official, said it would save $746,555 a year now, and ultimately it would annually save $1,377,300. Here is the keynote. Mr. MADDEN asked this question on page 334:

> Why don't you use the power presses?
> Mr. CLARK. We would like to.

What kept him from it? I will tell you, it was our union friends who now sit in that gallery, watching us, who said to this Government, "You can not do it because we are not going to give up our jobs."

Then Mr. MADDEN again asked the question, "Why do you not do that, Mr. Clark?" And the answer was, "We are waiting for Mr. MADDEN's bill to go through." And my good friend from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], with whom I am very glad to work, and whom I frequently follow here, asks, "Why do not you let his committee bring in the Madden bill?" The Madden bill has been before his committee, sleeping the sleep of death for seven long months. That is why. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is only fair to say that Congress has not been in session all that time.

Mr. BLANTON. It has been in session much of the time, and we met frequently from day to day, affording plenty of time to have brought in the Madden bill and to have passed it, if the committee had forced its consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. You can not get a bill like that considered through the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is sometimes difficult. But we have got that very proposition here before us now. Why not consider it now? It is brought in by the Committee on Appropriations. Now is the time and place.

Why is not the head of the bureau down there willing to use the power presses now? Our bunch of plate printers you now see up in the gallery will not let them. I am in favor of the interests of the whole people of the United States rather than the interests of any class. I will help any of these employees to get another job. I will work for them as willingly as any other Member here to get them new jobs. They will not lose their present jobs down there for practically a whole year. They have nearly a whole year in which to look around and get other jobs. I have helped many men in Washington to find new civilian jobs. Men whom I have helped here in Washington will tell you that. I do not care whether they come from my own State or not; I do not care where they come from; I go with them and try to help them get new civilian positions.

Yesterday's Post stated that a lot of these plate printers were here in the Capitol day before yesterday, up yonder in the gallery, in the effort to beat this provision. They were not at work day before yesterday. Yesterday afternoon they were again in that gallery, and the very minute that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] had this matter postponed until to-day you saw the whole bunch of them get up and leave. Now they are up there again. This is the third day that they have been idle. They are here to prevent this legislation from going through. They are here in behalf of a class against the interests of the whole people. I am not afraid to get up here and speak in their presence. I never say anything behind their backs that I would not say to their faces. Personally I have friendly sympathy for them all.

Mr. KING. Why do you not go up in the gallery?

Mr. BLANTON. I face them daily everywhere. They can go into my district and try to beat me; but I am going to speak, so long as I am a Member of this House, in the interest of the whole people of the whole United States, no matter if every union in Washington gets up in that gallery against me. [Applause.]

Mr. KING rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that my good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] takes every occasion to make appeals to the galleries of this House. The galleries have been very kind to the gentleman from Texas and have frequently applauded him here upon certain sentiments which he has uttered from time to time.

But for some reason, I can not understand why, the gentleman from Texas has great antipathy toward the galleries of the House. These men who are now sitting in the gallery are citizens of the United States, are citizens of our common country, and they have just as much right to be in the gallery of this House as the gentleman from Texas has to be upon this floor. I am not seeking the applause of the gallery. I am not trying to invite the gallery to applaud. Applause of the galleries is reserved for the gentleman from Texas. It belongs especially to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Will my friend yield?

Mr. KING. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The only difference is that my business is here on the floor and their business is down in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. KING. The gentleman's business for three months was down in the State of Texas running for Congress; which is all right, and I have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. And I came back.

Mr. KING. I am glad the gentleman did, as far as I am concerned.

Now, the main proposition here seems to be whether you will discharge a certain number of plate printers. They have been held up to ridicule here by a number of Members of the House, especially by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], as though they were simply trying to hang on to their jobs, as though they came here without any right to those jobs.

I desire to read a little appeal that was made to these men to come to Washington during the war, most of them having occupied paying positions in various private institutions of this country.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1918.

To the Plate Printers of the United States:

Never before in the history of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has the demand for plate printing been as large as at the present. We are running with all the capacity at our command and still have need for more plate printers.

I am taking this means of appealing to all plate printers whose work is slack or who are out of employment to communicate with me relative to employment in the bureau. I can offer permanent position with good rate of pay, both for hand and power press plate printers. We need your services now, and it is to be hoped that you will respond to this appeal by submitting an application to me, stating whether you have served a full apprenticeship, giving your actual experience, your age, and your nationality.

Respectfully,

JAMES L. WILMETH, *Director.*

So it seems that there was some degree of patriotism which prompted these men to come to Washington during the war when the Government was in such dire need of their services; and it seems to me to be rather ill advised, now that they happen to be in the gallery for a day or two in a matter in which they are so vitally interested, to excoriate them for doing so.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is only one question involved here. That is, Are we in favor of the economy that we have been preaching? At the very lowest figure there is $800,000 involved in the amendment now under consideration. It will probably run up as high as $1,376,000. The question before us is, Are we going to vote $1,376,000 or even as low as $800,000 out of the pockets of the American taxpayers in order to do something that is not necessary to be done? That is all there is to it. [Applause.] If we are here to do what we ought to do, of course we will vote for this economy. We have heard a good deal said about the inability to print bank notes or any other notes on power presses without making them subject to counterfeiting. There is only one thing connected with the whole subject. The engraving of the plates is done by the engraver and not by the printer. You have a good bill or a bad bill depending upon the character of the engraving and not upon the character of the printing. All of the presses everywhere throughout the United States, except in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, print all kinds of money for everybody outside of the United States on power presses, and nobody raises any question of it not being well done.

It is true that a plate printer may do a bad job on a well-engraved plate, or he may do a good job on a well-engraved plate, but no plate printer can do a good job if there is not a well-engraved plate from which to do it. All the testimony from all the experts goes to show that it is not a question whether the money is printed on a power press or on a hand press when it comes to the matter of counterfeiting. The whole matter of counterfeiting is due to the increase in the perfection of the art of photography and has nothing to do with the printing of the money on any kind of a press. But notwithstanding all that there is nothing here before us except the question whether you want to spend $800,000 or $1,000,000 a year without any justification, or whether under your oaths of office you are bound to save $1,000,000 whenever the case justifies it. Here, gentlemen, we present the justification for the economy. I submit the question now for your consideration without any further debate. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. ZIHLMAN) there were—ayes 87, noes 38.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that as amended the bill do pass.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to the final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I ask for a separate vote on the amendment inserted on page 32 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment on which the gentleman from Maryland demands a separate vote, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, after line 10, insert: "Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each upon power presses the fronts and backs of any paper money, bonds, or other printed matter now or hereafter authorized to be executed at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this paragraph, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate printing presses by not less than 218.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. ZIHLMAN) there were—ayes 165, noes 26.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 168, nays 85, answered "present" 1, not voting 176, as follows:

YEAS—168.

Ackerman	Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Reece
Andrew, Mass.	Dempsey	Kline, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Anthony	Dickinson	Kraus	Roach
Appleby	Drewry	Lanham	Rogers
Arentz	Driver	Larsen, Ga.	Rouse
Aswell	Dupré	Larson, Minn.	Sanders, Ind.
Atkeson	Echols	Lawrence	Sanders, N. Y.
Bankhead	Ellis	Layton	Scott, Tenn.
Barbour	Fairfield	Lea, Calif.	Sears
Beedy	Faust	Leatherwood	Shaw
Benham	Fitzgerald	Little	Shelton
Bixler	Fordney	Lowrey	Shreve
Black	French	McArthur	Sinnott
Bland, Va.	Frothingham	McDuffie	Sproul
Blanton	Fuller	McKeusie	Stafford
Boles	Garner	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stedman
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	McPherson	Steenerson
Box	Gifford	MacLafferty	Stephens
Briggs	Gilbert	Madden	Stevenson
Brooks, Ill.	Glynn	Magee	Summers, Wash.
Buchanan	Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Sumners, Tex.
Bulwinkle	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Temple
Burtness	Greene, Mass.	Martin	Thompson
Byrns, Tenn.	Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Tilson
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Michener	Timberlake
Cannon	Haugen	Miller	Tincher
Carter	Hawley	Mondell	Tinkham
Chindblom	Hersey	Montague	Towner
Christopherson	Hickey	Moores, Ind.	Treadway
Clarke, N. Y.	Hooker	Murphy	Turner
Clouse	Huck	Nelson, Me.	Underhill
Cole, Iowa	Hudspeth	Nelson, J. M.	Vaile
Collier	Hukriede	Newton, Minn.	Vestal
Colton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Oldfield	Walters
Connally, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Oliver	Wason
Coughlin	Jacoway	Paige	Watson
Crago	Johnson, Miss.	Pringey	Webster
Cramton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Quin	White, Kans.
Curry	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Ala.	Williamson
Dale	Kearns	Ramseyer	Woods, Va.
Dallinger	Kelley, Mich.	Rankin	Wyant
Darrow	Ketcham	Rayburn	Young

NAYS—85.

Abernethy	Hayden	McSwain	Speaks
Andrews, Nebr.	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Steagall
Beck	Hill	Moore, Va.	Strong, Kans.
Browne, Wis.	Huddleston	Morgan	Swank
Burdick	Hull	Mott	Sweet
Cable	Jeffers, Ala.	Mudd	Swing
Chalmers	Johnson, Wash.	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, Tenn.
Cooper, Wis.	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Thomas
Crowther	King	O'Connor	Tyson
Cullen	Kissel	Parker, N. J.	Vinson
Dowell	Kleczka	Parks, Ark.	Voigt
Favrot	Kline, N. Y.	Patterson, Mo.	Weaver
Fields	Knutson	Raker	Williams, Ill.
Fish	Kopp	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson
Focht	Lampert	Rhodes	Wingo
Foster	Lankford	Ricketts	Woodruff
Fulmer	Lazaro	Riordan	Wright
Gahn	Lineberger	Robsion	Wurzbach
Gensman	Logan	Rose	Zihlman
Gernerd	Lyon	Sanders, Tex.	
Hardy, Tex.	McClintic	Sandlin	
Hawes	McCormick	Sinclair	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Elliott

NOT VOTING—176.

Almon	Cockran	Goodykoontz	Knight
Anderson	Codd	Gorman	Kreider
Ansorge	Cole, Ohio	Gould	Kunz
Bacharach	Collins	Graham, Pa.	Langley
Barkley	Connolly, Pa.	Griest	Lee, Ga.
Begg	Cooper, Ohio	Griffin	Lee, N. Y.
Bell	Copley	Hammer	Lehlbach
Bird	Crisp	Hardy, Colo.	Linthicum
Blakeney	Davis, Minn.	Harrison	London
Bland, Ind.	Deal	Henry	Longworth
Bond	Denison	Herrick	Luce
Bowers	Dominick	Hicks	Luhring
Brand	Doughton	Himes	McFadden
Brennan	Drane	Hoch	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Britten	Dunbar	Hogan	McLaughlin, Pa.
Brooks, Pa.	Dunn	Husted	MacGregor
Brown, Tenn.	Dyer	Hutchinson	Maloney
Burke	Edmonds	Ireland	Mead
Burroughs	Evans	James	Michaelson
Burton	Fairchild	Jefferis, Nebr.	Mills
Butler	Fenn	Johnson, Ky.	Montoya
Byrnes, S. C.	Fess	Jones, Pa.	Moore, Ill.
Campbell, Kans.	Fisher	Kahn	Morin
Cantrill	Frear	Keller	Norton
Carew	Free	Kendall	O'Brien
Chandler, N. Y.	Freeman	Kennedy	Ogden
Chandler, Okla.	Funk	Kiess	Olpp
Clague	Gallivan	Kindred	Osborne
Clark, Fla.	Garrett, Tex.	Kirkpatrick	Overstreet
Classon	Goldsborough	Kitchin	Park, Ga.
Parker, N. Y.	Rodenberg	Snell	Upshaw
Patterson, N. J.	Rosenbloom	Snyder	Vare
Perkins	Rossdale	Stiness	Volk
Perlman	Rucker	Stoll	Volstead
Petersen	Ryan	Strong, Pa.	Ward, N. Y.
Porter	Sabath	Sullivan	Ward, N. C.
Pou	Schall	Tague	Wheeler
Purnell	Scott, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.	White, Me.
Radcliffe	Siegel	Taylor, Colo.	Williams, Tex.
Rainey, Ill.	Sisson	Taylor, N. J.	Winslow
Ransley	Slemp	Ten Eyck	Wise
Reber	Smith, Idaho	Thorpe	Wood, Ind.
Riddick	Smith, Mich.	Tillman	Woodyard
Robertson	Smithwick	Tucker	Yates

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).

Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Mead (against).

Mr. Butler (for) with Mr. Carew (against).

Mr. Ackerman (for) with Mr. Ransley (against).

Mr. Patterson of New Jersey (for) with Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. Perkins (for) with Mr. Kindred (against).

Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Cockran (against).

Mr. Hutchinson (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).

Mr. Olpp (for) with Mr. Tague (against).

Mr. Radcliffe (for) with Mr. Keller (against).

Mr. Lehlbach (for) with Mr. Hogan (against).

Mr. Hoch (for) with Mr. Cooper of Ohio (against).

Mr. Taylor of New Jersey (for) with Mr. O'Brien (against).

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Upshaw (against).

Mr. Free (for) with Mr. Griffin (against).

Mr. Purnell (for) with Mr. Rainey of Illinois (against).

Mr. Wood of Indiana (for) with Mr. Sabath (against).

Further notice:

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Begg with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Campbell of Kansas with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Synder with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. Schall with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Barkley.

Mr. Dyer with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. Brennan with Mr. Rucker.

Mr. Morin with Mr. Sisson.

Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Burroughs with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Ten Eyck.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Longworth with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Crisp.

Mr. Fenn with Mr. Smithwick.

Mr. Codd with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Anderson with Mr. Johnson of Kentucky.

Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.

Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Blakeney with Mr. Goldsborough.

Mr. Bland of Indiana with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Deal.

Mr. Fess with Mr. London.

Mr. Denison with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion to recommit by Mr. TINKHAM: Recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith, with the following proviso:

"Insert on page 28 a new proviso, as follows:

"'*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of the salary of any employee who shall not have been appointed after competitive examination and certification by the Civil Service Commission.'".

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not in order because it changes substantive law. It is legislation on an appropriation bill, and unauthorized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that it is a limitation.

Mr. BLANTON. The present law provides how the employees shall be appointed and employed. That is substantive law. It is within the Volstead law. This is a change, and to that extent it is legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized. I call attention to the fact that this same amendment was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts in the committee and the gentleman from Illinois made the point of order and the Chair sustained it.

Mr. DOWELL. The Chair overruled it.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well, I was mistaken about that.

The SPEAKER. This is clearly a limitation and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands the yeas and nays. All in favor of taking the question by yeas and nays will rise. [After counting.] Five Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

The question was taken on the motion to recommit, and the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone;

H. R. 540. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes;

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 8062. An act amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher;

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith; and

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor;

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire; and

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, for two days, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

Mr. GARNER, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of John W. Harris, Sixty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a short summary of the American Legion convention at New Orleans, including a speech made at that convention by Judge Kenesaw M. Landis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with permission granted by unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a summary of the proceedings of the Fourth National Convention of the American Legion, held at New Orleans, La., October 16 to October 20, I submit the following:

Whereas there was introduced in the Congress of the United States immediately following the armistice, November 11, 1918, more than 50 separate and distinct bills providing for the payment of an adjustment of compensation in various forms to the service men and women of America who served in the World War practically without pay, while the workers at home were receiving unusually high wages with many bonus features; and

Whereas the American Legion in national convention assembled at Minneapolis in 1919, at Cleveland in 1920, and at Kansas City in 1921 indorsed the justness in principle of such adjusted compensation, realizing the great financial and economic handicap suffered by our service men and women, and whereas adjusted compensation for military service in principle and practice is based upon historic precedents; and

Whereas the Nation should pay and is paying all of its other war debts and obligations, and this obligation to its defenders is of supreme importance; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is to be commended for the careful consideration it has given this legislation, and has affirmed its belief in its justness by passing it upon every occasion that has come before it by increased majorities; and

Whereas, after careful consideration by this convention of all the arguments advanced in opposition to this measure, including the letters of the Secretary of the Treasury, the address of the President to Congress in 1921, and the message of the President to Congress accompanying his veto after this legislation had been passed by the Senate and by the House, we still firmly believe in the justness, the fairness, and the immediate necessity for adjusted compensation legislation: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the American Legion, at the Fourth National Convention assembled, do reaffirm our belief in the American Legion plan for adjusted compensation with full confidence of the support of the American people, and we do now instruct the newly elected national commander, the national executive committee, and the national legislative committee to continue the fight for this legislation until it has been enacted into law.

As a supplement to the report which you have just adopted, and as declaring the policies of the American Legion, the committee on resolutions has instructed me to present the following declaration of policy:

"The American Legion in its fourth national convention assembled submits to the people of the United States this declaration upon the subject of adjusted compensation.

"The Legion recalls that at its first national convention, November, 1919, it passed the following resolution on the subject of adjusted compensation: Be it

"*Resolved*, That while the American Legion was not founded for the purpose of promoting legislation in its selfish interest, yet it recognizes that our Government has an obligation to all service men and women to relieve the financial disadvantages incidental to their military service—an obligation second only to that of caring for the disabled and for the widows and orphans of those who sacrificed their lives, and one already acknowledged by our allies; but the American Legion feels that it can not ask for legislation—it is selfish interest—and leaves with confidence to the Congress the discharge of this obligation.

"Thereafter the Congress of the United States requested the American Legion to aid it in determining what form of adjusted compensation would best meet the needs of the service men. In answer to this call the American Legion submitted its fourfold optional plan of adjusted compensation, designed to meet the varying needs of the service men in all parts of the country, by its home aid, land project, insurance and cash options—a measure designed to meet the Nation's obligation to the service men and at the same time promote national welfare.

"The Congress of the United States by overwhelming majority votes, recognizing the will of the American people, passed an adjusted compensation measure, which has now been vetoed by the Nation's Chief Executive.

"The American Legion in convention assembled has given consideration to the arguments urged against adjusted compensation. The Legion believes:

"(a) The argument that the Nation can not afford it is unsound. The cost of adequate compensation would not exceed one month more of the war, and the Nation could and would have afforded that. The net debt of the United States is billions below that of our principal allies, though our economic strength is manyfold greater, our allies have granted adjusted compensation to their war veterans.

"(b) The argument that the adjusted compensation measure should fail because it does not carry taxation provisions is insincere. None of the great war acts calling for expenditures, such as the vocational training act, or the war risk insurance act, or, indeed, any of the acts of Congress calling for expenditure, ever contained special taxation features to raise revenue for the purposes provided in the act—revenue-raising measures under our system of government being independent measures.

"(c) The argument that the cost would be five billions is misleading. That figure is arrived at by opponents of adjusted compensation by compounding at 4½ per cent interest for 20 years the real cost, if met now, of one and one-half billion.

"(d) That the Nation is spending millions on the disabled is not an answer, because there is a debt to the nondisabled; it should be paid as all other war debts are being paid, and the payment of one debt does not excuse nonpayment of another.

"The American Legion believes in adjusted compensation not only as an expression of the Nation's gratitude to those who dedicated their all to its service but more especially as an approximate adjustment of the economic losses sustained by the service men by reason of their service. Congress drafted the soldier and ordered him to serve at $1 or $1.25 per day. Labor was not drafted. The wages of those not drafted doubled and trebled in the war period. This basic injustice compels the Nation to do what it can toward rectification. The adjusted-compensation measure passed by the Congress is a recognition of this injustice and an attempt to remedy it by constructive legislation.

"The economic losses thus sustained by the service men are a debt from the Nation to them, and this debt should be paid by all of our people, as all other war debts have been paid. It should not be allowed to remain a burden upon that element of our people least able to bear it, and who themselves bore the military risks of war.

"Instead of meeting this just obligation in the manner indicated by the Congress, with the approval of the representatives of the service men, by the passage of an adjusted-compensation measure which would make home owners, home builders, and possessors of insurance of thousands of American service men, the Chief Executive proposes a pension.

"The American Legion stands foursquare in favor of adjusted compensation and against a pension. What is sought by the American

Legion is that the entire Nation shall meet its obligations to the service men by the constructive legislation proposed and not by the creation of a pension system.

"The Legion wants the Nation to pay its debts and not to do charity. Whenever the people have voted, their verdict has been for adjusted compensation.

"Our commander, officers, and committees worked to carry out the will of the people and the wish of the Legion. They were right and their efforts should have succeeded. The Legion presses the passage of a constructive adjusted-compensation measure. The Legion hopes and expects this act will be passed without delay, so that the Legion may devote all of its energies to the other constructive measures of its program productive of good to the Nation we served.

"The Legion desires to stand not in a position of getting something from the Nation but of giving something to the Nation. The Legion must carry on its Americanism program in behalf of better education and aid generally in the development of patriotism and love of country—its program to help inculcate in all our people a sense of individual responsibility to community, State, and Nation, and must now actively help in righting one of the greatest wrongs in the history of the American people—a wrong connected with the prosecution of the war, and therefore the duty of the American Legion to help correct—the exposing of the war profiteers.

"The Legion recognizes this as among its immediate obligations, because when the American people are aware of the extent of war profiteering, a national determination will have developed that in any future war there shall be a draft not only of service men but of the laboring man and capitalist as well. Had there been such a draft, the fundamental basis of adjusted compensation now temporarily thwarted by Executive action would never have arisen.

"The American Legion proposes to render these services to our people, to continue its program for better and truer Americanism, to inculcate patriotism, to develop comradeship, and to aid those of our comrades upon whom the physical burden of the war still rests. The American Legion intends that the American people shall regard it in its true light, not as an organization seeking anything from the Nation for its own selfish purposes but as an organization marching in time of peace as it did in time of war under the banner of service to country."

AMERICANIZATION OF, IMMIGRATION OF, NATURALIZATION OF, AND EXCLUSION OF, ALIENS.

Whereas the continued admission of undesirable immigrants into the United States under the operation of our present laws, taken in connection with the vast number of nonnaturalized and nonassimilated persons heretofore admitted through lax laws and law administration of our immigration laws, constitutes a vital and growing menace to American institutions and American ideals; and

Whereas if this menace is not checked it will eventually undermine and destroy respect for law, orderly government, every patriotic impulse, and the loyal character of American citizenship, as well as disorganize our industrial and economic structure, and ought therefore to be the concern of every true American: Be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we earnestly and respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to wholly suspend and forbid all immigration for such period of time as will enable the formulation of a definite and constructive plan for the protection of our people and our Nation from this dangerous influx; and be it further

Resolved, That among other salutary regulations should be preference given by law under restricted immigration to the immediate families of those who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States, and, secondly, to the immediate families of persons resident in the United States, its Territories and possessions, who are citizens thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That for the purpose of furthering the control of this danger at its source, immigration commissioners should be authorized to be attached to American embassies and legations throughout the world; and be it further

Resolved, That Congress be urged to permanently deny admission hereafter, as immigrants or permanent residents, to all aliens who are ineligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States.

2. A resolution requesting legislation to provide a remedy for veterans who are of foreign birth who are debarred from entry to this country because of the immigration laws.

3. Whereas it is the belief of a very large proportion of our people that immigration to the United States should be completely discontinued for a period of several years; and

Whereas Congress enacted a law, known as the Dillingham bill, providing that not more than 3 per cent of the nationals of any country residing in the United States according to the census of 1910 shall be allowed to enter the United States between the years 1922 and 1925; and

Whereas, contrary to the spirit and purpose of the above-mentioned act of Congress, there has been permitted to enter the United States during the past year a number of tens of thousands in excess of the quota legally authorized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The American Legion in national convention assembled hereby denounces the laxity with which our immigration laws are being enforced, and the American Legion hereby calls upon Congress to investigate the matter and take every means necessary to see that our immigration laws are rigidly and properly carried out.

4. A resolution urging legislation giving to parents and dependent relatives of American citizen ex-service men precedence under the quota law governing the admission of aliens into this country.

5. Whereas certain State constitutions require that no naturalized citizen shall be entitled to vote unless able to read and write English; and

Whereas upon naturalization such naturalized citizens are not required to pass this literacy test; and

Whereas this highly commendable and heartily indorsed literacy test after naturalization often has resulted in citizens being deprived of the voting privilege: Be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That it urges legislation by Congress that will make the literacy test compulsory for admission to citizenship.

6. *Be it resolved*, That the American Legion, in national convention assembled, in view of the efforts of the Territory of Hawaii for Americanization and its need for aid in its tremendous problems, urges Congress to aid the Territory of Hawaii in educational Americanism and other measures applying to the States.

7. Whereas, the national oriental committee of the American Legion, Thomas N. Swale, chairman, has rendered a valuable service in the collection of data on the danger from the influx of the oriental into the United States, compiled in a formal report,

Resolved by the American Legion, in national convention assembled, That said report be transmitted to the national legislative committee of the American Legion for use before the Congress of the United States in urging laws consistent with the facts set forth and the recommendations contained in said report; be it further

Resolved, That this convention urge the enactment without delay of laws, and the negotiation of treaties if required, for the permanent exclusion as immigrants or permanent residents of the United States of all persons ineligible under the laws thereof to citizenship.

CIVIL SERVICE.

A resolution urging the issuance of an Executive order requiring heads of all departments and bureaus of the Government to notify honorably discharged ex-service men whose ratings fall below the rating of "good" at the time such rating will be made, and further providing no ex-service man shall be discharged or reduced in rank or salary on the basis of an efficiency rating covering a period of less than three months.

DISABLED MEN.

The amendment of existing law to make rehabilitation training available to widows and dependents of deceased persons who lost their lives in line of duty in military service.

The amendment of existing law so as to permit all claimants suffering with compensable disabilities of service origin to be allowed compensation pay on a hospital basis when so hospitalized.

The amendment of section 310, war risk insurance act, so as to allow all disabled veterans compensation from date of discharge, providing they submit evidence showing a disability of compensable degree.

The amendment of existing laws so as to inaugurate a system of permanent ratings by a board, with laymen representation, who will consider the man's previous education, earning ability, and general status in life, as well as his physical condition, with the end in view of establishing a permanent disability rating code.

The amending of subdivisions, section 302, of the Sweet Act so as to eliminate the word "pulmonary" before tuberculosis and the insertion of the words "chronic empyema," "psychosis," "neurosis," and "psychoneurosis," and to make time when service origin is presumed to be five years, except neurosis and psychoneurosis, to be two years.

Federal aid for agricultural trainees to establish them as self-sustaining farmers.

The time limit for securing certificates of disability to be extended to August 9, 1926.

The full assistance of the Legion to procure the enactment of efficiency bills to make possible the completion of all projects of the first and second Langley bills, and a further appropriation to build mental hospitals and for the improvement of existing hospitals.

The amendment of section 2 of the rehabilitation act in such manner as to recognize any service connection established under provisions of section 300 of the war risk insurance act, amended, as sufficient for all purposes under the provisions of the rehabilitation act.

A resolution urging continued support of House bill 11195, known as the Sweet bill.

A resolution urging support of the legislation providing for the payment of $20 per month to the widow and $3 per month to every orphan child of the Spanish War veterans.

A resolution providing an amendment to the war risk insurance act continuing in force term insurance beyond the date now fixed by law—March, 1926.

The amendment of article 408, war risk insurance act, to permit the insured to reinstate term insurance in such manner if not able, due to the exigencies of their conditions, to pay the back premiums and interest due upon back premiums and said arrears may be charged against the principal sums of the policy. And to provide further that if inability to pay arrears continues the said arrears may be carried as a charge against the principal of the policy until March 3, 1926, which is the date fixed when all policies must be converted into permanent ones.

A resolution providing an amendment to section 13 of the war risk insurance act to permit the payment of moneys on a judgment awarded claimants from regular appropriations of the United States Veterans' Bureau.

A resolution advocating legislation to increase the traveling allowance of officials and employees of the United States Veterans' Bureau sufficient to meet their actual expenses.

"Whereas the Veterans' Bureau did, without medical examination or previous notice as required by law, reduce the rating of totally deaf ex-service men from 100 per cent permanent total disability carrying $100 compensation per month and $5.75 per $1,000 of insurance carried, to 65 per cent partial permanent carrying $52 per month and no insurance; and

"Whereas this reduction is considered a discrimination against deaf men and an injustice in the light of other ratings, and

"Whereas the Veterans' Bureau program of rehabilitation of totally deaf men has proven a failure in the average case and $52 to $65 a month is inadequate for the support of a single man, let alone one with family: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the National Convention of the Legion in convention assembled*, That the rating of 100 per cent permanent total disability for totally deaf ex-service men be reestablished, and as a means of securing this end that the national legislative committee of the Legion be instructed to secure the passage of the two bills, one now in the Senate Finance Committee (S. 1497) and the other in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (H. R. 6422) covering this point, with the added provision that payment of compensation and insurance be made retroactive to date when reduction went into effect."

That all legislation affecting veterans of the World War be referred to a standing committee in each branch of Congress, so that the responsibility of such legislation shall be upon a single agency.

A resolution urging the establishment by Congress of a new and separate committee to consider all matters of legislation dealing with compensation, hospitalization, and rehabilitation.

Resolved, That the national and departmental legislative committees take steps toward the enactment of civil-service legislation that will automatically give positions to disabled persons, when qualified, instead of merely proffering them on civil-service registers: Be it

Resolved, That proper steps be taken to secure the following amendment to article 3, section 301, paragraph (g), of the war risk act, so that it will read as follows:

"If the death occurs before or after discharge or resignation from the service as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service and compensable under the laws and regulations governing the United States Veterans' Bureau, the United States shall pay for burial expenses a sum not to exceed $200, as may be fixed

by regulations. The United States shall also pay for the return of the body to his home, if still in the service or in a hospital receiving treatment as a United States Veterans' Bureau patient, but the total allowance for burial expenses and return of the body to his home shall not exceed $200, except when the expense of transportation of the body exceeds this amount, and in that event the actual cost of transportation shall be paid."

GENERAL ARCHIVES BUILDING.

Whereas at the national convention of the American Legion at Kansas City, 1921, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, viz: That "The American Legion urges the proper legislation for the erection of a suitable repository for all national archives where they may be safe from any future possibility of fire, vermin, or other causes for their destruction"; and

Whereas since the adoption of the above resolution no steps have been taken by Congress looking toward the erection of an archives building, and the danger to the national archives from damp, fires, vermin, theft, is an ever-increasing one; Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion in convention assembled at New Orleans, La., That we do protest the failure of Congress to provide a suitable building for the storing of our national records upon which depends future knowledge of the history of our country and the part taken by its citizens, both in a civic and military way, and we insist upon our representatives in Congress using all proper means to obtain legislation which will provide adequate protection to our national archives without further delay.

ARMISTICE DAY.

A resolution of third national convention making armistice day a national holiday.

FLAG USAGE.

A resolution urging legislation making it an offense to misuse the flag of any country on friendly terms with the Government and people of the United States, and urging similar reciprocity for the protection of the American flag within the boundaries and possessions of such friendly countries.

MEMORIAL AT ARLINGTON.

A resolution requesting legislation for the erection of a memorial in Arlington Cemetery in honor of the dead of the World War.

SLACKERS.

A resolution requesting immediate dismissal from Government service of slackers.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD EMPLOYMENT.

Whereas it appears that foreigners are in command of American ships in preference to Americans, particularly those operated under the United States Shipping Board: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we urge that the national legislative committee take necessary steps to petition Congress and the Shipping Board to give preference to American citizens in securing officers and men for all ships operated by the United States Shipping Board.

RECLAMATION OF LAND.

The convention recommended that the incoming national commander appoint a special committee of five members to carefully study the plan proposed and make a report to the national legislative committee.

Be it resolved, That the American Legion indorses and approves the plans submitted to Congress for the lending of Federal aid to the reclamation of arid lands and the drainage of swamps, such as the Columbia Basin project, the Colorado River, the Shoshone and Platte River projects, the recovery of waste swamp lands in Florida and Louisiana, and other similar projects, and urges that Congress speedily enact legislation whereby the vast amount of land included therein may soon be made productive.

Whereas there are now in the United States millions of acres of swamp, waste, and arid land that can be reclaimed and made available for settlement: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in convention assembled go on record as favoring the immediate and speedy enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States having for its object and purpose the reclaiming of such swamp, waste, and arid lands; be it further

Resolved, That such legislation provide, as has been the policy in the past, that the ex-service men and women of this country be given preferential rights in the settlement of such lands when they have been reclaimed.

MILITARY AFFAIRS—POLICY.

1. *Be it resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled*, That we indorse H. R. 12106, introduced in the Congress of the United States by Comrade FISH, which provides for the retirement of enlisted men after 25 years' service in the United States Army with retired pay of not less than $100 per month and allowances.

2. *Be it resolved*, That the national convention of the American Legion indorses the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as a sound foundation for the military policy of the American Government, and urges adequate appropriations to maintain the Regular Army, National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and Citizens' Military Training Corps under its provisions in a state of organized efficiency that will guarantee the peace, security, and integrity of the country.

Resolved, That this convention regards as a national peril of the gravest character the reduction of the Regular Army below the total enlisted strength provided in the national defense act of June 4, 1920. This convention further recommends the immediate repeal of the Army elimination clause of the Army appropriation bill of June 30, 1922, so that the minimum commissioned personnel shall not be less than 13,000 officers.

3. The committee reaffirms previous action of our conventions on military policy. It reaffirms its indorsement of the national defense act of June 4, 1920, as amended, and opposes vigorously any material departure from its principles and obligations.

We urge the Legion's continued support to the Federal and State Governments in the formation, recruiting, and maintenance of the National Guard and Organized Reserves.

We urge that the citizen soldier components of the Army of the United States, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves, which are the chief reliance of our country in time of national emergency, be officered in peace and in war, as far as practicable, by qualified men from their own ranks and that all provisions for qualification be established in time of peace.

We urge the immediate enactment of the Bursum bill as heretofore indorsed by the American Legion, National Guard Association, and Reserve Officers' Association.

We urge the immediate enactment of Senate bill 674, which provides for the distribution of the captured war trophies of the World War to the respective States, Territories, and District of Columbia, and, further, the immediate passage of the joint resolution in Congress to provide for one of each type of these trophies to be allotted to the national museum of the American Legion at Indianapolis.

We believe that our battle fields in Europe should be properly marked and we urge that the military affairs committee of the Legion be hereby instructed to take suitable action to accomplish this result.

We urge the enactment of a graded retirement law which will provide for the enlisted men of the Army after 16, 20, or 25 years of service similar in benefits as is now provided for enlisted men of the Navy.

We urge the continuance of the military affairs committee of the American Legion as a permanent committee, constituted and appointed as heretofore.

4. UNIVERSAL SERVICE LAW RECOMMENDED.

The third national convention of the American Legion adopted a resolution, submitted by the national military affairs committee at that convention, which directed the national commander to appoint a committee to study the question of a universal draft of all persons capable of industrial as well as military service, and in addition the universal draft of land, material, plants, and capital necessary to the prosecution of war.

That national commander in January of this year delegated this duty to the National Military Affairs Committee. This committee met in Washington, D. C., in February, and again in June, and upon both occasions this subject was carefully and fully considered. The committee in its deliberation has had the advice of some of the best economic and military experts of our Nation. It has further studied the experiences of France, England, and Germany on this subject during the World War. It has further reviewed all of the war-time legislation enacted by Congress between April 6, 1917, and March 4, 1919, that was in force in our country at the end of the war, the national defense act as amended, and the many specially prepared articles on industrial mobilization.

The only important legislation on the statute books at the present time which provides for mobilization of any part of our country's resources is the national defense act as amended June 14, 1920. This makes provision for:

First. Drafting the National Guard in order to overcome the limitations placed by the Constitution upon the use of the militia as such.

Second. A commandeering section which authorizes the President to place order for munitions and other supplies in any factory he may select, and provides not only punishment for a refusal to accept such orders but authorizes him, if necessary, to commandeer such factories.

There is no legislation to give the President power in case of any emergency declared by Congress to mobilize all of the material resources, industrial organizations, and services for the purpose of carrying on war, including power to stabilize prices not only for those commodities required by the Government but for the whole civilian population. The additional legislation necessary should provide for:

(a) The selection for service of any necessary part of the unorganized militia.

(b) Control of material resources and industrial organizations other than the commandeering section in the national defense act.

(c) Control over prices of commodities for the Government and the civil population, together with control over service.

(d) Creation of the various auxiliary agencies which were found to be necessary in the last war, such as the War Industries Board, Fuel Administration, War Trade Board, Food Administration, etc.

It must be made clear that the draft features of the Federal statute submitted for the approval of the fourth annual convention of the American Legion would not be operative until Congress had declared war or other emergency authorizing the use of the armed forces. The provisions of this statute other than the draft would become operative when war is imminent, the purpose being to authorize the President to establish the necessary machinery to stabilize conditions before war conditions have thrown the economic machinery of the country out of gear.

The business men are generally willing to take Government contracts if assured of prices of raw material, labor, power, and transportation remaining stable, and labor in general will be content with existing wages if assured that the cost of food, shelter, and clothing will remain stable.

It is the opinion of this committee that if all necessary stabilizing machinery can be made operative immediately upon the imminence of an emergency that a long and important step forward will have been made in an orderly, equitable, and economical manner.

This committee believes that this important piece of legislation should be approved by this convention, and that its enactment into law should represent one of the primary activities of the coming year. The committee believes that a statute of this character will, if properly administered, take the "profit out of war" and will preclude in any future crisis many, if not all, of the economic ills, dissatisfaction, and unrest that have been the aftermath of the World War.

This committee further believes that if such a law had existed in 1917 our real activity at the front would have been advanced many months, our Nation could have saved billions of dollars, and adjusted compensation would not now be necessary.

Our Nation has to-day for the first time in its history a sound military policy, which provides for a small Regular Army and a citizen army capable of rapid expansion in time of a national emergency. This Army of the United States (Regular Establishment, National Guard, and Organized Reserves), if properly administered and not handicapped in its functioning by lack of adequate appropriation from Congress, should form the nucleus of a harmonious and efficient national defense and be prepared to take a national position in readiness.

This military policy, however, is incomplete without legislation that will prepare our country to draft immediately, without favor, all the man power and resources of our Nation by a comprehensive and carefully considered plan of action.

The American Legion is for peace; but it believes, as did the Father of our Country, that the best assurance of peace is to be found in a reasonable state of preparedness.

"Equal rights for all and special privileges for none" was said long ago as a protest of our people against the same influences in our public life that during the World War profited on every side and developed a war-strength division of millionaires. We are not here to criticise our country for its failure to protect itself against this attack of

selfishness and greed, but the American Legion is looking our Nation in the face to-day and saying that in any future emergency our national motto must be "Equal service for all and special profit for none."

The following is the proposed law:

An act to provide further for the national security and defense.

Be it enacted, etc. (1) That in the event of a national emergency declared by Congress to exist which in the judgment of the President demands the immediate increase of the Military Establishment, the President be, and he hereby is, authorized to draft into the service of the United States such members of the unorganized militia as he may deem necessary: *Provided*, That all persons drafted into service between the ages of 21 to 30, or such other limits as the President may fix, shall be drafted without exemption on account of industrial occupation.

(2) That in case of war, or when the President shall judge the same to be imminent, he is authorized, and it shall be his duty, when, in his opinion such emergency requires it—

(a) To determine and proclaim the material resources, industrial organizations, and services over which Government control is necessary to the successful termination of such emergency, and such control shall be exercised by him through agencies then existing or which he may create for such purposes.

(b) To take such steps as may be necessary to stabilize prices of services and of all commodities declared to be essential, whether such services and commodities are required by the Government or by the civilian population.

5. DISCHARGE CERTIFICATE TO NEXT OF KIN.

Resolution.

Whereas The Adjutant General of the United States Army holds that certificate in lieu of a lost or destroyed discharge certificate can only be furnished to a soldier or his widow; and

Whereas no provision is made for the furnishing of such a certificate to the next of kin of a deceased soldier: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That national headquarters of the American Legion take necessary steps to secure the correction of the present situation.

MUSCLE SHOALS.

Resolution on reclamation and national defense.

Whereas at the beginning of the World War the United States Government was brought to a realization of the fact that it was wholly dependent upon the Chilean nitrate beds and German war-built nitrogen plants for its supply of nitrogen, which is absolutely necessary for the manufacture of high explosives; and

Whereas the said United States Government did thereupon appropriate large sums of money for the erection and operation of plants Nos. 1 and 2 at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of nitrogen in large quantities by extracting same from the air, which said plants were completed and successfully operated prior to the armistice, or just after, and are the only air-nitrogen plants in the United States of America; and

Whereas the above-mentioned plants have not only been left inoperative since the war but have fallen into a state of deterioration at an expense of many thousands of dollars annually to the taxpayers of this country while similar air-nitrogen plants in Germany were speedily converted so as to manufacture cheaply nitrogen fertilizers for the enrichment and reclamation of the arid farm lands of Germany, which has proven to be an untold blessing to the people of that country; and

Whereas we believe that the continuance of our dependence upon foreign countries for the necessary supply of nitrogen for fertilizers in time of peace and for explosives in time of war is not only an unspeakable humiliation but is positively perilous from the point of view of the national defense: Now therefore be it

Resolved, (1) That we, the American Legion in national convention assembled, do hereby call upon the Congress of the United States, upon the assembling of same, immediately to take up and act upon the measures pending in Congress or that may be introduced immediately upon the reconvening of same on the subject and to determine upon a definite fixed policy as to the disposition of same; and

(2) In determining upon the disposition to be made of said properties they may be governed by the following principles which we believe to be fundamental, namely:

(a) No policy or plan should be accepted which does not provide for the operation of said plants in time of peace and the manufacture of fertilizer, and the test for acceptance of any offer should be the amount of fertilizer proposed to be manufactured.

(b) No plan or policy should be adopted which is calculated to introduce Federal operation of the project.

(c) The fertilizer production at Muscle Shoals shall have preferred supply of power in time of peace.

(d) No plan or policy should be adopted which does not assure the Government that a research or experimental department will be maintained and conducted in connection with the plants for the purpose of keeping up with the most approved methods of nitrogen production, and that in the event of military emergency the said plants will be made available to the Government at the call of the Secretary of War for the manufacture of nitrogen for explosives.

(3) That the national legislative committee of the American Legion be directed to use all possible legitimate efforts to the end that the Congress of the United States immediately enact such legislation as aforesaid.

NAVAL AFFAIRS POLICY.

During the last year our country has adopted a naval policy which places the United States, jointly with Great Britain, the leading naval power of the world.

It is our duty to maintain this position and to keep the Navy up to the letter and spirit of the Washington conference.

We therefore respectfully reindorse the report of a year ago, believing that the American Legion stands behind those definite policies which have been adopted by the American Government.

The Government of the United States having established that a 5–5–3 ratio will provide an adequate navy in capital ships, it is held that this ratio must be maintained in personnel, aircraft, submarines, light cruisers, and auxiliaries. Congress must appropriate sufficient funds to keep up our ratio in both personnel and material. Because of the different terms of enlistment and differences in our seafaring population, we believe our regular Navy should have a personnel of 105,000, and under no conditions should the personnel be allowed to drop below 96,000. If the Appropriations Committee of Congress does not allow for an adequate personnel to fully man our allotted ships, we automatically drop from a first-class naval power to a ratio below that established as our national policy.

We condemn ourselves for our passive attitude relative to preparedness of our country's first line of defense—the Navy. No Congressman or Senator who has not come forward for a strong Navy should receive the support of a single legionnaire.

The need of a real naval base on the west coast of the United States is even greater to-day than it was a year ago. At the Washington conference this country agreed not to fortify our possessions in the Pacific. In case of war in the Pacific our fleet would have to base on the west coast, and for this country not to have a properly equipped base in this area is criminal negligence. So far Congress has declined to appropriate for a naval base which the Navy Department has urged to be built at Alameda, Calif. It is our belief that work on this base should be started at once.

We believe that all combatant first-line vessels should be concentrated in one fleet for purposes of better training and more economical administration; further, that this fleet should be based where it can be maintained and administered at the least cost to our Government.

Although the average citizen believes that Congress has provided for an adequate Naval Reserve Force to supplement our reduced Navy, since September 29, 1921, we have had no Naval Reserve worthy of the name. The reserve bill which has been proposed and is now before the Senate does not entirely meet requirements, as it tends to create a retired list under another name. As an example of this, the last naval appropriation bill carried $8,000,000 for the reserves, but of this amount $5,000,000 is used as a retirement fund for 10 and 20 year men, leaving only $3,000,000 actually available for the reserves. From this remaining $3,000,000 must be deducted expenses for cruisers, upkeep of ships, rent of armories, target practice, etc. This appropriation is by no means adequate. It is urged that sufficient appropriation and arrangements be made to maintain a sufficient and efficient reserve along the lines adopted by our third annual convention.

Expert authorities agree that destroyers will deteriorate more when laid up than when used, even though used by an inexperienced personnel. We believe that this class of ships should be supplied to the Naval Reserve units for training purposes.

We are of the opinion that the Marine Corps should be maintained at its historical efficiency and always held as an area of the Naval Establishment.

We recommend that the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy be not reduced, even though the reduced strength of the Navy will not permit the assurance of permanent commission to all graduates. The saving in cost of training a few instead of many is not commensurate with the advantage of having the excess midshipmen graduates and become a part of the reserve force.

To maintain our ratio 5–5–3 it is necessary to have an efficient merchant marine. The Department of the Navy and Merchant Marine should be closely connected so that both could be operated in harmony with one another at a moment's notice. In order that our merchant marine may be aided, to economize on our naval expenses, and to train our regular naval personnel on combatant ships, naval auxiliary vessels should, as far as possible, be chartered from well-established merchant lines.

We are heartily in favor of the ship subsidy bill as a means to establish our trade routes. If carried out the ship subsidy bill will automatically increase the available personnel of the Navy, add materially to the efficiency and strength of the Navy, and at the same time be a great aid to all business throughout the United States.

Since the earliest days of history, the control of the trade routes has been the secret of the growth and greatness of all world power, and this country, because of the paltry sum necessary to carry out the requirements of the ship subsidy bill, must not take the place of a decadent Nation.

RETIREMENT, DISABLED EMERGENCY OFFICERS OF THE ARMY.

A resolution urging the immediate enactment by the House of the Bursum bill, Senate 1505, providing retirement for disabled emergency Army officers.

STATE LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN.

EMBLEM PROTECTION—FLAG USES AND PROTECTION—INHERITANCE TAXES.

A resolution concerning the use of the Legion emblem by persons not members of the American Legion to further their personal business, and urging enactment of legislation to protect the Legion emblem.

We recommend that national headquarters, through its legislative department, direct the various State organizations of the American Legion to immediately take up the matter of procuring uniform laws for the purpose of preventing the abuse of or the right to wear the American Legion emblem.

INHERITANCE TAXES.

Resolved, That all departments urge the legislatures of their various States to amend inheritance tax laws so that dependents of a deceased beneficiary of the United States Veterans' Bureau receiving back compensation or insurance shall not be subject to tax upon such moneys received.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks upon the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks opposing the point of order raised on the bill passed this afternoon by including as a part of my remarks the paragraphs of the acts referred to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the bill passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a statement of the Secretary of War upon the purposes of the American Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am printing herewith a speech delivered by the Secretary of War, Hon. John W. Weeks, at the annual dinner of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, November 14, 1922. I have asked the leave of the House to permit the publication of this address because it seems to me by far the clearest exposition I have ever seen of the problems, accomplishments, and usefulness of the War Department of the United States as a peace-time agency.

The speech is as follows:

"I DIDN'T KNOW THAT."

(By John W. Weeks, Secretary of War.)

In a recent issue of a well-known magazine I read with deep interest an engaging article on the Netherlands, written by one of her eminent sons, who is also our fellow citizen, Mr. Edward Bok. With characteristic energy Mr. Bok pictured the ignorance of the average American concerning that enterprising little country, which he proved to be, however, not tiny at all, but indeed a great empire. I confess that I was very much instructed by his picture. One must admire the strategy employed to emphasize his very earnest and praiseworthy purpose. I hope that I might, therefore, be forgiven for attempting to employ Mr. Bok's method while avoiding any pretense of borrowing his inimitable style to emphasize an equally earnest and, I trust, admirable purpose of my own.

Strange as it may seem, it is a fact that the average American knows very little about his own Government. He is too busy with his everyday affairs to give much attention to its activities. He knows that it is divided into three branches, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative. He knows the name of the President, the Vice President, probably two or more of the Cabinet, the names of the Senators from his State, and the Congressman representing his district. Every two years he goes to the polls—that is, if nothing more important interferes—and votes. Beyond this point he takes little interest in his Government until perchance he discovers through the medium of his daily newspaper something in the Government to criticize.

During my labors and studies of the past year and a half it has often impressed me that the average American knows scarcely more of the problems and accomplishments of his own War Department than he does of the geography and history of the Netherlands. He knows that there is a Regular Army, that its officers are trained at West Point, that there is a militia, that in event of an emergency he and his fellow citizens will become a part of the military force of the Nation if their services are needed, and that in time of war an American Army will acquit itself with honor and credit. In times of peace, however, so little publicity is given to the activities of the Regular Army that it is very seldom, if ever, brought to the attention of Mr. Average Citizen, and if he gives any thought to it at all he is apt to think of the Army as an organization housed in very comfortable barracks, which drills a little, parades on national holidays, stands guard at forts along our coast for which we may never have any use, has a number of vague and probably unimportant duties to perform, and costs a great deal of money which could well be devoted to other purposes. I have accordingly felt it to be one of my duties to bring to the attention of our citizens the varied and important activities of the Army. My efforts in that direction quite frequently draw the response, "Well, I didn't know that." This always encourages me in my efforts, since we appreciate that true self-government can come only through knowledge. It is my present purpose to endeavor to interest you, as I have been interested, in this instructional problem, with the hope that you might yourselves gain a deeper understanding of our difficulties and be better able to continue and possibly increase the loyal support which the members of the Boston Chamber of Commerce have always given to constructive programs of the Government.

You may not be aware that by the act of June, 1920, a definite military policy was adopted, based on the lessons of the World War, and that this program is the first permanent military policy the United States has ever had. The War Department is devoting itself very enthusiastically to the execution of the terms of this project, and the Secretary of War is charged with the responsibility for its proper administration. Under the requirements of law he has, however, an additional duty to urge upon our people a continued attention to their need for defensive preparation. In attempting to defend the activities of the department in this respect, I explain that what we advocate is really a most conservative policy of insurance against war and internal disturbance. When called upon, as I frequently am, to defend myself against the charge of militarism, I reply that I have no greater fondness for war than I have for fire, theft, murder, disease, and bankruptcy; yet I continue to urge the degree of insurance against the one that is recognized by most business men as sane policy of insurance against the others. It then is pointed out that the insurance offered is of the participating type. The investment in national defense has always brought full returns to the country in the physical and sanitary training of young citizens and in the constructive accomplishments of the War Department and its personnel. The question is sometimes asked, "Why do Americans need this physical and sanitary training?" I reply, of course, that our experiences with the drafted men during the late war disclosed the alarming truth that approximately 50 per cent of our young men have physical defects, many of which would eventually prove disabling and most of which could easily be corrected by physical training and instruction, which is usually followed by the comment, "Well, I didn't know that."

This, I believe, is one of the most interesting aspects of military training. We are living in an age when most serious-minded men are studying the problems of race betterment. All about us are springing up organizations such as the "better babies" movement, the "Life Extension Institute," and other activities whose purpose is the enrichment of our national life through physical improvement. What will be the influence upon our future of our physical evolution? Every American should ask this question, and there is no better source of pertinent information than in the writings of the Surgeon General of the Army on "Military anthropology." It is proven therein that the majority of our World War recruits were awkward, narrow chested, under weight, and generally in poor physical condition. After a few months of training they were developed into broad-chested, two-fisted specimens of American manhood. These citizens received dividends from our defense investment in the form of definite and material gains in weight and in chest measurements. They were enrolled in the greatest "Life Extension Institute" in the world. The War Department was given an opportunity of surveying the health of the nation. Many basic diseases and disabilities, such as weak arches, weak backs, malaria, social diseases, incipient tuberculosis, and countless other infections were discovered in time and eradicated. Camps were made models of neatness, and personal hygiene and sanitation were taught as primary studies. Inoculations against typhoid and similar plagues resulted in the establishment of new minimum records for prevalence. It can not be questioned that the occurrence of these diseases throughout our country has been considerably lessened as a result of the training and medical administration of young men during the war. "Is not this, Mr. Average American, a satisfactory dividend from military training?" "Oh, certainly," you reply, "but I didn't realise that all this was true."

Mothers and fathers frequently protest against exposing their boys to the "dangerous" influences of military camps. They fear that the boys might become dissipated. We reply to these parents that the records of the Surgeon General show that there is a prevalence of social diseases among the young men of our country, straight from their own homes, that constitutes a shocking menace to our national existence. The influence of the military camp is a continual education against the dangers of intemperate life. While the soldier is in camp he is protected in every possible way from these demoralizing diseases—by education, by disciplinary measures, and by prompt treatment of those who can not resist nor escape. The American Army in France was accordingly able to establish such a low record of disease that our allies were astonished. We have continued to progress in handling this grave problem and I believe that one of the greatest benefits which can be conferred upon national life through military training will be the effectual control of this menacing evil. The first step is to instruct those who "didn't know that."

The statements that I have just made are sometimes questioned by individuals who remember the disease rates which prevailed in our armies in former wars. The reply is that we have been progressing. During the Civil War smallpox claimed over 7,000 soldier victims; during the Spanish-American War and the Philippine insurrection there were 258 deaths from this disease; in the World War we lost 14 soldiers with smallpox, although there were 4,000,000 of them in service. In the Civil War over 15,000 men died from malaria, while during the World War we lost but 25. In the Spanish-American War 20,000 soldiers, or 12 per cent of the total, suffered from typhoid fever; during the World War there were 2,000 cases, or about one-twentieth of 1 per cent. Had the death rates for typhoid in the World War been the same as in 1898, we would have lost 60,000 soldiers from this alone—more than we actually lost from all diseases.

It is difficult for the average American to appreciate that the Surgeon General of the Army is not merely the head of a small body of "military" medical men. He truly represents the entire medical profession in the military field, just as the Chief of Engineers represents the engineering profession and as the Army itself represents the country. At the same time, the medical profession itself gives generous recognition to the wonderful pioneering work of Army surgeons. Our Medical Department has established certain basic principles that influence the prevention of disease throughout the world. Many of their achievements have resulted in the saving of innumerable lives and have actually made possible the free commercial intercourse between the countries on this continent. The countries to the south of us were once ravaged by yellow fever and malignant malaria. The French enterprise on the Isthmus of Panama was completely blocked by the fact that 75 per cent of the employees from France lost their lives from disease within a few months after landing on the Isthmus. In 1901 a group of medical officers, headed by Maj. Walter Reed, determined definitely that yellow fever was transmitted by the mosquito. Within a very few months after this discovery Habana was cleared of the disease that had ravaged it for 150 years. Our greatest achievement in Panama was the conversion of this pestiferous district into a healthy region. Since 1906 one can live in Panama with equal assurance of protection against disease as if living, for example, in Boston. This was the work of the Army. When we took over the administration of Porto Rico the entire population was affected by "tropical anemia." The Army doctors demonstrated that this disease was a hookworm infection, and the measures taken accordingly have redeemed these people from a plague that would forever have hindered their development. There are many equally striking illustrations of the work of the American Army in improving the health of this country, our dependencies, and, indeed, of the entire world.

"That is all extremely interesting," reply my questioners, "but how about the other 'constructive' accomplishments of the War Department? We thought that the purpose of the War Department was to wage war." This is an almost ineradicable tendency—to believe that the War Department is hoping for war and uninterested in the pursuits of peace.

"Do you realise," I respond, "that until the middle of the past century the Army was the only public organisation fully able to encourage and assist our citizens in their development of this great country?"

"Do you know that the great Lewis and Clarke expedition that opened up the Northwest was conducted by the Army?"

The Army conducted nearly all preliminary explorations in the early days of the country. It constructed the early roads. It built bridges and canals. It alone was able to conduct the early surveys and make the maps which are so essential in the opening up of a new region. Army engineers initiated most of the accurate methods which are now employed in the geodetic, topographic, and hydrographic surveys of

our possessions. The Army was virtually the pioneer of the pioneers. As our citizens moved west over the prairies and through the forests they traveled routes which were surveyed by Army engineers, constructed by the Army, and protected by military posts. They settled on locations which had been surveyed by the Army, and their titles were established and valid only because of such surveys. In developing the land, the settlers were protected against Indians by troops of the Army. Finally, when the time came to link these outposts to our eastern civilization, it was the Army that located and constructed the railroads. Only after the railroads had developed engineers of their own and the country had become safer for travel, did the Army relinquish its tasks and turn elsewhere for its missions. The troops of the line remained on the frontiers. The engineers of the Army began then to develop the great waterways, improving our rivers and harbors, to supervise public parks, and to construct and administer our public buildings.

Up to 1855 there was scarcely a railroad in this country that was not projected, built, and operated in large part by the Army. Army engineers located, constructed, and managed such well-known roads as the Baltimore & Ohio; the Northern Central; the Erie; the Boston & Providence; the New York, New Haven & Hartford; and the Boston & Albany. Practically all of the transcontinental railroads were projected by the Army. An Army officer built the best locomotive of his time, after his own design. So widespread was his fame that when the Czar of Russia desired to build a railroad from St. Petersburg to Moscow he chose the American officer for the task. The officer, Lieut. G. W. Whistler, died before completing the work, but he passed it to another Army officer to finish. Americans are proud of their railroads. They owe their early development to the Army.

If the listener is interested, he usually asks, "What else do we owe to the Army in early development?"

So I continue. The Army built the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal and the Erie Canal. The most effective influence in opening up the Middle West was the old Cumberland Pike, running from Cumberland, Md., to St. Louis, Mo. This was built by the Army. Practically every boundary of the United States, and most of the State boundaries, were surveyed and marked by the Army. The famous Lake Survey was made by the Army. Because of engineering difficulties involved in its construction, the old lighthouse erected on Minots Ledge in Boston Bay was one of the most prominent sea-rock lighthouses in the world. This, like most of our lighthouses, was erected by the Army. The old channel of Boston Harbor had a depth of only 18 feet. The Army engineers have increased the depth of this important waterway to 35 feet and widened it from 100 feet to 1,200 feet, and similar work has been carried on by them in all harbors and navigable streams of the United States.

When the American citizen visits our National Capital the first sight to greet his eye is the stately Washington Monument, completed under great difficulties by the Army. He next turns to the Capitol, of which the wings and dome were built by Army engineers. The Army likewise built the old Post Office Building, the new Municipal Building, the Government Printing Office, the War College, the Agriculture Building, and the beautiful Library of Congress. Army engineers supervised construction of the new Lincoln Memorial and practically all of the park system in the District of Columbia. They built the Washington Aqueduct, and are even developing the playgrounds in our Capital City.

I now will discuss the present work of the Army engineers, developing and maintaining our great waterways, including the Panama Canal, which the Army largely built. You gentlemen are familiar with this work and I will not bother you with its details. In addition to the present work itself, there is the planning and projection of future activities. The Board of Rivers and Harbors has recently instituted extensive studies of the port development in our country, concerning their present commercial facilities, the hinterlands which they can serve, their proper development, and factors which advance or retard their progress. Two of these studies for the ports of Boston, Mass., and Portland, Me., have already been published and are attracting enthusiastic attention among the railroads, shippers, and commercial interests generally. It is felt that this work is meeting a long-felt want.

Then there is another direction of interest. One of the most critical points in our transportation system is at the terminals of transfer between land and water carriers. Because of the antiquated facilities the transfer costs are often greater than the cost of transport over hundreds of miles by rail or by ship. The Board of Rivers and Harbors is conducting a thorough investigation of terminal conditions and is giving very valuable advice to the local communities which can profit by improvement in this important respect.

A striking example of this is the project for the development of the port of New York, which presents a most difficult problem. While the Army engineers are not actually physically developing the project, it is being done under their supervision and with their cooperation. The Army engineers are rendering most valuable assistance in developing the ports of Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif., which are becoming great terminals. The Army is actually constructing the ship channels entering these ports, and is cooperating and advising with the local authorities regarding the construction of terminals, docks, etc. In short, the Army engineers are working with a zeal that is excelled by no other public organization to adapt their various projects to a coordinated scheme for the entire country—one that will fit properly into the industrial and transportation fabric of our national life.

It was not long after the railroads had bound our country into a unity that was further cemented by reconciliation after the Civil War, when we were faced with the problem of colonization of acquired territories—the problem that is perhaps the severest test of the ideals of any nation. Alaska, Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines, Guam, and the Canal Zone—one by one these burdens were thrust upon us. We have done this successfully and the major part of the task has been the work of the Army. When our citizens began their mad rush into the Klondike, it was the Army that opened the harbors and built the roads and trails leading to gold. When the gold was discovered or lost, men remained in this new land, and they were protected from mob rule and lawlessness by the Army. The Army surveyed their lands and policed their frontiers. Their only link with civilization was the cable constructed and operated by the Signal Corps, which also operates 000 miles of telegraph overland. Army engineers projected the railroads which are beginning to open the country to intensive culture. Even to-day a large part in the administration of this great territory is played by Army officers. Business to the extent of over $100,000,000 annually is transacted over the 57 cable and telegraph offices and 17 inland radio stations, all operated by the Signal Corps. Alaska knows the Army as a friend in need. And as it was in Alaska, so also in the other colonies or territories which we have acquired.

The Philippines, Hawaii, Cuba, Porto Rico, and Panama all have histories of achievement, histories in which the progressive forces of civilization have struggled against reaction and decadence. That civilized forces are triumphant is due primarily to the intelligent administration and constructive talents of the American Army. Building up public utilities, eradicating terrible diseases, educating the children, attending even to the spiritual needs, creating the institutions of self-government and protecting these institutions from aggression—in all these has the Army left its seal upon our possessions and protectorates and proven itself once more the pioneer of the American pioneers.

Then this question is asked: "You say that the Army is responsible for our colonization—just what is their success?"

In the Philippines, where strife between tribes was almost continuous, we have built roads, and railroads, and schools, as well as churches, and have done more in 20 years to make the Filipinos a united people than was done before in centuries. Do you realize that we have taught practically all of the children to speak one language—the English language?

In Panama, our predecessors were unable to remain. Our work there is a conspicuous example of what can be accomplished, under the worst tropical conditions, in sanitation, municipal engineering, and construction. The American occupation has exerted and will continue to exert a powerful influence upon all of the near-by countries in Central and South America. These are stimulated to undertake much-needed improvements for which the means are derived from the increased prosperity which the canal has brought. For the last four months the tolls collected by our own Government have exceeded a million dollars per month. Seventy-five lines of vessels serving the great trade areas of the world ply through the waterway. The equipment of the Panama Canal as a base for fueling, supply, and repair is complete. It is, incidentally, a military asset of the greatest importance. Its use increases our ability in defense at least 50 per cent, although its total cost is no more than the cost of 10 modern battleships, which would be doomed to obsolescence in 20 years.

Americans do not believe in conquest of territory. The average citizen feels, perhaps, that our pioneering days are over. We can not admit, however, that we have reached the end of our constructive abilities. There are other methods in which a civilization makes itself an influence for good. We have barely emerged from a war in which we fought for our convictions. It was our purpose to fight not only bravely and with determination, but also fairly and with mercy toward the weak and helpless. "American relief" has acquired as much significance as a slogan of American progress as once attached to the cry of "westward ho." The average citizen knows and loves Mr. Hoover for his part in American relief in Europe. Does the average citizen know that, except for the titular head of the organization and a few clerical assistants, the American relief in Europe was the Army and its individuals? Five colonels of the Regular Army acted as Mr. Hoover's principal assistants either in Paris or at the head of more important missions, such as those which were sent into Poland and Armenia. There was a military personnel of 320 officers and 464 enlisted men who constituted the missions and agencies which distributed American relief. In addition, there was a vast amount of work, such as providing convoys and courier service and unloading supplies, performed directly by the American Expeditionary Force itself. In other words, the American relief was merely one of the activities of the American Expeditionary Force. The Russian relief is similarly an organization of Army officers and enlisted men carrying on the work of American civilization as pioneers.

We are obviously on the eve of perhaps the greatest period of construction and progress that we have yet known. The War Department is already playing its accustomed role of constructive pioneering. I have mentioned the work of the military engineers. There is a very significant influence in standardization of manufacture exerted by the department in its planning for the mobilization of industries for war. Military experiments in design of tanks and artillery tractors were influential in stimulating the development of the new tractor industry. The pioneering activities of our Air Service are preparing the way for an aviation industry in stimulating manufacture and in projecting or advising on projects for airways and communication facilities for air traffic. In the near future aerial activity will play a great part in our national existence. The aerial development of the Army is not only for the purpose of war preparation but an extension of the service to commercial life. The department encourages the construction and development of new and better airplanes and is furnishing every aid practicable within appropriations to develop air lines which will be beneficial commercially. If this were not done, I venture to say that there would be years of delay in obtaining any commercial results worth mentioning. I have no doubt that within the next 10 years we will see many air routes established and doing a prosperous business; in fact, it would not be an extreme statement to make that the development will be comparable to that of the automobile.

The Army has likewise had a pioneering part in the development of the radio. Although the primary task of the Signal Corps is the modification of commercial apparatus to suit military purposes, its research and development experts are continually presenting to the scientific world solutions of vexing problems. Among these may be mentioned the loop, which superseded the cumbersome outside antennae, and which led the way to the radio compass, and General Squier's remarkable invention, which applies radio principles to commercial telephone systems and makes possible the utilization of existing telephone, telegraph, and even power lines for the sending of private messages and for broadcasting and reception. The Army has to-day 72 radio stations comprising its radio nets installed to cover the United States. Last month these handled official messages employing more than 230,000 words and accordingly saved the Government a considerable sum of money that would otherwise have been spent on these communications. Does the average citizen realize that the Signal Corps to-day operates approximately 400 telephone systems, half of which are owned by the Government, and that the Army is accordingly a telephone organization second only to the Bell telephone system, which is, of course, the largest telephone organization on the Western Continent? "Just what," he asks "is the value to the country of these systems?"

To answer this I look back first to the construction of the transcontinental railroads and point out that the continual progress of the Army in development work was always followed by elaboration through civilian activities and that it was the elaboration of what the Army began that gave us what we call our civilization to-day. One of the greatest impetus to the expansion of our telegraph system was given by the Signal Corps of the Army just after the Civil War. As late as 1877 there were more than 3,000 miles of telegraph service throughout the South operated by the Signal Corps as an outcome of their service in the war. These wires provided the framework for building up the

telegraph service in the South that exists to-day, just as the activities of the Army in early pioneer days resulted in settlements which later became great cities, such as Pittsburgh on the site of Fort Pitt and Chicago on the site of Fort Dearborn. So we can now look upon the activities of our Signal Corps with realization that they provide us with an enormous addition to our other available means of communication and with full expectation that in our coming development these means will prove of inestimable value.

The invention of the Chief Signal Officer of the Army in applying radio principles to commercial telephone and telegraph systems has greatly multiplied the capacity of existing telephone and telegraph lines and increased manyfold our facilities for electrical communication. By utilizing the principle embodied in this invention, it is now possible to send simultaneously over the same line a number of telegraphic messages and at the same time carry on several telephone conversations. The system is now in actual practical use by the large commercial companies, and it is the present practice to send eight two-way telegraph messages and three two-way telephone channels, these being in addition to the messages transmitted by the usual practices. It might be remembered that this new system is just coming into use and its full possibilities have not as yet been worked out, but it is fairly certain that this method offers tremendous possibilities for increasing our facilities for communication. This method is particularly adapted for long-distance telephone transmission, and in all long-distance telephone communication this system is now used to a very large extent. The old-fashioned battery telephone method is quickly becoming obsolete, and the newer methods employing radio principles are rapidly taking its place.

It was also found that by the utilization of the same principles it is possible to transmit telephone and telegraph messages over power transmission lines, and these are being now utilized for broadcasting. As a result of experiments carried on in the Signal Corps a new method of broadcasting, which consists of transmitting speech or music over the lighting circuits, is now being introduced, and it is hoped that before very long it will be possible to receive broadcasted material, whatever its character, by connecting a small suitable receiving set to the light sockets in your homes.

It is interesting to appreciate that our Army has actually been a veritable "vanguard of American civilization," just as the Roman armies left behind many of the most imperishable monuments to that earlier Republic.

I proceed to other little-known activities, such as those of the Chemical Warfare Service. Does the average citizen know that the deadly mustard gas, as well as several other war gases, is being employed experimentally with great hopes of its proving a valuable retardant in the treatment of tuberculosis?

"Why," the citizen exclaims, "I thought that war gases caused respiratory diseases."

I inform him that, on the contrary, it has been established that they tend to prevent such diseases. Among the employees of large war-gas factories influenza and similar diseases were practically unknown during the period of the plagues that swept our country at the close of the World War. Extensive arrangements are being made in the laboratories of the Chemical Warfare Service to conduct research into the fields of medical employment of war gases and by-products.

One of the greatest problems of modern sanitation is that of effective and safe fumigation. It is necessary to wage continuous war against the rats and other vermin which carry plagues. Only recently, in the fumigation of a ship in San Francisco, several men were killed and many injured by the fumes of hydrocyanic acid. The Chemical Warfare Service offered their cooperation and have already given promise of solving this problem. Tear gas was finally selected by them as the best possibility for use in fumigation. Near the end of October a test was made with a concentration of one-eighth the strength which would injure human life. Several officers spent the night in a room adjoining the kitchen which was selected for the test. The gas was projected into the kitchen in the evening, and the officers in the next room reported that they were not inconvenienced thereby. In the morning it was discovered that every mouse, fly, cockroach, and other insect was dead. The gas was then projected into a large warehouse, killing hundreds of pounds of rats, mice, bats, and other vermin. The experiment was repeated in fumigating a ship, and the results were beyond expectations. The Public Health Service are enthusiastic about this work and the possibilities seem limitless.

Tear gases have also been demonstrated as very effective in employment against barricaded criminals and in attempted jail deliveries and other riotous actions. The gas mask is becoming very valuable for use in mining activities. The Chemical Warfare Service has produced the only substance suitable for protection of miners against the deadly carbon-monoxide gas. In their development of gas masks and suitable materials therefor the scientists of the Chemical Warfare Service have made another valuable contribution to the industries in the form of a very active charcoal which is useful in manufacturing gasoline from natural gas and coal-tar products.

It is becoming recognized that any effective control of the boll weevil and similar pests must come from the adaptation of these poisonous compounds. The Air Service is cooperating in experiments by spraying the fields and orchards with the vapors. Experiments are being conducted by the Chemical Warfare Service in cooperation with the Navy Department in hopes of producing a nonfouling paint and thereby avoiding the results of barnacles which gather on ship bottoms. Gases are being used in experiments with the hope of destroying the teredo and limnoria, which bore into submerged timbers in our southern waters. Finally, in addition to all of these constructive activities, one must recognize that the work of the Chemical Warfare Service has led the way to the foundation of an American dye industry that should one day be one of our most valued assets.

Do you know that the Army started our steel industry, guided it through its early development, and, in cooperation with the Navy Department, stimulated it throughout its expansion to the present gigantic proportions? Our Interior Department was an outgrowth of the activities of the War Department; in fact, the latter once consisted of three parts which are now the War Department proper, the Navy Department, and the Interior Department. The Bureau of Public Roads grew out of the work of the Corps of Engineers. The Signal Corps can be said to have played a major part in development of the telegraph industries. The development of our Life-Saving Service was possible largely through the cooperation of hundreds of miles of governmental telegraph lines operated by the Signal Corps. The Lighthouse Service, that plays such an important part in coastwise and terminal ocean traffic, was built up by the Army and turned over to civil agencies only after its success was assured. In all of these ways the Army has proved that it can lead the way as a pioneer, not only through forests and over prairies but also through the fields of science and industry.

The dominating influences in building up "steel" have been the provision of markets, the increasing adaptation in employment, and the specifications for design. The Army was the original market for steel products—offered an ever greater field for the use of steel—and led the entire industry in specifications for design. High-grade steel, as we know it to-day, dates from the Civil War, when the Army called for superior quality in gun metal. In 1880 the requirements for high-carbon steel in making guns were fully 50 per cent more severe than were the general industrial specifications. The Ordnance Department introduced alloy steels in the manufacture of Army material, and prescribed the use of nickel steel at a time when there were very few commercial uses for nickel steel in the entire country and when only two or three commercial concerns were capable of its manufacture. In 1875 the board of investigation at the Watertown Arsenal established a program of investigation and built an emery-testing machine that was the largest in the world; this machine is still in daily use, and was only recently superseded in its rank as the largest in the world. The work of Watertown Arsenal was truly pioneer work in this country, and it has a tremendous influence in stimulating similar investigators on the part of technical schools and colleges. Until the creation of the Bureau of Standards the arsenal was recognized leader in metallurgical study, and it is even to-day doing very original work which must have a noteworthy effect in the future.

When the American citizen takes his family out for a day in the country he frequently meets with a mishap, perhaps breaking a part of his automobile. Does he seek a country blacksmith or a machine shop to repair his Ford? Not he. Proceeding to the nearest garage he finds a stock of spare parts which meet his wants and enable him to go "flivving" off in short order. He might, if he is scientifically inclined, utter a brief prayer to the inventor of "interchangeable manufacture" which produces spare parts. If he were historically inclined as well he could look back over a century and discover that he owes this happy development to the filling of a contract for 10,000 muskets in 1798. That was the beginning of interchangeable manufacture. When the War of 1812 was forced on us the art was so well established that interchangeability had become a normal contract specification of the War Department. One of our contracts in that year contained a clause which reads as follows: "The component parts of pistols are to correspond so exactly that any limb or part of one pistol may be fitted to any other pistol of the 20,000."

It is natural that out of this early development in Army arsenals should have come some consideration for the problem which we now call "scientific management." We feel that America leads the world in the art of the efficiency expert. Does my inquiring friend know that in this field as in so many others the Army appeared as a pioneer?

I refer him to Doctor Taylor, who is well known as a noted protagonist of scientific management and who makes frequent mention of the work of the Army in this respect. In one of his books he observes that the card system of shop returns was invented and introduced as a complete system for the first time in the Government shops of the Frankford Arsenal, and that this was a distinct advance in the art of efficiency management. My prospect is thus brought once more to appreciate that the by-products of our national defense can not sensibly be ignored.

It is common knowledge that one of the greatest developments ahead of us must be that of effectively utilizing our great resources in water power. It is necessary to harness this cheap energy, and yet to do it in such a manner as not to interfere with our navigable waterways, with the growth of our national forests, and with the public enjoyment of our national parks. In the second year of the power commission it has had to study projects for proposed developments of water power in excess of 20,000,000 horsepower, or more than twice the existing power development of this country and more than the combined potential resources of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Arctic and Baltic drainages of Russia—the principal water power region of Europe. In two years its engineers have had to study projects for development greater than double the resources of France and Italy and six times the aggregate of projects for development of resources under Federal control in the preceding 20 years. The greater part of this work of examination and study has fallen to the War Department, and the Chief Engineer and his assistants and the chief counsel of the power commission are officers of the Regular Army.

Does the citizen know that the Army organized the Weather Bureau and that during Army control this bureau gave out information that was of tremendous interest throughout the scientific world? Does he know that the Army has played a prominent part in diverting our explosives production into fields that offer great hopes of building up a great American nitrate industry which would be of inestimable benefit to the farmer? Does he know what the Army has done in helping to conserve our resources? The Army Engineers have led us in flood prevention and have assisted greatly in forest protection. At the present time the Air Service is cooperating, as much as funds will permit, in the work of the Department of Agriculture concerning forest-fire prevention. In the past year over 100,000 square miles of forest lands were covered by fliers. Of 1,248 fires occurring in the national preserves of California in three months, the aerial patrols reported 664 and were first to report 370.

"Why must such products come from the Army?" I am asked. "Why can not some other agency do all of this work?"

I reply that neither the Government nor any individuals could afford to maintain a great pioneer organization with no other functions. Such benefits can come only from the work of an organized and trained public force which can produce them virtually as by-products and still perform its primary tasks. About the middle of last April the Mississippi River rose to the point of threatening disaster to thousands of families along its banks. Members of Congress from that region visited the War Department for advice, and varying degrees of concern were manifested by officials of the States affected. It was apparent that there was no organization other than the Army that could drop its routine tasks and handle such an emergency. The War Department had experienced this situation in the past and had prepared detailed regulations to govern the forces which might have to operate under these conditions. It was necessary only to put the existing machinery into motion. The governors of four States were notified that certain military authorities would be assigned districts in their States. Military authorities were informed of depots which would furnish supplies needed. Commanding generals of corps areas were advised of the situation, and they made arrangements for utilizing troops that might be necessary. Our fears were not realized. The danger passed. There was an excellent illustration, however, of the potential value of an organization like ours.

This potential power has unfortunately been called upon many times in our past. After the San Francisco earthquake and fire in 1906, it was the Army that took charge of disorder and administered the forces of order. In the Galveston disaster of 1915 the Army made a record for heroic achievement. Similarly the constructive value of the War

Department was felt in the Mount Pelee disaster and during the Ohio and Mississippi floods of 1912. There is a huge file of grateful letters received by the department for its work in these instances and others similar, of which the following is an example:

"Whereas the relief extended to our people during the recent flood * * * has minimized the great loss and damage * * *

"*Be it resolved by the Harrisonburg flood relief committee* * * * That we hereby extend an expression of our thanks and appreciation for the prompt and efficient manner in which the said relief has been given by the War Department * * *." (1912 floods, Mississippi.)

Last year, in the coal fields of West Virginia, a situation arose that promised untold difficulties for the industry and for the community. The subsidence was so sudden that few citizens were able to appreciate the firm yet friendly manner in which the Army took control and insisted that the rights of the public must be maintained against the actions of any particular class or classes. In a very short time they assured peace without making a single aggressive move and without antagonizing any party to the pending disputes. It is scarcely too much to state that these incidents alone justify the investments which we have made in a national force organized and trained for the national defense against outlawry. It is amazing to discover how little our citizens understand of this dramatic history of purely civic accomplishment. It is equally amazing to most of them when they do learn the facts.

There is a tendency to think of military men as hard-boiled masters of red tape and inefficiency. My own interest in the matter has led me to investigate the individual civil records of officers, to determine the effects of their military training. Their records are brilliant. In spite of the fact that their training has been for war, the influence of the high ideals of the Army and its spirit of teamwork has been enough to counteract the handicaps and enable officers to compete on fair terms. During the first century of its existence, West Point sent 2,371 of its graduates into civil life, most of them after some years of military service in the Army. Even a very small college would graduate as many as 2,371 in a few years. Yet where is there a small or great college or university that can excel the record of these 2,371 graduates in civil life? Here is their record:

President of the United States	1
President of the Confederate States	1
Presidential candidates	3
Vice presidential candidates	2
Members of the Cabinet	4
Ambassador	1
Ministers to foreign countries	14
Chargé d'affaires to foreign countries	2
Consul generals and consuls	12
Members of Congress	24
United States civil officers of various kinds	171
Presidential electors	8
Governors of States or Territories	16
Bishop	1
Lieutenant governors	2
Judges	14
Members of State legislatures	77
Presiding officers of State senates or houses of representatives	8
Members of conventions for the formation of State constitutions	13
State officers of various kinds	51
Adjutants, inspectors, quartermaster general, chief engineers of States	28
Officers of State militia	158
Mayors of cities	17
City officers	57
Presidents of universities or colleges	46
Principals of academies or schools	82
Regents and chancellors of educational institutions	14
Professors and teachers	136
Superintendent of Coast Survey	1
Surveyors general of States and Territories	11
Chief engineers of States	14
Presidents of railroads and other corporations	87
Chief engineers of railroads and other public works	63
Superintendents of railroads and other public works	62
Treasurers and receivers of railroads	24
Civil engineers	228
Superior general of clerical order	1
Clergymen	20
Physicians	14
Manufacturers	77
Artists	8
Bankers	18
Bank presidents	8
Bank officers	23
Editors	30
Authors	179
Merchants	122
Farmers and planters	230
Electrical engineers	5
Architects	7

"Where do officers gain the administrative knowledge that is necessary to make such records as these?"

After all that I have told of the achievements of the Army at home and abroad my questioners still fail to appreciate that the War Department and the Army is one of the greatest administrative concerns in the country. That it is criticized for adherence to "red tape" is true, but the critics often fail to appreciate that this is because such a huge organization, open as it is to criticism from any citizen of this country, must be conservative and "safe," both of which qualities demand recognized forms of procedure. In the files of The Adjutant General are records of more than 80,000,000 individuals, nearly 10,000,000 of whom have had military service. I could make some picturesque comparisons, such as that the cover sheets of draft records alone would, if placed side by side, reach from the Atlantic to the Pacific, etc. The records of The Adjutant General are accommodated in 83,000 filing cabinets and occupy 450,000 square feet of floor surface.

The very citizen who criticizes us for "red tape" might have sent us one of the countless queries which we receive daily, such as, "Did George Washington throw a silver dollar across the Potomac River?" and "Who originated the term 'Buddy?'" If the citizen makes these inquiries in good faith we are required to answer him, for it is his business even more than ours.

During May, 1919, the average number of pieces of mail received daily in this one office of The Adjutant General was over a half million. In 1919 over 80,000,000 pieces of mail were received. I give these figures to the curious one in order to convince him that there is plenty of opportunity for the Army officer to learn administration. The Adjutant General's is but one of a great number of offices maintained by officers of the Army. There is every known phase of human life involved in their administrative calendars. Does the citizen realize that the Army must train thousands of young men not only for war but also in vocational and educational features? We have a continuous school problem and a normal provision for training men in the following occupations:

Horseshoeing, tractor drivers, dynamo tenders, steam-engine tenders, firemen, oilers, carpenters of all kinds, concrete workers, photographers, lithographers, painters, stonemasons, brick masons, blacksmiths, plumbers, pipe fitters, welders, printers, linemen, radio operators, telegraph operators, switchboard operators, auto mechanics, chauffeurs, battery repairmen, tire repairers, ignition and carburetion experts, sheet-metal workers, canvas workers, tailors, butchers, clerks, stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, instrument repairers, machinists, foundry men, pattern makers, farriers, pharmacists' assistants, X-ray operators, buglers, bandsmen, surveyors, topographers, highway construction men, bridge builders, draftsmen, interior wiremen, riggers, radio electricians, telephone electricians, telegraph electricians, motion-picture operators, bakers, cooks, cargadors, teamsters, wagon masters, wheelwrights, shoemakers, saddlers, laundrymen, and storekeepers.

Officers must pay the Army, keep accounts for the Army, feed the Army, give spiritual guidance for the Army, and in a word administer the Army according to the most civilized concept of human administration. Every officer must understand the military law.

Incidentally, in the face of all criticism which has been leveled at our system of military jurisprudence, it has been pronounced excellent by some of our best civil lawyers. The citizen sometimes asks me about the hard-boiled methods of prison administration prevalent in the Army. I invite his attention to various comments which indicate that our military prisons have donated many valuable contributions to the science and art of prison management. Everything possible is done to humanize our prisons and to develop the unfortunate occupants so that they can practice trades upon release and, even more important, so that their criminal tendencies might be lessened or completely eradicated. In each of our prisons there is a board of psychiatry and sociology which has for its purpose to modernize our treatment of this problem. Does the citizen realize all this?

"No, indeed," he replies, "and I am intensely interested by your exposition." "I begin to see what you meant when you claimed that your policy of national defense was of the participating type." "Nevertheless," he frequently adds, "it costs too much, doesn't it, Mr. Secretary?"

It is indeed a serious objection, at this trying time, that national defense should be so costly, or rather that it is made to appear so costly. As a matter of truth, it is not costly. In 1921, in the city of Boston, Mass., from each dollar paid by the citizen for taxes 3½ cents went for military preparation and 3.7 cents for naval preparation. In other words, his policy of national defense (which he admits to be a participating policy) cost only 7.2 per cent of his total taxation. This is astonishingly small. The citizen is so often misled into charging up against his policy of insurance the cost of a war which his insurance failed to guarantee against. He should rest assured that in a defenseless State he would be continually attacked by predatory forces, and his insurance is only against these potential attacks. The World War is costing us a great amount, it is true. A comparatively small investment in preparation before the war would, however, have greatly decreased the present cost of our unpreparedness.

This accusation that the War Department wastes its money extravagantly is, of course, rather easy to refute. I do not know where this idea started—that the Army wastes its money so lavishly—unless it is from the knowledge that when we rush into war unprepared there is great general inefficiency of spending at a time when we must "spend or take the consequences." I do not desire to inject a political atmosphere into this discussion, and accordingly I hesitate to discuss in detail our efforts to save money. I believe that the operations of the Budget Bureau have, however, been approved by all parties. It seems safe to mention that during the past fiscal year the War Department withheld from expenditure about $85,000,000 which it might have spent. Of this amount, $35,000,000 represents projects that were postponed, while $50,000,000 was actually turned back into the unappropriated balance in the Treasury.

"Why, that is unheard of!"

Unheard of, perhaps, but true. It is difficult to appreciate the determination with which the entire Army has entered into our campaign of saving. Does the citizen know that the chief coordinator has been assisted by nine regular officers and that there would doubtless be more of them in the Bureau of the Budget if their numbers were not now so limited? Or that the present coordinator is himself a retired officer of the Army?

I had occasion to remark a recent editorial in which surprise was manifested at the activity of the officials of the War Department in appealing for a minimum strength for our Regular Army (150,000–130,000). The editor remarked that we should follow the sensible policy of other American countries in spending our money for peace organizations instead of for warlike preparation. I wondered if he knew what policy he was advocating? The United States maintains a smaller per capita strength of Army than that of any other American country except Canada, which is protected by its participation in the British Empire. If we followed the average policy of the Americas we should maintain a Regular Army of 200,000. If Canada is excluded as a part of an Empire whose per capita strength is much greater than ours, we should raise this figure to 250,000. If we determine our policy upon a basis of national wealth the figure would be still higher. If we followed the average policy of the world we should have approximately a million men constantly under arms. The editor, no doubt, didn't know all this. It is to the advantage of all of us that we know these facts about the country in which we live, or else that we do not distort facts for purposes of argument.

I mentioned that Canada is maintaining a smaller army than we are. She is, however, manifesting an interest in military preparation in another direction that can be gauged by one brief comparison. During the past summer we trained about 22,000 men in our citizens' training camps. Canada trained about 100,000 men in hers. With less than one-tenth our population she is training five times as many citizens for

national defense. Her "sensible policy" of pacification (to quote the editor) involves fifty times the intensity of effort that we exert in preparation for defense. What a striking contrast this is. Canada evidently believes in the principle expressed by Thomas Jefferson: "None but an armed nation can dispense with a standing army."

"But how does Canada afford this training?" inquires my curious prospect.

I might reply that it is by cutting down on her use of chewing gum. We are a nation of gum chewers. In a year we spend three times as much for "chewing gum and candy" as we spend for military preparation. For soda and confections we spend more than three times; for tobacco, more than four times; for perfumery, jewelry, and other items of adornment, nearly five times; and for theaters, cabarets, and similar amusements, more than three times. In other words, this military preparation that appears to cost so much really costs us about one-eighteenth of what we spend for mild vices and "harmless amusements."

During and after the Conference for Limitation of Armament last fall, I frequently heard the remark, "Why doesn't this country set an example in practice, as she does in words, for the reduction of military forces?"

I reply that although we are one of the greatest of powers, our Army stands sixteenth on the list of the armies of the world. If we had taken the average of military strengths of the powers in that conference, we should raise our strength to about 450,000 men. If we based our strength upon population we should have, roughly, 1,000,000 men. Yet we reduced recently to a strength of 125,000 men.

"Oh," is the reply, "but we could quickly throw 4,000,000 men into the field."

Really, the Army can not take the field without materials and supplies. The proceedings of the conference would have shown that whereas Great Britain was prepared to throw a force of 6,000,000 men into immediate service, France more than 5,000,000, Italy more than 3,000,000, and Japan more than 1,000,000, we could with difficulty outfit an army of a bare million, even if these were available, officered and freshly trained for service. "No, my friend," I reply, "there need be no fear that we might fail to lead the way to reduction. By every conceivable method of comparison you can find that we have set the example in limitation by a very pronounced inferiority to the strength of any civilized power of great importance in the world." The greatest fear is that we might lead too far and tempt other nations before they are prepared for the trust which reduction implies.

The response sometimes comes, "Would not our trust cause other nations to disarm rather than to take the aggressive?"

I reply that I would like to believe it. There are few exceptions to the general rule that all peoples desire peace and decry war. No country has made more determined efforts to remove possible causes of conflict and to lighten burdens of preparedness. For further developments we must, however, wait until the world follows the example already set. We damage other peoples by placing too much trust in them—a trust that we can not even place in our own population.

"What do you mean, Mr. Secretary, by saying that we can not trust our own people?"

I reply that we can not bare our own institutions to the citizens of the country—that we must provide a guard that protects not only the institutions, but also unfortunate individuals against their own worst tendencies, which might lead them to crimes destructive alike to the public weal and to their own happiness. The 1920 census discloses that there were in this country at least 32,314 marshals, sheriffs, and detectives; 82,214 policemen; and 115,653 watchmen, guards, and doorkeepers—a total of 229,981 employed for protection against dangerous impulses. Added to this there were 50,171 firemen, making a total of 280,152 engaged in protection of our institutions against the elements which force us to insure our private affairs. Yet we maintain less than half the number as our share of the police of the world—against peoples at most no more law-abiding than are we. In one year the insurance companies of the United States paid out to policyholders as insurance against death, fire, marine losses, and industrial loss over $1,125,000,000. It is presumable that policyholders paid at least as much for insurance. Added to this amount is the amount paid to the police and watchmen for protection. We invest in a military preparedness policy, accordingly, less than one-fifth of the amount paid for internal insurance and protection.

"These figures are very remarkable," he says. "I am impressed with the logic of your position—but something still makes me dislike to spend money for military preparations."

If I can not defend myself against the imputations of militarism I turn back to my predecessors for support. John C. Calhoun remarked many years ago when he ran afoul of similar objections, "If our liberty should ever be endangered by the military power gaining the ascendancy, it will be from the necessity of making those mighty and irregular efforts to retrieve our affairs, after a series of disasters, caused by a want of military knowledge, just as in our physical system a state of the most dangerous excitement and paroxysm follows that of the greatest debility and prostration. To avoid these dangerous consequences and to prepare the country to meet a state of war, particularly at its commencement, with honor and safety, much must depend upon the organization of our military peace establishment." My immediate predecessor also observed that "I know of no war in which America has been engaged, offensive or defensive, which was brought about by Army pressure, or, indeed, stimulated by military desire." This deep belief has been manifested by practically every public official in close contact with this department, and it has been, perhaps, the most common thought of our Chief Executives that we must look well to defensive plans if we would accomplish best our peaceful program. One has but to look over the face of the earth to-day to realize that even those nations who have adopted the most fantastic theories of idealistic organization continue impressed with their need for national defense.

"Perhaps this is all true," replies the citizen, "but why is it, then, that the officials of the War Department and of the Army are always talking and thinking about national defense and about war, when the rest of us are thinking about peace?"

The citizen so often forgets that we pay these officials to think about war and about defense. The policemen are supposed to be on the lookout for thefts and the firemen for fires. The householder thinks only of the robberies in his own block. I ask the citizen a question, "How many wars have we Americans been through in our history?"

"Oh, about five or six," is the reply.

I then point out to him that while he counts war on the fingers of one hand the War Department numbers its actual calls to active service at more than 100.

"Why, I didn't know that! What were these calls?"

I observe that there has actually been an average of one call every year and a half, as follows:

1775. The Revolution.
1762. Wyoming Valley insurrection.
1786. Shay's rebellion.
1790. Northwest Indian war.
1791. Whisky insurrection.
1798. War with France.
1799. Fries's rebellion.
1801. Tripolitan war.
1806. Burr conspiracy.
1806. Sabine expedition.
1807. Chesapeake Bay affair.
1808. Lake Champlain affair.
1811. Northwest Indian war.
1812. Great Britain.
1812. Seminole war.
1813. Peoria Indians.
1813. Creek Indians.
1817. Second Seminole.
1819. Yellowstone expedition.
1823. Blackfeet Indians.
1827. Lefevre Indian war.
1831. Sac and Fox Indians.
1832. Blackhawk war.
1832. South Carolina nullification.
1833. Cherokee war.
1834. Pawnee Indians.
1835. Third Seminole.
1836. Second Creek Indians.
1837. Osage Indians.
1838. Heatherly Indian war.
1838. Mormans.
1838. New York-Canada frontier.
1846. Doniphan's Mexican expedition.
1846. Mexican War.
1846. New Mexican expedition.
1848. Cayuse war.
1849. Navajo.
1849. Comanche Indians.
1850. Pitt River expedition (California).
1851. Yuma expedition.
1851. Utah Indians.
1851. Oregon and Washington Indians.
1855. Snake Indians.
1855. Sioux Indians.
1855. Yakima expedition.
1855. Cheyenne Indians.
1855. Florida war (Seminoles).
1856. Kansas border troubles.
1857. Gila expedition.
1857. Sioux Indians.
1857. Mountain Meadow Massacre.
1857. Utah expedition.
1858. Northern Indian expedition.
1858. Puget Sound expedition.
1858. Spokane Indian troubles.
1858. Navajo expedition.
1858. Wichita expedition.
1859. Colorado River Expedition.
1859. Pecos Expedition.
1859. Antelope Hills Expedition.
1859. Bear River Expedition.
1859. San Juan Imbroglio.
1859. John Brown Raid.
1859. Cortina troubles.
1860. Pah Ute Expedition.
1860. Kiowa and Comanche Indians.
1860. Carson Valley Expedition.
1860. Navajo Expedition.
1861. Apache Indians.
1861. Civil War.
1862. Indian Massacres (Minn.).
1862. Sioux Indians.
1863. Cheyenne War.
1865. Northwestern Indian War.
1865. Fenian Raid.
1867. Mexican Border Indian War.
1868. Canadian River Expedition.
1871. Yellowstone Expedition.
1871. Fenian troubles.
1872. Yellowstone Expedition.
1872. Modoc Campaign.
1873. Yellowstone Expedition.
1874. Indian Territory War.
1874. Sioux War.
1874. Black Hills War.
1875. Nevada Expedition.
1876. Sioux War.
1876. Powder River Expedition.
1876. Big Horn Expedition.
1876. Sioux War.
1877. Nez Perces Campaign.
1878. Ute Campaign.
1878. Snake Indians.
1890. Sioux.
1891. Mexican Border (Tin Horn War).
1895. Bannock Indian trouble.
1898. Spanish American War.
1898. Chippewa Indians.
1899. Philippine Insurrection.
1900. Boxer Insurrection.
1912. Nicaraguan Expedition.
1913. Haitian and San Domingo.
1914. Vera Cruz.
1916. Punitive Expedition in Mexico.
1917. Germany.

The Army remembers these incidents by the loss of friends or predecessors and, generally, by the augmentation of the difficulties in each case due to lack of previous preparation. The country should remember them as events in the evolution of our very active nationality.

during which our principles and our possessions were defended or our possessions actually increased. We can accordingly find in this history what is a very great dividend in return for the comparatively small investment made by our country for its defensive preparation, and yet a very great cost for our lack of such preparations. When I have reached this conclusion my prospective supporter for national defense generally becomes very silent and thoughtful and leaves me—no doubt to pore over his histories in hopes of finding something wrong with my story. Since he never returns with refutation, I assume that he has accepted my statements and been somewhat instructed.

I trust, gentlemen, that I have not wearied you with this quite expansive treatment of what is to me an intensely interesting subject. I hope that you will forgive my method of attacking the problem, and that if you are wearied you will appreciate that it is because I lack the graphic powers of an Edward Bok, and not because my purpose is less important than arousing an interest in the Empire of the Netherlands. I feel convinced that this chamber understands the merits of the policy which I have endeavored to present in its true light to the citizens of our country. I did not come before it to sell insurance to you gentlemen, for you have always been coworkers for reasonable defense. I do hope, however, that you might, individually or collectively, from time to time remember my little discussion and pass it along. Knowledge of our country and of its institutions we must have. We are united in our ideals; we must be united in our methods of defending those ideals. Regardless of our political affiliations or beliefs, we can always join in wholehearted response to the appeal of Theodore Roosevelt when he cried, "Our voice is now potent for peace, and is so potent for peace because we are not afraid of war. But our protestations upon behalf of peace would neither receive nor deserve the slightest attention if we were impotent to make them good."

ORDER OF BUSINESS—THE CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to me for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The suggestion offered yesterday by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] tentatively touching the matter of the Christmas recess did not strike a very responsive chord. There is no objection on this side of the House, so far as I know, to holding night meetings and proceeding with these appropriation bills. I, personally, do not see any reason why we should not go ahead with the appropriation bill that is now ready this afternoon and possibly conclude general debate upon it, and we are willing to sit nights. There is a desire, however, for some change in the program as outlined by the gentleman from Wyoming touching the matter of the holiday recess.

Mr. MONDELL. What does seem to be the desire? To have a recess of a week?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Something like that, I should say; seven or eight days.

Mr. MONDELL. I would say to the gentleman that no request of that sort has come to me. One or two gentlemen have suggested that they would like to go away. I understand that some gentlemen want to go to Panama and others would like to go elsewhere and have a vacation, but in the main the membership will, I understand, be here, and I think we owe more to the gentlemen who are going to remain, who must remain, than to the few who feel they must leave. Of course, the House must decide this matter eventually, but as matters now stand it seems to me that the majority opinion on both sides is in favor of a very short recess.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if history repeats itself, as I assume it will, there will not be a quorum here during about seven or eight days of the holiday season, whether Members go to Panama or to their homes.

The gentleman from Wyoming knows from long experience here, I am sure, that at no holiday season have we ever had a quorum, and that when a quorum was insisted upon all business stopped. I think it would be very desirable to have an arrangement for some seven or eight days' holiday, and, so far as this side of the House is concerned, we are willing to stay at night to bring about the passage of these appropriation bills and do everything we can to expedite business. This side of the House does not want any extra session of Congress, I will say to the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. If I may say so, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that committee will sit nights if it is necessary, or any time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think it has been generally understood for some time that we would proceed continuously with the appropriation program until it is completed by the House. That may discommode some gentlemen; it may not be satisfactory to all, but I believe the majority of the Members want to remain here and have only a very short recess at Christmas. Personally I feel that it is the duty of the House to remain and to proceed with its legislation. Of course, if the House is not disposed to do that, the House must be the judge of the matter.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In so far as I know the sentiment of this side of the House—and I do not mean that I have canvassed it thoroughly—we are willing to stay late enough at night to make up the time that will be required to have a seven or eight day holiday recess. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think it would be humanly possible, and I doubt if the gentleman from Tennessee thinks it would be, to have evening sessions or night sessions sufficiently to dispose of the business that might be disposed of during the holiday week.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My observation has been that upon appropriation bills business is done more rapidly and more satisfactorily at evening sessions than at any other time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word. I am nearly as old as anyone around here, and I would come here every night and stay as long as anybody to complete business, but I would like to go home for a week at Christmas. If it is necessary I shall stay here, but I will not be absent a single night or day during the session. I think that we can do business nights. I always work at home in the night to 10 or 11 o'clock, and have done so for the last 60 years. It does not make a man any older if he works, but if he loafs he is good for nothing, and if he spends any time drinking whisky he is worse off yet. I work all the time. I have not been home earlier than 10 o'clock any night in Washington since I have been a Member of this House.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday will be the day for the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. There are only two bills on the calendar, and one of them is hotly contested. People are interested in that bill and will probably come here if it is coming up for consideration. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it is likely we shall consider Calendar Wednesday business on next Wednesday?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my present purpose to ask the House to dispense with Calendar Wednesday and all other special days, except, perhaps, unanimous-consent days, until the appropriation-bills program is disposed of, [applause], or at least very well along. And, referring again to the matter of the Christmas recess, I am still of the opinion that the recess should only be for two days. However, if that is not the view of the House, I would like to have gentlemen inform me as soon as may be in the near future what their views are. There are many Members who can not leave here, who can not get away even though the vacation is for a week, and I think that, notwithstanding some gentlemen may want to make trips home or elsewhere, we could have a quorum during the holiday recess and do quite a bit of business. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is District of Columbia day. In case the members of that committee should insist on District of Columbia business on that day, would it not require a special rule to do away with District day?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. BLANTON. It would be by a mere vote of the House?

The SPEAKER. That depends upon whom the Chair recognizes and what the action of the House was upon his motion.

Mr. BLANTON. But in case the committee did demand that day it would require a vote of the House to set that day aside?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the day is not worth anything.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that the House do now adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

808. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of papers in the files of the Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department, together with copy of memorandum of the Board of Inspection and Survey, requesting that certain papers be added to the list which are not needed in the transaction of public business and should be disposed of; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

809. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill for the relief of the Campagnie Francaise des Cables Telegraphiques; to the Committee on Claims.

810. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with supplemental report of Maj. M. C. Tyler, Corps of Engineers, on increase of water supply, District of Columbia, prepared in compliance with a provision in the District of Columbia appropriation act approved June 29, 1922; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

811. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting annual report of the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for the payment of four claims presented by the Government of China against the Government of the United States (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committees on Appropriations and Claims.

813. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriation "Contingent expenses, War Department," during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HICKS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 13238. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure, purchase, manufacture, or construct additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SCOTT of Tennessee: Committee on War Claims. S. 462. An act for the relief of Max B. Baldenburg; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4653. A bill for the relief of Allie Melinda Outterside; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13012) granting an increase of pension to Ralph Waite; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12845) granting a pension to William Karch; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13106) granting a pension to Malissa A. Bostwick; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13292) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat, and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat, and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13293) providing for certain personnel in, and authorizing and making provision for, certain activities, investigations, and services by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13294) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a commission for the purpose of securing information in connection with questions relative to interstate commerce in coal, and for other purposes," approved September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13295) to authorize the transfer of certain vessels from the Navy to the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13296) to provide for the organization of organized reserves in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 13297) fixing the pay of carriers in Rural Mail Delivery Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 13298) to amend the war risk insurance act and the rehabilitation act, with amendments prior to the passage of this act, extending all of the provisions of these acts to all disabled veterans of all wars of the United States and to their dependents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13299) amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fourth judicial circuit, for the appointment of additional district judges for certain districts, providing for an annual conference of certain judges, and for other purposes," approved September 14, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOND: A bill (H. R. 13300) to facilitate commerce by prescribing overtime rates to be paid by transportation lines for inspection of arriving passengers and crews; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KING: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 405) proposing an international relief fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13301) granting a pension to Mary M. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 13302) for the relief of Lyman H. Blakeslee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 13303) for the relief of Frank Stinchcomb; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 13304) granting a pension to Maria L. Fagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 13305) for the relief of James Augustine Gagan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13306) granting a pension to Anna D. Gooch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13307) granting a pension to Martha S. Roth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13308) granting a pension to Mary Ann Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 13309) granting a pension to Samuel A. Damarest; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13310) granting a pension to Henry Kahrs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13311) for the relief of M. I. Kunselman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 13312) for the relief of Charles Edward Bailey; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13313) granting a pension to William Napier; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13314) granting a pension to Edward McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 13315) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6558. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6559. Also, petition of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, asking for a national archive building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6560. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of National Association of Owners of Railroad Securities, Baltimore, Md., relative to conditions respecting transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6561. By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, praying for the repeal of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thy goodness is continued unto us and we recognize Thy manifold mercies, beseeching Thee to accept of us this morning. Enable us to see clearly what line of duty to pursue, and grant unto us always the desire to follow the teachings of Thine own gracious purpose, and help others on in the right and in the truth. We ask in Christ Jesus' name. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

RALPH H. CAMERON, a Senator from the State of Arizona, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced his signature to the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor;

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.;

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire;

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 450. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher.

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam;

H. R. 8062. An act amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act; and

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FULLER, Mr. LANGLEY, and Mr. RUCKER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from the Lions Club, the Rawlins Board of Trade, the Rawlins National Bank, and the First National Bank, all of Rawlins, Wyo., praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Fremont County Woolgrowers' Association, at Lander, Wyo., favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented resolutions adopted by Local Union No. 307, General Teamsters and Chauffeurs, of Cheyenne, Wyo., protesting against any modification of the immigration laws permitting a larger number of immigrants to come into the United States, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition numerously signed by sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution of Local No. 10, United Cloth Hat and Cap Makers of North America, at St. Paul, Minn., favoring recognition by the United States of the present Soviet Government of Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LADD presented petitions of Henry R. Halvorson and 8 others of Finley; C. H. Berger and 6 others of Baldwin; Elvick Stouke and 5 others of Enderlin; George Caribiom and 3 others of Fort Ransom; P. H. Anderson and 8 others of Dawson; Karl Gerger and 8 others of Glen Ullin; Maurice Rife and 9 others of Sheldon; Palmer Demmy and 4 others of Sykeston, Carl Dabelon and 20 others of Kramer; Frank Kelly and 15 others of Richardton; R. T. Paton and 9 others of Neche; Carl Schentt and 7 others of Rugby; Gilbert Larson and 8 others of Crosby; Michael J. Masseth and 9 others of Dawson; J. W. Rickford and 13 others of Sheldon; Magnus Helland and 4 others of Kathryn, A. H. Opsal and 3 others of Taylor; Mrs. Lulu M. Reynolds and 28 others of Powers Lake; J. P. Johnson and 11 others of Park River; Ole Clemetson and 30 others of Hoople, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ORGANIZATIONS INDORSING AMERICAN VALUATION—CORRECTION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present and have printed in the RECORD two letters in regard to the appearance of certain names in a list of organizations indorsing American valuation, which were printed in the RECORD September 18. These letters are from the representatives of the Arkwright Club and the consolidated tariff committee of American Manufacturers stating that the names of those two organizations were printed without any authority from either organization and should not have appeared in the list. I ask that the two letters be printed in order to make the record correct.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM F. GARCELON, AGENT,
THE ARKWRIGHT CLUB, 1880,
Boston, December 6, 1922.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 18, 1922, on page 12836, there appears a so-called list of "organizations indorsing American valuation." This was presented by Senator ODDIE. In that list there appears the name of the Arkwright Club.

The Arkwright Club, as an organization, has taken no position in this matter and has authorized no one to place its name in such a list.

It would be appreciated if you will place this statement in the RECORD.

Some of the members of the club have been strongly opposed to the American valuation plan; therefore, the club itself took no position.

Very truly yours,

WM. F. GARCELON, *Agent.*

(Consolidated tariff commission representing National Council of American Cotton Manufacturers, American Association of Cotton Manufacturers, National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, Association of Cotton Textile Merchants, Arkwright Club.)

BOSTON, MASS., *December 6, 1922.*

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 18, 1922, on page 12837, there appears a so-called list of "organizations indorsing American valuation." This was presented by Senator ODDIE. In that list appears the name of the consolidated tariff committee of American Manufacturers.

This committee authorized no one to place its name in such a list and did not, as a committee, indorse the American valuation plan, individual members at times expressing their opinion for and against it.

Will you kindly have this statement placed in the records of the Senate, so that the misstatement as above may not stand?

Very truly yours,

WM. F. GARCELON, *Secretary.*

LECTURES BY LIEUT. CAPT. HELLMUTH VON MULCKE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Captain Newell Rodney Fiske Post of Cranford, N. J., opposing the lecturing by Lieut. Capt. Hellmuth von Mulcke on his experiences on the German cruiser *Emden.*

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1922.

Hon. JOSEPH S. FRELINGHUYSEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am taking the liberty of transmitting to you the following resolution, which was passed by the Captain Newell Rodney Fiske Post, No. 335, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, in Cranford, N. J., and which has been concurred in by our national officers. The resolution is short, and I am sure that the situation should be brought to the attention of the country through the medium of its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May we count on your good offices?

"*Resolved*, That the Captain Newell Rodney Fiske Post, No. 335, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Cranford, N. J., goes on record as being emphatically opposed to allowing Lieut. Capt. Hellmuth Von Mulcke to come into the United States of America and lecture, either privately or publicly, relating his experiences on the German cruiser *Emden* in sinking ships and destroying human lives.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN S. BETTELHEIM, Jr., *Chairman.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 247) providing funds for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property during the convention of the Imperial Council of the Mystic Shrine in the District of Columbia June 5, 6, and 7, 1923, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 938) thereon.

Mr. McLEAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4096) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, reported it without amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 250) to donate to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States certain war trophies captured by or surrendered to the armed forces of the United States in the World War, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 939) thereon.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

Mr. NELSON. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended, and I submit a report (No. 936) thereon.

I wish to make a brief statement, if the Senate will permit me.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Minnesota is asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NELSON. Yes; it simply grants an extension of time, and I shall make a brief statement about it.

Under the trading with the enemy act six months' time was given for claimants whose property had been taken by the Alien Property Custodian to make requests for the return of the property and to prefer claims for it. By the act of 1921 that time was extended 18 months and by the bill which I have just reported it is intended to extend it for another year. The letter of the Alien Property Custodian states that—

> The same situation arises this year as existed last year, and unless the time for filing suit is further extended much hardship will ensue, and in all probability there will be hundreds of suits filed against the Alien Property Custodian by those who will not await further congressional action dealing with the disposition of the alien property. The bringing of those suits will not only work a hardship to a lot of enemy owners but will necessitate an expenditure on the part of the Government of additional sums in the employment of assistant counsel and otherwise for the handling of these suits.

The bill is recommended not only by the Alien Property Custodian but by the Department of Justice. The present time within which claims may be filed will expire on the 2d of January next. The object of the bill is simply to extend that time for one year. That is the whole purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand that section 9 of the trading with the enemy act authorized these claimants to property to go to the courts and sue for the return of their property, and that there is no statute of limitation which rests upon that right to go to the courts. I inquire of the Senator from Minnesota if there is any statutory limitation that prevents these people from going to the courts?

Mr. NELSON. I think that is the statute we refer to. The claimants were originally given six months' time under the trading with the enemy act, and in 1921 the time was extended by the act of that year for 18 months, and it is the purpose of the bill to give additional time in which to prefer claims and bring suit.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding was that the limitation related to their making settlement with the Alien Property Custodian and the Attorney General, and not with regard to the question of their going into the Court of Claims and suing for the property.

Mr. NELSON. The bill proposes to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The limitation probably relates to both.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. The bill has been approved by the Alien Property Custodian.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Under section 9 of the trading with the enemy act it was proposed that property unlawfully and unjustly taken might be recovered either through the Alien Property Custodian or the courts. By that was meant cases where the property of an American citizen or a national of one of our allies was involved or was taken only as a war measure, because the American citizen or the national of one of our allies was in the enemy's country or where the property was taken by mistake.

I would have no objection if the bill limited the matter to one year further in order to give people who may have a righteous cause an opportunity to go to the courts and be heard. But, Mr. President, I think the time has come to take affirmative action with reference to the payment of American claims. I am not objecting to the Senator's proposition. I am not going to object now. I am perfectly willing that the bill shall be considered.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to interject one remark? The bill does not change the law in any respect except that it extends the time one year.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what I understand, and I have no objection to that; but I think the time has come when some affirmative action should be taken looking to the payment of American claims. Property was taken over by the German Government from its nationals and under the treaty of Berlin given to us to pay our claimants; that is to say, it really belonged to the enemy at the time it was taken; but there has been no action taken by this Government to protect the rights of its own citizens up to this time. In 1914 some of the American claims arose, and here we are about to enter 1923.

Nine years ago some of these claims arose and most of them have existed for five or six years, and yet no action has been taken. It is true the President has appointed a commission to hear the claims, but the commission has not met. Congress has taken no action. There are a great many of the American claims which are meritorious. The property of innocent American citizens was sacrificed and their lives were sacrificed. I think the time has come when the American Congress and the American Government should give some attention to looking after the claims of American citizens as well as the claims to property of aliens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended is amended by striking out the words "18 months" in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "30 months."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAND PATENT TO JOHN W. STANTON.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2934) to provide for the issuance to John W. Stanton by the Secretary of the Interior of patent to certain land, upon payment therefor at the rate of $1.25 per acre, and I submit a report (No. 937) thereon.

I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I make a very brief statement relative to the purpose of the bill. I should like to have the bill read at the desk for the information of the Senate, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

It is a bill that is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and he urges immediate action in order that it may stand some chance of getting through the House at this session. I have a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior urging the passage of the bill in order that the party interested may not lose all his rights in the matter.

The land in question was entered under the homestead law, and the entryman complied with the law in all respects and cultivated and improved the land to the extent required. He borrowed from a party, with whom I am well acquainted, $500 with which to improve the land, and all that money was put into improving the land, but just before the entryman made the final proof, or just before patent was issued, he died. He left no relatives or heirs whatever. The party who loaned the $500 which went into improvements on the land, and for which he

holds a mortgage on the land, asks leave to have the Secretary of the Interior issue a patent to him instead of to the original entryman upon the payment by him of $1.25 an acre, the exact amount the entryman would have had to pay.

I send the bill to the desk and ask that it may be read for the information of the Senate, and then I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The reading clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to issue patent to John W. Stanton, of Great Falls, Mont., for the west half of the southwest quarter of section 2, the north half of the northwest quarter of section 11, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 3, all in township 28 north of range 4 east, principal meridian of Montana, upon payment by said John W. Stanton therefor at the rate of $1.25 per acre.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to ask the Senator from Montana if the bill which has just been read has been before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and has been unanimously reported from that committee?

Mr. MYERS. The bill has received the unanimous report of the committee. There was a good attendance of the committee, constituting a quorum, and all members of the committee who were present thought the bill should be enacted into law at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4145) providing that the State of Wyoming be permitted to relinquish to the United States certain lands heretofore granted and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof; and

A bill (S. 4146) granting certain lands to Natrona County, Wyo., for a public park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4147) granting a pension to Isaac Hawley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODING:

A bill (S. 4148) relative to reduction in freight rates on products of agriculture and live stock; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. WELLER:

A bill (S. 4149) for the relief of Mary A. Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4150) to provide for the organization of organized reserves in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

GRADE OF PROFESSOR EMERITUS AT NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7864) providing for sundry matters affecting the Naval Establishment, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SALARIES OF CERTAIN ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 425) fixing the salaries of certain United States attorneys and United States marshals, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROPOSED SIX-YEAR PRESIDENTIAL TERM.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 253) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and providing for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ARMAMENT CONFERENCE TREATIES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read. It is very brief, and I think there will be no objection to it.

The resolution (S. Res. 381) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to furnish the Senate information showing to what extent and by what nations the six treaties known as the armament conference treaties, described in Senate Document No. 124, Sixty-seventh Congress, second session, have been ratified, and to give the date of ratification in each case by each country.

THE CALENDAR—THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gooding	McKellar	Simmons
Bayard	Hale	McLean	Smith
Borah	Harreld	McNary	Smoot
Brookhart	Harris	Myers	Spencer
Cameron	Harrison	Nelson	Stanley
Capper	Heflin	New	Sutherland
Caraway	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Townsend
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Trammell
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Underwood
Culberson	Kellogg	Overman	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dillingham	Ladd	Pittman	Warren
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Weller
Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Robinson	Willis
Glass	McCumber	Sheppard	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar provided for by the rule may be suspended for the day. We had a call of the calendar the other day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I think we did have a call of the calendar the other day, and I do not know that there is any business very pressing on the calendar, although there is a bill on the calendar which I should like to have taken up, but I do not seem to be able to have an opportunity to have that done. However, I desire to ask the Senator from Washington what is his purpose. Does he intend to push to a final vote the bill which he seeks to have taken up to-day? I have no desire to delay the consideration of the bill, I will say candidly to the Senator, but a bill of such magnitude, of course, requires some consideration.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator from Alabama has no intention of unduly delaying the passage of the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, several days must elapse before the Senate will be in a condition to consider a measure of such importance. If the Senator intends, when the shipping bill shall have been taken up to-day and the debate for the day seems to have been concluded, to ask that the Senate adjourn, I have no objection to suspending the call of the calendar this morning.

I wish to say, and I wish to have it understood, that I do not intend to interpose any unusual delay against the consideration of the bill, but I know that there are Senators on this side of the Chamber who desire to speak on the bill in its initial stages who are not prepared to do so to-day. I should not, therefore, desire to consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with, if the intention on the part of those pressing the ship subsidy bill is, while Senators who are opposed to that measure are not prepared to speak, to resort to extreme measures. If that is not the purpose of the Senator from Washington, I shall have no objection to his request.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, of course, I did not expect that the bill would be disposed of to-day. I did intend to make some brief remarks myself upon the measure. Then, of course, if Senators are not prepared to consider it further to-day, I would not press for a vote, because I know it is quite a controverted measure and that it will take some considerable time to dispose of it even without any unnecessary opposition. When we conclude our business to-day I should like to have the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, but I would not be disposed to press that suggestion, of course, after what the Senator from Alabama has said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think we ought so soon to start taking recesses until 11 o'clock the following day. Later on we may do so. I have no objection to taking a recess until to-morrow, but I think, with the committees meeting, 12 o'clock

would be time enough to have the Senate convene following the recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Probably, so far as to-morrow is concerned, that suggestion may be all right.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word to the Senator brought out by his suggestion of a recess until 11 o'clock either to-morrow or for the next several days. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have arranged some hearings on legislation which I think is of very great importance, and, in accordance with those arrangements, men have come from different parts of the United States. There is quite a delegation here now. I talked with the man who has charge of the arrangements for a number of bankers and farmers from the Northwest, and he stated it would take them three or four days to be heard. The Senator knows that if the Senate meets at 11 o'clock that means that committee work will have to suffer. I realize that it may be said the committee could go on while the Senate is in session, but everyone knows that is very unsatisfactory, for it frequently results in having only one or two members of the committee present. The legislation which we are considering pertains to and is intended to affect directly the agriculturists of the country. I would very much dislike to see any action taken within the next several days at least that would prevent us from going on without hearings in the regular way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that I will not ask the Senate to take a recess to an earlier hour than 12 o'clock to-morrow in any event.

Mr. NORRIS. A recess to an earlier hour for the following day and for several days thereafter would be just as bad. I do not want silence on my part to be intrepreted as in any way giving my consent to that kind of an arrangement.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. POMERENE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I realize the force of what the Senator from Nebraska has said. Furthermore, I know that the Banking and Currency Committee will meet to-morrow at 10.30 o'clock to consider the rural credits bill pending before that committee, and it will be quite impossible for that committee to consider that and other matters and give hearings if we are going to recess and meet here at 11 o'clock. I understand the Senator now to suggest that he will not press such a request for the present, at any rate, and he certainly ought not to insist upon it, because it would deprive us entirely of the opportunity of considering very important measures, especially those on the subject of rural credits.

I do not know that there is any measure of particular importance now on the calendar, but there have been some bills reported since the last call of the calendar, and I am inclined to think that we ought to go on regularly and stand by our rules. This being Calendar Monday, let us dispose of such measures as ought to be disposed of, and then, after that, I presume it is the purpose of the Senator to move to consider the ship subsidy bill. In the meantime, however, I think we ought to proceed regularly and deal with the calendar.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a further suggestion?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand this matter is really not debatable, but I have no objection to the Senator making a suggestion.

Mr. POMERENE. I wanted to make a suggestion along the line of those made by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Nebraska. We are going to have a number of hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee on the subject of rural credits. The chairman of that committee has just advised me that those hearings will probably take a week or two weeks. They are of the utmost importance. I recognize the fact that the Commerce Committee has been studying this question of a merchant marine for many weeks. Some of the rest of us have tried to give it some attention. Personally, I have not come to any conclusion about it; but I want the opportunity to attend religiously upon these debates as they occur, and I can not perform my duties in the Banking and Currency Committee and be here at the same time.

While this is the short session of the Congress, this is a matter of the utmost importance; and whatever may be the ultimate result of this legislation, it does seem to me that we can afford to study it very carefully before coming to a final conclusion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I appreciate just what the Senator from Ohio says. I appreciate that it is difficult to hold these committee hearings with the Senate in session. Some Members would like to be at the committee meetings. They would also like to be on the floor of the Senate. I can not give any assurance, however, with reference to the action of the Senate in that respect, except to say that I shall not ask the Senate to-day to recess to a time earlier than 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Everybody recognizes the controversial character of the bill that we hope to bring up; and while I assume that whatever opposition there is to the bill will be based upon its merits, and that there will be no disposition to take advantage of the situation by reason of this being a short session to defeat the bill or unduly delay it, yet the bill is on the calendar; it has been pending for quite a long while; and it seems to me that we shall have to take every reasonable means at our disposal to expedite its passage, even though we may have to interfere with the hearings that may be necessary in other very important matters. I think everybody recognizes the situation that confronts us, and everybody will appreciate, I think, any efforts that are made to expedite the passage of the bill, even though they may interfere with hearings upon various important measures.

As I say, however, I shall not ask the Senate to-day to recess to an hour earlier than 12 o'clock to-morrow. I had hoped that we might dispense with the call of the calendar this morning. I know that under the rules this is Calendar Monday, and if any Senator objects I shall not complain, of course. He has a perfect right to do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the bill which the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] proposes to bring forward is an important measure. It was made an issue in the political campaign which terminated in the election on the 7th of November last. It would not be accurate to say that this measure was the sole issue which determined the very far-reaching results of that election. It is true, however, that when the President proposed to bring the bill forward prior to the election and have it passed upon by the Congress then, it was announced in the public press that the leaders of the majority of the body at the other end of the Capitol were opposed to that action, because they anticipated that if the ship subsidy bill was passed by the House of Representatives prior to the election it would inevitably result in the defeat of many Republican Members for reelection, and Members particularly from the sections represented by the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives recognized the measure as unpopular with the American people, particularly with their constituencies.

They had no hesitancy then in saying that the consideration of the ship subsidy bill should be deferred until after the election; and the reason this action was suggested was that to pass it prior to the election would prevent their reelection or return to Congress.

The President, as the press announced, reluctantly responded to that attitude of the leader of the majority in the House of Representatives and others associated with him in the political affairs of this Nation. No effort was made to bring the bill forward and pass it prior to the election. It is true that other measures were pending which consumed the time of the Congress. The President's purpose, expressed early in the session, was to make this the supreme legislative issue. He yielded that attitude out of respect to the leaders of the majority party in this body and in the body at the other end of the Capitol.

When the election was held, this bill was one of the primary issues that determined the results in 50 or more congressional districts throughout the country; and everywhere this bill was made an important issue the result was an overwhelming defeat for the champions of the measure. You can not name a western district where the ship subsidy bill was an issue at the last election where the advocate of this legislation, the open and avowed champion of the measure, won the support of his constituents.

This issue, with others associated with it, came near resulting in a reversal of the political control of both Houses of Congress. It encompassed the defeat of many Representatives and of some Senators. Now it is proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], representing the administration, to take advantage of the very short period which must transpire under the Constitution of the United States before those who received the approval of the public in the last election, those who won on this and other issues associated with it, shall have the opportunity of registering their votes in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and pass the bill in virtual defiance of public sentiment in the United States. That is the proposition implied from the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington, when he an-

nounces his purpose, on this the very first day the ship subsidy bill is before the Senate, to begin a process of pressure, before its provisions have even been explained to the Senate, to drive the measure through the Senate under whip and spur so that it may go back to the House and pass the conference before the 4th of March, because he knows and the administration knows that if the bill does not pass before that time its doom is sealed for all time.

No, you do not concede that openly. Let me ask you, if you were not afraid of the issue, why did you postpone it until after the election, and why are you so hasty in bringing it forward since the election, so as to have it disposed of before the newly elected representatives of the people in the House and in the Senate have the opportunity of reflecting in their votes respecting this bill the voices and the pleasures of their respective constituencies? The proper thing to do, since you did not have the courage to bring it forward and expressly make it an issue in the last election, and since you must know that the measure is unpopular, as evidenced by the result of the election, is to give those who have the new and recent approval of the constituencies represented in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States the opportunity of disposing of the issue. That is representative government.

Something has been said heretofore about changing the Constitution so as to reflect more promptly in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives the desires of the constituencies represented in these bodies. While the framers of the Constitution undoubtedly recognized the dangers of hasty action in legislation, they never dreamed that after a measure had been passed on by the American people, and disapproved by them, those who had been rejected in the election would dare to insist upon passing measures which the election showed to be unpopular.

You have the power to take this action. I presume you have the votes. If you can get the votes you can pass this bill, which you know the people of this country refused to approve, and which you know they will not approve, and thus permit the men who have been defeated upon this very issue to determine it against the will and the desires of their constituents.

This measure ought to go over until the long session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington to dispense with the call of the calendar?

Mr. FLETCHER. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection. The calendar will be proceeded with under Rule VIII.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 214) to amend section 24 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, was announced as the first business on the calendar.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1467) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Elizabeth White, administratrix of the estate of Samuel N. White, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 491) to provide, without expenditure of Federal funds, the opportunities of the people to acquire rural homes, and for other purposes, was read.

Mr. ROBINSON. This appears to be a bill of considerable importance. The author of the bill, or some one who is familiar with its provisions, should, I think, give the Senate an explanation of its terms and purposes. I do not desire to object to its consideration, but I do want to understand what the object of the bill is.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1016) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to hold hearings here or elsewhere and to employ stenographers to report the same was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution be placed on the calendar under Rule IX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOANS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The bill (S. 7) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.

The bill (S. 2391) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That was virtually taken care of in the tariff bill, or we undertook to take care of it, though not so fully as this bill would do. I ask that the bill may go to the calendar under Rule IX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2228) to amend certain sections of the Judicial Code relating to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 8331) to amend the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill has been considered as in Committee of the Whole two or three times, has been amended, and there is an amendment pending, which the Secretary will state.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) authorizing transportation for dependents of Army field clerks and field clerks Quartermaster Corps was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

DRY DOCK AT NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The bill (S. 2718) to provide for leasing of the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La., was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, given to the Secretary of the Navy, when in his discretion it will be for the public good, to lease, for periods not exceeding five years and revocable at any time, the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La.; and such lease shall be reported annually to Congress: *Provided*, That all moneys received from such lease shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PAGE subsequently said: Mr. President, referring to the bill (S. 2718) to provide for the leasing of the floating dry dock at the naval station, New Orleans, La., the facts about the bill are these: Some questions have arisen which seem to render it necessary to have the bill go back to the Committee on Naval Affairs and for that committee to have further consideration of the matter. I had intended to ask that it might go over when it was reached at this time. I was not in the Chamber when the bill was called, however, and I now ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed may be reconsidered, so that the bill may remain upon the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNARY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLETCHER. I know nothing about it, but I suggest, if the Senator thinks it ought to be recommitted, that he then have it recommitted instead of being kept on the calendar.

Mr. PAGE. I prefer that it be not recommitted until after to-morrow, when the Committee on Naval Affairs expect to consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection to the reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed, it will then go to the calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS, ETC., PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2589) to amend section 11 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved January 15, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 67) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1539) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1861) authorizing the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claim of Capt. David McD. Shearer for compensation for the adoption and use and acquisition by the United States Government of his patented invention, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 14) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill can not be considered this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2292) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish certain information for historical purposes to the adjutant generals of the several States and the District of Columbia, and making an appropriation therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That will have to go over to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3254) to encourage the development of the agricultural resources of the United States through Federal and State cooperation, giving preference in the matter of employment and the establishment of rural homes to those who have served with the military and naval forces of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1343) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1345) to amend an act entitled "Interstate commerce act," approved February 28, 1920, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1346) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and all acts amendatory thereof, including the safety appliance acts and the act providing for the valuation of the several classes of property of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission, approved March 1, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. NEW. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2921) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to considering the bill, but I want to know what it proposes to do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the bill should go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 188) creating a committee to investigate existing conditions of industry and commerce in the United States for the purpose of recommending to Congress legislation defining the rights and limitations of cooperative organizations as distinguished from illicit combinations in restraint of trade was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3384) authorizing an appropriation to meet proportionate expenses of providing a drainage system for Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the Newlands reclamation project of the Reclamation Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 171) to extend the provisions of the act of May 11, 1912, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 227) rejecting bids for the acquisition of Muscle Shoals was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 13) to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws, and to punish the crime of lynching, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3146) to amend section 5 of the United States cotton futures act was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. There is an adverse report on the bill, and it had better go over to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2388) for the relief of Augusta Reiter was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Neither the Senator reporting the bill nor the author of the bill is present, and I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3858) to define butter and to provide a standard therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNARY in the chair). On objection of the Senator from Utah the bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 211) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, and May 1, 1920, to the officers and enlisted men of all State militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3995) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exterminate bean beetles in the State of New Mexico, and authorizing expenditures therefor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the Senator from Utah the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3515) for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J., was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over on objection of the Senator from Florida.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 253) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and providing for the election of President and Vice President by direct vote, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LODGE. Let the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the Senator from Massachusetts the joint resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 2792) for the relief of John L. Livingston was announced as next in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the bill had better go over. The Senator introducing and reporting the bill is not here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the Senator from Florida the bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 7658) to amend the act approved August 25, 1919, entitled "An act for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for the post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection of the present occupant of the chair the bill will be passed over.

MARINE HOSPITAL RESERVATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

The bill (H. R. 11040) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of the act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916, be amended by striking out after the word "therefor" the words "within a limit of cost of $400,000, and the balance of the proceeds of the sale shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts" and insert in lieu thereof the following words, "and the Secretary of the Treasury shall with the proceeds procure, by purchase, a site in or convenient to said city of Cleveland, Ohio, and erect thereon a suitable building for use as a United States Marine Hospital and other Government hospital purposes, the same to be in accordance with the designs to be prepared by the Supervising Architect to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the cost of the site and construction of the new building shall not exceed the sum realized from the sale of the present building and site: *Provided further*, That after the sale of the present property it shall remain in the custody and control of the United States until after the completion of the proposed new hospital plant."

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] give a short explanation of the bill? There is no report filed with it.

Mr. POMERENE. I have been somewhat familiar with this matter for a period of several years. The hospital was built probably 70 years ago or thereabouts, in what is now the central part of the city. One of the officers of the Health Department told me to-day that the building is now perhaps worth about $50,000 to $75,000, on a site which is worth a million dollars or more, and the place is not at all fitted for a hospital. The ground has advanced tremendously in value. It is anticipated that out of the sale of the land more than a million dollars can be obtained, and that would build a new hospital in an appropriate location in the city.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there a real necessity in Cleveland, Ohio, for a marine hospital?

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, yes; I think so.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the only thought in my mind in asking the Senator the question.

Mr. POMERENE. At this hospital they have taken care of the sailors in the Lake service and at the present time, I understand, they are taking care of some of the veterans. I saw the hospital not to exceed three weeks ago and I am sure that no Senator would say that it is in a proper place. It is not at all modern, and it would be very unwise to attempt to refit or reconstruct it on the present site. I have no doubt about that at all.

Mr. SMOOT. The only doubt I had in my mind was whether it was necessary to build a new hospital there.

Mr. POMERENE. Oh, I think so.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the land is very valuable and that the present site is no place for a hospital. The only question in my mind was whether we would want to take the million dollars or more which we may get for the land and build a new hospital at this time.

Mr. POMERENE. I am sorry that I can not give the Senator the full details in that behalf, but I am perfectly clear in my own mind that the property ought to be sold.

Mr. LODGE. I take it that the hospital renders service for the Lakes similar to that rendered by our marine hospitals on the coast?

Mr. POMERENE. I think so.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me it is a most meritorious and proper measure.

Mr. POMERENE. There is no doubt about it at all. I think it would be a waste of good money to have that large investment in land in a place which is wholly unfitted for hospital purposes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Cameron	Curtis	Fletcher
Bayard	Capper	Dial	Frelinghuysen
Borah	Caraway	Ernst	Hale
Brookhart	Cousens	Fernald	Harreld
Harris	La Follette	Phipps	Sterling
Harrison	Lenroot	Pomerene	Sutherland
Heflin	Lodge	Ransdell	Townsend
Hitchcock	McCumber	Reed, Pa.	Trammell
Johnson	McKellar	Robinson	Underwood
Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Jones, Wash.	New	Shortridge	Walsh, Mass.
Kellogg	Nicholson	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Kendrick	Norris	Smoot	Warren
Keyes	Overman	Spencer	Weller
Ladd	Page	Stanley	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names and a quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12817.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington moves that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. The question is on that motion.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the motion now submitted by the Senator from Washington contemplates a very extraordinary proceeding. The bill which he presents for the consideration of the Senate has not been explained to this body; it has not even been read; and yet he is now asking to exclude the consideration of all morning business and to confine the deliberations of the Senate wholly to this measure. Frankly speaking, this is a bill that ought to be considered and discussed at length by the Senate. There is no justification before the bill has been read to hasten action concerning it. Such proceedings are calculated to provoke obstructive processes. There will be no disposition of this bill until the Senate has had an opportunity to give it full consideration and to discuss it fairly. While that is being done there is no reason or justification for precluding the consideration of morning business or the transaction of other business which it may be found necessary to bring before the Senate.

Many of our proceedings here are by unanimous consent; there are a large number of appropriation bills which must be considered and disposed of during the present short session; and I apprehend that the Senator from Washington himself within a very short time will be asking that the pending measure may be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may, by its process of unanimous consent, proceed to the consideration of some appropriation bill.

For my part, I have no disposition to cause the business of the Senate to be conducted in any extraordinary manner; but the Senator from Washington, it seems to me, should at least explain the bill and seek to justify it before he attempts to commit the Senate to a hastening-up process for its passage.

The bill is voluminous. As reported by the Commerce Committee of the Senate the bill contains some very far-reaching amendments. The bill passed the House of Representatives by a majority of only 24. Sixty-nine Members of the House who voted for the bill and constituted more than that majority have been defeated, and their places in the body at the other end of the Capitol, after the 4th of March, will be occupied by other Representatives. This bill in the form that it passed the House, if submitted to that body to-day, could not be passed if the Members who voted for it, although they had been defeated, sought in a direct way to reflect the will of their constituents.

I repeat, 69 Representatives in the House who voted for the bill have been defeated. Of course, it can not be said that their attitude in favor of this measure constituted the sole cause of their defeat, but there is not a Senator here who represents a constituency in the West or Middle West, there is not a Representative from the Middle West in the House who does not realize that the pending measure is unpopular with his constitutents. In that view of the matter the conduct of the Senator from Washington asking, before the bill has been read, that the Senate adopt an extraordinary course in reference to its consideration is explained. He wants to make certain that this bill, which has been repudiated by the American people in an election, shall be passed before those who have been elected to the new Congress shall have the privilege or opportunity of participating in its consideration. Every Senator and every Representative has the right, of course—indeed, it is his duty—

to reflect in his vote his conscientious judgment respecting measures that come before the Congress; but in a representative government, where issues and candidacies are submitted to the American people and voted for and determined by them, it is bad faith—it is inexcusable—to insist upon the precipitate determination of a measure which has been impliedly rejected by an expression of popular will.

If any Senator doubts that this measure is unpopular, why did the leader of the House of Representatives insist that the President subordinate his views concerning the subject to political expediency and consent to postpone the ship subsidy bill until after the election? Only one answer can be made—not to postpone it at that time meant the defeat of many Representatives allied with the majority side.

The bill was made an issue in the election; it was discussed in all the congressional districts during the campaign. It was in part, at least, responsible for the almost unparalleled change in representation in this body and in the body at the other end of the Capitol. The largest majority which the Republican Party ever had in the House of Representatives came near being converted into a minority in the election on the 7th of last November. No construction can be placed upon that election except that the measures and policies advanced and promoted by the party in power were unpopular and disapproved among the respective constituencies.

Now, the Senator from Washington, before he has said one word in explanation of his bill, seeks to commit the Senate to an extraordinary course in reference to its consideration. Why can we not go forward, consider, and discuss the bill in the ordinary way, at least for a reasonable time, until the Senate and the country have had an opportunity of understanding not only the proposals as originally presented but the new proposals reported by the Committee on Commerce in an effort to popularize the bill and bring to its support in this body the Senators on the majority side who had announced their purpose to oppose it in the form in which the committee first sought to bring it out.

The Senator from Washington no doubt proceeds upon the theory—

> If it were done when 't is done, then 't were well
> It were done quickly.

But the time has passed in American politics when measures which tax and burden the people of this Nation can be imposed upon them in conflict with their expressed will; the time has come when in this representative government men who hold their positions by the approval of the public must seek to reflect in a fair degree the intelligent, well-informed, and deliberate conclusions of their constituents.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to make a point of order against the motion made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. The Senator's motion, as I understand, was that when the Senate recess this afternoon it recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not exactly that; that when the Senate shall conclude its business to-day it recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. That is in substance what I stated. I submit that Rule XXII lays down the order of business, and that the first motion that is in order is a motion to adjourn. This afternoon, when the Senate has concluded the consideration of this proposition, or whatever may be pending before it, a motion may be made to recess. If a motion is then made to adjourn, the motion to adjourn will take precedence over the motion to recess. Suppose, Mr. President, when the Senate concludes the consideration of business this afternoon, a suggestion of no quorum is made, and on the call of Members, a quorum is not obtained, in that event, it will be conceded, the Senate can only adjourn; a recess can not be taken. The only exception would be by a unanimous-consent order. That is not requested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. His request is in the form of a motion. I submit that it is premature at this time, it is extraordinary, it is almost unprecedented, that a motion shall now be made that when the Senate has concluded its session this afternoon it recess until to-morrow; so I make the point of order that the motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. President, I do not want it to be understood that as one Member of the minority I am trying to delay the consideration of the ship subsidy bill. Personally, I shall not from now to the 4th of March, and I do not believe that any Senator on this side of the Chamber will, attempt unnecessarily and without good cause to delay the consideration of the ship subsidy bill. The country knows, however, that an extraordinary session of Congress was called by the President for one purpose, and that purpose was to consider the ship subidy bill. We met here day after day for two weeks, and during the whole time there was not a suggestion made, so far as the Senate is concerned, of the ship subsidy proposition. It was not presented. It was not hinted. The only suggestion that did come up during all of that time was the President's message to the Congress and the consideration of the subject by the House; but during those two weeks that the American taxpayer was burdened by enormous expenses through the calling of Congress into extraordinary session, what did we do? Only four things were done, and if a Senator on the other side of the aisle can suggest anything else that was done I shall pause to make amend.

One was a very extraordinary proposition, and one which the American people welcomed, namely, the swearing in of a woman, for the first time in the history of the American Congress, as a Senator from the State of Georgia.

Another was equally welcomed by the American people, and was more welcomed by some Senators on the other side of the aisle, and that was the resignation of Mr. Newberry as Senator from the State of Michigan.

The other two propositions that came before the Congress were matters that were not offered in good faith, that were attempted to be passed here in a sham battle in order to obtain colored votes throughout the country—the Dyer antilynching bill, which all Senators on the other side knew was dead the moment it was born, and the Liberian loan proposition, that had been debated in the Senate for weeks and weeks and weeks before we adjourned prior to the election in November. As to the latter measure, we saw Senators on the other side, like the King of France with 40,000 men, march up the hill and then march down again; and by votes furnished by the Republican majority the Liberian loan bill, carrying an appropriation of $5,000,000 as a loan to the colored population of Liberia, was sent back to the "sleep that knows no waking" in the committee where it had originated.

That is the fruit of the extraordinary session of Congress called by President Harding to meet and to pass the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. President, we know that we have but about two months and a half in which to pass the great supply bills that must run this Government for the next 12 months. It will be a very difficult task to give consideration to all these important measures and to adjourn by the 4th of March. I want to see the country next year be free from interference by virtue of an extraordinary session, provided we can pass the legislation for which we are called into session and which the American people desire. I want to see us get a rest for the first time in almost a decade; but you will not get a rest if you insist on laying aside the great supply bills to run this Government and put ahead of them and insist upon the passage of this infamous piece of legislation that will impose on the American people an additional burden of $875,000,000. So we see, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has pointed out, the chairman of the great committee having this bill in charge asking for the adoption of an extraordinary motion—that we shall have no morning hour; that when we recess we shall start on the consideration of this bill the first thing to-morrow; that supply bills may wait; that the distress among the farmers in the great Middle West may continue; that all the legislation may be ignored which the American people have been promised, and which the President of the United States only last week appealed to Congress to pass.

Oh, it was an extraordinary political message that he delivered. He was answering, in part, the voice of the American people as expressed last November. He was trying to still the tide that is continuing to surge over this country. He knew of—and I am glad that he had read—the report of the Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, which for months and months and months labored, calling in from every part of the country the representatives of the farming interests, obtaining from every avenue statistics to show the condition and needs of the farmers in every part of the country; and this commission, nonpartisan as it was, was trying to do something for the farmers, seeing that the things which they needed and which were necessary to carry on their occupations were costing so much and increasing in price, while the price the farmers received for their products was going down, made certain recommendations. Among them was the creation in the Federal land bank system of an agricultural credit system, in order that the farmers might borrow for three years, if necessary, money with which to operate. For almost a year that matter has been before the Congress. We have not heard a whisper from any part of this Government urging us to pass it; but when the farm bloc and the American farmer became aroused then it was that the President incorporated in his message the sug-

gestion that this was a splendid piece of legislation, and that it should be enacted into law.

The ideas as expressed in that bill will be enacted into law. It will be enacted into law during this session of Congress. I do not care with what enthusiasm you start out on the ship subsidy bill; I do not care how unanimous you may be for it on the other side of the aisle, a motion will be made, even if I have to make it myself, under the rules of the Senate, and you will be put on record to say by your votes whether you would rather continue the consideration of the ship subsidy proposition giving to the Shipping Trust this special privilege of $875,000,000, at the expense of the American taxpayer, or take up an agricultural credits system that will help the farmers of the great Middle West and Southland of this country. So make up your minds now what you are going to say by your votes and how you are going to respond to your constituents, who need help more than the Shipping Trust needs it.

When this motion is made, to which you will have to answer, another motion will be made, even if I have to make it myself, and then we can see in this body who are the friends of the great western country and who are the friends of the Shipping Trust who are seeking to gouge the American taxpayer by increased taxes through subsidizing the Shipping Trust; and that is the bill that was reported out of the committee months and months ago, and which has silently slept, and no hand has lifted it up, no voice has been raised to create enthusiasm in the American Congress to pass it—the McNary irrigation proposition.

You men from the West bear in mind, now, that a motion will be made to proceed to the consideration of that bill, which means so much for the reclamation and the irrigation of the great western country. You will be called on to vote, and you can take your stand on whether or not you are going to vote for the shipping interests of the country, that for years have gouged the American shippers in high, conscienceless, and extortionate rates, enriching themselves at the expense of the American shippers, that you now seek by this bill further to perpetuate in their riches by subsidies that will increase the burdens on the American people. The West must answer; their representatives in this body will be called on to respond; so I am unwilling to start out in this proposition by seeing this exceptional motion made that when we have concluded the deliberations of to-day we shall recess until to-morrow.

I submit, Mr. President, that the motion is not now in order. It will be in order when we get ready to recess or adjourn this afternoon. When the motion to recess is made, a motion perhaps will be made to adjourn, so that the orderly business that is on the calendar can be passed if there is no objection made, and so that this Congress can at least give some relief to the American people, rather than to constitute itself a citadel for the protection of these gouging shipowners whom we saw increase the rates from 1914 on through the years until in some instances they had reached 2,000 per cent.

I make the point of order against the motion made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Washington will not press his motion. If a point of order is raised, it would involve a motion to adjourn, and that would have precedence over a motion to take a recess. But the Senator will not gain any time of any consequence if we take a recess. If we adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock there will be morning business, which probably can be disposed of in 15 or 20 minutes, and probably there would not be a delay of more than 20 minutes involved between a recess and an adjournment.

If a recess is taken it will have all the appearance of forcing and crowding unnecessarily and unduly the consideration of the pending bill. A number of Senators on this side have stated to me that they not only desire to hear all the discussion and the debate regarding the measure, considering it to be of great importance, but that they themselves wish to discuss the measure and for the first time this morning they have been advised of the character of the bill. They have not yet had an opportunity to read the reports on the bill or to read the bill and the amendments which have been reported to it and it seems to me to be seeking to unduly crowd things to ask that the bill shall be kept constantly before the Senate every minute until it is voted upon. It is due Senators who wish to be thoroughly advised regarding the merits of the different proposals involved in the bill that they shall have an opportunity to consider it.

It is true the measure was introduced last April in both Houses of Congress but the proposition now before the Senate is entirely different from the bill as originally introduced in this body and as originally introduced in the other body. The bill as it was finally acted upon in the other body is entirely different from the bill then referred to the Commerce Committee as having passed the other body and the bill reported by the committee is entirely different from the measure which went to that committee.

Those are all matters Senators are entitled to know about and to have a few hours at least to consider before they are pressed into either discussing or voting upon the bill. I submit that it would be unnecessarily crowding the measure now, and depriving Senators of the proper time to consider and reflect upon and study what is involved in it, to call upon them either to debate or to vote upon the various propositions involved.

I say again that this morning for the first time the bill was laid upon the desks of Senators, with the amendments proposed by the Commerce Committee. For the first time this morning the majority report and the minority views are upon the desks of Senators. They have not had time to read either. Yet it is proposed now that the Senator from Washington shall explain the bill from his standpoint, and then that we shall recess so that we will be obliged to take it up the first thing in the morning.

I submit that the Senator ought to be willing that we adjourn to-day and meet at 12 o'clock to-morrow, and that there is not enough involved in the mere saving of time by recessing to justify this attempt to unduly press and crowd the Senate into the disposition of the measure. If the Senator insists upon his motion, I shall have to move an adjournment, which would take precedence over his motion to take a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Washington will withdraw his motion. This is a very important measure, and it is going to be considered by the Senate. We might as well make up our minds to that. It is going to be debated, it is going to be debated fully, and it is going to be debated freely. We all might as well understand that.

I think upon reflection the Senator will feel that we should not be asked to go into a continued consideration of a bill we have not had time to go over, without any explanation having been made or offered about the bill, before the bill has been read.

Those of us who are not on the committee and have been very busy on other things have not had time to go over it as fully as we should, and we want to go over it. I am engaged in that matter now, speaking for myself, and I am sure the Senator will not gain any time for his measure by forcing his motion. I hope he will withdraw the motion. I can assure him he will not gain time. I can give him the assurance that he will lose time if he insists upon the motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator that that has no effect, as far as I am concerned. But I do want to say that it is not the intention, of course, by taking the recess proposed, to cut off consideration of the bill. I did not expect to do that; I knew I could not do it; and I have no hesitation in saying now that if no one were ready to speak to-morrow and Senators should ask that the bill go over until the next day to give them time to make preparation, there would not be any objection to that. The only idea is to follow the course we usually adopt in reference to a measure of such importance. We know how often time is taken up in the morning hour, I do not like to say unnecessarily; yet Senators know it is. That is the only reason why I made the motion.

We have disposed of the morning business to-day. Possibly there would not be very much time taken up to-morrow in routine business, and possibly in 15 or 20 minutes we could get the bill before the Senate. The Senator knows that matters of that kind are always permitted to come up by unanimous consent. If a Senator wanted to introduce a bill or present a petition or submit a report, no objection would be made. The only purpose of this motion is to enable us to start out to-morrow with this bill before the Senate. Of course, we all know that that would not prevent Senators from talking about any matter they desired to talk about. Possibly it would not gain any time; it certainly would not deprive anybody of any opportunity to discuss this measure or any other measure he desired to discuss.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is ready to decide the question of order raised unless Senators desire to be heard further upon it.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, the motion that this bill, palpably promoting the shipping interests of the country in behalf of a few men disposed to get rich operating ships, should take precedence over great supply bills, admittedly in the interest of all the people, is most instructive, not only on account

of its vital relation to the people in so far as this bill is concerned, but because it marks a great change in our attitude toward legislation.

How far, oh how far, have we drifted in a few short years! When I look back over the dim vista of the past, and see through the lapse of a century the twinkling of a faint light that once illumined the paths of all patriots and all parties, I am filled with regret and almost with despair.

I have read somewhere, or heard it read—I do not want to be too sure in quoting these forgotten and musty documents, long since thrown into the limbo of things that were; but somewhere, at some time, it strikes me there was once a patriotic soul who wrote what at the time was a rather conspicuous and illustrious document, about which I have read, or heard somebody read—I will not be too sure—strange as it may seem to us, inexplicable as it may seem to us, he said certain things which at that time were considered aphorisms. For instance, he talked about "equal rights to all and special privileges to none."

Mr. BORAH. Who was that?

Mr. STANLEY. Oh, do not ask me. Poor deluded soul, he is dead. Now, we know how asinine was such saying, how silly for the Government to talk about equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Now we know that a wise Government provides special privileges for all and equal rights to none.

The purpose of this Government is to give any organization, any clique, any combination that is strong enough, a good, wholesome graft on the Federal Treasury, and it is the privilege of these poor, disorganized creatures who do not belong to any organization, who do not affiliate with any clique, who are simply citizens, to be plundered, to be plucked, to be forgotten, to be despised.

That same strange man, who is dead, sleeps now out on a mountain side in Virginia. They carved upon his tomb, at his own request, not what the people did for him, although they made him governor more than once, a leader of the legislature, a minister to France at a most crucial hour, a Secretary of State, a Vice President, twice a President, and, like those "sceptered sovereigns who still rule our spirits from their urns," this mighty man dominated the destinies of America for a quarter of a century. But now, alas, notwithstanding these somewhat remarkable performances, he is dead and forgotten.

On one occasion he wrote an instrument which at the time was actually read by the people generally and adopted by this country. We hold a sort of a holiday in commemoration of the adoption of that strange document, in which—think of it, my fellow Senators—he actually said that men were endowed by their Creator with certain "inalienable rights" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that all governments were instituted among men, not to confer, not to restrict, not to deprive, but to preserve those rights; and he held it actually to be self-evident, he did not need to prove it, that the only province of any government on earth was simply to see that individuals, men—because they were created a little lower than the angels—yea, higher than the angels, for they who come up through great trials and tribulations are above cherubim and seraphim, men clothed with no other majesty than their naked manhood, dependent upon no political combination, identified with no clique or combination, supported by no organization—just men and citizens—that they had rights given them by God, not by government, and that it was not the province of any government on earth to invade them. He went further in his strange document and said that whenever any government on earth imperiled those inalienable and God-given rights it was the province and duty of that people to destroy or to change that government.

That was the idea which subsisted 100 years ago, before we learned that the province of government was to supply special privileges to all and equal rights to none, before we learned from Prussia, before we learned from the dead and buried autocracies of the past, that individuals had no rights which a coterie of self-constituted censors and uplifters might not imperil and destroy. And now to cap it all, to prove it all, to establish it all, to bury Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence and all that they stood for who believed in the rights of men and the duty of government to attend to all men's business before it attended to a few men's profits, the chairman of the committee proposes here that our duty to all the people, bills that affect all the people, shall be laid aside, unless we agree by unanimous consent to consider the public generally, in this effort to foster the fortunes of a handful of avaricious, profiteering millionaires. Do it if you will, and then let some Senator for consistency's sake ask unanimous consent that in the future we cease to celebrate the Declaration of Independence, and on the Fourth of July let the banners flaunt, let the guns boom, let the trumpets resound, let the multitude rejoice, let glad orators proclaim a new era when special privilege has the right of way in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNARY). The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has moved that when the business of to-day is concluded the Senate shall take a recess until to-morrow. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has raised the point of order against the motion that it is not now in order. The present occupant of the chair, under Rule XXII, takes the same position as the Senator from Mississippi, and declares that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

Mr. FLETCHER. I object. I think the bill should be read in full.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. Let us have the bill read, and the report read, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First the bill will be read.

The reading clerk read the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay the consideration of the bill, but the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] coupled with his request the reading of the report. He is not present, and I do not want to take any advantage of his absence.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Florida stated to me before going to the restaurant for a few minutes that he desires to have the report read.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He announced that as a part of his request. So I suppose the report will have to be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report.

The reading clerk read the report, as follows:

AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920.

[Senate Report No. 935, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.]

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 12817:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass with the following amendments:

On page 3, line 15, after the word "sell," strike out the word "such"; and after the word "vessels," in the same line, add the following: "operating on routes established by the board prior to the enactment of this act."

Page 3, line 16, after the word "who," insert "in the judgment of the board."

Line 24, after the word "sales," insert the words "and its assignment."

Page 7, line 8, after the word "appliances," insert the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the construction or equipment of vessels by corporations or individuals primarily for the purpose of transporting their own products."

Page 8, strike out lines 3 to 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 24. That all mails of the United States shipped or carried on vessels shall, if practicable, be shipped or carried on vessels documented under the laws of the United States which are not ineligible under subdivision (c) of section 406 of the merchant marine act, 1922, to receive compensation under Title IV of such act (hereinafter in this section referred to as 'qualified vessel'). No contract hereafter made with the Postmaster General for carrying mails on qualified vessels shall be assigned or sublet, and no mails covered by such contract shall be carried on any vessel not so qualified. No money shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States on or in relation to any such contract for carrying mails on qualified vessels when such contract has been assigned or sublet or when mails covered by such contract are in violation of the terms thereof carried on any vessel not so qualified."

Page 9, strike out lines 5 to 25, inclusive.

Strike out all of pages 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and down to and including line 21 on page 17.

Page 17, in line 23, after the word "Sec.," strike out the figures "203" and insert "201."

On page 19, change sections 204 and 205 to 202 and 203, respectively.

On page 22, strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive.

Page 23, line 16, after the word "qualified," insert "except after a public hearing."

Line 24, same page, after the word "months," insert a colon and add the following:

"*Provided*, That no contract made hereunder shall extend beyond a period of 15 years from the date of the enactment of this act."

After the preceding amendment, insert a new subdivision to read as follows:

"(c) The board shall not enter into any contract for the payment of compensation, or increase the rate of compensation fixed in any contract, unless it is satisfied that the amount payable under such contract in any fiscal year, plus the total amount payable in such year under other contracts for compensation, will not exceed the sum of $30,000,000."

On page 24, line 1, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

In line 7, same page, strike out the words "authorized to be" and insert the word "permanently."

Line 9, after the figures "416," insert a comma and add the following: "subject, however, to the proviso to paragraph (c) in section 410."

On page 27, in line 9, strike out the figures "500" and insert "1,000."

Page 34, in line 15, after the word "least," strike out the figures "75" and insert "50."

On page 37, at the end of line 15, after the word "paid," insert a semicolon and the following:

"*Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made from the merchant marine fund because of any increased compensation granted under the terms of paragraph (c) of section 410 except out of the appropriations made annually therefrom by Congress."

On page 45, after line 25, add the following:

FINAL DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.

"SEC. 418. The determination of the board as to the amount of compensation to which any person is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be subject to review by the General Accounting Office."

We have made a few substantial changes in the bill as it passed the House.

The exemption provisions contained in sections 201 and 202 have been stricken out because, under present circumstances, no substantial results will be attained under them.

The amount of compensation that may be paid in any one year is limited to $30,000,000. The Shipping Board estimates that when this amount is reached we will have 7,500,000 tons of shipping privately owned and operated under the American flag, carrying over 50 per cent of our commerce.

The provision in the House requiring specific appropriations from the merchant marine fund to be made annually by Congress has been stricken from the bill. This is vital to its success. One main object of the bill is to bring about the purchase by private parties of the ships owned by the Government. This will require capital which must be secured from banks and those who are willing to invest in shipping securities. This can not be borrowed by proposed purchasers and operators of the ships if there is the least uncertainty of the payment of the compensation provided in the bill. By reason of the changing of the political complexion of Congress, and because of the bitter opposition to aid of this kind to shipping, no man would loan his money upon security of this kind, and thus one of the great purposes of the bill would be defeated. The committee does recommend an amendment preventing any money from being paid out of the merchant marine fund to increase the compensation provided in any contract except under a specific appropriation by Congress for such purpose. This, we believe, is as far as we should go in this direction.

We provide that no contracts for compensation shall extend beyond 15 years from the enactment of the law. It will take from 3 to 5 years to get all the good ships of the Government into private hands, and so under this limitation a large part of the compensation contracts are not likely to run more than 10 years. We will have a permanent merchant marine in that time or we will know what is needed further to secure one or that we can not have one.

The other changes in the bill are of a very minor kind.

The substantial objections to the bill are summarized in the minority report of the House committee on this bill. They are urged against it now and concise and specific answers in the same may not be amiss in this report.

1. Without pointing out that the $8,000,000,000 cost of the Emergency Fleet Corporation's activities included transportation projects, housing projects, plant equipment, shipyards and dry docks as well as ships; that even the expense for ships included the cost of wooden, concrete, and composite flascoes, and that such a cost, representing as it does the necessarily extravagant outlay inevitable in the creation during war's emergency of something which should have been provided gradually and without haste in peace time, the point still may be made that there is no real relation between the war-time outlay of the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the present measure.

This measure would be necessary and probably would be only slightly modified if we had no fleet at all to-day. Our problem is primarily to provide for the future; the element of salvaging as much as possible from the existing Government fleet is only secondary.

Had we had an intelligent merchant-marine policy prior to the war, we should not have been called upon to build overnight a fleet, for we would have had the necessary ships at a tithe of the expense we incurred during the war for their construction.

Further, from the standpoint of salvage alone, it may be stated that whatever amount is realized from the sale of vessels under a program of Government aid will be greater than we can expect otherwise, as few ships can be sold under present conditions.

The statement made by the opposition that we will give the ships away and then pay $500,000,000 in subsidies is of course erroneous. We are not giving any ships away, but are selling them, as we must, at the same price at which an owner can buy similar ships anywhere. We will not pay in direct aid, assuming that we sell all the Shipping Board vessels presently active, more than eight or nine million dollars to those ships, plus five or six millions to existing privately owned ships. By the outlay of this eight or nine million dollars we will not only realize from the sale of the active ships but we will end the expensive governmental operation which is now costing us $50,000,000 annually. In other words, we will save $40,000,000 a year and will cover into the Treasury the proceeds from the sales of these active ships. Whatever else we pay will be conditioned on the creation in American yards of new and desirable vessels.

2. Construction loan fund: The provisions in the present bill are only a modification of the construction loan fund in the act of 1920. The present bill makes this available as it accrues instead of limited to $25,000,000 a year. As modified in the House, a minimum rate of 4½ per cent has been fixed. This fund will be necessarily limited in its application and will apply particularly to aid the construction of especially costly and desirable types of vessels or the reequipment of existing vessels with pioneer types of machinery. Its provisions therefore are in no way analogous to the farm loan act.

3. Tax exemption: This is only a half truth. For a limited time, eight years, shipowners are exempted from the payment of taxes upon profits made by ships in foreign trade provided the amount of tax so waived is invested, together with an equal amount of the owner's private capital, in new construction, or is set aside in trust for such purpose. In other words, to secure this exemption the shipowner must double the amount exempted and invest it in American-built ships.

Similarly, for eight years, profits from sales of pre-war ships (built before January 1, 1914), are exempt from tax provided the entire proceeds from the sale are invested in new tonnage built in American yards and of a type approved by the Shipping Board.

4. Freight rates: Contrary to the above statement being true, the entire basis of the proposed bill was that of cheaper ocean freight rates for American products. The great keynote was the guaranty of adequate transportation. In almost every argument on the subject the chairman of the Shipping Board and others pointed out the greater cost of an uncertain transportation system. In depending on foreign bottoms our farmers and manufacturers may enjoy reasonable rates during normal times, but the moment abnormality enters their adequacy of transportation is interrupted and rates go sky-high. If carriage can not be obtained at any price or only at prohibitive rates, it is obviously the most expensive transportation conceivable. With adequate American tonnage in normal times American ships would have to meet foreign competition and thus rates would be held at a reasonable level; and in abnormal times, by governmental control or otherwise, the permanent services should be insured against disruption.

It is impracticable to control freight rates in the foreign trade charged by the American ships where similar control can not be exercised over their competitors. The bill does provide for most careful control of freight rates by the Shipping Board on vessels engaged in interstate commerce ships restricted to American flags.

5. Term of the contract: The 10-year period of the contract in no way prevents a repeal of the act by subsequent Congresses. It does give a guaranty for contracts that may have already been entered into, because without such guaranty it would be unsafe for any company to enter into contracts requiring heavy commitments whose duration was based upon the political complexion of the Government. In adopting the 10-year basis the Shipping Board is only given powers which have heretofore been granted to the Post Office Department, as, for example, in the ocean mail act of 1891, which authorized the Postmaster General to contract for a period up to 10 years for the carriage of mails.

6. Permanent appropriation: The objected-to requirement has been changed in the bill as it finally passed the House, and the Shipping Board will have to appear before Congress and obtain appropriations. While it is questionable whether this will not in a large measure defeat the purpose of the bill, this change nullifies the minority's objections.

7. Powers conferred on the Shipping Board: The merchant-marine problem is a large problem. Some organization must exercise large powers with respect to it. Congress created the Shipping Board to further the interests of the merchant marine. The minority might advocate the location of the vested powers elsewhere than in the Shipping Board, but it can not do away with the number and extent of responsibilities that some organization in the Government must exercise. Under the existing law that organization should be the Shipping Board.

8. Report by Shipping Board: In the organic act creating the Shipping Board, the shipping act of 1916, section 12 requires that the board make an annual report to Congress on the 1st day of December each year, which shall include a summary of its transactions. The drafters of the bill felt that this would apply to all subsequent duties imposed upon the board and did not believe it necessary in each piece of legislation to include a provision that the board should specifically report upon it. It may be pointed out that the merchant marine act of 1920 contains no provision as to a special report; indeed, its provisions have always been duly noted in the annual report of the board. In addition to this, all Members of Congress are well aware that a Government organization is always subject to the wishes of Congress, and even individual Congressmen, as to the furnishing of information. Volumes have been printed of testimony at hearings before various congressional committees concerning the work and transactions of the Shipping Board.

However, to remove even an erroneous supposition there has been inserted a clause requiring specifically the report referred to.

9. Salaries of executives: While it is true that salaries of the executives in the shipping industry, as in all other industries, are higher than the governmental standard, it is not true that these are high in proportion to the size of the enterprise and the amount invested therein.

There are literally thousands of employees in industry all over the country earning annual salaries ranging from $25,000 to $100,000 per year, and in some instances more than the latter amount; and yet the Government hesitates to pay $25,000 per annum to the best available and most experienced practical shipping men who are conducting for the Government the operation of the largest fleet and one of the greatest enterprises in the history of the world.

As to the statement that no large salaries are paid in Great Britain, with few exceptions, the statement is incorrect in general, and where, in the case of certain tramp lines, it is true, it is because of the peculiar organization of such companies where the stockholders are really bondholders, and the executive staff hold all the common stock and receive, instead of large salaries, the greater part of their remuneration by retaining all profits after the modest interest of 4 to 6 per cent has been paid upon the debentures.

10. Compensation to industrial carriers: As passed in the House, the bill does not grant direct aid to any industrial carrier where such carrier is engaged in transportation of its own products. This change nullifies the minority's objection. The change, however, is not sound from the standpoint of the best interest of our merchant marine. If the purpose of the bill were in any way to insure a profit to shipowners the point might be taken that the great industries, as the oil companies, the steel companies, and the fruit companies, who chiefly own their own carriers, were in no need of aid, although it should be carefully noted that profits earned by these companies are earned on their shore properties and probably in no way flow from their maritime holdings.

However, the bill is not to guarantee nor to insure profits. The bill is to encourage companies to invest in ships built in American shipyards, registered under the American flag, and manned by American crews. Under existing laws there is nothing which prevents these companies from securing their vessels in the cheapest markets, operating them with the cheapest crews, and flying over them such flags as they see fit. It is natural that since we wish to encourage American capital to invest in American ships we should be particularly anxious that the industrial companies so invest, since they are by far the greatest individual shipowners.

Before the war practically all the above-mentioned groups had their ships under foreign flag. One of the first acts passed by our Congress after the outbreak of the World War was that passed August 18, 1914, permitting the transfer of these American-owned foreign-flag vessels to American registry. By so moving we secured to the American flag 160 vessels, most of which were under the British flag. Had Great Britain issued a requisition order immediately on the outbreak of the war, as she did subsequently, the transfer of these vessels would have been impossible. As it was, those which were under the German flag were interned for the period of the war.

Denial of aid to the industrial companies whose ships cost just as much more to build in this country, whose wage differential is just as great, and who are just as free to employ foreign-flag ships as any

other American owner, will result in these companies seeking transfer of their existing ships and securing their future additions abroad and operating them under foreign flag. This is shown in the policy followed since the war by the United Fruit Co., which has added since the war 11 new steamers to its fleet, all valuable passenger and refrigerator types, but each one built in England and flying the British flag.

The following are the majority reports in the House, one on H. R. 12021, the bill as originally reported, and the other the supplemental report on H. R. 12817, this bill:

[House Report No. 1112. Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 12021.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12021) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendments:

Page 24, line 14, strike out the following: "and for the purpose of section 206."

Page 26, strike out lines 15 to 25 and lines 1 to 4 on page 27, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(5) Carries a crew (exclusive of licensed officers required by law) at least two-thirds of which are citizens of the United States, and the remainder of which are individuals eligible to United States citizenship. During the first year after the enactment of this act the required number of citizens of the United States shall be one-half instead of two-thirds; and, during the second year, six-tenths instead of two-thirds. In the case of passenger vessels the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to the deck and engine departments. If the vessel is deprived of the services of any member of the crew by desertion, casualty, or other cause beyond the control of the master, in any port outside of the United States or on the high seas, the right of the vessel's owner to compensation, during the period prior to the next arrival of the vessel at a port in the United States shall not be impaired by failure to comply with the provisions of this paragraph, provided the owner and master of the vessel exercise reasonable diligence to procure the necessary individuals to comply with such provisions. If the vessel is outside the United States at the time of the enactment of this act, or on the first day of the second or third year after the enactment of this act, the owner shall not be required to comply with the provisions of this paragraph applicable to such year until her first arrival at a port in the United States, if he complies with the provisions of this paragraph applicable to the previous year."

Page 53, line 22, insert at the end of the line the following: "unjust discrimination between ports of the United States or commerce accustomed to move through such ports, or in."

The following statement is divided into three parts, as follows:

Part I.—General consideration.
Part II.—Synopsis of the bill.
Part III.—Discussion of important features of the bill.

Part I.—General considerations.

HISTORY OF THE BILL.

On February 28, 1922, the President delivered to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives his memorable message on the American merchant marine.

On the same day Senate bill 3217 was introduced by Senator JONES of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, and H. R. 10644 was introduced by Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. These were identical bills.

An arrangement for joint hearings was entered into between the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Sessions were held beginning on Tuesday, April 4, and continued practically without interruption daily until Friday, May 19. During this period of 45 days the whole program of proposed legislation was gone into most exhaustively, 35 witnesses being heard and cross-examined. It is noteworthy that of this number 28 appeared generally in favor of the proposed legislation, while only 7 witnesses appeared in opposition.

The record contains references to a total of nearly 200 resolutions passed by commercial, civic, and labor organizations indorsing the principles of the proposed bill and only 8 in opposition thereto. Of the latter, a number indicated only qualified disapproval, based on certain features of the bill H. R. 10644. These features have been, as far as practical, modified in H. R. 12021 in the endeavor to meet the objections thus expressed. The indorsements show that the interior States, which in past years have shown little interest in development of the American merchant marine, are more interested in the present measure than even the States on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

An elaborate opening statement was made by Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, which appears in the record beginning at page 2. This statement your committee recommends to the serious consideration of those Members of Congress who would like to review an authoritative and comprehensive statement and analysis of the problems affecting the United States Shipping Board and the American merchant marine.

The bill upon which this is a report (H. R. 12021) is based upon the general principles contained in H. R. 10644, taking into consideration the voluminous record of the joint hearings and the facts brought out therein, and of such other facts and data as have been adduced at previous hearings and in studies relating to the vital problem of the successful and permanent establishment of an adequate American merchant marine.

NEED OF A MERCHANT MARINE.

Little time should be spent in arguing for the imperative necessity in war as well as in peace of an established and well-balanced national merchant marine. The enlightened statesmanship of every progressive nation having access to the sea strives for this as a desideratum for national security and national welfare. Those impractical theorists who are willing to see the bulk of our foreign commerce carried under the flags of other nations must also be willing to rely upon combatant ships and naval auxiliaries of other nations for the protection of our shores and our foreign trade in time of war or national emergency.

The President in his message well stated the necessity of the merchant marine from the standpoint of international trade and international safety when he said, "We can not hope to compete unless we carry, and our concord and our influence are sure to be measured by that unfailing standard which is found in a nation's merchant marine."

It is a well-recognized fact that the countries having large merchant marines have an advantage in international trade. This is due chiefly to the fact that ships are not only a necessary facility of foreign trade, but that they are one of several interrelated agencies that cooperate in making foreign trade successful and profitable. International commerce on a large scale under the present conditions of competition requires a world organization of industry, trade, and shipping. This organization begins with manufacturing and includes merchandising, international banking, marine insurance, ship brokerage, freight forwarding, and the construction, ownership, and operation of vessels. When this interrelating organization has been completely developed, as it has been by the people of Great Britain, foreign commerce can be carried on under the best of conditions. If shipping under the national flag is absent from the organization, or negligible in amount, the organization is ineffective. Shipping under the national flag and an adequate tonnage of vessels of different types are an absolutely essential part of the trade facilities and organizations for world-wide commerce.

The United States has long since ceased to be a self-sufficient nation. Without the sale abroad of our surplus annual production, estimated at 25 per cent of the total, many of our farms would have to be abandoned, factories closed down, hundreds of thousands thrown out of employment, all resulting in national retrogression and inevitable decay.

We can not depend upon the vessels of foreign nations to carry our surplus products to market because when we most need them they fail us. Foreign-flag ships are, of course, most anxious to carry our goods to market in ordinary times, and to collect and retain and carry abroad the fabulous amount involved in international carrying trade; but the purpose of fostering a national merchant marine is to have it available for national purposes in national emergencies; and the moment such a national emergency occurs the ships of foreign nations are immediately subjected to war-time orders by their own Governments, the sea lanes and carrying trade of the entire world are completely disarranged, and the nation with goods to export that must needs rely upon foreign-flag ships to carry its surplus finds itself in a sorry plight.

History affords abundant illustrations of such national predicament. We need only refer to the most recent example of international trade confusion caused by the Great War, in which our powerful Nation found itself in the humiliating position of being obliged to rely almost entirely upon foreign-flag ships for the carriage of our commodities. We were dictated to as to what goods would be carried, how, and when, and we saw countless millions of dollars of our surplus production stacked up along the railroads and on the wharves and docks, deteriorating and rotting. Such goods as were carried for us were carried at fabulous and excessive rates of freight.

The opportunity, born of conditions the result of the Great War, is here. Should we for any reason fail to take advantage of it, we shall deserve, and will surely have, the condemnation and censure of coming generations.

OUR PRESENT SITUATION.

The situation to-day is different from that obtaining on any previous occasion on which the question of aid to shipping has arisen. In other days, if the people decided that they did not wish a merchant marine, such decision settled the matter for the time. To-day it is not a question of whether we wish a merchant marine or not, for we have a merchant marine. It is not a question of subsidy or no subsidy, because to meet the Government's loss of $50,000,000 a year in the operation of our merchant marine the people are being taxed far beyond what would be needed were the ships brought into efficient commercial operation.

The question is, What shall we do with the fleet that we have, so that, with the least cost to the taxpayers, that fleet may be made of the greatest use to the country as a whole, both in peace and war? The alternatives are plain. Either make it possible for private enterprise to take this nucleus which we now have and add to it until it becomes a great and efficient entity, an American merchant marine, or refuse the relatively slight amount of aid necessary therefor and continue at a great expense the inefficient method of Government operation until the ships are worn out.

The purpose of Government operation, as clearly outlined in the merchant marine act of 1920, was that the Government might build up its trade routes until purchasers could be found ready to take over the ships upon established routes and with that necessary element, the good will of the shippers. Unfortunately, this policy has to a great extent worked to defeat its own purpose, for in the upbuilding of those routes the Government has operated ships, and in the operation of the ships has driven its potential customers off the seas. When a private American shipowner is competing with a private British shipowner, with all the handicaps under which the American owner suffers, his competitor is at least bound by the limitations of a finite capital. His resources are not endless, and he can not forever compete in a losing trade. When an American shipowner has to compete with his own Government, however, he has not only the foreign competitor but at the same time has in the field a competitor whose resources are, comparatively speaking, limitless. The result can not be in doubt. Continuation of a marine part Government owned and part privately owned simply means that the private owners will be driven out of business.

DISADVANTAGES OF GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

In some quarters there might be found those who would advocate this policy with a view to complete Government ownership and eventual direct operation of the ships. Such a policy would be more ruinous than the present system of governmental operation through agents, even though the Government in its bookkeeping can neglect many factors of cost for which the private owner must provide.

Successful Government operation, directly or indirectly, is an impossibility. Restrictions imposed by Congress upon salaries, methods, and policies, the pressing demands from varying sections of the country, prompted more by local interest than by a realization of the needs of the country as a whole, the limitations upon responsibility, and the fettering of initiative make governmental operation unthinkable where it is to be brought in competition with the operation of other ships not similarly handicapped.

In the Post Office, in the Army, or in the Navy Government ownership can prevail, because a monopoly is created. Even in the railroads, if the Government adopted a policy of State ownership, it could at least create a monopoly. With shipping it is entirely different. Our governmental merchant marine must ever be in free competition with the privately owned shipping of other nations of the world. No monopoly can be created either to bring efficiency to life or to

remove any comparative standard of its inefficiency. In the competition between Government ownership on the part of our Nation and the initiative and sense of responsibility concomitant with private ownership in other nations the fettered State-owned ships are foredoomed to failure.

These are demonstrable facts and present records bear them out. It is our object to carry the greater part of our commerce in vessels flying our flag, and by law the operation of Government ships is with a view that ultimately they shall be sold to private owners. At present, in spite of the most efficient operation that is possible under the limitations imposed upon the Shipping Board, we are not attaining the carriage of the greater part of the various forms of our commerce, and what we are carrying is chiefly due to the efforts of the Shipping Board and only achieved at tremendous loss. Were the board ships removed from the seas, we would lapse almost immediately to our pre-war standard as a maritime nation.

PROPORTION OF OUR TRADE CARRIED.

Our exports to overseas continents, excluding trade with the near-by West Indies and Central America, are now slightly more than three times our imports. Of these exports, foreign ships carried during the year 1921 an average of 71 per cent, while the American ship carried but 29 per cent, and only reached this figure by virtue of the large amount of coal exported in American ships during the British coal strike.

For a recent normal month foreign ships carrie. 76 per cent of our overseas exports, leaving 24 per cent to be carried in American ships. This 24 per cent measured our success in competing against foreign nations for the carriage of our products to the markets of the world. Of the 24 per cent, 19 per cent was carried in Shipping Board vessels and 5 per cent by private owners.

To carry this 19 per cent of our commerce costs the taxpayers of the United States $50,000,000 annually in direct operating loss. This does not take into account deterioration of the fleet, it does not include hull insurance, and it does not allow interest on actual or assumed investment. Worst of all, it is not providing for the future, for the Government will not again embark upon a campaign of shipbuilding, and the private owner can not build new ships of the types we need as long as he must meet not only his heavy operating costs but at the same time the competition of his Government.

Thus we come to the conclusions from which there can be no escape, that since Government operation itself is impossible and builds nothing for the future, since its continuance means the elimination of private operators, a method must be devised whereby the Government shall end its operation and the accompanying heavy losses by the sale of its fleet to private owners, as directed by the merchant marine act of 1920.

NEED OF AID TO SELL SHIPS.

At the present time there is, by and large, no market for our vast tonnage. Compared to the total tonnage built by the Government, practically no tonnage has been disposed of. After thorough consideration in January last the Shipping Board decided to sell its tonnage at world-market prices; and on its steel freighters, after careful investigation, it found this to be a minimum of $30 per ton for the best tonnage. So difficult is the situation for an owner of American tonnage to-day that even at these prices it has been able to dispose of but 100,000 dead-weight or 65,000 gross tons. Nor can we see any great hope of disposal of an appreciable part of the total tonnage we have unless, through Government aid, the difference between the cost of our operation and that of the foreigner is provided for, and thereby automatically the competition of wasteful Government operation removed.

By the extending of a moderate amount of national aid the maintenance of adequate American service under private ownership can be insured and the Government's heavy loss can be ended. Only by making private operation profitable can the Government find a market for its own tonnage. With such aid we can promptly dispose of our salable ships for private operation, get rid of our worthless tonnage and an annual operating loss of $50,000,000, give our people a better and more assured service on the seas than America has ever enjoyed heretofore, and successfully turn a war-time and war-built enterprise into a great instrument of peace-time profit and peace insurance.

HIGHER COST OF SHIPS BUILT IN THE UNITED STATES.

In normal times American ships cost to build approximately 25 per cent more than do vessels of the same type and size constructed in British shipyards. The reason for this lies almost entirely in the higher cost of labor in American shipyards.

Many years ago most of the materials entering into ship construction—the plates, angles, bars, and frames—were also lower in Great Britain than in the United States. To-day, however, on materials such as these, which are susceptible of quantity production, the advantage lies on this side of the water. For this reason previous measures admitting shipbuilding materials free of duty have not been of serious advantage in lowering the cost of an American ship. Items of equipment, in whose construction there is a great deal of labor still, are more expensive in the United States. Considering this, and also the fact that labor, whose cost constitutes one-half of the cost of the completed ship, receives twice as much in this country as abroad, the reason for the first-cost differential is obvious.

The amount of the first cost of the ship determines the annual carrying charge which the owner must meet. The interest on the money invested, the writing off for depreciation, and the insuring against current risk all are based upon the book value of the ship, which is originally fixed by the first cost. The three together involve an annual charge of from 15 to 20 per cent upon the book value of the vessel or, in the case of a new ship, her cost. If that cost be 25 per cent in excess of a British-built vessel, the owner of the American-built craft must annually set aside, out of the same amount of revenue as that accruing to the British ship, an excess amount ranging from 3 to 4 per cent of the cost of the ship. In the case of a passenger vessel costing in the neighborhood of $10,000,000 this would amount to a handicap to the owner of an American vessel of $240,000 to $320,000 per year. There is no practical way in which this differential can be lowered. It is simply a tax which the shipowner must pay for the privilege of having his ship constructed in the United States.

SHIPS AND SHIPYARDS VITAL TO NATIONAL DEFENSE.

Under present conditions there is no provision preventing Americans from having vessels constructed abroad for transfer to American registry, except that such vessels may not engage in coastwise trade. Such foreign-built vessels will be free, it is true, from the heavy handicap that American-built craft would be under, but no policy for the general interest of the United States could be more shortsighted than that of letting foreign nations build our ships.

Our shipyards, employing in normal times thousands of artificers, are already threatened with stagnation by the great curtailment of that naval construction which has always been their primary support. If we withdraw from them the chance to build our merchantmen, we will find in some time of bitter need that the art of shipbuilding has been lost to the country, and with it one of our most valuable elements of defense. The ability rapidly to repair damaged war vessels is too vital a national resource to jeopardize; the power of adding quickly in time of war to our fighting fleet is made more than ever important by the peace-time limitation imposed upon that fleet in the interest of national economy and by international agreement.

Indeed, it is a question whether the recent Conference for the Limitation of Armament has not made the possession of a merchant fleet, built in American yards, and manned as far as possible by American citizens, even more important to the United States from the standpoint of national defense than it is from the very vital ground of trade necessity. The commercial ships, as Secretary Hughes said, become important to a country in inverse proportion to the number of her fighting ships. At the hearings before the joint committees Secretary Denby made the statement:

"If we sank every ship of war in the world at this moment Great Britain would rule the world, beyond a question of doubt. Therefore, from the military standpoint, it seems to me that the creation of an American merchant marine is a vital necessity to our country."

The fleet which the American people built as a war-time measure, imposing though it is in number of ships and in total tonnage, is nevertheless of limited value to the country in time of war because of its lack of balance. Only 16 ships of more than 15 knots speed were built by the United States, yet speed in modern warfare is of vital necessity to the auxiliary vessel. The German ships seized in our harbors gave us a number of passenger vessels, but all of them are old and many of them are obsolete. Our fleet, therefore, is sadly lacking in fast passenger ships, one of the most desirable types that a merchant marine can furnish to the military forces in time of war. Great Britain has 202 vessels of this type with speeds in excess of 15 knots.

Even in ordinary cargo ships we have none, or almost none, that are capable of keeping with the battle fleet at sea. Nearly all the Shipping Board cargo ships have speeds of 10 knots or thereabout. Such ships carrying munitions for the fleet would either reduce the speed of the fleet itself to a very low point or would have to be separately convoyed by a large protecting force.

Our fleet is lacking in refrigerator ships necessary to carry fresh meat to feed our sailors or soldiers; is lacking in vessels suitable for transports; is lacking in ships which could be converted to airplane carriers; in fact, is lacking, broadly speaking, in everything except two types—slow-speed cargo vessel and bulk-oil carriers.

There can be no thought of a 5–5–3 naval ratio of fighting ships unless those fighting vessels are adequately supplemented by a commensurate fleet of merchant vessels suitable for conversion to the manifold types of auxiliaries which modern warfare demands. Without such a merchant fleet, whatever the paper strength of our fighing fleet is, its actual potency is measured by the character and extent of its left arm—the merchant marine.

DIFFERENTIAL IN WAGES AND SUBSISTENCE.

The committee had much testimony as to the extent of the wage differential between the crews of American vessels and those of foreign vessels. Apparently conditions at one time obtaining which required American vessels to carry much larger crews than did those of Britain have altered so that for practical purposes to-day the size of the crews is nearly the same. In the wages paid to individuals, and especially those paid the licensed officers, the superior American standard of living again exerts an unfavorable influence upon American owners. Whatever equaling effect the seaman's act may have in normal times toward establishing an international seaman's wage, it can not affect the pay of the licensed officers, who in almost all maritime nations must by law be citizens. It is in the wage of the officers that the greatest differential exists.

To-day, when there is a great surplus of shipping labor in this country obliged to take almost any wage offered, the differential between the cost of wages of the crew of an American cargo ship and that of a British ship of the same type is approximately 30 per cent of the total cost of wages, or for a medium-sized tramp about $10,000 a year. At present there is no requirement that any of the crew other than the licensed officers be American citizens, and less than 50 per cent are citizens. The higher wages are set by the higher wage standard of the country, it being axiomatic that wages are set by the standards at the port in which the men are obtained.

The cost of subsistence on board ships under the American flag also reflects the higher national standard of living. Under our statutes an American ship is required to provide food of such quality and quantity that in the cheapest possible markets the cost of the daily ration for an American crew is more than one-third greater than the cost of the British ration. It is for the country a proud boast that its seamen are better paid and better fed than are those of any other nation, but obviously the shipowner can not afford to bear the cost of such pay and of such food while he is competing for cargoes in the world's market against vessels manned by cheaper labor. This higher cost of American labor is felt by the vessel in all the services rendered her in the United States. The cost of repairs is higher here than abroad, yet to maintain our shipyards it must be arranged that all possible repairs are made in home yards. The clerical and supervisory staffs of a steamship company are paid American wages for performing the work which a foreign owner secures for a vessel at the lower rate prevalent in his own country.

All of these higher costs—each of which will be found upon analysis to flow directly from the higher cost of American labor—form an aggregate which has prevented in the past, and will prevent in the future, the unaided operation of vessels built in the United States and flying the American flag. From the days when the metal steamer became practicable until the war the merchant marine of the United States has been declining. This downhill course was reversed at enormous cost to meet our war needs, acute because of our previous neglect. If, however, the underlying causes of that decline are not removed or compensated for, the existing fleet will but prove another starting point for a decline as relentless and continued as that which marked our disappearance from the sea after the Civil War.

THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920.

The need for intelligent legislation looking to the disposal of the Government fleet and the upbuilding of a private American merchant marine has already been felt; and, it was thought at the time, met by the passage of the merchant marine act of 1920. The lack of results from this act shows clearly that the mere possession of a fleet of ships will not give a country a merchant marine unless it is made possible for private capital to take over and operate efficiently such fleet.

The merchant marine act of 1920, known as the Jones Act, provided generally for a series of indirect aids, the keystone of the structure being preferential tariffs to inure to goods imported in American bottoms.

The greatest disadvantage, outside of added capital charge and added wage and subsistence cost, which American owners must meet in building up our mercantile fleet, is the fact that in overseas carriage, other nations which are securely established in control of trade routes have the volume of business, and American ships must undergo the great initial expense of invading the field and building up that volume.

Fundamentally, the existence of a merchant marine is dependent upon actual carrying of cargo. All privileges, economies, and aids, notwithstanding the ultimate success or failure of a merchant ship, lies in its employment at sea carrying cargo. Then, and then only, does the vessel become a producer. Economy of operation without revenue means nothing. This basic requirement was provided for in the Jones Act and was embodied mainly in section 34.

The hoped-for aid from preferential tariffs was not realised because of the refusal of President Wilson to abrogate those portions of certain commercial treaties with foreign nations which forbade preferential treatment of our ships as against the ships of other nations. After long deliberation and careful investigation, President Harding concurred with President Wilson, and thus both a Democratic and Republican President are in accord that, for the time at least, the provisions of section 34 can not be carried out.

Even if the provisions of section 34 had been made effective the benefits to be derived therefrom would have been only from inbound cargo and on dutiable articles. When it is considered that our imports are approximately only one-third of our exports, and of this portion about 30 per cent dutiable goods only would be affected, it may readily be conceded that these provisions might not have produced the results expected of them.

Other sections of the act of 1920 from which it was hoped our merchant marine would derive aid have proved to be ineffective because of changed conditions or because of unforeseen difficulties. The act alone will not give us our commercial marine, nor aid us in disposing of our State-owned vessels. It is therefore necessary to supplement it, and for this purpose H. R. 12021 has been introduced.

Part II.—Synopsis of bill.

TITLE I.—AMENDMENTS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920.

This title consists of amendments to the merchant marine act, 1920, relating to the power of the Shipping Board to sell vessels and to make loans for construction.

SALES.

Section 1 of the bill amends section 5 of the merchant marine act, 1920, relating to the power of the Shipping Board to sell vessels, in such manner as to remove the enumeration of the matters which the board is to take into consideration in fixing the sale price, leaving as the only direction to the board that the sale must be consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by the merchant marine act, 1920.

The amendment also provides that vessels may be sold without advertisement or competitive sale if such action is approved by not less than five of the seven members of the board and if such vote and a full statement of the reasons are spread upon the minutes of the board.

The amendment also provides that interest on the unpaid purchase price must be paid at least annually at a rate of not less than 4 per cent per annum; and, further, that payments of principal shall be so arranged that at any moment of time the amount paid shall be sufficient to cover depreciation up to such time, but the board may waive this latter requirement upon the giving of adequate security. It is further provided that the board in making sales may include conditions as to the use and disposition to be made of the vessels sold.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 7 of the merchant marine act, 1920, relating to the duty of the board to make use of the vessels in such manner as to secure the establishment of necessary routes and providing that preference in the sale or assignment of vessels for operation on such routes shall be given to persons having the support of the domestic communities primarily interested. The amendment consists in the addition of a proviso defining the term "domestic communities primarily interested" as meaning the geographical regions known as the North Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts and the regions naturally tributary thereto.

The amendment also provides that for two years after the enactment of the act the board shall not sell vessels so assigned to any person who does not have the financial and other support of the domestic communities primarily interested in the lines. The amendment also adds a declaration that it is the policy of Congress to discourage monopoly, and to that end the board is directed to endeavor in every way to bring about the permanent establishment of such routes and services and their retention, as far as possible, in the hands of persons having the support of domestic communities primarily interested.

CONSTRUCTION LOAN FUND.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 11 of the merchant marine act, 1920, which created a loan fund in which the board could annually set aside $25,000,000 out of revenue from sales and operation for five years from June 5, 1920. The fund was to be used to aid citizens of the United States in the construction in private shipyards in the United States of the most efficient type of vessels. The amendment establishes a revolving fund of $125,000,000, to be created out of receipts of the board except appropriations and profits of the board from operation of the vessels; and the fund may be used not only to aid in the construction of new vessels but also to aid the equipping of vessels already built with the most efficient and economical machinery and commercial appliances. The amendment adds a provision that all loans must be repaid within 15 years and that the interest, payable at least annually, shall be at a rate not less than 2 per cent per annum. Loans for construction purposes are limited to two-thirds of the cost of the vessel to be constructed, and loans for equipment purposes are limited to two-thirds of the cost of the equipment or two-thirds of the value of the vessel when reequipped, whichever is the lesser. The provision of existing law which limited loans to cases where the new vessel was to be operated in a particular service, deemed necessary by the board, has been omitted.

TITLE II.—TAXATION.

EXEMPTION OF EARNINGS IN FOREIGN TRADE.

Section 201 of the bill adds sections to the income tax title of the revenue act of 1921, granting to the owner of a vessel of 1,500 gross tons or more, registered or enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States, a deduction in computing net income equal to the income derived from the operations of the vessel in foreign trade; but the granting of this deduction is conditioned upon his investment of double the amount of the resulting saving in tax in the building, in private shipyards in the United States, of new vessels of a type and kind approved by the Shipping Board, and to be put under the American flag. This exemption is to last for nine years, beginning with 1921.

A similar provision was found in the merchant marine act, 1920, but was limited to exemption from taxes (now repealed) imposed by the revenue act of 1918. The bill carries out the policy declared in 1920 but contains detailed provisions for the determination of the amount of the exemption and for easier administration.

In case the owner does not build a new vessel before filing his tax returns for the taxable year for which the deduction is claimed, provision is made for the setting aside by the taxpayer in a trust fund, before the making of the return, of an amount equal to the tax saving. The amount in the trust fund, together with an equal amount out of the ordinary funds of the taxpayer, must be invested by him in the building of new vessels in American shipyards within a reasonable time determined by the Shipping Board, and to be put under the American flag. If such investment is not so made the entire amount of tax becomes due, together with interest from the time it should have been paid.

If the taxpayer invests a less amount than as above provided, the amount of his tax saving is proportionately reduced.

EXEMPTION FROM TAX ON SALE OF VESSEL.

Section 201 of the bill also restates, in a form easier of administration, another policy declared in the merchant marine act, 1920. If an American vessel launched prior to January 1, 1914, is sold, the owner may be exempt from tax upon the gain derived from the sale if he invests the entire proceeds of the sale in the building in private shipyards in the United States of new vessels of a type and kind approved by the board, to be put under the American flag. If a part only of the proceeds of the sale has been so invested the amount of tax exemption is proportionately reduced. The same provisions as to the creating of a trust fund are provided as in the case of the exemption of the earnings of the vessels in foreign trade, and it is provided that the new vessel shall be carried on the books of the taxpayer at the cost of the old vessel for the purpose of determining his profit in the case of a sale, and for the purpose of computing his deductions for depreciation.

Section 202 of the bill contains clerical changes in the revenue act of 1921 made necessary by the amendments provided in section 201 of the bill.

DEPRECIATION OF VESSEL.

Section 203 of the bill amends the income tax title of the revenue act of 1921. It provides that, in the case of vessels documented under the laws of the United States, the deduction for depreciation allowed under the income tax law shall be determined under the rules and regulations prescribed by the Shipping Board, instead of by the Treasury Department.

The section also provides that in the case of an American vessel of 1,000 gross tons or more, acquired after the outbreak of the European War and prior to January 1, 1921, there shall be allowed for five years, beginning with 1922, a reasonable deduction for exceptional decrease in value since the time of acquisition, but not again including any amount otherwise allowed by law as a deduction. This deduction is to be determined, and spread over the five years for which allowed, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Shipping Board. At any time before March 15, 1927, the Treasury Department may, and, at the request of the taxpayer, shall reexamine the return, and if it is found that the value on which the deduction was based was wrong or has changed, the taxes for the years affected shall be redetermined and the amount of tax due or overpaid adjusted accordingly.

CREDIT ON INCOME TAX FOR OCEAN FREIGHT MONEY.

Section 204 of the bill adds to the income tax title of the revenue act of 1921 a new section providing that any person making expenditures for the transportation of property in an American vessel in foreign trade shall be allowed 5 per cent of the amount of such expenditure as a credit against the amount of his income tax. The section is so drawn as not to permit this credit in the case of persons transporting property in their own vessels or in vessels of corporations with which they are affiliated to the extent of ownership of more than 50 per cent of stock, nor is it allowed in the case of transactions between two corporations if more than half of the stock of each is owned directly or indirectly by the same interests.

DIRECT AID AS INCOME TO VESSEL OWNER.

Section 205 amends the income tax title of the revenue act of 1921 in such manner as to exclude from gross income the amounts received by a vessel owner as direct aid under Title IV of the bill.

TONNAGE DUTIES.

Section 206 provides for the doubling of all tonnage taxes except those payable into the treasury of the Philippine Islands, but excepts sailing vessels, without auxiliary power, of less than 1,000 gross tons, and all other vessels of less than 1,500 gross tons.

TITLE III.—TRANSPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS BY WATER.

This title provides that as nearly as practicable one-half of the total number of immigrants admitted to the United States in any fiscal year shall be transported in American vessels under regulations provided by the Commissioner General of Immigration with the approval of the Secretary of Labor. Provision is made that the title shall not take effect so as to limit transportation of immigrants in vessels of any foreign country until the President proclaims that the provisions of the title or regulations made thereunder are not in conflict with any treaty with such country. The President is directed to take such steps as may be necessary to remove any such conflict. Whenever, in his opin-

ion, no conflict exists in the case of any country, the provisions of the title are to take effect in the case of immigrants transported in vessels of such country at such time as may be fixed in his proclamation.

TITLE IV.—COMPENSATION TO VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Title IV creates a fund from which vessels of the United States are to be directly compensated upon entering into a contract with the board and complying with the terms of such contract and the terms of the title.

MERCHANT MARINE FUND.

Section 402 creates a fund in the Treasury to be known as the merchant marine fund. The moneys in the fund are to be comprised of (1) all tonnage duties, tonnage taxes, and light money, as doubled by this act, (2) 10 per cent of all customs duties, (3) the amounts which except for a contract for compensation would be payable for the transportation by vessels of mails other than parcel post, including poundage payments and the moneys payable under contracts made under the mail subvention act of 1891 and sections 7 and 24 of the merchant marine act, 1920, and (4) all excess earnings which are to be repaid by owners of vessels in accordance with the provisions of section 417.

CONTRACT FOR COMPENSATION.

Section 403 authorizes and directs the Shipping Board to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States for the payment of compensation to vessels, with a limitation that the Shipping Board is not required to enter into the contract if, in its judgment, the person with whom the contract is made does not possess ability, experience, resources, and character to justify a belief that the payment of compensation is reasonably calculated to develop the American merchant marine, promote the growth of the foreign commerce of the United States, and otherwise promote the general welfare of the United States. The Shipping Board may not give such refusal unless authorized by an affirmative vote of at least five members of the Shipping Board and unless the vote and a full statement of the reasons for the refusal are made public by being spread upon the minutes of the board. Contracts may run for a period not exceeding 10 years and shall provide that the payments of the compensation shall be made at reasonable intervals not exceeding six months. The moneys in the merchant marine fund are appropriated for the purpose of making such payments.

DETERMINATION OF COMPENSATION EARNED.

The computation of the amount of compensation earned by any vessel is subject to the limitation set forth under the following headings:

Speed and tonnage: The amount of compensation is based in part upon the speed of which the vessel is capable.

Regardless of speed the vessel receives one-half of 1 per cent for each gross ton for each 100 nautical miles covered by the vessel; but in addition to this amount power-driven vessels capable of a speed of 12 knots or over when on such draft as the owner may select, are to receive compensation graduated from one-tenth of 1 cent for each gross ton for each 100 miles covered by the vessel if the speed is 12 knots but less than 13, up to $2\frac{1}{10}$ cents for each gross ton for each 100 miles covered by the vessel if the speed is 23 knots or over (sec. 404).

A power-driven vessel as defined by the act for the purposes of this additional graduated compensation (sec. 405 (a)) is a vessel equipped so as to be self-propelled through the use of machinery if the rated horsepower of the propulsive machinery exceeds one-third of the gross tonnage of the vessel. The definition of power-driven vessels is so framed as to include sailing vessels with auxiliary power, and power vessels with auxiliary sails, if sufficiently powered for efficient operation when propelled by power only. Sailing vessels, on the other hand, are not to receive this additional graduated compensation. The gross tonnage of the vessel is to be that stated upon the vessel's certificate of admeasurement (sec. 405 (c)).

A power-driven vessel, as above defined, of 5,000 gross tons or less, but of 1,500 gross tons or over, is to be compensated as if it were a vessel of 5,000 gross tons (sec. 405 (f)). Auxiliary vessels coming under the definition of power-driven vessels, as above set forth, also receive the benefit of this advantage. Sailing vessels and slow steamers not qualifying as power driven do not have this advantage. On the other hand (sec. 406), any power-driven vessel less than 1,500 gross tons, or any sailing vessel less than 1,000 gross tons, is not to receive compensation. Compensation is thus payable to sailing vessels not equipped so as to be propelled by machinery, if between 1,000 and 1,500 gross tons, while power-driven vessels of similar tonnage are not eligible for compensation. The restrictions as to speed are only as to the speed of which the vessel is capable and not as to the speed on the particular voyage.

Mileage: As above outlined, compensation is based in part upon each 100 nautical miles actually covered by the vessel. Compensation shall not be paid in respect to any mileage excepting that comprising the customary route for vessels of same kind and type upon similar voyages between the ports touched by the vessel, based upon tables approved by the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board may, however, if such tables are not, in its opinion, fairly representative of the distance which under efficient operation is actually required to be traversed by the vessel upon its voyage, increase the mileage to such an extent as it deems fair and reasonable, but in no case shall the total mileage allowed be in excess of the mileage actually traversed by the vessel (sec. 405 (e)).

Classification: Compensation is payable to a vessel only in respect to mileage covered while classed by the American bureau of shipping in the highest classification open to a vessel of its kind and type, according to the rules of the bureau (sec. 406 (b) (4)).

Crew: Compensation under the committee amendment is payable to a vessel only for mileage covered while carrying a crew at least two-thirds of whom, exclusive of licensed officers, are citizens of the United States, and the remainder of whom are eligible for United States citizenship, except that during the first year after the enactment of this act the required number of citizens of the United States is one-half instead of two-thirds, and during the second year is six-tenths instead of two-thirds. In the case of passenger vessels the above requirements apply only to the deck and engine departments. Suitable exceptions are made for temporary situations arising from desertions, casualties, or other causes beyond the control of the master of the vessel and occurring at a port outside the United States or upon the high seas (sec. 406 (b) (5)).

Tows: Compensation is payable to a vessel only for mileage covered when self-propelled by sails or machinery. Suitable exceptions are made for cases of distress and for assistance on entering or leaving any port or in navigating inland or restricted waterways (sec. 406 (b) (8)).

Vessels of the United States: Compensation is payable to a vessel only for mileage covered while operating as a privately owned merchant vessel and registered or enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States. No vessel is to be paid compensation unless it was documented under the laws of the United States on the sixtieth day after the enactment of this act, or was after the enactment of this act built in the United States, or was at such time undocumented and owned by the Shipping Board or by a citizen of the United States, and is not thereafter documented under the laws of any foreign country (sec. 406 (c)).

A vessel built in a foreign country before the enactment of the act and not falling within any of the categories above outlined may, if registered under the laws of the United States within three years after the enactment of the act, be paid compensation if such payment is authorized by an affirmative vote of at least five members of the Shipping Board and the vessel is found to be essential to the proper development of the merchant marine by reason of its particular type or kind and if the vote and a full statement of the reasons for such authorization are made public by being spread upon the minutes of the Shipping Board (sec. 406 (c) (5)).

Foreign trade: Vessels are entitled to compensation only for mileage covered in foreign trade. Section 407 prescribes in detail what mileage shall for the purpose of compensation be considered as being in foreign trade. Roughly speaking, mileage upon any voyage excepting a coastwise voyage may be made the basis for compensation. There are certain exceptions, however. Voyages between possessions and Territories of the United States, voyages as auxiliaries to the military or naval forces, voyages on sight-seeing tours or for scientific purposes, if not in competition with vessels in the coastwise trade, may be made the basis of compensation. Voyages in ballast between ports of the United States, and voyages between two ports in the Virgin Islands, the Philippine Islands, or the Canal Zone may be compensated if the next voyage is to a port outside of the United States or outside such possession or zone. Voyages upon the Great Lakes, whether or not in the coastwise trade, are not to be compensated unless beginning or ending east of Quebec. Voyages embracing in part mileage between a port in the United States and a port in Hawaii are to be compensated only under certain circumstances (sec. 407).

Tramps and feeders: A vessels shall be entitled to compensation for any period of time only if it has entered or cleared from a port in the United States at any time during the 12 months prior to such period of time, or if during the six months ending with such period of time it has derived at least one-half of its total revenue from passengers and cargo received from or delivered to vessels of the United States whose voyage began or terminated at a port in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the Canal Zone (sec. 408 (a)).

Voyages of less than 150 miles: Compensation is not to be paid for mileage upon any voyage during which the vessel enters or clears from a port in the United States, its Territories, possessions, or Canal Zone, if the distance between terminal points is less than 150 miles (sec. 408 (b)).

AMERICAN OWNERSHIP.

Compensation is not to be paid a vessel unless owned by a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the shipping act, 1916, as amended by the merchant marine act, 1920. At any time more than three years after the enactment of this act compensation shall not be paid the owner of a vessel unless 75 per cent of the gross tonnage of all vessels owned or chartered by him or by any person affiliated with him, or for which either acts as agent, is comprised of vessels registered under the laws of the United States. In determining such percentage of tonnage, vessels of a particular type or kind and which are found by the Shipping Board to be not reasonably available for the purpose desired, are not to be counted (sec. 409).

INCREASE AND DECREASE OF COMPENSATION.

Section 410 provides that the Shipping Board may increase the rate of compensation to not more than double the normal rate when necessary in order to procure the establishment and maintenance of any particular class of service or the operation of any particular type or kind of vessel; or the Shipping Board may decrease the rate of compensation to such extent as it deems advisable. When the contract for compensation has been entered into such increases or decreases may be made only with the consent of both parties. In no case may any increase or decrease be made unless authorized by an affirmative vote by at least five members and unless the vote and a full statement for the reasons for the increase or decrease are made public by being spread upon the minutes of the Shipping Board. All contracts providing for the operation of a vessel in a particular service shall provide not only the rate of compensation in case the vessel is so operated, but a different rate of compensation to be paid in case the owner fails to so operate the vessel, provided the owner gives six months' notice to the Shipping Board of his discontinuance of the service (sec. 411).

OBLIGATIONS OF COMPENSATED OWNER.

Requisition of vessels: Any vessel in respect to which a contract for compensation is made may, at any time during the life of the contract, be taken and purchased or used by the United States for national defense or during any national emergency. The owner of the vessel shall be paid the fair actual value of the vessel at the time of taking, or fair compensation for use, based upon such value, in either case without enhancement by reason of the causes which necessitated the taking. The vessel is to be returned to the owner in a condition at least as good as when taken or an amount sufficient for reconditioning the vessel shall be paid the owner. The owner is not entitled to any consequential damages. Provision for arbitration is made in case of disagreement between the United States and the owner as to the fair value, fair compensation, or amount necessary for reconditioning (sec. 412). The purchaser of any vessel which is under a contract for compensation takes the vessel subject to the above right of requisition at any time during the term of the contract. The vessel is no longer eligible for compensation after the sale unless a new contract is made with the purchaser (sec. 415).

Repairs, renewals, and reconditioning: All repairs, renewals, or reconditioning of a compensated vessel are to be done at a port in the United States, its Territories, or possessions, or the Canal Zone, excepting repairs or renewals essential to the safety of the vessel, its passengers, crew, or cargo, or repairs or renewals of a feeder vessel (sec. 413).

Carriage of mails: Compensated vessels shall transport upon all voyages mail matter of any kind, except parcel post, required by the Postmaster General (sec. 414).

Repayment of compensation: Section 417 provides that the owner of a vessel or vessels who has made a contract for compensation in respect thereto shall pay to the United States 50 per cent of the amount by which his net income from the operations of such vessels exceeds 10 per cent of his invested capital in such vessels, but the amount of payment shall not in any case exceed the amount of compensation earned by such vessels during the year.

Net income and invested capital are to be computed in accordance with the revenue act of 1921, and all the provisions of that act and other internal revenue laws are made applicable to the determination and collection of the amount payable. In computing net income the compensation earned is to be included, but no deduction is allowed for the earnings of the vessels in foreign trade.

Provision is made whereby the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to enforce the section, with full power to look behind the accounts of corporations and others affiliated by stock ownership or otherwise, and to apportion their profits and invested capital in accordance with the facts, regardless of any financial trick or device (sec. 417).

Terms specified in contract: The obligations above outlined are to be placed in the contract for compensation, but, whether or not so included, the vessel owner shall be held to have agreed to the obligations. The Shipping Board may incorporate in the contract any terms or conditions comprising such obligation or necessary to enforce such obligations or the maintenance of service or necessary to ascertain and determine the amount of compensation.

REVIEW BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.

The determination of the Shipping Board as to the amount of compensation to which any person is entitled shall not be subject to review by the General Accounting Office (sec. 419).

TITLE V.—ARMY AND NAVY TRANSPORTS.

Section 501 provides that whenever the President finds that American vessels afford adequate facilities to meet the needs of the Army or Navy for the transportation of persons or property he may direct the discontinuance of the transport service of either the Army or Navy, and either place the vessels out of commission or transfer them to the Shipping Board. Thereafter the War Department and the Navy Department are directed to contract for their transportation requirements with owners of American vessels. Such contracts may be entered into for terms of 10 years, and the two departments may avail themselves of the expert knowledge of the Shipping Board in making the contracts.

TITLE VI.—RAIL AND WATER TRAFFIC.

Section 601 defines the term "commission" to mean the Interstate Commerce Commission.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND THE SHIPPING BOARD.

Section 602: This section declares it to be the policy of Congress to promote water transportation in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster and preserve both rail and water transportation; and directs the Shipping Board and the commission to cooperate to that end by the creation of a joint board to study the interrelations of rail and water traffic and the methods necessary to carry out the policy of Congress, above declared. The joint board is to meet at least twice a month, and is to formulate and transmit to the Shipping Board and to the commission such recommendations, not inconsistent with law, as it deems necessary to carry out the policy declared by Congress. Thereupon it is to be the duty of the Shipping Board and of the commission, by independent action, each within its own sphere and by the use of its own powers, to make effective such of the recommendations of the joint board as they may, respectively, approve.

EXPORT BILLS OF LADING.

Section 603 amends section 25 of the interstate commerce act, which provides for the issuance of through bills of lading in the case of goods transported by railroad to a port of the United States and thence by water to a foreign country. The amendment provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission in prescribing the form of the bill of lading shall adopt as the portion thereof governing the water portion of the voyage such form as may be certified by the Shipping Board.

RAIL-OWNED WATER LINES.

Section 604 amends paragraph (9) of section 5 of the interstate commerce act, which paragraph forbids railroads to own common carriers by water or vessels with which they compete or may compete for traffic. The effect of the amendment is to permit railroads to own water lines engaged exclusively in commerce not included within the coastwise trade or engaged in trade between the United States and the Philippine Islands even after the Philippines have been put under the coastwise laws. The amendment, however, does not permit railroads to own water lines engaged in trade with foreign contiguous territory.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS AFFECTING WATER TRANSPORTATION.

Section 605 amends section 15 of the shipping act, 1916, which section provided for the filing with the Shipping Board of all agreements entered into between common carriers by water, fixing or regulating rates, controlling competition, or in any manner providing a competitive working arrangement, and imposed a penalty for carrying out such an agreement without the approval of the Shipping Board. The amendment adds to the kinds of agreements which must be filed, those providing warehousing, docking, or other terminal facilities, and those providing that one carrier shall act as agent or representative of the other.

The amendment also compels a common carrier by water and a common carrier by railroad to file with the board all agreements between them relating to the interchanging of freight or passengers, or the making of joint rates, or providing warehousing, docking, or other terminal facilities, or providing that one carrier shall act as agent or representative of the other, or providing in any manner for a cooperative working arrangement. The amendment, however, applies only to agreements relating to passengers or property transported or to be transported to or from a foreign country or the Philippine Islands. The amendment also makes it unlawful to carry out such agreements until approved by the Shipping Board. The amendment also provides that all agreements covered by the section, in effect at the time of the passage of the bill, shall be valid until disapproved by the board.

Section 606 amends paragraph (d) of paragraph (13) of section 6 of the interstate commerce act, which section authorises the Interstate Commerce Commission to compel a railroad which has made an arrangement with a water carrier operating to a foreign country for the handling of through business to enter into similar arrangements with other carriers operating to the same foreign country. The effect of the amendment is to provide that such agreements shall be subject to the approval of the Shipping Board.

JOINT OR PROPORTIONAL RATES.

Section 607 amends section 28 of the merchant marine act, 1920, which section provides that no common carrier shall make any preferential rate based on the fact that the passengers or property transported are destined for or have come from a foreign country by water, unless such water transportation is to be or has been in an American vessel. The section further provided that if the Shipping Board found that adequate shipping facilities to or from a port in a foreign country were not afforded by American vessels, it should certify this fact to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the commission could then, in its discretion, suspend the operation of the section. The suspension might be terminated by order of the commission whenever the Shipping Board found that adequate shipping facilities by American vessels were afforded. The amendment takes away from the commission the discretion as to suspending the section and makes it its duty to do so when the Shipping Board certifies the lack of adequate American vessels; and likewise makes it the duty of the commission to terminate the suspension upon 30 days' notice when the Shipping Board certifies that adequate facilities are furnished by American vessels. The amendment also adds a paragraph providing that whenever the board and the commission are both of the opinion that putting into effect or keeping in effect the provisions of the section will result in materially changing the channels of transportation within the United States, or in unduly congesting one or more ports of the United States, the commission shall suspend the operation of the section until such time as the commission and the board reach a contrary conclusion, whereupon the commission shall terminate the suspension upon 30 days' notice.

TITLE VII.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND SUPPLIES.

Section 701 provides that all officers and employees of the United States shall, whenever practicable, travel in an American vessel if the travel expenses are directly or indirectly chargeable to the United States. Voyages may be made in vessels under a foreign flag only when specifically ordered by the head of the department or upon orders specifically approved by the head of the department, who in all cases is to report promptly to the board all voyages made in foreign vessels, together with the reasons why the voyage is so made. If any person fails to comply with this section he is not to be reimbursed for his passage money, or is to be surcharged in his accounts with the United States, as the case may require.

Section 702 provides that so far as practicable all goods belonging to or intended for the United States transported by water shall be shipped in an American vessel. If such shipments are not practicable and shipment is made in a foreign vessel, it is the duty of the officer or employee of the United States authorizing or making the shipment to notify the board in writing, with the reasons why shipment was so made.

REGULATIONS.

Section 703 authorizes the Shipping Board to make such regulations in respect to matters placed under its jurisdiction by the act as it deems necessary to make effective the intent and purposes of the act.

SEPARABILITY.

Section 704 is the usual provision that the unconstitutionality of a part of the act shall not affect the validity of the remainder.

SHORT TITLE.

Section 705 provides that the act may be cited as the "merchant marine act, 1922."

Part III.—Discussion of important features of the bill.

In the first place, the bill makes a number of amendments to the merchant marine act, 1920, with a view to removing some obstacles which in practice have arisen under certain provisions of this act.

SALE OF SHIPS.

Section 1: The effect which this amendment has is to give the board power, under special circumstances, to make sales over the counter when five or more members of the board are convinced that the interests of the United States are best served thereby. The committee added to this amended section a clause giving the board the power to write into their sale agreement a provision as to the use or the disposition of the vessel in order that, for example, with the wooden ships the board might, if it desired, sell ships with the provision that they may be broken up, or in the case of other ships, that desired services and routes should be maintained with those vessels. The committee also amended the original bill so that the deferred payments must at all times cover the depreciation of the vessel as determined by the board and fixed the rate of interest on the deferred payments at not less than 4 per cent. The committee felt that in the case of the sale of vessels where the price was left wholly in the hands of the Shipping Board the rate of interest should not be appreciably lower than that which the United States paid for its moneys.

THE MIDDLE WEST AMENDMENT.

Section 2: During the hearings, representatives of the Middle West and the South Atlantic expressed themselves as apprehensive that the sales policy of the board might be such as to vest control of the board's tonnage in the hands of monopolistic interests so as to work eventually to the detriment of the shippers of the Middle West, and possibly undo the work done by the United States Shipping Board in building up adequate services from all American ports. The committee recognized clearly the need of insuring that all sections of the country be afforded adequate water transportation facilities, and while believing that the danger of monopoly in cargo lines is not as great as is feared, nevertheless agreed that adequate guaranties should be incorporated in the bill to remove all doubt upon the point.

Accordingly a new section was added to the original bill under consideration, inserting two provisos and a new paragraph to section 7 of the merchant marine act of 1920. The effect of these additions is to insure that local interests, in the seaboard communities and in the inland districts naturally tributary thereto, shall have not less than two years in which to organize steamship companies and raise the necessary capital to purchase the lines which the board is operat-

ing from such communities; and that in developing its sales policy the board shall work to continue existing lines and endeavor in every way to bring about their permanent retention in the hands of those directly interested in the communities which the lines serve.

CONSTRUCTION LOAN FUND.

Section 3: The bill amends section 11 of the merchant marine act, 1920, by providing that the construction loan fund therein established shall come into existence as rapidly as the funds authorized for transfer to it become available, where the act of 1920 only permitted setting aside $25,000,000 each year. No increase in the eventual size of the fund, namely, $125,000,000, is contemplated. The bill added a provision to section 11 that the loan fund could be used not only in aid of construction of vessels but also for the reequipment of vessels already built with machinery and commercial appliances of the most efficient and the most economical type. It is also provided that the rate of interest to be charged shall be not less than 2 per cent per annum, while the act of 1920 specified no rate.

The minimum rate of interest of 2 per cent is authorized because of the fact that this loan is to be expended in construction in American yards, and that the Government will receive through the administration of this loan new or reengined vessels of the most desirable type. The committee therefore feels that the board should have power to loan from the fund at as low a rate of interest as 2 per cent.

TAXATION OF VESSELS.

Section 201: This section continues the policy expressed in section 23 of the merchant marine act, 1920. The exemption from income taxation allowed to shipowners by that section was by its terms to continue for a period of 10 years. It was, however, confined to the war profits and excess profits taxes of the revenue act of 1918. With the repeal of those taxes by the revenue act of 1921, the provisions of section 23 ceased to be of any effect. Section 201 of the present bill merely carries out the promised tax exemption of the merchant marine act, 1920, with some slight changes. The exemption applies only to the earnings of vessels of 1,500 gross tons or more and the vessel owner is required to supply out of his ordinary funds only one-half of the cost of new vessel construction instead of two-thirds, as provided in the former act.

The general policy of exempting the earnings of vessels in the foreign trade, upon condition that the amount of taxes thus saved to the owners of such vessels shall be invested in the building of new vessels in American shipyards, is thought by the committee to be thoroughly sound. It serves not only to encourage the operation of vessels in foreign trade but at the same time helps to maintain our American shipyards.

This section also continues another policy of income-tax exemption expressed in section 23 of the merchant marine act, 1920. Under the provisions of that section the owner of a vessel built prior to January 1, 1914, was exempted from all income taxes payable upon any gain resulting from the sale of such a vessel under the revenue act of 1918, if the entire proceeds were invested in ship construction in American shipyards.

This section makes this exemption applicable to the taxes imposed by the revenue act of 1921, thus continuing to make effective the policy expressed in section 23 of the merchant marine act, 1920. The result of this policy is to encourage the replacement of old vessels by the construction of new vessels in American shipyards, thus aiding to keep our merchant marine composed of the best and most efficient types of vessels and at the same time providing for the maintenance of our vitally necessary shipbuilding industry.

DEPRECIATION OF VESSELS.

Section 203: This section authorized the Shipping Board to prescribe rules and regulations for the determination of the depreciation of vessels of the United States for income-tax purposes under the revenue act of 1921. The committee believes that this subject is one which should properly be intrusted to the Shipping Board because of its expert knowledge of the subject. The rules heretofore applied by the Treasury Department have placed American shipowners at a disadvantage as compared with their foreign competitors. Under this provision the Shipping Board will be enabled to make rules and regulations covering depreciation of vessels which will result in overcoming the handicap to American vessel owners by reason of the less favorable treatment heretofore accorded to them in the application of the revenue laws.

Provision is further made for additional allowance in case of vessels of 1,000 gross tons or more, acquired after August 1, 1914, and prior to January 1, 1921, for depreciation based upon the exceptional decrease in values of shipping which has taken place since the latter date. This is to be determined under rules and regulations prescribed by the Shipping Board and is to be allowed to be distributed over the five years beginning with the taxable year 1922. Provision is made for a redetermination of any allowance which may be made, based upon any change in values during the five-year period. Similar allowance is made under the British revenue laws and the effect of this section is merely to place the American vessel owner in this respect on a parity with his British competitor.

INCOME-TAX CREDIT FOR TRANSPORTATION BY WATER.

Section 204: This section provides that any person paying freight for the transportation of goods between the United States and a foreign port in an American vessel shall receive as a credit against any income tax payable by him an allowance of 5 per cent of the amount of such freight money. If the person whose goods are thus transported has more than 50 per cent interest in the vessel, whether direct or indirect, no allowance is given him. The purpose of this latter provision is to exclude from the benefits of the section industrial concerns which carry their goods in their own vessels.

This section is one of the most important indirect aids provided by the bill. If direct subsidies were made enormous, vessels might be operated even without cargo. Obviously, such a method of securing a merchant marine would be highly artificial and extremely costly. A permanent and healthy merchant marine can never be established merely by paying subsidies. The secret of success in shipping, as in any other business, is volume, but American vessel owners are at a tremendous handicap in this respect compared with their foreign competitors. For so many years have Americans been dependent upon foreign vessels for the carriage of their goods, so firmly established are such foreign vessels in the carrying of freight, their commercial and financial connections are so widespread, their shipping organizations so broad and efficient, that successful competition on the part of the new American shipping industry is possible only if some means can be found for overcoming these advantages. The mere appeal to the patriotism of American shippers is insufficient. Some practical inducement to use American vessels must be found. The force of inertia tends to continue American shipments in foreign vessels. It is believed that the 5 per cent allowance provided by this section will furnish the necessary inducement to bring about the use of American vessels by American shippers, in preference to their foreign competitors, yet the total cost of this provision is estimated by the Treasury Department as not exceeding $4,500,000 per annum. No amount of direct subsidy will accomplish the same results. Even though an increase in the amount of direct subsidy paid might equalize the results of this section so far as the earnings of the vessels are concerned, it could do so only at a cost perhaps four or five times the amount of the cost of this indirect aid and no basis would be laid for the permanent establishment of the merchant marine.

If it be said that the results of this income-tax allowance can not be definitely measured, it seems none the less desirable to give the plan a trial. If it is successful, the result will be to increase the earnings of the shipowners, and under the provision of a 10 per cent limitation upon profits the amount of direct subsidy required will be decreased. If, on the other hand, the income-tax deduction does not cause American shippers to use American vessels, the cost will be negligible.

The merchant marine act of 1920 was largely based upon a similar plan. Under the tariff act provision was made for a 5 per cent deduction on customs duties, payable on goods imported, but this was not made effective because the Supreme Court held that it was in violation of our treaty obligations, and both President Wilson and President Harding have found it impossible to carry out section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920, which authorized and directed the President to abrogate the provisions of treaties so as to enable discriminating duties to be put into effect. The income-tax deduction provided in this section applies both to imports and exports and to goods dutiable and nondutiable. Thus, while it embodies the same principle as that sought to be carried out by section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920, it covers all goods carried in American ships, whether imports or exports. Your committee believes that this section should prove far more effective than would the carrying out of the provisions of section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920.

TONNAGE DUTIES.

Section 206: This section doubles the present tonnage duties, except in the case of sailing vessels of less than 1,000 gross tons or in the case of other vessels of less than 1,500 gross tons. American tonnage duties are far less than those customary abroad. Even after this section becomes effective the American tonnage duties will be generally less than those charged in foreign ports.

TRANSPORTATION OF IMMIGRANTS BY WATER.

Title III: This title is intended to secure for American vessels their fair share of the immigrant traffic. Had this provision been in effect prior to the enactment of the quota law we would to-day have had a prosperous line of passenger steamers upon the North Atlantic second to none, and this without expense to the Treasury; but America has always permitted those coming to her shores as immigrants to travel as they saw fit. The result has been that the immigrant traffic has been largely divided between Germany and Great Britain, and the steamship companies of those countries have for many years entered into agreements definitely apportioning the traffic between them. It is now proposed that American passenger steamers shall be entitled to one-half of this traffic. This title accordingly provides that as nearly as practicable one-half of the total number of immigrants admitted to the United States in any fiscal year shall be transported in American vessels, and the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, is directed to make the regulations necessary to bring this about.

In view of possible conflict with the obligations of commercial treaties this provision is not to be made effective until the President is satisfied that no treaty obligations will be broken, or if he finds that such treaty obligations will interfere with the carrying out of this provision, then until the President has taken the necessary steps to renegotiate such treaties.

This title, like the 5 per cent income-tax deduction, should prove one of the most valuable of the indirect aids afforded by the bill. As the income-tax deduction provision should fill our vessels with cargo, so this provision should fill our vessels with passengers. In each case the result should be that increase in volume of business which is the sole foundation of a permanent and successful merchant marine.

DIRECT AID.

Title IV: The history of direct aid to shipping, under whatever name it may be given, postal or admiralty subventions, or navigation or construction bounties, shows clearly that there is almost no nation in the world which has not realized the importance of a merchant marine, and, to some extent, endeavored to obtain one by granting direct aid from its treasuries.

Stripped of all but the basic considerations, the problem of having a merchant marine comes down to the question of whether the economic conditions are favorable or unfavorable. The primary factors governing the situation are: First, trade to an extent sufficient to support a merchant marine; second, the necessary elements entering into its construction, i. e., coal, iron ore, and labor available cheaply and adequately; third, the necessary personnel to operate such a merchant marine available cheaply, adequately, and of a naturally capable type.

A nation which has all the specified factors will be successful at sea without national aid, because it has no economic handicaps to be overcome other than inexperience and inertia. A nation lacking any one of these factors and still desirous of a merchant marine must compensate artificially for its lack. Countries like Great Britain and Germany are examples of nations having an ocean trade upon which they are practically dependent, dowered with cheap steel and having an ample supply of labor available at low wages. Their success at sea was eventually certain, but even these nations paid postal subsidies to develop vessels of the higher types. Japan is an example of a nation similarly equipped but which entered the competition for ocean carriage only recently and therefore found it necessary to subsidize in order to get a start and while gaining experience. Japan's merchant marine is firmly established now and will probably increase steadily in the future. Her subsidies in late years have been markedly reduced.

On the other hand, nations not favored with all of the necessary factors have endeavored to make up the deficiency by national aid. They have been successful only when the national aid fully compensated for their national handicaps, and they have failed almost completely when such aid did not compensate for their economic disadvantages, although in the latter case subsidizing nations have main-

tained by their subsidies a merchant marine which would have been impossible without those subsidies. The one clear lesson to be learned from history is that a subsidy which is insufficient is little better than no aid whatever.

In the United States we have ocean trade and we have been becoming increasingly dependent upon it. We have cheap steel and we have a population which would again take to the sea naturally and efficiently if opportunity offered. Our one great handicap is that because of the ample resources of this great and wealthy Nation our people are able to win for themselves comfortable livings on shore, at wages two or three times those which citizens of a foreign nation could hope to obtain in a similar walk of life.

Because of the high wage of labor in this country the American shipowner is doubly handicapped. First, a ship costs him more to build because of the high labor costs in American shipyards, and he therefore must assume an annual carrying charge upon his greater first cost much in excess of that which his foreign competitor bears; second, because of the higher standard of living in this country, he must pay a higher wage to the crew obtained in American ports than does his foreign competitor for the crews which he obtains from the cheaper European or oriental labor.

It is to meet, in part, the excess cost of building a ship in the United States and operating it under the American flag that direct compensation is provided for in this bill.

The history of direct aid in the United States, as well as in other countries, shows clearly that to be effective any legislation in aid of merchant shipping must provide as far as possible for a reasonable degree of permanence. Time will be required to institute the various parts of the program, such as the sale of the Shipping Board fleet, the establishment of the loan fund, and the construction of the new ships required to round out the merchant marine, and time will be required for American private operators to establish themselves on new routes. New ships will not be contracted for, nor services developed, unless there is a definite assurance that the benefits of the proposed legislation will be applied for a period of years. All this is particularly true in view of the fact that the depression in shipping may continue for several years and that during this period a fair test can not be applied to all parts of this program.

MERCHANT-MARINE FUND.

Section 402: The source of funds for the direct aid proposed in the bill is to be a fund established in the Treasury Department and called the merchant-marine fund. This fund is to be made up of moneys derived from the tonnage duties, taxes, and light money paid by vessels entering our ports, 10 per cent of the amount of all customs duties, and the amounts which American vessels receiving compensation under the contract would have been paid, except for this section, for the carriage of mails other than parcel post. In addition to these moneys the merchant-marine fund receives all refunds of compensation paid into the Treasury by reason of the operation of section 417.

THE CONTRACT.

Section 403: The bill therefore provides that no vessel owner shall be entitled to compensation unless he has entered into a contract with the United States Shipping Board. These contracts may be for any period of time up to a maximum of 10 years. The board is authorized to refuse such contract to the incapable or inexperienced owner, or to the owner whose lack of resources or of character are such as to make him, in the opinion of the Shipping Board, unfit to receive compensation from the National Treasury. Because of the broad power this proviso gives the board, the committee felt it essential that this power could only be exercised on the affirmative vote of not less than five members of the board, accompanied by a full statement of the reasons for such action spread upon the minutes of the Shipping Board.

Section 412: To the United States the contract will insure that the vessel with respect to which it is made will be available for use by the Nation in time of war or any other national emergency at a fair price, and such fair price is to be based upon a fair actual value of the vessel without inflation, due to the causes which necessitated the taking. It relieves the United States of any liability for consequential damages to the requisitioned vessel; that is, damages resulting from the loss of possible profits due to the seizure.

Section 413: In addition to binding himself to sell or lease his vessel to the United States at a fair price in time of national emergency, the vessel owner who enters into a contract for compensation agrees that all the repairs or renewals or reconditioning of the ship or its fittings shall be done in a port of, or belonging to, the United States, except that in case of emergency the minimum work necessary to the safety of the vessel may be performed in a foreign port; and, except in the case of special feeder vessels, never touching American ports.

Section 414: The owner also contracts to carry free of charge mail matter of any kind, except parcel post, to such extent as may be required of him, and in so doing to waive all rights for compensation under the law or under any contract made thereunder, but in so waiving his rights to compensation the vessel owner is not relieved of any obligations incurred under existing law or contract, and the transportation of mails is subject to all the requirements of the Post Office Department, and the owner is liable to the prescribed penalties for infraction thereof.

Section 415: If a vessel in respect to which a contract for compensation has been made is sold prior to the expiration of the contract, compensation automatically ceases unless the new owner makes another contract with the board. Such sale, however, does not relieve the new owner of the vessel from the liability of having his vessel requisitioned in time of national emergency.

The owner contracts to turn into the Treasury one-half of his net earnings in excess of 10 per cent in any one year until the compensation received during that year has been repaid.

RATE OF COMPENSATION.

Section 404: The direct aid is based upon the size and speed of the vessel and the distance covered. The reasons for the adoption of this method of computing compensation were brought out clearly and in considerable detail during the hearings.

All vessels, otherwise eligible, receive compensation at the rate of one-half of 1 cent per gross ton per 100 nautical miles covered. Power-driven vessels, capable of making speeds on trial of 12 knots or more, receive a higher rate, proportionate to their speed, and hence to their first cost and to their operating cost. The maximum rate provided is 2½ cents per ton per 100 miles, which may be paid to vessels of 23 knots speed or above.

LIMITATIONS OF COMPENSATION.

Section 406: In order to make the compensation apply to vessels which are of real value to the foreign trade of the United States, and to obviate the need of negotiating contracts with a multitude of small vessels, a limit of 1,500 gross tons is provided, and no vessels of less than this tonnage receive compensation, except in the case of vessels solely propelled by sails, for which a minimum of 1,000 gross tons is established.

In the bill as reported it was provided that a vessel to be eligible for compensation must carry American citizens to the extent of not less than half her deck and her engine department, considered separately, and without counting licensed officers required by law. The committee amended this subparagraph by requiring that vessels must carry a crew two-thirds of which, exclusive of licensed officers, should be American citizens, and the entire remainder of the crew should be eligible to citizenship. Because of the impracticability of getting American servants, the committee excepted the steward's department of passenger vessels from this requirement and further allowed a period of two years in which the proportion should be attained, providing that in the first year after the enactment of this act only 50 per cent citizens would be required, in the second year only 60 per cent, while thereafter the full two-thirds should be demanded.

This subparagraph as amended will not only raise the proportion of American citizens upon vessels in the merchant marine to an extent probably greater than ever existed but it further has the effect of barring from the crews, except in the case of the steward's department of passenger ships, all aliens who are ineligible to citizenship during the period. The committee feels that this amendment is the most important provision in the interests of an American-manned merchant marine.

Because the encouragement of American shipbuilding is one of the primary purposes of the bill, it provides, generally speaking, that only American-built vessels shall be entitled to compensation. Exceptions are the vessels of foreign construction now under the American flag, either privately or publicly owned, and such ships as only brought under the flag within 60 days after the enactment of the act.

It might be desirable, or even necessary, to add to our merchant marine in the immediate future special types of ships which at present we do not possess but which do exist elsewhere. To make this possible the board has power, upon a vote of not less than five members, to admit to compensation a foreign-built vessel owned by a citizen and admitted to registry after the taking effect of the section. Such admission can only be made to a vessel built prior to the enactment of the act—that is, to existing vessels. This exception, therefore, will not permit new contracts to be placed abroad with the idea that the vessel may be given compensation. Further, only three years are allowed for the exercise of this prerogative by the board, for that time is sufficient to permit American shipyards to build the needed vessels.

OWNERSHIP OF VESSELS BY CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 409: This section does not become effective until three years after the enactment of the act. Thereafter, at least 75 per cent of any vessel owner's total gross tonnage engaged in foreign trade must be American, otherwise he is deprived of any right to compensation under the act. This applies equally to tonnage owned, chartered, or for which the owner acts as agent.

Provision is made for the suspension by the board of this provision with respect to vessels of a particular type or kind not reasonably available under the American flag.

At the present time nearly all American vessel owners and operators are more or less heavily interested in foreign vessels. The committee feels that this was a condition which, in the interest of the American merchant marine, should not be allowed to continue. Of course, Americans must be allowed to be interested in foreign vessels if they see fit to do so, but it seems a reasonable requirement that they shall not receive the benefits of a subsidy unless they devote their capital, their skill, and their industry solely to the development of the American merchant marine, for whose benefit the subsidy is given. There can be no divided allegiance or conflicting interest. Such a radical change in existing shipping interests and relations, it was felt, however, could not be instantly brought about, and accordingly a period of three years was allowed before the section is to become effective.

ALTERATIONS IN RATE OF COMPENSATION.

Section 410: As the board has for sale a number of vessels of the passenger or combination type, some of which the United States acquired by seizure at the outbreak of the war, the sales price of these vessels will not reflect their present-day cost of construction. The rate of compensation for vessels of the higher speed is based upon their cost of construction. Obviously, therefore, the board should have it in its power to decrease the rate of compensation where vessels are sold at such prices, or, where special circumstances otherwise make it desirable, to reduce this rate from that provided for new construction.

On the other hand, it is possible that, to further carefully laid plans, either for trade or national defense, special types of vessels should be constructed whose nature might render them unprofitable for a number of years at least, or it might be that the board, to build up a trade over a certain route, desired to have a line operated thereon in spite of the fact that such operation will be manifestly unprofitable even with the scheduled amount of compensation. In order to bring into being such types of vessels, or to establish services upon special routes, the board has the power to give more than the schedule rate of compensation. Further, in case the conditions change materially after the contract has been entered into, the board may, with the consent of the vessel owner, alter, or further alter, the terms of the contract. It should be emphasized, however, that while the board is free to set such rate as it pleases in the contract that it enters into, no change can be made, once this contract is executed, except by mutual consent.

The maximum rate to which the amount of compensation can be set by the board is twice that provided in the bill. Any change in rate, either increase or decrease, can only be made upon the affirmative vote of not less than five members of the board, with full reasons for their actions spread upon the minutes.

MILEAGE AND CONSTRUCTIVE TONNAGE.

Section 405: Because of the fact that in small steamers the wage cost and cost of construction is very little less than for vessels of much greater size, the bill provides that these small steamers, on which a very large portion of our commerce depends by reason of our trade to the West Indies and Caribbean countries, should be computed for purposes of compensation upon a constructive gross tonnage in place of their actual tonnage. The words "power driven" have been defined

so as to include only those vessels whose horsepower bears a certain ratio to their gross tonnage. This prevents underpowered steamers or auxiliary vessels, who have not the differential which the constructive tonnage was designed to compensate, from receiving its benefits.

The mileage covered by the vessel is to be determined by the table of actual distances between the ports touched, except that when such distances do not fairly represent the distance required by efficient operation to be covered by the vessels, the board may allow up to the actual mileage covered by the ship. The idea of this exception was that vessels might be engaged in important work with a negligible distance between ports touched; for example, a steamer chartered to carry a cargo of coal to naval vessels operating at sea might return to her port of departure without having called at any port whatever, and hence without this exception not being entitled to any compensation.

FOREIGN TRADE.

Section 407: Because of the somewhat peculiar status of the island possessions of the United States with regard to their distance and their present lack of trade in any great volume, it was necessary in drafting the bill to define for compensation purposes foreign trade in such manner as would best promote the establishment of necessary services to our distant possessions and in a period of years would give them an opportunity to build us such trade, especially with the United States, as could be expected from their natural resources. With some of these possessions—small, distant, and in many cases used only as naval stations—it is hopeless to expect that their trade will ever reach such an extent as to make them profitable ports of call for first-class lines. The maintenance of services to such points is essentially part of the duty of the Nation and one of the basic reasons for national aid.

These points are cared for by providing that trade between ports of the United States, or between the United States and Alaska or Porto Rico, is not to be considered as foreign trade. Trade between the United States and Hawaii is not to be considered foreign trade unless the revenue from such trade forms one-fourth or less of the total revenue accruing to the vessel; or, in other words, the important part of the voyage is that part beyond Hawaii.

This special requirement was necessary because a vessel traveling, say, from San Francisco to the Philippines direct would be compensated for the entire distance. If a vessel which called at Hawaii was compensated only for the distance from Hawaii to the Philippines, the natural tendency would be to eliminate Hawaii as a port of call. On the other hand, if a vessel going past Hawaii were to be compensated fully for the run between the United States and Hawaii, even though the majority of her cargo were for or from those islands, it would seriously affect her competition with those lines terminating at the islands and therefore receiving no compensation whatever.

Intraisland carriage is also excluded from foreign trade for purposes of compensation. Special rulings can be made by the board in the case of unusual voyages, and such voyages can be considered as foreign trade even though passengers might be transported between two ports of the United States, provided the transportation is done in such manner as not to compete with vessels in the coastwise trade.

The compensation was designed primarily to be paid to vessels which were engaged in furthering the direct foreign trade of the United States; that is to say, were carrying passengers or cargo between the United States and foreign ports. Because of the excess of exports of the United States in bulk over the imports, the ordinary cargo steamer of the tramp type, as distinguished from the vessel operated on a regular line, must engage in indirect trade and adopt the so-called triangular route to reduce as much as possible the distance steamed in ballast. In order not to penalize such craft but at the same time to insure that vessels receiving compensation are engaged to a reasonable extent in the direct trade of the United States, the bill provides that a vessel shall be compensated for indirect trade provided it returns to the United States at least once a year.

One other type of service was excepted from the direct-trade provision. In distant waters there is a use for small vessels to collect cargo and bring it to some principal port, where it can be picked up by a larger vessel in direct trade, or to take it from such vessel and distribute it to the various ports of destination in small lots. The larger vessels can not with profit call at numerous ports. To supplement them vessels of this "feeder" type are needed, and under the American flag are to receive compensation, if otherwise eligible, provided the great part of their revenue is derived from persons or property received from or delivered to a vessel flying the United States flag and engaged in direct trade.

REPAYMENT OF COMPENSATION.

Section 417: The charge which has been most often brought against direct aid to shipping is that it led to abuses and resulted in profiteering. Your committee believes that in H. R. 12021 the possibility of these evils has been effectively prevented by a means probably unique in shipping legislation.

The rate of compensation itself has been set at a rate which falls short of equalizing the actual difference in cost of operation of American ships as compared to foreign vessels. The bill hedges about the payment of compensation with such requirements as to insure that all direct aid is paid to the vessels which are directly furthering the trade of the United States and promoting its future safety. In addition to all these restrictions, the bill further provides that compensation shall be returned by any vessel which does not actually need it.

In any year in which a vessel having a contract for compensation makes in excess of 10 per cent on its invested capital, the owner thereof must return half of all his net earnings in excess of 10 per cent until the entire amount of direct aid received in that year has been returned to the Treasury.

The bill provides in a most definite and certain manner that in computing his net profits the owner is restricted beyond any possibility of fraud to a profit based upon his vessels alone. He can not include the workings of other activities, such as stevedoring companies, piers, lighterage companies, or other means by which profits could be unequally distributed through a single control of several activities. In case he owns goods carried in his own vessels he can not charge himself a lower rate of freight nor otherwise penalize his ship to the advantage of his cargo. The ships, and the ships alone, are considered.

The committee feels that this provision should be sufficient answer to those who feel that national aid to shipping is a private raid upon the Treasury. While in no year and at no time guaranteeing any profit whatever to any vessel, the bill provides that any year in which the vessel makes a profit of more than 10 per cent she shall repay compensation to the Treasury.

ARMY AND NAVY TRANSPORTS.

Section 501: As another means of indirect aid the bill proposes that where adequate facilities are afforded by private American shipping for performing services required by the military or naval forces of the United States the President may direct that such forces lay up their own vessels or such of them as are not needed, or if the superfluous vessels are of a suitable commercial type they may be transferred to the Shipping Board for eventual sale or other disposal.

In such cases Army and Navy are directed to make the contracts with owners of private vessels necessary to obtain the required services. The section grants the power to make these contracts for a 10-year period, so that private owners may be assured of a permanence sufficient to justify the construction of special types of ships, or the investment otherwise of substantial amounts in establishing suitable services.

RELATIONS BETWEEN INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

Section 602: This section reiterates the policy of Congress, expressed in previous legislation, to foster and promote both rail and water transportation. The importance of the closest cooperation between the United States Shipping Board and the Interstate Commerce Commission is recognized and a joint board is created to assist in solving the problems arising out of the interrelations of rail and water transportation.

The committee believes that valuable results may flow from thus bringing these two bodies together in a common effort to solve our vastly important and difficult transportation problems.

SECTION 607.

Section 28 of the act of 1920 may prove to be of valuable assistance in the upbuilding of our merchant marine. There has been a certain amount of distrust of its provisions on the part of various communities. To remove any apprehension the bill amends the section and permits the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Shipping Board, when both are of the opinion that the provisions of section 28, as amended, will result in changing the channels of transportation within the United States or in unduly congesting any ports, to suspend its operation.

TRANSPORTATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES OR SUPPLIES.

Section 701: It is provided that, wherever practicable, the transportation of personnel and property of the United States the expense of whose transportation is borne by the Public Treasury shall be either in a vessel the property of the United States or in a vessel flying our flag.

In the case of passengers, if the travel is undertaken on a foreign flagship, the person concerned will be obliged to bear the expense himself unless the head of the organization of which the traveler is a member specifically approves or directs travel by such ship and reports the reason for so doing to the Shipping Board.

It seems unnecessary to comment on the futility of attempting to build up an American merchant marine if the Government itself does not set the example of patronizing, whenever possible, the vessels of its nationals.

AMEND AND SUPPLEMENT THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1920.

[House Report No. 1257, Sixty-seventh Congress, third session.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 12817:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass.

This bill is practically the same as H. R. 12021, reported to the House last June, except for a few changes which are hereinafter discussed. The reasons for the passage of this bill are fully set forth in House Report 1112, accompanying H. R. 12021. The following are the differences between this bill and that bill as reported:

REPORTS BY SHIPPING BOARD.

The second paragraph of section 12 of the shipping act, 1916, requires the board to include in its reports, among other things, "a statement of all expenditures and receipts under this act." This provision, strictly construed, would not require the board to make any statement of expenditures or receipts under any other act than the shipping act. In order to make clear that the board is required to make a statement of all expenditures and receipts, this paragraph of existing law is amended by section 703 of the bill.

INSURANCE.

This section amends section 9 of the merchant marine act of 1920 so as to permit the board to require purchasers of vessels from the board to place the insurance necessary to protect the equity of the United States in the vessel with the separate insurance fund, created under section 10 of the merchant marine act of 1920, in any case where the purchaser is unable to place such insurance with American insurance companies at as low a rate as that quoted by foreign insurance companies. It is obviously desirable that such insurance shall be placed at home, but at the same time the purchaser should not be burdened with the added insurance cost where for any reason he is unable to obtain his insurance with American companies at as favorable rate as from the foreign companies. To meet this situation the board is given authority to permit the placing of such insurance under these special circumstances in the insurance fund. This applies both to hull insurance and to protection and indemnity insurance. With respect to the latter form of insurance the board is permitted to waive the requirement that it shall be furnished by the purchaser in all cases. This is to meet the situation where the character of the vessel sold by the board is such as to make protection and indemnity insurance unnecessary for the proper protection of the Government's equity.

Section 10 of the merchant marine act of 1920 is amended so as to make possible the carrying out of the provisions of section 9 as amended. In addition, the language of section 10 is broadened so as to remove any doubt as to the power of the board to cover in its separate insurance fund every form of insurance, including both hull and protection and indemnity insurance, to the full extent of the interest or equity of the United States in any vessel. (See secs. 3 and 4 of the bill.)

COMPENSATION FOR THE CARRIAGE OF MAILS.

Under H. R. 12021 it is contemplated that any vessel in respect of which a contract for compensation under that act was executed would forego any compensation for mail other than parcel post and that compensation which would otherwise have accrued for such transportation would be turned over to the merchant marine fund. This procedure met with objections on the part of the Post Office Department, which contended that without receiving compensation directly for the carriage of mails vessels would cease to take an interest in the carriage of mails and the efficiency of the service would suffer therefrom. They also felt that certain administrative difficulties would arise in view of the fact that all compensation would be vested in the hands of the Shipping Board and that the Post Office Department, on which the responsibility for mail services still lay, would be deprived of effective authority and control over the carriers.

It was also felt that a certain amount of inequity might result. Cases might occur where two carriers were receiving the same subsidy, but one was carrying large quantities of mail while the other was carrying little, if any.

In order to correct this situation and at the same time to remove conflicting and obsolete legislation, the following changes are made:

Vessels receiving subsidy are not required to carry mails free of charge and the provision whereby the compensation properly payable for such transportation of mails was to be paid into the merchant-marine fund is struck out. The ocean mail act of 1891, no longer practically effective and under which no contracts exist to-day, is repealed. Sections 7 and 24 of the merchant marine act of 1920 are amended by striking out so much thereof as authorizes the Postmaster General, in conjunction with the Shipping Board, to enter into contracts for the carriage of mails. (See sec. 6 of the bill.)

In addition to the foregoing reasons for the change, there is the added one that the application of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act seriously affects the revenues of passenger ships. It is these ships which usually carry the mails, and the committee feels that the slight additional compensation which would thereby accrue to passenger vessels is highly desirable in view of the difficulty experienced in maintaining under our laws American passenger services in competition with foreign services on which those laws are not applicable.

RATES OF INTERSTATE WATER CARRIERS.

The act of 1916 provided that common carriers by water in interstate commerce should file with the board their maximum rates and that if an unfair or unreasonable rate were charged the board could prescribe a just and reasonable maximum rate.

Section 704 amends section 18 of the shipping act of 1916 so that such carriers shall file with the board their actual rates, fares, and charges. These rates and charges can not be altered except with the approval of the board, and after 15 days' notice in the case of an increase and 3 days' notice in the case of reduction. In case the board disapproves any rate or charge on the ground that it is unjust or unreasonable, it may prescribe a reasonable rate or a maximum or minimum limit, or both. In this the procedure of the interstate commerce act is followed and the powers given the board herein with regard to interstate carriers by water are those which the Interstate Commerce Commission enjoys with regard to interstate commerce by rail.

APPROVAL OF BOARD TO TRANSFER OF DOCUMENTATION.

Section 42 of the shipping act of 1916 provides that vessels are documented under the laws of the United States until their documents are surrendered with the approval of the board. As it reads, however, this section only applies to Subdivision B of section 37 of the same act, which subdivision prohibits the transfer without the approval of the board of a vessel documented under the laws of the United States during war or national emergency. The effect of the amendment, which consists of the addition of the words "of section 9 and," is to make the board's approval of the surrender of documents equally necessary in time of peace and to prevent any evasion of the provisions of section 9 by first surrendering the vessel's documents and then transferring the undocumented vessel. (See sec. 709 of the bill.)

HOME PORT OF VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 4141 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows:

"Every vessel, except as is hereinafter provided, shall be registered by the collector of that collection district which includes the port to which such vessel shall belong at the time of her registry, which port shall be deemed to be that at or nearest to which the owner, if there be but one, or if more than one, the husband or acting and managing owner of such vessel, usually resides."

The above section was enacted in 1792, before the time when corporations were engaged in operating vessels. The language of the provision was framed without consideration of the possibility of corporate, as distinguished from individual, ownership of vessels. The result is that, if the requirement that a vessel's home port be the place where "the owner * * * usually resides" were literally enforced, many of our vessels would have home ports in such interior points as Denver, Colo., and Nogales, Ariz. However, the Bureau of Navigation has in practice generally authorized the issuance of the marine documents of a vessel at the port where the greater part of the vessel business of the owner is conducted rather than at such interior points. This interpretation of existing law is based in part upon the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in White's Bank *v.* Smith (1868) (7 Wall. 646), in which the court remarked that the home port is the port where negotiations or dealings with respect to vessels would naturally be conducted and in part upon certain implications drawn from the case of Southern Pacific Co. *v.* Kentucky (1911) (222 U. S. 63). This existing practice of the Bureau of Navigation is made law by the present bill in order that any question as to the lawful authority of the bureau to select coast ports as home ports rather than interior points in the State in which the corporation is created may be removed.

The question of the home port of the vessel also is of importance, not only in connection with the place of issuance of marine documents but in determining the place at which records of sales, conveyances, and mortgages of vessels of the United States shall be made. Subsection B of section 30 of the merchant marine act, 1920, is therefore amended to require that such record shall be made at the home port, as shown in the vessel's documents. In inserting the language "as shown in the vessel's documents," the validity of the record is made to rest not upon the vendee's or mortgagee's guess as to the home port of the vessel but on the definite fact of the actual determination of the home port by the collector of customs and the Secretary of Commerce, as shown in the vessel's documents.

While the general rule provided by the change is that the home port shall be "that port of documentation at or nearest to, and in the same customs district as, the place at which there is conducted the greater part of the vessel business of the owner," the Secretary of Commerce is given power by regulation to prescribe home ports in cases not within the above rule—as, for instance, vessels owned by the United States or the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation, vessels not engaged in trade, as yachts or cabin boats—and cases where there is no port of documentation in the same customs district as that which includes the place where the greater part of the vessel business of the owner is conducted.

The new provisions as to the home port of a vessel do not change the existing law (sec. 4178 of the Revised Statutes, as supplemented by sec. 21 of the act of June 26, 1884) relating to the port of hail of a vessel; i. e., the port whose name is to be painted upon the bow and stern of the vessel.

The new provisions determining the home port of a vessel do not in any way affect the situs of a vessel for taxation purposes, for the Supreme Court has held in Southern Pacific Co. *v.* Kentucky, above cited, that the taxable situs of a vessel is not dependent in any way upon the home port or port of hail.

Subsection O of section 30 of the merchant marine act, 1920, is also amended. The existing law provides that the documents of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage may not be surrendered without the approval of the board, except in case of the forfeiture of the vessel and its sale by court order. By agreement between the Bureau of Navigation and the United States Shipping Board the board has given a blanket approval to surrender of the documents of a vessel covered by a preferred mortgage, in case of the renewal of the documents without change in ownership of the vessel, and in case of change of documents incident to change of trade, but without change of ownership of the vessel. These additional cases are now incorporated in the law. (See secs. 705 to 708 of the bill.)

TAX PROVISIONS.

Several minor changes have been made in the administrative provisions of Title II of the bill relating to taxation.

The Assistant Secretary read the minority views, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS.

GOVERNMENTAL POLICY.

This is a proposal to enact a law adopting a permanent policy of the Government which has been repeatedly proposed heretofore and as often rejected by Congress.

That policy involves launching the Government upon a sea of trouble and enormous expense, in the form of a direct cash contribution from the Treasury to specific private enterprise.

The proposal is based upon the averment that the adoption of such a policy is necessary to the establishment and maintenance of a merchant marine adequate for the needs of the United States.

The measure is attempted to be supported by the assumption that it is sound because the opponents of such a policy do not propose anything better or different.

Such an assumption is, of course, unwarranted. It assumes that if an unwise or positively vicious measure is proposed it should be accepted unless some substitute for it is suggested.

The answer to such a measure is and must be resistance and defeat.

Any attempt to modify, amend, or substitute, means compromise, more or less recognition of the principle involved, and therefore would be inadequate and unsatisfactory.

The argument in support of the measure is based upon two proposals.

First. The Government now has a fleet of some 1,400 steel vessels, cargo carriers, and 44 passenger carriers, and their maintenance and operation is costing the Government some $3,000,000 per month over and above their earnings.

Second. It is essential to the establishment and maintenance of an American merchant marine that these vessels should pass to private ownership speedily and the Government agency or bureau known as the United States Shipping Board should go out of existence.

The first and complete answer to these reasons for the measure is that it will not accomplish either of these things.

The second answer is that by the merchant marine act of 1920 ample provision has been made for the orderly and proper accomplishment of these proposals in so far as they should be accomplished in the public interest.

The third answer is, if the Shipping Board is incompetent or inefficient and can not execute the law or administer the affairs intrusted to it, the remedy does not lie in making an annual draft on the Treasury of from $53,000,000 to $75,000,000, but rather by a change of officials or Government agency, or change in the plans and practices which are producing alleged disastrous results.

The proposed measure means simply the establishment of a general subsidy system which will be fastened on the country for an indefinite period.

That can be determined on its merits, and the fact of the Government's having idle ships is not a material factor.

That it is put forward simply shows that the bill is based on a temporary situation which happens to be a period of intense depression.

It is a question of cargoes, and payments out of the Treasury will not solve that question. Natural and economic causes for decline in volume of international trade can not be overcome by financial Federal aid, out of the Treasury, to ships.

The whole tendency of the administration is against encouraging international trade. We can not have cargoes in the absence of foreign trade. Losses will not be eliminated because only a small portion of the tonnage will pass into private hands, as proponents of the bill admit, even if it should become a law, for years to come, and a costly overhead will continue.

In consequence, overhead expenses of the bureau and the losses will simply be supplemented by cash out of the Treasury. The taxes of the people will be increased by the amount of the aid given.

If the Government had no ships would this subsidy be voted?

The Government owning the ships, with full authority under existing laws in the Shipping Board to dispose of them on such terms as they may determine, so far from that situation supporting the grounds for the subsidy, it absolutely destroys or removes all basis for the demand.

The claim that there is need for a balancing of the fleet, as an argument for some of the provisions of the measure, is fallacious. We will never get a balanced fleet under this bill.

COMPENSATION—DIRECT SUBSIDY.

It is alleged that the subsidy is intended for the benefit of a suitable fleet to carry American grain and provisions and cotton to markets in foreign lands. These are described as "the farmers' kind of ships."

It is perfectly plain, on the other hand, that the ships which would chiefly be benefited are not the cargo ships at all, but passenger ships, and those of other types.

For instance, a cargo ship of 5,500 gross tons, such as those vessels built at Hog Island, would receive a minimum compensation. Such a ship, along with practically 1,200 others, composing our cargo carriers, would have about 200 steaming days a year, and make about 200 miles a day, and receive the one-half-cent rate, which would amount to about $11,000 per annum.

It is not conceivable that this amount would induce purchasers to acquire those ships or be a very material figure in their operations.

On the other hand, for instance, the *George Washington*, 25,000 gross tons, would receive approximately $300,000 per annum.

This ship on a recent voyage, just completed, made a profit over expenses of $140,000.

Is there any need for taxing the people $300,000 a year to be paid out of the Treasury to this particular ship directly when she is, even in present circumstances, able to make a profit of $140,000 per voyage?

Her sister ship, *America*, made a net profit of $45,000 on her last voyage, and she would receive out of the Treasury annually a gift of $300,000 under this bill.

These ships are 18½ knots, and it is estimated that they would sail 400 miles a day, and have 220 sailing days, and they would receive 1.3 cents per gross ton for each 100 miles.

If these passenger ships carried mail they would receive the mail subsidy in addition to the compensation mentioned.

The Standard Oil Co. has approximately 100 ships, aggregating 700,000 gross tons. Even at the minimum rate they would receive, as the bill was introduced and reported, a subsidy in the shape of direct compensation, it is called, of about $1,500,000 a year, notwithstanding they are engaged primarily in carrying products of their own. The bill was amended so as to eliminate this particular contribution to them as respects their own goods.

The United States Steel Corporation has 35 ships, aggregating 200,000 gross tons. They are engaged in carrying their own products primarily, but they would receive out of the Treasury, as the bill was reported, and from this direct compensation, approximately $500,000 a year. This, too, was eliminated by amendment, as applied to their own products.

The United Fruit Co. has 22 ships, 100,000 gross tons. On this compensation basis they would receive, as the bill was reported, about $250,000 a year, although they were built and are operated primarily for the transportation of their own commodities. The amendment applied to these vessels, respecting their own commodities.

The *William Penn*, 7,600 gross tons, our only ship equipped with the Diesel engine, recently made a voyage to the Orient, and her net profits were $30,000—her speed 10 knots.

The operating expenses of these ships equipped with the Diesel engine is about two-thirds of the oil or coal burners. The oil burner is generally cheaper than the coal.

Under this bill the *Minnekahda*, 17,281 gross tons, 16½ knots, would have a rate of compensation of 1 cent, and her subsidy would amount to $150,000 a year. She is owned by the Atlantic Transport Line, affiliated with the International Mercantile Marine. We never understood they were in need of a subsidy, or of any direct aid by way of compensation.

The Pacific Mail has 12 ships. They are rather slow and small, and they aggregate 60,000 gross tons, and the amount of compensation or direct subsidy for the entire fleet would be about $150,000 under this bill.

It will be seen that one ship of 17,281 gross tons would receive as much compensation as an entire fleet of 12 ships of the aggregate gross tonnage of 60,000 would receive.

The *Leviathan* will be entitled to receive of this direct compensation $1,250,000 per annum, which may be doubled.

In all cases compensation is to be computed "for each gross ton of the vessel," no matter what her cargo may be. If she goes empty, she will receive as much as if she goes loaded.

We mention these cases by way of illustrating how the bill would operate and to show the utterly indefensible results of the legislation.

These contracts are to run for 10 years from the time they are made—not from the passage of this act—as the bill was reported, but the Commerce Committee proposes to amend by limiting the period of all contracts to 15 years after the passage of the act. That question may go to conference.

It is true the bill vests in the Shipping Board the power to withhold compensation entirely or double it, at its discretion.

Instead of strengthening the bill, this provision, vesting such enormous power in a bureau which loudly proclaims its inability to cope with the situation, is enough to defeat it.

This power to build up or destroy ports, to enrich or impoverish ship lines, thus dominating localities, controlling shipowners, ship operators, and financial institutions, and the insurance companies, and all other connecting interests, would make that bureau a political autocracy and a dominating influence, equipped to work its own will.

SUBVENTIONS AND INDIRECT SUBSIDY.

As to indirect subsidies and subventions provided in the bill as reported to and as it passed the House, it was conceded by the proponents of the measure that they can not be, without any approach to accuracy, estimated. In that form, it was admitted, such benefits would be greater in extent and value than the direct compensation provided.

Congress was asked, therefore, to pass a law conferring benefits in the way of exemptions from taxation and deductions from income taxes, the extent and amount of which can not be stated, but known to be most unusual, discriminatory, and extensive, and constituting drains on the Public Treasury. The Commerce Committee of the Senate reports an amendment striking out sections 201 and 202, respecting exemptions from income taxes, and that question may go to conference.

The estimates of benefits arising from this provision in the bill range all the way from $7,000,000 to $15,000,000 per annum. Then, in addition, there are provisions respecting a huge loan fund at 4½ per cent (reported at 2 per cent), respecting the transportation of immigrants, depreciation allowances, monopoly of the mails, elimination of Army and Navy transports, transportation of Government officers and supplies, all conferring extensive indirect aids.

LOSSES.

Regarding the alleged losses now experienced by the Shipping Board from operations we have no accurate data.

One thing is certain, and that is, there is no occasion for continuing those losses.

If the Shipping Board can not escape them, then let them turn the ships over to the Panama Steamship Co., or to the United States Line, under Mr. Rossbottom, these two concerns alone now being guilty of the offense of Government operation, and we have no doubt we will share in the experience which these lines have enjoyed up to this time, namely, a profitable and successful business.

The present plan of operation by the Shipping Board was condemned in the hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, July 27, 1921, by the chairman and his advisors. (See pp. 17, 116, 117, and 118 of those hearings.)

The chairman of the committee asked Mr. Smull (p. 117):

"You are not in favor of continuing this present contract under which the Government pays all of the expenses and the operator receives 5 per cent of gross receipts?

"Mr. SMULL. I would prefer to have a man with something at stake, so that he would be vitally interested in the operation of the boats.

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you in favor of abolishing the present contract system of operating those ships?

"Mr. SMULL. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is there any chance under the present system for the Government ever to make anything out of the operation of ships?

"Mr. SMULL. That just keeps the Government in the business.

"The CHAIRMAN. And it keeps the taxpayers paying the loss?

"Mr. SMULL. Yes."

And yet that system has been continued, and it has been the only kind of Government operation we have had until recently, when the United States Line was placed in charge of Mr. Rossbottom, who was borrowed from the Panama Steamship Co. to operate that line for the Government.

All the other ships are operated under that system, to wit, a contract made with private parties under which the Government pays all of the expenses and the operator receives 5 per cent of the gross receipts.

As to the alternative proposal, briefly it may be stated in the language of Mr. Lasker, the chairman of the Shipping Board, at the hearings which we have alluded to, at page 116.

Mr. Smull then said:

"The best plan, and the one we advocate most strongly, is the sale of the ships, so as to get rid of the fleet, and get out of the business entirely. Getting these ships into American ownership is the best plan, and that will be done as soon as the market will absorb this tonnage and give us any kind of price which will let us out at all.

"Mr. KELLEY. Have you figured how much leeway Congress should give you in order to get rid of this fleet?

"Mr. SMULL. That is a hard question.

"Mr. LASKER. I will answer it. When the world's shipping gets buoyant the avarice of men will make them want to increase their fleets, and we will sell the ships, and that day is sure to come; and the Government has got to keep the ships going and put confidence either in ourselves or some others to keep them going as efficiently as can be under the circumstances until such time arrives. Is that a fair statement?

"Mr. SMULL. Yes, sir; I can not tell you how long it will be."

AMOUNT OF SUBSIDY.

Let us quote from Lasker himself respecting two other important facts.

At the hearings of the joint committee on this measure as it was first introduced, page 273, Mr. Lasker gave the items as to the amount of the proposed subsidy.

He said:

"The total cost to the Treasury if the bill ever becomes highly successful in operating, so that we have an adequate merchant marine for peace and war, will be:

Customs	$30,000,000
Tonnage	4,000,000
Income tax	10,000,000
Construction	8,000,000
Postage	5,000,000

"Mr. DAVIS. How much does that add up—$52,000,000?

"Mr. LASKER. That will add up $52,000,000."

If the Commerce Committee's amendment prevails, it would exclude one item in this list, to wit, income tax. That has not yet been determined, but supposing that elimination is accomplished, the subsidy would then stand at $42,000,000 a year.

How consistent is that with the talk that the amount of this subsidy should not exceed one-half of the present losses from operation!

HIGH WAGE COST.

A great deal has been made of the suggestion that our laws operate to make the cost of operation of American ships greater than the cost of foreign ships.

At the hearings mentioned, page 43, volume 1, the following appears:

"Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand from the President's address to Congress, and also from the statement that you have made, that you do not undertake to recommend or urge any material change in the seaman's act that now exists?

"Mr. LASKER. You are right. I want to take occasion to say here that I think the seaman's act has been one of the most misrepresented acts of which I have ever heard. I came down to Washington believing, as most people in my part of the country do, if you repeal the seaman's act you would have a merchant marine. That is pure bunk.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the reason I asked the question, because for a long time those who were undertaking to give reasons why we could not operate successfully with our foreign competitors based their assertions exclusively on the discrimination caused by the seaman's act.

"Mr. LASKER. I think they have gotten worn out on those representations.

"Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to hear that."

At the hearings Mr. Andrew Furuseth stated:

"As a result of these reductions the wages of American seamen are now much lower than the wages of Canadian and Australian seamen; are practically on a level with British wages; and are substantially higher than the wages only of Japanese among the principal maritime nations."

SHIPYARDS.

We have all the raw material for building ships in the United States. We have demonstrated our ability to build ships. At Hog Island we laid the keel of a cargo steel ship and launched her in 27 days. We set the high mark and standard for the world.

Under the recent tariff act we tax ships 50 per cent of the repairs made in foreign yards in order to force them to have their work done in our yards. This will add to insurance and other expenses of the American ships.

What we lack in this country is cooperation on the part of shippers and owners and the people generally. It is that spirit of cooperation which has built up the merchant marine of other countries.

Subsidies never created or maintained permanently a merchant marine in any country.

SUBSIDIES TO COMPETITORS.

It is argued that we must have a subsidy because our competitors subsidize shipping and shipyards.

These competitors are named as Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

The entire aggregate provision made for subsidies, subventions, and other aids in those countries amounts all told—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—to approximately $17,000,000 per annum.

Ten per cent of our customs duties would yield over $40,000,000, which must go into this compensation fund under this bill.

That item alone will amount to nearly three times the total of all subsidies and subventions afforded by all our competitors named.

On this subject of cooperation we refer to clipping from a newspaper headed, "Germans building ships for Bethlehem Steel Co." and reading as follows:

"HAMBURG, November 19.—Two motor-driven ore-carrying steamships, each of 20,000 tons and measuring 560 feet in length and 72 feet in width, are under construction in German shipyards here for the Bethlehem Steel Co. The boats will ply between Chile and the United States."

Also,

[From the Public Ledger.]

ORDER SHIPS BUILT ABROAD—LIVERPOOL FIRM TO BUILD THREE FOR BOSTON CONCERN.

(Special cable dispatch.)

"LONDON, June 25.—Three electric motor-driven refrigerator ships have been ordered by the United Fruit Co., of Boston, from Liverpool shipbuilders, it was announced to-day.

"The operative power will consist of Diesel engines, and each ship will be about 4,000 gross tons, making them the largest ships in American fruit trade to make use of this new type of engine."

And,

[From the Manufacturers' News of Chicago.]

"CHICAGO.—The arrival June 12 of the Cunard Line steamship *Mauretania* at Cherbourg with Morris & Co. products from Chicago again demonstrated the practicability of a fast overseas freight service from Chicago to Europe in seven days. On June 4 the shipment left Chicago over the Erie Railroad at 4.30 a. m., and after a fast run to New York was loaded aboard the *Mauretania* early Tuesday morning. The ship sailed at 1.30 p. m. same day. Cablegrams announce the arrival of the ship after a world's record-breaking ocean voyage, 5 days, 8 hours, and 10 minutes to Cherbourg, France, making a total running time from Chicago of 7 days, 9 hours, and 40 minutes.

"Two weeks before the White Star liner *Majestic* carried a shipment from Chicago to Southampton in 7 days, 11 hours, and 56 minutes in connection with a fast New York Central train.

"Another refrigerator trainload of provisions from Chicago, over the Erie Railroad, was loaded Saturday onto the fast Cunard liner *Caronia* for Hamburg, Germany, and on the White Star liner *Majestic*, which also sailed Saturday noon."

This is simply an illustration to show that legislation—donations, gifts, aids, subsidies—such as proposed here will not solve our problem.

Our total exports and imports for this year are but little over one-third what they were in 1920. The world's trade pendulum will swing upward again, and there is no occasion to be stampeded into paying some people to relieve the Government of temporarily unsalable but very valuable property.

THE GOAL.

We must keep in mind the real and vital purpose of a merchant marine, namely, the preservation, development, and extension of American commerce overseas. We make a mistake to constantly think only in terms of the ship operator and his profits. Commerce is the main thing. While we are establishing new markets, new shipping lines, transportation may not be profitable purely as a business venture, particularly in times of depression and readjustment, we must expect to encounter discouragement and financial loss. That condition simply calls for constant prodigious effort. We will make national advancement and enrich American commerce beyond the seas by such effort and proper cooperation, resulting in the creation and maintenance of an American merchant marine. At the same time, while promoting foreign trade, we provide a fleet of vessels to meet national emergencies.

The kind of encouragement and support, and the ways and means of supplying it, as provided in this bill, would simply result in the unseemly spectacle of representatives of private enterprise crowding to the Capital from every quarter of the country, besieging the Shipping Board, vested with the vast powers provided in the bill, for a participation in governmental favors. It is inconceivable that such a spectacle should be tolerated.

"MO 4" CONTRACTS.

Operating losses are arising by reason of the falling off in international trade and the fact that the Government ships are being operated under what is known as the MO 4 contract, except only in the case of the United States Line, now under the management of Mr. Rossbottom for the Shipping Board.

This contract Mr. Lasker himself said in July, 1921, page 16 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on the urgent deficiency bill, "is the most shameful piece of chicane, inefficiency, and of looting of the Public Treasury that the human mind can devise."

Further, he said, page 17:

"The minute that the world trade shows up at all, the minute it gets so that men may make money, we are going either to make them charter or buy these boats or take them away from them and give them to somebody who will charter or buy, and maybe while doing that we can get rid of some, but in the meantime we are under this MO 4 contract."

He promised also:

"If we have not fully succeeded in putting in our system, you can hurl it back to me when I come again in six months."

It has now been a year and a half since the promise to change that plan so strongly denounced by Mr. Lasker was made, and yet it is continued.

As to Government ships operated by companies in connection with their own, there would appear to be no justification for the plan—the MO 4 contract—and no escape from loss. It was condemned in the strongest language a year and a half ago, and yet it is continued in practice.

Operating losses have been reduced by tying up two-thirds of the ships and operating only one-third, approximately.

The problem is stated to be to relieve the Public Treasury of the drain of about $50,000,000 a year, estimated by those who heard the testimony before the joint committee to be about $36,000,000 instead. This is the chief plea for the subsidy which is erroneously stated to be about one-half that amount, in the face of itemized estimates by the board that it will amount to $52,000,000 a year, and while the direct subsidy may be limited to $30,000,000, the mail monopoly and other indirect aids will be very considerable. Instead of merely authorizing all moneys in the merchant marine fund to be appropriated the committee amendment (p. 24, line 7) permanently appropriates all such moneys, except the discretionary increases. There is therefore $30,000,000 a year actually and permanently appropriated in the way of direct subsidy, and the friends of the measure themselves can not definitely say what the various aids and benefits will aggregate.

These vast donations to shipowners will be added to terrific expenses of Shipping Board and Fleet Corporation. A few hundred of the best and only profit-producing ships of the fleet will be sold at about one-tenth their cost; the remainder will be on hand, tied up, or operated at a loss. Nothing will be gained, but enormous burdens will be added.

ALTERNATIVE.

The proper course is, the alternative, if you please, to stop this loss immediately by turning all the ships over to the highly successful Government-owned and Government-operated line, and the only one, except the United States Line, lately established in the trans-Atlantic business, the Panama Steamship Co., or both that company and the only other Government-owned and operated line, the United States Line, or else care for and operate them directly, properly, and efficiently, as conditions require. Not only would the loss be stopped, but the ships employed would be operated at a profit, as are the ships now being operated by these two Government steamship companies.

AMERICAN SHIPPING.

The rash claim is made that American shipping can not exist, that private shipowners can not finance themselves, without a subsidy.

The answer is, there is to-day a greater privately owned tonnage under the American flag than there ever has been in the whole history of our country at any previous time.

On November 1, 1922, there were 1,900 privately owned ships of 500 gross tons or over, and the total tonnage of these ships is 5,797,925 gross tons—approximately 8,500,000 dead-weight tons. They are being operated by some 76 ship-owning corporations, under the American flag, without any subsidy, and new ships are being constantly added.

At least 16 American companies are operating ships under the American flag, successfully and profitably, to foreign countries, in competition with foreign-flag ships, without a subsidy.

The effect of a subsidy will be not to create but to retard the proper and permanent development of an American merchant marine. The subsidy proposed will be at best a premium on inefficiency.

Subsidy never created, established, or maintained permanently a merchant marine in any country. It has proven either an unimportant or a positively harmful factor wherever tried.

Some 14 companies owning ships for their own requirements primarily, carrying their own goods, capitalized at $5,046,000,000, will receive compensation and benefits under this bill, running into millions. Its provisions are indefensible and monstrous as it was reported, and the amendments agreed to and those now proposed still leave the principle asserted and an unwise policy established and the tax of millions each year for 15 years fixed and certain.

GETTING RID OF THE SHIPPING BOARD.

One avowed object of this measure is to put the Shipping Board out of business.

We submit it is not in the public interest to dispense with a Government agency of this character.

Whether all the ships are privately owned, or whether some are so owned, and some are owned by the Government—in any case we shall need some governmental agency to deal with the question of rates at which American commerce shall be carried. If this measure is passed and results in the elimination of the Shipping Board, as its friends intend and expect, American commerce will be at the mercy of the lines running and operating the ships, even though they fly our flag. Conference agreements will determine the rates of freight, as well as passenger traffic. There would be no control with reference to the routes upon which steamship lines would be established.

These questions of rates and routes, together with questions of discrimination, classification, insurance, and such other regulatory powers as will favor the development of American trade in foreign lands and facilitate the movement of our surplus products overseas are matters which clearly should be within the supervision and control of the Government. Unless the ocean freight rates are kept just and reasonable it avails us little to have our flag on the ships.

For these reasons an effort to dispense with the Shipping Board and close up its affairs should not prevail unless some substitute is provided.

This, of course, is predicated upon the theory that such a board will perform its full duty, conscientiously and intelligently.

The bill should not pass.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER.
MORRIS SHEPPARD.
T. H. CARAWAY.
N. B. DIAL.
F. M. SIMMONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the following order. One Senator especially has stated to me that he would like to have four or five hundred copies of the bill to send out to his constituents, and he also stated that several other Senators would like to do the same thing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed order.

The order was read and agreed to as follows:

Ordered, That 5,000 copies of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I had intended to go on this afternoon and finish my statement with reference to the bill, but several Senators have asked me not to do that until to-morrow. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were opened, and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1922.

UNITED STATES COAL COMMISSION.

John Hays Hammond.
Thomas Riley Marshall.
Samuel Alschuler.
Clark Howell.
George Otis Smith.
Edward T. Devine.
Charles P. Neill.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

To be captains.

Maj. Richard Bolles Paddock, Field Artillery.
Maj. Carl Spatz, Air Service.
Maj. Harold Roe Bull, Infantry.
Maj. James Byron Haskell, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Charles Morton Milliken, Signal Corps.
Maj. James Fred Byrom, Infantry.
Maj. Woodfin Grady Jones, Infantry.
Maj. James Patrick Hogan, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Paul Clarence Paschal, Infantry.
Maj. John Leo Parkinson, Infantry.
Maj. Rudolph Gwinn Whitten, Infantry.
Maj. Louis Thomas Byrne, Infantry.
Maj. Gooding Packard, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Glenn Preston Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. Walter Cyrus Gullion, Adjutant General's Department.
Maj. Francis Marion Brannan, Infantry.
Maj. Vicente Lim, Philippine Scouts.
Maj. Adam Emple Potts, Coast Artillery Corps.
Maj. William Rutledge Orton, Infantry.
Maj. Rufus Sumter Bratton, Infantry.
Maj. Thomas George Lanphier, Air Service.
Maj. Sylvester DeWitt Downs, jr., Field Artillery.
Maj. Orlando Ward, Field Artillery.
Maj. Benjamin Grant Weir, Air Service.
Maj. Ralph Royce, Air Service.
Maj. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Infantry.
Maj. Roger Burnett Harrison, Infantry.
Maj. Benjamin Fiery Hoge, Cavalry.
Maj. Frederick Herr, Cavalry.
Maj. Clifford James Mathews, Infantry.
Maj. Frank William Milburn, Infantry.
Maj. George Horton Steel, Quartermaster Corps.
Maj. Harold William James, Infantry.
Maj. Donald Henley, Infantry.
Maj. John Hamilton Chew Williams, Air Service.
Maj. Richard William Cooksey, Cavalry.
Maj. James deBarth Walbach, Coast Artillery Corps.

To be first lieutenants.

Capt. Overton Walsh, Field Artillery.
Capt. Clarence Harvey Bragg, Infantry.
Capt. Paul Rutherford Knight, Infantry.
Capt. DeWitt Clinton Smith, jr., Infantry.
Capt. John Curtis Newton, Infantry.
Capt. Vaughan Morris Cannon, Cavalry.
Capt. Wilson Stuart Zimmerman, Field Artillery.
Capt. Graeme Gordon Parks, Infantry.
Capt. Edwin Paull Ketchum, Corps of Engineers.
Capt. Frank Lee McCoy, Infantry.
Capt. Cyril Clifton Chandler, Infantry.
Capt. Fred Harold Norris, Infantry.
Capt. James Francis Clark Hyde, Corps of Engineers.
Capt. Robert James Kirk, jr., Infantry.
Capt. James Edward Mendenhall, Infantry.
Capt. Leo Alexander Bessette, Infantry.
Capt. Kent Clayton Mead, Infantry.
Capt. James Wellington Younger, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Amory Vivian Eliot, Infantry.
Capt. James Clarence Reed, Infantry.
Capt. John Matthew Clarke, Quartermaster Corps.
Capt. Charles Oliver Wolfe, Infantry.

To be second lieutenants.

First Lieut. John Creel Hamilton, Cavalry.
First Lieut. John Joseph Breen, Ordnance Department.
First Lieut. Mark Rhoads, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward Arthur Dolph, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Joseph Kittredge Baker, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Charles William Leng, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Edward Ward Hendrick, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Frederick Pearson, Infantry.
First Lieut. Charles Frederick Colson, Infantry.
First Lieut. Albert Walker Johnson, Cavalry.
First Lieut. Donald Frederic Carroll, Infantry.
First Lieut. Bernard Wellington Slifer, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Willard Ames Holbrook, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Auston Monroe Wilson, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
First Lieut. Samuel Powell Walker, jr., Cavalry.
First Lieut. Robert Alwin Schow, Infantry.
First Lieut. John Harrison Stokes, jr., Infantry.
First Lieut. Jesse Ellis Graham, Infantry.
First Lieut. Carlyle West Graybeal, Air Service.

POSTMASTERS.

INDIANA.

Stella D. Evans, Russellville.
Bert C. Lind, Sanborn.

NEW JERSEY.

Sadie E. Johnson, Fort Hancock.
Arity L. Hope, Raritan.

OHIO.

George R. Warren, Groveport.
Clarence E. Dowling, Prairie Depot.

RHODE ISLAND.

Arthur L. Taylor, Phenix.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

George S. McCravey, Liberty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 11, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, bless abundantly the Congress assembled and let the unifying principle be founded upon the moral forces of justice and righteousness. Upon the work of this day let Thy benediction rest. May the knowledge that we have of Thee be so directed that we shall go on to greater virtue, to finer fortitude, to better aspiration, and to utmost endeavor for our country's sake. Everywhere promote mutual confidence among men, and may no great destructive power be allowed to spread its dark shadows over humanity. By faith, by hope, and by love may we hold on to Thee and the best that is in the world. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 9, 1922, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3593. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Glacier National Park.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BALL and Mr. TRAMMELL members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of January 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers of the Board of Inspection and Survey, Navy Department.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3593. An act to authorize an exchange of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Glacier National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. SHREVE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year 1924, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves all points of order on the bill.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignations, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1922.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, and request that the same be immediately accepted.

Respectfully,

F. N. ZIHLMAN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 11, 1922.

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith offer my resignation as a member of the following committees: Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Indian Affairs, Expenditures in the War Department, and request that the same be immediately accepted.

Respectfully,

ALBERT W. JEFFERIS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES H. MACLAFFERTY, Member of Congress from the sixth district of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of standing committees of the House, as follows: Mines and Mining; Insular Affairs; Expenditures in the Treasury Department; and

That A. R. HUMPHREY, Member of Congress from the sixth district of Nebraska, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committees on Irrigation of Arid Lands; Claims; and Alcoholic Liquor Traffic; and

That R. H. THORPE, Member of Congress from the first district of Nebraska, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committees on Invalid Pensions; Territories; and Expenditures in the Department of Commerce; and

That CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Member of Congress from the sixteenth district of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committees on Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; and Expenditures in the War Department; and

That WINNIFRED MASON HUCK, Member of Congress at large from the State of Illinois, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the Committees on Reform in the Civil Service; Woman Suffrage; and Expenditures in the Department of Commerce; and

That ALBERT W. JEFFERIS, Member of Congress from the second district of Nebraska, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and

That FREDERICK N. ZIHLMAN, Member of Congress from the sixth district of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Labor; and

That JAMES P. GLYNN, Member of Congress from the fifth district of Connecticut, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department; and

That THOMAS D. SCHALL, Member of Congress from the tenth district of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I endeavored to have the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, sent to conference. At that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] made an objection, but after conference with him I understand that he does not now wish to object further. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3275 be taken from the Speaker's table, and that the House further insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pension to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] one day last week asked unanimous consent to take this bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. I objected because I wanted time to compare the Senate bill and the House bill. Since then I have had that time, and I find, according to my judgment and my viewpoint, that there are some very objectionable features in both bills, but as far as I am able to figure, the House bill, if passed without amendment in lieu of the Senate bill, would probably entail a larger charge upon the Treasury than the Senate bill would, and for that reason I think that almost any kind of an agreement reached in conference would be an improvement probably over either one of the bills, and I have decided not to insist upon my objection, because if the Senate should adopt the House bill I think it would probably entail a larger charge upon the Treasury than the Senate bill would.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman about the provision that was stricken out of the bill relative to certain Indian wars and ranger service. What about that provision?

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, the only reason why that was stricken by the Committee on Invalid Pensions is that it is a matter over which that committee has never assumed any jurisdiction. It is one that belongs to the Committee on Pensions. There is a bill now pending there to the same effect.

Mr. BLANTON. I am receiving a good many letters from ex-rangers and Indian service men from all over the West, asking about that provision.

Mr. FULLER. I understand the Senate insists on reinserting them.

Mr. BLANTON. Unless something is done for the rangers and Indian service men, and done soon, it will be too late. I hope the gentleman will not object to the inclusion of those in the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. As I understand the difference between the two bills, so far as the widows are concerned, the Senate bill provides that the widows of Union soldiers shall be eligible to pensions down to the date of the enactment of the bill, and your bill takes it down to 1917?

Mr. FULLER. To 1915.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I should like to know whether we are going to have a right to pass upon that question before the gentleman and the other House conferees agree to that provision of the Senate bill.

Mr. FULLER. I will say to the gentleman that there can be no possible agreement upon that provision in the Senate bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman assures the House of that?

Mr. FULLER. I am very sure of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FULLER, Mr. LANGLEY, and Mr. RUCKER.

BILLS STRICKEN FROM CALENDAR.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have stricken from the calendar of the House certain bills that have already passed and become law, but which are still on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to strike from the calendar certain bills.

Mr. SNYDER. The bills are S. 2532, S. 902, S. 2211, S. J. Res. 59, and H. R. 7426.

The SPEAKER. Have they all been acted on?

Mr. SNYDER. They have all been acted on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, what disposition has been made of these bills?

Mr. SNYDER. All these bills passed through the House in an omnibus measure that passed the House and then passed the Senate in the final days of the previous session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. We are going into Committee of the Whole on an appropriation bill and there will be general debate for two or three hours. I do not understand just why the gentleman should go ahead now in the House and get 10 minutes when he can get it as soon as we go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that it is necessary that I should be absent from the House for a part of the day on account of official duties, and I have a matter in which I believe the House is very much interested, and under the circumstances I should like to address the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there was held in the city of Washington a so-called free speech and amnesty meeting in memory of Ricardo Flores Magon, a so-called political prisoner who died in Leavenworth prison on November 21, 1922. The following announcement of this meeting was circulated:

Mrs. WINNIFRED MASON HUCK, Member of Congress from Illinois; Dr. John A. Ryan, of the Catholic University; Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, of New York; and Mr. Robert Morss Lovett, editor of the New Republic, will speak on free speech and amnesty at a meeting held in memory of Ricardo Flores Magon, political prisoner, who died in Leavenworth prison November 21, 1922. You are invited to attend the meeting at 3 o'clock Sunday afternoon, December 10, Shubert-Garrick Theater, Seventh and F Streets NW.

I believe that in the interest of the facts in regard to Ricardo Flores Magon the House and the people of this country should have some knowledge of the record of Magon and of the offenses for which he was convicted.

No one questions the right of American citizens to gather together peacefully and hold meetings in the interest of anyone or in the memory of anyone they please; but in a notice which was sent out to the Members of this House under date of December 6, 1922, which I desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, certain very misleading statements, to say the least, were submitted in regard to the crimes for which Flores Magon was incarcerated and regarding the testimony and the methods which were used in his prosecution.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I think it is quite probable that a good many of the Members did not receive this notice. I did not, and I would be very glad to have it read.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will read the notice:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 6, 1922.*

To the Members of the Congress of the United States:

You are cordially invited to attend a meeting in memory of Ricardo Flores Magon, a political prisoner, who died in Leavenworth, November 21, 1922.

Magon, who was the editor of a paper in Los Angeles, was arrested in 1918 for publishing an article in which he set forth his views on war and pleaded for the brotherhood of man. For this he was sentenced to 21 years' imprisonment in Leavenworth.

The New York World, commenting upon his death on Friday, November 24, said: "In reality the article for which Magon was convicted had no bearing on the war with Germany except what was read into it by the prosecution. That, of course, was not unusual. In the heyday of witch burners and unofficial spies Magon was only one of the victims."

The failing health of Magon was well known to the Department of Justice. His case was placed before them many times, and they had been told in a physician's report that he must eventually lose his sight, which was fast failing. In spite of this knowledge, Attorney General Daugherty refused to release him upon the grounds that he was "unrepentant."

The liberty-loving people of this country should give notice in some way to the world that they have had no part in this shameful act of officials intrusted with authority which all the records show they have abused.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States to whom the whole earth now looks for guidance out of the wilderness of world-wide misery you are invited to attend a meeting in honor of Magon and thus be able to show by your presence that you have had no part in bringing this blot on the fair name of a country dedicated from its foundation to the cause of freedom.

This meeting is called by citizens of many political and religious beliefs, bound by a desire to show the world that they continue to cherish the traditions of liberty, and that the persecution of Magon and other political prisoners was not the act of our people but of those intrusted for a very little day with authority.

You will doubtless welcome this opportunity to show that our love of liberty is not just a glorious tradition but a living principle to be honored through maintaining liberty of speech and conscience in our own day and generation.

Following this is the statement that this meeting is indorsed by a committee, of which the chairman is Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, and among the names appear those of 8 or 10 Members of Congress.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman please read them?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will read all the names:

Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, chairman; Mr. Dean Acheson, Hon. J. D. Beck, Mr. Jose Miguel Begarano, Mrs. Ethel S. Cohen, Mrs. Wilbur F. Dales, Mrs. Gilson Gardner, Miss Edith Goode, Mr. Frederic C. Howe, Hon. George Huddleston, Mr. William H. Johnston, Hon. Oscar Keller, Hon. Charles L. Knight, Hon. Florian Lampert, Hon. W. Turner Logan, Mr. Lowell Mellett, Mrs. William Spencer Murray, Hon. John M. Nelson, Mrs. George Odell, Mrs. Nanette Paul, Hon. Joseph C. Pringey, Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, Dr. John A. Ryan, Hon. J. H. Sinclair, Hon. Edward Voigt, and Mrs. Laura Williams.

Now, gentlemen of the House, in order that the record may be clear, and in order that the people of this country may know something of the facts in the matter, I desire to read into the record a statement, for which I will assume full responsibility, and for which I want to say to you that I have consulted the Department of Justice, which department can substantiate the statements contained therein, and I propose to submit to the House at a later date copies of official records existing in the Department of Justice and the Federal courts of southern California bearing on this case. The facts are substantially as follows:

Ricardo Flores Magon was a Mexican anarchist who was forced to leave Mexico and come to the United States in 1919. He was the author of the publication entitled "Carranza se Despoja de la Piel de Oveja," a rabid publication advocating the overthrow of government and the substitution of anarchy. Upon his exile from Mexico he came to the United States, where, together with his brother Enrique, he was connected with the publication of Regeneration at Los Angeles. In 1920 he was convicted of a violation of section 211 of the Criminal Code for printing an article in Regeneration tending to incite murder or assassination. He was sentenced to a term of 21 years in the penitentiary. Because of several previous convictions of a less anarchistic nature, he was given the severe sentence which the court imposed. He was also convicted on a count under the espionage act and sentenced to a term of 20 years in the Federal penitentiary at McNeil Island. He had been previously convicted on two occasions for anarchistic activities and sentenced for short terms. He commenced to serve his term at McNeil Island, but due to the climate was later transferred to Leavenworth, where he died in November of this year. Together with his brother, Enrique, he was the source of considerable trouble both in Mexico and in the United States and was looked upon as one of the most pronounced Mexican anarchists with whom this country has had to deal.

Gentlemen, no less a personage than the President of the United States, in the address which he delivered on the floor of the House on the 8th of December, had the following to say:

While I have everlasting faith in our Republic, it would be folly, indeed, to blind ourselves to our problems at home. Abusing the hospitality of our shores are the advocates of revolution, finding their deluded followers among those who take on the habiliments of an American without knowing an American soul. There is the recrudescence of hyphenated Americanism which we thought to have been stamped out when we committed the Nation, life and soul, to the World War.

Now, gentlemen, I am not here to accuse or to berate anybody; but when such a worthy organization as the American Defense Society takes up a matter of this kind, when the entire House of Representatives is circularized with such a letter as I have read to you to-day, I think it is time that we, as Members of this House and as American citizens, take cognizance of some of the things that are going on about us. I herewith insert an article appearing in this morning's issue of the Washington Post quoting the American Defense Society on the subject under discussion:

REBUKES SYMPATHY FOR WAR CONVICTS—DEFENSE SOCIETY POINTS OUT ALL WERE FOUND GUILTY OF CRIMES AGAINST LAWS—NOT "POLITICAL PRISONERS"—NO SUCH THING EXISTS IN AMERICA, SAYS STATEMENT—SOLDIER POISONERS ARE CITED.

[From the Washington Post, Monday, December 11, 1922.]

Denying that there are any "political prisoners" in the United States, a statement issued yesterday by the Washington bureau of the American Defense Society declares that every prisoner was duly convicted of a crime against the laws of the country.

"The so-called 'political prisoners,'" the statement continues, "were all convicted on substantially the same charges, in every case involving conspiracy against this Government.

LISTS CONSPIRACY CHARGES.

"The charges were in substance as follows:

"1. Conspiracy by force to prevent, hinder, and delay the execution of certain war-time legislation of the United States.

"2. Conspiracy to injure, oppress, threaten, and intimidate citizens of the United States in the exercise of a legal and constitutional right, to wit, to furnish the Government war munitions and supplies, etc.

"3. Conspiracy to obstruct the selective service act, otherwise known as the draft act, and cause desertion from the service of the United States in time of war.

"4. Conspiracy to violate the espionage act, to wit, to cause insubordination, disloyalty, and the refusal of military duty by personal aid, solicitation, public speeches, articles printed, and distribution of certain I. W. W. publications in violation of the espionage act."

CITES SOLDIER POISONERS.

The statement further declares that "among these criminals whose release is now sought by the communists here and in Russia and by such misguided persons as those ignorantly connected with amnesty drives are men who deliberately misdirected food supplies to be sent to American soldiers in France, who actually poisoned such foods when not misdirected intentionally, who set fires at plants engaged in the production of war materials, who placed bombs where they would explode and destroy property, and who burned or otherwise destroyed crops needed for the successful prosecution of the war."

CALLS THEM MURDERERS.

"The Joint Amnesty League," the statement continues, "Members of Congress, and others who are thus apologists for criminals should not be allowed to get away with the idea that these prisoners are languishing in jail simply because they violated the American right of free speech. They are murderers and destructionists, and the I. W. W's themselves have not had the hardihood to claim that they are illegally confined.

During the dark days of the war, when all patriotic men, women, and children under American skies were giving their all in order that the country might win the war, people such as Ricardo Flores Magon were seeking to obstruct our endeavors in winning that war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I ask one minute more in order to conclude.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Ricardo Flores Magon during that time was publishing this paper of his, Regeneration, in Los Angeles, obstructing the draft, trying to get those Mexicans in this country who were of American citizenship to refuse to serve under the colors, and inciting them to return to Mexico and enlist themselves under the banner of Mexico with Germany in order to recover the so-called lost provinces of Mexico, to wit, California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. So I hope that the patriotic membership of this House will give cognizance to some of the things that are going on about us, and I hope that the American people will read and know the facts in regard to this infamous Ricardo Flores Magon. [Applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is the matter of the circular and the statement which the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] has just made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see any question of personal privilege.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman from California read a circular and used in connection with it my name and that of other Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman think that that raises a question of personal privilege?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That circular in connection with the statement raises a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman think that the circular accuses the gentleman of improper conduct?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think the circular in connection with statements made by the gentleman from California places Members of Congress whose names were used in a position which justifies them in making some defense.

The SPEAKER. That may be, but the Chair does not think it raises a question of personal privilege. The gentleman can probably get time——

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, Mr. Speaker, we are soon to take up an appropriation bill and the gentleman can get time in general debate.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to say what I have to say now, and I think the gentleman will find it desirable not to object at this time.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I called attention to this when the gentleman from California asked for 10 minutes. I called attention to the fact that we were going into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this bill and he could take 10 minutes in the general debate, but no one objected to his request, and now, it seems to me, the gentleman from Alabama ought to have 10 minutes as well.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, a number of names of gentlemen have been mentioned in connection with the letter, and if we give one time all will want time. We are to have some general debate, and gentlemen can be heard as well in that general debate as now.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am willing to give way now to anybody else that wishes to discuss the matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama to proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not sign the circular that has been read nor was I asked to sign anything. The matter was mentioned to me by a lady who explained that she and some other persons desired to hold a memorial meeting and that Magon was one of those who had been convicted merely for expressing an opinion in violation of the espionage act. The statement was further made that in order to enable them to get a hall in which to hold the meeting it was necessary that some persons of responsibility should allow their names to be used, and to the end that it might not appear that the meeting was being held by a lot of extremists I consented that my name might be used.

I did not attend the meeting. I do not know who was there. I was informed that it was the purpose of certain Members of Congress to address the meeting, and I presume they did so.

I have no personal knowledge of the case of this man Magon. I assumed that it was similar to the cases of other men who are being held in prison for having expressed their sentiments during the war. Their sentiments did not meet with my approval. I did not share in them. It may be that they were foolish, it may be that they were wicked, nevertheless I have no hesitation in saying that the war is now over, and now that every civilized country in the world has released its political prisoners I see no reason why the United States should lag in the rear and appear the most tyrannical of all peoples.

Mr. MONDELL. From what standpoint does the gentleman refer to these men as political prisoners?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. As men who were not in accord with the purposes of their Government during the war. They expressed themselves against the espionage act and conscription and criticized various other harsh and oppressive measures which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] rejoiced to support during the war.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No. I have only a short time; I can not yield.

The gentleman from California shows the poverty of his case by undertaking to say what this man Magon did in Mexico while a citizen of that country.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield? I hope the gentleman will not misquote me.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman from California said that this man had been engaged in publishing an anarchistic paper in Mexico. He retailed hearsay charges as to what Magon had done before he came to the United States.

Mr. LINEBERGER. And also in Los Angeles.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Why did the gentleman charge Magon with violating the laws of Mexico if he had a good case against him in this country? Why did not the gentleman confine himself to the acts of Magon in this country?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I wanted to show that he was an anarchist.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. No; the gentleman was trying to prejudice the public against Magon, who is now dead and can not answer him and to embarrass Members of Congress who allowed their names to be used to get a meeting in Magon's memory. That is the reason the gentleman brought in this hearsay and extraneous matter. He sought to blacken Magon's name, to damn the dead man so as to discredit those who countenanced the meeting so that all others might be intimidated from taking a part in similar meetings.

No, there was no purpose to deal fairly. If this man committed an offense against the United States as the gentleman from California wants to make it appear that he did, why did he not produce and read the disloyal or anarchistic article Magon was charged with publishing and let it speak for itself? Why did not the gentleman produce the indictment against him? Why did he not confine himself to the facts contained in the record? The gentleman has obtained leave to extend his remarks—he has plenty of time in which to get the papers. I now challenge the gentleman to put in the RECORD in his extension of remarks the article which Magon is said to have published. If he wants to be fair he can not fail to do so.

I would like to see the indictment against the man. I know nothing about the facts in Magon's case, and it may be that everything the gentleman from California tries to make you believe is true. But he contents himself with generalities, vague charges, and calling Magon names. I demand the facts.

It may be proper for us to put a man in the penitentiary and leave him to die there because he was an anarchist while in Mexico. It may be more proper to put a man in the peni-

tentiary for having expressed certain sentiments in this country. But it seems to me that those who believe it is right for men to be put in jail for expressing their opinions need to go back and read the first amendment to the Constitution before they begin to pose as super-Americans and patriots. This is a time of peace. Men ought not now be in jail merely because they did not agree with the majority during the war.

Some of the superpatriots of this country, some of the "unco guid," were themselves guilty of excesses during the war. There were many of them who took occasion to rob our Government and profiteer on our people during that time of distress. Let us prosecute them and put them in the penitentiary, and not confine ourselves merely to prosecuting men who did not happen to think we had sufficient cause to go to war or that we ought not to have passed certain harsh and oppressive laws in connection with carrying on the war.

No, Mr. Speaker, the very ones who are most bitter and vituperative against those who expressed their opinions of dissent from the majority are the chiefest defenders of the Attorney General who has failed to prosecute the grafting war contractors.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman's party was in power for years and did not put any of these men in jail; you knew them better than we know them.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] assumes that we know the war contractors and profiteers better than Mr. Daugherty does, I have only to say that he pays a very high compliment to our acquaintance with the criminal classes.

But I am not defending the past administration for whatever, if anything, it may have done or failed to do. This is not a partisan matter, it is a matter of whether we believe that honesty should rule our affairs and whether we should have men in the Department of Justice who would prosecute those who robbed their country and did it infinitely greater injury than some humble and obscure fellow who merely expressed an opinion. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. Is it not true that this man was sentenced to deportation, and that Acting Secretary Post refused to deport him and extended to him the charity of an American prison because his own country would take his life if he had been deported? [Applause.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not acquainted with the facts.

Mr. TINCHER. That is the fact.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not acquainted with the facts, but I do say this, that any government which, merely for the expression of opinion, would deport a man to a country where his life would be forfeited, would deserve the contempt of civilization.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that under the law, as it stands to-day, when a man is convicted he can not be deported until after his sentence is carried out?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am not interested in legal technicalities. I am concerned about the principles of humanity and good government.

Here are about 60 cases of men who are still in prison, not for spying, not for disloyalty, not for aiding the enemy, but for expressing opinions against war or conscription or otherwise dissenting from the majority. I do not know whether the Magon case is a fair sample or not—I know nothing about the particular facts in his case. I rest my judgment upon the cases of the other men who are in prison, and as a citizen who loves the fair name of his country I demand that their prison doors be opened. It can not be said that they took any active part against our Government, that they did anything more than simply to say something which tended to obstruct conscription or to question the motives or conduct of some of those in authority.

I like to think of America as a land of free men—of liberty of conscience and opinion. I would rescue her from the stigma of holding men in prison four long years after the war merely for the utterance of a few ill-considered words. Others may have taken an active part against the war, but these men are not even so accused; they merely expressed their opinions; and they are yet in jail. And all the while war profiteers, crooked war contractors, and grafters run freely at large.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman has been so persistent that I yield to him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Colorado. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13232.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13232, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, this is the bill covering all general appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, including the foreign service and the judiciary. Last year the total appropriation carried for both these departments was $28,676,921. This year the bill carries appropriations exceeding that amount by about four and a half million dollars, due to the fact that we did not carry in the bill last year the $5,000,000 payment to Colombia. Eliminating that payment, therefore, our appropriations for this year are a little over $500,000 less than the appropriations for last year. There is only one important change made in the items for the State Department proper. We have here assembled for the first time all of the printing and binding items, which amount in the total to $160,750, and we expect thereby to effect a considerable saving. We have reduced the item for post allowances to diplomatic and consular offices, which is a mere increase of compensation. We hoped to wipe it out entirely, but it did not seem to the committee just to bring about a greater reduction under present conditions. In many cases the cost of living is still greatly affected by the rate of exchange.

I am glad to report that the boundary-line work between Alaska and Canada and between the United States and Canada, which has been dragging along for many years, is completed, so far as the field work is concerned, and that the official in charge of that work has more than kept his word with the subcommittee. He told us last year that he would do it if we gave him the requisite funds.

But from the general history of such matters possibly some of us had our doubts about it. It is completed and there is nothing now left to be done but the work of compiling field notes and making the maps and arranging for their publication.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Have the boundaries been marked and the monuments set up?

Mr. HUSTED. The actual physical boundaries have been set up and the work on the boundary line of every name and nature has been fully completed.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I notice at the bottom of page 37 an appropriation for assistants to the Attorney General, in special cases, including an appropriation of $50,000 for clerical help for such assistants.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentlemn yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. On page 15 I notice the International Boundary Commission for the United States and Mexico.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I notice you have an appropriation here of $30,713.50. Is not that increased again? We had reduced that appropriation very largely, I believe to $5,000.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir; we had reduced it; but since then they have appointed a commissioner, and he is now cooperating with the Mexican commissioner, and while they are not authorized to make definite decisions, still they can accomplish a great deal by coming to informal agreements. The Mexican commissioner's status is a little different from ours. He can have his action immediately ratified by the Mexican Government, but our commissioner's status is somewhat different.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What can our commissioner do under the present status of affairs with Mexico?

Mr. HUSTED. He can do a great deal. The course of that river is constantly changing, and there are many points seriously affected; one of them is El Paso.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That has been for some 20 years——

Mr. HUSTED. The situation there at the present time is serious and some action will have to be taken.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What can be accomplished under the present status between the United States and Mexico; what can our commissioner do?

Mr. HUSTED. He can do this: He can arrange for the measuring of the water and for making the necessary surveys, and he can meet with the Mexican commissioner and discuss these different situations that come up on the river and have stenographic notes taken of the facts in each case to be kept for future action.

Mr. EVANS. If the gentleman will permit, there are constant disputes arising between claimants who reside in Mexico and those who reside in the United States because of the constant change of water, and those disputes become quite acute, and by reason of tentative agreements arrived at by the commissioner appointed by Mexico and the commissioner appointed by the United States they have been enabled to have these citizens agree rather than quarrel and create still worse conditions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I know that the appropriation got very large and then Congress cut it down and finally got rid of the commissioner until some arrangement could be made with Mexico and the United States as to the use of water. They can measure that water without any commissioner, so what can be accomplished? Now the subcommittee has been very active in reducing this appropriation and wisely so, but this old Mexican sore has been in evidence very long, and this Congress has been fighting this appropriation, and I can not see why this subcommittee is willing for the $30,000 appropriation.

Mr. HUSTED. Well, that amount was retained at the solicitation of the Secretary himself. He said it was necessary; that this amount was needed, and that a larger amount was really required to do the work which should be done for the preservation of American property interests on that river.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Some time ago General Mills, a retired Army officer, was appointed. He served and was paid through the War Department. I can not understand why we should embark on this Mexican situation again. It is very expensive.

Mr. HUSTED. Well, the appropriation is not a very large one.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. ROGERS. I note there has been appointed to represent the United States in the matter of the German claims certain officials, a commissioner, counsel, and so forth. Has there been any provision made in this bill for the payment of salary and expenses of these officers?

Mr. HUSTED. No, sir; they are not to be carried in this bill at all, as I understand it.

Mr. ROGERS. This would seem to be the place to carry them, in view of the fact that we appropriate for the International Boundary Commission with Great Britain in this bill.

Mr. HUSTED. No provision whatever has been made.

Mr. ROGERS. And none asked for?

Mr. HUSTED. None asked for and none made.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman know in what bill there will be a provision carried?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not know.

Mr. ROGERS. The officials are functioning and arguing cases, and I suppose it would be natural for them to know where the money was going to come from.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Certainly.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to page 11 under the heading "Expenses, passport control act." How does that item of $259,500 compare with the appropriation for the present year?

Mr. HUSTED. It is about $90,000 less than the amount carried in the present law.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. There has been a great deal of congestion in some of the various consular offices, and my own files show that a great deal of attention is being given to these matters. I was wondering why the appropriation is so much less this year than in preceding years—the reason for it.

Mr. HUSTED. This is not the only fund that is drawn upon to cover passport expenses. We think we have made ample provision in the different funds to meet all the necessary expenses.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Did the information presented to the committee by the Department of State indicate that they were going to be less busy in the next fiscal year in these matters than they have been in the present year or were in the preceding year?

Mr. HUSTED. Well, they are better organized now than they were a year ago, and they can accomplish the same amount of work for less money.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Can the gentleman tell me whether the amount provided for in this bill is substantially the same as the amount provided for in the Budget?

Mr. HUSTED. It is exactly the same as the Budget figures.

Mr. EVANS. You will find it on page 47 of the hearings.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUSTED. We think we have made ample provision.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I notice at the bottom of page 31, in the appropriation for the investigation and prosecution of war frauds, an appropriation of $500,000.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And then at the bottom of page 37, "For assistants to the Attorney General and to the United States district attorneys employed by the Attorney General to aid in special cases," an appropriation of $850,000. I presume that is for the same purpose. There you will notice an approriation of $850,000.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes, sir.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are these apropriations in addition to the $500,000 that the Congress appropriated for the Attorney General at the last session?

Mr. HUSTED. Last year we did not carry any specific amount for the prosecution of war frauds, but $500,000 was provided later in one of the deficiency bills.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How many special attorneys are now employed in this special investigation by the Attorney General?

Mr. HUSTED. Thirty, and they are all paid out of that specific $500,000 fund.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How much salary do they draw?

Mr. HUSTED. I think the highest-paid attorney gets about $7,500.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are not about nine drawing $10,000 each?

Mr. HUSTED. We have a list of them here, stating just exactly what they get. I shall be glad to give the gentleman their names and the amount of salary paid.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What is the highest amount paid any special attorney, and how many of them are receiving that amount?

Mr. HUSTED. I think the highest-paid attorney in the Department of Justice receives $12,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How many of them are receiving $10,000?

Mr. HUSTED. Very few. There are just 30 attorneys employed in this special work of investigating and prosecuting war frauds.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is under the $500,000 appropriation?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes; that is under the $500,000 appropriation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Can the gentleman give the committee any idea of what the total salaries of the 30 are?

Mr. HUSTED. We have got the evidence here somewhere in the hearings. I will look it up and let you know later.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman know how many additional attorneys are contemplated to be employed under this $850,000 appropriation?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not think they have increased the number of attorneys at all except for this special work of investigating and prosecuting these war frauds.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it not a fact that one of the chief accountants under the $500,000 appropriation is now drawing $18,000?

Mr. HUSTED. That is a very highly paid man. He is not a lawyer; he is an accountant.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Now, if the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask him if he knows what progress is being made under the $500,000 appropriation, and how many men have been indicted, and how many have been sent to the penitentiary?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not think anybody has been sent to the penitentiary. They were not organized for the work until the month of August last. They have passed on to United States attorneys a great many cases for prosecution.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Has anyone except one man been indicted?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not know how many have been indicted, but I do know that about three hundred and some odd cases are in course of active prosecution.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Are those criminal cases?

Mr. HUSTED. Criminal and civil; and I know that at least $150,000 have already been covered into the Treasury which was recovered in one of these cases.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. In preparing the bill, in so far as it pertains to the State Department, did the committee give any consideration to the matter of——

Mr. KINCHELOE. Before the gentleman goes into that matter I just wanted to make this observation: I remember when these investigating committees, created in the Sixty-sixth Congress, had finally made their reports they said there was plenty of ground and plenty of evidence to send many war profiteers to the penitentiary, but that the reason why they had not been sent was because the then Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, would not do it; but when Mr. Daugherty came in there would be an immediate and vigorous prosecution; that the prosecutions would go on vigorously and those gentlemen would be sent to the penitentiary.

The fact is that there was not even a dollar asked to be appropriated under this administration to prosecute anybody for these war frauds until the gentleman from South Dakota and the gentleman from Michigan undertook to impeach the Attorney General.

Mr. HUSTED. I do know this, sir, that since the $500,000 fund was provided and the force was organized for this work, the preparation of these cases has gone on with all reasonable speed. They have examined and acted upon some 450 cases, over 250 of which have been placed in the hands of United States attorneys for prosecution.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that we are almost certain to be disappointed in the amount of money that may be returned, because these people have acted under contracts that were made, under which these exorbitant profits were produced?

Mr. HUSTED. That may be true. The claims already investigated by the advisory council and passed upon for prosecution amount to over $100,000,000.

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman please, I know of one case in Ohio where they are undertaking to set aside a contract for cost-plus, and if that can be set aside there will be an immense amount of money recovered, but if it is not set aside, then the tremendous amount of profiteering was under a contract, so that we have no ability to recover.

Mr. HUSTED. That may be.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman from Ohio know of any probability of anybody going to the penitentiary under the administration of the present Attorney General?

Mr. FESS. If fraud can be established I hope they will go.

Mr. KINCHELOE. So do I.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think the Government officials who made these contracts are just as culpable as the men who profiteered under them?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do, and I do not care whether they are Democrats or Republicans. I know we have appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars for their prosecution, and for my part, I would just as soon see a Democrat sent to the penitentiary as a Republican, if he has been guilty of fraud.

Mr. HUSTED. I think the gentleman is unjust when he intimates that nothing has been done. There have been 32 criminal indictments found, and 284 cases have been passed upon, which involved a tremendous amount of work. If I thought this business had not gone forward properly, I would be free to say so. It has gone forward properly since we provided money for the purpose, and I have not seen the slightest evidence of any disposition to delay.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I have no doubt the gentleman is honest in what he says. The point I am making is that there has not been anything done.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not true that before the present administration came in probably 85 per cent of the documentary evidence upon which convictions could be had was destroyed, making prosecutions impossible in many cases?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Where did the gentleman get that information?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Where does the gentleman get any such information as that?

Mr. KNUTSON. It is absolutely true. There are whole files missing down in the Department of Justice—that were taken out of the files before March 4, 1921.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has made a definite statement. Where is his evidence?

Mr. KNUTSON. I make that statement upon my responsibility as a Member of this House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman makes the statement, but he does not give any information.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Besides the only final judgment which has been secured through the efforts and instrumentality of our former colleague from Nebraska, Mr. Reavis, who is doing splendid work, has there been any other final judgment obtained against these men, either criminal or civil?

Mr. HUSTED. I think the gentleman is a lawyer, and I have already stated that the money for this purpose was not furnished to the Department of Justice and the force was not organized until the month of August, 1922. They have had charge of this work only four months.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman can not tell us of any other final judgment than the one secured by Mr. Reavis?

Mr. HUSTED. I told the gentleman that they have passed on 284 cases and put them in the hands of United States attorneys for active prosecution.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, they are pending?

Mr. HUSTED. And they have found 32 indictments.

Mr. BLANTON. And they are pending?

Mr. HUSTED. And they have recovered at least $150,000 in money which has been covered into the Treasury.

Mr. BLANTON. Just one other question. Besides this salary of $18,000 a year that the chief accountant gets, how many other parties are employed at salaries greater than $7,500 a year?

Mr. HUSTED. Very few, if any. I will give the gentleman all that information under the five-minute rule, when the item comes up.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman put a statement of that in his remarks in the RECORD?

Mr. HUSTED. I will give it to the gentleman under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman give their names and the salaries that they draw respectively?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is all in the hearings.

Mr. BLANTON. No; not all of it; not the answer to the question I have asked.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I will secure the names of the attorneys and the salaries paid, and give the gentleman the information he desires.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not object to the salary drawn by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Reavis]. He is earning every cent of it, because, as I said before, he is doing splendid work, and I wish all of them were doing as good work as he is.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman made the statement a few minutes ago that 85 per cent of the testimony has been destroyed.

Mr. KNUTSON. I said probably.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will accept the gentleman's amendment. He said that probably 85 per cent of the testimony that had been collected in connection with these war frauds had been destroyed and taken from the files of the Department of Justice, which, if true, constitutes in itself a crime on the part of the persons responsible for such action. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if he has any information of that kind.

Mr. HUSTED. I have no information on the subject.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does any Member of Congress outside the gentleman from Minnesota have any knowledge of the subject?

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say the gentleman misquoted me. I did not say that the evidence collected had been destroyed. I said that documents pertaining to the different contracts had been removed from the files of the Department of Justice prior to March 4, 1921, so that special investigators in pursuit of certain cases were left in a blind alley, and could not proceed any further for the want of testimony which has been surreptitiously extracted from the record.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then my statement was correct, because documents constitute evidence. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. He has made these assertions charging against some one, making a charge against some official, whether Democrat or Republican, and I want the gentleman to tell the House and the country from whom he gets his information.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have never quoted anyone unless I had authority to do so, but I got it from a very good authority.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think that as a Member of Congress, having made that sort of a charge, the Department of Justice and the country and Congress are entitled to the names of the persons from whom he got it?

Mr. KNUTSON. The statement was made to me in the presence of other Members, and there were at least two Democratic Members present at the time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has brought his charge on the floor of the House——

Mr. KNUTSON. I just made a plain statement.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I regard it as the duty of the gentleman to give the name of his informant.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not know the people who did it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I say the name of the person who gave the gentleman the information.

Mr. KNUTSON. It came from a very high official.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Who was it?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not quoting people without authority to do so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I submit that the gentleman ought not to make statements on the floor of the House impugning officials without he gives the authority from whom he gets it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Tennessee, namely, to request the gentleman from Minnesota to mention one single case in which this thing has happened—he need not mention the person from whom he got the information, but mention a case in which the department has been embarrassed by the loss or destruction of evidence in the manner stated.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FESS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time under general debate because the first part of the bill is devoted to the Department of State. I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to some of the serious problems that were inherited from the war that had to be taken up by the State Department, and then to make a brief statement, as I see it, of the accomplishments of that department of the Government.

You all recall that the first great problem that the administration had to deal with was an adjustment of the difficulty arising from the relationship with our enemy country because we had not achieved peace, and the first problem was after the restoration of peace the resumption of diplomatic and trade relations. These after-war problems were carried on largely through diplomatic channels.

Then, in addition to that, were involvements with our former associate countries that grew out of the mandate power in the Versailles treaty. Two of those countries, very prominent, with which differences arose were Great Britain and Japan. The dispute with Great Britain grew out of the mandate touching Mesopotamia; that with Japan grew out of the mandate touching the Pacific islands, and especially the Yap Island. Secretary Colby had already taken up the question of Mesopotamia. His position was followed by Secretary Hughes in his wonderfully concise method of procedure, and I think all will agree that it has progressed to a finality without any loss of honor or prestige to our country.

However, the dispute with Japan was more delicate, because it involved the possibilities of our intervention in the development of the Pacific interests.

I will not take the time at this moment to indicate what I think are our possibilities in the Pacific other than to make the mere statement that in time when the oriental countries with their teeming millions and their industrial possibilites shall become what Japan has already become, the largest and most important channels of trade between the Orient and the Occident will go over the Pacific through the Panama Canal, rather than by way of the Straits Settlement, the Suez, and the Mediterranean, for reasons, I think, that will appear to all Members if they look into the possibilities in that future trade. Therefore it was very important that we should not lose our vantage position in that area; that we should hold our rights inviolate in the Pacific, especially in a dispute growing out of Yap Island. So the arms conference recently held here in the Capital, whose opening was somewhat delayed because of the scope of the discussion, finally included in the agenda the discussion of the Far East question as well as the limitation of armaments on the sea.

Members of the committee, we have had several world conferences, but no conference in the same length of time left such definite, far-reaching, and significant results as the one that was held here last year. These results plainly and simply expressed as I interpret them would be the limitation of armaments on the sea, the lessening of the chances for war, the reduction of the burdens of taxation due to war, the end of naval rivalry for all time, and an incident that is not usually viewed in its fullest significance—an agreement with Great Britain and Japan, that the British Navy, which heretofore was always conceded to be double the next largest navy, should not be larger than our own Navy, and that ours would be 40 per cent larger than that of Japan. Such in brief were the definite results on the original purpose of the conference. In addition to this achievement in the limitation of armaments, we also have definite results appertaining to the solution of the Far East problem. The most outstanding item in this program was the unanimous adoption by the nine powers in conference of the Magna Charta of China, in which China won in that short space of time more than she ever won in 500 years before.

In addition to that achievement there is the open-door policy, which was fostered by McKinley back in the unfortunate Boxer rebellion and is now agreed upon by the nine nations. This is primarily an American doctrine, in which our country led in 1900 and in 1921–22. Then there is the agreement to cancel the offensive Anglo-Japanese alliance that had existed for 20 years, a cancellation without offense to Japan and with the approval of Great Britain. In many respects this was supremely important and alone would be looked upon as a great achievement. We obtained our contention in respect to the island of Yap, and therefore have lost nothing along that line of the future development of channels of trade between the Orient and the Occident. Also there is the fulfillment of the agreement of the withdrawal of the troops of Japan from Siberia and China, and lastly, but of most importance to the peace of the Orient, we see the return of Shantung to China. The machinery was outlined to avoid war in the Pacific between the four great powers whose interests are found in that area. Measured by their possible significance, I believe those achievements to be as far-reaching as any ever conducted by the Secretary of State of any country. So much for our service to reduce the burdens of war and promote peace in the Orient.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman mentioned Mr. Colby in relation to the island of Yap.

Mr. FESS. No; in respect to Mesopotamia.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think that Secretary Colby's idea in reference to the island of Yap, protesting against its being assigned to Japan, if it had been followed up, would have been better than to have allowed them to have the island and obtain a station there?

Mr. FESS. I think so, and that was one of the unfortunate outcomes of the Versailles treaty which the arms conference corrected. I mentioned Mr. Colby especially with reference to Mesopotamia, however. Then we have had some rather strained relations with some of our South American neighbors, especially with Colombia. That trouble has been adjusted by this administration. Members will recall the serious dispute for a time with Panama over her difference with Costa Rica in a boundary dispute, in which the United States had pointed the way to close it. Exercising a sort of suzerainty over Panama, we acted as umpire, and the two countries followed our advice. Then the settlement between Chile and Peru of a long-time contention, quite serious at times and a continuous source of concern between the countries, a settlement which largely took place in Washington, is of very far-reaching possibilities and regarded by the head of the State Department as of tremendous possibilities for better understandings. Then, in addition to that, there was recently a meeting here in Washington of representatives of the Central American countries looking to possible settlement of all disputes which may arise in the future without resort to war.

So much for our influence toward a better understanding between the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

While there may be a tendency in some circles to criticize the United States because of the position we assume at Lausanne, it strikes me that our position there is sound and to be approved. We can not very well close our eyes to the situation in the Near East. What we have done for peace in the Far East is very suggestive of what might be done in the Near East. The conference at Lausanne was not called by the United States and it is not meeting in the United States. Therefore we are not sponsor for it, but as an observer and a well-wisher of all the countries we prefer not to umpire their disputes, but at the same time we wish to be helpful. For that reason our Nation watches the trend of that conference.

Whether that position be subject to criticism I do not think it is. We are virtually leading that conference to-day, without any commitment whatever of our own country or without any interference whatever with the rights or prerogatives of the conference or any members of it. It is almost certain that the suggestions and recommendations of our country, unofficial as they are, will be the final decision of the Lausanne conference. It is not too much to believe that this influence as now exerted will be the determining factor in the adjustment of the difficult situation in the Near East.

There are two difficulties with which we are not yet through. One is with Mexico, and while it is not unpromising it is not yet finished. I believe that all unprejudiced minds that will look into the Mexican situation and recognize the position of our Government as expressed by the Secretary of State will admit that the way is open and the terms defined upon which that adjustment can be made, and so far as I can follow I think the United States is taking precisely the proper attitude on the Mexican situation. Mexico can find a recognition of her Government, in my judgment, as quickly as she is willing to recognize the rights of America, especially those rights that were possessed prior to 1917, when the present constitution took effect, and the rights which were due to an invitation of a prior Mexican Government, when these American citizens went in that country in response to an official invitation to develop the Mexican resources. I think we are right on this. I believe the administration, through the Department of State, has taken the only sound view of the matter.

The situation in Russia is serious. It seems to me not promising, but that is not because of any laxity on our part, that is not the subject of any criticism on the part of our State Department or of the present administration. Russia is in a rather hopeless situation—a country that a short time ago commanded the respect of the world, a country that was not long ago a rival of the Anglo-Saxon possibilities of the world, with now none so poor to do her reverence—a nation of 200,000,000, with all of the natural resources that America had 70 years ago, with a territory 7,000 miles in extent in the direction in which the sun travels, and 2,500 miles in the direction that the glacier moves, a contiguous territory of one-sixth of the inhabitable globe, with prospects were the way open for growth and development that none would put a limit upon, awaiting only a sound system of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Under the present régime in Russia, which comprehends but a fraction, a very small proportion, of the population as the ruling element—and I do not want to be critical, and do not want to speak without information, as I am one of the last Members of the House that would attack without grounds—I say, under the present régime there is total disrespect for the sanctity of any kind of contract, the basis of all law and order, even the foundation of government; and our Government has taken the right position, I think, when it announces that until a different policy is pursued with respect to the validity and sanctity of a contract this Nation is not in a position to enter into any sort of international contractual relations with that country. It strikes me that that is the sound view, and the only salutary position for our country to take.

Mexico and Russia are the only two problems on our international horizon that have not yet been adjusted, so far as our foreign relations are concerned. But in each case the way is open and the terms are specified.

There is a problem yet in the Atlantic countries. What is to be the solution of that problem is still in doubt. The famous Frenchman who has just left our shores has concentrated the American mind on the problem of the western countries of Europe. I know what he would like to have us do, and I am certain that we will not do what he would like to have us do. At the same time, America stands always ready to perform her duty to the world, and we will now, as we always have done, perform that duty, but America will never permit any foreign country or any group of foreign countries to state to her what that duty is. We will define that duty ourselves.

I have no authority to say what I am now going to say, and I say it on my own responsibility. It is this: What we did for the Far East, what we are doing in the Near East, what we are this moment doing for Central and South America, may be a suggestion of what we will yet be able to do for the countries in western Europe. [Applause.] That does not mean the League of Nations, it does not mean a supergovernment, it does not mean that we will surrender our sovereignty or independence, but it may mean that we will yet be able to lead the public mind of western Europe in the way of peace that will not involve the loss of our sovereignty.

Take these two years of the direction of our foreign relations under the present administration, measured by the adjustment with our enemy countries, by the composure of the differences between us and our former associates, by the adjustment of disputes between our Government and several neutral countries, by the accomplishment of the arms conference in its Far East problems and the limitation of armaments, and by what we are now doing in the Near East—taking these into consideration as a measure of success, I think it will challenge the record of diplomacy anywhere in the world. I rose to make that statement while the bill providing for the appropriations for the Department of State is under consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a few minutes something relative to the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which is being pressed by the President, to prohibit the issuance of further tax-free securities. This agitation did not begin until the farm-loan system began to function and the bonds to procure the loans for the farmers of this country were being sold tax free over this country. We have had a tremendous amount of agitation against flooding the country with tax-free securities as the result.

The situation is this, that we are getting the money for the farmers and lending it to them at 6 per cent. The law as it originally was provided that they could not charge a farmer more than 1 per cent more than they paid on the bonds, and not exceeding 6 per cent. It became evident that we had to give a little higher rate, because the rate of 5 per cent represents the limitation as being the highest that could be paid. We had difficulty in selling them at 5 per cent. The result was that, at the request of the farm-loan system, we have amended it so that bonds can be now sold by them at 5½ per cent, and the farmer is charged 6 per cent, and the system is run on one-half of 1 per cent, and it is now running; but if you put a tax on the bond or a tax on the income derived from them you can see very easily you have got to elevate the rate to the farmer or you can not sell the bonds. Now, this is the thing I desire to refer to. The President made a considerable appeal on behalf of the farmer. He is exceedingly interested in their behalf, both in his first message and in his last message. Now, I want to call attention to one of the things that the farmer has been after, and that is to have a farmer member of the Federal Reserve Board. That law has been in existence since last May, and yet the President has not been able, being so interested in the farmer, to appoint a member yet. The financial problems for the coming year have been all staked out and the program arranged. I am inclined to think that this promise to the farmer is not being justified by the performance in so doing. This proposition to retire all tax-free securities is a proposition which will immediately and inevitably raise the rate on the farmers' mortgages that are being taken all over the country.

Mr. QUIN. What is the reason the President will not appoint a farmer member?

Mr. STEVENSON. I do not know what is his reason. It has been announced that he will appoint J. R. Howard, who is the only farmer in the United States who has announced that he was in favor of a ship subsidy bill.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I deny that.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Mellon gave out the statement, and he is higher authority than the gentleman from New York. The proposition to make all State bond issues of every kind taxable by the National Government is simply a proposition to destroy, cripple, and limit the credit of the State and its subdivisions. You may say that is a rash statement. Let us see if it is. What does the President say about it? He says:

> Tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation and encouraging unproductive and extravagant expenditures by States and municipalities.

In other words, the power of this Government is invoked by an amendment to the Constitution and by the taxing power to step in and regulate extravagant expenditures and unproductive expenditures of States and municipalities. In other words, when you want to build a schoolhouse in any school district in this country they propose to fix it so they will put a tax on the bonds issued for the purpose, because they are spending too much money on schoolhouses. If you want to build good roads and the county wants to issue bonds, they propose to put a tax on it, because, forsooth, the President says the States and municipalities are becoming extravagant.

It is just simply another effort to dehorn and to destroy the power of the State governments, and to do it by more dictation from Washington, as to what shall be spent in school districts, as to what shall be spent for roads, as to what shall be spent for courthouses, and as to what shall be spent for any internal improvements by the States.

Not only that, but he says there is more in it than a menace to the payment of the public debt; there is a dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. That is the same cry that we have from the Secretary of the Treasury in his report just filed, in which he says we must reduce the surtaxes from 50 per cent to 25 per cent in order to have money to go into productive industry. It is the same old song in another key. Choke off the power of the States to finance their local affairs, to finance their public roads, to finance their schoolhouses. Choke it off by Federal legislation, in order that we may have more money with which to exploit the oil resources of this country and other countries wherever we may go.

And not only that, he says it will correct the growing menace of public borrowing. That is not merely to keep the sources of public income from drying up. It is a proposition boldly propounded by the President in this House in a message, in a solemn declaration well thought out, to put a curb on the power of any State or any of its subdivisions to borrow whenever it or any of its subdivisions sees fit to borrow and in such sums as they see fit.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. As a suggestion along the line which the gentleman is pursuing, the President nowhere in his message suggested that the Republican Party change its policy, which it has been pursuing for three years, of exempting the trading corporations and the shipowners from taxation, which will not require an amendment to the Federal Constitution; but the whole program is to undertake Federal legislation to control and stop the issuance of bonds by States and municipalities and school districts.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. That is a very proper statement. The very bill we had here before us, backed by the administration, the ship subsidy bill, is intended to further increase the enormous sources of income which are to be exempted from Federal taxation. But there is another proposition. To-day there are $40,000,000,000 of these outstanding securities; $25,000,000,000 on United States issues which the Congress could have taxed already and only $15,000,000,000 on State issues; they are owned largely by people who are wealthy. Leave them alone and begin to tax those securities that are issued hereafter. What is the result? The $40,000,000,000 bonds outstanding, that are already in the hands of the millionaires very largely, will be increased in value by 25 per cent, and you will lift them by one stroke of the pen $10,000,000,000 in value for the holders of these securities, and yet the income arising from that increase can not be reached by Federal taxation. [Applause.] But if they say they will exempt farm loan bonds this very proposed amendment makes that impossible, because it provides that tax on issues by States can not exceed the tax on issues made "under the authority of the United States," and if none is imposed on farm loan bonds none can be imposed on State issues and the amendment is worthless. Hence to get at the State issues they will necessarily tax farm loan bonds also and will do it without question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. TINCHER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I just want to state that the last speaker [Mr. STEVENSON] labors under a singular misapprehension with reference to the constitutional amendment which he was discussing. It would not affect the condition of the farm loan bonds in the least to tax them now. We can leave them exempt under this amendment if we see fit. It will not affect their situation in the slightest degree, one way or the other.

And the gentleman is equally in error as to the other matter. But I can not go into that now. The gentleman from Kansas has control of the time, and I do not wish to take up the time now in discussing it.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, of course the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is correct. Every Member of Congress knows that the Congress could tax the Federal farm-loan bonds now if it wanted to and that the change in the Constitution would have no effect one way or the other upon that. However, I think the statement was fairly accurate, considering the statements made by that side of the House concerning the things that the Republican Party does.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman does not mean to state that if a constitutional amendment were passed forbidding the issuance of tax-free securities, without exception being made of agricultural bonds, that it would exempt these?

Mr. TINCHER. No such amendment was advocated by the President in his message.

Mr. JONES of Texas. He said there should be an amendment to the Constitution forbidding the issuance of tax-free securities.

Mr. TINCHER. Authorizing the legislative bodies of the United States and States hereafter to tax all securities. But there is no danger of Congress taxing farm-loan bonds.

But I did not rise to talk about this particular subject. Other suggestions in the President's message appealed to me. I am going to talk real business. I think if this Congress adjourns without passing some law looking to the relief of the people who are oppressed by excessive freight rates to-day it will be inexcusable on the part of Congress, and we shall have to take the consequences.

On the 11th day of last April—on April 11, 1921—I introduced a bill to abolish the Railroad Labor Board, and that bill was on that day referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On the same day I took up with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the proposition of obtaining hearings on the bill, and I got the customarily polite receipt for the bill, saying that the chairman of the committee would keep the matter in his mind; and as a demonstration of the size of his mind, it has been there ever since, and I have been unable to secure any hearings on the bill.

In the President's message the other day he indorsed this measure and took a firm stand in favor of abolishing the Railroad Labor Board. At the time the bill was introduced it met with the denunciation of organized labor, but since that time I have reason to believe that even organized labor has to some extent changed its mind concerning the necessity of retaining this monstrosity known as the Railroad Labor Board, and it has always been my opinion that we would never have a fair adjudication of the railroad rates in this country so long as we had one board to fix the rates and a separate agency to fix railroad wages; one tribunal to fix the cost of operating the railroads, and another to fix the charges on the public.

I want to call your special attention to the fact that the President, on page 6 of his message, says:

> The substitution of a labor division in the Interstate Commerce Commission, made up from its membership, to hear and decide disputes relating to wages and working conditions which have failed of adjustment by proper committees created by the railways and their employees, offers a more effective plan.

He says that in connection with his advocacy of the proposition to abolish the Railroad Labor Board.

I am not criticizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because I know that, just like any other big committee of this House, they have a great number of bills before them and ordinarily they do not pay much attention to a bill that does not come from a member of the committee. But I have taken the precaution this morning to introduce a motion, which will be put on the calendar, because I am determined that if this Congress does not act on this matter this Congress alone shall be responsible. I have offered a motion to discharge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, if permitted to do so under the rules of the House, after it has been pending seven days I shall call up this motion to discharge the committee and place this bill on the calendar for passage. I do not have much hope of calling it up. I think the committee will take action, and I have no pride of authorship in the matter. The fact that I offered this bill the day that the first session of this Congress convened does not necessarily entitle it to have my name. If the members of the committee want to take the bill and work it over and amend it, that is their privilege. The President suggested an amendment to increase the number of the interstate commerce commissioners. That is the only change he has suggested in the bill I have offered. If some member of the committee wants to do that, that is all right; but I say we can not sit here all winter and go home next March without having made some effort to change these freight rates, in the face of the final analysis of

this situation by the President, and look our constituents squarely in the face. If the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not intend to act on the bill which I have introduced, then I intend to try to press my motion to have that bill placed on the calendar for a final vote. As I say, I am not making any criticism of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I know they have hundreds of bills before them, but there is no excuse for our not acting on this matter. We can carry out a good part of the President's program before the 4th of March. We can pass the farm credits bill, and we will do so, no doubt, if the Banking and Currency Committee will get a move on themselves, which I think they have shown a disposition to do in the past. We can pass that bill and we can pass this bill, which if it had been passed in the summer of 1921 would have saved to the people of this country hundreds of millions of dollars. It will behoove this Congress not to let a thing like this go by, especially now that we have the O. K. of the Chief Executive. It will behoove us not to wait until another strike and another and another before passing some law of this kind. I think while the committee are having hearings on that bill it would be well for them to take up the Hoch bill and try to settle this whole disputed question of what interest the whole public has in labor disputes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. As I remember, the gentleman's bill provides for abolishing the Labor Board.

Mr. TINCHER. Transferring their powers and functions to the Interstate Commerce Commission, exactly as the President's message advocated the other day.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Do I understand, then, that the gentleman wants still to continue the regulation of wages through some sort of governmental agency?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, yes. I am not making an appeal to overturn that. I think we must have an agency of that kind. The fact is, from what little I know about it I am inclined to think I support the Kansas idea, as voiced by the Hoch bill pending in the gentleman's committee at this time. It would not be a bad idea if we passed it before the 4th of March; but I figure that that bill will probably excite so much opposition that it will be impossible to pass it before that time, and if we pass this one little measure that I propose it will probably have a tendency to prevent another strike. No one wants the Labor Board now. Even the labor people, who claimed I was an enemy of labor when I proposed to abolish the Labor Board, have changed their minds about that, because when the Labor Board made an order which reduced wages the railroad employees whose wages were reduced went out on a strike which cost the people of this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The railway managers also refused to accept the decision of the Labor Board, did they not?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It is only fair to mention that.

Mr. TINCHER. The railway managers, however, so far as I know, did not abuse me for introducing the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What improvement does the gentleman believe the Hoch bill would be on the present Railway Labor Board, if the Hoch bill was enacted into law?

Mr. TINCHER. I think the Hoch bill, if enacted into law, would at least have this improvement—that it has teeth in it and gives the power to enforce the orders of the board; and as I understood the President's message he thinks the time has come in this country when the Government agency that has to do with these matters should look to the interest and rights of the over one hundred and some odd millions of other people as well as the interests of organized labor and of the owners of the railroads. That is the idea of the Hoch bill, and that is the idea of the Kansas industrial law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I ask that the gentleman have one minute more so that I may ask him a question.

Mr. HUSTED. I will extend the gentleman's time one minute.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman may ask his question, and if I can not answer it, it will be all right.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe we ought to pass a law along these lines—that if a Government tribunal makes an award of wages and the railway employees refuse to accept that decision they should be penalized and fined or put in jail for not doing so?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, no. That is not in the Hoch law and that is not in the Kansas industrial court law or in any other law that I have ever heard advocated. The only time I ever heard anything like that intimated in any case was from those seeking to totally misrepresent the law.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. The President did not advocate that.

Mr. TINCHER. The President did not say anything like that in his message.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I agree with the President that the present Railway Labor Board should be abolished.

Mr. TINCHER. Then let us do it.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. But I believe, in the next place, that we should go back to the condition which existed before the war and reestablish the board of mediation and conciliation, and let the railway employees and the railway managers settle their own differences and let the Government keep its hands off.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio and the Senator elect of that State [Mr. FESS]—in what he has said as to the accomplishments of the State Department during the present administration. I entirely agree with him that much has been accomplished. It is a great honor to the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, but it must be remembered that he has always been in favor of an alliance between the nations of the world to preserve peace; in fact, in the famous letter which he and Mr. Root are given credit for drafting, which was signed and issued on the 14th of October, 1920, by Mr. Hughes and some 30 other gentlemen, it said:

> The undersigned, who desire that the United States shall do her full part in association with other civilized nations to prevent war, have earnestly considered how we may contribute most effectively to that end by our votes in the coming election.

And again—

> The conditions of Europe make it essential that the stabilizing effect of the treaty already made between the European powers shall not be lost by them, and that the necessary changes be made by changing the terms of that treaty rather than by beginning entirely anew.

It is manifest, therefore, that the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, has always been in favor of an association of nations, if not identical, then similar to the League of Nations. He has never been heard to issue his voice against the purposes of the league.

Mr. Hughes, the Secretary of State, in addition to this firm foundation, has been big enough, broad enough, and in the exercise of his knowledge and intelligence has not cast aside the policies of the Democratic administration, but has rather followed them, and has carried to fruition the work begun and partially finished by Mr. Colby, his predecessor.

The gentleman from Ohio mentions what was accomplished in Mesopotamia. Mr. Colby on November 20, 1920, sent a note to the British Government asserting the equality of treatment for the citizens of all nations, including, of course, the United States, in mandatory territory, and this policy has been carried out by Mr. Hughes.

The principle of the "open door" in China was a Wilson policy, which President Harding in a note of his Secretary of State dated July 8, 1921, reiterated and which was later confirmed by the Washington conference.

Ratification of the wrong done to the Government of Colombia by the illegal seizure of the Panama Canal route was a Wilson policy, and the Senate was asked to ratify a treaty to that effect, which it refused to do until the Republican Party secured control of the three branches of Government, and then on April 20, 1921, the treaty providing $25,000,000 for Colombia was ratified.

Nonrecognition of the unstable and illegal de facto government of Mexico was a Wilson policy, which has been consistently pursued by President Harding and his Secretary of State.

Nonrecognition of the barbarous Bolshevik government of Russia under Lenin and Trotski was a Wilson policy, which President Harding and his Secretary of State still maintain.

The Secretary of State under Mr. Wilson on November 9, 1920, protested to Japan and the other allied powers to giving Japan a mandate over the island of Yap. On February 21, 1921, a second note of similar character was addressed to the League of Nations, and on April 6, 1921, President Harding approved of that policy and sent a note similar in character and in argument to Great Britain, France, Japan, and Italy. The Washington conference, however, allowed Japan to maintain its mandate over the island of Yap but confirms to the United States full privileges of equality in the maintenance of wireless and cable stations on the island. Perhaps this was the best the Harding administration could procure, but it is certainly far less desirable than the policy laid down by the Wilson administration, because so long as Japan maintains control of this island just so long is it a menace to the Philippines, and our cable rights will avail us very little in the event of hostilities.

I wish to congratulate the Secretary of State for what was accomplished under the four-power agreement entered into at the Washington conference. It is a movement in the right direction, and from the tone of the President's message before Congress on Friday last it may lead to big things through an association with European nations. It must be said, however, that the Harding administration went far beyond the League of Nations in that they entered into an alliance with the other three powers. I think it could have been improved had the Senate adopted the Robinson amendment making it conform to the underlying principle of the covenant of the league.

If we can not enter the league by the front door it is better to enter into peace by the back door of a four-power treaty than not at all.

The gentleman from Ohio has spoken of the Near East conference now in session at Lauzanne, Switzerland, and says the United States is leading in this conference. I am glad to know that this is a fact, but it does seem to me if we want to lead in matters for the peace of the world we should also be willing to accept membership and responsibilities to maintain that peace. It seems astounding that a great nation like ours, which only a few years ago was foremost in world affairs, is now only in the position of looking on, looking in, or advising with. I note, however, in this Lauzanne conference that the Harding administration has declared that the Dardanelless and the entrance to the Black Sea must be kept open and free to the nations of the world. This same doctrine was issued by President Wilson as the twelfth of his famous 14 points.

I say this with no disparagement to the present Secretary of State and without any desire to belittle his accomplishments; in fact, it is to his honor and greatness that he has seen fit to grasp the good, whether from the Wilson administration or from the present administration.

What I do deplore is the fact that this Nation, with all its intelligence, with all its wealth and power, should not be willing to help maintain the peace of the world by assuming the leadership and the consequent responsibility which comes with it. In 1920 I was talking to the Secretary of State of Germany, and he said:

> We can never have reconstruction and peace and prosperity in the world until the United States is willing to sit down with the other great nations and help solve the problems which now confront us.

He said:

> We are all debtor nations; the United States is the only creditor nation. How can the affairs be settled unless the debtors and creditor together reach a conclusion?

The four-power pact will perhaps accomplish a great deal in the Far East, but there are great responsibilities which we must in some manner, either as a nation or as a people, assume if we would bring peace and normal conditions into the world. We have established in the Philippine Islands a democracy; the people constitute a mixture of Malay and Spanish. The task is perhaps one of the greatest and most progressive in the world's history. The Philippines extend for several hundred miles along the coast of China and the Malay Peninsula. India is near by. It is at the crossroads of world commerce. Can we not perceive that democracy is gradually entering the minds and hearts of the people of these far-off nations? There is India, with 320,000,000 people. Some 20 years ago they scarcely realized that they were more than chattels and slaves. They have awakened to the fact that they are human beings, with human rights and human aspirations. Look at China, with her 400,000,000 people. Already a democracy. A great Chinese Republic has been established. Japan has 70,000,000 people, who long since realized their position in the world. Take these great nations, and you have a people of over 800,000,000, constituting half the population of the globe. Can we not behold that the fires of democracy which were started by our forefathers in this country, which has consumed the nations to the south of us, has leaped the great Pacific, maintaining foothold in the Philippines, and spreading to this vast concourse of people?

In Europe democracy has spread like wildfire, and the great nations are to-day either republics or largely conform to the principles of that kind of government. Who shall say that America has not her responsibilities and, more than that, her opportunities, as a great leader of world affairs, and to her own honor and glory help settle the great questions which confront the peoples of all nations? Not long ago I was talking to Mrs. Sharp, the wife of our former ambassador to France. She had just returned from several months spent in the countries of Europe. She described conditions as deplorable, money as worse than valueless, and she said:

> What the people of Europe want is not sympathy, gifts, or donations, but leadership. They have reached that state of despondency and despair when they know not where to look for guidance. They feel that we have neglected them, and yet they pray for America to take the lead in righting things and bringing the Old World to its feet again.

We need not fear entangling alliances. No nation or people would ask it; but what they do want is leadership; and if the League of Nations can not be agreed upon by such amendments as may seem proper to the majority party, then let us pray that our Secretary of State will devise some other method which will bring peace, happiness, and prosperity, and likewise confidence, to the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to direct attention to the condition with respect to the district judiciary, suggested by the item on page 33, appropriating $937,000 with which to pay the salaries of the district judges of the United States. Gentlemen will recall that last year the Department of Justice urged very strongly upon the Congress to increase the number of district judges in the United States, stating that the business of the country is congested, that justice is denied and criminals are permitted to escape because there is no tribunal before which they may be tried. Acting on that suggestion, Congress passed a bill which was approved on the 14th of September, and about the 22d of September the President sent to the Senate the names of three nominees for those positions, two for Massachusetts and one for the eastern district of Illinois. Some twenty-odd judgeships provided for in this bill have not been filled. The remaining days of September have gone by, all of October has passed, November has gone into history, and we are almost at Christmas. During all of that time determination as to nominations has been possible and the Senate has been in session since November 20. In so far as I can ascertain not another name has been suggested to the Senate to fill the positions created by Congress. In the southern district of New York, the heart of the congestion, a vacancy has remained unfilled for more than a year, and the country has the right to know why. If the condition obtains which the Attorney General a year ago told us did obtain, congested prisons, congested courts, and civil litigants denied the opportunity of trial, why this holding up of nominations to fill the positions created by Congress in response to the Executive request? Why is it that the nominations are not forthcoming for these congested districts and these men put to work? If any gentleman on the Republican side has an answer to the question, I yield to him that he may answer in my own time.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am addressing myself now to gentlemen on the Republican side. I want to hear from them.

Mr. McSWAIN. Assuming nobody is going to rise, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. STAFFORD. It may be that conditions have changed, and that there is no need for them, and that would be a saving to the Treasury.

Mr. McSWAIN. But is it not the gentleman's observation and information that conditions are worse than they were a year ago?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not think that anyone will contend that the congestion in the district courts of the United States has to any degree subsided since the time when the Attorney General first came before the Judiciary Committee of the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Possibly it may be that the Attorney General has been so busy answering these charges laid against him that he has not had time to make his recommendations.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know about that, but with this need, which is insisted upon by the Attorney General, by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, by the committees of the House and Senate, and by gentlemen who have stood in their places here and detailed the conditions of congestion in their respective sections of the country, it seems to me, with nothing having been done since September, we have a right to know why. Congress provided the positions, too many positions it is true, but some are needed; badly needed. Almost a quarter of a year has passed since Congress created the positions, and only three of them have been filled. I say some of these positions ought not to have been created. I tried my best to have the extra judgeship for the district of New Mexico stricken from the bill.

That judgeship was not recommended by either the House or the Senate Judiciary Committee. I have recently introduced an amendment to the law striking from it the judgeship provided for the district of New Mexico. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the positions on the Federal judiciary ought to be held

absolutely free from every suspicion of political jockeying. At this time I am not proposing to call a spade a spade, although I shall do it some other time——

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Do it now.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Very well, I shall. I say there was but one possible consideration for incorporating the judgeship of New Mexico, which was not recommended either by the House or the Senate Judiciary Committee investigating as to the needs of the situation. I say in regard to that judgeship, if I must call a spade a spade, that the hand of practical politics was laid on the Federal judiciary. If we are to endure as a Government we must protect the judiciary from the fact and from every just ground to suspicion that judicial positions are created to meet political exigencies. If it be apparent that that be the motive for the creation of the position, who can be made to believe that that motive stopped short of the filling of the position? I am not speaking merely in criticism. It is not too late to strike from the law of the country the congressional authorization for the appointment of this judge for New Mexico. While there are, I believe, a number of judgeships included in that bill that ought not to be there, this one stands out indefensible, a reflection upon the Congress and a hurt to public confidence. In the year preceding the writing of this bill, according to the report of the Attorney General, there was tried in the district of New Mexico only one civil case to which the United Sates was a party; as I recall it, 22 civil cases to which the United States was not a party; and 22 criminal trials where a jury was had. In all, 44 cases. And yet we send another judge into that district for the taxpayers of this country to support at a time when every public interest demands the most rigid economy. Of course, no new judge is needed there. The present judge must either remain idle much of the time or go out of the district in order to find employment. If there is no public need, the only other need is a political need; the only other motive is a political motive.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman inform the House as to the number of cases now on the calendar in New Mexico?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. At this moment I do not have the report, but they are relatively small.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield for just another question?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I make this statement. I know the gentleman well. The gentleman serves on the Judiciary Committee with me. He is a high-toned, patriotic, efficient legislator and he will not say to the membership of this House that he believes that there is need in the district of New Mexico for another judge.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what I was trying to find out, and that is in regard to the length of those cases tried down there. The gentleman well knows in some cases 44 cases of a certain kind tried in a year would be a big program.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is right. The gentleman is a member of the Judiciary Committee. He voted for the bill, and I will ask him if he knows now there was such litigation in New Mexico as to justify this appointment?

Mr. MICHENER. No; we did not put it on in the committee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No; and we ought to take it off. If there had been any need we would have heard of it when the bill was being prepared.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will.

Mr. GARNER. If the President should delay the appointment of a judge in New Mexico in proportion to the delay in appointing those that seems to be necessary he will not make the appointments during this administration, will he?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that there seems to be a rather general opinion that these appointments will come pretty soon after they get through with a few bills in the Senate, including the ship subsidy bill. But about that I do not know. All I do know is that the three judges who have been appointed were appointed within about a week after the bill was passed; then two months followed in which to determine other appointments. The Senate has been in session since the 20th of last month to receive those appointments, and they are not forthcoming. It is not because there has not been time in which to consider a substantial number and determine as to nominations in most of the districts of greatest need. It can not be because there is not the most urgent need in some districts. One of the districts where there is the least need of a new judge—the eastern district of Illinois—was given one of the three which has been appointed; yet the appointments are not being made. Why, I do not know, but it does not seem to me that the reason can be the only worthy reason which can obtain in this situation, namely, the lack of time in which any of the remaining selections could be made. That, of course, is an Executive responsibility. I want to speak a little further of the congressional responsibility. I want to direct your attention with reference to the New Mexico judgeship to the further fact that it can not be claimed that this judge, who is not needed in New Mexico, can be sent into any of the contiguous country. You can not send him into California, because by this bill we are providing one new judge for each of the districts of California. You can not send him to Arizona, because we are providing a new judge for Arizona, which oversupplies that district. We are providing new judges for the northern district of Texas, the eastern district of Oklahoma, for Wyoming, and for Montana. If used at all, he will have to be transported across the continent at public expense and $10 per diem extra. The fact is that good faith and due regard for the sacredness of the Federal judiciary will not countenance an excuse for such an appointment as this, that maybe work for the appointee can be found in some other district into which from time to time he may be transported. Such appointments are not made when the motive is to serve the public interest. It is not done that way. The Congress ought to right itself in this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 7 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LOGAN].

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I simply want to make a statement in connection with the public meeting which was held in Washington on Sunday in regard to a man by the name of Magon. On Friday or Saturday a lady called at my office and asked me if I was in sympathy with these political prisoners. I told her, "Yes." I understood the meeting would be called generally for clemency, and under those circumstances I stated she could use my name. I did not have any idea that the meeting was to be of the nature that it was, and while I have no idea that I was intended to be deceived, I would not have signed the call had I known the nature of the meeting that was going to be held. I only wanted to make that statement in justice to myself and other Members of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN].

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement concerning a bill which I have introduced affecting rural credits, known as, I think, H. R. 13270, and also some additional facts in regard to House Joint Resolution 400.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take a few minutes of time to explain the provisions of the bill that I have introduced, being H. R. 13270, to provide adequate credits for the assistance of farmers, whether they are producing the products of the fields or of live stock. In the very beginning I must acknowledge my obligation to the well-worked-out and well-expressed bill introduced by Mr. McFADDEN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and also to the bill subsequently introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, chairman of the Agricultural Commission. I confess to having adopted much of the language of Mr. McFADDEN's bill with respect to the details of organization, management, and inspection of the rural-credits banks, but my ideas of the fundamental principles underlying the systems differ so widely from the plans contained in the bills of Mr. McFADDEN and Mr. ANDERSON that I feel it my duty to put before the Congress my plan. I do this with all deference to the wider experience of the gentlemen already named, but each one of us is responsible to his own constituency and to his own conscience for the exposition of his own convictions.

PROMPT RELIEF NECESSARY.

Mr. Chairman, while it is now universally admitted by all classes, even by the large bankers of the East, that agriculture is the fundamental and the basic industry upon which rests the hope of prosperity and of life itself for the Nation, and while an adequate and wonderful system of financing has been devised for the use and convenience of commerce, industry, and capital in the Federal reserve system, yet the farming business has been left to the very last to receive such relief, when in fact it should have been the first for consideration. No doubt this is due largely to the fact that the farmers are not organized, or at least are disorganized, and their various organizations present a diverse and conflicting

front, but everybody is beginning to recognize that there is too great a difference between what the consumer pays for what he eats and wears and what the farmer gets for those very things when they leave his hands.

The farmer, as the primary producer of the essential wealth of this and all countries, is certainly entitled to the first and, I solemnly believe, to the largest slice of the profits to be made out of the commodities he produces. Strange to say, we all know that many persons who never see the farmers' meat, and corn, and wheat, and cotton, and vegetables, and other produce, and merely allow the same to pass over their books, take infinitely more profits than the farmer himself. The mind of the thoughtful man must be impressed with the comparison between the modest, and oftentimes pitifully inadequate, homes upon the farm, with few conveniences and no comforts, whereas the great cities contain mighty palaces and structures reared at vast cost out of the profits made from handling over the books the very things that the farmers' toil and skill and long watchfulness have builded by the assistance of the magic processes of nature, out of sunlight and moisture and soil, into the most delicious morsels that tempt the human appetite.

WE SHOULD EMPLOY EXISTING MACHINERY.

The bills of Mr. McFADDEN and Mr. ANDERSON contemplate employing in a large measure the machinery of the Federal land bank and farm loan system, and, on the contrary, my suggestion is to employ the machinery of the Federal reserve system. These systems are fundamentally different. The farm loan system has the dual aspect of first furnishing an absolutely safe and continuing investment for capital, and, on the other hand, long-time loans at reasonable rates, with the opportunity to pay off gradually for the borrower. The investing public has been convinced that the farm loan bonds are the best in the world, as they are. But the loans necessary to assist the farmer in producing his crops annually or in raising his live stock, over a period not exceeding three years, do not correspond with the ideas of the farm loan system, but do coincide with the plan of the Federal reserve system. The Federal reserve system is designed to furnish credits to meet fluctuating demands of commerce and industry. By the concentration of reserves, and by the transfer of reserves, and by the power to issue Federal reserve bank notes and Federal reserve notes, that system can expand as the requirements demand and contract as the needs cease. It is true that the limitation of 90 days applies to commercial paper in the Federal reserve system, but we all know that, as a matter of experience, merchants and manufacturers who borrow from their local bank for 90 days do not expect, nor does the bank expect, that the note itself will be paid in full and forever at the end of the 90 days. It is expected that the note will be renewed for a larger or a lesser amount, because the merchant or manufacturer, or other business man, who must borrow once will most likely be in need of constant borrowing. The Federal reserve system has in its several reserve banks over $15,000,000,000 on deposit that are drawn from member banks and from the Government, for the use of which absolutely nothing is paid, and so the member banks have thousands of millions of dollars on deposit, a large part of which belongs to farmers themselves and little, if any, interest is paid for the use of this money. The farming class, the essential class, the producing class, the conservative class, the class from which is drawn the fresh blood and pure morality that constantly saves the Nation, is entitled to every consideration of convenience and relief.

PLACE RELIEF CLOSE TO EACH FARMER.

One of the chief objections that I must offer to the plans of Mr. McFADDEN and Mr. ANDERSON is that they are too remote from the small and, as we say, one-horse farmer who lives on his own small place or upon a rented place and works the land with his own hand with the assistance of his wife and his boys and girls, and this class of farmer constitutes more than 75 per cent of those who produce the things upon which we all live. If transactions must be through the Federal land banks, as their plans suggest, and as there are few such Federal land banks, they are therefore far removed from the masses of the people. The large farmer with hundreds of thousands of acres can carry on correspondence with the Federal land banks or take the train and go hundreds of miles to confer, but not so the small farmer.

HOW CAN LOCAL RELIEF BE ACCOMPLISHED?

It is fundamental in a system that will be convenient and at the same time safe that there must be assurance of at least one bank in each county in the agricultural sections, and there must also be local financial responsibility in order to insure that advantage will not be taken and thus the system weakened. It is but human nature for people to borrow all they can, and it is sadly true that often persons fail to show the same diligence in repaying that they do in borrowing. Therefore I suggest that there may be organized banks under the Federal Government, to be chartered by the Comptroller of the Currency, consisting of at least 10 natural persons with a minimum capital stock of $10,000 and with no maximum, and that State or National banks may take not more that 49 per cent of this stock and that the business may be transacted in the same banking room, if desired, and that the same officers, if elected by the board of directors, may administer the affairs of the local rural credits bank as administers the State or National bank in connection with which the rural credits bank may be organized. Of course the rural credits bank may be entirely separate, with an entirely separate set of officers, but I believe, in the interest of economy and of speedy organization, that the banks will take up the organization of rural credits banks very quickly. My observation and experience is that the local banks in the small cities and towns in agricultural sections are entirely in sympathy with the needs and requirements of the farmers and wish to help them, but for economic reasons they can not.

First, the farmer must compete with business men who can pay a higher rate of interest, and usually the farmer who must borrow has no money to deposit, though there are many farmers out of debt and depositors. With a minimum capital of $10,000 and with power to turn over and lend a total of $100,000, and with the power to make 2 per cent thereon, it will net to the local rural credits bank $2,000, and as there will be little clerical work I am persuaded that the cashiers and assistant cashiers of the banks will be only too glad to take a salary of $100 per month to attend to the business of the rural credits bank, so that the bank can pay 6 per cent interest on $10,000 capital and have $200 margin of profits.

The bank itself will be glad to have the farmers' bank operated in connection with it. The bankers want to show themselves friendly to agriculture. Many banks in my section furnish seed grain, brood sows and boars, and thoroughbred bulls and stallions at actual cost, and finance the farmer in order to promote the welfare of the farmers. Therefore, I am convinced that they will gladly organize these banks, at least one in each county, and they will also derive a certain financial benefit for two reasons: First, the farmer borrowing his money at the first of the year will deposit it in the State or National bank and check it out gradually so that the deposits of the bank will be swollen; and in the second place, the farmers having found the way into a certain bank will return when they begin to be prosperous and have money to deposit generally.

RIVALRY WILL ENCOURAGE BANK ORGANIZATIONS.

In practically all of our county-seat towns, even in the remotest rural sections, there are at least two banks, and if one bank organizes in connection with its business a rural-credits bank, the other bank, fearing the effect of such competition, will also organize one, and by watching and competing with each other we may make sure that the farmers' needs will be fairly met. Then if the cashier is having his salary increased $100 per month, the cashier in the other bank will be anxious to receive the same increase. One hundred dollars per month additional in our smaller towns is a vast increase to men who are receiving now in many cases $150 to $300 per month.

MY PLAN OFFERS USE FOR SURPLUS GOLD.

Gold is still the basis of money value and probably will be for generations to come. The statement of the United States Treasurer for December 4, 1922, shows that we have in gold $3,270,472,528.86. It is admitted by everybody from the President down that we do not need so much gold. Some have argued with show of reason that this vast quantity of gold is a detriment to our commerce, and the unequal distribution of gold among the countries of the world is certainly one of the prime causes for the destruction of a stable basis of exchange. In my bill, therefore, I propose to transfer to the Federal Reserve Board $500,000,000 of this gold as a guaranty for the Federal reserve notes that shall be issued in order to meet the requirements of the farmer. As will be found by reading the bill, this money is virtually lent in trust and will be ultimately refunded out of the profits of the system itself, and, when fully refunded by the profits of the system, will accumulate in gold in the notes of the Federal Reserve Board in order to guarantee and insure the stability and par value of the circulating medium required to be issued in order to finance the farmers from year to year.

ADDITIONAL CURRENCY WILL STIMULATE BUSINESS AND ENCOURAGE PROSPERITY.

The need for a larger volume of money as a medium of exchange is increasing every year, as our business becomes more complex and our business transactions more multiplied. Our fathers and grandfathers, living on large plantations, each of

which was a sort of empire within itself, with the mill and the tanyard, shoe shop, and the cows in the pasture to produce the hides, and the smokehouse to cure the meat, and the sheep and cotton to produce the thread, and the spinning wheel and loom to make the cloth, did not need much money. They required only enough to pay small taxes, and to buy some sugar and coffee, pepper and salt, medicine, and something for the doctor and preacher. But now, under a constantly multiplying division of labor, the farmer usually does not even sharpen his own plows and shoe his own mule, much less make or mend his own shoes, or grind his own wheat or corn, or manufacture his own cloth. And all these things must be paid for in money, so that it takes a larger volume of money constantly passing through his hands in order to meet his requirements. This increase in the volume of currency will help the merchant and the manufacturer, and the railroad, and the banker himself, and will help everybody except the person or corporation whose sole assets consist of cash itself, and who will find that the demand for their cash is diminished as the quantity of actual money in the country is increased.

HOW WILL THE VOLUME OF CURRENCY BE INCREASED?

The plan contemplated by my bill is that when the farmer takes his note and mortgage, whether on land or on crops or on stock, to the local farm credits bank and has the same discounted, that note can be sent to the Federal reserve bank for the district, which must discount it at a rate not exceeding the interest being earned for the preceding year by the investors in Libery bonds or Victory bonds, which are unsecured obligations of the Government of long standing. This duty to rediscount by the Federal reserve banks is obligatory. That is one of the sharp differences between the bill introduced by myself and that offered by the gentlemen named. If the Federal land banks merely may rediscount for local banks the paper of farmers, then the local banks will be very chary to accommodate farmers, so long as it is a mere matter of discretion with the Federal land bank. But under the plan proposed by me the Federal reserve bank must rediscount every paper that the local farm credits bank tenders and indorses.

IS THIS PLAN SAFE?

I submit that it is safe, because the local farm credits bank must indorse and guarantee payment to the Federal reserve bank of every one of these notes, and the stockholders will be responsible in double the amount of stock invested by them, and the associate bank will have a certain degree of moral responsibility for the safety of the loans. There is no duty imposed by this bill upon the local farm credits bank to lend money to any and every farmer who wants to borrow. If the farmer is lazy or inefficient or dishonest, he neither can nor should expect any help from any system. On the other hand, if he is honest and if he is industrious and if he is capable, he has the right to expect accommodation upon reasonable terms for at least 12 months at a rate of interest not exceeding 6 per cent.

HOW CAN THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANK FINANCE THESE FARMERS' OBLIGATIONS?

When the paper is rediscounted by Federal reserve banks it is then tendered to the Federal reserve agent and it is obligatory upon him to pay to the Federal reserve bank the amount of such paper in Federal reserve notes, and it is the duty of the Federal Reserve Board to issue Federal reserve notes in sufficient sums, backed up by a $500,000,000 guaranty in gold, in order to meet these requirements. It is hardly possible that the total short-term credits of all the farmers in the United States under such a system would aggregate five thousand million dollars, but if it should, the soundness of the currency is guaranteed by one-tenth of the amount of gold and by 100 per cent of the amount in paper and by 200 per cent of the amount of the liability of the stockholders of rural-credits banks. With this margin there can be no reasonable doubt about the soundness of the currency. Every dollar of the Federal reserve notes, which will bear upon their face evidence of the fact that they have been issued to carry on the agricultural industry in this country, will be redeemable any day in the year in gold. But who can demand their redemption? They will be legal tender for all obligations, both public and private, in the United States. The citizens of other countries can not acquire them in any substantial quantities, because other nations and other citizens owe us and our nation in the aggregate sum of at least fifteen thousand million dollars. Therefore, by no possibility of international finance can these Federal reserve notes for farm purposes fall into the hands of foreigners and, therefore, we will not find them presenting them to the Federal Reserve Board and demanding their redemption in gold.

WHAT WILL BE DONE WITH THE PROFITS OF THE SYSTEM?

The local bank can not charge more than 2 per cent above the rate of rediscount and that will be used to pay dividends and the expenses of administration. Out of the balance a fair proportion of the expenses of each Federal reserve bank and any losses on any paper will be paid, to be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board, and the balance will be placed to the credit of the Federal Reserve Board and used to redeem and refund and to restore to the Government the $500,000,000 in gold lent by the Government to set the machinery in motion. When all of the advancement by the Government shall have been refunded, then the rate of rediscount shall not exceed 2 per cent and thereafter the farmers will be receiving their annual accommodations at a rate of interest not exceeding 4 per cent; and then probably it will be found that the 2 per cent allowed to the local bank may properly be reduced to 1½ or even 1 per cent, so that we may reasonably hope for a time when the farmers who go forth to sow and to reap, who watch the live stock from birth until the day of sale or slaughter, will be receiving financial assistance at about 3 per cent per annum.

RELIEF WILL COME QUICKLY.

Under the system proposed by the eminent and able and experienced gentleman referred to a delay of one or perhaps two years even after the enactment of the legislation will follow. The huge corporations proposed by them must be organized, and in our impoverished sections of the country their organization will be practically impossible. Then the bonds, in order to raise the money from private subscribers, must be floated, and that will involve delay. Their plan is to furnish a place for the investment of capital that the very people have accumulated who have made enormous profits out of the produce of the farm, and by a strange irony of fate these people who have grown rich by using the opportunities and agencies of our economic and transportation structure to exact an unreasonable profit and toll for the things that they handle almost theoretically for the farmer are now brought to believe and think that they are benevolent and almost charitable by subscribing to bond issues to finance the farmer when they are to draw interest on those bonds and to continue to profit immensely on the products of the farm. I make no war upon any line or class of business. I recognize that some middlemen are necessary under our economic structure, though I believe that there are too many middlemen, and I believe that we have permitted to continue an economic and transportation system that makes it possible for those who stand at the gates to exact a toll for their services altogether out of proportion and excessively large for the value of the services actually rendered.

WHY SHOULD NOT THE LAW DO FOR THE FARMER WHAT IT DOES FOR THE BUSINESS MAN?

It may be objected that my plan proposes the issue of a sort of "fiat money" in order to finance the farmer. While I deny it and in a few minutes can prove it to be false, yet I remind you that the Federal reserve system contemplates the issue of the same sort of "fiat money" in order to help the merchant, the manufacturer, the railroad, the speculator in cotton and wheat and corn and meat. The Federal Reserve Board can issue Federal reserve notes when there is only 40 per cent in gold or other legal money as a guarantee behind the same, and in such a case 60 per cent of the circulating medium thus poured into the channels of commerce is "fiat money" in the sense of those who may criticize the plan I propose. But I submit that in neither case is it actually fiat money, and the Federal reserve notes to be issued to finance the farmers will be safer and sounder and more sure and certain of redemption than those issued to finance the merchant, the manufacturer, and the speculator. Why? Because the Federal reserve notes to accommodate the farmer are backed not only by the gold above mentioned and not only by the indorsement of the local bank but by the papers, which represent actual commodities and actual values, either in existence or to be brought into existence in a little while, and when brought into existence constitute the very things that more than 100,000,000 people of this Nation and the teeming millions of other people must eat every day and must wear all the time.

The basis for the Federal reserve notes now being issued to accommodate commerce and business consists, to the extent of 60 per cent, of the unsecured notes bearing the signature of two or more persons and resting solely upon their financial responsibility at the date of maturity. Take the statistics to see how 95 per cent of the merchants of this country ultimately become bankrupt. Ask the statistics how many of the notes of these merchants are worthless, or partly worthless, at maturity. But, on the other hand, under my system, as a matter

of fact the obligations of farmers based upon a lien on the crop or the live stock are worth almost par. A gentleman of high character, well known to me, and now more than 70 years of age and having been engaged in business as a merchant and banker in a rural section for more than 40 years, has often told me that out of the perhaps millions of dollars that he has lent to farmers $500 would perhaps cover all the losses he ever sustained. Not at all, by a great deal, were the papers paid when due. Many of them had to be carried over and added into the next year's obligations, and some of them had to be continued for three or four years in part, but ultimately, when Providence smiled with suitable seasons, and fortune aided with adequate prices, the honest farmer stepped up and met his obligations, new and old. The plan provides criminal penalties for anything like fraudulent representations and fraudulent failure to preserve and protect the commodities and apply the cash proceeds to the liquidation of the farmer's debt. Therefore, there can be no reasonable doubt about the soundness of the system.

WHICH SYSTEM WILL YOU CHOOSE?

Will you choose the system that involves delay; that rests upon the word "may"; that depends upon the willingness of the capitalists to subscribe stock; that rests upon the impossibility of raising capital sufficient to organize the financing corporation, when the farmer has already waited too long and waited to his own loss and suffering and to the consequent impoverishing of the Nation as a whole and to the delaying of the return of prosperity, or will you adopt the system here offered by me that can be put into operation by every agricultural section of the country within at least 60 or 90 days after its approval by the President? The press can advise the country of this ample and easy method of furnishing financial relief. The banks in the smaller towns and cities, with eyes open and ears keen to learn of ways and means to promote their business interests, will be applying for permission to organize the rural credits banks the very next day after the law has been placed on the statute books. When one bank in the town, through its friends and business associates, to wit, at least 10 natural persons, shall have organized such a bank as a sort of side pocket and business feeder, the other banks in that town and the banks in the neighboring towns will wake up and begin at once the organization of such banks.

The very day the bank is chartered by the Comptroller of the Currency it can begin to lend money, and if this bill could be put through the House and Senate by the 15th day of January, 1923, then by the 15th day of February, 1923, the farmers could be getting money at not exceeding 6 per cent for a period of 12 months; and with this financial aid they could prepare the soil and buy the fertilizer and buy the seed and cultivate and harvest the crop, and eventually market it in an orderly manner; and at the end of 12 months hope would have returned to their hearts, confidence would have been restored, the volume of commodities necessary to support the Nation would have been increased, and by the assistance of cooperative markets the farmer would be getting a better price and at the same time the ultimate consumer in the cities would be getting what he must eat and wear at a lower price, and a contented and happy people would join in a common chorus of praise for the blessings of such a system. All the world agrees that the Federal reserve system is a marvel in the world of finance. While it has defects that should and can be easily corrected and perfected, yet in the main it is a matchless system. Now, on behalf of the farmers, whom everybody serves with his lips and so few assist with their hands, I ask for the application of the blessings of this wonderful Federal reserve system to his needs. The farmer reminds us that he is a part of this Nation, and as such part had a hand in the forming and chartering of the Federal reserve system. It is as much his system as it is anybody's. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I know that we are told by the lawyers, and it is technically true, that the Federal reserve system is a private banking system and that it belongs to the banks as a private institution, and that it is in no sense a governmental institution, but we must remember that it required long years of agitation to convince an American Congress that such a system would be necessary, and it required the exercise of sovereign power on the part of this National Government to create this system and to breathe into it the breath of life. The private banks never could have created it and, worse still, they never would have created it. They fought it from the beginning, and most of them went into it unwillingly and were forced in only by mandate of law, and some national banks surrendered their charters rather than enter the system. I can well remember that the national banks in the little towns and cities, echoing the voice of Wall Street and of the mighty financial interests that had profited immensely by the control of money and currency, fought with all their might to prevent the Congress from enacting the law. Now these very banks all join in singing its praises. It is a blessing to the little bank. It has saved the little bank from the clutches of the greedy manipulator of money on Wall Street.

TREAT THE FARMER AS YOU DID THE BUSINESS MAN.

All we ask is that the Government exercise the same power for the benefit of the farmer as it does for the benefit of the business man. The Government uses its sovereign power and right to make money to circulate as a medium of exchange and to have the quality of legal tender in order to accommodate the requirements of commerce and industry. How can it and how dare it do less for the farmer? Remember that the farmer has struggled through three desperate years with the prices of his products constantly falling, while the prices of the things he must buy remain constant and in some cases rising. To adopt a system that will involve a continuing delay of at least one and perhaps two or three years, that will not carry its conveniences close to the farmer's door, that will accommodate the large farmers but be practically beyond the reach of the smaller farmers, will result in continued stagnation, so that hope so long deferred may not rise in the farmer's heart; and since the prosperity of all the people depends upon his labor and production, the return of prosperity of the whole Nation will certainly be delayed and may be prevented by such a system as is contemplated by the honorable and able gentlemen above mentioned.

I appeal for relief, for quick relief, for adequate relief, and in the name of the farmers who feed and clothe this Nation and a large part of the world, of the farmers who settled this continent, who cleared its fields and drained its swamps, and ultimately built its cities and all of its great industries, I affirm that we have a right to demand this quick and adequate relief.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to call the attention of the House to the following extract from the inaugural address of President Harding, delivered on March 4, 1921, in connection with House Joint Resolution 400:

> Our supreme task is the resumption of our onward, normal way. Reconstruction, readjustment, restoration—all these must follow. I would like to hasten them. If it will lighten the spirit and add to the resolution with which we take up the task, let me repeat for our Nation we shall give no people just cause to make war upon us; we hold no national prejudice; we entertain no spirit of revenge; we do not hate; we do not covet; we dream of no conquest nor boast of armed prowess.
>
> If, despite this attitude, war is again forced upon us, I earnestly hope a way may be found which will unify our individual and collective strength and consecrate all America, materially and spiritually, body and soul, to national defense. I can vision the ideal republic, where every man and woman is called under the flag for assignment to duty for whatever service, military or civic, the individual is best fitted; where we may call to universal service every plant, agency, or facility, all in the sublime sacrifice for country, and not one penny of war profit shall inure to the benefit of private individual, corporation, or combination, but all above the normal shall flow into the defense chest of the Nation. There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord with the ideals of representative democracy, when one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war while another is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for national preservation.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, I submit that the principle contained in House Joint Resolution 400 is as sound and as unassailable as the axiomatic principles contained in the Declaration of Independence. How can it be said that the only persons morally bound to make sacrifices on a large scale in time of war, to sacrifice health, to sacrifice body, to sacrifice life itself are the young and vigorous men who take up arms and follow the flag? Why should our country, the first great modern democracy, demand one citizen to give up his life in time of war and at the same time bestow vast wealth upon another citizen as profits upon war supplies bought by the Government? If our Nation should suffer a defeat at war—a thing well-nigh unthinkable—all investments, all capital would be very largely wiped out. Reparations are paid out of property and not measured in human blood. Therefore, there is the selfish motive for the holders of vast accumulated wealth to furnish the sinews of war, while the masses of humanity furnish the soldiers.

It seems hardly necessary to argue the proposals contained in this resolution. In fact, remembering the fine and unselfish spirit of patriotism which moved and inspired our civil population during the World War, I conclude that if they had been called upon to make voluntary donations to carry on the war we would not have lacked for material and supplies. Men too young to be drafted, men too frail to be accepted as volunteers, and men too old to bear arms saw with tear-stained eyes the boys marching out to the transports to go over to defend and to

save liberty, justice, freedom, and democracy, would gladly have given a fractional part of their wealth to have been parties by proxy in that heroic crusade. And certainly when we now propose that there shall be equity and fairness and justice in the draft upon the resources of the different industries and individuals we conclude that no man will raise his voice in opposition to the adoption of the plan.

The man power making up the Army must itself fight out the war now and can not postpone and shift the fighting duty to subsequent generations. Then why could it be urged that the nonmilitary part of the population should have their obligation to contribute the material to make war postponed, as represented by bonds, to be paid with interest by later generations? The adoption of this method of universal mobilization will be evidence of America's devotion to the ideals of democracy and of her faith in the justice and permanency of republican institutions. We will no longer see the choice and selected young men, found to be physically and mentally superior, serving in the Army at a dollar a day while those who have been rejected as physically or mentally unfit or, worse still, while the dodgers and yellow backs are earning from five to ten dollars a day digging ditches, building ships and shacks, constructing roads, and performing other kinds of unskilled labor.

The adoption of such a policy of military preparedness will remove the motive for jingo propaganda; it will also notify industry to get ready for a change to war needs, and such change can be made with less shock and jar. Furthermore, to conduct a war on this principle of universal service and universal contribution to the common cause will prevent the feeling that injustice has been done because some have contributed more than their share, as measured by the profits that others made and the security that others enjoyed in the defense of those principles of national life that are dearer to the American people than life itself. When the feeling of resentment arising from injustice no longer prevails, then we may confidently hope for internal peace and social solidarity. The only safe and abiding foundation for any government, and especially a government that rests upon the consent of the people, as does ours, is justice. And by that I mean something approaching moral justice. I do not mean justice in the sense in which it is used in the courthouse when the criminal is being tried according to the law as already written; I mean justice as it should abide in the breast of the lawmaker who searches and seeks to know what the law should be.

I am personally grateful that the President, in his message delivered to the Congress on December 8, 1922, asks us to give this principle of drafting the resources of the Republic, both human and material, for national defense our approval, and I hope it will receive our speedy approval. I think the reasons assigned by the President are ample, but I cite the fact that the American Legion, at its annual convention at New Orleans in October, 1922, unanimously adopted the report of its military affairs committee approving this principle of war duty. I think the war power as it now exists in the Constitution is sufficient. The adoption of this legislation now would be conditional upon the subsequent declaration of war by Congress. The President could not exercise the power of mobilization until war shall have been declared by Congress. The war power is full and complete. In time of war this Nation may do all that any sovereign may do to prosecute war, especially where the Constitution itself expressly forbids the conduct of war in a given manner. The Constitution does not forbid Congress to exercise the power now in question. However, if I am wrong about this, then I am for a constitutional amendment; and I believe the people are for such a constitutional amendment, and I can not believe that any substantial number of persons will resist the adoption of such a measure so manifestly just, so long as 4,000,000 men still live who were called upon to make the great sacrifice of time and effort, and many of them of blood and 70,000 of them of life, while, on the contrary, thousands and hundreds of thousands remained in security, bought with the soldiers' blood, and piled up such profits as they had never dreamed of, even in the wildest moments.

The joint resolution which I propose merely lays down a broad proposition undoubtedly sound. In order that there may be no snap judgment and no lack of many-sided considerations, I propose that we call to the council table 12 men who ought to know more about the Nation's needs in times of war than any other 12 men.

Three of them will represent the nonofficial and civilian point of view. In fact, all of them will represent the interests and feeling of the people themselves. The four Members of the House of Representatives have come fresh from an election by the people. This may also be true of the Senators who will serve. The three members of the Cabinet have rendered conspicuous public service, two of them in Congress, two of them in war, and one of them as the most conspicuous administrator of relief to suffering humanity that history yet records. Then the President is asked to choose three persons from nonofficial life to represent by their experiences and vocations and sympathy those interests which we ordinarily describe briefly as labor, industry, and capital. When their conclusions are laid before Congress, then the 531 Members of the House and Senate will give it very close scrutiny before it is enacted into law. Therefore we may have confidence that no half-baked and immature notions will be enacted into law. But when the principles contained in this joint resolution shall have finally found their way to the statute books a new day will have dawned in the history of this American people. Just as the Declaration of Independence was epoch making, not only for America but for the world, so this measure of military duty will make its way into the minds and hearts and upon the law books of the other civilized nations. As America has ever lead in the march toward human justice in government so we confidently hope and reverently pray that she may renew, by the adoption of this principle of war service, her commitment to the everlasting principles of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the original Bursum bill contained a provision that veterans of the Indian wars and of the Ranger Service in the West should have their pensions raised from $20 to $30. As that bill came back to us this morning it did not contain that provision, and had been changed in many other material respects from its text when the House passed the measure. There were fundamental differences. Now when it comes back from conference, if it is in the same fix, a man who might support the conference report might have been against the provisions of the original bill and vice versa. I just mention this to show that a vote for a conference report upon a bill in many instances is not a support of the original measure, because many things may intervene, many new questions may arise. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] spoke of amending the Esch railroad bill in one vital particular. That reminds me of the vote on the conference report on the Esch bill.

A vote for the conference report was not necessarily in support of the Esch bill. I mention this because in my district in the recent campaign my several opponents went around the district stating that I had supported the Esch bill, because I supported the conference report in final action thereon. Now, let me mention the real facts concerning the matter. That bill came up for passage in the House on November 17, 1919. Four days before that I gave to the press a statement protesting against the provisions of that bill, and here is the statement:

WARNING TO THE PEOPLE—THE ESCH RAILROAD BILL IS PREPOSTEROUS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *November 14, 1919.*

From the people's standpoint, the proposed Esch railroad bill is ridiculously preposterous. It is but another call upon the people to make additional sacrifices to the molochs of railroad corporations and autocratic labor unions. Half of the bill has been drawn by railroad attorneys, and the remainder has been framed by the big attorneys for railroad employees. The American people have been left out and forgotten. Their rights are ignored. Congress again is asked to sidestep and truckle. The public has in it no guaranty or even promise against continued tie-ups of public business and Government industries.

To pay the railroads the sums asked is outrageous. To continue the $1,300,000,000 increases in salaries granted by the Government to railroad employees during the war, under threats of strikes, means the continuation of present unconscionable freight and passenger tariffs, which precludes passengers from riding trains and producers from shipping farm and ranch products to market.

The proposed Railway Labor Adjustment Board, of thirty-odd members, will prove as inefficacious and impotent and as fully dominated by American Federation of Labor influence as the present Board of Mediation and Conciliation, and promises nothing but additional expense to the people.

Likewise, the proposed railway board of labor appeals, with its nine members drawing $10,000 each per year from the Government, will accomplish nothing but added expense to the people.

Does any sane person imagine that unions will pay any attention to the decisions of these boards when same are mere recommendations with no teeth to enforce decrees?

God only knows what is to become of this Republic unless the people demand of their representatives that their rights be protected. The railroads must be returned to their owners immediately if we keep our Nation out of bankruptcy. The 110,000,000 people must speak and demand proper action by Congress.

THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Representative Seventeenth Texas District.

When the bill came up for passage in the House on November 17, 1919, the vote shows, on page 9181 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I voted against the Esch railroad bill, but it passed by the vote of yeas 208, nays 160. Then what intervened? The bill went to the Senate. Then it went to conference. Several months elapsed. During that interim there arose a substitute plan known as the Plumb plan, a pernicious plan of

Government ownership; and as much as I opposed the provisions of the Esch railroad bill, I just that much more opposed the provisions of the proposed Plumb plan, which meant Government ownership at a greater cost to the people, which beyond doubt led to bankruptcy.

If there is any one single lesson that the World War taught the people of America it is that the American people do not want Government ownership of railroads. It would bankrupt this country in a very short time. If it had not been for the fact that we returned those railroads to their owners the country would have been bankrupted. That was the only thing that saved this country from bankruptcy.

When the bill came to conference it was a question with the conferees whether they should stand by the Esch bill or accept the alternative of Government ownership under the pernicious Plumb plan. While the Esch bill would cost the American people millions of dollars, the proposed pernicious Plumb plan would have cost the American people billions of dollars. It was just that much worse than the Esch bill. Of course, a man, when he had just two alternatives, when he had just two roads to go in, one leading down the pathway of the Esch bill, the other down the pathway of the Plumb plan, has to make his choice, and I was one of those who accepted the lesser of the two evils and supported the conference report on the Esch bill in preference to accepting the ruinous Plumb plan.

I was paired on it. My opponents, who contested my seat in Texas, asked the question during the campaign: "Where was BLANTON? He ought to have been here. He was paired." Why, I was fighting that very Plumb plan proposition. I went to the State of Massachusetts and made a speech against this very Plumb plan and had a telegram sent from Massachusetts, signed by 100 leading business men of that State, denouncing the Plumb plan. That is where I was on that day, and because I was paired in favor of that conference report my friends in Texas, after my seat, said that I had deserted the Democrats and had gone over to the Republicans in pairing in favor of the conference report.

Now, let us see if I deserted the Democrats and whether I went over to the Republicans. That vote on that conference report came up on February 21, 1920. Let us see who was voting "yea" with me for the conference report, as against the Plumb plan in the way that I was paired. I find the distinguished leader of the minority, the present leader of the Democratic Party in this House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], voting as I did. I find our late friend, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Saunders], who was the chairman, when he left us, of the Democratic caucus, voting as I did on the proposition. I find our late colleague, whom we all loved, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], who succeeded Mr. Saunders as chairman of the Democratic caucus here in the House of Representatives, voting "yea" for the conference report as I did. I find the present chairman of the Democratic caucus [Mr. RAYBURN] voting "yea" as I did. I find voting as I did such distinguished Democrats as our good friend Governor MONTAGUE and another distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and another distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODS]; and I find voting the same way such distinguished Democrats from North Carolina as Mr. POU and Mr. SMALL, and such other distinguished Democrats as Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BLACK, and the late lamented Lucian Parrish from Texas, our good Democratic friends from Georgia, Mr. CRISP and Mr. UPSHAW, and various others whose Democracy can not be questioned. Yet it was asserted that I had bolted the Democratic Party and gone over to the Republicans.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I was very glad to hear the gentleman a few minutes ago express himself against Government ownership of railroads. I would like to ask him this question.

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It is just a short question. Do you think it is good policy to have the Government attempt to fix the wages and working conditions of two million men employed in a private industry?

Mr. BLANTON. It is rather strange on this question for me to find myself in accord with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], but I am with him on the proposition of establishing a proper industrial court for this Nation, such as they have done in the State of Kansas.

It was asserted that when I voted for the conference report on the Esch bill, which stopped that Plumb plan of Government ownership, that I was voting against the railroad laborers of the land. I understand that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], than whom there is not in this House or in this land a finer gentleman or a better or more loyal friend to railroad labor and every other kind of labor—I notice that he, too, would not follow Government ownership, Plumb plan, and I find myself voting with him in favor of that conference report and against Government ownership, which meant nothing in the world but bankruptcy for this Nation.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I believe that the gentleman from Texas will realize that there is a vast difference between an industrial law that will cover a State and an industrial law that will cover a nation, making its decisions national in scope.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I would not go back to the old strike conditions. The gentleman spoke of the Board of Conciliation and Mediation. Under that kind of a board, which you had in the Department of Labor during the war period, just during the war, from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, you had 6,000 strikes in this Nation.

I am with the President in his statement the other day that in time of war, if we have the right to take your boy and send him to France to fight the enemy where he may lose his life and not come back, so also we have the right to say to every man who remains, "Go and work for the Government in war time. Go work if you will not fight. Fight or work. You have got to do one of those two things." [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have not said anything since the Congress reassembled in extraordinary session. I have been reflecting on the things that have come to pass. The President of the United States came here and said a few kind words for the farmers and the laboring people of the United States. As I sat back there in one of those seats and listened to him I wondered if it was the same President Harding who advocated the iniquitous measure to take the surtaxes off of the rich. I wondered if it was the same President Harding that encouraged and approved the outrageous Fordney tariff law. I wondered if it was the same President Harding who came before this Congress after such a walloping on the 7th of November as the Republicans had not had in years, asking the American Congress to give a subsidy for ships and to exempt from taxation the wealth invested in ships, to take out of the pockets of the American people $150,000,000 and hand it over into the coffers of the shipowners. I wondered if it was the same President Harding who vetoed the soldiers' bonus or adjusted compensation for the ex-service men who went out and offered themselves as a sacrifice for their country in time of peril. I wondered if it was the same President Harding who appointed the Railway Labor Board that handed down decisions against the poor fellows who operate the trains and repair the cars and locomotives and the tracks. I wondered if it was the same President Harding who appointed a well-known railway lawyer from the State of Minnesota to the vacancy on the Supreme Bench of the United States, a man whose mind is so warped after all these many years' service for the combinations of railroads that he can not see anything for the laboring man or the common pepole of the United States. Yet I thank President Harding for his kind words. I thought maybe he would change his mind and put on the Federal Reserve Board a man who stands for the farmer, a real farmer who would not let the finances of the farmers be juggled for the benefit of the great manipulators of wealth in this country against the actual producers of that wealth. Yet in that same message he met himself coming back. He said we must amend the Constitution of the United States so as to prevent the farmers from securing the money to build consolidated schools and to build good roads over which to haul their products to market. He favored the monstrous proposition of taking away from the States of this Republic the right to control their purse strings.

He proposed an amendment to the Constitution to lay the strong arm of taxation upon the bonds that are issued by the States, the municipalities, and counties and subdivisions thereof. Is it possible for good roads to be built in any farming district of the United States without the sale of bonds? Is it possible for them to build consolidated schools and equip them and employ teachers without the issuance of bonds? Is it possible for the small municipalities, or, for that matter, even for the great cities of this Republic, to make the necessary improvements of modern civilization without the issuance of bonds? Every man understands the law of taxation. When-

ever you place a tax upon a bond that is to be issued that tax must be borne by the taxpayers. If that bond now sells on the market for 5 per cent interest, and you allow the taxing power to reach that bond, that same farmer will be bound to pay 8 or 10 per cent interest on the bonds to build his roads and his schools. Every municipality in this Republic will be bound to pay that higher interest rate for its bonds in order to pay for a few municipal and city improvements. Yet that proposition comes after $11,000,000,000 of securities of that kind are already in the vaults of the rich. Those securities could not be touched, because this amendment could not be ex post facto in its effect and reach back to the securities already issued. So the increase in the value of these $11,000,000,000 worth of bonds already issued would amount to $6,000,000,000 in addition. Yet that proposition is brought here in the same breath with the honeyed words for the farmer and the poor laboring people. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] a moment ago seemed to indorse this other man from Kansas, our friend TINCHER, who wants to go out and establish a court to grab the workingmen by the neck and force them to compulsory arbitration or throw them into the hoosegow. It is plain that the administration does not propose to live up to those kind words that we heard fall here, because in the very same message here is this other proposition to cut out from under the farmer his prop and let him do without schools and do without good roads unless in the future he is willing to pay twice as much as he now pays for those wholesome benefits. The President even suggested that freight should be taxed on the good roads, so as not to be a competitor, in fact, with railroads. What did he offer to reduce the transportation charges?

With all that before us we have this same administration marching over to the other end of the Capitol and endeavoring to pass the ship subsidy bill, not by the votes of men who will be in the next House of Representatives and in the next United States Senate after the 4th of March, 1923, but to pass it by votes of gentlemen who were repudiated at the polls by the people who marched up to the ballot box with their majestic tread on the 7th day of November last. [Applause.]

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, at the bottom of page 31 in this appropriation bill there is a provision to appropriate $500,000 for the investigation of war frauds; and beginning at the bottom of page 37 of this bill is another provision appropriating $850,000 for the pay of attorneys in investigating war frauds. We all remember that at the last session of Congress we appropriated $500,000 for the investigation of war frauds. Here comes the Department of Justice, at the instance of the Attorney General, asking for $500,000 more for investigation and $850,000 more for attorneys. When these amounts shall have been appropriated there will have been appropriated in less than one year over $1,850,000 of the people's money for the use of General Daugherty and the Attorney General's Office in order to prosecute war grafters and to recover the money that they stole during the war. And, yet, when anyone makes any criticism of the present Attorney General or his administration he comes back on the one hand with a pitiful denial, and in addition to that an accusation that everybody who criticizes him is undertaking to protect the war grafters who created the frauds during the war. Why, I remember—and so do you—when those investigating committees were appointed, when you came into power in the Sixty-sixth Congress, when you spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money in investigating the activities of the war under the Democratic administration; and when those investigating committees finally reported the majority members said there was plenty of evidence to send men to the penitentiary, that there was plenty of evidence that millions of dollars had been grafted, but that the then Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, would not investigate and would not prosecute these war grafters, but just to wait until the administration of President Harding and his great Attorney General, Mr. Daugherty, came into power, and they would send all the grafters to the penitentiary and sue them for the millions of money that they had grafted.

You have been in power over two years, and your Attorney General never would have come to Congress last session and asked for a $500,000 appropriation had it not been that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], two Republicans, gave notice on the floor that if he did not prosecute these war grafters and sue these people he would be impeached, and that alone brought him to Congress asking for $500,000 of the people's money. Now here he is asking for $500,000 more for investigation and $850,000 more for attorneys to give more faithful Republicans and lawyers jobs.

Mr. HUSTED. Oh, the gentleman is in error about that; that is not so. There is absolutely no increase for the attorneys.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What is this proposition on page 37?

For assistants to the Attorney General and to the United States district attorneys employed by the Attorney General to aid in special cases—

And so forth—

Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

What is he going to do with that? You already have 30 Assistant Attorneys General on the pay roll under the $500,000 last year. You have 9 attorneys drawing $10,000 a year.

Mr. HUSTED. These men are used in other cases.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I will refer the gentleman to page 128 of the hearings, where it says that 9 attorneys are drawing $10,000 each, 1 attorney at $7,500, 2 attorneys $7,200 each, 1 attorney $7,000, 2 attorneys at $6,000, 3 attorneys at $5,000 each, 4 attorneys at $4,000 each, 1 attorney at $3,500, 1 attorney at $3,250, 5 attorneys at $3,000 each, and 1 attorney at $2,500; a total of $186,150. You are paying that amount for special attorneys out of the $500,000 appropriation passed last session of Congress.

Mr. HUSTED. I think the gentleman is laboring under an error.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I know I am not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the Attorney General would not have come to Congress asking for a dollar if he had not been threatened with impeachment. The representatives of the Department of Justice appeared before the Appropriations Committee May 14, 1921, two months after Daugherty went into power and advised that the investigation of the cantonments was still going on with only 30 men engaged in the work. It says: "They figure that it is now drawing to a close." That was two months after Daugherty had gone in. His representatives came before the Appropriations Committee and said that the investigation of the cantonments was drawing to a close. Of course, the Attorney General was fixing to quit. I do not say this because the Attorney General is a Republican. I say it because there are grafters in the country that made millions during the war when our boys were baring their breasts to the bayonets, and they were robbing this Government, and I do not care whether the grafter was a Republican or a Democrat he ought to be punished to the fullest extent of the law. [Applause.] But you know as well as I do that the Attorney General is not doing it, but he is expending $500,000 of the people's money and he has put but one man in the penitentiary, and collected practically nothing, if anything, from any war grafter.

They make the complaint that Palmer did not do it. I bear no brief for Palmer, but I am going to show what he did do, and he did more than his duty. Up to May 10, 1919, he, with the intelligence division of the War Department, investigated 10,058 cases. Five hundred and seven were arrested and 196 were convicted, and up to June 16, 1919, he collected $600,000 from war grafters. According to the Attorney General's report in 1920, 6,032 cases were investigated. There were 435 convictions in that year. In 1921, with eight months of Palmer and four months of Daugherty, there were 146 men convicted and $63,548 recovered.

Under Palmer, since the war and until he went out, there were 777 men convicted. Now, how many under the two years of Daugherty? As I say, if you criticize him you are either a liar or in collusion with the war grafters. That is what Daugherty says in his feeble answer to the charge of impeachment. Crime is running rampant all over the country now and he does not enforce the law.

The point I am making, the pathetic thing about it, is that the man at the head of this great Department of Justice of the United States of America, having under his control United States district attorneys, having 30 special assistant attorneys drawing $186,150 a year salaries, asks for $1,800,000 of the hard cash out of the Treasury in order to help him investigate, and he has sat around for two long years and has not recovered a dollar from the war grafters and has put only one man in the penitentiary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Chairman, the joint resolution which I have introduced providing that arrangement shall be made for a bugler to sound taps in the American military cemeteries in France reads thus:

Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to detail buglers to American military cemeteries in France in which are buried American soldiers who died in the service during the late war with Germany.

Whereas during the late war with Germany many thousands of American soldiers lost their lives in defense of their country; and

Whereas thousands of these soldiers are buried in what are known as American cemeteries in France; and

Whereas the memory and service of these fallen heroes for the Government of the United States should for all time be perpetuated: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to detail from the musicians in the Regular Army of the United States, through military channels, such buglers as may be required to perform the duties usually performed by such musicians at Regular Army posts, to serve at each American military cemetery in France. It shall be the duty of such buglers so detailed at evening of each day in the year to sound the call of taps over the graves of American soldiers in the cemeteries aforesaid. The said buglers shall receive pay for foreign service.

In the press recently it was stated that an American firm had constructed a candle 6 feet in circumference at the base, and of a considerable height which, it was intended, would be placed in a certain church in Italy in order to perpetuate the memory of Enrico Caruso. It was purposed that the candle should be lighted and burned on All Souls Day for 24 hours in each year, and it was estimated that so burned the candle would last for 1,800 years.

Caruso possessed the greatest tenor voice known to history, and therefore the reason for keeping his memory alive, as also in addition the religious significance of the ceremonial act.

In a few American military cemeteries in France lie sleeping 60,000—a mighty host—of our illustrious dead. Far from home and native land, these gallant soldiers who laid down their lives for their country await the resurrection morning. They are widely separated from friends and relatives. Only a few of the latter—and these at great intervals of time—will ever be privileged to visit their resting place.

It has seemed to me fitting that our Government, acting through the Department of War, at evening of every day that is to follow, in each of the great military cemeteries where these soldiers lie buried, should provide a bugler, whose duty it would be to sound "Taps."

In the joy of spring when the vernal breezes are blowing over their graves, in the gladness of summer when they are carpeted in living green, in the sadness of autumn when the turf upon them is dying, and in the gloom of winter when they are mantled with the deep snow, let the clear, beautiful, and hopeful notes of the bugle at evening be sent out over the great dead, just to relieve their loneliness and to remind them that they are not forgotten.

An author has said that there are few musical compositions held in deeper reverence than the bugle call known as the sounding of taps, when the day's work is done. The words written for the music are full of tenderness and sweetness. Allow me to repeat them:

Blow, bugles, blow—soft, and sweet and low,
Blow a "lights out" call for those who bravely faced the foe;
Taps will tell of truce to pain,
When they sleep nor wake again,
'Neath the sunshine or the rain,
Blow softly, bugles blow!

[Applause.]

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there were 100,000 dead remaining in France? I think he must be mistaken, as a vast number have been brought back.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. There were 125,000 or 130,000 deaths; how many have been brought back I do not know.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. There are only about 60,000 dead left over there now.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to enter into the discussion of the merits or demerits of the proposed constitutional amendment on this question of exemption from taxation. It is a question that is being agitated a great deal, and I think it is a good thing always to have the real proposal considered by the public and not some imaginary proposal. Those who are insisting upon cutting out what they claim is an abuse of tax exemption, both by the States, municipalities, and by the Federal Government, at the time center their drive and use as their chief illustration two issues—one of United States bonds and the other of bonds of the Federal land bank system. Now, the press has carried to the country an intimation that this administration, through the President, has recommended, and that the Ways and Means Committee of the House has reported, a resolution that will cure the evils of which complaint is made, will give the relief desired and which these advocates want. I say I shall not discuss the merits of the amendment but point out what the proposed amendment does, whether it be wise or unwise. I have before me House Joint Resolution 314, introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], and it reads:

SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States; but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of such State.

Gentlemen, even if the amendment be ratified by the requisite number of States, and I doubt it will be, it will not touch the alleged evil of which a great many of those advocating it are now complaining. The thing that these people are complaining of, if it is an evil as they allege—understand, I am not discussing the merits—does not require any constitutional amendment to remedy it.

For illustration: The issuance of securities by the United States Government now can be regulated by Congress, and in some instances the income is made subject to taxation. This Congress, if it thinks it wise and wants to do it, can take away from bonds issued at the time it provides for the issue an exemption from taxation. It can do that. Congress at the time it authorized the issuance of joint-stock land bank bonds and Federal land bank bonds could, if it wished, have made them subject to taxation. The thing that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON] complained of—and that is the reason I take the floor—is that, as he was saying, you did not propose to correct the evil that is complained of, but all on earth that you propose to do, as intimated by the President's message, is to do that which I do not believe you can get a majority of the Republican side of the House to vote for when they understand it, and even if you submitted it you could not get a dozen States of the Union to ratify it, and that is to give to the Congress of the United States the power to tax out of existence the States, cities, and school districts of this Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLINE] a few minutes ago asked unanimous consent to revise the RECORD of to-day's proceedings by eliminating his name from a certain document read into the RECORD. No point of order was made when the Chair put the unanimous-consent request, which was granted. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from New York that these proceedings are a part of the proceedings of the House, and that the House alone has control over its RECORDS and Journals, and if it is to be effective it will have to be repeated when the House is in session. It is likely, and more than likely, that the consent of this committee would not be sufficient.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

Salaries: For Secretary of State, $12,000; Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, $7,500; Assistant Secretary, $5,000; Second and Third Assistant Secretaries, at $4,500 each; Director of the Consular Service, $4,500; officers to aid in important drafting work—8 at $4,500 each, 5 at $4,000 each, 15 at $3,500 each, 15 at $3,000 each, 17 at $2,500 each, to be appointed by the Secretary, any one of whom may be employed as chief or assistant chief of division or as chief of bureau, or upon other work in connection with the foreign relations; assistant solicitors of the department, to be appointed by the Secretary—1 $4,500 (who shall also represent the interests of the United States in all matters or investigations before the International Joint Commission created by the treaty of January 11, 1909, between the United States and Great Britain), 5 at $3,000 each, 2 at $2,500 each; chief clerk, who shall sign such official papers and documents as the Secretary may direct, $3,000; law clerks—1 $2,500, 2 at $2,250 each, 3 at $2,000 each; law clerk and assistant, to be selected by the Secretary to edit the laws of Congress and perform such other duties as may be required of them, at $2,500 and $1,500, respectively; 2 translators, at $2,100 each; private secretary to the Secretary, $2,500; private secretary to the Undersecretary, $2,000; clerk to the Secretary, $1,800; clerks—27 of class 4, 30 of class 3, 40 of class 2, 63 of class 1 (3 of whom shall be telegraph operators), 40 at $1,000 each, 10 at $900 each; lithographer, $1,400; chief messenger, $1,000; 8 messengers at $840 each; 27 assistant messengers at $720 each, 4 messenger boys at $420 each; packer, $720; 7 laborers at $660 each; 4 telephone switchboard operators at $720 each; chauffeur, $1,080; in all, $605,740.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on all of the paragraph, and I now make a point of order on that portion of the paragraph beginning on line 3 of page 2 and ending on line 5 which provides for an Undersecretary of State, to be appointed by the President, carrying a salary of $7,500

a year. I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill that is unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves a point of order on the matter indicated.

Mr. HUSTED. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I make it as to the Undersecretary—the salary.

Mr. HUSTED. The paragraph is unauthorized by law, but I think it is a great mistake to make the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the gentleman think that the time has come when we must cease creating new offices, and rather than do that, is it not better that we take out some of those whom we have here who are surplus? I think the position referred to is surplus.

Mr. HUSTED. I think the salaries provided in the bill are reasonable. You will find that the estimates of the Secretary of State are the closest of any of the departments. That is the opinion of General Lord. They have been cut down. I do not think they have asked for anything unreasonable.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call attention to the fact that we are giving the Secretary of State an Assistant Secretary at $5,000, and a Second and Third Assistant Secretary at $4,500 each, and then we are proposing to create this new Undersecretary.

Mr. HUSTED. That was carried in the bill last year.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but it was a provision which I objected to at that time, and others objected to it. But it was brought in under a rule, if I remember correctly.

Mr. HUSTED. No; it was carried in the bill, and the gentleman from Texas made no objection to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, I did, and——

Mr. HUSTED. If the gentleman did, he withdrew it.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it ought to be stopped, Mr. Chairman, and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas insists on his point of order as to the Undersecretary of State, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BLANTON. Further, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York, under the reservation of the point of order, how many new positions are there among the solicitors of this department provided for in this bill? I direct the attention of the Chairman to lines 14 and 15. How many new assistant solicitors are allowed under this bill that are not authorized by law?

Mr. HUSTED. None.

Mr. BLANTON. None?

Mr. HUSTED. No.

Mr. BLANTON. All of these are allowed by law?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the reservation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, to conclude what I was discussing a moment ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the discussion I was making on House Joint Resolution 314, on the question of exemption from taxation. I repeat I am not discussing the merits of the complaint against tax-exempt bonds, but I said this resolution will not meet the demands of the people who are back of this clamor to stop the issuance of tax-exempt securities.

Congress now has the power, if it deems it wise, to-day to provide taxation of these securities in every manner they wish except one. What is that? The issuance by the States themselves of their securities and exempting them from taxation. I repeat the statement I made awhile ago: Whether it be wise or unwise, I venture the assertion that when you face the bald proposition that you will amend the Constitution of the United States so that Congress can tax the bonds issued by the sovereign State of Illinois or the sovereign State of New York—that is, the income from these bonds—or that the Congress of the United States can tax the income on bonds issued for the erection of a schoolhouse in Iowa by a school district, those bonds to be retired by taxes levied by the people themselves on their own property in their districts; I say when you face that proposition I do not believe you will get a dozen thoughtful, level-headed Republicans, much less Democrats, to invade the local rights to that extent. And if you did do it, gentlemen, do you think you are going to get the requisite number of States to permit the Congress of the United States, the tax-levying agency of the Federal Government, to have unlimited exercise of the taxing power, which, as has been well said time and time again, is the power to destroy? I say, do you believe you are going to get the legislatures of the requisite number of States to make that step in surrendering the rights of States and municipalities to a centrally organized power at the seat of the Federal Government?

Now, my object in calling attention to that is this: If it be wise to stop the issuance of so many tax-exempt securities, do not meet that demand with an evasive proposition like this. If this administration and this Congress think it is wise to stop the issuance of tax-free securities, then the example for us to set, when we authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue United States bonds, is to say that we will make the income from them subject to taxation. But, gentlemen, you are not going to do that. So why try to deceive anybody? Why try to deceive these people who are advocating this? You have not advocated that. Of course, the advocacy of it by some people indicates that they are either totally ignorant of the philosophy of our dual system of Government, or else that they have a perfect contempt for our institutions and wish to overthrow them and set up instead a Government totally different from that which was founded by the fathers. If you want to start correcting this alleged evil, why did this Congress during its life in some instances grant tax exemption to private corporations when engaged in foreign business? If you are sincere in saying to the country through your President and through your support of this that you are going to stop this great evil, why did you the other day, when you passed the ship subsidy bill, grant as one of the special privileges of that bill exemption from taxation to the shipowners? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. That is the trouble with the country at this hour and that is the trouble with its viewpoint of Congress. You may give different reasons for the conduct of the electorate in the last two elections, apparently contradictory. I will tell you the one thing that is deeply rooted in the minds of the electorate of this country is the fear that we are planning in this body for the success of one side or the other in this House, that we are not thinking about the philosophy of government but thinking about the expediency of political campaign issues and what is going to get votes and what is not. So I insist that the Ways and Means Committee, a committee that has borne a reputation for considering public matters carefully and sincerely, shall bring in a bill which will repeal some of the Federal exemptions you have already granted and authorized for the future, if you are going to try to stop the issuance of tax-free securities, instead of coming in here saying that you are going to meet that difficulty by giving Congress the power to levy a tax upon States and municipalities and school districts that, as the President said, are improvident. I am sorry he said it. I am sorry he said that he thought the Federal Government could thereby check what he believes to be improvident expenditure by the States and municipalities. Have not Congress and the Federal Government all they can do in handling the problems of the Federal Government without attempting to be a supergovernment and to tell the States and municipalities and counties and school districts when and how they shall raise their revenues to be spent for their own local improvements? I am sorry the President of the United States ever gave such a reason for this kind of legislation in his utterances here the other day. If it is right, let us right it along the lines along which the greatest abuses are complained of and of which the Federal Government already has power. If municipalities overissue securities, the fault lies with the people in the community that is going to be taxed, and my observation has been that the taxpayers of every municipality, county, and State are pretty jealous of the proposition of issuing bonds; and I believe the reaction has started the other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUSTED: Page 2, line 3, after the amount, "$12,000," insert: "Counselor for the Department, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, $7,500."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill that is unauthorized by law. I will state to the Chair that all of these positions in paragraph 1 are statutory positions. They

are positions which have been created by substantive law; and to attempt to place in this paragraph any position that is not authorized in the statute is in effect substantive legislation. The chairman will not deny that. He knows that to be the fact.

Mr. HUSTED. The gentleman is incorrect, simply because he is not advised as to the facts. The point of order which the gentleman made at an earlier stage of the proceedings was good as against the change of title from counselor to Undersecretary. The State Department for some reason preferred to have the office called Undersecretary of State instead of having it called counselor for the department, as being a little more in conformity with diplomatic usage. But the legislative act of March 4, 1915, has this provision:

SEC. 6. The officers and employees of the United States whose salaries are herein appropriated are hereby established and shall continue from year to year to the extent they shall be appropriated for by Congress.

And then in the Department of State appropriation bill is the provision for the counselor for the department, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, $7,500.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I happened to be on the conference committee at the time the title was changed from counselor to Undersecretary of State. It was done by a Senate amendment and agreed to by the House, and my impression was that that change was made permanent law. Has the gentleman looked that up on the appropriation bill?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was under the impression that it was permanent law.

Mr. HUSTED. The title was not made permanent law.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I was trying to get the gentleman to see was this: That one of the solicitors provided for in this paragraph takes the place of this counselor. In other words, you have a man filling the position of counselor under this bill.

Mr. HUSTED. No; the gentleman is quite mistaken. The office of Undersecretary of State is exactly the same office formerly held by the counselor for the State Department, and the counselor for the State Department was really the first man under the Secretary of State.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman hold that if this bill contains this appropriation for this Undersecretary, it does not contain more offices than are provided for by the act of 1915?

Mr. HUSTED. No more; no.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I admit that there is law for this position.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is statute law for the position of counselor for the State Department. When the war came on counselors got to hobnobbing with European diplomats, and because the European functionaries who performed duties similar to those of counselor under our system were called Undersecretaries of State they came around to the committees of Congress and insisted on the importance of the title being changed from counselor to Undersecretary of State. I made a point of order against the change in the title, but when the bill got over to the Senate the provision always went back in as "Undersecretary." But the duties of Undersecretary of State and that of the counselor are supposed to be identical. The Undersecretary has a little more entrée to the afternoon teas, and he has another ribbon on his shirt front after dinner when he goes to the reception, and in view of the importance of such things it has been futile to oppose the change of title. The duties are exactly the same, except that the Undersecretary is announced in a little louder tone of voice by the taxi callers when they call the carriages after the reception. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas withdraw his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For temporary employees in the Department of State, $260,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $2,500 per annum and not more than eight persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from New York a question. Are these lump-sum appropriations going to be continued with reference to the State Department?

Mr. HUSTED. I think they are very likely to be continued for some time.

Mr. GARNER. Why does not the Appropriations Committee take up the matter and appropriate as they do in other parts of the bill? It looks to me as if you could classify these clerks, give them the salary that the Appropriations Committee deems they ought to have, but instead of that you give them a lump sum and then limit them in the amount of the salary.

Mr. HUSTED. The object of retaining it in the present form is this: We hope to be able to get it down a little further before we make a general classification. We think it is a little better for Congress to know how many of these clerks are in the so-called temporary employment and how much they are paid.

Mr. GARNER. I call attention to it because there are so many lump-sum appropriations, and we hear the statement made in reference to every bill that the committee hopes to do away with it at the next session of Congress. It seems to me that the committee ought to attempt to figure out the number necessary and make the appropriations.

Mr. HUSTED. We have reduced them this year.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. It does not appear that there is any reduction in the bill. Two hundred and sixty thousand dollars—is not that the sum we appropriated last year?

Mr. HUSTED. There is a reduction in the total number of temporary employees, but perhaps not in this particular item.

Mr. GARNER. Wherever the salaries are the largest we make no reduction; if you have small salaries, then we make a reduction.

Mr. HUSTED. In this item we provide that not more than eight persons shall be paid in excess of $1,800, and none shall be paid at a rate of compensation greater than $2,500. So you can not pay any big salaries out of that appropriation.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. If I understand the gentleman, he stated that the appropriations might be made in this way among the employees—confessing my ignorance, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee how many clerks are employed?

Mr. HUSTED. There are 5 clerks employed at a salary of $2,000, 187 at a salary ranging from $900 to $1,800, and 216 at a salary of $300 to $400.

Mr. SEARS. That statement is in the hearings and not in the bill. Members would have to go to the hearings to settle that.

Mr. HUSTED. As a matter of fact, the lump sum was imposed by the Appropriations Committee. They wanted it kept that way because they thought they could watch it better and be more apt to get some reduction.

Mr. GARNER. That is one more mistake that Congress made, probably.

Mr. HUSTED. It may be so.

The Clerk read as follows:

PASSPORT BUREAUS.

For salaries and expenses of maintenance, including rent outside the District of Columbia, of passport bureaus at New York City, N. Y.; San Francisco, Calif.; Chicago, Ill.; Seattle, Wash.; and New Orleans, La., $54,250.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Did the committee examine into the necessity for maintaining this bureau at Chicago, or did they have any hearings on that or go into it in any way? As I recall, that was added in the Senate.

Mr. HUSTED. We carried it here.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What is the necessity for maintaining it? Is travel so heavy to Canada that it is necessary to keep a passport bureau there?

Mr. HUSTED. I remember last year when the department officials came before us they did not so strongly advocate the maintenance of separate passport bureaus, but now they say it would be a great mistake to abolish them, that it would cost the Government more money, and that they are needed for the convenience of the public. They say that it makes for actual reduction in expense.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Because they do it?

Mr. HUSTED. Because it is good administration.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I was anxious to know whether or not conditions had changed so as to make it possible to do away with these bureaus. It seems to me they are very expensive.

Mr. HUSTED. They are not expensive. The total amount of the appropriation is $54,450.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I suppose it reduces the work here on the local bureau.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. When were these passport bureaus first established?

Mr. HUSTED. Either two or three years ago.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I suppose it was when the practice of issuing passports became general?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. So far as the gentleman knows, has the matter of curtailing that practice been given any consideration?

Mr. HUSTED. It has been given consideration, and I think that the Government hopes that the time will come in the not distant future when the practice may be given up. Apparently it can not be given up very well at the present time, and as a matter of fact the visé business is very profitable to the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand that. My reason for asking the question is that there has been a very interesting discussion of the matter before a committee of which I happen to be a member. I had thought that very soon perhaps we might get rid of maintaining these bureaus by doing away with the work which they perform.

Mr. HUSTED. I think the Secretary of State told the subcommittee that was his personal view, but that it is impracticable to accomplish it at the present time.

The Clerk read as follows:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE.

AMBASSADORS AND MINISTERS.

Ambassadors extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Spain, and Turkey, at $17,500 each, $227,500.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 4, line 20, strike out the word "Mexico."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to effect a very substantial saving in this appropriation bill. Of course, this money will never be utilized if it is appropriated. It may be used to pay the ambassador, but it will never be utilized to avail the Government of the services of an ambassador to the Republic of Mexico. I very much regretted that I happened to be for the moment out of the Chamber when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] this afternoon, according to my information, explained the triumphs of American diplomacy in Mexico, Asia, and in Europe. I think it due to the gentleman to say that I was not absent in anticipation of his speaking, because I did not know that he was going to speak. I would have been delighted to hear him, as I always am. If the chairman of the committee has any information with reference to how soon this money will be utilized, I should be very glad to have him advise me.

Mr. HUSTED. It is entirely possible, of course, that it will not be utilized during the next fiscal year, but I think everyone hopes that it will be. Everyone hopes that the relations will be adjusted to such a basis as will permit us to appoint an ambassador. I think it would be unwise to strike it out, because if such a situation does arise it would be desirable to act at once, and it costs the Government no money to leave it in there.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Let me say in this connection that the Department of State two or three weeks ago handed out a rather elaborate statement to the newspapers in explanation of an incident that occurred in the Mexican Congress a short time ago. It seems that the American chargé in Mexico City, Mr. Summerlin, had been carrying on conversations with the minister of foreign affairs rather informally in such a way as to arouse resentment on the part of Mexican officials, and an incident occurred in the Mexican Congress expressing that resentment, and intimating that this Government, through its diplomatic officers, had been unduly concerned in the particular verbiage, the particular form, of a proposed act of the Mexican Congress relating to the subject of petroleum in Mexico.

The Department of State handed out a statement, and I shall ask permission to include it within my remarks, in which the department explained that it had not been unduly concerned, and yet admitted that it had been given to understand that its views with respect to the particular form of legislation which would be acceptable to this Government would not be unwelcome, and significantly added that the Mexican authorities wanted recognition. The inference was entirely plain that this Government would influence the action of Mexico by dangling before Mexico the alluring prospect of recognition if the Mexican Congress would enact specifically the kind of legislation referred to concerning oil concessions in the Republic of Mexico which would be satisfactory to the Department of State. I might suggest in this connection, and I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] adverted to it in a general way, that the constitution of Mexico of 1917, in article 27, against which all of this assault has been made, refers in general terms to property of that character. It does not in terms appear to apply retroactively, but through an abundance of caution the Department of State and those oil concerns interested have feared that it would be construed retroactively. The President of Mexico, under his own hand, has given assurance that the Government of Mexico never intended it should be construed retroactively.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But through the State Department the United States Government says, "But that is not in the form of a treaty," and this Government laid down the proposition that if that construction was to obtain this Government desired that that kind of a covenant should be placed in a treaty between the United States and Mexico. Of course, Mexico declined, not because of any lack of good faith but because it would create a political situation in the Republic of Mexico that would imperil the prestige and standing of the present administration. It is always a powerful irritant in Mexico to raise the issue of anti-Americanism, just as it was raised in the Congress over the incident which I mentioned a little while ago. Of course, President Obregon refused to execute a treaty, because at the least excuse a revolution breaks out in Mexico with almost as much frequency as insurgency does on the Republican side of this Chamber. The Supreme Court of Mexico, having similar functions to those of our own Supreme Court, has decided time and again in cases involving the construction of article 27 properly brought before it that article 27 of the constitution is not retroactive, and in no way endangers concessions of American citizens or other nationals in property granted before the adoption of the constitution of 1917. But after all of that the administration still withholds recognition; and that is the only question upon which this Government predicates its refusal to recognize the Republic of Mexico. That there is now in Mexico an existing Government that is capable of maintaining a fair degree of order and law and respect for property goes without question.

And yet, because the Republic of Mexico will not come up and take the formula, because it does not relish the prescription written by the Department of State here in Washington, recognition is withheld. Now, we have in our city a conference of the Central American powers. The Secretary of State invited them here for the purpose of cultivating good feeling among the Central American and South American Republics. The conduct of this Government toward the Government of Mexico will nullify anything that possibly could be gained in that respect. Mexico is the largest country of that particular group. It is not here, it is not represented around the council table, and you should not forget that each one of those countries has been well aware of that situation. Mexico is not recognized, and I do not believe it will be recognized irrespective of the kind of government in power, until it takes the formula to be prescribed by the Secretary of State, and that is to give an iron-clad assurance about the oil concessions in the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman would not want the Government of the United States to recognize the Government of Mexico until Mexico is willing to protect American rights in Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Certainly not. If the gentleman had been paying as close attention to this as he does to the appropriation bills usually—and I commend him highly in that regard—he would have known from what I have already said that the President of Mexico has given solemn assurances over his signature that those rights would be respected and that the Supreme Court of Mexico not once or twice or thrice, not four times, but more than five times has decided that those rights are safe and that there is no danger whatever of confiscation under the constitution of 1917, provided the rights asserted were acquired before the adoption of that instrument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I assumed that the gentleman would ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment because apparently the effect would be exactly what he does not desire.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Agent and consul general at Tangier, $7,500: *Provided*, That no salary herein appropriated shall be paid to any official receiving any other salary from the United States Government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee in regard to this proviso. This proviso appears to be to the effect that no salary herein appropriated shall be paid to any official receiving any other salary from the United States Government. Do any of these officers receive any salary from any other Government as representatives of business concerns engaged in business in the countries to which they are accredited?

Mr. HUSTED. I am sure they do not.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It was considered that the provision was sufficient to limit their activities exclusively to the services of the Government?

Mr. HUSTED. I am quite sure of that.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARGÉS D'AFFAIRES AD INTERIM.

For salaries for chargés d'affaires ad interim, $50,000.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. Let me ask the chairman this: This item of $50,000 is for the purpose of paying secretaries and others who temporarily act as chargés d'affaires. Is that right?

Mr. HUSTED. Quite right.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why can not they perform such duties without extra compensation? It is a part of their duties to act in the absence of the ambassador. Why is it necessary, because the ambassador may be absent, that they should have their salaries increased?

Mr. HUSTED. That has been the practice for many years. They are acting on the basis of ambassadorial or ministerial salaries for the time during which they perform that service.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The secretaries generally perform the duties of the ambassador when he is there as well as when he is absent, and I really do not think it is the part of economy to pay them an increase in salary——

Mr. HUSTED. The law authorizes it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Do I understand the gentleman to say these secretaries receive the same rate of pay when the ambassador is absent as the ambassador receives when he is present?

Mr. HUSTED. Fifty per cent of what the ambassador or minister would receive if present.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In addition to his pay as secretary?

Mr. HUSTED. No; I think not.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I would rather know.

Mr. HUSTED. The law is, "for such time as any secretary of embassy or legation shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim, at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his salary as secretary to embassy or legation, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the ambassador or minister at such post."

So you see he could not receive more than 50 per cent of the salary paid to the ambassador or minister, and the difference between the salary of the secretary and the salary of the minister or ambassador is not so great that 50 per cent would be a very considerable sum. It would not be a very large amount of money. You see it is only $50,000 for the entire service throughout the world.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Of course, that is the only item carried here. I offer the amendment; I do not care to argue it because it is useless. Here is a chance to make a real 100 per cent saving if anybody wants to do so. Now, if there is anybody on the Republican side, or the chairman over there, who really wants to make a saving and not increase anybody's duties, but only to increase the prestige temporarily of an official like this while his chief is away, here is a way and here is the time to save $50,000.

Mr. HUSTED. There is another argument that enters into that. Of course, when these men are acting as ambassadors or as ministers they are under greater expense than they are when they are merely acting as secretaries, and I think this allowance is only to provide for that additional expense. Of course, they will have to do things, socially and otherwise, that they would not be called upon to do if they were not in charge. If you strike that out, you would be doing a very great injury to the service. These men are appointed with the idea that they will receive this compensation in the event they are designated to act.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do so in order to ask the gentleman a question. They are appointed, are they not, under the statute that you referred to?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And would it not be the breaking of a contract and would it not be bad faith to deny them what they are entitled to by statute when they are appointed?

Mr. HUSTED. It would provide less compensation for them than they are justly entitled to receive.

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are entitled to it by statute, by the contract under which they are appointed, and you could not strike it out and still conform to the law. You would be legislating by striking it out?

Mr. HUSTED. Absolutely.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You are appropriating now strictly in accordance with the statute?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes. I think it would be an unwise thing to strike it out.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And if you struck it out without repealing the statute you would deny them what they are entitled to receive?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes. They could put in a claim.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. This will not go into effect until July 1 of next year. If we see fit to reduce the salaries for the fiscal year 1924, we would not be interfering with the contracts. They could withdraw from the service.

Mr. HUSTED. They are pursuing a career in the service covering a series of years.

Mr. BLANTON. But only at the pleasure of the President.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TILSON. We should not waste time in doing a perfectly futile thing. If we proceed to strike out this item without changing the law, these gentlemen will get the salary just the same, because they are entitled to it under the law. Of course, we can change the law here. An amendment will be in order under the Holman rule by which we can change the law. If, however, we simply strike out the appropriation and leave the law as it is, we have done a futile thing.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman's idea is that they have a vested right to it in the absence of their chief?

Mr. TILSON. They have a statutory right to the money, because they will have earned it under the law in cases where the chief is absent.

I have no doubt in my own mind that they are entitled to it equitably, because, as has been said already, in the absence of their chiefs they are frequently called upon to entertain Americans and others who come there, and who must be shown some attention. It seems to me that it would be an unwise, an unfortunate, thing to strike it out at all, but to do it without repealing the law would be a useless performance.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendments are withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Turkish assistant secretary of embassy to Turkey, $4,000; Total, $415,875.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I notice that on page 8 there is a total sum of $730,000 appropriated for clerical and various and sundry other things, and on page 10 there is another allowance of $1,400,000 for allowance for clerk hire at consulates and things of that kind, and on page 12 there is another allowance of similar character of $300,000—making a total of about $3,000,000 for clerical help. I do not know what the situation may be; I have not read the hearings; but I recall when I happened to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the appropriations were made for this service that the total appropriation was about $6,000,000. I notice now it is something like $14,000,000, although you have about the same number of ambassadors, and ministers, and the same number of consular representatives in foreign countries. It seems to me strange that in the course of 10 years, say, without increasing our representation in the way of ambassadors, and ministers, and consuls, you have increased the total appropriation almost 100 per cent. These items that I speak of are lump-sum appropriations. You can go and hire a dragoman, or a guard, or 40 guards, whatever you want, at any price you desire, and pay them out of these lump-sum appropriations. These items look to me as though they were too large, although I am not familiar with details. I mention it only because this is the first paragraph that carries items of this character for clerical offices.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] thinks the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] is correct, I take issue with the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Texas is not correct. This has not been a growing appropriation.

Mr. HUSTED. The gentleman from New York did not say he was correct. He thought he was incorrect.

Mr. TILSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am now sure that the gentleman from New York is correct. The gentleman from Texas does not take into account the fact that these appropriations carry a treaty payment of $5,000,000 for Colombia. If you take that out, and if you take out the $250,000 payment to Panama, for which we are under treaty obligations, you have the aggregate reduced to less than $10,000,000.

It seems to me that in view of the fact that we are required to send representatives to all of the small countries that were created by the treaty of Versailles and set up in different parts of the world, the increase has been very small indeed. The fact that it has been reduced below $10,000,000 is most creditable to the State Department.

Mr. GARNER. What increase has there been in the number of ministers and ambassadors in the last three years?

Mr. TILSON. I do not say "in the last three years," because three years ago these new countries had been set up.

Mr. GARNER. The treaty of Versailles is more than three years old.

Mr. HUSTED. There are quite a good many of them.

Mr. GARNER. How many?

Mr. TILSON. Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Egypt, Esthonia, Latvia—

Mr. SNYDER. Lithuania.

Mr. TILSON. Yes; Lithuania and a number of others that I can not call offhand without referring to some of the jawbreaking names.

Mr. HUSTED. I can give the gentleman the names.

Mr. TILSON. We have considerably increased the number.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLERKS AT EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

For the employment of necessary clerks at the embassies and legations, who, whenever hereafter appointed, shall be citizens of the United States, $350,000; and so far as practicable shall be appointed under civil-service rules and regulations.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the necessity for the language "whenever hereafter appointed" in line 16. Why should they not be citizens of the United States whether appointed hereafter or now?

I move to strike out the language "whenever hereafter appointed."

Mr. HUSTED. I do not think there will be the slightest objection to that at the present time. It was put in there because it would have been manifestly unjust, at the time the language was originally inserted, to cover certain people already appointed and who were doing good work; but at this time I see no reason why it can not be done without injury.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. They have had 10 years' notice.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Have we not a number of clerks in Japan and China?

Mr. HUSTED. We have a number, but I think they have already been provided for.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I think they come under the other section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas offer an amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I offer an amendment to strike out the language "whenever hereafter appointed," in line 16, page 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 6, line 16, strike out the words "whenever hereafter appointed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 15 student interpreters at the legation to China and the embassies to Japan and Turkey, who shall be citizens of the United States and whose duty it shall be to study the language of the country to which assigned with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation or embassy and consulates in such country, at $1,500 each, $22,500: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as an interpreter at the legation, embassy, or consulate in the country to which assigned so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: On page 7, strike out lines 1 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, each one of these $17,500-a-year ambassadors to China, Japan, and Turkey gets his proportion for secretarial hire out of the appropriation of $386,875. Then the ambassador to Japan is allowed a Japanese secretary at $5,500 a year. He is an interpreter. Then he is allowed an assistant Japanese secretary at $4,000 a year, who is an interpreter. So the ambassador to Turkey is allowed a Turkish secretary at $5,500 and an extra Turkish assistant at $4,000 a year. Then out of the appropriation of $350,000 there will be clerks in various proportions to each of these ambassadors. Again, we provide in this bill, as has been done for nearly 20 years, for 15 student interpreters, whom we pick up here and send to Japan and Turkey, where they are sent to school for three years. We pay them $1,500 apiece, and then we pay $350 a year for their tuition, and then in Japan we pay $1,200 a year for quarters. And what do we get out of them? If every young man in the United States had an equal chance at these positions I would not object; but these are partisan political appointments, and there is no duty connected with them if they do not want to give it afterwards. They go to school for three years, receive $1,500 a year salary, get this $350 for tuition, and this $1,200 for quarters. They are educated, and although they sign up an agreement when they begin that they will act as interpreters for at least five years, there is nothing in the contract that would hold them to it if they wanted to leave. They could break the contract at will. There is no penalty attached to it. If they all stayed in the service, we would have more than we need, because we have been providing for these same 15 student interpreters every single year for nearly 20 years. How long are we going to keep it up? It is just the same thing over and over again. When you get an item in an appropriation bill for one of these departments you are going to find that same item reappearing every year in every single estimate that comes in, whether it is needed or not. I maintain that we certainly ought to have interpreters by this time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I understand the gentleman, he says he would not object to this if it was nonpartisan.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not object to it so much, although I think it ought to be stopped.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What is the meaning of this provision in lines 7 and 8—

that the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman what does the English language mean?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does it not mean just what it says?

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose the administration wanted to be nonpartisan by appointing no one except friendly Republican boys, it would be nonpartisan nevertheless.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; that is assuming that they do not carry out in good faith the direction contained in this paragraph.

Mr. BLANTON. Give me the name of one single Democrat who was appointed last year.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think you will find that during Woodrow Wilson's time——

Mr. BLANTON. Give me the name of one single Democrat among the 15 appointed last year. If the gentleman can do that I will withdraw my statement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There were eight years of Democratic administration.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the last year under the Harding administration. Name one Democrat.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman give me the name of one Republican who was appointed under the Wilson administration?

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt it. But my argument is just that much stronger, because they do not pay any attention to it. If there was a provision in here that they must be selected under the civil service it would be all right, but those words that the selection shall be nonpartisan mean nothing.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply to say that the gentleman's statement is made without any knowledge of the facts whatever, because he could not give the name of one Republican that was appointed.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Our foreign service would be badly crippled if the provision for student interpreters were taken out. It is manifestly necessary to have men as clerks in our consulates and in our embassies who understand the foreign languages, the language of Japan and of Turkey and of China. The object of this provision is to educate men so that they will understand these languages. They are needed, they are useful; they probably never acquire a complete mastery of the language, but they do acquire enough to be helpful to the Government. They eventually find their way into the consular grades.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. KING. Why is it that only rich men's sons are appointed to these positions? It is not a question of policy; it is business.

Mr. HUSTED. So far as this provision is concerned, I think the gentleman is in error; but there are many rich men's sons appointed in the diplomatic grades for the reason that the Government does not pay enough money to permit a poor man's son to take the positions.

Mr. KING. They appoint these rich men's sons who want to have a good time.

Mr. HUSTED. They go out to serve the Government and not to have a good time; but we do not pay money enough to permit the son of a poor man to accept the position of diplomatic secretary. It is an outrage that it is not possible for a poor man's son to take up a diplomatic career. It ought to be possible, and I hope the Rogers bill, which is now pending before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, will become a law, so that it will be possible.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How many young men have received the benefit of this provision?

Mr. BLANTON. Fifteen every year.

Mr. HUSTED. No; not as many as that. There are no more than needed in the service.

Mr. LONDON. How old is the law providing for the appointment of 15?

Mr. HUSTED. It is several years old; it has been carried for a good many years.

Mr. LONDON. For 10 years or more?

Mr. HUSTED. I should say so.

Mr. LONDON. Have we 100 or 150 men that have been benefited by the law?

Mr. HUSTED. I can not say how many; we have a lot of them in the consulates.

Mr. LONDON. This provision is designed to develop experienced men?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes; the men usually pass into the consular grades.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read from the hearings a very brief statement for the benefit of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] as to whether his constituents, or anyone else who wishes, can get a chance under this provision. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED] in the hearings asked Mr. Carr as follows:

Mr. HUSTED. What I wanted to get at was this: Have you more student interpreters than you really need to draw upon?

Mr. CARR. No; our difficulty is in getting enough. We have difficulty in getting men to come into this service and there are constantly requests from our missions in Japan and China and from all of our consulates out there for more students. A telegram came in about a week ago from the minister in Peking, asking for more student interpreters and stating that there was urgent need for more language-trained men.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. In answer to the gentleman from Connecticut I want to refer him to the gentleman from Illinois and to get the gentleman from Illinois to tell the gentleman from Connecticut the success he had when he tried to get an appointment for a poor boy from Illinois who happened to live in his district. He did not get the appointment because he was a poor boy and did not have the political pull. If the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a Member of the House and of the present administration, could not get the position for this poor boy in his district, what chance would a Democrat in the South have with a Republican administration?

Mr. TILSON. Probably there were other reasons why the candidate did not succeed.

Mr. HUSTED. He was not denied an appointment because he was a poor boy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, translators, and the compensation of and rent for dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, including such loss on bills of exchange to officers of the United States Court for China and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of this sum appropriated for contingent expenses, foreign missions, shall be expended for salaries or wages of persons not American citizens performing clerical services, whether officially designated as clerks or not, in any foreign mission, $730,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in the hearings that there was an estimate for a steam launch, $1,800, at Constantinople. It was not used last year nor the year before, and the witness was not sure whether it would be used this year or not. Is that appropriation continued in the bill?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes; it is. But it costs the Government nothing unless the launch is used.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They do not divert the appropriation to anything else?

Mr. HUSTED. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF CONSULAR INSPECTORS.

For the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of consular inspectors while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, $25,000: *Provided*, That inspectors shall not be allowed actual and necessary expenses for subsistence, itemized, exceeding an average of $8 per day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in the phraseology of the proviso just read that the average is $8 per day. In two other items of the bill where we allow a per diem it is not an average, but it is $8 a day. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee is the actual allowance for these men and subsistence an average of $8 a day? Can it, under this phraseology, amount to more than $8 for a single day?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes. It might amount to a great deal more, but it can not amount to more than an average of $8 a day. That is necessary because of the long distances these inspectors have to travel in visiting the consulates. It is absolutely necessary. They might run up a bill of $100 or $150 in two days for traveling expenses alone.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it can not exceed in any one year more than an average of $8 per day.

Mr. HUSTED. No.

The Clerk read as follows:

For allowance for clerk hire at consulates, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, $1,400,000. Clerks, whenever hereafter appointed, shall, so far as practicable, be appointed under civil-service rules and regulations.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee why the words "so far as practicable" are inserted in the bill. If the Consular Service is to be under the civil service, I do not understand why it should not be under it instead of "so far as practicable."

Mr. HUSTED. The consular agents, as the gentleman knows, are not usually Americans. As a matter of fact, it is not possible to get our citizens in some of these small places where we need a representative to render some consular service of a slight character.

Mr. DENISON. I am referring now to clerks, page 10, line 8.

Mr. HUSTED. I may not know all the reasons why that language was inserted, but apparently it is not always practicable to have that done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman think it is practicable to have a civil-service examination for a clerk to assist a deputy consul in Patagonia or in the Fiji Islands?

Mr. DENISON. It is either practicable or it is not practicable. If it is not, we ought to take out the language and not make it apply to some and not to others.

Mr. HUSTED. There may be and evidently are some situations in which it is not practicable to hold an examination.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Might not this situation arise, from time to time, where temporary help is needed, and where it would be utterly impracticable to have an examination for temporary help?

Mr. DENISON. I am not able to state about that.

Mr. HUSTED. I think the gentleman's question is pertinent. I do not think I can give him an entirely satisfactory answer. I know no more about it than what the language would suggest to me, and that is that there are some situations where it is not practicable, and they ask that that language be included to permit them to dispense with the examination in certain cases.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do not know that I can add any information, but having lived for about 8 or 10 years in Latin American countries, I know that, as the chairman of the committee says, there are many out-of-the-way places, where the salary is very small and the duties not at all onerous, and I think there would be certain places where it would be highly advisable to dispense with the civil-service requirements.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman from Illinois will turn to page 43 of the hearings, he will find the following:

> The visēing work, since the 3 per cent law has gone into operation, has not occupied all of the time of the men in some of the consulates, in perhaps the majority of the consulates, so that it has seemed to us better to reduce that visēing fund gradually and take the part-time men onto the regular clerk fund as clerks in the consulates and put the whole-time men onto the visēing fund.

In other words, what I suggested to the gentleman from Illinois is obviously the case, that they have part-time men as well as full-time men, and it would not be practicable to have a civil-service examination for the men who work only part of the time.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES.

For expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (so much as may be necessary), repairs to consular buildings owned by the United States, postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising, messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agencies in the transaction of their business and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, $969,500.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman. Has his subcommittee or the full committee ever had presented to it, or has it considered, the desirability of making an appropriation for our foreign offices, consular and ministerial, to take care of American citizens who happen to be stranded at the ports? I had a case presented to me in which some American citizens were quite unfortunate. They had their grips stolen from them in one of the foreign ports and in the grips were their railroad tickets and money, and they had nothing left and could not get any assistance from our representatives there, the consulate or the embassy. On the other hand, some other countries I might mention have in a way provided for that situation. Has that matter ever been considered by the committee?

Mr. HUSTED. Oh, yes, it has, and the very next item in the bill provides $200,000 for that purpose.

Mr. DENISON. But that is for stranded seamen.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I am speaking of American citizens, business men or tourists, who happen to be there and who are left in an unfortunate situation by accident or other matters over which they have no control.

Mr. HUSTED. There is nothing for them.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman considered the language on page 10—

> and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary.

Does not the gentleman think that would perhaps be available for meal tickets and return tickets and things of that kind?

Mr. DENISON. I have taken the matter up with the State Department and they have advised me that they have no funds provided for that purpose. I am only inquiring whether the committee has ever considered the advisability or the desirability of making provision for a situation of that kind.

Mr. HUSTED. Of course, that would be a legislative question and could not probably be taken up by our committee, but I take it the policy of the Government is only to extend relief to shipwrecked seamen and not to provide it for individuals. Of course, anybody might go over there and spend their money and then go to the Governemnt and apply for funds to get home. I do not think the Government ought to go into the business of relieving people of that kind.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the statement of the gentleman from New York that the matter is a legislative question and not one properly for his committee does not just exactly coincide with the facts, because the Appropriations Committee is constantly bringing in legislative propositions in its bills.

Mr. HUSTED. Oh, we are not. The gentleman will not find a legislative proposition in this bill, nor in the bill of last year.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from New York for that splendid showing, and only wish other appropriation subcommittees could show as much.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST ALLOWANCES TO DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS.

To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, $150,000.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York to what officers accredited to particular countries were these allowances made the last year?

Mr. HUSTED. Is the gentleman referring to post allowances?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUSTED. I think they were made in China; in fact, I know they were made there, and in some of the Balkan countries, and I think some places in South America.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is a very reprehensible practice of legislating in this way and of making appropriations in such a manner as to authorize the Department of State to absolutely vary the amounts of money fixed by Congress as compensation of diplomatic and consular officers throughout the world. Now, of course, I know the plea upon which justification is sought is that it is the desire of the Government to adjust the compensation to the cost of living. The cost of living is the basis of the plea of anybody who wants his salary raised. Every clerk who comes and wants his salary raised bases it on the plea of the increase in the high cost of living. The United States officers in China, of course, have made the argument for getting this post allowance, which is an addition to their salaries, on the ground that it costs more in China to live than anywhere else. But it is also based upon the claim that they lose in exchange. You will find in this bill the committee has provided that the Department of State has the privilege of giving to the officers of the United States Court in China what they call "loss in exchange."

They say silver is the basis of the money in China and that Chinese silver, on account of the war and all that kind of business, is so much higher than the United States standard of value that they lose by reason of exchange, and so the bill

provides that the Department of State, whenever the diplomatic officers in China or officers of the United States Court in China make complaint about the rate of exchange, the Department of State may reach over into the Treasury and hand out a largess. But that is not enough. In this item of the bill the Government of the United States is appropriating $150,000 a year out of which the Department of State can increase the compensation of any diplomatic officer of this Government or that of any minister or consul at its own pleasure and the Congress can not help itself.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman will find a statement, so far as there is a statement regarding allowances made last year, on pages 54 and 55. The statements are quite incomplete, because they do not show anything like the disbursements.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Why not?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am stating simply the fact that they do not show anything like the disbursements of the appropriation, but they do show a certain number of disbursements, as, for instance, South Africa and China are among the places. The gentleman, I think, will find quite interesting reading here, so far as it goes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have not read that particular hearing, but I have been in touch with this situation for some years because the committee of which I am a member formerly made these appropriations. They made complaint on account of the war. Now the war is four years away from us, and in most of the foreign countries, on account of the exchange situation, living is cheaper than in the United States, and yet we continue to make a $150,000 appropriation each year, and I submit it is not sound, I submit it is not good legislation, I submit it is contrary to established rules against lump-sum appropriations so eloquently enunciated on the floor of this House by gentlemen on both sides of the aisle. It simply gives the Secretary of State and those under him power to handle these sums of money in such a way as to discriminate even between employees of the department and more especially discriminate against the Treasury of the United States. If salaries are not sufficient they ought to be increased.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation has been run down from a total of $700,000 in 1919 to $200,000 for the current fiscal year, and we have made a further reduction of $50,000, so it has been brought down from $700,000 to $150,000. I agree with the gentleman from Texas absolutely under normal conditions that it would be bad practice to allow these salaries to be increased at the will of the Secretary of State, but I think it would be a great mistake if we cut out this entire appropriation at the present time, because the gentleman from Texas must know and everybody else in the committee must know that there are conditions actually existing in certain parts of the world which would make the statutory salary grossly inadequate, and simple justice requires that they shall be increased in this or some other way. In some cases the cost of living has increased fully 100 per cent.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the director of consulates makes these statements as showing the necessity for it. He says:

> I think the full allowance is very necessary. For my own comfort I wish it had never existed.

Mr. HUSTED. Of course.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He says it does not increase the salaries in the cases where allowances are made to an amount to offset the increased cost of living, and he says the allowances are made in almost all cases to men with small salaries. There have been only a very few instances where they have been made to men with large salaries.

Mr. HUSTED. Yes; and the average amount paid from this fund to any one individual has been very small.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; from $1,200 to $1,500 at the outside.

Mr. HUSTED. That is the largest one; the average is about $250.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I will oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I notice there is an item on page 13 of $3,000 to purchase land at Mukden, China, for consular purposes. I wish the chairman of the committee might give to the House the benefit of such information as he has about that item, so that the House may know whether it is voting intelligently on this subject or not. Tell us what is the purpose, and whether the land has any buildings or not, and whether it is proposed to erect a building.

Mr. HUSTED. That land is sought to be acquired for consular purposes.

Mr. DENISON. I suppose that is true, of course, from the language used.

Mr. HUSTED. I want to explain it to you. Here is what Mr. Carr has to say about it, on page 52 of the hearings:

> I would like to explain that purchase of land at Mukden. Several years ago the Chinese authorities set apart a certain section in the new part of Mukden for consular quarters of the different governments, and they offered to us an option on a plot of ground there. We had, of course, no money with which to buy it. We recommended an appropriation by Congress for a building there a number of years ago; Congress did not see fit at that time to appropriate the money; and the matter ran along and was practically lost sight of.
>
> And then there was a likelihood that the option would be canceled; and our consul, desiring not to have that done, conferred with the representative of a business concern there about it. That gentleman put up the money to acquire the property. Now, we can get title to that property for the United States for within $3,000 gold. The property is probably worth $25,000 or $50,000, according to my best information; it is a very excellent site for a consular building, and it would be a great pity not to acquire it. It is an excellent business investment, and apparently it is the general policy of Congress to erect buildings for our diplomatic and consular offices so far as is consistent with our financial resources.

Mr. DENISON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope the reading of this statement of Doctor Carr into the RECORD will bring to the attention of the Members of the House and the Congress and the country the condition that exists, which I think has too long been neglected by our Government, and which, I think, is a disgrace to our Government; a condition under which the Government is unable or unwilling to buy a little office for our consulate, and an American citizen, who happens to be in business there, has to come forward and advance the money for the acquisition of a consular building which is badly needed.

I think, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Committee on Appropriations ought to get busy on this question of securing proper buildings and quarters for our consular officers and for our embassies in foreign countries, so that the representatives of this great Government will have some place in which to live and some place in which to transact the Government's business in foreign ports. That matter has been too long neglected. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906 between the United States and Mexico, including not to exceed $900 for rent, $30,713.50.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to state to the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill that I am pleased to see an item here of $30,713 for the United States-Mexico Boundary Commission. This is very essential and timely. As I recall under a Democratic administration we provided the sum of $50,000 for this commission, and I believe this amount to be needed at the present time. However, I am glad to know that the Secretary of State, after considerable importuning from myself and the people of my home city of El Paso, has appointed a boundary commissioner to represent this country in all landed disputes with Mexico and other questions affecting the boundary between the two countries. Certainly at the present time and until Mexico is recognized no definite agreement can be reached by the commissioners of the two countries, but in case of a change in the river, which might change the boundary, our commissioner could be on the ground, and have surveys made, and get data that would avail our country at such time when Mexico should be recognized.

Now, gentlemen, relative to the recognition of Mexico, which has been so loudly demanded by certain gentlemen on this floor, and one especially, who preceded only a few minutes ago, and who from time to time for the past year in speeches here has demanded the unconditional recognition of Mexico by this Government, permit me to state that as a citizen of this country I would welcome a recognition of Mexico to-morrow if it were brought about in the proper manner. If that country would give sufficient guaranties of protection to the lives and properties of Americans residing there and rescind its confiscatory laws. Has she done it? No. Will she do it? That is to be seen. So much has been said about that stable government down there, and her splendid constitution, and its great guaranties of life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to its citizens, and all within her gates. Well, I happen to hold in my hand this remarkable document, the constitution of 1917, formulated and ordained by Venustiano Carranza, and by its side in deadly parallel, the constitution of 1857, which I believe was adopted under the able administration of that patriotic statesman and patron saint of Mexico, Benito Juarez.

In the very first preamble of the constitution of 1857 we find these significant words, "In the name of God and by the authority of the Mexican people." Not the slightest reference to God in the Carranza-Obregon constitution of 1917; and the failure was not unintentional, as I will show later. I believe in the Christian religion; so do you, I trust. In Article III, clause 2, of the Carranza-Obregon constitution of 1917 I quote as follows: "No religious corporation nor minister of any religious creed shall establish or direct schools of primary instruction." Does it stop there? Oh, no! In Article XXIV, clause 2, Carranza-Obregon constitution of 1917, I quote the following: "Every religious act of public worship shall be performed strictly within the places of public worship, which shall be at all times under governmental supervision." If I interpret correctly, it means that no religious service can be conducted outside of a church, no religious service in the home or on the street, and the Mexican Government will demand and direct the kind to be conducted. And is that all? Oh, no! We read on page 19, clause 2 of the latter part of Article XXVII, as follows:

II. The religious institutions known as churches, irrespective of creed, shall in no case have legal capacity to acquire, hold, or administer real property or loans made on such real property; all such real property or loans as may be at present held by the said religious institutions, either on their own behalf or through third parties, shall vest in the nation, and anyone shall have the right to denounce property so held. Presumptive proof shall be sufficient to declare the denunciation well-founded. Places of public worship are the property of the nation, as represented by the Federal Government, which shall determine which of them may continue to be devoted to their present purposes. Episcopal residences, rectories, seminaries, orphan asylums, or collegiate establishments of religious institutions, convents, or any other buildings built or designed for the administration, propaganda, or teaching of the tenets of any religious creed shall forthwith vest, as of full right, directly in the nation, to be used exclusively for the public services of the Federation or of the States, within their respective jurisdictions. All places of public worship which shall later be erected shall be the property of the nation.

III. Public and private charitable institutions for the sick and needy, for scientific research, or for the diffusion of knowledge, mutual aid societies or organizations formed for any other lawful purpose shall in no case acquire, hold, or administer loans made on real property, unless the mortgage terms do not exceed 10 years. In no case shall institutions of this character be under the patronage, direction, administration, charge, or supervision of religious corporations or institutions, nor of ministers of any religious creed or of their dependents, even though either the former or the latter shall not be in active service.

You will see that all places of religious worship are declared the property of the nation, likewise all charitable institutions for the sick and destitute, scientific research, and of learning are prohibited from acquiring or holding property for a period exceeding 10 years, and in no case can these latter institutions be under or directed by religious institutions. Now, it would seem that this would be "out-Leninning" Lenin, in blotting out religious freedom, for we find as a part of article 130 of this Magna Charta of Mexican liberties the following:

The law recognizes no juridical personality in the religious institutions known as churches.

Ministers of religious creeds shall be considered as persons exercising a profession and shall be directly subject to the laws enacted on the matter.

The State legislatures shall have the exclusive power of determining the maximum number of ministers of religious creeds, according to the needs of each locality. Only a Mexican by birth may be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico.

No ministers of religious creeds shall, either in public or private meetings or in acts of worship or religious propaganda, criticize the fundamental laws of the country, the authorities in particular, or the Government in general; they shall have no vote, nor be eligible to office, nor shall they be entitled to assemble for political purposes.

And in pursuance of this clause in this constitution, in the State of Oaca, in the southern part of the Republic, the number of ministers of religion has been curtailed to six in the entire State, having a population of at least a half million. The humblest citizen of our country can criticize its laws and its rulers without let or hindrance, but a minister of the gospel can not do so in Mexico. If he does, he goes to jail. And you will find in other parts of this remarkable document that only a Mexican by birth can be a minister of any religious creed in Mexico, nor can any minister vote, hold office, or assemble for any political purpose.

Now, I am a Democrat, but I trust I am not a partisan to the extent of being unfair to those of the opposite party. Secretary Hughes has been criticized repeatedly by gentlemen on this floor for failure to recognize Mexico. Well, let me say to all such gentlemen that the able Secretary of State has not originated any new policy; he is simply walking in the same path trodden by his predecessor, Mr. Colby, and reaffirming the doctrine laid down by Mr. Norman H. Davis, the Acting Secretary of State during the latter part of Wilson's administration; and, let me further add, one of the ablest men that ever held that position, and as bright and scintillating a mind as I ever walked into the presence of. He stated to me in person once when I called to discuss the Mexican situation with him that if his policy was carried out, and he had so informed the Mexican authorities, that Mexico would be recognized when she agreed in writing to protect American lives and property, and repeal her confiscatory laws as to American property, and modify the iniquitous section 27 of the constitution of 1917.

Now, if I understand the position of Mr. Hughes correctly, this is exactly what he requires. I say more power to the strong arm of the present Secretary of State. [Applause.] Let us not have any namby-pamby, dillydallying, note-writing, equivocating policy this time. Let them understand that Americans must be treated as well on that side of the Rio Grande as Mexicans are treated on this side. There are 475,000 Mexicans residing in the United States and 10,000 Americans in Mexico. There were 75,000 Americans in Mexico when Carranza became President, but they have been driven out and murdered until there are 10,000 left, and still we are told that the present Government of Mexico, as far as Americans are concerned, is a shield and an anchor, "a pillow of cloud by day and a Kansas prairie fire by night," to lead them on and protect them in their lives and property.

Now, my friends, a certain gentleman, who probably never wet his feet in the Rio Grande in all the days of his life, will get on this floor almost daily and assume to tell you all about conditions in Mexico, and describe all the characteristics of the Mexican people, and hollo his head off for immediate recognition, and criticize and give the present administration "unshirted hades" because it has not embraced Mexico and swallowed article 27 and its socialistic constitution, head, hide, and hair, not omitting the tail. Now, my friends, I do not hesitate to criticize a Republican, or a Republican administration, if I think he or it deserves it.

I do not know all about Mexico by any means, but I feel I have some little personal knowledge. I have traveled over the country. I have dealt with the Mexican commercially; I have broken bread with him; I have practiced in the courts a little; I have ridden the range with him; I have conversed with him upon various topics in his own tongue; I have mingled with the men in all walks of life, and in other days, when these silver locks were more of the auburn tint, I have tripped the "light fantastic" and whirled the dark, dreamy-eyed señoritas to the south of the Rio Grande through the giddy-glide waltz to the soul-stirring and heart-soothing strains of "Aboja la Solas" and "La Paloma," and I tell you, gentlemen, it is my experience that in order to insure absolute compliance with all contracts with the Dons, the Juans, and the señors beyond the shining Rio Grande you must have him where he can not squirm, twist, nor shiver.

Now, a great deal has been said by gentlemen advocating immediate recognition that article 27 does not confiscate American property. Well, I am going to read it to you here and let you pass judgment.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman from Texas insert it in his remarks?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will.

And it was further claimed by a gentleman a few minutes ago that the supreme court of Mexico has held that this article was not retroactive. It is true it did hold that in the Texas Company case, as applying to its lands and its rights, but, unfortunately, a supreme court decision in Mexico in a certain case only extends to that particular case and is not like our Supreme Court decisions—a precedent for all similar questions and cases. It might, and probably would, reverse itself in the very next case that comes up involving retroactive legislation and confiscation of property under this article. Can they confiscate? Well, they have done it in many instances. Recently an American citizen, Marion C. Dyer, suffered confiscation of all his lands in the State of Durango. The Corralitos Cattle Co., owned by Americans having large landed interests in the State of Chihuahua, about a year ago had their lands lying along the watercourses confiscated by the State government—squatters got upon them—their cattle driven away, and many perished for water and sustenance. "Oh," the Mexican Government replies, "we will pay you for the land we take in agrarian bonds—in other words, State bonds." Well, no one has ever seen one of those bonds up to this good hour, and in my judgment no one ever will; but if they were issued and delivered they would not be worth the paper they were printed upon.

Now, in pursuance of this article 27, they have passed in many States what is known as the "Idle land law," which operates as follows: Say my friend, Congressmen HADLEY, there, an American, was farming in Mexico; he has 80 acres in wheat and 10 acres in a meadow for his milch cows and work horses to graze upon. Along comes a Mexican citizen, probably a goat herder, and he says to a municipal authority, or a justice of the peace, as provided herein: "Señor HADLEY is not cultivating all that land; he has 10 acres of idle land." "All right," says the judge, "You take HADLEY'S land and cultivate it." No bond required for protection of property. The Mexican goes on HADLEY'S land, he gathers the wheat and sells and appropriates the proceeds. He pays HADLEY 5 per cent of the crop, unless HADLEY furnishes him a home to live in, cows to milk, and teams and implements to work and harvest the crop, then he pays HADLEY the magnificent sum of 10 per cent. After harvesting and disposing of the crop, he turns the land back to HADLEY, if HADLEY has not been run across the Rio Grande, in the meantime, and goes back to his goats. Do you men want to immediately rush pell mell into a recognition of that kind of a government? Many of you shake your heads, and many more of you will shake them, when I get through reading and expostulating upon this remarkable document.

Again, my friends, let me remind you, as you well know, the President of the United States can not expel a foreigner from this country without said foreigner has been decreed to be an undesirable citizen, a dangerous person, a menace to society and to this Government by some tribunal of competent jurisdiction. If he attempted to do so, every Federal court from the Rio Grande to the Canadian boundary would be resorted to to prevent it. The president of Mexico, upon his mere ipsi dixit, can expel a foreigner without any court procedure whatsoever when he may deem the presence of said foreigner inexpedient, and I read the latter part of article 33 of the constitution of 1917:

> The executive shall have the right to expel from the Republic forthwith, and without judicial process, any foreigner whose presence he may deem inexpedient.

If an American goes into Mexico to acquire land, what does he have to do? First, say that he is a Mexican with respect to such property, and agree before the department of foreign affairs that he will not invoke the protection of his government with respect to same, and in case of breach, a penalty of forfeiture of said property. And in a certain zone, within 100 kilometers—about 75 miles—from the frontiers, and 50 kilometers—about 40 miles—from the sea, no foreigner can, under any conditions, acquire land.

Now, my friends, is this all there is in this remarkable constitution? No; let us see about religious institutions and churches owning and acquiring property in Mexico. I say this, that the property of churches and religious institutions is under this constitution confiscated and declared the property of the nation. Some of my colleagues look a little skeptical at this unusual and astounding statement. Well, I will read you the exact language, and let you draw your own conclusion. But before I do, let me state that it is my understanding that this constitution of 1917 was patterned largely after the Bolshevik constitution of Russia. I do not know that to be a fact, but I do know that the true theory of Bolshevism is diametrically opposed to all religion and all religious exercises. Now, read this constitution as to ministers of religion, as to religious meetings, as to schools under religious institutions and as to churches acquiring property, and draw your own conclusions.

Now I am going to insert all of article 27, and I call your especial attention to title 2, relative to confiscation of church property and vesting title in the nation. And no supreme court, or decision of one in Mexico, has ever declared this section unconstitutional or that it was not retroactive in its provisions. And right under it I will insert article 27 of the constitution of 1857 for comparison—one promulgated by a statesman, the other by a socialist:

(Constitution of 1917, art. 27—Carranza-Obregon.)

ART. 27. The ownership of lands and waters comprised within the limits of the national territory is vested originally in the nation, which has had and has the right to transmit title thereof to private persons, thereby constituting private property.

Private property shall not be expropriated, except for reasons of public utility and by means of indemnification.

The nation shall have at all times the right to impose on private property such limitations as the public interest may demand, as well as the right to regulate the development of natural resources, which are susceptible of appropriation, in order to conserve them and equitably to distribute the public wealth. For this purpose necessary measures shall be taken to divide large landed estates; to develop small landed holdings; to establish new centers of rural population with such lands and waters as may be indispensable to them; to encourage agriculture and to prevent the destruction of natural resources; and to protect property from damage detrimental to society. Settlements, hamlets situated on private property, and communes which lack lands or water or do not possess them in sufficient quantities for their needs shall have the right to be provided with them from the adjoining properties, always having due regard for small landed holdings. Wherefore all grants of lands made up to the present time under the decree of January 6, 1915, are confirmed. Private property acquired for the said purposes shall be considered as taken for public utility.

In the nation is vested direct ownership of all minerals or substances which in veins, layers, masses, or beds constitute deposits whose nature is different from the components of the land, such as minerals from which metals and metalloids used for industrial purposes are extracted; beds of precious stones, rock salt, and salt lakes formed directly by marine waters; products derived from the decomposition of rocks when their exploitation requires underground work; phosphates which may be used for fertilizers; solid mineral fuels; petroleum and all hydrocarbons—solid, liquid, or gaseous.

In the nation is likewise vested the ownership of the waters of territorial seas to the extent and in the terms fixed by the law of nations; those of lakes and inlets of bays; those of interior lakes of natural formation which are directly connected with flowing waters; those of principal rivers or tributaries from the points at which there is a permanent current of water in their beds to their mouths, whether they flow to the sea or cross two or more States; those of intermittent streams which traverse two or more States in their main body; the waters of rivers, streams, or ravines when they bound the national territory or that of the States; waters extracted from mines; and the beds and banks of the lakes and streams hereinbefore mentioned, to the extent fixed by law. Any other stream of water not comprised within the foregoing enumeration shall be considered as an integral part of the private property through which it flows; but the development of the waters when they pass from one landed property to another shall be considered of public utility and shall be subject to the provisions prescribed by the States.

In the cases to which the two foregoing paragraphs refer the ownership of the nation is inalienable and may not be lost by prescription. Concessions shall be granted by the Federal Government to private parties or civil or commercial corporations organized under the laws of Mexico only on condition that said resources be regularly developed and on the further condition that the legal provisions be observed.

Legal capacity to acquire ownership of lands and waters of the nation shall be governed by the following provisions:

I. Only Mexicans by birth or naturalization and Mexican companies have the right to acquire ownership in lands, waters, and their appurtenances or to obtain concessions to develop mines, waters, or mineral fuels in the Republic of Mexico. The nation may grant the same right to foreigners, provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their governments in respect to the same, under penalty in case of breach of forfeiture to the nation of property so acquired. Within a zone of 100 kilometers from the frontiers and of 50 kilometers from the seacoast no foreigner shall under any conditions acquire direct ownership of lands and waters.

"II. The religious institutions known as churches, irrespective of creed, shall in no case have legal capacity to acquire, hold, or administer real property or loans made on such real property; all such real property or loans as may be at present held by the said religious institutions, either on their own behalf or through third parties, shall vest in the Nation, and anyone shall have the right to denounce property so held. Presumptive proof shall be sufficient to declare the denunciation well founded. Places of public worship are the property of the Nation, as represented by the Federal Government, which shall determine which of them may continue to be devoted to their present purposes. Episcopal residences, rectories, seminaries, orphan asylums, or collegiate establishments of religious institutions, convents, or any other buildings built or designed for the administration, propaganda, or teaching of the tenets of any religious creed shall forthwith vest, as of full right, directly in the Nation, to be used exclusively for the public services of the federation or of the States within their respective jurisdictions. All places of public worship which shall later be erected shall be the property of the nation.

"III. Public and private charitable institutions for the sick and needy, for scientific research, or for the diffusion of knowledge, mutual-aid societies, or organizations formed for any other lawful purpose shall in no case acquire, hold, or administer loans made on real property, unless the mortgage terms do not exceed 10 years. In no case shall institutions of this character be under the patronage, direction, administration, charge, or supervision of religious corporations or institutions, nor of ministers of any religious creed, or of their dependents, even though either the former or the latter shall not be in active service.

"IV. Commercial stock companies shall not acquire, hold, or administer rural properties. Companies of this nature which may be organized to develop any manufacturing, mining, petroleum, or other industry, excepting only agricultural industries, may acquire, hold, or administer lands only in an area absolutely necessary for their establishments or adequate to serve the purposes indicated, which the executive of the union or of the respective State in each case shall determine.

"V. Banks duly organized under the laws governing institutions of credit may make mortgage loans on rural and urban property in accordance with the provisions of the said laws, but they may not own nor administer more real property than that absolutely necessary for their direct purposes; and they may, furthermore, hold temporarily for the brief term fixed by law such real property as may be judicially adjudicated to them in execution proceedings.

"VI. Properties held in common by coowners, hamlets situated on private property, pueblos, tribal congregations, and other settlements which, as a matter of fact or law, conserve their communal character, shall have legal capacity to enjoy in common the waters, woods, and lands belonging to them, or which may have been or shall be restored to them according to the law of January 6, 1915, until such time as the manner of making the division of the lands shall be determined by law.

"VII. Excepting the corporations to which Clauses III, IV, V, and VI hereof refer, no other civil corporation may hold or administer on its own behalf real estate or mortgage loans derived therefrom, with the single exception of buildings designed directly and immediately for the purposes of the institution. The States, the Federal district, and the Territories, as well as the municipalities throughout the Republic, shall enjoy full legal capacity to acquire and hold all real estate necessary for public services."

The Federal and State laws shall determine within their respective jurisdiction those cases in which the occupation of private property shall be considered of public utility; and in accordance with the said laws the administrative authorities shall make the corresponding declaration. The amount fixed as compensation for the expropriated property shall be based on the sum at which the said property shall be valued for fiscal purposes in the catastral or revenue offices, whether this value be that manifested by the owner or merely impliedly accepted by reason of the payment of his taxes on such a basis, to which there shall be added 10 per cent. The increased value which the property in question may have acquired through improvements made subsequent to the date of the fixing of the fiscal value shall be the only matter subject to expert opinion and to judicial determination. The same procedure shall be observed in respect to objects whose value is not recorded in the revenue offices.

All proceedings, findings, decisions, and all operations of demarcation, concession, composition, judgment, compromise, alienation, or auction which may have deprived properties held in common by co-owners, hamlets situated on private property, settlements, congregations, tribes, and other settlement organizations still existing since the law of June 25, 1856, of the whole or a part of their lands, woods, and waters, are declared null and void; all findings, resolutions, and operations which may subsequently take place and produce the same effects shall likewise be null and void. Consequently all lands, forests, and waters of which the above-mentioned settlements may have been deprived shall be restored to them according to the decree of January 6, 1915, which shall remain in force as a constitutional law. In case the adjudication of lands, by way of restitution, be not legal in the terms of the said decree, which adjudication have been requested by any of the above entities, those lands shall nevertheless be given to them by way of grant, and they shall in no event fail to receive such as they may need. Only such lands, title to which may have been acquired in the divisions made by virtue of the said law of June 25, 1856, or such as may be held in undisputed ownership for more than 10 years, are excepted from the provision of nullity, provided their area does not exceed 50 hectares.

Any excess over this area shall be returned to the commune and the owner shall be indemnified. All laws of restitution enacted by virtue of this provision shall be immediately carried into effect by the administrative authorities. Only members of the commune shall have the right to the lands destined to be divided, and the rights to these lands shall be inalienable so long as they remain undivided; the same provision shall govern the right of ownership after the division has been made. The exercise of the rights pertaining to the nation by virtue of this article shall follow judicial process; but as a part of this process and by order of the proper tribunals, which order shall be issued within the maximum period of one month, the administrative authorities shall proceed without delay to the occupation, administration, auction, or sale of the lands and waters in question, together with all their appurtenances, and in no case may the acts of the said authorities be set aside until final sentence is handed down.

During the next constitutional term the Congress and the State legislatures shall enact laws, within their respective jurisdictions, for the purpose of carrying out the division of large landed estates, subject to the following conditions:

"(a) In each State and Territory there shall be fixed the maximum area of land which any one individual or legally organized corporation may own.

"(b) The excess of the area thus fixed shall be subdivided by the owner within the period set by the laws of the respective locality, and these subdivisions shall be offered for sale on such conditions as the respective governments shall approve, in accordance with the said laws.

"(c) If the owner shall refuse to make the subdivision, this shall be carried out by the local government by means of expropriation proceedings.

"(d) The value of the subdivisions shall be paid in annual amounts sufficient to amortise the principal and interest within a period of not less than 20 years, during which the person acquiring them may not alienate them. The rate of interest shall not exceed 5 per cent per annum.

"(e) The owner shall be bound to receive bonds of a special issue to guarantee the payment of the property expropriated. With this end in view, the Congress shall issue a law authorizing the States to issue bonds to meet with agrarian obligations.

"(f) The local laws shall govern the extent of the family patrimony, and determine what property shall constitute the same on the basis of its inalienability; it shall not be subject to attachment nor to any charge whatever."

All contracts and concessions made by former governments from and after the year 1876, which shall have resulted in the monopoly of lands, waters, and natural resources of the nation by a single individual or corporation are declared subject to revision, and the Executive is authorized to declare those null and void which seriously prejudice the public interest.

Constitution of 1857, article 27, I think, under Benito Juárez, and patterned after ours:

ART. 27. Private property shall not be taken without the consent of the owner, except for reasons of public utility, indemnification having been made. The law shall determine the authority to make the expropriation and the conditions on which it shall be carried out.

No religious corporations and institutions of whatever character, denomination, duration, or object, nor civil corporations, when under the patronage, direction, or administration of the former, or of ministers of any creed shall have legal capacity to acquire title to or administer real property other than the buildings immediately and directly destined to the services or purposes of the said corporations and institutions. Nor shall they have legal capacity to acquire or administer loans made on such real property.

Civil corporations and institutions not comprised within the above provision may acquire and administer, in addition to the buildings mentioned, real property and loans made on such real property required for their maintenance and purposes, subject to the requisites and limitations to be established by the Federal law to be enacted by the Congress on the subject. (As amended May 14, 1901.)

Now, let me refer you in this same constitution to some rare specimens of socialistic declarations. First, if you employ a person over there you must pay him in legal currency. No checks, even though certified, go under this remarkable document. Now let me show you the absurdity and hazard of this foolish provision. The Mexican Northwestern Railroad, that enters Mexico at Juarez and runs into Madero, has its head offices in El Paso; some of its officers stay there and its accounts are kept there. Under this constitution you have to pay, if exacted, once a week. Now, the paymaster, or treasurer, at El Paso has to load a man on the train once a week, give him, we will say, $20,000 in currency, and send him to Madero to pay off its employees. Well, Mr. Mexican Bandit gets onto the exact time of pay day. He meets the messenger with the $20,000 each week, and takes his tariff. Ah, well, what does this measly (?) sum amount to, anyway? The "poor bandit" needs the money—but I should not think it would tend to encourage investment of foreign money in Mexico or strengthen a protection of American investments already there. Now I am going to quote you the exact language embraced in Title X, of article 123, of this "remarkable constitution": "Title X. All wages shall be paid in legal currency, and shall not be paid in merchandise, orders, counters, or any other representative token with which it is sought to substitute money." Nor is this all the socialist declarations of this remarkable constitution of the Government we are asked by certain gentlemen here to dive in and swim the murky waters of the Rio Grande, without even removing our "hickory shirt" and "jean pantaloons," to embrace. You have to pay your employee in his place of business or his home. You can't pay him in a church or a schoolhouse or a city hall or a courthouse, but you must take the puro plata, the old peso, to his place of business or his home and put it in his very fist. Furthermore, if you desire to discharge an employee you have to give him three months' notice prior to time of discharge. Well, no, you do not have to do that, exactly; you have the option of paying him three months in advance and letting him go at any time. Do you think that would displease Trotsky and his other Bolsheviks? If you have a stenographer in your office who is the sole support of a widowed mother, and you desire to pay her overtime, eight hours being all she can work for you, you can not do so, for this article 123, Title XI, says no woman can engage in overtime work. Now, personally, I don't believe a woman should be compelled to work over eight hours, but if she wants to do so in order to make a few extra dollars for herself and dependents, I certainly think she should be permitted.

Now, there are some provisions in this constitution compelling employers to provide sanitary quarters for their employees that I indorse, and also forcing said employers to guard against accidents in machinery and tools of employment. Such laws we have in this country, and I helped to enact many of them as a member of the legislature of my State. But there are so many unreasonable, socialistic, and anarchistic, unworkable provisions that no person calling himself a Democrat or a good American could indorse. I would like to incorporate this entire constitution as a part of my remarks, but there is so much of it that I do not wish to impose upon the generosity of this House and encumber the RECORD. I simply was astounded when I read it. I believe it would even jar the socialistic nerves of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Now, the general trend of all this propaganda for immediate recognition of Mexico is to the effect that there will be no confiscation and no retroactive laws, but the constitution and laws of Mexico by express and very clear terms both are confiscatory and retroactive. In reply to this propaganda Secretary Hughes wrote on June 7 of this year: "If Mexico does not contemplate a confiscatory policy the Government can conceive of no possible objection to the treaty." And again I agree with the Secretary of State when he says: "The fundamental question under consideration is the safeguarding of property rights against confiscation. Mexico is free to adopt any policy which she pleases with respect to her public lands, but she is not free to destroy, without compensation, valid titles which may have been obtained by Americans under Mexican laws." Oh, you say, "What business is it of ours what kind of a constitution Mexico has—let it be socialistic or anarchistic." Well, we have not recognized the Bolshevik government of Russia, and still there has been no confiscation of American property there. We did not recognize the government of Victoriana Huerta, founded upon assassination, pillage, and murder, although it was not alleged that American property was being confiscated. I am not so greatly concerned personally as to how Mexico governs her own people, although I do not indorse a socialistic government anywhere on this earth; but, gentlemen, I am deeply concerned, and every red-blooded American ought to be, as to the treatment she accords Americans over there that the government in-

vited in there and are still extending invitations to come, and the extent of protection she accords their person and property. [Applause.]

Now, let me state to some of my friends who are hollowing so loudly for immediate and unconditional recognition; that if the Mexican Government, operating under this constitution, is recognized, the effect will be to release Mexico from every article of the existing treaty between that country and the United States binding Mexico to respect the private property lawfully acquired, or the liberty of American citizens in that Republic. Ah, you say, "the Supreme Court will safeguard their rights. They can resort to that tribunal to guard against confiscation." Well, you could sue out in the supreme court of that country what is called the writ of amparo; this writ combines the essential elements of the writ of habeas corpus, certiorari, and mandamus. It gives redress to a specific person or entity, and never makes any general statement of law. It can never declare a law unconstitutional. Now, Mexico says, and it has been repeated here on the floor by some of my friends, that she can not sign the treaty; it would be humiliating to her national pride. Now, she did sign a declaration acknowledging the independence of Texas on the battle field of San Jacinto. I do not know whether she saved her national pride, but Santa Ana saved his hide. And again, this utterance may seem strange indeed, for after the war of 1848, when the Mexican nation was prostrate before victorious American armies and the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed at the point of the bayonet, the United States Government dictated just what should be the status of an American citizen in Mexico, and that these provisions were binding upon both Governments. The United States Government said, in effect, "You shall treat Americans in Mexico exactly thus and so, and their rights shall be just so. But the rights of Mexicans in the United States shall be exactly the same. Now, that is all the United States is contending for to-day. Who is it on this floor or elsewhere that will deny but that a Mexican has the same rights before the courts in this country as an American, and the same judicial mantle of protection is thrown over his property? Now, let us exact this from Mexico, and while I desire diplomatic and friendly relations to be resumed between the two countries, and probably recognition would greatly advance the commercial interests of my home city and along the border in my district, which I would greatly desire, still, Mr. Chairman, if that can not be brought about in the proper manner, if Mexico is not both able and willing to guarantee that protection over her own signature, nothing humiliating, and nothing unreasonable, as one Representative I would be willing to defer recognition till the crack of doom. With the cold, naked, horribly mutilated bodies of 18 good Americans murdered at Santa Isabelle a few short years past staring me in the face and fresh in my memory and many other horrible instances of splendid Americans yielding their lives in Mexico without even "a dog's show," and the virtue of American women sacrificed to Mexican lust, too numerous to mention here, I would not forego one American life or endanger the virtue of one American woman for all the gold in Mexico. [Applause.]

Ah, you say, several States along the border have already recognized Mexico and that many of the representative citizens on the border are advocating recognition, and it is shouted in my face that my own State has recognized Mexico. Now, let me say to you, gentlemen, what in the Hades can Texas do toward recognizing Mexico? [Laughter.]

It is true her governor was invited down to the inauguration, was met at the border by a special train sent by Obregon, went down to the capital, wined and dined—anyway dined—I have heard somewhere he does not "wine" [laughter], came back and issued a proclamation or made a declaration recognizing Mexico, but still Hughes failed to take cognizance of it, and this country has never sent an ambassador down there; and if Texas has either an ambassador, minister plenipotentiary, or even a chargé d'affaires down there, I have never heard of it.

Now, my friends, I did not intend to impose myself on this House. I live on the border. I was raised there. The Mexican question is not Pancho Villa. It did not end when Pancho, in recognition of his "valiant services to his country," was presented by the Government of Mexico with a small farm of 800,000 acres in Chihuahua and retired to lead the life of a "country gentleman," but the fundamental question that confronts our country in considering its relations with Mexico is the protection of American lives and the safeguarding of their property rights against confiscation. If Mexico would effectively bind herself to do this, gentlemen, I would be in favor of our country recognizing her to-morrow, and vote to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to loan her, upon her national bonds, such a sum of money to properly enable her to rehabilitate and place upon a stable and sound financial basis her devastated country and her depleted treasury. [Applause.]

That is all the people in my section want. Of course, there are a few gentlemen in my State who want to sell a few tons of coal or a carload of Mexican blankets down there, and they care nothing about Americans, their lives, and property, and they would not indorse it. I wanted to show you gentlemen the constitution of this Republic and also wanted to show you what Mr. Obregon says he will do; and Secretary Hughes and Secretary Colby knew the nature of the Mexicans, as Norman Davis, the Assistant Secretary of State, once said to me that they will not get recognition until they agree to protect the lives of Americans. [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. HUDSPETH and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, it was my pleasure to-day to introduce a bill in the House providing for the bestowal of a medal of honor upon former Chief Boatswain's Mate William Henry Schmidt, veteran of the World War and one who gave distinguished service under fire.

Mr. Schmidt was commander of the gun crew attached to the armed guard ship *Amphion* when, on October 12, 1918, a German submarine attacked that vessel in midocean. For 1 hour and 20 minutes a pitched battle followed, in which the submarine fired more than 200 shots and the crew of the *Amphion* 93.

As a result of the distinguished work of Mr. Schmidt, Lieut. Commander H. H. Norton, United States Navy, acting commander of the *Amphion*, recommended him for a medal of honor. This award was reduced to the granting of a Navy cross.

The handling of the gun crew and the conditions under which the gun crew operated during the fighting alone would warrant the medal of honor award for Mr. Schmidt. During the battle the deck caught fire. Directly underneath of the fire was located the ammunition magazine. There was danger of the fire spreading into the magazine. Notwithstanding this the gun crew continued action, driving off the submarine.

The action of the board of awards in reducing the award to Mr. Schmidt has been called to the attention of Secretary of the Navy Denby. The board of awards acted under a misapprehension as to the length of the battle and clearly made a gross error in the reduction of the award. Apparently because this was an error of the previous administration, Secretary Denby has not seen fit to consider a review of the award.

I have received the following letter from Secretary Denby concerning the case of Mr. Schmidt:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated November 18, 1922, with inclosures, relating to the case of Mr. W. H. Schmidt, formerly chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy.

Mr. Schmidt was recommended for a medal of honor by Lieut. Commander H. H. Norton, United States Navy, while acting as commander of the armed guard ship *Amphion*.

This recommendation was carefully considered by the board of awards and the board recommended the award of a Navy cross in this case.

Many officers and men were recommended for various decorations and awards for their services during the war, and it was the duty of the board of awards to consider all papers placed before it and to recommend in each case that action which was deemed advisable and just after thorough consideration of all cases.

It is not the policy of the department to reconvene the board of awards nor to take any action contrary to the recommendation of the board. This has not been done in the case of any officer or man whose recommendations were considered by the board.

The inclosures forwarded with your letter are returned herewith.

It is a very narrow and shortsighted policy on the part of the Secretary of the Navy not to reconsider cases where awards were granted under misapprehension or on mistaken facts. I feel that Mr. Schmidt should be given the medal of honor recommended for him and hope that consideration will be given the bill I have introduced by the committee in the very near future.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had under consideration the bill H. R. 13232, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MECHANICAL DEVICE FOR COUNTING VOTES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been requested to inform the membership of the House that in the majority room in the House Office Building there is a new device for mechanical voting in the House which will be on exhibition for several days, and they would be very glad to have Members drop in and inspect it.

UNAUTHORIZED SIGNATURES TO PETITION.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have a correction made. I understand that the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] this morning placed in the RECORD a list of names purporting to be subscribed to a petition to hold memorial services in honor of some Federal prisoner, and that my name was on the petition. I did not know there was such a prisoner living or dead. I did not authorize my name to be put on such a petition; I did not know that it was on there. I ask unanimous consent of the House that my name may not appear in the printed remarks.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to interpose any objection to the gentleman's request, but any responsibility for striking out any of the names or making any change should rest on the House and not upon me. The document I inserted just as it came to me. I have no objection to individual Members seeking to have their names stricken from it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KLINE of New York. Mr. Speaker, my request is of the same nature. I find my name was attached to that communication, but I did not sign it. I have authorized no one to sign it for me, and I ask unanimous consent that my name may be eliminated from the Journal and the RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The SPEAKER. It will not, of course, appear in the Journal. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Reserving the right to object, I appreciate the very serious, wicked trick that has been played on the gentleman, but I think the perpetrator of the outrage ought to be held up to public scorn. When did the gentleman first know that his name was attached to it?

Mr. KLINE of New York. When I came to the House.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Did he call it to the attention of the man who attached it to the document?

Mr. KLINE of New York. I did not. I did not know it was a man.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Or a woman?

Mr. KLINE of New York. I do not know.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I think anyone who would practice this kind of a trick on Members of Congress ought to be exposed. I hope the gentlemen who are concerned will institute an investigation, because we do not want to have this develop into a practice. It would be embarrassing to have circulars continually floating around here with the names of Members of Congress on them that are not authorized.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I think I can suggest to him probably how the names got onto the petition, so called. A lady called at my office and asked me about how I stood on the question of pardoning the war prisoners. I made to her the answer which I make to the country now, and for which I make no apology, that I had had sufficient experience with criminal trials to think that in all probability many of these men had been convicted because of the inflamed state of the public mind, and if the records were carefully examined, perhaps 50 per cent of them would be and ought to be pardoned. I did not refer, nor did I understand the lady to refer, directly or indirectly, to any memorial service or proceedings to be held over a dead prisoner. What I say to the House I said to her. I presume I am blameworthy for not being more abrupt, for not telling her I would have nothing to do with her nor with any application to pardon the prisoners.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, having interposed no objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, it having been granted, of course nothing can be done; but in view of the gentleman's remarks just had, I should have interposed an objection if he had made the remarks before I withdrew the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLINE]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CONNOLLY of Pennsylvania, at the request of Mr. VARE, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for two weeks, on account of illness, at the request of Mr. MAPES.

To Mr. APPLEBY, for two days, on account of a death.

To Mr. MCFADDEN, an extension of leave of absence for six days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

814. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Jamaica Bay, N. Y., with a view of securing increased depth and width, including the entrance channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

815. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survy of Muskegon Harbor, Mich. (H. Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Bureau of the Budget, an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Narcotic Control Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, $800 (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

817. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation in the sum of $6,969.46 to pay claims for damages by naval vessels which have been adjusted by the Navy Department and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 496); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

818. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Tariff Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, $250,000 (H. Doc. No. 497); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13317) for the extension of Virginia Avenue west of Rock Creek to the north end of the new Key Bridge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13318) providing for the comprehensive development of the park and playground system in the National Capital; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 13319) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Shasta National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13320) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Tahoe National Forest, in the States of California and Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13321) for the improvement of channel connecting the deep waters in James River with Hampton Roads, Va., and for the modification of the existing project for the improvement of said channel; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13322) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Columbia, Marion County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13323) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Poplarville, Pearl River County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13324) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lumberton, Lamar County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 13325) to amend section 9 of an act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 13326) in reference to a national military park at Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 13327) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the city of Redlands, Calif., for certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 406) to authorize the conveyance of the south half of Red River bed, in the State of Oklahoma, to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FOSTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to child labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A resolution (H. Res. 465) providing for the appointment of a select committee of five Members of the House, who shall make full inquiry into the matter of the permanent installation in the House wing of the Capitol and in the Hall of the House of Representatives of the apparatus or device now experimentally in operation therein, designated as a "public address or voice amplifying system," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introducted and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13328) granting a pension to Katherine Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 13329) granting a pension to William E. Hamer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 13330) for the relief of Luther Lysander Martin; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13331) granting a pension to William T. Prater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13332) granting a pension to John W. Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13333) granting a pension to Lucy Stevens Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13334) granting an increase of pension to James A. Carver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13335) providing for the examination and survey of Manhasset Bay, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KENNEDY: A bill (H. R. 13336) for the relief of Thomas A. Tabele; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13337) for the relief of Mary F. Spaight; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13338) for the relief of Thomas F. Sutton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13339) granting an increase of pension to Paul W. Thomson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13340) for the relief of Frank L. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13341) granting an increase of pension to Greene B. Caywood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 13342) granting a pension to John O. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 13343) granting a pension to Minnie Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6562. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of Intracoastal Canal Association, for completion and improvement of the intracoastal canal in Louisiana and Texas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6563. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of C. W. Chamberlain and 50 other residents and business men of Gastonia, N. C., to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6564. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of New Century Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing the passage of the Bursum Indian bill; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6565. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of J. Bert Peabody and 16 other residents of Birmingham, Mich., to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6566. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of National Aeronautic Association of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., on a national policy for air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6567. Also, petition of the Celotex Co., Marrero, La., regarding the flood and overflow of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

6568. By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of Henry G. Babcock and 42 other residents of the eleventh congressional district of New York, favoring a modifying of the Greek and Turkish immigration quotas in such a way as to grant asylum in the United States of America to as many as possible of these sufferers; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6569. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of Federation of Polish Hebrews of America, favoring the amending of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6570. Also, petition of the New York Waterways Association, of New York, favoring improvement of the New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6571. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Pima Indians of Arizona, favoring an appropriation for a canal from Florence, Ariz., to Pima lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, life without Thy help and inspiration would indeed lack real significance and outlook. We therefore ask that this morning there may be given to us such a consciousness of Thy presence, Thy graciousness, and Thy willingness to help in every situation as to guide in proper deliberation to the highest interest and welfare of the country. Hear us this morning and be very near and gracious. For Christ Jesus' sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions adopted by the Federation of the Missouri Pacific Railway Shop Crafts, of Little Rock, and the Federated Shop Crafts, of Paragould, both in the State of Arkansas, favoring prompt action by the Federal Government to remedy faulty condition of railroad-operating equipment, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution adopted by the annual convention of the Michigan State Federation of Women's Clubs, at Flint, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide adequate physical education for children in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ELKINS presented resolutions adopted by Parkersburg Post, No. 15, American Legion, of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring the passage of legislation for the relief of Gill I. Wilson, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LADD presented a petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association, of Willow City, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. NICHOLSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Monte Vista, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

OPERATION OF THE PROHIBITION LAW.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD in 8-point type a statement which I have prepared on the progress of prohibition in the United States. I prepared the statement for one of the metropolitan papers and the paper used it partially but not in full.

I desire to add in this connection that prohibition in the United States has come to stay. Gentlemen who are striking at it and complaining of the operation of the Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment may well reserve their energies for a better purpose. The President of the United States said in his recent message that the most demoralizing feature of American life was the violation of the Volstead Act. I differ from him. I think the most demoralizing factor is the growing difficulty which the average American family experiences in meeting the increasing pressure of economic conditions. Prohibition has helped that situation substantially, but prohibi-

tion can not do everything. Prohibition has helped that situation because the savings deposits in the United States have grown more rapidly since the advent of prohibition than in any previous period of similar duration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair feels that it should call attention to the rule of the Senate. This is a statement or communication prepared by the Senator from Texas which he asks to have printed in the RECORD. It is the equivalent of asking leave to print a speech in the RECORD. The Chair will not raise the objection, but desires the Senate to understand that it is a violation of the rule as the Chair understands the rule.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am willing to reserve the request until morning business is closed and then renew it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think the Senator from Texas understood the suggestion of the Chair. The Chair did not make the suggestion that the request is out of order now, but that it is equivalent to printing a speech in the RECORD. It seems to me it is in order to do anything by unanimous consent that is not expressly prohibited from unanimous consent being granted.

I never have seen any reason in the world why the Senate should not have adopted the rule of business prevailing in the House, and let Senators print instead of talking when they want to do so. I think it would be more edifying to the country and to the Senate very often to have speeches printed. It costs less money and takes less time than to make the speech, and I see no reason in the world, so far as I am concerned, for objection if a Senator desires to print a statement in the RECORD instead of taking the time of the Senate to read it to the Senate, as the Senator from Texas can do if he wants to. I have never seen the logic or reason for objecting to such a rule.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a short statement prepared for a newspaper. I could read it in a few minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; the Senator could occupy the time of the Senate in reading the statement into the RECORD, but if he prefers to print it in the RECORD without reading, I see no reason why he should not do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears no objection and the statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

The statement referred to is as follows:

SENATOR SHEPPARD'S STATEMENT ON PROHIBITION.

Prohibition has registered distinct gains in the country as a whole by virtue of the recent election. Changes in the membership of Congress have been due more largely to the opposition to the Republican Party than to any other single cause. They represent a readjustment of the country along more normal political lines and a strengthening of the sentiment for prohibition, regardless of political divisions.

The best indication of public sentiment on the liquor question is found in those States where referendum votes were had. In Ohio where a beer and wine amendment was submitted to a vote of the people the proposed amendment was defeated by a vote of 188,000. California is one of the largest grape-growing States in the Union, and there was supposed to be a strong sentiment against prohibition in that commonwealth on account of its alleged detrimental effect on this industry, and yet the people of California adopted at the recent election an enforcement code which has the effect of putting into operation the one-half of one per cent definition contained in the Volstead Act. This code was adopted by a majority of more than 80,000. When we recall that in 1920 a similar measure was proposed in California and was defeated by 65,000, the growth of prohibition sentiment in California becomes plainly evident.

A referendum vote on a beer and wine proposal was taken in Illinois under what was known as the public policy act. Under that act the measure would have been inoperative even if adopted and would have been nothing more than an indication of sentiment to the legislature. Owing to the futility of such a vote, and the obvious unconstitutionality of the measure, even if passed by the legislature, the prohibition forces advised their supporters not to vote. Two million votes were cast in the election, the wets polling 800,000 on this question, the drys 200,000. Practically one million people did not vote at all on the beer and wine proposal. The wets failed, therefore, to receive a majority of the votes necessary to constitute an indication of the popular will.

An enforcement code closely resembling the Volstead Act was submitted to the people of Massachusetts and was defeated by a large majority. This does not mean a recession of prohibition sentiment in Massachusetts, because no prohibition code has ever been enacted there since the prohibition amendment came into being. In fact, in the year 1920 the general court of Massachusetts, that is the State legislature, passed an act attempting to legalize the sale of beverages of an alcoholic content exceeding that permitted by the Federal statute. This measure passed both branches of the general court. Governor Coolidge vetoed the act and prevented it from becoming operative on the ground that it was in conflict with the Federal statute which under the Constitution of the United States was supreme.

Later a 2.75 per cent beer proposal was approved by the electors through a referendum.

It will be seen, therefore, that in the last election Massachusetts merely ran true to form so far as prohibition enforcement is concerned. The situation there is due very largely to the foreign element and shows the necessity for the continuation of a campaign of education.

An investigation of changes in the Senate will show that there has been a gain from three to five votes for prohibition. In the House of Representatives the situation is practically unchanged. In many of the districts where wet candidates supplanted dry candidates or where dry candidates supplanted wet candidates, there were local and partisan questions which undoubtedly affected the result, and it is not possible to determine the extent to which the prohibition question weighed with the voters in such districts.

The futility of the so-called light wine and beer movement in Congress becomes evident when it is recognized that Congress can not legalize liquors which are intoxicating in fact. The eighteenth amendment prohibits the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. The courts take judicial notice that wines are intoxicating liquors and the extent to which the alcoholic content may be increased beyond the one-half of 1 per cent now fixed until it becomes in fact intoxicating is a mere matter of conjecture. What will intoxicate one man will not intoxicate another. A definite standard is essential to the effective enforcement of the law, and any standard which does not contemplate the sale of liquors intoxicating in fact will not satisfy the desires of those who wish an alcoholic stimulant and who are crying for light wines and beers. The adoption of any of these so-called light wines and beer proposals would utterly frustrate the eighteenth amendment and it is absolutely certain that no legislation of the character proposed will be adopted. If the sale of such beverages are permitted, some place must be provided where they may be manufactured and sold. This means the restoration of the brewer in the United States or the return of the saloon.

The baneful and degrading effect of the liquor traffic on the political life of America was one of the principal reasons for the adoption of prohibition. The almost entire removal of this result has been one of the beneficient results of prohibition. There can be no compromise on the liquor question. One of our chief difficulties even under the existing law with its present one-half of 1 per cent standard is its violation by the brewers. To liberalize the standard by any way would be but to invite increased complications and difficulties. Suppose it should be possible by any chance for the opponents of prohibition to secure a modification of the existing definition by an act of the Sixty-eighth Congress. This would not legalize the sale of beer and wines in those States that have a State law as strong or stronger than the present Volstead Act. More than three-fourths of the States have adopted laws prohibiting the sale of beverages containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol. These State definitions have been enacted, in most instances, after many years of experience in attempting to enforce prohibitory liquor laws. Several of these States have tried out the light wine and beer proposal as a solution of the prohibition problem but have found it entirely impracticable and have later repudiated it.

Several countries are now attempting to enforce partial prohibition by prohibiting the sale of beverages with the stronger alcoholic content. Liquor interests in these countries fight these partial prohibition measures as completely as they fight complete prohibition in this country. When, therefore, they argue in this country that they are opposed to the saloon and wish to promote temperance by securing the sale of the lighter alcoholic beverages, we should not overlook the position they are taking against the lighter alcoholic beverages in the countries where the light wine and beer policy is being tried out.

The campaign for light wine and beer is a cleverly disguised attack on prohibition in its entirety. It is destined to fail because prohibition is firmly embedded both in the Constitution and in the hearts of an overwhelming majority of the American people. Exceptional instances of Volstead violations are played

up in flamboyant headlines by the sensational press. The Volstead Act in the country as a whole is 90 per cent efficient and the masses of the people are saving more money for legitimate purposes than ever before. The volume of liquor consumed in the United States since the advent of prohibition has decreased so enormously as to constitute one of the chief assurances of our continued development and prosperity.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 940) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. WARREN. Allow me, Mr. President, to give notice that I shall ask the attention of the Senate to the consideration of the bill at the close of morning business.

INSURANCE CLAIMS OF EX-SOLDIERS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, there have been referred to the Committee on Finance eight bills, all of them relating to cases in which the soldier either failed to make application for insurance or had allowed his insurance to lapse. The cases will probably increase very materially in the future, and the question arises whether they should be taken cognizance of by the Committee on Finance. It is the opinion of the Committee on Finance that it should not consider the bills, but that they should be referred to the Committee on Pensions. Some of them involve the question of the rating for disability, and there are no experts connected with the Committee on Finance to investigate that subject. Others relate to the question simply of excuse for the failure to comply with the law either in making the application or in keeping up the insurance payments. In either case, as the insurance is a matter purely of contractual relation between the soldier and the Government, it seems to me very proper that if there is anything given at all it should be awarded by the Committee on Pensions, because they are matters of gratuity in which there is no legal obligation on the part of the Government. Therefore, under instruction of the committee, I report all the bills back with the request that they be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bills, and that they be referred to the Committee on Pensions. Without objection that order will be made.

The bills were referred to the Committee on Pensions as follows:

A bill (S. 935) for the relief of Gill Irwin Wilson;

A bill (S. 2986) for the relief of Angy Anderson;

A bill (S. 3434) directing the Veterans' Bureau to pay Constance Van Brunt Lynch the present value of a term insurance policy;

A bill (H. R. 546) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay war-risk insurance to the foster parents of Edward Short;

A bill (S. 3536) for the relief of the heirs of Nels Rudi;

A bill (S. 3560) to provide for payment of the amount of a war-risk insurance policy to a beneficiary designated by Capt. Clarence Centenial Sichel, deceased;

A bill (S. 3707) for the relief of Hazel E. Simms; and

A bill (S. 4021) for the relief of Edna Mae Baird.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 11, 1922, they presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor;

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.; and

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 4151) to permit certain persons to make purchases in the Quartermaster Departments of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4152) for the relief of Frank A. Jahn; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 4153) granting an honorable discharge to Ustacio B. Davison; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 4154) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Mott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 4155) granting a pension to John King (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4156) authorizing the accounting officers of the General Accounting Office to settle the accounts of W. H. Power; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

A bill (S. 4157) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Wilson B. Burtt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4158) for the relief of Eugene Oberdorfer, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4159) granting a pension to John E. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. SIMMONS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECHES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table, for present consideration, Senate Resolution 351. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask what is the Senator's request?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take up Senate Resolution 351.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The reading clerk read Senate Resolution 351, submitted by Mr. HEFLIN September 12, 1922, as follows:

Whereas the officials of the 12 Federal reserve banks have admitted that they have had printed and circulated, out of the funds of the banks, thousands of copies of a speech made in the Senate touching a controverted subject, and in which the position of one Senator is assailed and criticized by another Senator; and

Whereas the Senate feels that the Senator who spoke on the other side of the subject involved in the Senator's speech which was printed and circulated by said Federal reserve bank officials, is entitled, in fair play and justice, to have the opportunity of sending copies of his speech to the citizens who have received the speech which assailed and criticized him; and

Whereas the Senate, by resolution, requested and received from the officials of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta a certain list of citizens to whom they have sent the speech in question; and

Whereas the Senate feels that the officials of the other 11 Federal reserve banks should furnish to the Senate a list of the names and post-office addresses of citizens to whom they sent copies of said speech; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Reserve Board be, and it is hereby, requested to obtain from said Federal reserve bank officials, and have sent to the Senate, a list of names with post-office addresses of the citizens to whom said speech was sent.

Mr. WARREN. I will ask the Senator if the resolution is on the calendar?

Mr. HEFLIN. It is a resolution which I introduced several weeks ago, but I could not get it considered at that time, so I requested that it remain on the President's table until I called it up at some future time. I do not think there will be any objection to it. There ought not to be any objection.

Mr. SMOOT. There has been objection to it in the past.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not exactly in this form.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not remember the exact words, but the substance seems to be the same.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senate passed a resolution calling on the bank in Atlanta to supply a list of the names to whom they sent the speech in question. This is the same kind of resolution calling on the other 11 banks to send a list of the names to whom they sent the same speech. I discovered later that the other 11 banks had sent out that speech, and that all of the banks together had sent out 142,000 copies of it, and I simply want an opportunity to send my speech to the same people who read the other speech. My speech was a part of the controversy on Governor Harding and deflation.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know just how the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] feels about it, but I believe he objected to it before. Does the Senator care about the adoption of the preamble in the resolution? Is not the information all that the Senator wants?

Mr. HEFLIN. The preamble simply states what the other 11 banks have done, and the resolution would not make complete sense if it did not have some of the preamble, because it sets out that one of the banks has complied with a former resolution. There is not anything in the preamble that ought not to be there. It simply says that the Senate feels that the other Senator—meaning myself—should have the right to send his speech to the parties who read the speech attacking him. I think the Senate feels that way. I think every fair-minded Senator would feel that way about it.

Mr. SMOOT. As I gathered from the reading of the preamble, it makes a statement of what the other 11 banks did. I do not know whether they did it or not.

Mr. HEFLIN. They admit they did it. They sent in reports giving the number of speeches they sent out. We have that information from each one of the banks, and they sent in all about 142,000 copies. Each and every one of them admit they sent out the speech in question.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator want to print 142,000 copies of his speech and send a copy to every one who received a copy of the speech of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]?

Mr. HEFLIN. I would like to send it to all of them, but it would cost me $20 a thousand to print it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought.

Mr. HEFLIN. But I want to take excerpts from it and give the main points of my reply to every one of them. I am willing to do that in order that the truth about the matter may be known.

Mr. WARREN. At the time the Senator received recognition I had addressed the Chair pursuant to the notice I had given that I would undertake to bring up the appropriation bill at the close of morning business.

Mr. HEFLIN. This will only take a moment, if the Senator will allow me to go ahead. I do not think anyone will object.

Mr. WARREN. Has the Senator any objection to my calling up the appropriation bill?

Mr. HEFLIN. I had rather take up the resolution now and press it. I am very much in earnest about the matter involved and feel like employing all tactics at my command to secure the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WARREN. Is it the idea of the Senator from Alabama to occupy the remainder of the morning in making a speech?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; unless my resolution can be now considered; I do not propose to discuss the resolution if I can have it adopted now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Secretary has read. Is there objection?

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	Lenroot	Smith
Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Smoot
Bayard	George	McKellar	Stanley
Borah	Gooding	McLean	Sterling
Brookhart	Hale	McNary	Sutherland
Cameron	Harreld	Nelson	Swanson
Capper	Harris	New	Townsend
Caraway	Harrison	Nicholson	Underwood
Colt	Heflin	Norris	Wadsworth
Couzens	Johnson	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Warren
Curtis	Kellogg	Pomerene	Watson
Dial	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Williams
Dillingham	Keyes	Robinson	Willis
Fernald	Ladd	Sheppard	
Fletcher	La Follette	Simmons	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13180.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that very few amendments have been reported by the Committee on Appropriations to the bill which is now under consideration, and the changes proposed only increase the total appropriations by a trifle over $400,000. I make the usual request that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with; that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary," on page 1, line 8, after "$12,000," to insert:

> Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $7,500 per annum and shall perform such duties in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law, and under the provisions of section 177, Revised Statutes, in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease, $7,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if that amendment does not propose new legislation?

Mr. WARREN. It does not. The amendment is in the exact form in which the item has been incorporated in the law during two preceding years, and in the House of Representatives the item was originally in the bill as reported; but on a point of order in that body the item was stricken out, and the bill came to us in that form. The proposed amendment merely reinstates a provision which has been in the law for two or more years and which was also found in the House bill as originally reported.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is already in the law, why should it be repeated in the pending bill?

Mr. WARREN. The Senator's question is a pertinent one, but he should bear in mind the difference between the rules of the Senate and the rules of the House. Under the rules of the House an appropriation in any amount for an office that has not at some time preceding been provided for by legislation other than an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. A similar point of order, however, would throw out probably one-fourth of the employees of the Government. The gentleman who made the point of order in the House of Representatives is perhaps the only one in that body who would have made it. The item, however, in the House went out under that rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not also the rule of the Senate that new legislation shall not be incorporated in an appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. The amendment does not propose new legislation. It is the law now.

Mr. McKELLAR. It necessarily proposes new legislation or it would not be here in italics. Is not that true? Upon what foundation, upon what act of Congress is this amendment based? I am opposed to the general policy of creating undersecretaries in any of the departments. I think they are a foolish aping of British customs along that line and wholly unnecessary. If the amendment is subject to a point of order, I do not know but that I should be inclined to make it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think the amendment is subject to a point of order under the rules of the Senate; I think it is general legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me it is general legislation.

Mr. WARREN. I do not consider it to be general legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have had an agreement here about our rules and we ought to stand by them and not permit general legislation to be enacted upon appropriation bills.

Mr. WARREN. Provision for the undersecretary of the Treasury is already in the law and that law is in operation to-day; so the amendment does not propose new legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator to point out the law to which he refers.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment simply proposes to continue the present law for the coming fiscal year, and the appropriation for the office; that is all.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator can point me to the law, I shall be very glad to see it. If it has already been declared to be the policy of the Government by law of Congress to create undersecretaries and if, therefore, amendment is not subject to a point of order, it would be useless for me to make it; but without such information I should be compelled to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. A similar provision is in existing law. If the Senator would like to see it, I will hand it to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I find on the examination that the item to which the Senator refers is contained in an appropriation bill heretofore passed. I doubt very much whether that may be considered a law creating the office. I call the attention of the Chair to the rule as found on page 20 of the Rules of the Senate, which reads as follows:

> The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriations bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill; and if the point of order is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

I have no desire in the world to have this bill recommitted, but I do not believe in the system of undersecretaries; I have opposed it consistently for a number of years, ever since it was undertaken to establish it. Therefore, Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator may reach his object in another way by asking that the amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the amendment does not propose general legislation. The amendment applies only to one officer of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. I differ with the Senator about that; I think it does propose general legislation. The creation of undersecretaries for the departments of the Government is surely general legislation, and that is shown on the face of the pending amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may be right and I may be wrong, but I differ with him; and I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will look up the precedents, I think he will find that an item of this sort is not general legislation. It applies only to one man, and does not apply generally throughout the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that event we could just make up our entire laws for the departments as special legislation, which I think equally comes within the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. But that is the rule that was established when this large authority was vested in the Appropriations Committee to report on all appropriations—that they were not to legislate also. The Senator from Utah will remember that one of the objections raised to vesting the vast authority of making all appropriations in the Appropriations Committee was that it would continue, as it had in the past, to assert the right of legislating as well as appropriating, and it was said that this would not be done. Now we come to a provision which is legislation in its truest and most perfect sense, as I look at it.

Mr. WARREN. Let me ask the Senator if he will not simply make a motion to strike it out? I shall not contend against it if the Senator wishes to strike it out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can not hear the Senator, there is so much confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. WARREN. I say, let the Senator make his motion, and let the Senate settle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator is willing to have it go out in that way——

Mr. WARREN. I am not willing to have it go out, but I am willing that the Senate shall say whether it shall go out or stay in.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it will go out on the point of order, and I do not know what the result of the motion will be. If my point of order is overruled, then I will make a motion to strike it out.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee has made a point of order against this item on the ground that it is general legislation on an appropriation bill. This is not general legislation on an appropriation bill, and there is precedent after precedent sustaining my position. This appropriates money for one person, one position, and it is not general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is it new legislation?

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what the rule says. It says "general legislation upon an appropriation bill."

Mr. McKELLAR. The rule also says "new legislation."

Mr. SMOOT. It is not new legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. It must be new, or, if it is old legislation, that is just as good as new legislation. If it is old legislation, it is not necessary to reenact it, and if it is new legislation it goes out under the rule. That must be perfectly apparent to anyone.

Mr. SMOOT. Under existing law these very words appear in the last appropriation bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that is the case, may I suggest to the Senator, why repeat it in this bill, in apparent violation of the rules, if not in actual violation of the rules?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a violation of the rules at all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that this constitutes new legislation or general legislation seems to be well taken. This provision expressly authorizes the creation of a new office, to be designated as that of Undersecretary of the Treasury, the officer to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and so forth.

While I have not had an opportunity of examining in detail recently the precedents upon the subject, my memory is that the practice in the body at the other end of the Capitol, where the rules have long held obnoxious new or general legislation, is to the effect that a provision proposing the creation of an office and prescribing the method by which that office shall be filled constitutes general legislation; and the point made by the Senator from Utah, that merely because the legislation relates to one office, and consequently is limited to one person, it can not be held obnoxious to the prohibition against new or general legislation, can not be supported in argument.

This provision is equivalent to saying that hereafter there shall be a new office, to be known as that of Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be filled by appointment——

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator, I suppose, knows that it does not create a new office in its action. The man is already there. It is simply repeating the language of the law as it exists. He is on duty now, and would be, anyway, to the end of the year, and this simply extends his time.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but that is by virtue of a provision limited as to duration in an appropriation bill, and the Senator can not escape the purpose and effect of this rule, which is to segregate the appropriating power from the authorizing power and to vest in one committee the power to create the office and in another committee the power to appropriate for the incumbent of the office. The very purpose of this new rule of the Senate is to require the creation of an office before the Committee on Appropriations shall have authority to provide funds to pay the salary of the officer.

As said by the Senator from Wyoming, it has always been held in the House of Representatives that such a provision is obnoxious to a rule closely analogous to the rule now incorporated in the Senate rules.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. While that is true, as I stated, since the time that rule was adopted, and not many years ago, during the time of the chairmanship of Mr. Fitzgerald, it was abrogated in this way: They passed a law reading, as I remember, in substance, that hereafter the salaries made in an appropriation bill which had passed and become the law should afterwards not be subject to the rule which I mentioned and of which the Senator so well knows.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; but that provision is not in the Senate rules. If the Senator were a Member of the House of Representatives and the point of order were made there, the Senator could invoke the rule of the House; but the provision in the Senate rules is analogous to, if not identical with, the old rule of the House, and the House changed its rule to meet the very difficulty which now confronts the Senator from Wyoming upon the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. If, as the Senator from Wyoming contends, this office is already created and now established, and we are simply making an appropriation for it, why not just say "Undersecretary," at a certain salary, without putting in the italicized proviso that indicates how he is to be appointed?

Mr. ROBINSON. An intelligent answer to the question asked by the Senator from South Carolina makes a conclusive

argument sustaining the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee. The object of this provision is to create an office for two years and at the same time to provide a salary for the officer. Under the new rule of the Senate that can not be done if a point of order is made.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will allow me, I notice, in reading the text, the words "Secretary of the Treasury," so much. If this other office were on all fours with that of the Secretary of the Treasury, it would have been sufficient just to say: "Undersecretary, $7,500."

Mr. McKELLAR. That could not have been done, because there is no legislation providing for an Undersecretary.

Mr. ROBINSON. And it follows from that very declaration, if correct, that this is legislation creating an office, as I stated in the beginning, and providing for the manner in which it shall be filled.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the opposite contention were true it would have been perfectly proper to put in here a first undersecretary, a second undersecretary, a third undersecretary, or as many as they pleased, without warrant of law, and it would be good under this rule. This rule was so amended as to make it impossible for legislation of this character to be put on appropriation bills; and, in order to enforce it, it is provided in the very rule itself that the bill shall go back to the committee if it is found that general legislation is on the bill. I have no desire to send the bill back to the committee. I merely desire to have this provision stricken out, and the reason why I desire to have it stricken out is that I have uniformly opposed such provisions, and I do not believe it is right to have officers named as this proposed officer is named.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me make this statement, in view of the expression of the Senator from Tennessee: My purpose in supporting the point of order is to preserve what appears to me to be the integrity of the rule. It is true that the Senate in specific cases, by vote of this body, has somewhat arbitrarily construed to be not general legislation a provision which according to the facts and the law actually was general legislation; and the Senate has the power now to abrogate or nullify this new rule by holding that this is not new or general legislation, should the point of order be submitted to it by the Chair.

If, however, the Senate should pursue that course it would destroy the value of the rule. The very object of the Senate in adopting this rule was to prevent the Appropriations Committee from doing what it seeks to do by this provision, namely, authorize appropriations. The object of this rule was to restrict the power and authority of the Appropriations Committee to providing the funds necessary to meet obligations already created. If this does not create a new obligation, why does the committee incorporate here the provisions creating the office and providing for the manner in which it shall be filled? Why does not the committee simply say: "For Undersecretary of the Treasury, $7,500 per annum, $15,000 for two years," or such other provision of appropriation as may be necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is very obvious why it does not do so.

Mr. ROBINSON. The committee, however, has plainly included a legislative provision in its amendment. It says:

> Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him.

It creates an office just as plainly as any language could create an office, and it is legislation according to common sense and according to the rules of both branches of Congress.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have concluded all I have to say upon the subject. I have not investigated the merits of this particular appropriation, but my judgment is that we can not escape the obligation to authorize this office by a separate measure by including the authorization in an appropriation bill from Congress to Congress. That is what the language seeks to do. It creates a new office, provides how that office shall be filled——

Mr. CARAWAY. And provides the duration of the office.

Mr. ROBINSON. And, as suggested by my colleague, it provides the duration of the office, which, of course, is legislation.

As stated before, my only object is to preserve the integrity of this rule, because such a ruling as would be implied in overruling the point of order would nullify the rule and prevent the accomplishment of the purpose which the Senate had in mind when it adopted the rule.

I have concluded.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has had no intention of committing any infraction of the rules. Heretofore we have been acting under this rule, and no exceptions have been taken. The object sought by the Senator from Tennessee is made very plain by him. He himself objects to this office being filled and also to the title "undersecretary," and hence proposes that it go out. The Senator from Arkansas has repeated a number of times, very forcefully and very convincingly, as he always does, that it is new legislation, when, as a matter of fact, in its action and in its outcome, it is not new, because it is simply the continuance of what has already been provided for and followed in at least two appropriation bills. So it is a factious proposition to make a point of order against it. As I said before, it is merely that one man wants to throw it out. I have nothing further to say, and I submit the matter to the Chair.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Tennessee to withdraw his point of order. I myself think that the amendment to the rule, as agreed to March 6, 1922, which specifically refers to new legislation, might apply.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I have been trying to get the act of last year, and just have it before me. I want to suggest it as my opinion that it is new legislation; but this identical language being in the act of last year it became legislation, and competent legislation, and if that is so, this is not new legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. I was calling the attention of the Senator to the fact that it is the exact wording of the appropriation act of a year ago. But what I wanted to say to the Senator from Tennessee is that the man holding this position is one eminently qualified for the work he is doing. I do not know just where we could get a man to take his place, and really I think if the Senator from Tennessee has the welfare of our Government at heart—and I know he has—he can make other points of order which would be of very much more advantage to the Government than the point of order he is now making against this particular item. I ask the Senator to take that into consideration, even though the point no doubt will be overruled by the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand Mr. Gilbert is now the occupant of this position?

Mr. SMOOT. He is.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I understand he is a very excellent man in every sense of the word.

Mr. SMOOT. He is.

Mr. McKELLAR. He was appointed as Assistant Secretary, and would it interfere with his duties or his capacity, or in any other way, not to call him Undersecretary? I think the title "Undersecretary" is very much less dignified than "Assistant Secretary," so far as my own view is concerned. I do not know what his view about it may be, but I imagine he feels the same way about it that I do, that the good old American "Assistant Secretary," which has been in vogue over a hundred years in our Government, is a better title and a more honorable title than the title of "Undersecretary."

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I want to ask a question of either the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming. It may clear up this matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield in just a moment. There are three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury provided for in this bill. When the law was passed one year ago we felt that it was best to have one designated "Undersecretary," just as we have one Undersecretary of State. There are more responsibilities and there is a higher salary attached to the position. As the Senator knows, the Assistant Secretaries draw $5,000 a year, a mere pittance; it is more of an honor than a financial return. I ask the Senator to withdraw his point of order, although I think the Chair will overrule it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think very highly of Mr. Gilbert. I believe he is a most excellent man in every way, and if he is entitled to $7,500 I will not object to an amendment fixing his salary at $7,500. I myself am of the opinion that his services to the Government are worth $7,500, and I shall not object to an amendment along that line; but I do object to the legislation creating the position of "Undersecretary," which I think is against our American system.

Mr. SMOOT. If this goes out, there will be no appropriation at all for the Undersecretary.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the existing law authorizes this appropriation, why employ the language that is used in the bill, which creates the office? Former appropriation bills, as ap-

pears from the acts of previous years, have embraced provisions identical with the one contained in this bill. There must have been some object in the minds of the committee in reporting this legislative provision. The defense against the point of order now is that it is an unnecessary legislative provision and therefore should be retained in the bill. If it is legislation at all, it should go out of an appropriation bill. The point of order apparently would be obviated if the legislation exists authorizing the appropriation, and the purpose of the committee is merely to make an appropriation and not to create an office; but if this language is retained in the bill, I think it would be subversive of a fair construction of the rules to hold that the language is not obnoxious to the provision in the amendment of our rules adopted a year or two ago providing against the reporting by the Committee on Appropriations of new or general legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator, I think I had better read the law passed in February of last year, and the Senator can plainly see, then, just what the law provided.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is identical with this provision.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Under the head of "Salaries, office of the Secretary," it provided:

> Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $7,500 per annum, and shall perform such duties in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law, under the provisions of section 177, Revised Statutes. In case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary of the Treasury he shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed, or until such absence or sickness shall cease, $7,500.

Mr. ROBINSON. There is not an "i" dotted or a "t" crossed so as to make that different from the language of the new provision. The new language is identical with the old provision, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. The old provision is repeated.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it has to be repeated, because it is in an appropriation act which will expire June 30, 1923.

Mr. ROBINSON. The law having expired, this is a provision for new and general legislation, just as that was a provision for new and general legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator from Utah denies that at all; but he has appealed to me to leave in the language on account of the services Mr. Gilbert is rendering. If he would ask unanimous consent to put into the bill provision for a First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, at $7,500, I should not object to it; but I am unwilling to withdraw my point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am very greatly interested in preserving the integrity of this rule. I am very clear that if the Senator from Utah is right, and the provision in the existing appropriation law will expire on the 1st day of next July, then the point of order is well taken with reference to the pending proposition; because if it does expire, this is clearly new legislation. I am not so clear, however, that the Senator from Utah is right when he says that the existing provision will expire on the 1st day of next July.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation, I said.

Mr. LENROOT. No; the Senator said the provision. That is why it will have to be repeated.

Mr. SMOOT. If I said the provision, I meant the appropriation.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, the appropriation expires. The whole question is, is this permanent law in the existing appropriation act? If it is, of course it is not necessary to repeat the language, because it is not new legislation. I am clear that as to a part of this provision it is permanent law, because we have the provision that in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary, the Undersecretary shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed, or such absence or sickness shall cease. If on the 29th day of June next the Secretary of the Treasury should become disabled, this provision would apply. The Undersecretary would continue to perform the duties of the Secretary, under this provision, beyond the first day of next July. To that extent certainly it is permanent legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. If I said the provision, I meant the appropriation. If the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee as to the First Secretary were carried out, then it would not apply to the law, because the law specifically says he shall be the Undersecretary, and we could not change it at this time. I really think the only safe thing to do is for the Senator from Tennessee to allow this provision to go in this year, and in the meantime, if we want to change it, let us change it by law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not believe we ever passed a law providing for this office, unless it was put on an appropriation bill. The Senator will remember that the office of Undersecretary of State was created in the same way, by an amendment to an appropriation bill, by legislation on an appropriation bill. That is the way it has been done. To say that under our rules you have to repeal temporary legislation of this kind, on appropriation bills, by a general law, seems to me to go far beyond what our rules contemplate when they provide that no new legislation shall go on an appropriation bill.

There is no reason in the world why we can not substitute the words "First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury" for the words "Undersecretary of the Treasury," and leave it just as it is otherwise. I am perfectly willing to have that done. I do not want to be misunderstood. I shall not object to it if "First Assistant Secretary" is put in the place of "Undersecretary."

Mr. LENROOT. If this is permanent legislation, providing for an Undersecretary, the insertion of this language now, providing for a First Assistant Secretary, would leave an Undersecretary and a First Assistant Secretary, would it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It might. We would then be taking the chances of that. Of course it just shows the impropriety of legislating in this way. To undertake to put a provision of this kind in an appropriation bill shows an utter lack of a legislative program.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I wish to make one more suggestion. If this is not new legislation, there is no occasion for repeating the language, and the appropriation should simply have been made $7,500 for the Undersecretary. Of course, if this language is necessary, it is new legislation. That is all I have to say.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has raised an interesting proposition in connection with the point of order. In my judgment, the question of law to be determined by the Chair is whether the provision is a reenactment from year to year of the authorization of this office. Under the decisions of the House of Representatives the reenactment from year to year of a law intended to apply only during the year of its enactment does not relieve the provision from the point of order.

Evidently the Committee on Appropriations took the view of the matter as first expressed by the Senator from Utah, namely, that the provision in the former appropriation act expired by limitation of law with that appropriation, and that it was necessary to reenact the provision in this bill, because that is the course which the committee pursued. If that is correct, the provision is subject to the point of order. If, however, the existing law permanently created the position of Undersecretary of the Treasury, there is no necessity in the appropriation bill for creating it again. The only step that the committee need have taken was to provide the funds necessary to pay the salary of the office already created and authorized.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas if he is advised as to the form in which the matter came over from the House?

Mr. ROBINSON. The provision was not in the bill as it came from the House. This is a Senate committee amendment.

The Senator from Wyoming stated—and I assume his statement is correct—that the House committee first incorporated the provision in the bill and it was stricken out on a point of order in the House, the identical point of order that is made here, under a rule so closely analogous to the rule of the Senate that no distinction of value from a legal standpoint can be made. Our rule was enacted to conform to the precedents and practice of the House of Representatives. It was to enable the Senate to protect itself against a practice, which had become quite general here, of placing in appropriation bills authorizations for large expenditures and coupling with those authorizations the appropriation necessary to supply the demand just created. The House struck out the provision under a point of order identical, substantially, with that made by the Senator from Tennessee, under a rule closely analogous to, if not identical with, the Senate rule. The Senate rule was enacted in order to conform its precedents to the practices of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that, under the rules of the House, if the amendment is permitted to go in, the House will have to have a yea-and-nay vote separately on the provision when the bill goes back there because of its being new legislation? Under their rules, as I recall, that would be the case, I am quite positive, and they would have to vote separately on the question.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; the House conferees, under the practice of the House that prevails there, would be compelled to

request that the matter be submitted to the House of Representatives for a special vote. However, that is not the controlling consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will have this effect, that the House, having stricken it out on a point of order, will then have to vote on the very thing which was stricken out and which ought to have been stricken out under the House rules and under the Senate rules.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senator from Tennessee is right in assuming that the House, having held it obnoxious to a point of order, would require its conferees to invoke the rule of the House that permits the matter to be submitted to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest, on the point raised by the Senator from Wisconsin, that the appropriation is made here for "Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, $7,500." That does not go into effect immediately. The bill covers the period up to June 30, 1924. The salary would really begin July 1, 1923, and the Undersecretary would hold office until June 30, 1924, and then the Assistant Secretary would draw the salary of $7,500 after that time. So we would not be duplicating the service and the pay.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator is right, after July 1, 1923, that would be an Undersecretary created by law, with his duties created by law, with his salary fixed by law, but merely no appropriation made to pay for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why should not the amendment simply appropriate $7,500 and let him take his chances on it? I imagine he would not want to take his chances on it, because I do not think it is the law.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question revolves around the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], but I am unable to agree to the suggestion that if the item were stricken out of the bill there would be an office of Undersecretary of the Treasury after the 1st of next July. The appropriation bill, which we are now considering, is limited to a duration of one fiscal year, and the law which we enacted a year ago was likewise limited. It seems to me that if the item were stricken out of the bill, after the 30th day of next June there would be no such office in existence as Undersecretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I gladly yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Does the Senator take the position that Congress can not in an appropriation bill create a permanent office?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not, but my contention is that the language of the existing appropriation act does not do that. The law which we enacted a year ago used the following language:

That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: For the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, namely—

Then—

Salaries: Secretary of the Treasury, $12,000; Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated—

And so forth. That is, for one year there is created the office of Undersecretary, and the appropriation is made for that office accordingly. It did not undertake to create generally the office of Undersecretary of the Treasury, and it seems to me, under a fair construction of the language of the act, if there be no new legislation, that on the 30th day of next June there will cease to exist the office of Undersecretary, because the language of the act specifically limits its operation to one year, which shall end on the 30th day of next June, and after that date, if there be no such legislation as that contained in the pending bill, the President of the United States would have no authority, in my judgment, to appoint an Undersecretary. It is consistent with the purpose and general tenor of an appropriation bill that it shall be limited in its operation to a period of one year.

Mr. LENROOT. If the Secretary of the Treasury should die on the 29th day of next June, how long would the Undersecretary continue to perform the duties of Secretary?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. He would go out of office on the 1st day of next July, in my judgment, and there would be no such office in existence on the 1st day of next July.

Mr. LENROOT. Notwithstanding the language expressly says that he shall perform the duties of the Secretary until his successor is appointed and qualified?

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be true, because this is an appropriation bill which expires by its own limitation.

Mr. LENROOT. With reference to that suggestion, the appropriation expires, of course; but there may be, and in every appropriation bill is, as a rule, legislation which goes beyond the year. Simply because it is an appropriation bill has nothing to do with the subject. It is a question as to whether it was the intention of Congress in the legislative provision to make it permanent legislation or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the attention of the Chair and of the Senator from Wisconsin, too, to the fact that this is absolutely a new office created by this particular bill for a limited time, and that is shown in the total appropriation, it seems to me. Under the bill as it came from the House there were three salaries which are provided for by law. There are only three of them, and the House appropriated for those three and the total amount of those and other appropriations, as will be seen in line 15, was $65,760. The addition of the new office which is created by the proposed amendment makes a total of $73,260, showing indisputably that the general law now provides for those salaries and they have all been appropriated for. There are not four Assistant Secretaries; there are only three under the general law, and they have been provided for, and unless the legislation is enacted the Undersecretary will have no place at all. That is the truth of the matter, and if there is to be a position of that kind it ought to be established by law and then appropriated for.

Mr. LENROOT. There has just been called to my attention this precedent. The office of Assistant Secretary of the Senate was created on a deficiency appropriation act several years ago. The paragraph reads:

There shall be employed in the office of the Secretary of the Senate an Assistant Secretary (Henry M. Rose), who shall receive compensation at the rate of $5,000 per annum.

Legislative appropriation bills since have not repeated the words creating the office, but have simply appropriated for the office of Assistant Secretary, naming Mr. Rose, $5,000. It seems to me that this is exactly the same situation.

Mr. WARREN. That is the case with probably three-fourths of all the salaries which are carried here, and in fact nearly all of them outside of the regular civil-service appointees in each department. I agree with the Senator perfectly that it is just as strong in the present case as in the one to which he refers, because the law states that the Assistant Secretary shall perform the duties of Secretary until his successor is appointed or such absence shall cease. I agree with the Senator that the money might not be there, but the service would be rendered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the act of the early part of 1922 created the office of Undersecretary of the Treasury, and that while the present amendment may be entirely unnecessary and useless legislation, it is not new legislation. The point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WARREN. That is the amendment as stated in the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SMITH. The question is whether or not the amendment proposed by the committee shall remain in the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as proposed by the committee.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HALE (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. STANFIELD], and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRISON (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS].

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BURSUM], and vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], which I transfer to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. WELLER], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr.

WILLIAMS] to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]; and

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Ashurst	Glass	Lenroot	Ransdell
Bayard	Gooding	Lodge	Reed, Pa.
Brandegee	Hale	McCumber	Smoot
Brookhart	Harreld	McLean	Sterling
Cameron	Harris	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Heflin	Nelson	Swanson
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Townsend
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Underwood
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kendrick	Page	Warren
Ernst	Keyes	Pepper	Watson
Fernald	Ladd	Phipps	Willis
France	La Follette	Poindexter	

NAYS—9.

Cummins	George	Sheppard	Smith
Dial	McKellar	Simmons	Trammell
Fletcher			

NOT VOTING—36.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Shields
Borah	Gerry	New	Shortridge
Broussard	Harrison	Norbeck	Spencer
Bursum	Hitchcock	Oddie	Stanfield
Calder	Johnson	Owen	Stanley
Caraway	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	McCormick	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	McKinley	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Elkins	Moses	Robinson	Williams

So the amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the office of the Secretary from $65,760 to $73,260.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Office of chief clerk," on page 2, line 21, after the word "Secretary," to insert the word "Undersecretary," so as to read:

Salaries: Chief clerk, including $300 as superintendent of Treasury Building, who shall be the chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, Undersecretary, and Assistant Secretaries of the department, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Customs Service," on page 18, line 18, after the word "revenue," to strike out "$11,950,000" and to insert "$12,250,000," and in line 19, after the word "which," to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$500,000," so as to read:

For collecting the revenue from customs, including not exceeding $300,000 for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, $12,250,000, of which $500,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming why the increase is proposed by this amendment from $11,950,000 to $12,250,000? Is that increase involved in any deficiency bill?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this amendment simply involves the question of providing sufficient funds for the collection of customs. We have not exceeded the estimate of the Budget. The question is whether even the appropriation asked for in the Budget will enable the department to provide properly for the collection of the customs and fulfill the other duties which officials of the department have to perform. Quite a large amount of money appropriated is made available for the present year. While that method does not meet with my approval, and it had not already been adopted by the other House, in any event, so far as results are concerned, it is as broad as it is long. If we do not increase the appropriation to the amount of $12,250,000 at this point, ultimately the sum will have to be appropriated under another heading. These appropriations are all necessary and are all within the estimates.

Mr. FLETCHER. There will be needed additional help in the District of Columbia to the extent provided by an appropriation of $40,000.

Mr. WARREN. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER "In addition to the sums herein and heretofore authorized"?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 18, at the end of line 19, after the word "available," to insert "and $40,000 of the $12,250,000 to be available for expenditure in the District of Columbia in addition to the sums herein and heretofore authorized."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, in connection with the amendments which have just been agreed to, may I ask the chairman of the committee if he has at hand the figures as to the relative cost to the Government for collecting taxes under the Internal Revenue Department compared with the cost a few years ago?

Mr. WARREN. That comes under another head. Does the Senator wish to know how much it costs to collect the taxes?

Mr. HARRISON. I am merely wondering if it costs the Government as much now to collect taxes as it cost heretofore, say, during the last five years.

Mr. WARREN. I think it costs nearly as much, because it is necessary to provide appropriations not only for the collection of the regular taxes but to provide for the examination and auditing of taxes collected as far back as 1917 up to the present time. Additional taxes collected on account of corrections made on reexaminations have amounted to something in the neighborhood of two or three hundred million dollars a year, but at the same time the Government is being obliged to pay back certain refunds on account of taxes illegally collected. The cost, therefore, is large, but the work, I may say, is perhaps more important and fully as exhaustive as heretofore.

Mr. HARRISON. I saw the other day in some newspaper an item to the effect that the cost of collecting taxes had increased greatly.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, the percentage of cost.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the percentage of cost. I was just wondering about that, and if the Senator has any figures, I should be glad to have him give them.

Mr. WARREN. I may say that the appropriation to pay the expense of collecting the taxes has been reduced some millions of dollars. In reference to the collection of taxes, I think that, with the experience which has been obtained and with the curb which has been placed on the raising of salaries, and so forth, the work is being carried on with the expenditure of less money than heretofore. This very bill contains a clause which prevents increasing salaries paid from lump sums. Employees so paid must have their grades and places and receive compensation accordingly, much the same as in the case of employees in the regular civil service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I noticed the statement in the newspapers, to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, to the effect that it was costing more for each dollar collected than it did in years past. That is true. The reason of that is that it takes just as much time for an employee of the Government to examine the return of an institution which made, say, $10,000,000 during each of the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920 as it does to-day, when the same institution, perhaps, only makes a profit of $500,000. Therefore the percentage of cost to the amount collected is larger to-day than it was during the years which I have mentioned. The appropriations, however, are less, as the Senator from Wyoming has said.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi is entitled to the figures. The appropriation for the purpose of paying expenditures incident to the collection of taxes last year was $60,628,380; under the pending bill for the same purpose there is proposed to be appropriated $57,360,290. Of course, as the Senator knows, some of the matters included involve even more expense than heretofore; for instance, there is the enforcement of the prohibition act, and the figures stated include the appropriations for that purpose. The Senator knows that the enforcement of that act is being pushed forward more vigorously than heretofore. As I stated before, the collection of back taxes was not kept up because we did not appropriate enough in the earlier years to give them the necessary accountants and examiners. That is now, I believe, being thoroughly done, so that the year 1917, I am informed, has had the last case adjudicated, or it is under adjudication, and they have adjudicated many of the cases arising in the later years, but there is quite a large amount yet requiring attention.

Mr. HARRISON. The reason why I propounded the question was that I thought the American people deserved an explanation of this report. We read of economies that have been effected and savings worked by the Government bureaus, and yet this report states that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue says that it cost $1.07 to collect every $100 of tax for the fiscal year

ending 1922. The previous report showed that in 1921 it cost 72 cents to collect each $100. That is a pretty large increase in the cost of collecting that $100. The report in 1920 showed that it cost only 55 cents to collect each $100; in 1919 it cost only 53 cents to collect every $100; and in 1918 it cost only 32 cents to collect every $100. For the last year the cost is given as $1.07, showing that there is an increase of 100 per cent in the cost. So I am glad to hear the statement that it is not due to bad management up there, but that there is a real explanation for the very large increase in the cost of collecting of this money.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to say to the Senator that when I read that statement it was my intention to answer it on the floor of the Senate at the time, but an occasion did not arise when I could do it; but I am sure the Senator sees the reason for the difference. Of course, in 1918, when everybody was making so much money and we collected between seven and eight billion dollars, there was not any more help required to do it than there is to-day, when the amount is falling down to about $3,000,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator how far behind they are in the matter of examining these returns? It seems to me rather important that the taxpayer should know where he stands.

Mr. SMOOT. I think they are absolutely through with 1917, and I suppose 80 or 85 per cent of 1918 and 1919 and 1920, and perhaps 1921, is settled. The remaining cases are those where there are disputes in those years, and only those where the Government really has to go into details and have an investigation made; and I hardly think the percentage of unsettled cases is as large as I have stated. I have not heard of late.

Mr. FLETCHER. About 15 per cent for each of the years?

Mr. SMOOT. Taking all of the years of 1918, 1919, 1920, and 1921. That may be a little large, but I am not quite sure. Of course, that means that a great many returns have to be investigated, but it is only where the face of the return shows a discrepancy; and it is very much easier now to arrive at the correct result by comparing the returns with former ones made by the same individual or corporation than it was in the beginning, when there was nothing to compare. So the work from now on is not going to be as difficult as the work was in the past, where we had to take virgin ground and go into nearly every case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriation for suppressing counterfeiting and other crimes, on page 36, line 2, to strike out "$415,000" and insert "$425,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 1, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500," so as to read:

For wages of workmen and other employees, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 16, to insert:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., ASSAY OFFICE.

Salaries: Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,800.
For wages of workmen and other employees, $1,000.
For incidental and contingent expenses, $300.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment by inserting, after the figures "$1,800," in line 19, the following:

Assistant assayer, $1,200; in all, $3,000.

I hope there will be no objection to that amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I do not know whether we can protect that in the conference, but I am inclined to accept it and let it go to conference. I will say to the Senate that it is within the estimate.

Mr. STERLING. Yes; I think there will be no conflict in conference over that amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice that at the Salt Lake assay office they are only given an assayer at $1,800, the same as at Deadwood, S. Dak.

Mr. STERLING. That is true; but the Senate will also notice that there is appropriated for the salaries of workmen and other employees at Salt Lake $1,200, as well as at Carson City.

Mr. SMOOT. Deadwood has $1,000 and incidental expenses of $300—the same in both cases. I think we have a great deal more assaying to do than at Deadwood.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know; I hardly think so.

Mr. SMOOT. We have that great intermountain country.

Mr. STERLING. Can the Senator state the number of assays a year at Salt Lake?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have not that information.

Mr. STERLING. I can give the Senator the figures in regard to the Deadwood office.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the figures with me. I did not know this matter was coming up.

Mr. STERLING. There were 1,330 assays at the Deadwood office in the last year, and with the renewed activity in mining operations out there there will be a great many more. It will be impossible to do without an assistant assayer at the Deadwood office.

Mr. SMOOT. It would not surprise me if there were twice or three times that number at Salt Lake City.

Mr. STERLING. I doubt that very much.

Mr. SMOOT. I say I do not know; I have not the figures.

Mr. STERLING. Deadwood is in the heart of one of the great mining regions of this country, as the Senator, I think, knows.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is there enough work to keep one man occupied continuously, or only at periods?

Mr. STERLING. There is, certainly. I will say to the Senator that there is an average of about four assays each day of the year. That has been true during the past year; and, as I have just stated to the Senator, there is a great renewal of mining activities now in the hills. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that these assays are for the benefit of the miner and the prospector, those in the community. It is not a great deposit assay office. We grant that. There are comparatively few deposits of bullion there, but it accommodates the people of that vicinity and in all that mining region.

I will say to the Senator that the production of gold in the Black Hills alone is about $7,000,000 a year. One mine produces nearly that amount a year, and then $100,000 worth of silver is produced in that region.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator, because I have very little information on the subject, what is involved in the making of an assay? How much time does it take?

Mr. STERLING. I can not state how much time is taken in an assay; but the prospector takes there the product that he has mined, and has it assayed, and a determination made as to the quantity of gold in the material or ore taken by him to the assay office.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator said they made three or four assays a day, and I was just wondering how much time it took. I presume that varies somewhat.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know how much time it takes, but I should think it would take considerable time and skill to make a careful assay of ore taken to the assay office.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is this item for incidental and contingent expenses?

Mr. STERLING. I would not be able to state just what the incidental and contingent expenses are. I suppose probably it may be in the purchase of some material or the making of some necessary repairs.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether the assayer there is a competent assayer, or do they have to have another man to do the work?

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that he is not the most expert assayer, and they have depended hitherto on the expert who is the assistant assayer at that place.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the trouble about it, and the House seems to have realized that in striking it out—that they appoint a man who does not know anything about this business as the head man, and give him an assistant who is an expert. They provide, at most of these places, that the head man shall be an expert in his business. He ought to be. Every one of them ought to be an expert; but they appoint a man there who does not know the business, and he does not do a thing but just sit down there and look on and draw his salary, while the expert does all the work. The Senator knows that that is so.

Mr. STERLING. The assistant assayer is the real expert; but the other man, Mr. Stewart, is a splendid man, a splendid supervisor.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt he is a splendid man, but what work can he do? What can he do to earn his salary?

Mr. STERLING. He has the general charge of the office; he gives directions in regard to assaying, and so on.

Mr. OVERMAN. If he does not know anything about assaying, he can not give any directions about it.

Mr. STERLING. Let me call the attention of the Senator to what he is required to do under the provisions of this amendment:

Assayer in charge, who shall also perform the duties of melter, $1,800.

Mr. OVERMAN. And he does not know a thing about it, and wants another assayer to assist him and do all the work, and the chief assayer does not do a thing on earth but draw his salary. The House left it out entirely. It seemed to me we were doing a great deal when we put it back again and put him on a par with a great many others of the same kind, where it is provided that the assayer shall know something about his business and that he shall do his own melting and assaying.

Mr. STERLING. I believe that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House will see the justice of retaining the assistant assayer if the Deadwood office is retained, and that there will be no conflict in conference over it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I agree with the Senator that we ought to put it back as to the assayer; but when it comes to giving an assistant assayer the committee thought we ought not to do that, because the chief assayer ought to know his business. This chief assayer does not know his business. He does not know a thing about it.

Mr. STERLING. I think he knows something about it, but, of course, he is not the technical expert that the assistant is in this case.

Mr. OVERMAN. He can not do the work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment on page 44, line 19, by inserting after the numerals "$1,800," and before the period, a semicolon and the words "assistant assayer, $1,200; in all, $3,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 45, line 19, after the figures "$1,800," I move to insert "assistant assayer, $1,200; in all, $3,000."

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not going to object to that, but it shows the evil of this kind of legislation. Of course, the Senator from Utah is entitled to have an assistant included if the Senator from South Dakota is entitled to one, and if the Senator from Montana were here he would say he was entitled to the same thing. I am not going to object to it, and if the House left that out let us put it in for Uah and everywhere else.

Mr. WARREN. These are matters which have been included in the estimates. I notice they took a great deal of testimony before the Budget officer and he estimated these amounts; hence, I do not object to it.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the chairman please, I think he estimated for Salt Lake, but did not estimate for South Dakota.

Mr. WARREN. Fifteen hundred dollars was estimated for Salt Lake, and I said I would consent to $1,200, and the Senator has made his amendment in that amount.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the provision be made for all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 45, line 19, at the end of the line, after the numerals "$1,800" and before the period, insert a semicolon and the words "assistant assayer, $1,200. In all, $3,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, on page 48, line 6, I move to strike out "$375,000" and insert "$700,000." Also to add the paragraph which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 48, line 6, to strike out "$375,000" and in lieu insert "$700,000" and the following proviso:

Provided, That where any appropriation has been made for any authorized post-office building, and a site acquired and the balance of the appropriation after paying for the site is insufficient to construct and furnish the building, in accordance with the plans of the Supervising Architect, such appropriation may be supplemented in a sum not to exceed $20,000 from this appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I admire the Senator and I sympathize with him most sincerely about these public buildings. We have one hundred and thirty-odd of them in the same fix. There are three of them in my State, and some of them date back to 1912. But the Senator's proposition is a matter of legislation and has no place here. Therefore I object to it and make a point of order against it as being legislation.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I was in hopes I could get help from the Senator from Wyoming. He says there are three of these buildings in his State. No doubt they need them badly. What I am trying to do is not to establish new propositions but to carry out those where the land has already been purchased. Of course, I understand this matter should come from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds if it were a new proposition, but it has passed that committee now, and is a question of appropriation. So it seems to me it is proper, and that this amendment is in order. If we do not do something like this, probably we will have to pass a general building bill to erect post offices in some places in the country where we need them and need them badly, and I think this would answer the purpose temporarily. I trust the Senator will not object to it. We have one in my State, and the Secretary of the Treasury informs me that the appropriation is not quite sufficient to build the appropriate building. The land has already been bought, and it seems to me this would be a very appropriate time to start to erect those buildings. I know other places where they need them and need them very badly.

Mr. WARREN. It hardly matters about the terms of the bill, because the whole subject is one which has to be handled, as the Senator has indicated, and probably there will have to be an omnibus bill. I hope that during this session we may have one to complete these buildings, some of the appropriations for which have already been made under the law. As to a hundred and thirty of the buildings, the appropriations have been made in full, but the legislation locating public buildings provides for less than the amount of any bids they can receive under which construction can be instituted which would be satisfactory to the representatives from the States. All this could be handled if the Senators and Members of the House would reduce the cost of the buildings to the amount which has been appropriated. But we have never in all my experience in the Senate varied from the rule that any enlargement of those public buildings must be provided for, so far as the authority is concerned, in a regular legislative way, before they can be considered by the Appropriations Committee or inserted in their bills. Hence I make the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

The next amendment of the committee was, under the item "General expenses," on page 52, line 24, after the word "postage," to insert the following words:

incident to shipments of drawings, superintendent's furniture and supplies, testing instruments, etc., including articles and supplies not usually payable from other appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item "Operating supplies," on page 56, line 17, to strike out "$2,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. RANSDELL. I move to strike out, on page 42, line 23, "$3,720" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,900." I understand that amount was recommended by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. WARREN. That is true; but there was a time when the product at New Orleans was confined to only a few items, and this assay office was stricken out entirely on one or two occasions. But I have been informed that there is now a very large business done in New Orleans, and, so far as I may, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I accept the amendment so that it may go to conference, and we will do the best we can for it. It was estimated for.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I have been informed that there is a considerable increase in the work of that office.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, for the purpose of getting some information, I move to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, on page 28, in the following words:

No part of the appropriations made herein for the Internal Revenue Service shall be used to increase the compensation of any class or grade of officers or employees.

I offer this amendment in order to get a statement of the facts from the chairman of the committee. A great deal of complaint has come to me from various quarters relative to the effect of this language. I do not know whether the language ought to be stricken out altogether or not; perhaps something ought to be substituted for it, but this is the situation which has developed in at least one of the offices in Ohio. As a result of this language, which was in a preceding law, and which is proposed to be readopted here, the old, higher salaried employees are going out of office gradually. Those in charge of the office find it impossible, under the operation of this clause, to increase salaries, and as a result they are losing their most competent and efficient employees.

There ought to be some remedy for this condition. We all want the Government service efficient, and we want to keep

in it men who are qualified. I know in the case of at least two offices in Ohio, of which I have personal information, that they are being very seriously crippled and handicapped in their work owing to the fact that their best men are leaving them. Perhaps the chairman could suggest an explanation or offer a substitute. I yield to him.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, this is no new matter. It is quite old, and we had before us the representative of the particular department under which this comes, and very close attention was given to him.

This is the condition: The Appropriations Committee has constant demands made on it for larger salaries, and so many people have so many ideas about salaries that we have gotten nowhere as to a final settlement, which we expect to reach very soon under the reclassification scheme, which will probably be just as effective in this particular branch of the Government as in any other. But these payments are from a lump sum, and the constant pounding, if I may use that word, of employees for larger salaries has sometimes heretofore carried many of these lump sums all the way from the grass roots to the clouds, and it has been necessary to halt them in such language as we are using here.

This applies to probably seven or eight thousand people, and when the law was passed it was made so as to be operative several months after the passage of the bill, giving the department that much notice that it would be the rule after that date. They had time to make their salaries and grades and classes accordingly. They made their grades and adopted their salaries in view of this provision, and during the year or two past, when certainly the salaries were and ought to have been as high as now, usually higher, they have proceeded without serious trouble.

It is true that every now and then a man in the Government service finds that he can get a great deal more out of a lump sum, and I will cite one particular instance to the Senator. We had in the Committee on Appropriations a junior clerk who was getting $1,440. He was taken away by an offer of $3,600, and immediately he left our service, and I presume he was worth what he got in the service to which he went. But if we are to have any control whatever over these lump sums we must have some kind of restraint, and in this case we open the door, as I understand it, as the legislation shows, for them to fix the salaries within the appropriation. We asked them to fix those salaries, and they did so. But, of course, complaints come, and they beg us to remove the restraint so that they can raise a salary, which I do not believe we should do.

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, the Senator sees the difficulty of the situation. An employee who goes out of office has been receiving $1,800 or $2,000 a year, perhaps, and the man who comes in and takes his place receives only $1,200. Now, that can have but one inevitable result. The more experienced men are certainly going to leave the service.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is a strained construction. Not a man goes out to a higher place but that the man next to him can take his place. But they make the rule that a newcomer must begin at the bottom, $1,200, and he goes to the foot of the list and then goes up with the others, very much in the same way as civil-service employees, who have their class numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the indications are that we shall soon dispose of the appropriation bill now before the Senate. So I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, just another word on the amendment I have offered. Attention was drawn to it in the hearings. One speaking for the head of the department that is involved in this matter made this comment in response to the following question:

> The CHAIRMAN. Your next item is on page 90. It is proposed in connection with this item to eliminate this language:
> "No part of the appropriation made herein for the Internal Revenue Service shall be used to increase the compensation of any class or grade of officers or employees."
> That was put in advisedly; it was not put in because we did not want to enforce it. Why do you want it stricken out, because you want unlimited authority to increase compensation?
> Mr. NASH. If we are not permitted to make promotions in meritorious cases our entire service will suffer. The reaction among the field officers has been such that we have been embarrassed by that clause.
> The CHAIRMAN. I guess we will have to continue to embarrass you by it, because we do not propose to allow unlimited authority to increase compensation out of lump-sum appropriations.

To find out more in detail about this matter I wrote to one of the officers in the State I have the honor to represent in part, and I wish to read one paragraph from his letter. I wrote for information about the effect of the provision. He said:

> Previous to this rider being placed in the bill we were permitted to make promotions semiannually and to use money saved from the salaries of employees who resigned or were removed from the service, i. e., if an employee resigned or was removed who was receiving $1,800 and the new employee coming in was started at $1,600, we could give the $200 to some deserving employee. Under the new ruling, however, this $200 reverts back to the bureau. We were also allowed an additional appropriation semiannually for promotions. It is also my understanding that we can make no more general promotions.
> As explained to you, practically all of our field men are getting around $1,700 per annum, as they were compelled to start at the minimum salary, while the outgoing force was getting around $1,900 or $2,000.

I do not know whether it will be safe to strike out this language without having some substitute for it, but it does seem to me there ought to be some arrangement whereby we can retain in the service men of ability and experience. I am certainly in favor of economy, but if we cut the salaries so low that efficient men will not stay in the service, the Government will suffer thereby.

Mr. WARREN. That always has been the case and always will be the case, that some must leave the Government service. I shall be glad to join with the Senator in taking up the matter when we get to the reclassification measure. I am trying to do justice to them all. I do not wish to introduce politics into the question at all, but the fact is if a lump sum were placed at their disposal for salaries there might be favoritism from time to time, and funds used for different purposes than those for which they were appropriated. Some restraint is necessary and we have adopted this as being the least obnoxious of any measure. Of course there is always the case that some employees will implore us to act differently. So far as the evidence taken before the House committee is concerned, while the matter did not come up in that case, yet there was a plea for larger salaries all the way through. We had before the committee a man who was a very excellent witness, and he presented the case before us with all the strength that there is in the problem, but I think he was rather contented when he left that the best we could do would be to let them go on under this arrangement until we can bring about reclassification.

Mr. WILLIS. May we have a vote on the amendment?

Mr. WARREN. This is not an amendment as I understand it. It is a question of agreeing to the language of the bill as it came from the House. I did not understand that the Senator moved to strike it out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio moved to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, on page 28, and the question is on his motion.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I have just entered the Chamber, and I am glad I did so at this time. I notice that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] has proposed to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, on page 28, reading as follows:

> No part of the appropriations made herein for the Internal Revenue Service shall be used to increase the compensation of any class or grade of officers or employees.

I do not know the purpose of the motion, but it seems to me that the prohibition-enforcement department has been organized long enough for the Senate in its wisdom to take advantage of past experience and fix by statute certain limitations as to the compensation of enforcement officers.

I rose in order to call the attention of the Senate to a few things that were said in the city of New Orleans on December 4, the present month. It appears that the law-enforcement conference of the Anti-Saloon League of America was held at the Grunewald Hotel, New Orleans, La. In view of the many statements made on the floor of the Senate and in the House and generally on the part of those who have imposed upon the Nation the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, as well as the Volstead law, and in view of their professions of respect for the law and its enforcement and the fact that they denounce certain people who favor modification as being against law enforcement, and in view particularly of the fact that the President has seen fit to single out this law and to declare that this particular law must be enforced, I desire to compare the attitude of those who have stood in this Chamber and in this Nation for modification with reference to law enforcement and respect of law with the statements which are being circulated widely at this time by those who favor an absolute bone-dry enforcement of the eighteenth amendment.

The pending bill carries an appropriation of $9,000,000 for the prohibition-enforcement department. I have no objection

to the $9,000,000 being appropriated, although when the Nation has laws such, for instance, as the Mann Act, laws to prevent the rifling of the mails, to prevent burglarizing banks, and the many statutes against such crimes as rape in certain jurisdictions, I do protest against singling out the Volstead law and expending $9,000,000 to enforce that law, whereas other very serious and detestable crimes, which are denounced by the moral laws, and have ever been denounced by the moral laws, as well as by statutes, are almost absolutely ignored and nothing said about them. Crimes that are wrong per se are left to be enforced by the ordinary peace officers, but millions must be spent to invade private homes and property and spy upon our people.

It must be that those who are responsible for the Volstead law and for the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution at this late day realize that when they attempted overnight to make a crime of something which was not a crime in its day, to convert what once was legalized and from which revenues were derived into a crime within 24 hours—that they realize now that, having embedded that proposition in the Constitution, the people generally are losing respect for the law.

Those of us who have been opposed to the Volstead law; those of us who have fought against the subjection of the industries of the Nation to the domination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue without appeal to any court; those of us who opposed placing in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the absolute discretion, without review, of limiting the quantity of alcohol to be used in a great many manufacturing industries of the country; those of us who opposed the limitations which have been placed upon the physicians contrary to the eighteenth amendment; those of us who have opposed all these nefarious schemes which are in effect in contradiction of the eighteenth amendment have been charged with being against law enforcement.

Mr. President, what I am about to read I think has not been printed generally throughout the United States, and I wish to place it in the RECORD, so as to show exactly who are for law enforcement in the Nation. At this gathering to which I have referred, held on December 4 in the city of New Orleans, we find such statements as I am about to read in order that they may appear in the RECORD, and I wish that the press of the Nation might carry them. I read from the Times-Picayune and the Daily States of December 4, 1922. For instance, Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler said:

> The average prohibition agent is patriotic and loyal, and the percentage of prohibition agents slain on duty is higher than the percentage of soldiers of the American Army slain during the World War. It is a shame that when these honored and hard-working men are shot down Federal judges often condone with the bootleggers instead of going after them.

Now, Mr. President, to the average reader this might appear to be a very light charge, but what say those who claim that people who advocate modification of the Volstead law are not for law enforcement when they themselves in public speech denounce the Federal judges as being, one might say, particeps criminis with those who kill the enforcement officers, and when they charge the Federal judges with condoning and pardoning and being too easy with murderers. That is a very serious charge, but that is only one of many statements made. I read another one:

> I want to reiterate what I said Sunday, said Dr. Purley A. Baker, general superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League of America, at the opening of the second day of the law enforcement conference at the Grunewald Hotel, Monday: Twenty per cent of the Nation's Federal judges ought to be in the penitentiary at hard labor, or impeached.

Do those gentlemen stand for law enforcement? Are those men trying to uphold the judiciary of the Nation or are they trying to tear it down and create more disrespect for law? Law-abiding citizens are being denounced merely because they stand upon this floor and say they would like to see a modification of the Volstead law, not through any wrongdoing on the part of any judge or wrongdoing on the part of any Member of the Congress of the United States but merely, Mr. President, because the eighteenth amendment provides that "no intoxicating liquor," instead of "no alcoholic liquor" shall be manufactured, transported, and so forth, and we believe that under that amendment it was never intended to exclude alcohol altogether, otherwise the amendment would not have recited "no intoxicating liquor," and therefore we claim that within the purview and the intent of that amendment to the Constitution the Volstead law may be modified and liberalized.

But there are other statements which I want to bring to your attention. For instance, Mr. Wayne B. Wheeler made this statement, and I think it is a pretty serious charge to make.

> We have no fear of Congress nullifying the dry legislation, said Wayne B. Wheeler, national counsel for the league. The Anti-Saloon League controls Congress.

I think that many people in the United States have that opinion, that many people in the United States quite agree with Mr. Wheeler; but that statement does not make for law enforcement and respect for the law, Mr. President. Whether it be true or not is immaterial, so far as I view the question, but the charge puts every Member of Congress in disrepute and makes for less respect of the law. We find in this instance a man who claims that an organization controls the Congress of the United States, and therefore he helped to make people respect the law by proclaiming it, while those of us who believe that the constitutional amendment never was intended to justify the Volstead law but was intended to permit a more liberal interpretation than that law allows are denounced as people who create disrespect for the law.

However, Mr. Wheeler goes to New Orleans and claims that he and his organization are not worried at all. Why? Because the Anti-Saloon League controls Congress. Is there anybody here who will defend that statement?

As I said before, whether it is true or not, it makes for disrespect for the law, and these gentlemen are largely responsible for the condition prevailing throughout this Nation to-day. Those of us who opposed the eighteenth amendment predicted before it was adopted this very situation. For that reason we said, "if you wish to embark upon an experiment of that kind, for God's sake do not put it in the Constitution, but make it an act of Congress so that the people in case they disagree with it later may repeal it." These gentlemen claim that they are being impeded in their efforts to enforce the prohibition laws, but they get upon the rostrum and charge that 20 per cent of the Federal judges of the Nation ought to be impeached and be in the penitentiary and that they are not afraid of a modification of the law because the Anti-Saloon League controls the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I want to quote again from Doctor Baker. I think that he makes a very severe arraignment. As a matter of fact, I have frequently thought since I read his remarks that Doctor Baker should be haled before the Federal courts for contempt. I do not think any Senator will take the floor and deny that this statement, for instance, should be taken cognizance of by the courts. Here is what Doctor Baker said:

> "These scoundrels"—
>
> These scoundrels—
>
> "who sit on the bench, and I use the term advisedly," said Doctor Baker, referring to the 20 per cent of the Federal judges who he said were obstructing enforcement of the prohibition law, "are drunkards themselves. I hold them responsible for the shooting down of 300 splendid law-enforcement officers during the last year."

Mr. President, as I said before, it seems to me that no man holding a responsible position has a right to arraign 20 per cent of the Federal judges of the United States and to call them scoundrels and drunkards. If that be assisting in creating respect for the law and in securing cooperation for the enforcement of the Volstead law, then I am very much mistaken.

I think when Doctor Baker made that statement he knew of course that there was not a particle of truth in his charges against the Federal judges. In addition Doctor Baker said:

> Senator BROUSSARD of Louisiana, along with REED of Missouri, STANLEY of Kentucky, and EDWARDS of New Jersey, he said were representatives of neither Republican nor Democratic Parties, but representatives "of whisky."

Mr. President, I think I was the first candidate for the United States Senate who offered on a liberal platform. I was opposed by two gentlemen who were prohibitionists. There was not a single individual in the State of Louisiana but who knew absolutely my attitude. So when I went into a Democratic primary and was made the choice of the Democratic Party I think there is no doubt of the fact that the voters knew my position as to prohibition, because it was the first plank in the platform on which I stood. Doctor Baker also knew that Senator REED of Missouri had just been reelected, and that one of the issues of his campaign was his attitude in favor of a modification of the Volstead law. Doctor Baker knew, furthermore, that Governor Edwards for the last eight years has been pronounced in his opposition to the prohibition law and in favor of its modification, and that he had made his position an issue in his campaign. Everybody knows how the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] stands upon the issue. I merely mention this, Mr. President, not that there is any particular reason for mentioning it except in connection with the fact that the gentlemen who meet for the purpose of holding a national convention to discuss questions involving law enforcement think it proper to go out of their way to denounce Federal judges and Senators, and I suppose in other States where Members of Congress have disagreed with them they also make similar charges against them.

We have heretofore been slandered by the agents of the Anti-Saloon League, but all of us were elected despite the slanders and the libels which were printed against us, and we stand here now—certainly I for one stand here—irrespective of whatever charges are made against me, to redeem the preelection pledges which I made to my people. I have not experienced any change of heart on the subject; I am still against the present Volstead law, and I am for modification. I deny the right of any organization to go throughout the country and to spread such charges against Federal judges and against Members of the United States Senate as those to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I shall not oppose the appropriation of $9,000,000 for enforcing the Volstead law. Mr. Wheeler, however, claims that his organization controls the Congress, and I wish to give this piece of advice: The $9,000,000 proposed to be appropriated in this bill will never make effective the Volstead law.

If Mr. Wheeler and Doctor Baker will see that the $9,000,000 are used, first, to prosecute members of the Anti-Saloon League, the subscribers to that league, the members of the various State legislatures and the Congress who passed dry legislation, various officials throughout the several States of the Union, and the officials of the Federal Government who violate the Volstead law, $9,000,000 will not be sufficient to go around, leaving out of consideration others who are of moderate and liberal views. If the Anti-Saloon League should take this $9,000,000 and expend it, it would be impossible to enforce the law in the case of those who have thrust this measure upon this Nation. If Doctor Baker and his colleagues are sincere in their efforts, I challenge them to do what I have suggested. They say they control both branches of Congress. I would not vote for such a measure, but I challenge them to have incorporated in this bill $100,000,000 for enforcement of the prohibition act. They have the votes to get it through, and if they want to enforce the law let them vote the money necessary to do it. They know they can not do it with $9,000,000; but they want the $9,000,000 appropriation because they desire the Anti-Saloon League to continue this work and to be paid for it, and to have their agents receive their salaries. That is why they want this appropriation of $9,000,000, although, I repeat, that sum could not make the individuals responsible by their votes for the submission and ratification of the eighteenth amendment and then for the passage of the Volstead law observe that law, and they know it.

Mr. President, I do not intend to vote against the $9,000,000 appropriation. I am not against law enforcement. My attitude is quite the contrary; but I merely wanted to suggest that while these gentlemen are spending the taxpayers' money they go about denouncing those who do not agree with them.

I want further, Mr. President, to remind the Senate that when the bill to create 18 additional Federal judges in this country was before this body the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] made the charge that the officials of the Anti-Saloon League had made appeals to Members of the Senate to create the additional judges and to give some one the power to send a Federal judge from any district of the United States to any other district in the United States. It was stated that the purpose was to enable the selection of certain judges who would send men to jail, possibly, for having taken a drink with a friend or for having otherwise violated the Volstead law. They were defeated in that, but the charge was made and never refuted by anyone that there was an attempt to reach down into and tamper with the judiciary of the country, which should be at all times above reproach, which should at all times have the entire support and respect of every good, loyal citizen of the United States. When they failed in that and that feature of the bill was eliminated, then we find them going out in the various sections of the United States denouncing 20 per cent of the Federal judges of this country as scoundrels and drunkards and claiming that 20 per cent of them should be in the penitentiary.

I merely wanted the country to know, in other words, that we are proposing to spend $9,000,000 to help these fellows get along and continue to abuse the men who go into their pockets and put up the taxes which meet these payments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if he intends to offer an amendment on page 41 on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who is ill?

Mr. WARREN. I have the amendment before me ready to present, but there is now a motion pending to strike out three lines on page 28, which I hope will not prevail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have one more amendment which I wish to offer. I may say that it has been considered by the members of the committee and has met with their approval. I offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 41, line 24, after the numerals "$1,800," it is proposed to insert "assistant assayer, $1,200; in all, $3,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], who is ill, I ask that the letter which I send to the desk may be printed in the RECORD in connection with the amendment just adopted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF DIRECTOR OF THE MINT,
Washington, December 12, 1922.

DEAR SENATOR ODDIE: Responding to your telephone communication of to-day relative to the appropriation for the support of the mint at Carson, I beg to submit the following:

The salary appropriation for the mint at Carson for the current year provides for one person, the assayer in charge, who is now required to do the work of the chief clerk, cashier, melter, and assayer. The wages fund provides $1,500, which is paid to one man, who is required to do the work of helper, janitor, and watchman.

The estimates as submitted by this bureau and approved by the Budget Bureau included a request for an assistant assayer at $1,500 and for wages, $1,000, to pay a watchman, who could also be employed to do janitor work, care for the grounds, and help wherever possible.

The bill as reported omits the technical assistant and reduces the amount of the appropriation for wages from $1,500 to $1,000.

With but two employees at the Carson Mint, as at present, it is necessary for the assayer in charge to not only do all of the technical and clerical work but to take the watchman's place at night if he has to be absent for a single hour from the building. The situation is obviously impossible and an assistant assayer should be allowed at this mint. As the bill stands we would be expected to induce a reliable man to work at the mint all day as helper and janitor and be watchman at night for the munificent sum of $1,000 a year; that is, he would spend every day in the year, 24 hours a day, at the mint without any relief, and with no one to relieve him even for temporary absence of the briefest period, except the assayer in charge.

It is physically impossible for one person to do unassisted the melting and assaying of metal, bookkeeping, cashier's work, and be responsible for the gold bullion belonging to the Government which is treated at that institution. At least one technical assistant should be allowed in addition to the assayer in charge, together with one watchman.

The estimate as submitted was the lowest possible for safety at this mint and called for the employment of but three persons:

Assayer in charge	$1,800
Assistant assayer	1,500
Watchman-janitor	1,000

This institution can not safely be maintained with less service and protection.

Very truly yours,
F. E. SCOBEY,
Director of the Mint.

HON. TASKER L. ODDIE,
United States Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that completes the bill so far as the committee is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment. On page 20, after line 25, and before line 26, as a new subdivision, I move to insert the matter which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 20, after line 25, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

That when used in this act the term "Federal farm loan act" means the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, as amended——

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, unless the chairman of the committee wants it read I will state that this is quite a long amendment——

Mr. WARREN. I shall be as well satisfied, perhaps, if the Senator will make a brief statement as to its provisions.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I do not care to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily.

The bill that I have offered as an amendment is an agricultural credits bill, and it comes very properly under this part of the appropriation bill, the Federal Farm Loan Bureau, because this is the bill which a great many Senators are advocating, and which the President of the United States in his message to Congress a few days ago practically indorsed. It is what is known as the Lenroot bill, providing for agricultural credits through the creation in the Federal farm loan system of a separate bureau to make possible agricultural credits along more ambitious lines, with enlarged opportunities, than is now provided by law.

There are many details of the bill which of course in the discussion, unless a point of order is made to it, we can consider

and discuss quite fully. I am explaining it now because I am sure the Senator from Wyoming understands the necessity for this legislation just as much as I do, or any other Senator. He knows the condition of the farmers of the country; that they have seen the prices of their products decline while the cost of the things that it was necessary for them to buy in order to produce their crops have gone up; that the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar has constantly depreciated. The Senator is quite aware of the fact that as far back as November 21 of this year the President of the United States, in addressing the Congress on the American merchant marine, employed not a great deal of language respecting agriculture, but what he did employ was quite forceful, and here is what he said:

> At the present moment the American farmer is the chief sufferer from the cruel readjustments which follow war's inflations, and befitting Government aid to our farmers is highly essential to our national welfare. No people may safely boast a good fortune which the farmer does not share.

Further, he says:

> To this problem, and such others of pressing importance as reasonably may be dealt with in the short session, I shall invite your attention at an early date.

In other words, away back a month ago he said that one of the first propositions coming before the regular session of Congress was to be agricultural credits.

Then, the other day, on December 8, in appearing before a joint meeting of the two Houses, the President again called the attention of the country and of Congress to the necessity of the prompt enactment at the present session of an agricultural credits bill; and he said in passing:

> The Farm Loan Bureau, which already has proven its usefulness through the Federal land banks, may well have its powers enlarged to provide ample farm production credits as well as enlarged land credits.

Mr. President, in addition to that message and the sentiment of the country for agricultural credits legislation and the fact that a year ago the joint commission of the two Houses on agricultural inquiry unanimously agreed to a report recommending the passage of legislation along the lines embodied in this amendment, a subcommittee of the farm bloc has been at work trying to agree on some kind of a plan to present to the other Members of the Senate in order that all the various elements in Congress may get behind the movement and obtain legislation for the farmer's relief during this session of the Congress.

The Lenroot provision does not in all of its details meet my approval; it does not meet the approval as a whole of any particular individual, perhaps; but it embodies so many good features and has been indorsed by so many elements in the Congress, including the President, that its passage would be insured at this session of Congress. There can not be a more opportune time for the Senate to take up the question and consider it than now; and the amendment that I have presented is the Lenroot bill, which was the bill recommended by the Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry and which has been indorsed by the subcommittee of the farm bloc, with some changes.

For instance, there are to be created 12 districts, 12 Federal farm land banks, and the amount specified for each one in this amendment is $10,000,000 instead of the $5,000,000 that is carried in the Lenroot proposal.

Another amendment to this proposal over the Lenroot provision is that in each agricultural or live-stock State an agency or branch shall be established to make these loans to the various interests and banks and cooperative associations. The proposal here allows agricultural paper to be rediscounted in the Federal reserve banks for nine months instead of the present limit of three or six months. It strikes out the provision that a State bank's indorsement will prevent the member banks of the Federal reserve system from discounting the paper. It is a splendid beginning. There may be other amendments that it would be wise to adopt, but it can be done in the consideration of this proposition. If a majority of the Senators should not agree to this amendment, but desire to offer a substitute, we can get a vote upon it; but the proposition that I wish to advance and urge upon the chairman of the committee and the Senate is to begin at this time on the floor of the Senate the consideration of agricultural credits legislation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, a point of order would strike out the amendment. I will yield to the Senator in one second. A point of order would strike it out; but if the point is not made, we can consider this proposition, make amendments if necessary, and send it over to the House, and it will insure agricultural credit legislation at this time. If it is not done, the time of the Senate will be consumed in passing this ship subsidy bill, which is in charge of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JONES), who is sitting here ready to begin immediately after this bill is out of the way to consider this subsidy for the shipping interests of the country. Instead of relieving the wants of the farmers it will add to their burdens and enrich the coffers of the Shipping Trust. So I submit that if we who welcomed the message of the President to that extent and who believe in the speedy enactment of agricultural legislation really desire to procure it we shall have to begin now; and if under this provision of the appropriation bill making appropriations for the operation of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau we can consider this amendment, we will adopt some measure before the ship subsidy bill shall have been taken up and we will be moving along with a better program than the one you have presented in this short session of Congress.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield now to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. As the Senator knows, a point of order cuts off all debate?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. But I was too much interested in the subject to make it until we have listened to the very able presentation of the matter by the Senator. I have read the bill very carefully. I understand it. I expect to vote for it when the Senator brings it up; but, of course, I must now make the point of order, because this is legislation and can not go on an appropriation bill under our rules.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator to withhold that point for a moment? I know that if the point of order is made the amendment will go out.

Mr. WARREN. May I appeal to the Senator? I am getting hungry.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and I am, too. We will eat together in a moment. When we get this agricultural credit provision up and out of a committee, does the Senator know whether or not the program of the steering committee is that the ship subsidy bill may be laid aside and that this most-needed legislation may be put ahead, so that the farmers will get some relief at the very earliest moment?

Mr. WARREN. In answer to that conundrum, I have not looked up the matter with my colleagues, but I very much hope that we may pass this bill, or some other one that may suit the Senator better, without regard to what other matters may be up. When it is presented again, in a proper way, I believe it will receive such unanimous support that it will not take a great deal of time. I do not want to base my approval of the bill or my expectation in regard to it upon any condition except that we want to pass the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. But the view of the Senator, as I understand, is that he believes that the Congress will be united for some legislation along this line, and that the sentiment is so strong that no matter what other legislation is up we can pass it so speedily, in such a short time, that we will really enact rural-credit legislation during this Congress.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator probably has observed that we have pending somewhere in the neighborhood of a dozen bills bearing upon this question. There has been a universal acceptance of the War Finance Corporation operations, which have to some extent helped to sustain the farmers, and it seems to be conceded that a further measure is needed because of the approaching expiration of the life of that measure; and that, added to all the other reasons that have been given, is a very strong factor.

If the Senator wishes to have his amendment printed, I have no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I desire to have it printed.

Mr. HARRISON's amendment was to insert the following on page 20, after line 25:

> That when used in this act, the term "Federal farm loan act" means the Federal farm loan act approved July 17, 1916, as amended, and the "Federal reserve act" means the Federal reserve act approved December 23, 1913, as amended.
>
> SEC. 2. That section 1 of the Federal farm loan act is amended to read as follows:
>
> "TITLE I.
>
> "SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the 'Federal farm loan act.' Its administration shall be under the direction and control of the Federal farm loan board hereinafter created."
>
> SEC. 3. That the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title, to read as follows:
>
> "TITLE II.
>
> "SEC. 201. That in addition to the powers granted by Title I, each Federal land bank shall have power—
>
> "(a) Subject solely to such restrictions, limitations, and conditions as may be imposed by the Federal Farm Loan Board (1) to discount for, or purchase from, any national bank, State bank, trust company, rural credit corporation, incorporated live-stock loan or farm credit company, savings institution, cooperative bank, or cooperative credit or marketing association of agricultural producers organized under

the laws of any State, or for any other Federal land bank, with its indorsement, any note, draft, bill of exchange, debenture, or other such obligation the proceeds of which have been advanced or used in the first instance for an agricultural purpose or for the raising, breeding, fattening, or marketing of live stock; (2) to buy or sell, with or without recourse, debentures issued by any other Federal land banks and (3) to make loans or advances direct to any cooperative association organized under the laws of any State and composed of persons engaged in producing, or producing and marketing, staple agricultural products, or live stock if the notes or other such obligations representing such loans are secured by warehouse receipts, and/or shipping documents covering such products, and/or by mortgages on live stock: *Provided*, That no Federal land bank shall discount paper for any national bank, State bank, or trust company which already has bills rediscounted equal to or exceeding the amount permitted by such bank or trust company under the laws of the jurisdiction creating the same: *And provided further*, That no paper shall be discounted for any incorporated live-stock loan company which has rediscounted paper equal to or exceeding ten times the paid-up capital stock and surplus of such company: *And provided further*, That if the laws of any jurisdiction under which any bank or trust company receiving demand deposits is created do not impose a limit upon the rediscount privilege of such bank or trust company, then no paper shall be rediscounted for such bank or trust company which has already rediscounted paper equal to or exceeding five times its paid-up capital stock and surplus. Such loans or discounts must have a maturity at the time they are made or discounted by the Federal land bank of not less than six months nor more than three years. Any Federal land bank may in its discretion sell loans or discounts made under this subdivision, with or without its indorsement. Rates of interest or discount charged by the Federal land banks upon such loans and discounts shall be subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

"(b) Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board to issue and to sell collateral trust bonds or other such obligations with a maturity at the time of issue of not more than five years, which shall be secured by at least a like face amount of cash, or notes or other such obligations discounted or purchased or representing loans made under subdivision (a): *Provided*, That no Federal land bank shall have power to issue or obligate itself for debentures or other obligations under the provisions of this section in excess of ten times the amount of the paid-up capital and surplus of the farms credits department of such bank. The provisions of Title I relating to the preparation and issue of farm loan bonds shall, so far as applicable, govern the preparation and issue of bonds or other such obligations issued under this subdivision; but the Federal Farm Loan Board shall prescribe rules and regulations governing the receipt, custody, substitution, and release of collateral instruments securing such bonds or other obligations. Such collateral shall be held separate and distinct from the collateral securing farm loan bonds and may be classified in such manner as the Federal Farm Loan Board shall approve and bonds issued upon the basis of such classes of paper. Rates of interest upon bonds and other such obligations issued under this subdivision shall, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, be fixed by the Federal land bank making the issue.

"SEC. 202. That before making any discounts under the provisions of this act, each Federal land bank shall establish and promulgate a rate of discount to be approved by the Federal Farm Loan Board. Any Federal land bank which has made an issue of debentures under the provisions of this act may thereafter establish, with the approval of the Farm Loan Board, a rate of discount not exceeding by more than 1 per cent the rate borne by its last preceding issue of debentures.

"No bank, trust company, live-stock company, or other agencies entitled to the privileges of this act, shall, without the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, be allowed to discount any note or other obligation, upon which the original borrower has been charged a rate of interest exceeding by more than 1½ per cent the discount rate of the Federal land bank at the time such loan was made.

"A Federal land bank may, subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, buy in the open market upon its own account and retire at or before maturity any such bonds or obligations issued by it.

"SEC. 203. That for the purpose of exercising the powers conferred by this title, each Federal land bank shall establish an agency or branch in each agricultural or live-stock State and operate under the supervision of its temporary directors and, after the establishment of the permanent organization, under the supervision of its district directors, a separate department to be designated as the farm credits department, for which $10,000,000 in capital shall be subscribed before any of the powers so conferred may be exercised. Capital stock of such amount shall be divided into shares of $5 each and shall be subscribed, held, and paid by the Government of the United States. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe to such capital stock on behalf of the United States, such subscription to be subject to call in whole or in part by the temporary or district directors of the Federal land bank upon 30 days' notice to the Secretary of the Treasury and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to take out shares as called and to pay for the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Capital so allocated to a farm credits department and the surplus of such department shall be applied solely to meet obligations and losses, if any, incurred in the operation of that department; and the capital subscribed, together with the reserve under Title I shall not be applied to meeting obligations or losses, if any, incurred in the operation of any farm credits department.

"SEC. 204. That the Federal Farm Loan Board shall equitably apportion the joint expenses incurred by the farm loan department operating under Title I of this act and the farm credits department operating under Title II of this act in each Federal land bank, and shall assess against the farm credits department of each Federal land bank in proportion to the capital and reserve of such department its proportionate share of the expenses of any additional personnel in the Farm Loan Bureau made necessary in connection with the operation of this provision. After all expenses of the farm credit department have been met out of earnings the capital stock held by the Government of the United States shall be entitled to a dividend of 4 per cent per annum, which dividend shall be cumulative. After the aforesaid claims have been fully met the remaining earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until such fund shall equal $2,000,000, and thereafter 25 per cent of the annual net earnings shall be paid to the Government of the United States in retirement of the stock owned by it until the stock of any farm credits department shall be reduced to $1,000,000.

"SEC. 205. That the farm credits department of any Federal land bank issuing bonds or other such obligations under section 201 shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall also be liable, upon presentation of the coupons for interest payments due upon any such bonds or obligations issued by the farm credits department of any other Federal land bank and remaining unpaid in consequence of the default of the farm credits department of such other Federal land bank. The farm credits department of any Federal land bank shall likewise be liable for such portion of the principal of bonds or obligations so issued as are not paid after the assets of the farm credits department of such other Federal land bank have been liquidated and distributed. Such losses, if any, either of interest or of principal, shall be assessed by the Federal Farm Loan Board against solvent farm credits departments of Federal land banks liable therefor in proportion to the amount of bonds or other such obligations which each may have outstanding at the time of such assessment. Every Federal land bank shall, by appropriate action of its board of directors duly recorded in its minutes, obligate itself to become liable on bonds and other such obligations as provided in this section.

"SEC. 206. That in order to enable each Federal land bank to carry out the purpose of this act, the Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized and directed, upon the request of any Federal land bank, (a) to furnish for the confidential use of such bank such reports, records, and other information as he may have available relating to the financial condition of national banks and rural credit corporations through or for which the Federal land bank has made or contemplates making discounts, and (b) to make, through his examiners, for the confidential use of the Federal land bank, examinations of State banks, trust companies, or savings institutions, rural credit corporations through or for which the Federal land bank has made or contemplates making discounts or loans: *Provided*, That no such examination shall be made without the consent of such State bank, trust company, or savings institution. Land-bank appraisers are authorized, upon the request of any Federal land bank and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to investigate and make a written report upon the products covered by warehouse receipts, shipping documents, and the live stock covered by mortgages which are security for notes or other such obligations representing any loan to any cooperative association, live-stock loan company, or farm credit company, under subdivision (a) of section 201. Land-bank examiners are authorized, upon the request of any Federal land bank and with the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to examine and make a written report upon the condition of any cooperative association, live-stock loan company, or farm credit company to which the Federal land bank contemplates making any such loan.

"SEC. 207. That the Federal Farm Loan Board is authorized to make such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, as it deems necessary for the efficient execution of the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 208. The penalties provided for in section 31 of Title I of this act shall apply to all false statements, counterfeiting of bonds or credit papers, and other fraudulent acts and misdemeanors against the farm credits department, as well as against the farm mortgage department, and the penalty provided for overvaluation of land as security shall apply to overvaluation of live stock or other farm products for the purpose of securing a loan, advance, or discount from the farm credits department of the Federal land bank.

"SEC. 209. The privileges of tax exemption accorded under Title I, section 26, of this act shall apply also to the farm credits department of each Federal land bank, including its capital, reserve or surplus, and the income derived therefrom, and the bonds issued under Title II of this act shall enjoy the same tax exemptions as are accorded farm loan bonds in said section."

SEC. 4. That the first two lines of section 12 of the Federal farm loan act are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That no Federal land bank organized under this act shall make loans, other than those authorized by Title II, except upon the following terms and conditions:"

SEC. 5. That section 23 of the Federal farm loan act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"The provisions of this section shall not apply to the earnings, surplus, and capital stock of the farm credits department of any Federal land bank."

SEC. 6. That section 5202 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Eighth. Liabilities incurred under the provisions of subdivision (a) of section 201 of the Federal farm loan act, approved July 17, 1916, as amended."

SEC. 7. That paragraph 1 of section 7 of the Federal reserve act be amended by striking out all of said paragraph and substituting the following:

"After all necessary expenses of a Federal reserve bank have been paid or provided for, the stockholders shall be entitled to receive an annual dividend of 6 per cent on the paid-in capital stock, which dividend shall be cumulative and may be paid out of any surplus in excess of 100 per cent of subscribed capital. Out of any net earnings remaining after the aforesaid dividend claims have been fully met there shall be paid each year to the United States as a franchise tax such an amount as will make the aggregate amount so paid for the year 1922 and subsequent years equal to the aggregate amount of the cumulative dividends paid to the stockholding member banks for such years. After the full amount of the franchise tax shall have been paid to the United States the balance of the net earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 100 per cent of subscribed capital, and thereafter when net earnings exceed 12 per cent an extra dividend of not to exceed 3 per cent may be distributed to the stockholders, the remaining net earnings, if any, going to the United States as an additional franchise tax."

SEC. 8. That the ninth paragraph of section 9 of the Federal reserve act be amended to read as follows:

"No applying bank shall be admitted to membership in a Federal reserve bank unless it possesses a paid-up, unimpaired capital sufficient to entitle it to become a national banking association in the place where it is situated under the provisions of the national bank act: *Provided, however*, That an applying bank organized in a place the population of which does not exceed 6,000 inhabitants may, in the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board, be admitted to membership if it possesses a paid-up, unimpaired capital of at least $50,000, and if the application is accompanied by adequate undertakings of such bank and of its principal stockholders that the capital of such bank will within three years be increased to $50,000: *And provided further*, That an applying bank, organized in a place the population of which does not exceed 3,000 inhabitants may, in the discretion of the

Federal Reserve Board, be admitted to membership if it possesses a paid-up, unimpaired capital of at least $15,000, and if it is accompanied by adequate undertakings of such bank and of its principal stockholders that such capital will within three years be increased to $25,000. If any such undertakings have not been fulfilled within three years the Federal Reserve Board may forbid such bank to enjoy any of the privileges of this act, and may require it to withdraw forthwith from membership in the Federal reserve system."

SEC. 9. That the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal reserve act, beginning with the words "*Provided*, That" is hereby amended to read as follows:

"*Provided*, That notes, drafts, and bills of exchange drawn or issued for agricultural purposes, including the preparation for marketing and the orderly marketing of farm products, by the producers of such products or their cooperative organizations, or based on live stock, and having a maturity at the time of discount of not more than nine months, exclusive of days of grace, may be discounted in an amount to be limited to a percentage of the assets of the Federal reserve bank to be ascertained and fixed by the Federal Reserve Board, and any Federal reserve bank may rediscount such notes, drafts, and bills for any Federal land bank. Any Federal reserve bank may also buy and sell bonds and other such obligations issued by a Federal land bank under Title II of the Federal farm loan act, but only to the same extent as and subject to the same limitations as those upon which it may buy and sell bonds issued under Title I of said act."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as the Senator having charge of the shipping bill, I simply wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that when the credit bill comes up if there is any substantial unanimity with reference to it, as I anticipate there will be, I shall be the last one to delay its passage, and I would do everything I could to have the shipping bill temporarily laid aside in order that that legislation may be passed; so that, as far as I am concerned, I do not anticipate any conflict between the rural-credits measure and the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Wyoming raises the point of order.

Mr. WARREN. I make the point of order against the consideration of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The matter of farm credits legislation is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Quite a number of bills have been introduced intended to afford the farmers of the United States a credit system to meet the requirements of their peculiar condition. I shall contend for a real and adequate agricultural credit system and no mere makeshift shall, with my consent, be foisted on us.

There was held last night in this building a meeting of what is called the farm bloc for the purpose of giving consideration to these several bills. The bill which the Senator has offered as an amendment was one of the bills discussed. Other bills were then discussed, and all of these bills are being discussed now in the hearings being held by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There is no man in this Chamber who is going to exert himself more strenuously than I to enact legislation in the interest of agriculture, but when we do obtain that legislation I wish to see the farmer given an adequate credit and financial opportunity and not a mere sop. One of the troubles we have to-day is that certain occupations are adequately financed, while the farmer is inadequately financed.

We have a banking system which affords all the credit that is needed by our commercial and our industrial activities. The farmer is without the means of obtaining anything like adequate credit with which to prosecute his operations. It is this unbalanced condition of the business of the country to-day that is very largely responsible for the fact that we see certain occupations very prosperous while the farming operations of the country are in a state of depression verging upon bankruptcy.

For one, as a friend of the farming interests, I do not intend to content myself with the passage of any measure which will not afford the farmer adequate relief from the situation in which he finds himself. He is either entitled to full relief or he is entitled to no relief. I shall resent the proposition to give him a mere makeshift as fulfilling the promise made to the farmer by the Chief Executive of the United States. The farmer is not a dog, to be satisfied with a bone. He is entitled to a financial system that will as adequately meet his demands and requirements and conditions as the present system provides for the other classes of the people of the United States. It may be said that we can not pass such a measure during the short session. If we can not pass a measure that will actually meet the agricultural needs, then I say we shall not pass a measure that is a mere pretense of relief. The American farmer shall receive frank and honest treatment at least.

It is said that the Treasury is in trouble, and that it can not afford to expend the money in the establishment of the necessary machinery and make the appropriation of the amount that may be necessary to put that machinery in successful operation. Oh, Mr. President, one-half of the people of this country create the basic wealth of the Republic, add more than 50 per cent of the accretion of wealth to this Nation every year, and can we not afford to do that which will put that half of the people on their feet, which will make them independent, which will relieve them from the commercial servitude in which they now suffer and struggle? It is alleged that the Treasury is in such a condition that adequate help can not be extended to them, although they are on the verge of bankruptcy and about to perish, but there is enough money, it appears, to give to the shipbuilders and the ship operators all that their avarice may demand.

Do you think that the real friends of the farmer can be deceived in that fashion? If so, I declare that they who think so shall have a rude awakening.

I want farm credit legislation, Mr. President, but I do not want any pretense about it. I want agricultural credit legislation which will relieve, which will make the farmer financially as independent a man as the manufacturer or as those of the commercial classes now are. The farmer will never be able to stand upon his feet and be a man until his operations are as well financed and his credit is as good as those of the other classes of people in this country.

The farmer possesses as good security as any. The man with stocks and bonds can get all the money he needs, and yet the farmer, with the wonderful assets of the farm, with the best security and the safest security in the world, stands a beggar at the counters of every bank in the United States as the result of our banking system and our refusal or neglect to supply him with the means that will make him just as independent a man as those who buy his products. Mr. President, I tell you that the farmer of this country will never come into his own until this situation is relieved, and relieved completely. This is no time for popgun or makeship legislation with reference to farm credits. The situation demands that the conditions be met fully and completely and adequately by legislation.

I do not know what bill will come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but I want to serve notice now that if it is a bill that is a mere pretense, a mere temporary expedient, to relieve and ameliorate in a slight degree temporarily the distressed condition of agriculture in this country, I for one shall not support it upon the idea that, while it is not much, it is all we can get. I shall stand here and insist that the farmer ought not to be content with any such treatment. He ought to demand now, and I shall demand for him, what he is justly entitled to and not compromise.

I do not know whether the Banking and Currency Committee will bring out a satisfactory measure or not. That is a question I think we shall have to fight out here on the floor of the Senate. I think a vast majority of this body is in favor of giving the farmer what he is entitled to, and I believe he is going to get it in the end, no matter what bill may be reported by that committee; but I think it would be a very bad policy to be adopting an amendment carrying one of these bills, and especially that one which, in my judgment, gives only a mere bagatelle compared with what we ought to do for these fifty-odd million of our fellow citizens who are to-day suffering in the midst of the prosperity of the balance of their countrymen.

Mr. President, I introduced one of these bills, and I am going to offer it not as an amendment to any appropriation bill but as an amendment to the shipping bill. If in the meantime the Banking and Currency Committee reports out a satisfactory bill, I shall withdraw mine and offer the latter bill as an amendment to the shipping bill in place of my own.

I wish to send to the desk two amendments to the shipping bill, which I now propose. Is the shipping bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WARREN. The Treasury Department appropriation bill is before the Senate. The consideration of it is concluded, except for the final vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will offer my amendments now instead of when the shipping bill comes up. As I am on my feet, I might as well offer them now. I am going to offer these two amendments to the shipping bill.

Mr. WARREN. Would the Senator object to our finishing with the appropriation bill? It will take but a moment.

Mr. SIMMONS. It will take me but a moment to finish this.

Mr. WARREN. I thought the Senator wished to make some speech or observations.

Mr. SIMMONS. The first amendment I shall propose to the shipping bill is the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill which we passed during the late session of Congress, and which the President of the United States vetoed.

The second amendment I shall propose is the substance of a bill which I introduced in this Chamber April 20, providing an adequate system of rural credits to relieve the agricultural situation of the country.

The shipping bill gives what we call a subsidy to the shipowners and the ship operators. It is, in essence, a bonus. The amendment which I propose embodying the adjusted compensation bill recently vetoed by the President, gives to the boys who followed the flag in the late Great World War a meager bit of adjusted compensation for their services.

The second proposition which I offer would give to the American farmer adequate financial relief, and would be in the nature of a relief measure, so far as he is concerned.

The propositions, therefore, are live propositions. Each of them calls for money. Each of them calls for expenditures by the Federal Government. The first proposition, the major proposition, the proposition to which I propose the amendment, namely, the shipping bill, is a measure which, as has been said in this Chamber in the past day or two, was discussed upon nearly every stump in the country in the last campaign. The second proposition, that with reference to the soldiers' adjusted compensation, is also a subject which was discussed upon every stump in the country in the late campaign. The third proposition, with reference to agriculture, is one which was discussed extensively and entered probably more extensively into the result of the election than either of the other two propositions.

In that contest, Mr. President, the major proposition, the ship subsidy proposition, received an overwhelming rebuke and repudiation. The proposition with reference to the soldiers' adjusted compensation, on the other hand, met with a ready response, and resentment against the action of the Chief Executive in vetoing the measure had very much to do with the result of the elections. With reference to the other proposition, the great agricultural vote of the country gave expression at the ballot box of its deep and abiding resentment against the present administration because of its failure to enact any legislation to relieve the American farmer. So keenly did the President of the United States appreciate this attitude on the part of the farmer, and the extent to which his resentment affected disastrously the Republican Party in the result of the election, that the special session of the Congress had hardly convened before the White House was in conference with Senators, some of whom had never shown any interest in agricultural legislation, in order to see if they could not devise some scheme by which they could quiet the anger and the wrath of the agricultural classes of the United States. We have had this propaganda in the newspapers. We have had this publicity with regard to the great things the administration was going to do for the farmer filling the newspapers ever since, and forming the basis of a large part of the message of the President. And all that has come out of it is the little popgun bill which was offered here this morning as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill.

Now, Mr. President, I offer the two additional propositions to the first proposition. I think they properly connect themselves with it. I want to see a vote upon them. I want to let the soldiers of the country know if those people who have proposed in this very bill to give millions piled upon millions of subsidies and bonuses to a few great wealthy shipbuilders and ship operators are to refuse to do even meager justice to the soldiers of America. I want a vote in this Chamber in connection with the two propositions upon the question of whether the administration forces in this body are going to deal as generously and as fairly with the farmers of the United States as they propose to do with the shipbuilders and the ship operators, and whether they intend to carry out their pledges made after election—and made because of the wrath which had been engendered by their failure to do anything before the election—or whether they are going to pass the ship subsidy bill and continue to close the legislative doors to the crying needs of the soldiers for simple justice and of the farmers for adequate credits.

Mr. President, we shall see what we shall see.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The appropriation bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 32, line 6, after the word "Treasury," insert the words "in his discretion."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will ask the Secretary to report the whole proposition so that we may intelligently vote on what is to happen, or that the Senator from Wisconsin say something in regard to it so we may know what is proposed.

Mr. LENROOT. The amendment merely makes it discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury whether he shall use the power presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of the faces of the currency, and the next amendment which I shall offer provides that the force shall be reduced only in case he exercises the power which my amendment gives him discretion to exercise instead of being made mandatory.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is the Senator's intention to make the provision discretionary instead of mandatory?

Mr. LENROOT. It is.

Mr. WARREN. I shall not object to the amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. May we have the amendment reported in full?

The READING CLERK. On page 32, line 6, after the word "Treasury," insert the words "in his discretion," so that it will read:

Hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to print from plates of more than four subjects each, etc.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is the amendment satisfactory to the committee? Was not a similar amendment voted down in the House?

Mr. LENROOT. I refer the Senator's question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WARREN. The amendment is offered to the language of the House text as it came to us.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not care to take the time to discuss the matter. I understand the chairman of the committee does not object to the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. I now offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 32, lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "in the exercise of the authority conferred upon him by this paragraph," and insert in lieu thereof "if the power conferred by this paragraph is exercised," so as to read:

And the Secretary shall, if the power conferred by this paragraph is exercised, reduce the number of persons employed in the operation of plate-printing presses by not less than 218.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement indicating the cost and distribution of the 13 publications issued by the commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of papers and documents not needed in the transaction of public business and having no permanent value or historic interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments. The Vice President appointed Mr. STERLING and Mr. MCKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate, and ordered that the Secretary notify the House of Representatives thereof.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATORS ELECT BRUCE AND NEELY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Maryland, certifying to the election of WILLIAM CABELL BRUCE as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which was ordered to be filed, as follows:

THE STATE OF MARYLAND,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year 1922, WILLIAM CABELL BRUCE, Esq., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Maryland a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Albert C. Ritchie, and our seal hereto affixed, this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

ALBERT C. RITCHIE.

By the governor:

PHILIP B. PERLMAN,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of West Virginia, certifying to the election of MATTHEW M. NEELY as a United States Senator for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which was ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Executive Department.

A proclamation by the governor.

Whereas it appears that at an election in the State of West Virginia, held on the 7th day of November, 1922, MATTHEW M. NEELY received 198,853 votes, M. S. Holt received 4,895 votes, and HOWARD SUTHERLAND received 185,046 votes for Senator in the Senate of the United States for West Virginia for the term beginning March 4, 1923:

Therefore, in accordance with the requirements of section 70, chapter 3, of the Code of West Virginia, I hereby make proclamation of the said result and declare the said MATTHEW M. NEELY duly elected a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed, at the capitol, in the city of Charleston, this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922, and of the State the sixtieth.

[SEAL.] EPHRAIM F. MORGAN.

By the governor:

HOUSTON H. YOUNG,
Secretary of State.

—

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Executive Department, Charleston.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

Whereas at the primary election held in said State on the 1st day of August, 1922, under chapter 26, acts of the legislature, 1915, MATTHEW M. NEELY, of the county of Marion, was nominated for the office of United States Senator upon the Democratic ticket, and M. S. Holt, of the county of Lewis, was nominated for the said office upon the Socialist ticket, and HOWARD SUTHERLAND, of the county of Randolph, was nominated for the said office upon the Republican ticket; and

Whereas at the general election held in said State on the 7th day of November, 1922, at which general election the said MATTHEW M. NEELY, M. S. Holt, and HOWARD SUTHERLAND were candidates for the office of United States Senator upon the Democratic, Socialist, and Republican tickets, respectively; and

Whereas the board of canvassers of the various counties certified to me the vote cast at said election for said MATTHEW M. NEELY, M. S. Holt, and HOWARD SUTHERLAND, the candidates for the office of United States Senator upon the Democratic, Socialist, and Republican tickets, respectively, which said votes as shown by said certificates filed in my office, returned by the board of canvassers from every county in said State, are as follows:

Counties.	Matthew M. Neely.	M. S. Holt.	Howard Sutherland.
Barbour	2,433	93	2,398
Berkeley	2,902	32	3,078
Boone	2,812	61	1,641
Braxton	4,322	9	3,481
Brooke	2,084	82	2,043
Cabell	9,208	83	8,633
Calhoun	1,940	5	1,320
Clay	1,683	6	1,675
Doddridge	1,280	15	2,153
Fayette	8,614	285	7,818
Gilmer	1,891	14	1,121
Grant	350	8	1,153
Greenbrier	4,943	50	3,442
Hampshire	1,946	9	867
Hancock	816	32	1,208
Hardy	1,637	7	860
Harrison	9,557	532	8,887
Jackson	2,416	.....	2,861
Jefferson	2,429	20	1,116
Kanawha	17,614	420	15,257
Lewis	2,825	344	3,415
Lincoln	2,738	12	2,381
Logan	5,097	10	1,964
Marion	8,998	864	7,844
Marshall	3,650	305	4,337
Mason	2,838	53	3,198
Mercer	8,057	30	5,734
Mineral	1,802	56	2,013
Mingo	4,085	3	2,972
Monongalia	3,174	307	3,762
Monroe	2,594	.....	2,359
Morgan	1,007	16	1,594
McDowell	3,688	16	7,892
Nicholas	3,212	.....	2,683
Ohio	6,614	240	6,759
Pendleton	1,534	4	1,147
Pleasants	1,404	11	1,371
Pocahontas	2,085	23	1,601
Preston	1,618	61	3,759
Putnam	2,306	67	2,212
Raleigh	6,467	73	5,719
Randolph	4,237	128	2,535
Ritchie	1,828	15	3,056
Roane	3,105	5	3,468
Summers	3,752	17	2,614
Taylor	2,175	102	2,209
Tucker	1,701	137	1,932
Tyler	1,643	19	2,553
Upshur	1,291	16	3,234
Wayne	4,918	.....	3,881
Webster	1,985	11	1,218
Wetzel	4,356	40	2,820
Wirt	1,483	.....	1,444
Wood	7,440	87	6,475
Wyoming	1,599	.....	1,819
Total	198,833	4,895	185,046

And it appearing that at said election MATTHEW M. NEELY received 198,853 votes, that M. S. Holt received 4,895 votes, and HOWARD SUTHERLAND received 185,046 votes, and that they were all the persons voted for at said election for said office; and

Whereas the legislature of said State did not enact a law prescribing the manner in which the credentials of election of United States Senator as provided by the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, providing for the election of United States Senator by the several States, should be certified to the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Federal Congress passed an act on June 4, 1914, providing a temporary method of conducting the nomination and election of United States Senators: Now, therefore,

I, Ephraim F. Morgan, Governor of the State of West Virginia, in pursuance of said act, do hereby certify that at the general election held on the 7th day of November, 1922, as shown by said certificates, the said MATTHEW M. NEELY was chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the said State this the 9th day of December, A. D. 1922, and of the State the sixtieth.

[SEAL.] EPHRAIM F. MORGAN.

By the governor:

HOUSTON H. YOUNG,
Secretary of State.

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF EUROPEAN STATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Senate:

In response to Senate Resolution 208 of January 16, 1922, requesting the Secretary of State, if not incompatible with the public interest, to lay before the Senate "such information regarding the revenues, expenditures, and deficits of the European States as may be available to the Department of State, showing for the last and current fiscal years especially the annual cost of land armaments in the several States, as compared with the annual deficits of the several States (including both 'ordinary' and 'extraordinary' expenditures) and the sum of the interest annually due from the several States on account of the loans made to them by the United States," I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, furnishing the information requested by the resolution.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1922.*

CHANGES IN THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

To the Congress of the United States:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

"The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to continue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs-collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs-collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor."

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that the following changes in the organization of the customs service have been made by Executive order:

By Executive order dated January 24, 1921, the port of Portland as then constituted was abolished and that place created as a port of entry in customs-collection district No. 29 (Oregon), the order defining the limits of the newly created port.

By Executive order dated January 9, 1922, various ports of entry were abolished and several new ports of entry created in several of the customs-collection districts as follows:

CUSTOMS PORTS OF ENTRY ABOLISHED.

In customs-collection district No. 1, of which Portland, Me., is the headquarters port, Rockport, Me.; Deer Isle, Me.; Vinal Haven, Me.; and Castine, Me.

In customs-collection district No. 4, of which Boston, Mass., is the headquarters port, Barnstable, Mass., and Holyoke, Mass.

In customs collection district No. 7, of which Ogdensburg, N. Y., is the headquarters port, Chaumont, N. Y.

In customs collection district No. 10, of which New York, N. Y., is the headquarters port, Greenport and Patchogue, N. Y.

In customs collection district No. 11, of which Philadelphia, Pa., is the headquarters port, Tuckerton, N. J.

In customs collection district No. 18, of which Tampa, Fla., is the headquarters port, Port Inglis and Punta Gorda, Fla.

In customs collection district No. 22, of which Galveston, Tex., is the headquarters port, Port Lavaca, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 23, of which San Antonio, Tex., is the headquarters port, Santa Maria and Roma, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 24, of which El Paso, Tex., is the headquarters port, Boquillas, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 25, of which San Diego, Calif., is the headquarters port, Campo, Calif.

In customs collection district No. 31, of which Juneau, Alaska, is the headquarters port, Fairbanks, Alaska.

In customs collection district No. 33, of which Great Falls, Mont., is the headquarters port, Plentywood, Mont.

In customs collection district No. 36, of which Duluth, Minn., is the headquarters port, Isle Royale, Mich.

In customs collection district No. 38, of which Detroit, Mich., is the headquarters port, Manistique and Petoskey, Mich.

In customs collection district No. 45, of which St. Louis, Mo., is the headquarters port, Cairo, Ill.

In customs collection district No. 46, of which Omaha, Nebr., is the headquarters port, Lincoln, Nebr.

CUSTOMS PORTS OF ENTRY CREATED.

In customs collection district No. 1, of which Portland, Me., is the headquarters port, Jackman, Frenchville, and Robbinston, Me.

In customs collection district No. 23, of which San Antonio, Tex., is the headquarters port, Hidalgo, Tex.

By Executive order, dated September 30, 1922, the port of Carrabelle, in customs collection district No. 18 (Florida), was abolished.

By Executive order, dated November 3, 1922, Seward, in customs collection district No. 31 (Alaska), was created a customs port of entry, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

All of the above changes were dictated by considerations of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes with the enforcement of which the Customs Service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
December 12, 1922.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR THOMAS E. WATSON.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene on Sunday, January 21, 1923, at 11 o'clock a. m., to pay tribute to the life, character, and public services of the late Senator WATSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the shipping bill may be laid before the Senate and proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ernst	Ladd	Sheppard
Bayard	Fletcher	La Follette	Simmons
Borah	George	Lenroot	Smith
Brookhart	Glass	Lodge	Smoot
Broussard	Hale	McKellar	Sterling
Cameron	Harris	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Townsend
Caraway	Heflin	Nicholson	Trammell
Colt	Johnson	Overman	Underwood
Cousens	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Wadsworth
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Kellogg	Phipps	Warren
Dial	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Dillingham	Keyes	Robinson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the indications are that the discussion of the pending bill will take a very wide range before it shall be disposed of. Possibly many diverse and varied subjects will be taken up not only with reference to amendments which may be proposed to the bill but in connection with the bill itself. I shall myself endeavor to refrain from discussing matters not connected with the bill, however inviting the field may be.

I shall ask that Senators will not request to interrupt for the purpose of making statements or putting in what might be termed a "speech" in the midst of my remarks, although I shall be glad to yield for questions in connection with the measure or in connection with any point that I am discussing, if Senators should desire to ask any questions with reference to it.

In the consideration of the bill in committee there was no exclusion of the minority, such as takes place in connection with many of the important measures which are considered in the Senate. The full committee met, considered the bill, considered the amendments that were proposed and the amendments that were offered to it. Votes were taken upon proposed amendments where there was a division, and the majority determined the amendments that should go into the bill.

The bill does not come to the Senate with the unanimous support of the committee, nor did the committee divide upon partisan lines. I think in justice to the minority I should also say that there was no attempt to delay the consideration of the bill in the committee. The bill was brought out probably more promptly than we had reason to expect.

It is fair also to say that reservations were made by members of the committee, so that the vote as announced by which the bill was reported may not indicate really the vote in favor of the passage of the bill. Some of the Senators who voted to report the bill favorably expressly stated that they might oppose the passage of the bill; all Senators reserved the right, which of course all Senators have upon a measure, to offer amendments or to vote upon amendments which might be offered as their judgment might dictate. I thought it but fair, in view of the announcement that the bill was reported by a vote of 11 to 5, that this statement should be made.

Mr. President, it was suggested on yesterday by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] that the consideration of this bill ought to be postponed because of the results of the last election, and he stated that the bill had been discussed in all the congressional districts of the States. He also practically stated that it had been made an issue in the various States of the Union. I do not know what the facts are throughout the country generally. I know that this was not an issue in my State in the campaign. It was not discussed one way or the other. I have spoken to quite a number of Senators, and they have stated that it was not an issue in their States; that it was not discussed especially in the campaign.

Be that as it may, a speech by one of the Members of the House was called to my attention yesterday in which he stated that this question was a distinct issue in his campaign, and I want to read just a brief statement from what he said. This is by the Hon. JAMES H. MACLAFFERTY, of California. He said:

> It has been said time and again that the people of the country in the recent election had given overwhelming evidence that they were against this bill. I want to say that I represent a district containing over 400,000 people, and one of the things that I stressed in this campaign was my advocacy of this bill.

Then he states that so far as the returns are known he received a majority of 28,000 to fill a vacancy, and a majority of 40,000 for the full term, and a pencil notation is made on here, "44,000 majority"; so I take it that this Congressman, who made this matter distinctly an issue in his district, was elected by a majority of over 40,000 in a constituency of about 400,000.

But, Mr. President, be that as it may, it seems to me that we can not escape our responsibility and our duty under the Constitution and under our oaths to deal with this question. I was not one of those who were in favor of putting over the consideration of this bill until after the election. I urged as strenuously as I could that the bill be taken up and acted upon in one if not both bodies before the campaign came on. Those in authority did not agree with me. Of course the question may have had more or less influence in the campaign. Of course it is true that the whole policy of the administration was at issue in the campaign; and it seems to me that it might be suggested with just as much reason that the administration abandon its whole policy, and wait until after the 4th of March before endeavoring to carry it out, as to urge it as a legitimate argument against the consideration of this bill at this time, or to suggest that we should put it over until the 4th of March.

This measure ought to be passed upon its merits. If it is a good measure, it ought to be passed. If it is a bad measure, it ought to be defeated. There can be no issue with reference to that. Whether we have a reduced majority in the next Congress or not, it seems to me, has nothing to do with the merits of this proposition. We have a majority in the next House of Representatives; we have a majority in the Senate of the

United States; but the fact that it is a reduced majority does not relieve us from our responsibility at this time. Under the Constitution we are the legislators until March 4, and we should discharge our duty as we see it until the term of the next Congress begins. We can not and should not amend the Constitution by stopping work now.

Mr. President, a Senator asked me yesterday if I expected to make an eloquent speech on this bill. I do not. I could not if I would, and I would not if I could. I want to talk about it in just as simple, plain, and concise a way as I can. I want to give the reasons that I think warrant me in supporting the bill. I am not a shipping man. I wish I were. I wish there were shipping men in the Senate. There are not. I have found that men with practical experience in a line of work or business are better able to determine the effect of legislation or the application of general principles upon their business than those who do not have a practical acquaintance with that business; and, while we may all have our general knowledge of the fundamental principles of business, in the framing of legislation it seems to me it is of vital importance that the application of those principles should at least be subjected to the practical experience of men who have been engaged in the business. But we must act upon this legislation, as far as the Senate is concerned, without the benefit of this practical experience and practical knowledge.

I have, however, taken the liberty of asking that a couple of the experts of the Shipping Board come on the floor of the Senate and be here not only that I may ask them for information with reference to the various matters that may come up in connection with this bill but that they may be at the service of any Senator who may desire information from those who are especially qualified to give it. I have asked the chairman of the Committee on Rules for permission to allow that to be done. I did not assume to have it done of my own accord. I hope that no Senator will think that because these men are connected with the Shipping Board, or possibly because they have been connected with the framing of the bill, their information can not be relied upon.

Their judgment, of course, may not be worth as much as it might be if they had not been intimately connected with the framing of the bill; but I think Senators will find that their judgment is pretty reliable, and I know that they will give us the facts as they believe them to be, and I think probably all of us can receive much benefit in connection with the consideration of this bill by conferring with them from time to time.

Mr. President, suggestions are made that it seems to me really question the good faith of those who favor this bill. Suggestions are made that this bill is in the interest of the Shipping Trust; that it is a bill especially for the benefit of special privilege; and that Senators advocating the measure are advocating a measure that they know is not for the best interests of the people of this country. I know that there are many people in the country who have that idea with reference to the measure. I believe that many of the people of this country have a prejudice against the bill because of suggestions that may have been made, either upon this floor or by those in responsible position, with reference to the motives that may animate the supporters of the measure, and with reference to the people that may get the benefit of it.

I have made some quotations from some of the letters that I get with reference to the measure. Here is one who writes me in this way:

> Vote for the ship subsidy bill and the good people of the country will know that you care nothing for their welfare.

Another writes:

> Vote for the ship subsidy bill and show your interest in the Shipping Trust.

Another says:

> Vote for the ship subsidy bill and prove to the farmers and taxpayers of the country that you care nothing for their interest—

And so on.

Mr. President, the people are good, honest, sincere citizens. They mean to do right and to judge rightly, and are really justified in making those statements, because of suggestions made by those who discuss this measure from responsible positions and from positions of trust; and it seems to me that we ought to be careful as to the suggestions or intimations that we put out with reference to those who may be for this bill or those who may be against it. I feel satisfied that there is no Senator on this floor who believes that any other Senator here supports this measure upon any other ground than that which he believes to be for the best interests of the people of this country.

I have no interest in ships or in shipping. I never have had. I never expect to have. The only interest that I have in this measure is the interest of the people of this country, the farmers, the laboring people, the business men, the business interests of the country, and above this the national interest. I believe as sincerely as I believe in anything that there is scarcely a measure that has ever come before the Congress that means more of benefit to the people of this country and more of benefit and safety to the Nation that we love so well than this measure—that is, assuming, of course, that it will accomplish the purposes that we hope and believe it will accomplish.

I do not question the sincerity of any man who opposes this measure. I do not appeal to the prejudices of anybody or any section of this country. I am satisfied that the men who oppose this measure do so because they believe it will not accomplish the purposes that those of us who support it believe it will accomplish; and it seems to me that this is the plane upon which we ought to consider a measure of such transcendent importance as this.

We who support this measure appeal to the business sense and the business judgment and the business needs of the people of this country; we appeal to the patriotism of the people of this country who want to have this Nation prepared in case of emergency; but in doing so we do not question the patriotism or the sincerity of those who may take a different view.

Mr. President, I can fully understand why a Democrat who sincerely believes in the policy or principle that has declared time and again against subsidies should on that ground as a fundamental principle oppose this measure if he feels that the conditions justify the application of that principle; but I can not understand why a Republican, at least upon a question of principle, should oppose this measure. It, in my judgment, embodies clearly and distinctly the policy of protection in which we so firmly believe.

Talk about infant industries and the building up of infant industries! Shipping is clearly an infant industry in this country when we come to compare our shipping with the shipping of the world. We built many ships under the need and stress of war, but that is not enough to make a merchant marine. The ships must be operated. Unless we can get the ships we have to operating we are not much better off than when the war began. Our merchant marine is now, and was then, more nearly an infant industry than any other industry in the country, and the facts and conditions and circumstances warrant the application of the doctrine of protection in this case if it was ever justified in any case.

Mr. President, the American people are confronted with the question: Do we want an American merchant marine? Are we going to do what is necessary to establish permanently an American merchant marine? Are we willing and ready to pay the price? It seems that everybody who has this question put to him says that of course we want an American merchant marine. Political parties have declared time and again in favor of building up an American merchant marine, and it may not be amiss to call attention to these declarations. I suppose that nearly every Senator is thoroughly familiar with them, but I want to refer to them just briefly. The Democratic platform of 1912 said this:

> We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Here, Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], in his minority views, congratulates the people and the Democratic Party on the fact that through a Democratic administration we had reached the aspirations of many years and secured a large merchant marine. Was it done in accordance with that platform? That declaration says they are in favor of building up an American merchant marine "without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury." Yet we know that the shipping which we have to-day was built up by taking from the Treasury of the country and from the pockets of the people over $3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, of course the ships we have were brought into existence under the stress and needs of war. It took that in order to get them built.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield for a question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I suggest that the Senator knows the conditions under which that money was spent and the ships were built.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. It was to meet war needs.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I just stated that; but what I am trying to call attention to is that I do not think the Senator should rejoice in our getting these ships that way and take great credit to the Democratic Party for accomplishing it in that way. That is what I just wanted to suggest.

In 1912 the Republican Party declared:

> We believe that one of the country's most urgent needs is a merchant marine. There should be American ships, and plenty of them, to make use of the great American interoceanic canal now nearing completion.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to a declaration contained in the Republican platform in 1900 which I think states the great fundamental purposes for which a merchant marine should be built and maintained. We said in that platform:

> Our present dependence upon foreign shipping for nine-tenths of our foreign carrying trade is a great loss to the industry of this country. It is also a serious danger to our trade, for its sudden withdrawal in the event of European war would seriously cripple our expanding foreign commerce. The national defense and naval efficiency of this country, moreover, supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

Mr. President, it is the purpose and ultimate object of this bill to attain the fulfillment of that declaration. We have many ships now, it is true, but we have not a permanent merchant marine. One of the fundamental purposes of this bill is to do what we think to be necessary to put our merchant marine upon a permanent basis and put us in a condition where our trade shall not be made subservient to the shipping of foreign countries.

What did a great Democrat say with reference to that plank in this platform when this country was confronted with the very condition the platform declaration pointed out? What did a great Democrat, in a high and responsible position, say about this platform when he was confronted with the very condition that it pointed out? Secretary McAdoo said:

> The man who wrote that had the power of a seer and the vision of a statesman, because what is there advocated is irrefutably sound, and what is there predicted is exactly what has happened. A European war has caused the sudden withdrawal of a large part of the foreign vessels upon which our foreign trade is dependent, and has seriously crippled our expanding foreign commerce.

Mr. President, we want to guard against a repetition of that situation. I could read from the other platforms of the two great political parties from that day until this declaring for an American merchant marine, but I will not do so.

Yes, Mr. President, the people of this country want an American merchant marine; but are they ready to pay the price? Are they ready to do what may be necessary to establish and maintain a permanent merchant marine?

I do not know what Senators think about it; I do not know what conclusion they have reached; but several years ago I came to the conclusion that an American merchant marine was so important that I would be justified in voting for any measure which would give any reasonable assurance of building up an American merchant marine and putting it upon a substantial basis, and that I am prepared to do.

When the Underwood-Simmons bill was pending in this body I made a speech in behalf of a provision placed in that bill in the House of Representatives, and which was ably supported by the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. I said then substantially what was said in this Republican platform of 1900, that even though we might not get into war, if other countries got into war our industries and our business and our people would suffer tremendous loss because of the taking away of the means of transportation which they furnished to us for the carrying of our own produce. That very thing happened, and that circumstance and the condition which confronted us made me more firmly convinced of my duty toward the people of the country and toward the Nation, as I saw it, to vote for any measure that would give reasonable assurance that it would bring about this result.

Mr. President, we can not be certain of what will come from this legislation. We do not know whether or not it will do what we hope it will do. No man knows whether it will or not. No man knows that it will not do it. The man who opposes this measure takes the chance that may mean so much of injury to the industries of the country and so much of danger to the safety of the Republic. Mr. President, I do not feel that I am justified in taking that chance.

As I said, I am not a shipping man; I do not know so well what the industry needs as the men who are in it; but men of integrity, men of sincerity, men of experience, men of practical knowledge have worked together in the framing of this bill, trying honestly and sincerely, I believe, to draft a measure which will put the merchant marine upon a permanent and lasting basis. Mr. President, I do not feel, with my scanty experience, with my small knowledge, that I can safely disregard their conclusions and their judgment, especially in the light of the experience of the past.

Mr. President, we have had the doctrine of protection for American shipping applied in this country. The signatures to the Constitution had scarcely dried before the fathers of this Republic framed and passed a law with the distinct object of building up the American merchant marine. They put into practice the doctrine of discriminating duties, and under that policy American shipping expanded until American ships were upon all the seas of the world, found in all the commercial ports of the earth, carrying up to 90 per cent of the foreign trade of this country.

I am not going into a historical or philosophical discussion of shipping. I am not going into the reasons why it declined. That is controversial, of course. We know it did decline after it had reached its high position under genuine protection. But we applied the doctrine of protection to American shipping in another direction. We said that no foreign-built ship should engage in the coastwise trade of this country, and under that policy we built up the shipping in the coastwise trade until we have six or seven million tons of shipping in that trade, built, of course, especially for that trade, and very little of it adapted to the foreign trade. I see that my friend from Florida congratulates us upon having nearly 6,000,000 tons of shipping under the American flag. I get the impression from his report that he would have the people of this country believe that we have five or six million tons of shipping now operating in the foreign trade in private ownership.

Mr. President, that is not correct. A great part of that tonnage is in the coastwise trade. Those ships are owned and operated privately. According to the statements from the Shipping Board, we have to-day not to exceed 2,000,000 tons of shipping in the foreign trade operating privately and owned privately. There are fifty or sixty million tons of shipping in the world, and about one-twentieth of it in private ownership under the American flag. That is not a very creditable position for a great country like this to be in when its commercial needs are so great and its means of defense are so scanty.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am afraid I will have to ask the Senator to read again the minority views. He has attempted to quote twice from the minority views, first saying that I boasted about what the Democrats had accomplished in building the merchant marine, and as to the amount of tonnage they constructed, and so on. I can not find anything of that sort in the minority views, and I do not remember having written it.

Now he quotes again, apparently from that report, to the effect that I claim that we have some 6,000,000 tons of American shipping in foreign trade. I do not claim that at all. The report says that in 1922 the Government had 1,960 privately owned ships of 500 gross tons or over, and that the total tonnage of those ships is 5,797,925 gross tons, approximately 8,500,000 dead-weight tons. That is all the ships under the American flag. I do not say that they are all engaged in a foreign trade.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator did not say that, and I did not charge him with saying it. I did say, however, that the impression gotten by anyone reading that who was not familiar with these things would be that this was in foreign trade, because that is what we are talking about, that is what we are trying to legislate about, that is the question under consideration, the foreign trade and the shipping in the foreign trade. I have not the time now to find the other statement in the report which gave me the impression that the Senator was really rejoicing in the construction of this large tonnage under a Democratic administration. I think I could find it. The Senator may not have had the intention of giving that impression, but he made that impression on my mind.

What are the handicaps to American shipping? What are the reasons for it not maintaining itself upon the sea? There are some facts that we must not overlook in the consideration of this question. For many years prior to 1914 we had been talking about building up an American merchant marine. We had been trying to enact legislation under which this would be accomplished, but we did not accomplish anything. The American merchant marine was not built up. Everybody wanted it, but nobody went into the business. I am going to point out in a very little while the shipping that we had and what the condition was in 1914, but I am now stating just in a general way what everybody knows to be the truth. We know that since the Civil War political parties and organizations throughout the country, men of high standing and low, have been expressing the hope of having an American merchant marine. They had been expressing a desire that we should build it up. But we did not do it. Capital did not go into it. There may have

been good reasons why it did not, but it did not. That is a fact about which we need not argue.

What were the handicaps then and what are the handicaps to-day, according to the testimony? Higher wages of crews on American ships than upon foreign ships; higher cost of construction in American shipyards than in foreign shipyards; higher cost of operation; and higher capital cost. These are some of the things that honest and practical men say handicap us in maintaining a merchant marine. It is, however, denied that American shipping is under these handicaps. Honest men differ with reference to it. Yet I want to say, Mr. President, that I do not believe we can examine the testimony that was taken by the joint committee of the House and Senate—some two or three thousand pages—without coming to the conclusion that the testimony from men of experience, from men who have actually run ships, who have actually paid the crews, who have actually had ships constructed and who have actually operated them, overwhelmingly shows that the cost of wages of crew and of operation and construction is greater for the American merchant marine than for the foreign. One can find some testimony to the contrary. You can take that testimony and find something to support either view; but, taking it by and large, the testimony seems to me conclusive that the cost of construction, operation, and wages is higher for our merchant marine than for the foreign merchant marine.

I have here a statement by a member of the Shipping Board, a man who has had practical experience with American shipping, a man who, I think, knows what he is talking about. His statement, it seems to me, is almost conclusive with reference to this very proposition. It is a statement by Mr. Plummer of the Shipping Board, in which he said:

> When giant American corporations like the Bethlehem Co. and the Texas Co., each of them financially stronger than any European steamship concern, and both of them shipbuilders as well as shipowners, find it necessary to close their own shipyards and have their own cargoes carried by foreign vessels, what is the answer? * * *
>
> When such as they find, as they do, that they can charter foreign vessels for less money than it takes merely to operate their own steamers under the American flag, what is the sense of setting up the claim—as opponents of American shipping do—that American ships, without Government aid, can compete with foreign ships in carrying the ocean commerce of the United States?
>
> It can not be done! Every practical shipping man knows that it can not be done.

Mr. President, I do not know that it can not be done, but I believe that it can not be done. I believe that that man knows what he is talking about. There is the statement of what he said are the facts, and it seems to me that the facts establish conclusively his contention. Why, I see in the minority report a statement to the effect that certain ships are being built to-day in foreign shipyards for American trade. Why is it? It must be because it can be done more cheaply there than it can be done in this country. What other reason could there be for such action? And such a fact is worth all their theories. How we are to get around a fact of that character I do not know. I know of no way, by process of reasoning, to get around it. It is a fact that speaks most eloquently and with absolute conclusiveness.

But, Mr. President, this is what I think is the greatest handicap that we have in the building up and maintaining of an adequate American merchant marine. It is the fact that our competitor is firmly established in the business. Who is our competitor? England, of course. England has had her merchant marine for many, many years. It is well rounded out. It is what is called a well-balanced fleet. Her ships go to every quarter of the globe. Her companies are formed, composed of people in Great Britain who are interested in the merchant marine and have been interested in it for years. They have their business connections everywhere. They have their business relations in every line of industry throughout the world. They have them in this country. They have been one of the most potent influences, in my judgment, that we have ever had in preventing legislation for the building up of an American merchant marine. They have their agents everywhere. They have banks established everywhere which use their influence to furnish trade to British shipping. They have their cargo ships. They have their fast mail and passenger liners. They have the good will that goes with long-established business relations.

What we are trying to do is to establish a merchant marine in competition with that character of a merchant marine. We have to go upon the same seas upon which they go. We have to go in the same harbors that they enter. We have to seek the trade that they are carrying. That, in my judgment, is the greatest handicap we have. It seems to me that it is very much like the situation that confronts the young lawyer when he enters a town to build up a practice in competition with old established practitioners. He has to have aid and help to maintain himself, either out of his own private capital or assistance from somebody else. For two or three years he does not make enough to pay living expenses, and if he has not capital he has to go into some other business. I know how it is. I have tried it. I started out to practice law in a little town. I only had two or three hundred dollars. In six months it was gone, and I had to go into some other line of work in order to live. That is the situation of the American merchant marine to-day. It must establish its lines, create its agencies, make its business connections, and get business in the face of this competition. It must have help until it can do so. When it is firmly established I have no fears that it will maintain itself when it has a fair or equal chance.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what he did with all that money? [Laughter.]

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator did not call upon the Public Treasury.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I called on my own treasury, and I was the public so far as that is concerned. The Senator has talked about the public and the Public Treasury. As I said, what we are trying to do here is in the interest of the public, and the Senator knows it. The Senator contends that the benefits of the bill will go to the shipping trust, and so on. Well, he may be right and I may be wrong, but I am not supporting the bill in the hope or with the belief that the greatest benefit goes to the shipping trust. I am supporting it, as I said awhile ago, because I believe the greatest benefit will go to the people of the country.

I might just as well inquire at this point, what shipping trust have we? We have none. We have no shipping to get into a trust. We never have had. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] yesterday, in his eloquent and delightful way, said:

> We want to keep the money proposed to be appropriated under the bill from getting into the clutches of those who robbed the people in 1914, and we propose to keep it away from them.

I am going to call attention in a few moments to who it was that robbed the people of this country in 1914. I want to do exactly what the Senator from Mississippi said he wants to do. I want to keep our people out of the clutches of the people in whose clutches they were in 1914. They were not in the clutches of American ship-owning companies, because we had none. They were in the clutches of foreign shipowners, as I think I shall very clearly demonstrate. We have no shipping trust under the American flag. I hope we will never have, and I do not think we will.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will admit that many American shipowners made as high as a thousand and two thousand per cent at that time?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think there were very many American shipowners who made that. There were some, but very few.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes, there were.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, certainly; and that is another thing I want to avoid. If we had had a well-developed and well-balanced American merchant marine, they would not have made those enormous profits, none of them, not a bit of it, and the Senator knows it. It was our lack of ships that allowed the others and foreign shipping to rob our people.

Take our great competitor, England. It is said that the English do not give subsidies to their ships. I am not going into a discussion of that question now, for many of these matters will come up as we discuss the particular items of the bill; but they grant subventions, and everybody admits that England has a great merchant marine to-day. She has not, however, always had it. There was a time in the history of the world when England saw ships under the flags of other nations carrying the products that came to her ports; there was a time when England's fleet and England's flag were not found on all the seven seas of the world or in all the ports and marts of commerce. How did England get upon the sea? Ah, Mr. President, she took heroic measures when Sir Walter Raleigh called her attention to the situation. She did not follow any half-way policies; she was not hindered because some Englishman might make some money under the policy which she adopted as necessary to build up her merchant marine. She did not hesitate about what other people would think of her policy; she did not hesitate because some other country might protest that the policy she was following was injuring its trade. I am going to take the time of the Senate to read a short statement prepared by Mr. Plummer, giving briefly the history of the establishment of the British merchant marine. He says:

> The history of Great Britain's modern merchant marine starts with the reign of Elizabeth.

He cites the authorities which are taken from English sources.

Prior to that time England's influence upon the sea was negligible. Spain far surpassed her in merchant tonnage and, says Lindsay, the great British historian of shipping, "while England was fighting for political freedom the Dutch became the real masters of the sea. They—the Dutch—were now at the height of their maritime glory, their merchant ships penetrated to every quarter of the globe and they were able to grasp and keep to themselves large and valuable portions of the carrying trade—of England—thus laying the foundation for their wealth and greatness." At that time—Elizabeth's—most English ships of burden were obtained by purchase at the South Baltic ports, and Raleigh immediately called attention to the fact that while Holland, "without a single tree within its own borders," was building ships for them the great oaks of England were rotting to the ground. "When the English," says the Encyclopedia Britannica, "were at last awakened by the advice of Sir Walter Raleigh and other writers who followed him to a full consciousness of their own strength and of their previous legislative errors, they with characteristic energy resolved to adopt the most effective measures then in their power to remedy existing evils."

What did they do? Listen:

First came the direct subsidy act of Elizabeth, which provided a bounty of 5 shillings per ton to encourage the building of merchant ships of 100 tons and upward; and for the development of her fisheries and the training of seamen the eating of flesh upon Wednesdays and Saturdays was prohibited.

I do not know enough about shipping to know just what effect that had, but that was one of the policies followed by England in the early days in order to build up her shipping.

The effect of these laws is thus concisely stated by the Encyclopedia Britannica: "In the time of Elizabeth England began to achieve commercial independence. Great building of ships took place, for which bounties were granted by the Queen, and Elizabeth set herself against the Hanseatic League. In every direction English influence penetrated and Englishmen before 1603 might be found in every quarter of the globe."

No sooner had Charles ascended the throne than there came the law of 1626, which increased the size of merchant ships that should be eligible for the bounty which Elizabeth had authorized, making the minimum 200 tons; and 1646—

Notice this—

brought the law that none of the (English) plantations might permit their goods to be exported to foreign places except in English ships.

Ah, that, Mr. President, was an effective policy in behalf of building up an English merchant marine—that none of the products of the English plantations should be sent to foreign ports except in English bottoms. If we should pass a law like that and permit it to remain in operation for about 10 years there would be no question about the building up of the American merchant marine; but, of course, we shall not do that.

Then came the great navigation act of 1651. Of this the Britannica says: "Under this far-reaching act the trade between England and her colonies and the British coasting trade was strictly confined to English bottoms, English owned and manned substantially by English seamen. The act contained further provisions in support of British shipping, the effect of which was greatly to prejudice foreign shipping in its competition for the British carrying trade. From the point of view of the Dutch, indeed, it was a 'vile act and order,' to be resisted at all costs."

But did that stop England from carrying out the policy? Not at all; she went on and built up her merchant marine. She looked after her own interests regardless of the opinions of others.

Says Lindsay: "The unequivocal object of this clause (quoted from the navigation act) was to secure to England, without, however, considering the interests of her colonies, the whole carrying trade of the world, Europe alone excepted. England had now asserted the practical right to carry on her own oversea trade in her own ships, and to obtain as much foreign trade as she could by her own industry and energy."

Then, as a special inducement for vessels to strive for the carrying of those cargoes which were coming from foreign countries to England, Parliament enacted the law of 1662, which provided that 10 per cent of the customs duties collected on the vessel's cargo should be paid to English-built ships of 2½ or 3 decks carrying 30 guns, armed merchantmen being in those days the only ships that could venture with safety into distant seas.

Says Meeker, in his History of Subsidies: "The effect upon the Dutch—

Not upon the English, but the effect upon the Dutch—

who were at that time the carriers of the sea, was immediate and disastrous. There is no means of learning how much it cost Great Britain to take possession of her foreign and colonial trade in this manner. Directly or indirectly the costs were enormous, but the results were tremendous and no one can maintain that the end did not justify the means."

Says Lindsay: "It is undeniable that from the date of these laws the merchant navy of England steadily increased, and that soon afterwards the power over the seas previously claimed by the Dutch was permanently transferred to the English."

Says the Encyclopedia Britannica: "As a result of the navigation act and its successful maintenance a great increase had taken place in English tonnage, which in 1688 was said to be nearly double that of 1666."

Thus England became the commercial mistress of the seas, a position she has maintained to this day.

Mr. President, in 1815, after our shipping had developed under the fostering policy of discriminating duties, we passed reciprocity legislation; we thought we were able to stand in competition with the people of the world in that respect.

England did not take advantage of that legislation until, I think, along in 1853, at least not until after her merchant marine was firmly established. She had violated the spirit of those reciprocity laws by giving subventions and giving subsidies directly to her shipping and to certain lines for the purpose of building them up, but when she became satisfied that she had established her place on the seas in competition with the United States, then she accepted the reciprocity measures, and from that time until the war of 1914 our shipping went down, the movement, of course, accelerated by what transpired during the Civil War.

But, in addition to this, how has England maintained her supremacy upon the seas? Mr. President, there was a commission, known, I think, as the merchant marine commission, and commonly called the Gallinger commission, which investigated this matter and made a report. They found that England's merchant marine had maintained itself very largely by conferences, by rebates, and by "fighting" ships. They found that the English shipping interests had divided the commercial world into zones, as they might be called, and entered into conferences to control rates and control business; then they gave secret rebates to shut out competition on the part of any foreign country; and, furthermore, to make her position doubly secure, when they found the vessels of some other country working into their trade they sent out ships to carry cargoes at any rate that was necessary in order to get the cargoes from the other ships. These were termed "fighting" ships, and they were used most effectively. Those were some of the handicaps which our people had to endure. These things were done to prevent anyone from becoming a serious competitor.

But that is not all. What do we find to-day with reference to some of the policies which the colonies of England are pursuing? Mr. President, Australia has a law to the effect that when American-produced goods are carried by American railroads to an American port on the Pacific and transported thence by American ships to Australia, the goods so transported shall be taxed at the Australian customhouse on the entire value plus the whole cost of the transportation across the United States. On the contrary, if similar goods are carried by Canadian railroads to a British port and thence to Australia in a British or Canadian ship, no tax is levied on the amount paid for transportation over the Canadian railroad. That is the policy which they pursue, and it is an effective one.

I offered an amendment to the tariff bill, and had it referred to the committee, designed to carry out that same idea with reference to goods brought into this country; but we were afraid to take such action; we were afraid we would offend England, or possibly it was thought that we would violate some of our treaties.

Yet the possessions and colonies of England are doing that thing. We hear some people talking about the prosperity of the Australian ships operated by the Australian Government. Is it any wonder that they prosper under legislation of that character, which practically compels the shipment of goods to Australia in Australian ships? Oh, Mr. President, if we would use half the firmness in looking after our own interests in this respect that England does in looking after her interests and after her shipping we would build up an American shipping in this country and we would not need to draw from the Treasury to do it.

Mr. President, there is another thing which has gone a long way, in my judgment, toward maintaining the English merchant marine. For many years every railroad in this country has been an active agency for supplying cargoes for English ships; the agent of every railroad throughout the country has been interested in seeing to it that American goods were shipped abroad in foreign ships. Is it any wonder we can not build up a merchant marine under such conditions? Copies of contracts were put in the RECORD here some time ago showing that our railroads had entered into contracts with English shipping lines under which they agreed to use all their influence, not only to get the English ships cargoes but to get them relieved of local taxation and local burdens, and all that sort of thing. Our railroads can not be blamed for doing it at the time they did it. Why? Because there was a lack of American ships. There were no American shipping lines to make contracts with. They were simply promoting their own interests in competition with each other. What we would like to do by this legislation is to build up American shipping lines, make them practical extensions of American railroads, and have every American railroad agent an agent for an American steamship line. Then, my friends, we can maintain an American merchant marine.

Mr. President, what does this lack of shipping mean to our country? What does it mean to business? I need not point it

out to Senators of the United States. They know what it means. They know that it means the development of foreign commerce by foreign ships. They know that it means that our people and our industries are absolutely dependent upon foreign shipping. They know that it means the encouragement of foreign insurance companies, under which the trade secrets of our people are acquired and used to our detriment and to the detriment of our trade. They know that it spells disaster to every industry in time of emergency. I need not take the time to go into this in detail. We have had experiences in the past that demonstrate conclusively what the lack of an American merchant marine means to the American farmer and the American business man. Surely all we need to do is to cite the facts.

When the Boer War was on we were not a party to it. It was thousands of miles away from us; and yet then we were dependent upon British ships for the carrying of the grain and the wheat and the corn, if any of it was exported, and the other products of the farm to foreign markets. What was the result? Because of the demands of that war English ships were taken for war needs and war purposes. That left fewer ships to carry the products of our farms, with the result that the rates charged for the transportation of the farmer's products went up and his prices went down.

Talk about this legislation being to the injury of the American farmer. There is no legislation that we can pass, possibly aside from rural-credits legislation and some other measures like that, that will be of greater substantial benefit to the American farmer than legislation that insures him transportation across the water for the surplus products for which he must find a market in the countries of the world. That is one reason why I am for this bill. I believe it means more to the farmers of my State and my section than any other legislation that we can pass.

Talk about the farmers of my State being against this measure. They will not be against it when they know what it means—that is, assuming that it will accomplish what we hope it will accomplish. Of course, it may not do it, but we believe that it will; and if it will establish permanently an American merchant marine adequate to carry at least 50 per cent of our products, then the farmer will be the great beneficiary of it, and they will sustain every man who votes for it.

Mr. President, it is said, and it is figured out by experts, that during the last 100 years we have paid to foreign ships $28,000,000,000 in freight for the transportation of American commerce—$28,000,000,000 transportation charges for our products. It is also figured that the balance of trade in favor of this country during the last 100 years is about $24,000,000,000. In other words, the balance of trade in favor of this country in our commerce has been more than overbalanced by the freight charges we have paid to our foreign competitors.

Is it any wonder that they can stand up against the great balance of trade that we have on paper in favor of this country? Oh, Mr. President, what would it have meant to American business and American capital and American industry if at least half of that $28,000,000,000 had been paid to our own people for carrying our own produce to market?

Take the Spanish War; the same conditions existed, my friends, that grew out of the Boer War, only probably to a less extent, because the Spanish War was a very small thing; but in order to maintain our own fleets we had to get ships under foreign flags to accompany those fleets and furnish them with the supplies and fuel necessary to maintain them.

We remember the time when the President of the United States sent the American fleet around the world; yet, Mr. President, it could not have been sent around the world without a foreign merchant marine. We did not have the ships to do it with; and so we had the humiliating spectacle of an American battleship fleet going around the world dependent upon foreign ships for its supplies and the carrying of its fuel.

But, Mr. President, that did not seem to be sufficient to wake up our people to the necessity of a merchant marine. That did not seem to be enough to convince our people of the injury that we might suffer by our dependence upon foreign shipping, and the World War came on. We were not in it at first, but we suffered from it. Have we forgotten, have the people of the country forgotten, have the farmers of the country forgotten what the condition was shortly after 1914?

In the first place, Mr. President, how many ships did we have then? I just want to read from a statement by Mr. McAdoo, an official document. I do not find that right now, but I remember what he said. He said that we had at that time just 15 ships of over a thousand tons engaged in the foreign trade under the American flag—just 15 ships! We had a little over a million tons of suitable ocean-going ships under the American flag when that war broke out, but only 15 of them were over a thousand tons, engaged in the ocean-going trade—that is, across the ocean—and what did he tell us about the result of this lack of American ships?

Mr. President, I want to read that. I want the American farmer to take this into account. I want to read this to refresh their memories, and possibly it may be well for Senators to refresh their memories and then to take it on and refresh the memories of their constituencies. I have a great deal of regard for the opinion of my constituency. I like to act as they think I ought to act. I like to go along the line that they seem to be going on, when I can do so in good conscience; but should we not assume that we know more about these things than the ordinary, everyday business man and farmer, busy with his crops and business cares, who has not had the time to look into these matters as we have and as it is our duty to do?

I may be wrong about it, but I think that after I have looked into these things and come to a conclusion from the facts I have as to what my duty is, I owe it to my constituency to do it, and then, if it does not seem to suit them, to tell them why I did it and let them pass upon it. I have no fears as to their judgment. I have no fears as to their verdict—not a bit of it. The American farmer, if you please, is an intelligent man, a man of good judgment, of sound judgment, a man who reaches sound conclusions when he has the facts presented to him, and above all he is a fair and just man. If he finds that he is mistaken in the facts he will revise his judgment. I want to say to you that if he finds that we have acted according to his opinion as to how we should act rather than according to our judgment upon the facts that we have, he will not hesitate as to the action he will take with reference to us later on.

There are facts bearing upon this question that many of the farmers of the country do not know, except it may be in a general way, if at all. They have not forgotten, however, how their farm produce rotted on the wharves at the ports of the country because there was no transportation. They have not forgotten how, when the World War broke out, they could not get anything for their produce. Have the farmers of the South forgotten the predicament they were in? I remember the impassioned plea of my good friend from North Carolina when he was urging on this floor the passage of a bill to loan money to the farmers of his section because they could not sell their cotton crop. I think I was the only man on this side of the aisle who voted with him. I did it because the condition appealed to me as warranting action by this great and powerful Government. What was the cause of the trouble? The trouble was the lack of ships—the lack of ships, that and that alone. There was a market for their cotton, there was a great demand for it, but there were no ships to carry it.

Listen to what Mr. McAdoo says in his report, which I have here now, and from which I am going to read. This is his statement about the shipping that we had then. This is a report to the Senate in response to a resolution of the Senate. He says:

> Lloyd's Register for 1914–15 states that the steam gross tonnage of the world of vessels of 100 gross tons or over is 45,400,000 in round numbers. Of this they credit 2,260,000 gross tons to the Great Lakes, and they state our ocean-going vessels as 1,113 steamers over 100 tons, with a total gross tonnage of 2,026,908. This includes both our seagoing coastwise steamers and our transocean vessels. Out of this 1,113 vessels 868 of 720,609 gross tons are registered by us for the foreign trade—

Listen—

> and out of this again there are but 15 of 1,000 tons or over which are engaged in the overseas (meaning the trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific) trade. There is no American vessel regularly engaged in the European trade, the Asiatic or Australian trade, or the African trade as large as 1,000 tons except these 15.

That was the American merchant marine when the World War broke out, and when we were not a party to it. What about the condition as to business and industry? Mr. McAdoo said:

> This condition coincides in time with the greatest crops of cotton and of grain in our history, and with an eager demand for the latter and a growing call for the former from foreign purchasers. At a time when we have the most to sell and customers abroad are eager to buy the fact that our ocean-carrying facilities are in the hands of others, subject to war risks and controlled by interests not our own, stares us in the face. Were we dependent to-day upon the facilities we ourselves have available for doing our foreign trade, that trade could not be done. Our cotton would lie idle in our warehouses, and our wheat, apples, and other crops would rot in storage. We are forced to take the chances of war and to ship in belligerent bottoms. In shipping circles it is estimated by some that 50 per cent of the total tonnage available has been eliminated through the tying up of the German and Austrian marine and through the commandeering of such a large part of the British marine by the Admiralty. Not only has there been a great reduction in the available supply of tonnage, but

on account of the large purchases of war supplies and the great profits which can be derived from shipments to European ports there has been a corresponding increase in the demand for ships for cargo purposes. The inevitable result has been a steady increase in the steamship rates.

Mr. President, what do I find? There is a great deal of talk about the farmer wanting to ship by the cheapest transportation method, and appeals are made to the farmer that under present conditions English shipping and other foreign shipping is the cheapest, and it is asked of him, "What difference does it make to you, so you get your products carried in the cheapest way?"

Mr. President, that may be all right one year; that may have been all right during the 25 years before the World War; but when the World War came on, the loss the American farmer suffered in one or two years more than overbalanced the cheaper rates he got for 25 years. He not only had to pay the high rates charged for conveying his products but he has to pay his part of the $3,000,000,000 spent to build ships.

What happened to rates? I am going to read a summary that Mr. McAdoo gives in his official report, which shows what the farmer is up against when he depends upon foreign shipping in the case of an emergency. It may be all right for a few years, but when the emergency comes, when the reed upon which he has been resting fails, then profits of a few years are wiped out and he is brought to bankruptcy. Listen to what Mr. McAdoo says. He heads this:

The effect of high ocean freight rates on the American farmer.

I do not suppose Mr. McAdoo could be accused of trying to mislead the farmers of the country or that it could be said that he was especially appealing to them for any particular reason. I am simply reading this to show that, not in a partisan campaign, not in a campaign of any kind, but upon a recital of the facts, the Secretary of the Treasury deemed it important to call especial attention to the losses the farmers of the country sustained by reason of not having an American merchant marine. He said:

It will be observed that the greatest increases in rates and the heaviest tax has been imposed upon the products in which the American farmer is most concerned, namely, grain and cotton. These commodities constitute the great bulk of our export trade and have the largest influence in throwing the balance of foreign trade in favor of this country.

While the steamship companies have imposed conscienceless taxes—

I would like to have my good friend from Mississippi remember that these steamship companies which had imposed conscienceless taxes upon the farmers were not American companies. They were the foreign companies, those whom we want by this bill, if possible, to keep from imposing these conscienceless taxes upon the American farmer—

While the steamship companies have imposed conscienceless taxes in the form of increased rates on grain, amounting, as already shown, to as much as 900 per cent to some ports, they have placed an even heavier burden upon cotton, where the increase in rates to some ports is as high as 1,100 per cent.

I can not understand why our people who are especially interested in cotton, remembering the conditions they went through, are not willing to take a chance, at any rate, upon the passage of this bill and its possible development of an American merchant marine. I know they are honest in their convictions and in their beliefs, and I have no fault to find. I simply can not understand it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator give the date of that report? My recollection is that the Senator's response to the strong appeal of the Secretary of the Treasury was a nine-hour filibuster against the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The date of the report is January 27, 1915. That has absolutely nothing to do with the merits of this case. I may have been wrong in that. The Senator thinks I was; but it has nothing to do with the merits of this proposition.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator is always candid. Does the Senator now believe he was wrong?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not. I think I supported the bill later on when it was modified and amended to meet the objections made against the original bill, and I believe we got some good legislation by the act of 1916. I think it was good legislation, and I join with my good friend from Florida in urging the retention of the Shipping Board as a proper agency. I would like to see it made a board of trade for this country, as the English Board of Trade is for the merchant marine of Great Britain. That is what I would like to see, and I believe we would get a merchant marine, possibly, without some of this legislation if that could be brought about.

Mr. McAdoo further said:

This increase is particularly onerous upon the cotton producers of the South, because it comes at a time when the effects of the war have greatly reduced the value of cotton and when the southern farmers are least able to bear additional burdens.

Grain, cotton, and other commodities are usually sold "delivered" at the port of destination. When steamship companies raise the cost of delivery of grain from 6 cents to 60 cents per bushel—

I hope Senators from the grain States will note this as to what happened—

it makes a vast difference in the price the farmer receives for his product; and when ocean freight charges on cotton are raised from $1.25 to $15 per bale, the price at which the farmer sells his cotton is seriously reduced.

To show what the burden imposed on the farmers by these high ocean freight rates means, it is necessary only to bring out the fact that while the total freight cost on our exports by sea for December, 1914, was $30,742,500, the great commodities of grain, cotton, and flour bore $11,782,250 of this charge, or more than 36 per cent of the entire freight cost on all exports by sea for December, 1914.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] tells me that some of the rates were as high as $1 a bushel. There is no question about it. The farmer had to absorb a great deal of that. He could not help himself. He was at their mercy.

Mr. McAdoo further said, as to the American people being burdened by reason of this lack of shipping, in the same report from which I have been reading:

BURDEN UPON AMERICAN BUSINESS.

Annexed hereto as Exhibit 1 is a summary of our sea trade and the estimated freight cost of handling it from July to December, 1914, inclusive, prepared by the Actuary of the Treasury Department.

From this it appears that our total exports by sea for July, 1914 (before the war), were $139,225,479, and the ocean freight cost was $7,833,482, or 5.63 per cent; the total of such exports for December, 1914, were $226,000,000 (estimated) and the ocean freight cost was $30,742,500, or 13.6 per cent—an increase over July of 141 per cent.

If the ocean freight cost on December exports had been at the same rate as July, viz, 5.63 per cent, the total freight charge on our exports for December would have been $12,723,800 instead of $30,742,500. In other words, the increased ocean freight tax arbitrarily imposed upon our farmers and business men for the month of December, 1914, only, was $18,018,700. If exports by sea continue for the 12 months of 1915 at the December, 1914, rate and the ocean freight charges are the same as for December, 1914, the American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign)—

He puts that in parentheses in his report. Of course, they would have to be largely foreign when we had only 15 engaged in the overseas trade, and only possibly 1,000,000 tons capable of going into it. I continue reading:

The American farmers and business men will pay to shipowners (principally foreign) increased freight charges above the normal rate of $216,224,400, or more than five times the $40,000,000 which the Government proposes by the shipping bill to put into American ships for the protection of our foreign commerce.

In two months and seven days the increased ocean freight charges (above the normal rates prevailing in July, 1914) exacted on our foreign trade at the December, 1914, rate would amount to $40,241,761, or more than the total amount, namely, $40,000,000, which the shipping bill authorizes for investment in an American merchant marine.

In 12 months, as before stated, the total increase in the freight tax levied by steamship owners, mostly foreign, upon our export trade at the December, 1914, rate would amount to the sum of $216,224,400. If the same be applied to our import trade, there would be an additional increase of $95,640,000, or a total increased ocean freight charge on exports and imports by sea in one year of $311,864,400, or 141.6 per cent over the usual cost.

An increased burden upon the business of this country because we did not have ships.

Mr. President, that is what we met in the time of the emergency, and that is what the American farmer and the American business man had to pay to foreigners for the carrying of their products because we did not have American ships.

I have here a little book written by Mr. Bernard Baker, who was, I may say, the originator of the shipping bill of 1915. He was a great shipping man. If we had put his ideas fully into effect as contained in that bill and then carried out the law, we would have gone a long way toward building up an American merchant marine. I want to read what he said as to the condition of things when we got into the war, as follows:

The distressing experience of American business during the two years past—and American business is the very life of the American Nation—has brought home to us the blundering policy of the past. It has demonstrated the supreme folly of placing our foreign trade at the mercy of alien ships.

Now, I know my friends on the other side and the opponents of the measure do not want our commerce placed at the mercy of alien ships. They probably believe that the bill will not aid in the establishment of an American merchant marine. I believe that it will. It is a matter of judgment. It is a matter of opinion. Neither one of us can be certain, but when I have disastrous results pointed out, and when I refresh my own recollection about the disastrous results which came about by our not having an American merchant marine, then, Mr. President, I am not willing to take the risk of delaying any longer trying to do something to establish an American merchant marine that will be with us when emergencies arise.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator a moment ago said that if we had adopted some of the ideas of Bernard Baker they would have gone a long way toward establishing a merchant marine. What were those ideas?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would just say in a general way that he proposed to give to the Shipping Board almost unlimited authority to deal with the American merchant marine in a business way.

Mr. POMERENE. Did he suggest a subsidy?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I do not think he did. I have not gone into the details of it recently, but I remember how it impressed me when I read the book. He suggested a great deal of authority should be given to that board that we did not give it in any of our legislation and which, I suppose, Congress would not be willing to give to an administrative agency.

Mr. POMERENE. I remember having read the book about the time it was written, and I wondered what special thoughts he had suggested which met the approval of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the general one, the authority which he proposed to give to the Shipping Board to meet the practices and methods of competition of our foreign competitors. He proposed to give to the board some authority to do this. The particular suggestions I can not call to mind now. I do remember that his suggestions in general appealed very strongly to me.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit a further interruption, I should like to ask another question. He spoke of the earlier days of our shipping industry, in the early days of the Republic, when Congress had provided for a differential in customs rates on all goods which were brought to this country in American bottoms. How long did that legislation continue in effect, or how long did that right continue?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that the legislation was repealed in 1828 as to the discriminating duty proposition. I am not sure about the date, but it continued, I think, until our shipping was carrying close to 90 per cent of the foreign commerce.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator, in the course of his discussion, indicate what other advantages were given by our Government to American shipping during the period when our shipping was really worth while?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I do not expect to go into that any further.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator suggest what other advantages were given to our shipping industry by Congress during that period?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My recollection is that they imposed tonnage dues, and so forth, which affected foreign shipping more than our own, but the great thing was the discriminating duty proposition. The act as first passed, my recollection now is, provided that goods imported in American ships should have a reduction of 10 per cent of the tariff rate, and that in a year or two they changed that so that they had the basic rate applying to all, and if the goods were brought here in foreign ships they added 10 per cent to the tariff. That was the principal thing. In fact, that is all there was in that tax.

Mr. POMERENE. We had a splendid merchant marine up until about the time of the Civil War.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In a speech I made when the Underwood-Simmons bill was up I took up the shipping history of the country in five-year periods and showed when we reached our apex and when we began to decline, and I convinced myself at any rate that our declining shipping was due to and began largely with our repeal of the discriminating duty clause. While it did not reach the final conclusion probably until the Civil War, it was going down, at any rate.

Mr. POMERENE. In the merchant marine act which the Senator introduced there was some provision to that effect, was there not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator refer to the act of 1920?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; which permitted discrimination.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will state what it did. It directed the President to abrogate the treaties we had which prevented our adopting a policy of that kind. It did not of itself undertake a policy of that kind. It simply directed the President to abrogate the treaties, and then Congress would have the power to act.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has stated the legislation more accurately than I did, but is the Senator of the opinion that if those treaties were now abrogated, so that there could be some differential in tariff rates on goods carried in American bottoms, it would meet the situation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am firmly convinced of it.

Mr. POMERENE. Does not the Senator think, if negotiations were begun with the other nations of the world, that some modification of those treaties could be made so as to permit it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so, if we would take a pretty firm attitude; but two administrations, one Democratic and the other Republican, have refused, I might say absolutely refused, to carry out that policy.

Mr. POMERENE. Did they refuse or did they simply neglect to do it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They refused to do it. President Wilson, I think, expressly gave out a statement that it would not be done, and President Harding has taken the same stand.

Mr. POMERENE. Both administrations refused to abrogate the treaties——

Mr. JONES of Washington. They did.

Mr. POMERENE. But they did not refuse to enter into negotiations with other nations so as to have them consent to a modification of those provisions of the treaties?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They did not refuse to do it. I do not know that they have been asked to do it. I do not think they would have done it. I have not made any inquiries as to whether they have tried to do it or not. Of course, unless we took some drastic action, I can see how the other nations would refuse to negotiate, because they are in the most advantageous position as long as those treaties are kept in effect and it is to their advantage not to have the treaties abrogated, and I suppose, of course, they would refuse to negotiate. We will never get it done unless we take some drastic action.

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress would have the right to repeal those treaties.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Congress would have that right. There could be incorporated in the pending bill an express provision imposing discriminating duties. We could not put it in the bill now because that would make it a revenue measure which should originate in the House. Congress has the right to do it and could abrogate the treaties in that way, but, of course, that would be a very drastic step to take. In the merchant marine act of 1920 the committee thought that the proper and courteous way to proceed was to direct the President to give to those countries the notice required in most of the treaties of the abrogation of the treaties at the end of a certain time; but that was not done.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the only point arising about the act of 1920 was that we provided that parts of the treaties which bore on this question should be denounced and abrogated, and, of course, that raised the question whether we could denounce part of a treaty. I think we should have denounced all of each treaty and made new arrangements and new treaties.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But that was not the ground upon which the administration refused.

Mr. FLETCHER. No; President Wilson said, and I think President Harding took the same view, that it was not wise and was not good business and was not the proper thing to do. But I think there is a lot of trouble involved there. I believe if they started in to negotiate those treaties it would take a good deal of work and some time, but it ought to be done, in my judgment. I do not know but the point was well taken that we could not denounce part of a treaty between ourselves and another nation, but that we must denounce the whole treaty and then negotiate a new treaty.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true, but that was not the ground upon which it was based. There is every reason to believe that if we had abrogated the whole treaties they would not have refused to negotiate new ones. I think President Wilson contended that Congress did not have the right to tell him to abrogate these treaties. Possibly we had not, but we could have abrogated the treaties ourselves. I would be in favor of doing it myself, so far as that is concerned, but that we can not act upon at this time.

Mr. POMERENE. Other countries are and have been granting certain subventions to their shipping. They have given, for instance, reduced rates on all goods which come from the interior of the country to their ports, and so forth. That operates indirectly as a discrimination in favor of their shipping. If we were to denounce the treaties or the provisions of the treaties referred to, that would simply be accomplishing by direct means what the other countries are doing by indirect means. If those countries were notified that unless they would consent to certain modifications of certain treaty provisions this Government would then denounce those provisions, and give the notice far enough in advance so that there would be an opportunity for further negotiation, I believe that something might be accom-

plished. I may be wrong about it, but in view of what the Senator has suggested was the cause of the original upbuilding of our merchant marine, it seems to me that we could do the same thing now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator and I are in hearty accord on that proposition. I am firmly convinced of it, and the reasons given for not doing it are not substantial at all to my mind. But I have taken it for granted, and I think the committee took for granted, that there is no chance of doing that, and so we have not considered it at all and I have not considered it in connection with this discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that were done, in the judgment of the Senator, would it take the place of direct aid or subsidy?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would that be satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It would be satisfactory to me personally. I think it would be the most effective way of building up our merchant marine; but it does not seem that we are able to get it, and so I am going to take the next best thing that presents itself. That is my theory. I consider this such a vital proposition, I consider it so essential that something should be done now to make use of the fleet that we have, and to use it in the establishment of a permanent merchant marine, that I am going to take the next best thing that anyone proposes which appeals to me.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I can see the Senator has not by any means approached the conclusion of his argument, and I was just wondering, as it is now 15 minutes after 5 o'clock, whether he would not prefer to go on in the morning. The hour is late, and there are very few Senators present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Personally I would prefer to go on to-day.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is quite late and I know that many Senators desire to leave. The attendance, as we are aware, has diminished considerably from what it was when the Senator began his speech. I think, perhaps, the Senator would advance matters somewhat by allowing us to adjourn until to-morrow morning.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will ask the Senator whether he thinks there will be very much morning business to-morrow?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If that is likely to be the case, as I like the way matters have progressed to-day, I think that I shall not speak further this afternoon. I am informed, however, that there is a desire to have a short executive session.

MERGER OF MEAT-PACKING COMPANIES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 364, agreed to December 6, 1922 (submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE), information relative to the proposed merger of large meat-packing companies, together with certain other information and accompanying documents.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I request that the letter of the Secretary be printed in the RECORD, and that the whole matter be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that perhaps it would be well to have the whole report printed as a public document, so that we can have the question in a convenient form to study it before it comes up in the Senate, if it is to come before the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It occurred to me that the accompanying papers ought to go to the committee for examination. I see there are some voluminous records attached which I did not take time to examine. The committee will consider the question of printing and report back to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to have it printed as a document?

Mr. SMOOT. I will look it over before I make such a request. I do not make it at this time.

The communication and accompanying papers were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, December 12, 1922.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: This communication is in response to a resolution of the Senate of the United States, adopted December 6, 1922 (S. Res. 364), copy of which was duly transmitted to me by the Secretary of the Senate under date of December 6, 1922. This resolution reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and hereby is, directed to report immediately to the Senate all information now in his possession relating to any proposed merger or mergers of large meat-packing companies, accompanying said report with a statement of the number of animals annually slaughtered under Federal inspection tabulated by fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1918, and the proportion slaughtered by each of the five principal packers, with their subsidiary and affiliated companies; also to report as to any application for the privilege of merger, by whom made, and what action, if any, he has taken or contemplates taking in reference to such proposed merger."

While I have in mind a due regard for the coordinate relations of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, I am quite willing to comply with this resolution so far as possible.

A statement of the number of animals annually slaughtered under Federal inspection, tabulated by fiscal years, etc., is transmitted herewith:

I have no information as to any proposed merger or mergers of large meat-packing companies other than certain information informally submitted to me by Mr. J. Ogden Armour and two members of his staff to the effect that there is under consideration a purchase by Armour & Co. of the assets and business of Morris & Co., but not the corporate stock or share capital of Morris & Co., the price to be paid approximately one-third in cash, one-third in preferred stock, and one-third in common stock of the purchasing company or its successors. Armour & Co. and Morris & Co. are two of the five largest meat-packing concerns in the United States. Representatives of Armour & Co. submitted to me three sets of typewritten papers. The first of these is entitled "Law, facts, and argument," and contains certain historical and financial data concerning Armour & Co. and Morris & Co., as well as summary statements of certain information obtained primarily from public records and documents relating to the slaughtering and meat-packing business in the United States, with special reference to the operations of these two concerns. This paper also contains a discussion of the packers and stockyards act, the Federal Trade Commission act, the Clayton Act, and the Sherman antitrust law in their bearings on the proposed action, together with a general argument. The second of these papers is a "Brief" on law points. The third is an "Appendix," containing detailed information purporting to be taken mainly from public records as to such matters as the purchase and slaughter of animals by the various packing concerns, volume and character of business over various periods of time, including a statement of the names and locations of competitive concerns operating at various markets where Armour & Co. and Morris & Co. are engaged in business. Copies of these papers are transmitted herewith.

In stating to me what they desire to do, namely, to purchase the physical assets of Morris & Co., Mr. Armour and the members of his staff did not present an application for the privilege of merger. They said they came to make plain in advance the proposed business transaction and they expressed the hope that it would not be found to be in violation of the law and that it would not meet the opposition of this department. They said further that they hoped that upon consideration I might be able to agree with them that the proposed transaction would result in substantial economies in the transaction of their business and that these economies would be reflected both in the price they were able to pay producers for live stock and in the price at which they would be able to sell meats to the consumers. They contended that the bringing together of these two plants would result in savings of many millions of dollars each year and would enable them to conduct their packing and distributing operations more economically and, consequently, to compete more vigorously both in the purchase of live stock and in the sale of meats.

I have given careful consideration to the provisions of Title II of the packers and stockyards act, particularly that portion which makes it unlawful for any packer to "engage in any course of business or do any act for the purpose or with the effect of manipulating or controlling prices in commerce, or of creating a monopoly in the acquisition of, buying, selling, or dealing in, any article in commerce, or of restraining commerce"; and to the provisions of section 402 of the packers and stockyards act, that "the provisions (including penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the act entitled 'An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 26, 1914, are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in enforcing the provisions of this act and to any person subject to the provisions of this act, whether or not a corporation." There is nothing in the act itself which specifically prohibits the purchase by one packer of the physical assets of another. The question seems to be whether out of such a transaction would flow conditions or actions which would come within the prohibitions of the act.

On Monday, November 27, I met with the President and the Attorney General, at which time the proposed purchase by Armour & Co. of the physical assets of Morris & Co. was considered. There was unanimity of agreement that there was no obligation upon either of us to indorse or acquiesce in the action proposed or to express an opinion concerning it. On the contrary, each was firmly of the opinion that none of us would or could be expected to approve in advance a transaction of this kind. The real question under discussion was whether the proposed purchase and sale might in and of itself be a violation of the law or whether it was of such a nature as to warrant action by any of us in advance of its consummation.

I addressed to the Attorney General an inquiry, as follows:

"The packers and stock yards act, 1921, in Title II, section 202, makes unlawful certain conduct on the part of packers as defined in the act; and in section 203 provides for a procedure in case the Secretary has reason to believe that any packer has violated or is violating any provision of Title II.

"Title IV, section 402, provides that for the efficient execution of the provisions of this act, and in order to provide information for the use of Congress, the provisions of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission act are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in enforcing the packers and stockyards act. The above references are not comprehensive, but serve to direct attention to the basis for the question on which I desire your advice.

"Recently the head of one of the five largest packing concerns has called upon me and has stated that he has in contemplation the purchase of the physical assets of another of these five largest packing concerns, the purchase price being part cash and part in the stock of the purchasing concern, and including the assumption of certain liabilities of the selling concern. The question upon which I desire your opinion is whether the terms of the packers and stockyards act contemplate or require me to take any action with regard to such a transaction in advance of its consummation."

In reply to this inquiry I have received the following communication from the Attorney General:

"In your letter of November 22, 1922, you state that the head of one of the five largest meat-packing concerns has called upon you, and

stated that he has in contemplation the purchase of the physical assets of another of these five largest packing concerns, the purchase price being part cash and part in the stock of the purchasing concern and including the assumption of certain liabilities of the selling concern. You also state in your letter that you desire my opinion as to whether the terms of the 'packers and stockyards act, 1921,' contemplate or require you to take any action with regard to such a transaction in advance of its consummation.

"Section 202 in Title II of the 'packers and stockyards act, 1921,' makes certain acts by a packer, as packer is defined in such act, unlawful. Section 203, in Title II, of this act provides that 'whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that any packer has violated or is violating any provision of this title' he shall cause a complaint to be issued and a hearing to be held. This section also provides that if 'after such hearing the Secretary finds that the packer has violated or is violating any provision of this title' the Secretary shall make a report of his findings of fact and shall issue an order requiring the packer 'to cease and desist from continuing such violation.'

"Section 402 of Title IV of the 'packers and stockyards act, 1921,' provides that 'for the efficient execution of the provisions of this act and in order to provide information for the use of Congress the provisions (including penalties) of sections 6, 8, 9, and 10 of the act entitled 'An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 26, 1914, are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary in enforcing the provisions of this act.

"The provisions of the Federal Trade Commission act pertinent to this inquiry are those found in section 6 and are as follows:

"'The commission shall also have power (a) to gather and compile information concerning and to investigate from time to time the organization, business, conduct, practices, and management of any corporation engaged in commerce * * * and its relation to other corporations and to individuals, associations, and partnerships; * * * (f) to make public, from time to time, such portions of the information obtained by it hereunder, except trade secrets and names of customers, as it shall deem expedient in the public interest.'

"It is my opinion that the packers and stockyards act, 1921, is essentially a regulatory act, and that the duties and powers of the Secretary of Agriculture thereunder are to regulate the industry included within its provisions. Neither the act itself nor the regulation provided for therein contemplates or requires that you should advise the industry in regard to such a transaction in advance of its consummation.

"In the opinion in the case of Stafford et al. v. Wallace et al., decided by the Supreme Court of the United States May 1, 1922, Mr. Chief Justice Taft said:

"'The language of the law shows that what Congress had in mind primarily was to prevent such conspiracies by supervision of the agencies which would be likely to be employed in it. * * * Congress has found as an evil to be apprehended and to be prevented by the act here in question, (in) the use and control of stockyards and the commission men to promote a packers' monopoly of interstate commerce. * * * Its provisions are carefully drawn to apply only to those practices and obstructions which, in the judgment of Congress, are likely to affect interstate commerce prejudicially.'

"The act in section 203 provides that when you have reason to believe that any packer has violated or is violating the provisions of that act you should proceed to issue a complaint and conduct a hearing, and if you find that the packer has violated or is violating such act you shall render a report of the facts and issue an order requiring the packer to cease and desist from continuing such violation. The provisions of the Federal Trade Commission act are carried into the packers and stockyards act, 1921, for the purpose, as expressed therein, of enabling the efficient execution of the provisions of the packers and stockyards act, 1921, and in order to provide information for the use of Congress. This does not seem to broaden the purposes or the essential powers conferred by the packers and stockyards act, 1921. The language used in the packers and stockyards act, 1921, makes it clear to me that the act does not require you to take any formal action unless you have reason to believe that the law has been violated or is being violated. To constitute a violation of the law within the meaning of this act there must be something more than a mere statement of what a person or corporation contemplates.

"In answer to your question as to whether the terms of the packers and stockyards act, 1921, contemplate any action on your part in connection with the proposed purchase of physical assets, I am of opinion that the act vests you with broad powers of inquiry and that you may make such inquiry."

For some weeks I have been making certain investigations and studies for the purpose of trying to measure the probable effect upon competition in the buying of live stock and the selling of meat if the suggested purchase and sale should be completed, but as yet no occasion seems to have arisen which requires formal action.

As to future action, that will depend altogether upon future events.

Respectfully,

HENRY C. WALLACE, *Secretary.*

AGRICULTURAL CREDITS AND COOPERATIVE MARKETING.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, two closely related subjects, rural credits and cooperative marketing of farm products, already have received from congressional agencies earnest consideration. The indications are that these questions soon will be brought before the Congress for action.

The importance of securing fair, wise, and adequate legislation with respect to these subjects is generally recognized. Much confusion and conflict occur as to what is the best means of liberalizing and stabilizing agricultural credits and marketing agricultural products so as to give assurance that a fair relationship may be maintained between the prices paid by consumers of farm products and the prices received by producers.

Mr. B. M. Baruch, a profound student of economics and a financier of world-wide renown, has for several years studied intensively these great questions. His researches have been comprehensive, his information seems accurate, and his conclusions are worthy of the attention of Senators and Representatives who are anxious to bring substantial and permanent relief to an industry the prosperity of which is inseparably associated with the comfort and well-being of all the people of this country.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD, in 8-point type, as a part of my remarks an address delivered by Mr. Baruch in Chicago yesterday on these subjects.

There being no objection, the address referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL FINANCE—A SOLUTION OF THE RURAL CREDITS PROBLEM.

[An address by Bernard M. Baruch before the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, December 11, 1922.]

Agriculture is the oldest and best-known business existing today—and it is a business much like any other. Yet it has seen grow up around it younger giants of industry that could not possibly get along without agriculture; young giants that by organization and modern methods have destroyed the fair relationship between those who produce from the soil and those who produce from mine and factory.

Other businesses have been centralized and concentrated to such an extent that the farmer finds himself buying at more or less controlled prices from great centrally directed industries and selling in an unlimitedly competitive manner in a market over which he has no control. All around him in the modern world he is met with organization where production and selling are concentrated in specialized hands. He finds, as a result, that he is not receiving a fair share of what he produces.

The statisticians of the Departments of Agriculture and Labor tell us that if prices of agricultural commodities were in a just relation to those of other commodities in 1913, they are now 36 points out of adjustment. That is to say, the purchasing power of farm products—their exchange value in other commodities—is only 64 cents on the dollar compared with what it was in 1913—and even then it was not equitable. An examination of Department of Agriculture figures will reveal the deadly effects of such economic injustice. Millions of good farmers on good land and with good crops are actually running their business, through no fault of their own or the mischances of nature, at a loss that spells ruin if continued. Capital is being impaired and burdensome debts incurred to keep the farms going and the farm people and, indeed, all of us, clothed and fed. This distressing situation is partly due to the general upset of the world during the war and after, but it has been aggravated by the weakness of the rural financing and marketing, which have caused the farmer to absorb much, if not most, of the losses of maladjustment and readjustment.

Some time ago, at the invitation of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau Federation, I made an investigation into the financial and merchandizing aspects of farming, and came to the conclusion that modern business methods and the growth of legislation had put the production and distribution of farm products out of line with the rest of the economic structure, to the disadvantage of agriculture. Being asked to suggest a remedy, it seems to me that the proper theory for correction should be based primarily upon the fact that without regular access to commensurate financing, modern business, with its highly specialized production and distribution, would be impossible. Agriculture needs like facilities in order to be placed upon an equality with all the other industries with which it has to deal. And in order to accomplish this, so far as access to credit is concerned, I have the following recommendations to make, regardless of whether you market cooperatively or as individuals, although I do not hesitate to say that I am unqualifiedly in favor of cooperative marketing.

A new finance system should be set up to increase the volume of three classes of rural credits: (1) Credit for the more orderly marketing of crops. (2) Credit for the purpose of raising and marketing cattle. (3) Credit for the productive purposes.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the necessity of credit for the more orderly marketing of crops. You are too well aware of, indeed, many of you are suffers from, the necessity of forcing upon the market the products of the soil because of inability to obtain credit to carry those products until such time as the markets and transportation were no longer glutted by the great flow of them.

The basis of increased credits for this particular purpose should be the placing of the products in a modern warehouse or elevator where a neutral authority would register their grade and amount, and where a certificate would be issued for the amount so stored or warehoused. Honest and dependable grading and weighing are essential to the acceptability of warehouse certificates, but should be guaranteed to the farmer as a matter of common decency and civil right under any commercial or financial system. However it may be now, there is no doubt that the farmer has been defrauded by undergrading and scant measuring.

The farmer, once in possession of this certificate (with his product well protected and insured in the warehouse and properly graded), could take it to the present banking system and obtain credit upon it in much the same way as is now done; or to a new finance corporation which should be created for the purpose of lending money to the farmer, at the lowest obtainable rate of interest, for not exceeding one year, upon his note secured by this certificate representing marketable commodities. The new institution, intended to be independent of the present banking system, would place the farmer's note, secured by his products, in its treasury, and issue its own obligations, as is now done by the Federal land banks in their field. The paper so issued should be discountable in the Federal reserve system when having not more than nine months to maturity.

Paper issued by a federally regulated institution of this kind would have the widest kind of a market and would place the farmer who deserves credit in a position where he can obtain it at the lowest rates of interest in the credit markets of the world.

The basis of the issuance to cattle raisers would be, of course, the cattle, which would have to be properly inspected, with restrictions that would be applicable in the circumstances. Debentures for this purpose should run for as long as three years, but only notes or debentures having nine months or less before maturity should be discountable in the Federal reserve banks.

In the matter of credit for production, because here we do not have collateral of unquestioned value and marketability as in the two other instances, we have more to consider the character and individuality of the farmer himself—what bankers call the moral risk. Heretofore, the country banks and merchants have furnished this sort of credit. But, mind you, we are now endeavoring to give the farmer as free access to the credit markets of the world as other producers enjoy, so that he shall be confined, necessarily, to local markets.

The Raiffheisen banks in Germany and the Credit Agricole in France have as their basis the sound principle of mutual individual indorsement; but I can see there are very grave difficulties in the way of that in this country. These could be overcome by the formation of financial associations or corporations in localities so desiring, whose purpose would be to provide the necessary guaranties to the note of the farmer who wants and is entitled to obtain credit for the purchase of machinery or fertilizer, or for anything necessary to the productivity of his farm. These associations or corporations would be somewhat analogous to the farm loan associations of our Federal land banks. They would be controlled by the farmers and others by whom the capital would be subscribed. Notes for productive purposes would be required to have the indorsement of the local organization, which would have the right to indorse and forward to a regional institution for sale an amount of notes equal to ten times the local's capital. The procedure under this plan would be somewhat as follows:

The farmer, if he can not borrow from the present banking facilities, goes to the local credit organization. If it decides to lend him money, it takes his note, indorses it, and passes it on to the regional institution, which in turn places the local body's note in its treasury and issues its own obligation against it for sale in the credit markets of the world. This latter paper ought to be discountable in the Federal reserve system when its maturity is within nine months.

The regional institutions would be controlled by a central organization under Federal authority. Each should be allowed to issue and sell its obligations in the open market to the extent of ten times its capital. Any present or future bank or financial institution, as well as the proposed local rural credit units, that could furnish proper guaranties could use this regional organization.

There is no reason why one central organization should not be the agency for all of the three above purposes; that is, for more orderly marketing of crops, for the raising and marketing of cattle, and for productive purposes. However, this institution should be rigidly departmentalized and a certain percentage of its funds allocated to each branch of the organization. Its obligations for the three different purposes enumerated would thus stand on their own bottoms, separate each from the other; each fund to be earmarked. Otherwise credit for the more orderly marketing of crops which have the warehoused product as collateral and for live stock would have to pay as high a rate of interest as that which was granted for productive purposes, which has no such marketable collateral.

After all is said and done, the final arbiters of how much money will be raised will be the investing public, banks and bankers, whose ability to furnish money by buying the notes or debentures is greater even than that of the Government. They are entitled to know what they are buying, so that orderly marketing, cattle raising, and production will each bear its just share of interest charges. Interest rates on credit for productive purposes might reasonably be slightly greater than for other purposes.

With proper governmental control and regulation we should thus soon have a new sound financial system supplemental to the present one, but independent in its administration, which would free the farmer from many of the present credit restrictions, of which he so justly complains. Like a big business, the farmer would be able to either get his credit from the Federal reserve system, as at present, or by going out into the general credit markets as well organized as those with whom he has to compete.

The initial capital of the new system could be obtained out of the liquidation of the War Finance Corporation. The amount can be readily determined by an investigation to ascertain what are the annual credit requirements for the three purposes necessary to supplement present sources. I might add that I am given to understand that the larger cattlemen do not desire Government capital investment assistance. Although available to them, it is not, however, for the few larger but for the vast number of smaller producers that the proposed system is suggested. Assuming that the new system would have a capital of fifty to one hundred millions of dollars—to be increased if found necessary—and the right to issue its own obligations to the amount of ten times its capital, you can readily see how, in addition to the present credit facilities, the farmer would be well taken care of and could have no just cause for complaint in respect to credit. It must be remembered, however, that no legislation can create higher prices, which are solely determined by the natural law of supply and demand; neither can legislation give a farmer any more credit than his character and volume of production entitle him to. But it can give him an equal access to credit and freedom to market his crop more at his own discretion.

The country should be divided into regions for the establishment of the regional loan institutions somewhat on the basis of the Federal land banks and the Federal reserve system. Each suitable locality within each of these regions should form its own organization for the purpose of dealing with the regional institution.

It is not necessary and might be confusing for me to go into an elaboration of the details of the method of creating and administering such a system as I am recommending. There are a number of bills before Congress aiming in this general direction, which it should be easily possible to combine to realize in one measure the fundamentals of the system here proposed. And it may be possible to avoid further extension of governmental machinery, already too complex and cumbersome, by utilizing the executive and administrative machinery of the Farm Loan Board with some adaptations and revisions. (Since preparing this address there has been introduced into Congress a bill covering most of the things herein suggested with a most valuable addition of admission of small banks into the Federal reserve system.)

As in the case of the land banks, provision should be made for the repayment of the original capital investment of the Government. In the end the Government would be repaid not only in the money sense but also in the greatly increased prosperity of 40 per cent of the population—yes, of the whole population.

This institution will not be a panacea for all our ills, and indeed, may not actually be used as much as now anticipated. But its potential credit-providing facilities will be there and operate powerfully as a restriction of the practices of which you now complain. But we must remember that whatever instrumentality we have, no matter how excellent its organization and objects, it is, after all, the intelligent direction of its affairs that will realize the desired results. Let us not be too critical of our Federal reserve system as such, for in fairness we must admit that it has accomplished much; nor should we expect too much of any new institution. It is wisdom of administrators rather than the agency itself that makes for failure or success.

The proposed system would place agriculture on an equal footing, as far as credit is concerned, with other industries. That is only a beginning, but it is a proper beginning. I have not been called upon to speak of the additional things that are necessary, but I may say that one of them has to do with greater cooperation in marketing. This, I am glad to say, is increasing by leaps and bounds. Let us always remember that we can not enjoy the fruits of cooperation unless each one gives up a certain amount of his individuality and allows a specialized organization, the cooperative society, to do his marketing for him. Each one may think that he can do it better, but if all

thought so we should still remain with the old-fashioned machinery, which has given such poor results and produced, comparatively, so little for the farmer.

Another matter of very great importance, which is a part of almost every program for the removal of unnecessary burdens upon agriculture, is that of the carrying of farm products from the producer to the consumer—the transportation problem. There is much to be done here of vital importance to the farmer.

But I would urge upon you the necessity of concentrating on the doing of one thing at a time. I believe that the matter of credit is basic and primary. And I would also urge you to have your leaders devote their attention to this matter, which is now before Congress, and provision for which could be placed upon the statute books within a very few days if you get behind it and do not allow yourselves to become diverted by too many scattered efforts.

Again, in considering the whole subject, one must have in mind that no matter what credit facilities, no matter what transportation and what distributive agencies you may have, there must be a market; and that market, as in other business, you must continually endeavor to widen.

That brings us to another point concerning which I feel that I must say a few words—and that is the question of your foreign markets. The price of all products is finally made by their surplus. If you can not sell your surplus abroad, you must take a much lower price for that portion of the product which can be consumed at home. A small exportable surplus often has a very disproportionate effect on the price of an entire commodity. So our thoughts must turn toward considering what, if anything, we can do to widen our foreign market, on which we are dependent for the sale of our surplus products. You farmers are the real exporters of this country. It is you who are most deeply interested in foreign affairs.

The whole world was thrown into confusion when Germany quit the workbench and drew the sword and the other nations had to follow. The sword may have been sheathed, but there is no peace; and when there is no peace men can not go on normally producing and consuming. Germany has not yet been restored to the economic circle; neither has Russia, Poland, Austria, or the Balkan countries; England, France, and Italy only partly so. There is nothing so important to you gentlemen as the full reestablishment of your foreign markets, which can come only from reestablishment of the world's economic peace and balance. It is true that last year large quantities of our products were exported—but how were they paid for?

In the first place, by the sale in this country during the first six months of the current year of some $800,000,000 worth of bonds issued by foreign countries at the highest rates of interest ever known in the history of international finance. Secondly, by the sale of family heirlooms, called by my old friends in South Carolina the "wedding rings." Families have sold their famous pictures that have been with them for centuries in order to be clothed and fed. Already there is almost an end of the sale of bonds of European countries, because nations can not pay the rates of interest that are being demanded. The supply of works of art and treasures must soon come to an end. The money secured from the sale of the bonds and the family treasures has not been used for productive purposes but to feed and clothe the population that has been paralyzed by corroding fear.

Gentlemen, I affirm that there is nothing in the world that affects your credit so much as the shrinking of foreign markets for your products. There is nothing to which you can give your attention that is of greater moment to you in a practical way than the creation of the international relations that are precedent to the reestablishment of those markets. I do not speak of our moral responsibility in the matter, nor of the great opportunity that America has to lead a stricken world into a finer and better order of things—an opportunity toward which the noble thoughts of all men urge them, though I do think this consideration the most compelling of all. These thoughts are fundamental to all religions and to the hope of a better world for men and their children. Rather, I dwell merely upon what enlightened selfishness or even just plain greedy selfishness demands—the necessity of keeping open and enlarging an ever-increasing market for the products of your hands and minds.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 12, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Eva M. Ellison to be postmaster at Empire, Ala. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Warren L. Hollingsworth to be postmaster at Lincoln, Ala. Office became presidential October 1, 1919.

Fred M. Fitts to be postmaster at Alabama City, Ala., in place of Y. E. Adams. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Mary D. Bass to be postmaster at Butler, Ala., in place of T. W. Bass, deceased.

Lee M. Otts to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ala., in place of L. M. Otts. Incumbent's commission expired August 29, 1922.

Walter T. Cowan to be postmaster at Orrville, Ala., in place of W. T. Cowan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Ed P. Johnson to be postmaster at Samson, Ala., in place of J. T. Farmer. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Tyler M. Swann to be postmaster at Roanoke, Ala., in place of L. M. Stevenson. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1922.

Albert N. Holland to be postmaster at Scottsboro, Ala., in place of J. B. Tally, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Fred D. Perkins to be postmaster at Wetumpka, Ala., in place of M. E. Cain, resigned.

ARIZONA.

Winchester Dickerson to be postmaster at Ashfork, Ariz., in place of Winchester Dickerson. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CALIFORNIA.

Edna J. McGowan to be postmaster at Belmont, Calif. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Paul Huneke to be postmaster at Lemoncove, Calif. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

John W. Drane to be postmaster at Alturas, Calif., in place of G. M. Kemble. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1922.

Fred W. Busey to be postmaster at Balboa, Calif., in place of P. J. Wilson, resigned.

James A. Lewis to be postmaster at Carpinteria, Calif., in place of J. A. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Hazel M. McFarland to be postmaster at Folsom City, Calif., in place of W. H. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George M. Heath to be postmaster at Ione, Calif., in place of S. H. Hawkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Bert C. McMurray to be postmaster at Lancaster, Calif., in place of W. M. Redman. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Kathleen M. Fleming to be postmaster at Lincoln, Calif., in place of K. M. Fleming. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Ida P. Durkee to be postmaster at Newport Beach, Calif., in place of L. S. Wilkinson, resigned.

George W. Fraser to be postmaster at Pinole, Calif., in place of J. W. Townes. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Bernice C. Downing to be postmaster at Santa Clara, Calif., in place of C. D. South. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

FLORIDA.

Grady W. Bailey to be postmaster at Florence Villa, Fla. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Clarence J. Carlton to be postmaser at Arcadia, Fla., in place of W. M. Platt. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Charles R. Lee to be postmaster at Clearwater, Fla., in place of W. A. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Jesse D. Knight to be postmaster at Lake Butler, Fla., in place of S. E. Driggers. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Albert L. Lucas to be postmaster at Ocala, Fla., in place of R. F. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Thomas W. Lundy to be postmaster at Perry, Fla., in place of L. M. Caswell. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1922.

Maxfield Sellers to be postmaster at White Springs, Fla., in place of O. K. Paxton, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MARYLAND.

Mary B. Workman to be postmaster at Fort Howard, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Elwood L. Murray to be postmaster at Hampstead, Md., in place of J. O. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Anna B. Bowie to be postmaster at Kensington, Md., in place of A. B. Bowie. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Leslie W. Gaver to be postmaster at Middletown, Md., in place of G. W. Kefauver. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Milton D. Reid to be postmaster at New Windsor, Md., in place of W. D. Lovell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

David S. Hickman to be postmaster at Snow Hill, Md., in place of J. S. Price, resigned.

William Melville to be postmaster at Sykesville, Md., in place of M. H. Weer. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Harry L. Feeser to be postmaster at Taneytown, Md., in place of W. E. Burke. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Ernest W. Pickett to be postmaster at Woodbine, Md., in place of F. T. Buckingham, deceased.

NEVADA.

Daniel E. Morton to be postmaster at Carson City, Nev., in place of A. B. Karns. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1922.

NEW MEXICO.

Augustin F. Sisneros to be postmaster at Espanola, N. Mex., in place of F. R. Frankenburger. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NEW YORK.

George W. Harris to be postmaster at Richmondville, N. Y., in place of E. N. Taber, declined.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Willis A. Willcox to be postmaster at Halifax, N. C., in place of L. N. Fenner. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Vernon W. Faris to be postmaster at Henderson, N. C., in place of I. J. Young. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1921.

Otis P. Brower, to be postmaster at Liberty, N. C., in place of W. M Hanner, removed.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Meeda McMullen to be postmaster at Forest River, N. Dak. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Paul Keller to be postmaster at Hebron, N. Dak., in place of Paul Keller. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

OHIO.

Linden C. Weimer to be postmaster at Dayton, Ohio, in place of F. L. May. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

OREGON.

Flora A. Fowler to be postmaster at Goble, Oreg. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Isaac W. Edgar to be postmaster at Glenshaw, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Carey W. Huff to be postmaster at James City, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Daniel A. Strayer to be postmaster at Coalport, Pa., in place of J. K. Gorman. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

RHODE ISLAND.

May B. Lamb to be postmaster at Greenville, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Bertha M. Brayton to be postmaster at Hope, R. I. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Robert L. Henderson to be postmaster at North Charleston, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

James M. Graham to be postmaster at Alcolu, S. C., in place of L. M. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Conley Collins to be postmaster at Morristown, Tenn., in place of J. E. Helms. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

TEXAS.

James W. Travers to be postmaster at South Bend, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

VIRGINIA.

Augustus R. Morris to be postmaster at Jetersville, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Charles V. Tucker to be postmaster at Phenix, Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Charles G. Rowell to be postmaster at Surry, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Ferdinand C. Knight to be postmaster at Alexandria, Va., in place of W. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

William H. Haney to be postmaster at Claremont, Va., in place of J. C. Hudgins. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Gatewood L. Schumaker to be postmaster at Covington, Va., in place of F. H. Rinehart. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Holdway E. Lane to be postmaster at Gate City, Va., in place of J. M. Minnich. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Ollie M. Colbert to be postmaster at Gretna, Va., in place of W. E. Ramsey. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Philip L. Harrington to be postmaster at Independence, Va., in place of C. W. Rudolph, resigned.

Georgie H. Osborne to be postmaster at Keysville, Va., in place of W. E. Hailey. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Ira D. Baker to be postmaster at Lovettsville, Va., in place of C. F. Shumaker. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Manley W. Carter to be postmaster at Orange, Va., in place of H. G. Shackelford. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Walter C. Franklin to be postmaster at Pamplin, Va., in place of L. N. Ligon, resigned.

Patrick J. Riley to be postmaster at Portsmouth, Va., in place of S. T. Montague. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Joseph W. Stewart to be postmaster at Richmond, Va., in place of H. T. Thornton. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Edward S. Barnitz to be postmaster at Salem, Va., in place of J. P. Saul, resigned.

Jacob H. Furr to be postmaster at Waynesboro, Va., in place of J. T. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Charlie R. Fisher to be postmaster at Wytheville, Va., in place of C. N. Otey. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

WASHINGTON.

Edward Van Dyke to be postmaster at Lake Stevens, Wash. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

Richard J. Hansen to be postmaster at Elcho, Wis. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Clara M. Johnson to be postmaster at Ettrick, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1920.

Marinus Jensen to be postmaster at Mountain, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Clarence W. Hebard to be postmaster at Sheldon, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Robert Luchsinger to be postmaster at Belleville, Wis., in place of M. M. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired April 30, 1922.

Clarence B. Jensen to be postmaster at Cambridge, Wis., in place of W. B. Telyen, resigned.

William Martin to be postmaster at Campbellsport, Wis., in place of A. F. Fleischmann, appointee declined.

John D. Laughlin to be postmaster at Marion, Wis., in place of J. D. Laughlin. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

C. Amelia Knudson to be postmaster at Scandinavia, Wis., in place of A. L. Olson, resigned.

Fred J. Hurless to be postmaster at Viola, Wis., in place of L. L. Henthorn. Incumbents' commission expired September 5, 1922.

Robert C. Bulkley to be postmaster at Whitewater, Wis., in place of W. C. Kiernan. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 12, 1922.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

William Lassiter to be major general.
Edwin Barnch Winans to be brigadier general.
Herbert Stephens Williams to be major, Veterinary Corps.
Alfred Lewis Mason to be major, Veterinary Corps.
Jack Glendon Fuller, to be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps.
John Dennis Foley, to be first lieutenant, Medical Administrative Corps.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Frederick H. Leach, Idaho Springs.

ILLINOIS.

Lloyd D. Wood, Batavia.
Forrest E. Peterson, Depue.
Benjamin F. Manley, Harvard.
Walter A. Leigh, Jerseyville.
Fred H. Stevens, La Grange.
William C. Roodhouse, Roodhouse.
Evan M. Klock, Sheffield.
Thomas A. Brown, Sparta.
Edward S. Bundy, Thompsonville.
Joseph E. Shantz, Wilmette.

IOWA.

Frank B. Moreland, Ackley.
Anna Reardon, Auburn.
George C. Lloyd, Dallas Center.
Frank P. Rotton, Essex.
George F. Monroe, Fairbank.
Guy A. Whitney, Hubbard.
Albert Lille, Lake View.
Milton G. Irwin, Merrill.
Harry J. Perrin, Monroe.
Leona S. Kay, Moville.
Charles S. Walling, Oskaloosa.
Leslie H. Bell, Paullina.
Frank J. Shearer, Prairie City.
George Sampson, Radcliffe.
Anna N. Dixon, Rock Valley.
Cecil E. Wherry, Wyoming.

KANSAS.

Albert H. Herman, Hiawatha.
Wiley Caves, Inman.
David D. McIntosh, Marion.
John F. Oliver, Oxford.

MICHIGAN.

Edna Donohue, Gregory.
Fred E. Pomeranning, Trenton.
Enoch J. Andrus, Utica.

NEBRASKA.

Mina R. Tweed, Bassett.
Louis R. Eby, Hartington.

NEW JERSEY.

William G. Z. Critchley, Allendale.
Clifford G. Hanks, West Englewood.

OHIO.

Annie Turvey, Amsterdam.
Berman K. Smith, Arcanum.
Gertrude Stormont, Cedarville.
John M. McGough, Harrod.
Owen E. Reed, Hiram.
William E. Thomas, Wellston.

OKLAHOMA.

John W. Rackley, Cherokee.
Martin G. Harrington, Garber.
Albert H. Keil, Haileyville.
Effie J. Malone, Harrah.
James H. Sparks, Healdton.
William H. McKinley, Pondcreek.
Floyd O. Hibbard, Snyder.

OREGON.

Irwin D. Pike, Grass Valley.
Rodrick A. Chisholm, Monroe.
Otto G. Schneider, Powers.
Russell H. Sullens, Prairie City.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Joseph G. Hart, Doylestown.
Wilson R. Kulp, Hatfield.
Fred E. Lukens, Macungie.
John W. Biddle, Millville.
William H. Brosius, Mont Alto.
Paul R. Majer, Pocono Pines.
Charles B. Illig, Womelsdorf.
Annie H. Washburn, Wyncote.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 12, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our heavenly Father, we bless Thee that we are still within the circle of Thy arms, for their protection is sure and their care is infinite. Each day give us courage and endurance, and may these virtues make us stronger and nobler men. O may Thy greatness flow around about our incompleteness. We ask the forgiveness of our sins. We pray for our families that Thy love and mercy may be their daily portions. In the integrity of soul, in the confidence and calmness of a conquering faith may our whole Nation set up the banners of the living God. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REREFERENCE OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which was referred to the Committee on Rules, be rereferred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I may say I took up this matter with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and this course is agreeable to him.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 be rereferred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House as to what the concurrent resolution refers?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The concurrent resolution refers to an investigation of the office of the recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia, and it is a joint committee of Members of the House and Senate, it carries no appropriation, and gives no unusual powers.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Rules he has examined the resolution, and it is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Yes; and the chairman of the Committee on Rules suggested I make this request on the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13232.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13232, with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13232, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUSTED: Page 15, line 15, after the word "rent," strike out the amount "$30,715.50" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$25,913.50: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of a consulting engineer: *Provided further*, That at the request of the Secretary of State the Secretary of War shall detail an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army to serve as consulting engineer to the commission."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition. I notice, in looking over the report, that the committee has in most instances granted the estimate of the department for the maintenance of these respective commissions. In the present instance the amount recommended by the department was $30,715. This item last year carried an appropriation of $15,000. It has been a subject for controversy for many, many years as to the utility and value of the work of this commission. It has been regarded more or less as a political football to send lame ducks and others of that type to obscurity.

Mr. HICKS. Is the gentleman a candidate himself?

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to state positively that while some gentlemen from New York may be candidates for these positions, I have given special notice that I like my home city too well to stay here at Washington if I am not a Member of this House. [Applause.] I wish now to inquire as to whether the committee has granted the allowance as asked for by the department, or whether they have scanned them rather closely and cut down the appropriations. In this instance the chairman of the subcommittee has reduced on the floor of the House the amount asked for with some qualifications, and yet that permits an expenditure of virtually the full amount asked for other than this for one officer.

Mr. HUSTED. We have made cuts wherever we felt we could do so without injury to a necessary or useful service.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is giving an increased appropriation over the $15,000.

Mr. HUSTED. They reconstituted the commission and they will use this money usefully.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question but what they will use it.

Mr. HUSTED. I say usefully, to the advantage of the Government.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. BEGG. How can this International Boundary Commission function with Mexico when you refuse to recognize that Government?

Mr. HUSTED. Well, I did try to explain all that yesterday. Of course, they can not come to any definitive agreements.

Mr. BEGG. Has not that been true for four or five years?

Mr. HUSTED. No. That has not been true, because they have not had a commissioner, until very recently, for some time past.

Mr. BEGG. No; the gentleman is wrong there. They have had a commission.

Mr. HUSTED. There is but one American commissioner, and he constitutes the commission. They have not had an American commissioner until recently with the Mexican commissioner for several years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BEGG. I want to ask the gentleman how many men are employed in this work? I am serious about this. I remember that we had quite an investigation, and we found that we were appropriating from $15,000 to $20,000 to $25,000, and they had but one meeting, and they were using all the funds. What are they going to do?

Mr. HUSTED. This new commissioner was appointed some time in the month of August last, and he has had a number of meetings with the Mexican commissioner.

Mr. BEGG. With whom does he meet?

Mr. HUSTED. With the Mexican commissioner.

Mr. BEGG. How can he?

Mr. HUSTED. They meet informally and arrive at informal understandings.

Mr. BEGG. How can they determine anything?

Mr. HUSTED. They can arrive, as I say, at informal agreements, which undoubtedly will be carried out when diplomatic relations between the two countries are reestablished.

Mr. BEGG. I think the latest evidence before the committee was to the effect that about all they did was to survey the water on the Rio Grande.

Mr. HUSTED. They survey the land that has been affected by the change in the course of the stream and measure the water, and then they hold meetings and have notes made of all the facts in these cases, so that later on, when diplomatic relations between the two countries have been resumed, some definite understanding can be arrived at.

Mr. BEGG. If we appropriate $25,000 a year for 10 years, that will be $250,000 in salaries for the purpose of ascertaining the location of a few shifting sand bars. Does the gentleman think it necessary to retain this commission indefinitely?

Mr. HUSTED. I will say to the gentleman that I have never been down there and know nothing about the facts, except as the Secretary of State and other people have testified. The hearings are quite full of information.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me right there to make a suggestion?

Mr. BEGG. Did you ever have anybody testify that knew anything about it? I have, and I have gotten my information from them.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. We have had the testimony of Mr. Carr, of the State Department, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] will go to the hearings conducted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs he will find that Secretary Root and Secretary Knox and Secretary Bryan and Secretary Lansing and every Secretary of State for the last dozen years have said that this was absolutely essential, that it could not be done with less expense to the State Department by any other method, and that if you would only get this data that you speak of, which in 10 years at an expense of $25,000 a year would amount to $250,000, it might save us a cost of $25,000,000 when we came to settle our differences with Mexico. The essential thing is the measuring of the water. The Mexican Government claims that we are taking more than our share of the water now. Now, if we are taking more than our share of the water, when it comes to settling our differences with the Mexicans we shall have to pay for it.

Mr. BEGG. Three years ago, after hearings, we cut the appropriation down to $5,000. Was the water measured that year?

Mr. GARNER. It was put in there for the purpose of measuring the water alone, and we did measure the water.

Mr. BEGG. Now, what is the use in having this commissioner and this traveling inspector continue to measure any water? It is the engineer on the ground that does the work, and the salary will not amount to $5,000.

Mr. GARNER. That is simply the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. It is not simply the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio. It is the testimony elicited in the hearings.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, there is no use in discussing it with the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. There is no evidence showing that it was essential and necessary to maintain a high-salaried commissioner during the time you are not recognizing the Government of Mexico and when they can not function. Now, next year you will probably find that they will have two or three meetings, and your $25,000 is gone.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARNER. I do so, Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentlemen of the committee may understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BEGG. "The gentleman from Ohio" knows what the evidence is.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. EVANS. Is it not a fact that by reason of the character of the Rio Grande and the changes it makes, which are sudden, there are constant disputes arising between the owners in the United States and Texas and those in Mexico, and that these two commissioners have been instrumental in marking the boundary under such circumstances, which has been recognized by the nationals of both parties, and so they have prevented many serious differences?

Mr. GARNER. Yes. I was just going to remark that if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] had done what he has said he had done—read the hearings—he ought to be better informed than his statement to the House indicates. The hearings are

full of statements to the effect that it is absolutely essential, when the Rio Grande rises and cuts off an island from Mexico and then flows from Mexico into the United States, to survey that locality under the treaty to ascertain how many acres are involved.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARNER. No; I decline to yield. The gentleman would not yield to me, and continued to make statements that were not justified by the record.

Mr. BEGG. That is just what you are doing now.

Mr. GARNER. The record is full of statements to that effect, that you must survey these bancos in the United States or in Mexico. If they exceed 640 acres they go to the country in which they are carried. If they are less than 640 acres they still remain part of the old territory. Now, who is going to survey it? Who is going to determine that question between the State of Texas and the Government of Mexico? They do do it now. The gentleman from Ohio is mistaken when he says that they do not do it. I am not in favor of fixing jobs for Republicans. This commissioner could well be suspended until relations are resumed between the United States and Mexico.

I insist upon having the money for the purpose of measuring this water, and I do think we ought to have a commissioner to keep down these difficulties if we possibly can. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is only indicting his own administration when he is indicting the efficiency of this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED].

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing and binding for the Pan American Union, and the Public Printer is authorized to print an edition of the monthly bulletin not to exceed 6,000 copies per month, for distribution by the union during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, $20,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that we appropriate $100,000 for the Pan American Union. Is the chairman of the committee able to state what the other American Republics contribute?

Mr. HUSTED. I think all of the other adhering members put together appropriate something less than the amount that we contribute.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose there is a deficiency at the end of the year; who pays that?

Mr. HUSTED. There is no deficiency.

Mr. WATSON. What is this money used for? Is it for the repair of buildings?

Mr. HUSTED. No; there is a large force employed at the Pan American Building here in Washington.

Mr. WATSON. What is the money used for?

Mr. HUSTED. It is used for the dissemination of information.

Mr. WATSON. It says it is to meet the expenses of the union. I want to know what the expenses of the union are.

Mr. HUSTED. They disseminate information. People in South America write to the union here at Washington for information on many different subjects.

Mr. WATSON. Is this amount for clerk hire?

Mr. HUSTED. It is for miscellaneous expenses, clerk hire, and for the payment of the salary of the director.

Mr. WATSON. Do the other American Republics pay as much as we do?

Mr. HUSTED. I think all of them put together do not pay quite as much as we do. It is really our institution, in a way. We started it and are the chief promoters of it, although the rights of all members are equal.

Mr. WATSON. And we own the ground and the building here?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Thank you. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration, $4,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KING: Page 17, lines 19 to 23, inclusive, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of ascertaining, if possible, something concerning this Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration. I have searched high and low for some act under which it was organized, or some contract of organization authorized by this Congress, and for some offices of this interparliamentary union. I understand that at one time they had an office at 54 Jackson Place, but a careful search made by competent detectives and men knowing that vicinity has failed to disclose any such office or any stenographer or chairman or anybody else in charge of it. It seems to be a sort of a mystery and myth. Yet I notice that some individuals who claim to be attached to this organization took a very nice junket to Europe along in the spring some time and attached themselves to the League of Nations by sitting in the gallery at Geneva, to all of which I have no objection whatever. It is, of course, our first and most intimate connection with the League of Nations. What progress is being made by the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration? The sum of $4,000 is asked for. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee and others what this trip to Geneva to visit the League of Nations cost the United States; how much was used for that purpose; and what useful reason there is for the existence of this organization. If there is anybody on God's earth who can tell me anything about it, I will be a most interested and anxious listener.

Mr. HUSTED. This is an institution in which I think our State Department is not particularly interested. It is purely a congressional matter. It is a union composed of members of various legislative bodies who are in favor of submitting all disputes between nations to arbitration. They meet annually at certain designated places abroad and hold a sort of international parliament for the discussion of certain important questions which are submitted. They met in this country in 1904. I think the Members of Congress who are particularly interested in it are the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES].

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. And Governor MONTAGUE, of Virginia.

Mr. HUSTED. And the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE]. They have always expressed great interest in it.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. KING. What effort has this institution made since its organization in 1904 to foster the spirit of arbitration between the nations? Did they take any part in attempting to prevent the World War or make any effort along that line?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not know how effective their efforts have been. I think their disposition has been good at least.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I think possibly this $4,000 is very well spent, because both abroad and when he came back here the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] gave everyone to understand that they might just as well quit talking about canceling any part of our foreign indebtedness. None would be canceled. That was one of the good things that grew out of the expenditure of this $4,000, and if we accomplished nothing more it was likely well spent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Certainly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some of us wish to know how this appropriation is expended and for what purpose, and who gets the actual benefit of this $4,000.

Mr. HUSTED. It is our share toward the expense of maintaining this bureau. The headquarters of the bureau are at Brussels. Twenty different countries make annual contributions, according to the size and population of the respective countries, for the maintenance of the bureau, namely: Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Austria, Italy, Spain, Japan, Turkey, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Hungary, Greece, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Rumania, and Serbia. The American Congress joined the union in 1904 and the first appropriation—$2,500—was made in 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to strike out the last word so that the chairman can give us a little more information about this. Does this organization make a report to anybody?

Mr. HUSTED. It is a matter in which our State Department takes no particular interest, they have no connection with it whatever. It is purely a congressional matter. If our

Congress is not interested in having the United States participate in the deliberations of this union, in getting all the information that is available from the bureau, there is no reason why the item should be continued to be carried.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that no part of the appropriation is used for the payment of the delegates.

Mr. HUSTED. It is not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That expense is borne by the delegates themselves?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the chairman's recommendation in regard to this?

Mr. HUSTED. I think we should continue the contribution to the bureau. I think it is a good thing for Members of Congress to meet the members of other parliamentary bodies. It promotes international good feeling.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. KING. What advantage do we get unless there are some reports made of the proceedings? I have investigated in the Congressional Library and I only found one short report made by Judge Slayden, an ex-member from Texas, who was much interested in the parliamentary union at that time. There has been no report of the expenditure since 1904. I presume it has been expended all right. What I would like is a little information to justify the expenditure of this money.

Mr. HUSTED. It is not a large amount of money—only $4,000—as a contribution on the part of this Government toward the maintenance of a bureau which promotes international good feeling and the settlement of disputes through arbitration. I see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES] on the floor, and I would like a statement from him.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. As a matter of fact, if the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MOORES] and the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] could make this trip to Europe on this mission that does not spend more than $4,000 of the people's money, was it not rather a cheap junketing trip compared with what some of the congressional junketing trips cost?

Mr. HUSTED. As a matter of fact, these gentleman do not spend any part of this appropriation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to correct the inference contained in the question by the gentleman from Texas. I understand that these delegates get no part of this appropriation.

Mr. HUSTED. Absolutely no part of it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, it is not a junketing trip.

Mr. BLANTON. The appropriation furnishes grounds for certain Members to make a European trip every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose this motion to strike out. During this discussion which has been had so far the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has not been here, and Governor MONTAGUE is out of the Chamber with the Judiciary Committee; but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has just come in. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN] was at the last meeting of the union, but I am not sure. I was not there. I was there three years ago. This union is maintained to secure an adherence of the various parliaments in some 20 principal countries to the principles of arbitration and peace. Not one of the members of any of these parliaments, so far as I know, has ever had a dollar of his expenses paid by this appropriation or any other appropriation. Every Member of Congress is eligible to membership in the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. That Interparliamentary Union was organized and is maintained for the purpose of inculcating the principles of international arbitration. The amount of $4,000 goes to the secretary, who is still, I think, Mr. Lange, whose home is in Norway. He is an exceedingly able and accomplished man, well posted in diplomacy. The meetings are largely attended by members of parliaments of the many different countries who meet on a common basis and discuss international arbitration and similar matters. It has been my privilege to attend but once. The gentleman from Ohio, Ex-Senator BURTON, has gone many times.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not along the same lines as the League of Nations?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. It is; there is no question about that in a general way. They have the same ultimate purpose—peace; but this union is limited to the members of parliaments of the principal nations of the world. It would seem exceedingly small—for the amount is not great—exceedingly small for the American Congress to refuse to pay this proportion of expenses to the bureau for the circulation of literature. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BURTON may have five minutes.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KING. The gentleman says the secretary lives at Norfolk, Va.?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Oh, no; I said he lives in Norway.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman know where he lives?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. No.

Mr. KING. Does he draw this $4,000 in salary?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. No; this $4,000 goes to the expense of maintaining the bureau and the maintenance of a large clerical force. I think the office is in Brussels.

Mr. BURTON. No; in Geneva.

Mr. KING. That is where the League of Nations is located. I would like to ask the gentleman has the secretary made any report?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. He has made reports to the association to which the gentleman is eligible as a member. The reports are in French and probably would not be of much service to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KING. Why is it that there is no report in the Congressional Library or in the Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the opposition this comparatively trivial item seems to arouse every year. It is along the same line as the expression of a United States Senator who said some years ago, "What have we to do with abroad?" We have a great deal to do with abroad, and our foreign relations are assuming increasing importance every year. This association has existed for some 25 years or more, indeed, 30 years, and has been one of the most helpful agencies for promoting arbitration and international cooperation. It was this body that presented to President Roosevelt a resolution which led to the convening of the second Hague Conference. Its deliberations are not entirely restricted to advocacy of arbitration. In the meeting at Vienna, held in August last, there was an extended discussion of the subject of the rights of minorities in the various nations. A great variety of nations have been represented at various times in the meetings I have attended. Japan is represented at every meeting. Even Turkey and Russia have been represented. This organization affords us a touch with international movements which is of the utmost value to us. It would be a decided reproach to us if we failed to adopt this small appropriation. The expenses are given to the maintenance of the bureau. The secretary, Mr. Lange, has prepared reports, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] will find them in the Congressional Library. There are various volumes; one, especially, for the year 1904.

I wish to say just a word about the idea of detachment that many Members seem to have. We can not keep aloof from movements in the world without the most serious disadvantage to ourselves. This idea that we can live in isolation belongs to the remote past and to a spirit of narrowness that would be utterly unworthy of this House and unworthy of the American people. I trust the motion will be voted down.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Other nations contribute to this fund?

Mr. BURTON. They do. Ours is the largest contribution. The contributions have been very carefully adjusted. Japan contributes, perhaps, two or three thousand dollars. They take into account as a primary consideration population, and the rates of exchange are considered also.

Mr. KING. I notice by the press that this union or some of the delegates attended the meetings of the League of Nations at Geneva. Was that done officially, and were they able to accomplish anything?

Mr. BURTON. Oh no. It was simply done as private individuals. I trust the gentleman will not come anywhere near to being in a fit simply because some of us went to Geneva to see what the League of Nations was doing.

Mr. KING. Oh, I am very glad the gentleman did. I would like to have him tell us about it sometime. I am simply trying to find out what this union is doing.

Mr. BURTON. I was there for five days attending the sessions, and, I may say to the gentleman, without any official sanction from this Government, and I took pleasure in paying my own expenses and conducting myself in my own independent way as an American citizen.

Mr. KING. Oh, I know the gentleman would do that. Was there any particular meeting at Geneva of this Interparliamentary Union to which we are contributing $4,000? Did they have any meetings?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. KING. Did the gentleman see the secretary or visit his office?

Mr. BURTON. Oh, yes; I saw the secretary, if that is what the gentleman desires to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salary of one member of the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1924, $5,000.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. EVANS] please tell me who is the American member of this international conference on agriculture?

Mr. EVANS. I can not give that information.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What are his duties? The gentleman is a distinguished representative of an agricultural State, and I would be glad to have him tell us what the duties of this international gentleman are.

Mr. EVANS. I can give the gentleman more detailed information as to the purpose for which the appropriation is made.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. What does he do during the year?

Mr. EVANS. It is for the purpose of collecting from all countries agricultural statistics as to supply, demand, methods of agriculture, and any information which might be of interest. When collated and gathered together that information is sent to the various countries, and we get ours now through the Department of Agriculture. It is sent to the agricultural constituencies through reports from the agricultural departments.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does this commissioner reside here or in Rome?

Mr. EVANS. I said I do not know who the commissioner is. He is there at times. The situation with reference to this, and to the increase in the appropriation, which perhaps is the reason the gentleman is making his inquiry, is this: The King of Italy furnishes the place, the residence of this bureau, and out of his private funds he furnished a large portion of the expenses of conducting its operations. During the war his finances got into such condition that he could not longer continue to make the contributions he formerly made, and hence there was necessity to increase the amount given by the contributing countries. It was because of that that our contribution was increased.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that Doctor Lubin, who had charge of this bureau, is now dead?

Mr. EVANS. It is. He was the one who instituted it.

Mr. KING. He was the one for whom the appropriation was really made.

Mr. EVANS. It was through his activity. He was the founder of the bureau.

Mr. KING. He was the founder of the bureau and the founder of the appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. In addition to the $5,000 salary, we are also providing in the preceding paragraph $19,000 for maintaining in Rome this particular bureau, which we designate as in the interest of the farmers. This is one continual appropriation, year after another. Will the gentleman tell me a single benefit that he can think of that the ordinary American farmer has ever derived from this appropriation?

Mr. EVANS. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question to his satisfaction. During the time that this item was under consideration a year ago we were in touch with and secured information from our Agricultural Department, and the Assistant Secretary very strongly advised the continuance of the item. I have explained in answer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] the reason for the increase.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; we caught that reason.

Mr. EVANS. The information for which the gentleman asks touches anything which is of interest to agriculturalists in this country, such as plant diseases.

Mr. BLANTON. I was not speaking of theoretical agriculture; I was speaking of the practical, ordinary, everyday farmer in the gentleman's district and in mine. The gentleman has admitted that the most of this increase as is embraced in this $19,000 item is spent for quarters?

Mr. EVANS. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, for what is it spent besides quarters?

Mr. EVANS. No; none to quarters.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I misunderstood the language of the gentleman. He said the King of Italy had been furnishing these quarters out of his own finances, but his finances became involved during the war and he was no longer able to furnish them.

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman is mistaken or else I did not correctly state the facts.

Mr. BLANTON. That is in substance the language of the gentleman. If he does not mean to convey that idea——

Mr. EVANS. What I attempted to say was this: That the King of Italy gave quarters——

Mr. BLANTON. Out of his own finances.

Mr. EVANS. Not out of his own finances, but gave quarters, and then out of his own finances he contributed to the extent of very largely covering the entire expense of the organization.

Mr. BLANTON. That is practically what I said.

Mr. EVANS. He is still giving quarters, but the expense of the organization he can not now maintain for the reasons which I stated.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, get down to the main question. The gentleman is a member of the committee and he should have more information about the matter than anybody else, and if he is unable to give one single benefit that the ordinary farmer in his district and in mine has ever derived from this annual appropriation, does he not think that instead of increasing it to $19,000 for the general fund and $5,000 for the salary that we ought to stop it all in the interest of the American farmer?

Mr. EVANS. But I did not say what the gentleman says I said. I did not say I could not give the information.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I understood the gentleman——

Mr. EVANS. No; the gentleman from Texas, when I tried to give the information, stopped me.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, now, I will suspend and yield the balance of my time to the gentleman, in which I would like for him to give one single practical benefit which the ordinary farmer in his district or mine has ever received from this appropriation for this bureau in Rome. I will yield to the gentleman to answer that question in my time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will answer it.

Mr. BLANTON. I want the gentleman from Nebraska, in charge of the bill, to answer it if he can.

Mr. EVANS. There is gathered from all countries of the world which participate in this bureau information as to plant diseases, plant insects, and the various things which affect the growing of crops. That information is then transmitted to this country and through our Department of Agriculture it is made available to the individual farmer. That is what I meant to say to the gentleman when he stopped me and told me he wanted something practical. That seems to me to be practical.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no practical farmer in my district who has ever received one single benefit from this information which comes from this office in Rome. He does receive some valuable information from the Agricultural Department about the growing of crops in this country. If the gentleman can find a single farmer in his district who has received any practical benefit from this bureau in Rome I would like to know it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Texas I would say this, that the hearings show that a considerable part of this fund is expended in the gathering of statistics. The gentleman from Texas says these statistics do not reach the farmer. The hearings show also those statistics, when gathered, are disseminated through the bulletins of the Department of Agriculture. Now the gentleman will readily concede that there is no literature gives as great benefit to the farmer of this country as the bulletins of the Department of Agriculture, which he uses and every other Member of this House uses by the thousands for distribution and which they find of enormous benefit, and the statistics gathered in this way are disseminated through those bulletins. Let me illustrate in a simple way.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not at the moment. I live in a very great fruit region, one of the greatest fruit regions in the world. We could not be raising any fruit to-day except by the gathering of such statistics as are gathered abroad under this appropriation. Crop and fruit diseases, as a member of the committee has said, have ravaged the European countries for years. The experts there study them and treat them and the diseases are eradicated, or the pest, whatever it may be, like the brown-tailed moth, are exterminated; diseases of wheat, diseases of cotton, in Egypt, for instance, are studied and combated abroad,

where they originate, and the remedies are transmitted to this country. The man who says we derive no benefit from the study of these problems in foreign countries, from the study of diseases which originate there and which are combated there and which they learn by experience how to successfully treat, whereas they might for years be infecting our crops, lessening our crops and making our farmers less prosperous, has not studied the situation, for all those things are of enormous benefit. This small appropriation of $19,000 is insignificant in comparison with the very great advantages that are derived from its expenditure.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; surely.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman this question, if he does not think that $24,000 a year is a high price to pay for the particular information that comes from Rome to our Department of Agriculture?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No. I think it is a very small sum; and I say, in answer to the gentleman, that it does not mean that the information comes from Rome alone; it means also that that information is gathered from all Europe and all Asia; that Rome is but the central point and the very point to gain information, for instance, as to the cotton trouble in Egypt. It is the central point to gain information from all southern Europe, and it is the central point to gain information from Germany and France; and then that information, gathered in these various places and forwarded to the central point, is sent here.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand that this bureau also gathers information concerning the pink boll worm, and that it gives our Agricultural Department information in regard to it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. I understand that is the fact, and it simply puts you four or five years forward in the way of combating a plant disease, and instead of our being obliged to find out how to fight the disease for ourselves the information as to the remedy is gathered abroad and sent here.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. One important thing, it seems to me, is the amount of crop production each year. I wondered if this bureau furnishes any statistics as to the amount of crop production and the marketing of crops.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The hearings show that that is true. If the gentleman will turn to page 63 of the hearings he will find the following:

Mr. CARR. As I understand, it benefits us, in the first place, in this way: That we get uniform statistics of agriculture from all over the world through membership in this institute, which we would not get if we were not members; because, then, all of the Governments would publish their statistics in any way they chose, and there would be no place in which statistics could be brought together and made comparable; and statistics of agriculture in various countries which are not comparable are not of any value in marketing American products abroad.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is this information furnished both by wire and by letter?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; in both ways. When it is important that it be furnished immediately it is furnished by wire, and when it is not so important that it reach here at once it comes through the slower process of the mail.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SECTION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGH COMMISSION.

To defray the actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the Inter-American High Commission, $15,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. KETCHAM. I do so for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Referring to the item in the bill, "Arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims," on page 19, I notice this in the hearings, that the representative of the department testified in the hearing that there was expended only $2,500 out of the appropriation of $55,000 for the year 1922, and earlier in the testimony he states that they will be able to expend all of the appropriation for 1923. He makes no statement with reference to the unexpended balance of $52,500 appropriated for the year 1922. With that in mind, does not the gentleman think we might make a saving of practically the entire amount for 1924?

Mr. EVANS. That lapses. It can not be used, if not used for the year for which it is appropriated. And if it will enable the gentleman to understand any better, I will say that there was no action during the year in question.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is shown in the hearings?

Mr. EVANS. Yes. That is shown in the hearings, and that is the reason why the money has not been expended. But there has been a commissioner representing the United States appointed, and they are now at work presenting cases.

Mr. KETCHAM. Then I understand that of this appropriation for 1922, $52,500 has been covered into the Treasury.

Mr. EVANS. It has been covered into the Treasury.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I wish to call attention to a statement that was made yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] and also to a statement made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] as to the proposed amendment to the Constitution with reference to tax-exempt securities.

The gentleman from Iowa made the statement that if the amendment were adopted it would not affect farm loan bonds that are hereafter issued, in so far as taxes are concerned. If I understood the gentleman from Kansas correctly, he made in effect the same statement. In the meantime I sent for a copy of the proposed amendment, which was introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], and which I suppose is in the very form in which it would probably be adopted.

Now, it is true that at the present time Congress may tax or not tax these bonds, but they are not subject to taxation by the States at the present time. Also, so long as Congress leaves the law as it is at present, the bonds that are issued are never taxable after they are issued. This amendment provides in the first section—

The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes on securities after ratification of this article by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from other States or other securities.

Then the second section provides that—

Each State shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on the income derived by its residents from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States.

In other words, if that amendment is adopted—and it is pursuant to the declared statement of the President—every bond issued by the Federal farm loan system after the adoption of that article will be subject to taxation by the State in which the citizen happens to live who owns that bond, and of course whether the tax is levied at the time of the issuance or not, the man who is buying the bond will want to raise the interest rate enough, or discount his bond enough, to enable him to be sure that the tax is paid by the borrower and not by the lender.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I supposed under the provisions of that amendment the State would have the same right to levy tax on any Government bond.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They have the right, specifically stated, to levy an income tax on any bonds that are held by people in that State; and, of course, when a man goes to buy one of these farm loan bonds he will know that they are subject to taxation at any time hereafter that any State sees fit to tax them. Therefore he will not pay as much for the bond, and as a consequence the bond will have to bear a higher rate of interest, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. TINCHER. I will state this. I hope the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], the author of the resolution, will get together on the meaning of the resolution.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not think anyone can gainsay that construction. It seems to me as clear as the English language can state it. This resolution in the final section provides that—

Each State shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued after the ratification of this article by and under the authority of the United States.

Are not the farm loan bonds issued by and under the authority of the United States? Certainly they are.

Mr. TINCHER. The only point I made was that it would not change the status, so far as the Federal Government was concerned. I never thought of anyone wanting to allow the States to tax farm loan bonds.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I am glad to hear the gentleman state that. But the position stated by the gentleman from Kansas is not the position stated by the President of the United States, and it is not in accordance with the provisions of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, in taking the floor yesterday I had no idea in the world of entering into a controversy over the amendment to the Constitution suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], only it was clear to my mind at the time the controversy came up here that the constitutional amendment would not change the status of the Federal farm loan bonds in so far as the Government was concerned, because I knew we had the power at this time to tax the bonds if the Congress wanted to do so.

I have asked permission to proceed out of order this morning for another reason.

On yesterday while the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] was discussing the matter raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] I suggested to him that Mr. Magon, whom he was then talking about, had had the charity of this Government extended to him in the form of a prison by Government officials instead of deporting him. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], who is very careful of the RECORD, took the liberty of suggesting to the House that I did not know what I was talking about, and that there had been no order of deportation. I do not want to be put in the attitude of stating anything that I do not know about, and I knew the wisdom of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and naturally felt some alarm.

Mr. Magon was an anarchist. He said himself in response to a question at the time of his trial: "I am a communist-anarchist." Later in his testimony he described what a communist is and what an anarchist is. To make a long story short, he admitted that he was against government and that where government interfered with him he believed in destroying government by force. Mr. Magon was ordered deported from the United States, and I want to read that order:

From the evidence of record in this case I find that Enrique Flores Magon is an alien, namely, a citizen of Mexico.

That he has been found in the United States in violation of the immigration act of October 16, 1918, in that he is a member of or affiliated with an organization that entertains a belief in the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States; that he is a member of or affiliated with an organization that advocated the overthrow by force or violence of all forms of law; that he is a member of or affiliated with an organization that teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States; that he is a member of or affiliated with an organization that teaches opposition to all organized government; and that he is a member of or affiliated with an organization that entertains opposition to all organized government, and that he is an alien anarchist.

I therefore recommend that he be deported.

WARREN E. LONG, *Immigration Inspector.*

It was later that Mr. Post held up the deportation, stating that he would not deport Mr. Magon but would leave him in the prison, as his life would be taken if he was deported to Mexico. I do not make this correction and contribution to the facts of history for the enlightment of most Members of the House, but as my friend from California [Mr. RAKER] is a bundle of wisdom itself, seeming to be in possession of all the information in the world save and except this one little thing, I want to put this in the RECORD so that he may embody 100 per cent wisdom.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] does not seem to be present in the Hall.

Mr. TINCHER. I thought he was here. He was here a moment ago.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understood the gentleman from Kansas to say that the gentleman from California had stated that no order of deportation had been entered.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman from California simply stated that he wanted to keep the record straight, and made a statement which would be convincing to all Members of Congress of what I said was false because it could not be true. I know exactly what he said.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the RECORD on page 208 shows that Mr. Raker's statement was as follows:

Mr. RAKER. Is it not a fact that under the law, as it stands to-day, when a man is convicted he can not be deported until after his sentence is carried out?

Mr. TINCHER. He wanted to keep the RECORD straight, and I wish to say that I am in sympathy with the gentleman from California. I am simply making this clear in order that he may be 100 per cent wisdom, because I am sure he did not think that they had ever ordered the deportation of Mr. Magon, and I know it is presumptuous on my part, whether I am familiar with the facts or not, to state anything that relates to the Committee on Immigration when the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas may proceed for one additional minute. Is these objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman from Kansas mind answering this question: In case a person is convicted and sentenced to imprisonment and is also ordered deported, would the gentleman from Kansas favor his deportation prior to the expiration of his prison sentence?

Mr. TINCHER. I was not talking about that phase of the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to know what the gentleman thinks about that.

Mr. TINCHER. There had been an indignation meeting held here in Washington——

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Does the gentleman think it would be better to deport him first and let him serve his sentence later?

Mr. TINCHER. Not being on the Committee on Immigration, I would not presume to express an opinion on that. What I am trying to do is to square myself with that committee and not get into further trouble with them. I was attempting to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] that perhaps it was an act of charity on the part of the Government that they permitted this man Magon to die in prison instead of sending him to his own country where his life would have been taken. The controversy over Magon at the time was between the then Attorney General, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, and a man at the head of the Labor Department named Post. I happened to know all the facts in that particular case, because I attended and was interested in the hearing.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Knowing the facts, would the gentleman have deported Mr. Magon first and let him serve his sentence afterwards?

Mr. TINCHER. I think under the facts in that case, if they were ever going to deport him they would have to deport him instead of sentencing him to prison.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Would the gentleman favor deporting him first?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had the last word, anyhow. [Laughter.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question with reference to the item on page 20 for the United States section of the Inter-American High Commission. This carries an appropriation of $15,000. I note in the hearings that there is considerable uncertainty as to the exact character of the work accomplished by this particular commission. For instance, in the hearings, page 220, this occurs:

Mr. HUSTED. Do you happen to know what they—

Referring to this commission—

are working on at the present time?

Mr. CARR. No.

Mr. HUSTED. Or what they did last year?

Mr. CARR. No; I do not.

That indicates that there is a considerable degree of uncertainty. I want to ask whether or not there is a duplication of work in the Department of Commerce and the Pan American Union with these related subjects, so that this item might be omitted?

Mr. EVANS. No; Mr. Carr, to whom the gentleman from Michigan refers, stated to the committee that there was no duplication.

Mr. KETCHAM. Can the gentleman inform us what is the line of work which this commission carries on?

Mr. EVANS. Pages 108 and 109 of the hearings will give the gentleman the information he is looking for.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is it the judgment of the gentleman that the item is necessary?

Mr. EVANS. It is necessary and should be retained. It has been carried for years.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA.

To enable the Secretary of State to pay to the Government of Colombia the second payment from the Government of the United States to the Republic of Colombia under article 2 of the treaty of April 6, 1914. $5,000,000.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an observation. I do not remember just what the treaty with Colombia provides as to the payment.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman will find the information on page 71 of the hearings. He will find that the second payment is to be made within one year after the first payment, and that the first payment is in process of being made but has not been fully made.

Mr. DENISON. The facts which I want to call to the attention of Congress are these: If there was any way that we could strike the item out of the bill without violating our treaty with the Government of Colombia, I would be in favor of doing so. I would do so for this reason: Before the Panama revolution the Government of Colombia had a great many troops stationed on the Isthmus of Panama, which at that time was a part of the Colombian Republic. The Colombian Government had no money with which to pay her own troops, and so she issued scrip, and the local parties in Panama cashed that scrip in order to enable the Colombian troops to be paid and remain there.

The result of it was that a great amount of Colombian scrip that had been used to pay the soldiers was cashed by the residents of Panama and a number of the banks there. At the time of the Panama revolution this scrip was held by the citizens and the banks, and members of the Colombian Republic who happened to be living on the Isthmus of Panama. After the Panama revolution Colombia repudiated these obligations and has refused until this time to pay the holders of this scrip any of the money which the Government owed them.

The result was that some of the banks in Panama were embarrassed and some of the citizens of Panama lost their fortunes because they had advanced money to cash this scrip issued by the Colombian Government to pay the troops.

We have agreed to pay the Republic of Colombia $25,000,000 to get them in good humor, on account of the revolution which led to the independence of the Republic of Panama. If I had been connected with the State Department or if I had been a Member of the United States Senate, I would have required that the Republic of Colombia meet her obligations to the citizens of Panama before our Government should pay them $25,000,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I think if the gentleman had been a Member of the other body he would not have voted for the treaty even with that proviso.

Mr. DENISON. I think I would not, but if I had voted for it I would have requested the Republic of Colombia to honor obligations to the citizens of Panama who were bankrupted by the repudiation of the Colombian Government. She refused to pay them simply because they resided in Panama, which revolted and won its independence. Now our Government is to pay $25,000,000 because of the supposed connection we had with the revolution, and it seems to me that out of the money we are going to pay to the Republic of Colombia, Colombia ought to pay her just obligations to these citizens of Panama who out of private funds advanced the money to pay the Colombian troops. I think the attention of the American Congress ought to be called to this situation, that the world may know of her repudiation of her just debts to the citizens of Panama. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TRADE-MARK REGISTRATION BUREAU QUOTA OF UNITED STATES.

For the annual share of the United States for the expenses of the maintenance of the International Trade-Mark Registration Bureau at Habana, including salaries of the director and counselor, assistant director and counselor, clerks, translators, secretary to the director, stenographers and typewriters, messenger, watchmen, and laborers, rent of quarters, stationery and supplies, including the purchase of books, postage, traveling expenses, and the cost of printing the bulletin, $4,961.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 22, after line 25, insert: International Bureau of the Union for the protection of industrial property. For the share of the United States in the expense of conducting the International Bureau of the Union for the protection of industrial property at Berne, Switzerland, $1,700.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee I will say that this appropriation has heretofore been carried in the appropriations for the Interior Department under the Patent Office division. It is a treaty obligation that has been transferred to this appropriation bill because the Secretary of State, the Patent Office, and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations have thought, and all concede, that this is the proper place. It is the same appropriation that was carried in the other bill and is not a new appropriation.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does it relate to the international patent office?

Mr. EVANS. It is a clearing house for patent matters.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And trade-marks?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Were all of these international agencies described in the last two or three pages, as well as the one the gentleman has mentioned, created by treaty?

Mr. EVANS. Not all of them, but nearly all. A statement was made with respect to those that were not treaty obligations at the time the item was reached in the reading of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Are they all functioning in a practical way?

Mr. EVANS. So far as I know, each and all of them is. This is true of some of these activities. For a time they may not function because the occasion for their functioning is not present, but, take it year by year, all of them are performing a work deemed valuable by the State Department or by the department for which they function.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill, and it is not authorized by any treaty agreement. The Chair will find, I think, that a point of order has heretofore been made against this item when it appeared in another appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Nebraska on the point of order.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this is under a treaty concluded at Paris on March 20, 1883, adhesion to which was advised by the Senate on March 2, 1887; ratified by the President March 29, 1887; accession to Swiss Confederation announced May 20, 1887; and proclaimed June 11, 1887; and I read from article 13 of the treaty, found on page 1939 of Senate Document No. 48:

An international office shall be organized under the title "International Bureau of the Union for the Protection of Industrial Property." This bureau, the cost of which shall be supported by the Governments of all contracting parties, shall be placed under the high authority of the superior administration of the Swiss Confederation, and shall work under its supervision. Its powers shall be determined by common accord between the States of the union.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of that treaty?

Mr. EVANS. It was concluded in 1883—March 20.

The CHAIRMAN. Signed by whom?

Mr. EVANS. By His Majesty the King of the Belgians, His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil, His Majesty the King of Spain, the President of the French Republic, the President of the Republic of Guatemala, His Majesty the King of Italy, His Majesty the King of the Netherlands, His Majesty the King of Portugal, the President of the Republic of San Salvador, the King of Serbia, the Federal Council of the Swiss Confederation——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the United States a signatory power?

Mr. BLANTON. His Majesty the United States does not seem to be a subscribing party.

Mr. EVANS. In order that we may save time, I ask unanimous consent that this may be passed until we can discover the signature.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it can be brought up later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to pass this section. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I object, because I think it is a matter that ought to be settled now.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request. It is signed for the United States of America by E. Byrd Grubb.

Mr. BLANTON. And was ratified when?

Mr. EVANS. In executive session, March 2, 1887. Article XVII provides:

SECTION 18.

The States that have not taken part in the present convention shall be admitted to adhere to the same upon their application.

This adhesion shall be notified through the diplomatic channel to the Government of the Swiss Confederation and by the latter to all the others.

It shall convey, of full right, accession to all the clauses and admission to all the advantages stipulated by the present convention.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before leaving the paragraph in regard to the International Trade-Mark Registration Bureau I wish to ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question. I note that the quota of the United States, or at least the appropriation for it, has been reduced from something like $10,000 to something less than $5,000. I know that this trade-mark registration bureau is a very important one for the business of this country, and I should not like to see it hampered in any way by lack of appropriations on the part of the United States.

Mr. EVANS. The reason for the reduction of the appropriation is because the activities of the bureau have nearly become self-supporting, and the amount of the appropriation is all that is asked for by the State Department and awarded by the Budget.

As the gentleman probably knows, when this bureau was originally created it came out of one of those many activities in which the Pan American Union engages, and this one has become nearly self-supporting. There is no intention or desire to cripple the bureau.

Mr. TILSON. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say so, because from my own knowledge I can say that this is one of the very important activities that we appropriate for.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will turn to page 74 of the hearings he will see that in 1919 we appropriated $56,000 for this same purpose.

Mr. TILSON. That appropriation was in connection with securing a place of abode for this bureau in Habana.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And they say that the fees that they receive are rapidly bringing the matter to a point where it will become totally self-supporting.

Mr. TILSON. It undoubtedly will, and this fact indicates the extent to which it is used by American citizens as well as any others who wish to avail themselves of the privilege.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It gives protection for a certain limited time.

Mr. TILSON. Without something of this kind we stand to lose a great deal by the taking over of our trade-marks without receiving any equivalent for them.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LONGWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2934. An act to provide for the issuance to John W. Stanton by the Secretary of the Interior of patent to certain land, upon payment therefor at the rate of $1.25 per acre.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 11040) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For paying for the keeping, feeding, and transportation of prisoners in China and Turkey and of those declared insane by the United States Court for China, $5,600;

For rent of prison for American convicts in Smyrna, Turkey, and for wages of keepers of the same, $1,000;

For rent of prison for American convicts in Constantinople, Turkey, and for wages of keepers of the same, $1,000;

Total, $15,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman in charge of the bill inform me what amount is paid for rent of a prison in Constantinople? Are there special cells set aside for American convicts, and who are the keepers?

Mr. EVANS. I do not know except that that is extraterritorial, and I presume the court authority would handle it in that way.

Mr. WATSON. I ask because an American in whom I am interested was a convict in Constantinople. He wrote me he was in an English prison, that he had plenty of food, the keepers were kind, but he wanted to be transferred to America. I wanted to know whether there is a special prison set aside for American convicts, and whether other convicts are placed with them, and how the whole matter is conducted.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I am unable to advise the gentleman as to what the facts are other than what the gentleman knows himself, namely, that we have extraterritorial jurisdiction there, and it would be under the control of the American official and those who had charge of the convicts.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose the keepers are not Americans?

Mr. EVANS. Of course, if we have rented quarters, they would be English keepers, unless we secured the privilege of also having one of our own at that place. That I do not know.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Does the gentleman think we could get very many keepers at $1,000 a year?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know; that is the reason I asked the question. The wages in Turkey are not quite so high as in America, as the gentleman well knows. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, was received.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including not exceeding $10,000 for clerical services and not exceeding $40,000 for compensation of attorneys at the seat of government, $200,000.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to inquire about the section just passed. I was on my feet when it was read. If the chairman of the committee will permit——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. BLACK. I understood the gentleman's amendment to apply to the paragraph in reference to the enforcement of antitrust laws. I wanted to make an inquiry of the paragraph preceding.

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, in lines 9, 10, 11, and 12, on page 30 of the bill, is included an appropriation for per diem in lieu of subsistence. Now, the regular per diem rate is not to exceed $4 per diem, as I understand, and I wanted to inquire if the following language, "when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914," is a restriction so that the per diem allowance of this sum will not exceed $4?

Mr. EVANS. It is the act which fixes the limit at $4.

Mr. BLACK. I had not time to examine the act, but I thought probably that was the case. That was the information I desired.

Mr. EVANS. That is correct.

Mr. BLACK. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 7, after the figures "$200,000," strike out the period, insert a colon and the following words: "*Provided, however,* That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and the associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation unauthorized by law on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, that is a provision that is carried in the current appropriation law, and it was also carried in the law last year and the year before, if I remember

correctly. It was carried in several appropriation bills, and points of order have always been made against it, I think by the same gentleman, or at least by some gentleman, and the points of order have always been overruled and the amendment sustained as proper, being a limitation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman allow the Chair to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Is this exactly in the words of the former act?

Mr. DENISON. It is unless the stenographer made an error, and I compared it very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas on the proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. I submit that the matter is legislation, and while the gentleman from Illinois is correct in stating it has been ruled on once before, and ruled adversely, yet the ruling of that particular Chairman was never passed upon by the House on appeal and did not become the ruling of the committee. Sometimes one Chairman makes a ruling and another Chairman of just as much parliamentary acumen changes the decision by making a contrary ruling. I submit it to this particular Chairman.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to state my own rule is not to vote for any amendment that brings in legislation upon an appropriation bill, and that is the rule I am going to follow. But this is not legislation. In making an appropriation we can place any limitation upon the money to be appropriated. This does not change the existing law, but is simply a limitation upon this appropriation.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. I will state for the information of the Chair that this limitation has been carried on this appropriation bill providing appropriations for the Department of Justice for the past 10 years. The point of order has been repeatedly raised against it, and, as far as I recollect, the Chair never held this limitation is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to follow the rulings that have been made in the past. The Chair distinctly remembers this point being up several times. Last year the same matter was up. It is plainly a limitation, and as such is surely authorized by the rules of the House. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Investigation and prosecution of war frauds: For the investigation and prosecution of alleged frauds, either civil or criminal, or other crimes or offenses against the United States, growing out of or arising in connection with the preparation for or prosecution of the late war, including the institution and prosecution of suits for the recovery of moneys which contain no element of fraud but arose incident to the investigation of alleged frauds, to be available for the employment of counsel and other assistants, rent, and all other purposes in connection therewith, whether in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, including not to exceed $10,000 for communication service, the purchase of furniture, law books, books of reference, and other necessary equipment and supplies at the seat of government, $500,000, to be expended in the discretion of the Attorney General: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia if suitable space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission: *Provided further*, That not more than one person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $10,000 per annum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there was some discussion yesterday with reference to the salaries that were being paid under this appropriation. The hearings and the discussion on yesterday disclosed that about 30 attorneys were employed, 9 of whom receive $10,000 each and the others $7,500 or a lower sum. It was also stated that the chief accountant under this appropriation receives a salary of $18,000 a year. There is no statement in the hearings showing just how many assistant accountants there are. I do find a statement in the hearings showing that there are some 20 receiving salaries ranging from $7,500 down. The hearings fail to show just how many accountants were employed, just how many on the regular roll, unless we take the 20 names to be the number on the regular roll, and also how many special accountants are employed.

I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he can tell us how many special accountants are employed under this appropriation?

Mr. EVANS. There is a director, whom the gentleman has already mentioned. Then there are five ranging from $7,500 to $4,200. There is one engineer accountant at $4,000. There are 14 accountants ranging from $1,680 to $3,600. The reason those facts were not included in the hearings is because they were expressed in the estimates attached to the committee estimate. They are in the Budget, however, so that they are available to the Members of Congress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is that the entire permanent force employed under this appropriation?

Mr. EVANS. That is a fact. Now, there is an accounting service other than that, of which I do not know the exact amount. It is variable. But this is the permanent force which I have given to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, in addition to that force, is it not a fact that quite a number of accountants are specially employed at quite large sums per diem to investigate different cases?

Mr. EVANS. That is possible for a few days, if occasion arose to need them, but not as a rule.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Take the case of the Lincoln Motors Co. Can the gentleman tell us how long that investigation has been going on with reference to the books and accounts of that company?

Mr. EVANS. As I understand, that matter has been concluded.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The hearings suggest that it has been about concluded.

Mr. EVANS. It states that the preparation of the case is about concluded. But I understood the accounting work had been concluded.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. I think if the gentleman will examine the hearings he will find that Mr. Cameron, this $18,000 accountant, stated that the accounting was practically concluded. Can the gentleman tell the committee how long the investigation has been going on?

Mr. EVANS. I can not say.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have been informed on the very best of authority, and I wanted to ask the gentleman for information in regard to it, that an accountant was employed under this appropriation at $50 a day, and that he had a number—I do not know just how many—of junior accountants or assistants, to whom he was paying $25 a day, and that he employed these junior accountants through firms which paid the junior accountants only $200 a month, and that the firm furnishing these junior accountants drew the difference between $200 a month and $25 a day.

Mr. EVANS. I can not give the gentleman either a confirmation or denial of that statement. I do not know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now does not the gentleman think that an investigation ought to be made to ascertain whether or not that is true, because if it is true I am sure the gentleman will agree that it is an outrage upon the Government and upon the Treasury.

Mr. EVANS. There is no question about that.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there was one accountant that received $18,000 a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. That was the information contained in the hearings, that one accountant receives $18,000 a year.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Is that from a direct appropriation, or is it out of a lump-sum appropriation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is paid out of a lump sum, because there is no limitation on these lump sums as to what amount shall be paid.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Does the gentleman know who that is?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is a Mr. Cameron, as appears in the hearings. I do not know him personally. I think the hearings disclose, according to his testimony, the fact that he has been a certified accountant since 1915.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. At that figure?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; not at that figure. He has been employed for the last few months under that appropriation, but he has had an experience of six or seven years. Yet under this appropriation of $500,000, without any limitation as to salary, those in charge of its administration have put him on the roll of the Government at $18,000 a year.

Now, this fact and the other fact that I have stated, if my information is correct—that accountants were employed in the Lincoln Motors Co. investigation at $50 a day, and that the chief accountant employed a number of junior accountants at $25 a day, while as a matter of fact they only drew $200 per month from the firm which they represent, the firm receiving

the difference between $200 a month and $25 a day—it seems to me is the best argument that could be offered against Congress appropriating these immense lump sums and leaving to the officials the right to fix the salaries to be paid thereunder. Because everyone must agree that when we consider the salaries which are paid to attorneys and other experts of this Government it is a perfect outrage to pay an accountant $18,000 per year. Why, the Chief Justice gets only $14,500 a year. The members of the Supreme Court get only $14,000. Cabinet members get only $12,000 a year. The Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of this House get only $12,000 a year. The Comptroller General, the chief accountant of the Government, gets $10,000. Yet here we have a certified public accountant of only six or seven years' experience as such receiving $18,000 out of this lump sum of $500,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In an effort to itemize this particular appropriation would you not encounter this difficulty: The hearings show that at least $100,000,000 is involved in these war-fraud cases. Now, the gentleman is an attorney. Here are these cases, which depend unquestionably upon the closest kind of an investigation both from the accounting and the law standpoints. How can you anticipate just what you are going to find it is necessary to do in a lawsuit? Because that is what you have to do. While generally the gentleman is undoubtedly correct that you should specify your items just so far as it is possible to do so, would that be possible in a variety of lawsuits, each of which involves endless details in the two particulars to which I have referred?

I ask the gentleman in all good faith and in all good nature, is it quite fair to compare the salary of an accountant with the other salaries which have been suggested? Take, for instance, the Chief Justice of the United States. He receives not only a small stated sum per year but he holds one of the most honorable positions in the world, and the honor goes to his compensation as well as the salary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Let us eliminate the Supreme Court. Does not the gentleman think it is entirely fair to compare the salary paid to the chief accountant who is investigating the books and accounts of these companies with the salaries which are paid to special attorneys who are brought in for the purpose of looking after the legal side of the case?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think it is; and yet my own experience as a lawyer has been that you can not get the services of a skillful, competent accountant for less than $50 a day. It seems to me you would want the very highest grade accountant here.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think there is any justification for paying the chief accountant practically twice the sum that is paid to the attorneys who are specially employed and who have to look after the legal side?

Mr. DEMPSEY. While I agree that the comparison is not fair, I have found that you can not get an accountant competent to handle such cases for less than $50 a day. I quite agree with the gentleman that if there has been a loading of the cost here, if somebody has acted as a contractor and brought in a lot of men and has been making double the amount that they make, that should be investigated. But, on the other hand, as to the payment of a high sum to a specially skilled man, I think he would be the cheapest man whom you could possibly secure, if he is really skilled.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think that the Department of Justice, having charge of this matter, having charge of the salaries paid to the accountants, ought to give some attention to the amounts paid to these junior accountants?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If my information is correct—and it comes from a very high source—junior accountants were employed in this Lincoln Motors case, and their firms were paid $25 a day for their services, whereas the junior accountants who actually did the work received only $200 a month from the firm.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I quite agree with the gentleman that that should be investigated.

Mr. EVANS. I wish to give to the Committee of the Whole and to the gentleman from Tennessee the information which the committee has, which is this, that there are a small number of highly paid accountants, but those accountants are supervising others who receive much lower salaries. For instance, those who simply make additions and checkings are not paid high rates at all, and our information is that it is the individual accountants who are paid, not their employers; but I can not answer the gentleman's statement positively about that, and hence I do not make the statement positively. Our information, obtained not only in the hearings but in conversation, is that there has been an attempt on the part of Mr. Cameron to make these investigations just as cheaply as they can possibly be made and at the same time get a high grade of service.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I recall the hearings, Mr. Cameron says that with reference to his permanent force, but he makes no statement with reference to these special accountants who are employed in these particular cases like the Lincoln Motors case; and, so far as I know—I have no information on the subject—there may be similar payments with reference to the investigation of other important cases pending.

Mr. EVANS. As I understand it, all the work in the Lincoln Motors case was done by those permanently employed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The hearings do not disclose that.

Mr. EVANS. The additional question came up as to whether there were other motor cases which were similar to the Lincoln Motors case. I think there are some 14 or 15 in all in which the investigations will run along similar lines, and I think in a general statement he said that all of these investigations were made in the manner I have indicated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman. I should also like the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee for a moment. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee think it is quite possible that the Government finds that in assembling a force of minor accountants it is unable to get them individually, and can only secure a supply of them through the large accounting firms in the country, and that if an attempt was made to get these minor accountants individually there would be delay, and it might be practically impossible to assemble them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say this to the gentleman from New York, that while that may be true, if there are accounting firms who have a monopoly upon junior accountants to the extent that they can pay them only $200 a month and at the same time force the United States Government to pay $25 a day for their use, it seems to me that they are in the class of the very profiteers whom we are seeking to prosecute and send to jail.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Probably the difference is too large, but I think undoubtedly the explanation is what I have suggested to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Congress made an appropriation of $500,000 last May for the purpose described in this particular provision. Now, there is proposed an additional appropriation for the next fiscal year of a similar amount of $500,000. These are very large lump-sum appropriations. The difficulty I have in reading the hearings is to determine how the money is being spent. More or less information is given but not definite and detailed information. I think that information ought to have been had and ought to be furnished here. I do not mean to say that there is an improper expenditure, but I do mean to say that we ought to know what the expenditure is and on what account. If the gentleman has the information I speak of we at least are not in possession of it, and I believe that he will agree that it is desirable that we should have it. I think when great lump-sum appropriations are made there should be a requirement at the time they are made that reports shall be presented somewhere from which it can be known how they are expended, and without such information we may acquiesce in some irregularity and some perversion that was not contemplated when the appropriations were enacted.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will give the information, if I understand the inquiry, which was in the possession of the committee when the bill was presented. As I have alrealy indicated, there is a director at $18,000; there are 5 accountants with a salary varying from $7,500 to $4,200; 1 at $4,000; 14 with salaries from $1,680 to $3,600. There are 2 typists at $1,200, 9 special assistants to the Attorney General at $10,000; special assistants to the Attorney General with salaries varying from $7,500 to $25,000; 1 at $14,000, 1 at $20,000, 1 at $25,000, 1 at $24,000; 11 stenographers with salaries varying from $1,200 to $1,800; 1 chief file clerk at $1,800, 1 at $1,400; 2 special employees, 1 at $1,000, 1 at $900, and 1 messenger at $660. These are permanent salaries.

In addition to this the appropriation of special accountants employed temporarily, the number of which at this time I do not have, but the amount paid to these can be readily arrived at by figuring the salaries of the others which I have given. The supplies and materials amounted to $1,200. Communication required $1,300; traveling expenses, $44,000; transportation of things, $50; stenographic work, $400; photographs, $100;

repairs, $250; special and miscellaneous current expenses, $500; furniture and fixtures, $2,000; educational and scientific equipment, $200; making a total of $500,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KINCHELOE: Page 31, beginning at line 16, strike out the section.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment for the purpose of getting some information if I can. From the reading of the hearings starting on page 126 there is no doubt but what the Department of Justice went before the Budget Committee and asked for $750,000. There is no doubt further that the purpose of that was to either increase the salaries of these accountants and attorneys or to employ more attorneys and more accountants, and there is no doubt further from the hearings that they expect to have a deficit of $250,000 to come in later. I want to read a part of the hearings here.

Mr. TINKHAM. What did you recommend?

Mr. DOWNING. Fifty per cent increase in the cost of the attorney services, at least.

Mr. TINKHAM. What would that be a total of?

Mr. HARRIS. A total of $750,000.

Mr. DOWNING. A total of $750,000 for the entire section.

Mr. TINKHAM. So that you wanted $250,000 for attorneys for the entire section?

Mr. DOWNING. Oh, no, sir; $250,000 more for all the costs of the entire section.

Mr. TINKHAM. Will you tell me what the $250,000 would represent—in detail?

Mr. DOWNING. It would represent additional cost of attorneys and stenographic assistance, additional cost of accounting, additional expense for traveling expenses, additional expense for stationery, additional expense for everything that would accompany the increase in the force.

Mr. TINKHAM. Do you believe that if we only allow you the $500,000 which has been allowed you by the Bureau of the Budget you will incur a deficiency for 1924?

Mr. DOWNING. I do. I might add that this is the first opportunity I have ever had to estimate on these subjects, and my opinion is only worth so much.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill did he get the impression from the hearings that this $500,000 is to go for an increased number of attorneys and an increased number of accountants and an increase in the number of the secretarial force, and so forth?

Mr. EVANS. No; I did not. I understood the $250,000 requested was to increase the number of attorneys and accountants and stenographers and to extend the scope of the investigation. As the gentleman knows, a great many things are crowding now for investigation, and they are all matters quite difficult to prepare. Five hundred thousand dollars, as I understand it, was to carry on practically the same organization that they now have in this division.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But Mr. Downing says that it represents an additional cost.

If you are not going to have an increase of attorneys and stenographers, but an additional cost, it can not mean anything but an increase in the salaries of the present force. Does the gentleman think this Department of Justice needs more than these attorneys already employed under the original appropriation?

Mr. EVANS. The opinion of the committee is evidenced by what they did in the making of the appropriation, in following the Budget recommendation, and I may say to the gentleman that the officer in charge of the Department of Justice touching these matters has stated that there will be no deficiency in any of these expenditures. While Mr. Downing said there would, he qualified it, as the gentleman has read, with the fact that it is his first experience, but Judge Holland stated that whatever was given would be expended, and the best work possible done, and that if more additional expenditures were made it would be presented through the Committee on Appropriations to the House.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was wondering what the attitude of the gentleman would be if they came back later and wanted $250,000 extra, and the facts are that they have increased the number of attorneys and salaries.

Mr. EVANS. Not the number of attorneys and the salaries. The gentleman is wrong. The organization which was made under the $500,000 appropriation is continuing intact, but not being increased.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But I am talking about the $250,000 item. He says that it would represent additional cost of attorneys. Does that mean extra attorneys, or to increase the salaries of the present force?

Mr. EVANS. The $250,000 represented the additional cost, not the $500,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. TINKHAM asked him to tell him what the $250,000 would represent in detail, and his answer was that it would represent additional cost of attorneys, and so forth.

Mr. EVANS. The $250,000, if the gentleman will permit, is the excess over the $500,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Absolutely.

Mr. EVANS. Included within the $750,000.

Mr. KINCHELOE. And they wanted that for the purpose of either increasing the salaries of the attorneys, and so forth, they already have, or for employing additional attorneys, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BLACK: Page 32, line 10, after the word "annum," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That the Attorney General shall report to Congress on or before the first day of its regular session, December, 1923, how the amount appropriated in this paragraph has been expended, classifying the names of the persons to whom paid, and the amount paid to each. A similar report shall be made of the $500,000 appropriated at the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress for the purposes named in this paragraph."

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman might as well make the point of order, because, of course, I do not care to make the amendment if it is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no objection to his language if he will make it so that it will not require the reporting of pay for services to detectives for secret work.

Mr. BLACK. I do not see any reason why he should not report the names of those.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What the gentleman has in mind is this: You are making a report perhaps of cases in progress and by reporting you might disclose some information which might seriously injure the chance of success in the litigation.

Mr. BLACK. I do want to modify the amendment because I intended that the report be made after the expenditure of the money. I ask unanimous consent that the figures "1924" be inserted in lieu of the figures "1923," because what I intended was to require the Attorney General to make a report to Congress after the money had been expended.

Mr. EVANS. If the gentleman will make it so that it will exclude the names of persons who are engaged in secret work, I have no objection to his amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I do not see any force in that suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman modifying his amendment in the manner indicated? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 32, line 10, after the word "annum," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided, further*, That the Attorney General shall report to Congress on or before the first day of its regular session, December, 1924, how the amount appropriated in the paragraph has been expended, classifying the names of the persons to whom paid, and the amount paid to each. A similar report shall be made of the $500,000 appropriated at the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress for the purposes named in this paragraph."

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment as modified.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would suggest that the changing of the date will not obviate the difficulty to which I directed attention. Lawsuits are slow things, and it may easily be possible that a case started now will not terminate by December, 1924. As I understand it, the committee does not want to object to any proper amendment. It seems to me that the amendment ought to be safeguarded in some such way as to state that what is required are expenses in cases which have been closed and in so far as is not incompatible with public policy in cases not yet concluded. I think words to that effect should be added to the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. I would say very frankly that if I could conceive how a report from the Attorney General of the way he has expended money could hamper the department in the prosecution of these cases, I would not offer the amendment, but I

can not see how it will impair in the least the administration of justice.

Mr. EVANS. Of course, much of the work in the preparation of these cases is necessary in the investigation of the facts which have been concealed or are attempted to be concealed.

Mr. BLACK. That is true; but they do not do that in secret.

Mr. EVANS. The same man who is doing that work for the Government is not known to the defendant in the case, and they do not wish him to be known. He may be through with his case and go into another case. We are perfectly willing to have the Attorney General give the information as to the names of all persons except those who are investigating in the manner I have indicated, and the amount, but I do object and shall insist upon the point of order if the gentleman insists on having the names of those persons included, because it furnishes no information to him that is valuable, and it may furnish information to those against whom the cases are being prosecuted that to them will be invaluable.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I withdraw the request temporarily.

Mr. BLACK. Would it satisfy the gentleman's objection if the amendment be modified at the end of the amendment to add the following language, "except as to names of detectives employed under this appropriation."

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, will the gentleman from Texas be willing to have the qualification to his amendment so as to say "not incompatible with the public interest in cases not yet determined"?

Mr. BLACK. Well, if the gentleman wants to offer that amendment——

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly shall offer the amendment if it gets by the point of order, and unless we can agree on something, in view of the statement of the gentleman in charge of the bill, conditions might arise where it might not be for the public interest to have a full disclosure of all employees paid out of this fund, and I think the gentleman will be perfectly warranted in pressing the point of order.

Mr. TILSON. This might arise: If you publish the names of the men who are active in one case which was closed would it not give information to some other party whom he might be investigating?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas has offered to modify it so as to except the name of detectives or special agents, so what possible information can be furnished to a defendant in any lawsuit by simply giving the name of the attorney and the amount paid him and the name of the defendant or anyone else?

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be conditions, I will say to the gentleman, where special agents are not detectives——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Special agents and detectives.

Mr. STAFFORD. What objection can there be to the language I have offered, "except when incompatible with the public interest"?

Mr. BLACK. That means it will go in the discretion of the Attorney General. Mr. Chairman, I ask at the end of the amendment to insert the language, "except the names of special agents and detectives."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the matter indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 32, line 10, after the word "annum," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following language: "*Provided further*, That the Attorney General shall report to Congress on or before the first day of its regular session, December, 1924, how the amount appropriated in this paragraph has been expended, specifying the names of persons to whom paid and the amount paid to each. A similar report shall be made of the $500,000 appropriated at the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress for the purposes named in this paragraph, except the names of special agents and detectives."

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVANS. As the record stands now there is a point of order to the amendment as reported.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no reservation of the point of order as modified.

Mr. EVANS. I reserve a point of order to the amendment as amended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think I can offer an amendment which the gentleman will accept. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas on that point.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph in question appropriates $500,000 for the use of the Attorney General's Department in the investigation of the war-fraud cases. Now, my amendment seeks to have the Attorney General make a report to Congress on or before the first day of the regular session of the December Congress, 1924, of the amount spent, the name to whom paid, and the amount paid to each. Evidently that is a requirement which Congress has the power and the authority to make and would not be legislation upon an appropriation bill. The further provision requiring him to make a report of the amounts expended under a resolution of the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress may be more questionable from the standpoint of the point of order. However, I do not believe that it would be such legislation as is prohibited by the general rule.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, may I make this observation. This is nothing more than an amendment in the nature of a limitation. Certainly Congress, when it makes an appropriation, has the power to say how the money shall be expended, and it further has the power, it seems to me, to provide that a report shall be made to Congress as to the manner in which it is expended. That is all this amendment proposes to do. It is simply in the nature of a limitation upon an appropriation bill. If Congress has the power to make an appropriation of $500,000 for the purpose, it has the power at the same time to say that the spending body shall make a report to Congress as to how it has been expended. It is not legislation. The House could by simple resolution which would not rise to the dignity of legislation direct a report as to the manner in which this money has been expended. It seems to me that it is clearly in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the proponent of this amendment would accept the suggestion of the committee, or that of the gentleman having the bill in charge, to modify his amendment so that this information would not be furnished when incompatible with the interests of the public service. In its present form it is open to very grave objection.

In discussing the point of order I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the following language. This is not a limitation in the first place. It is a positive direction to an executive head to perform some additional duties; and in confirmation of that position I read on page 363 of the Manual, construing Rule XXI, that relates to legislation on general appropriation bills:

Propositions to establish affirmative directions for executive officers (IV, 3854–3859), even in cases where they may have discretion under the law so to do (IV, 3853), or to take away an authority or discretion conferred by law (IV, 3862, 3863), are subject to the point of order.

Now, this amendment is a mandatory direction upon the executive head to make certain specific reports. This is not proposed even in the form of a limitation. The original law authorizing the doing of this work did not provide for any report. Under the original law the Attorney General was left free to utilize the funds as he sees fit. Now, we are placing a further restriction upon him as to the utilization of this fund, not in the form of a limitation, but of absolute, real direction.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has not the Congress the right, in making an appropriation by way of a lump sum, to direct the official who has charge of the expenditure how it shall be expended?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If that be so, has not the Congress the same right to require a report from him to show whether or not he has complied with its will?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has the right to do that, but in the bill authorizing this work no such substantive direction was carried.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There was no bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; there was a bill, which I hold in my hand, authorizing the beginning of this work. It was

passed on May 22, 1922, in which $500,000 was authorized to be expended for 1923. Now, we are proposing to extend that work to the fiscal year 1924.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this statement in connection with the pending point of order: The Attorney General under existing law, under the resolution to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] referred, is authorized to prosecute all the war-fraud cases. The only purpose of that resolution, as I understand it, was to appropriate the $500,000 to enable him to do it effectually, and specifying for what purpose the $500,000 might be used. The language of the present paragraph is a repetition of that purpose.

Now, I will admit that if this $500,000 was an appropriation to carry out some function of the Department of Justice which had already been defined by law and the language of the amendment which I have offered sought to interfere with the Attorney General's discretion, or if we sought by the language of this amendment to give him an affirmative direction in the expenditure of this money contrary to existing law, it would be legislation. But we are not seeking to do that. The only purpose of the language of the amendment which I have offered is to require him to account to Congress for the way it is expended. We do not undertake to direct as to how he shall pay it. We do not undertake to direct as to what sums he shall pay. We do not undertake to direct him in any way except to require him to make a report to Congress; and if we have not that authority, then we have been transgressing it from time to time in practically every appropriation bill that has been passed by Congress.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why could not the gentleman accept my amendment, upon which I understand the gentleman will withdraw his point of order?

Mr. BLACK. Because the amendment is not satisfactory.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman sure he understands it?

Mr. BLACK. I think I do. We will discuss it when the point of order is disposed of.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The resolution referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], passed in May, 1922, authorized an appropriation of $500,000 for the prosecution of war frauds. There is no authorization of this particular $500,000 for this special purpose. Therefore no legislation authorized it. No point of order was made upon the section when it was read, and I submit that under the well-known precedents if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is germane to the section, even though it be considered legislation, a point of order will not lie against it, because the section itself was not authorized by law.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I know of no authority anywhere for extending the doctrine of limitation as we are here asked to do. The purpose for which this appropriation is made is stated in the original law. It is as follows:

> That for the investigation and prosecution of alleged frauds, either civil or criminal, or other crimes or offenses against the United States, growing out of or arising in connection with the preparation for or prosecution of the late war, to be immediately available, for the employment of counsel and other assistants, rent, and all other purposes in connection therewith, whether in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000.

Now, with this authorization in the law, we are asked to reappropriate $500,000 for the next year. Of course, the special purpose is stated in the original law. This is but a continuation appropriation for the purpose of giving a certain amount of money for this ensuing year.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is not the fallacy of the gentleman's reasoning found in the fact that the resolution, a copy of which he holds in his hand and a part of which he has just read, appropriates $500,000 and does not contemplate any subsequent appropriation? If that be true, then this provision here, providing for an additional $500,000 for the next fiscal year, is legislation. It is not based upon any existing law. It is legislation.

Mr. TOWNER. No. The gentleman is mistaken on the proposition entirely, because under an authorization heretofore made we are now continuing the appropriation for another year. Mr. Chairman, we are not asked to express the purpose of this legislation. There may be authorities that go so far in some particular instances where they appear justified—and they would not appear justified in this case under any circumstances—as to hold that the purpose for which the appropriation is to be made may be stated and regarded as a limitation. But that is not the case here. The purpose is stated in the law. The purpose is already determined. Now, we are asked to have a report made giving the names of the persons to whom these amounts of money are to be paid. It is shown beyond question that this appropriation is for the apprehension and prosecution of criminals violating the law. It is shown by the purpose expressed in the original act that that is the declared purpose of the appropriation. This money, then, is to be used for certain definite purposes. Those purposes are stated. It is asked that the names of the persons to whom the money is paid and the amounts to be paid shall be reported, when, if that is done, the very object and purpose of these prosecutions may be defeated. It seems to me that gentlemen who desire, I know, as all do, that these frauds shall be prosecuted, who desire, as all do, that the men who have been defrauding the Government shall be punished, should be anxious that nothing that would prevent their punishment should be placed in the very law that provides for their punishment. But, aside from that consideration, we have now the mere question for the Chair to decide as to whether under our rules this can be considered as a limitation. I do not think there is any authority that goes to the extent asked in this case. For these reasons the objection to the amendment should be sustained.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I want to again call the attention of the Chair to the point already suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee, and to emphasize it, and that is the rule that where an amendment to or a section in a bill is subject to a point of order and the point of order is not made against it, then the point of order can not be made against amendments to that section on the ground that they contain legislation; and I think the reason for that rule will appeal to the Chair. In other words, here is a provision in this bill which is legislation, because, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Tennessee, the original resolution adopted in 1922 only authorized the expenditure of $500,000. That expenditure has already been made.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I think the gentleman's application to this item in the bill is erroneous, because the rule would apply only to a case where there was not a work in progress. This is a work in progress.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. With all due respect to the gentleman from Illinois, for whose judgment when he is in earnest I have very great respect—I believe he is not earnest in this case—this can not be a work in progress. It is not a physical work in progress, such as an uncompleted building or a continuous process of improvement of a stream, such as the gentleman from Illinois has in mind.

That rule has no application here. The resolution of last May authorized the expenditure of $500,000, and that sum of money has been expended. Therefore there is no permanent law authorizing the expenditure of the $500,000 in this bill. If that is true then it is also true that that whole section was subject to a point of order on the ground that it was not authorized by law, and on the ground that it contained legislation, because that provision directs the Attorney General to do certain things. If the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] is legislation, then the other provisions of this section which contain directions to the Attorney General are also legislation. Now, no point of order having been made against the paragraph, the point of order does not lie against amendments which seek to amend the section that contains legislation, and that would have been subject to a point of order if it had been made. Authority for my contention is found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3823, et seq.

I want to suggest this further point to the Chair: My contention is that the power to appropriate carries with it necessarily the implied power to require an accounting of the expenditures made, not on the theory of a limitation, not on the theory that it is an exception to any of the general rules, but there can be no question that under the rules of this House Congress possesses the authority to appropriate money to maintain the Department of Justice, and my contention is that the power to appropriate necessarily carries with it the power to require an accounting as to what has been done with the money. "Appropriating" does not mean simply going into the Treasury and shoveling out so much money into the street.

Appropriating does not mean abstracting so many million dollars from the Treasury, but appropriating means setting apart a certain amount of money for some particular purpose;

and in order to know how that money has been used, in order to know whether it is well spent, in order to know whether sufficient money has been appropriated to accomplish that purpose, Congress has the inherent right as an incident to the appropriating power to require of those into whose hands the money goes an accounting as to their stewardship and as to what has been done with the money appropriated.

So, if the Chair please, I contend that this point of order does not lie; first, for the reason that the section itself is subject to a point of order, and that it contains legislation; and that the point of order not having been raised against the section it can not lie to an amendment that is germane to the section; secondly, that there is comprehended within the power to appropriate the incidental power to require an accounting from the officers into whose hands the funds go as to the use made of such funds.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, just one further observation. I have not before me a copy of the resolution of May, 1922, but my recollection is that the language of this provision is not identical with the language of that resolution, that there is a departure from its terms, and if that is a fact it simply serves to emphasize the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the provision of this bill is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph in question, found on pages 31 and 32 of the bill, appropriates certain sums of money for the investigation and prosecution of war frauds. It has a proviso that the appropriation shall not be available for rent, and so forth, and it is further provided that not more than one person shall be employed at a rate of compensation exceeding $10,000 per annum.

To that section the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] offers an amendment, as follows:

Provided further, That the Attorney General shall report to Congress on or before the first day of the regular session in December, 1924, how the amount appropriated in this paragraph has been expended, specifying the names of the persons to whom paid and the amounts paid to each. A similar report shall be made of the $500,000 appropriated at the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, for the purposes named in this paragraph, except the names of the special agents and detectives.

It has grown into a rule of the House, although the Chair believes it is not specifically stated in any rule, that limitations on appropriations may be made, the theory being, of course, that the body which makes an appropriation can make any proper limitation on its use.

The Chair can see in this particular language no limitation on the use of the money that it appropriates. How does it limit it? How does it in any way say how the money shall be spent or for what purpose or to what extent? It is not a limitation. The provisos in question are plainly provisos made as to some duties imposed on the Attorney General.

The point of order is made to it which I assume is made under the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XXI, which provides:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This proposed amendment does not do any of the things mentioned in clause 2 of Rule XXI. There is no retrenchment sought to be made by it or any reduction in the amount to be expended.

The thing that is required by the amendment is this: The Attorney General shall report to the Congress on or before the first day of its regular session certain things—that is, how the money appropriated by this section shall be expended, and, second, the Attorney General shall make a report about the $500,000 that was appropriated by a former act. These are reports not required by existing law. The Attorney General is not required to make reports on these matters except by the amendment, and therefore this amendment imposes substantive duties upon the Attorney General, and, of course, is new legislation.

Now, to meet that point the gentleman from Texas argues, and argues very well, that the original paragraph under which this amendment is offered was not in order if a point of order had been made against it because it contained new legislation, and therefore this particular amendment which he claims is germane, although it contains new legislation, would also be in order to that section.

The rule invoked by the gentleman from Texas is that in an appropriation bill a paragraph embodying legislation may be perfected by a germane amendment, even though the germane amendment itself contains legislation. It is conceded this is the law. However, it has been held on numerous occasions that this exception to the general rule does not permit an amendment which adds additional legislation—that is, legislation not comprehended by, or embraced within, the subject matter of the paragraph sought to be amended. To illustrate this principle the Chair cites Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, paragraph 3830. In that case the Chair held—

That if a paragraph has been included in the bill which has in it a taint of illegality or of being contrary to existing law, that paragraph can be corrected or perfected by an amendment; but if the further paragraph which is proposed as an amendment carries a further degree of illegality affecting the whole paragraph as amended, then it is not in order.

Again, in the same volume of Hinds, paragraph 3862, where a provision in the naval appropriations bill which provided for the construction of new battleships, one to be named the *Maine*, was under consideration, where an amendment was proposed to name one of the said battleships the *Missouri*, it was held that while it would have been permissible to strike out the word *Maine* and insert any other name, it was not permissible to so change the law as to name more than one ship. To a similar effect is a decision made by Chairman Dalzell, found in the same volume of Hinds, paragraph 3838.

The substance of these rulings is that in an appropriation bill a paragraph embodying legislation may be perfected by a germane amendment, but that this does not permit an amendment which adds additional legislation.

If this is the parliamentary law there can be little doubt about what the ruling ought to be on this amendment. If the amendment were confined to requiring a report on the various items of appropriations contained in this paragraph it might be held to be in order, although that depends upon the question as to whether the original paragraph contains legislation, a point which has not been urged upon the Chair and upon which the Chair does not now express an opinion. But the amendment goes further and requires the Attorney General to report as to his expenditure of sums of money appropriated by a former act of Congress, and thus introduces new matter not covered by this pending bill in any way. It therefore does not come within the exception to the general rule forbidding legislation, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that there is in the gallery the greatest aggregation of football men ever assembled in one place, the Waite High School of Toledo. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

JUDICIAL.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Salaries: Chief Justice, $15,000; eight Associate Justices, at $14,500 each; marshal, $4,500; nine law clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding $3,600 each; nine stenographic clerks, one for the Chief Justice and one for each Associate Justice, at not exceeding $2,000 each; in all, $185,900.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to ask a question about a previous paragraph. I do not see the chairman of the subcommittee or the gentleman from Nebraska here, but I will put my question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who seems to now be in charge of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will try to the best of my ability to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. On the top of page 31, in a paragraph previously passed over, there is a provision that contemplates the automobile purchased from the appropriation for the detection and prosecution of crimes shall hereafter be under the exclusive control of the Director of the Bureau of Investigation. I was wondering when the lump-sum appropriation had been used to purchase an extra automobile for the Director of the Bureau of Investigation, and whether or not there was any specific authority granted in the lump-sum appropriation at the time the purchase was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps this appropriation was utilized rather belatedly for the purchase of this automobile, as belatedly as the gentleman from Tennessee has propounded his question. We passed that paragraph some time ago. If we have to take up the time of the committee in going back to these paragraphs we will not make much progress.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman may consider that an answer to my question.

Mr. STAFFORD. Having some acquaintance with automobiles in the Army, I would not give much attention to just one

lone automobile for the Department of Justice. Whether it is warranted or not we can well afford to pass it over without much debate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My question is propounded in all seriousness, if these lump sums are being used for the purpose of purchasing automobiles?

Mr. STAFFORD. From my acquaintance with the hearings and the work in the various departments, I think the gentleman from Tennessee will confirm me in the statement that lump sums are not being used for the purchase of automobiles; that there was probably a specific authority for its purchase. It is highly probable that an automobile was transferred from the War Department to this service, and this authorization is to provide for its upkeep.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the conjecture of the gentleman from Wisconsin, which the gentleman from Tennessee could make quite as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask that the gentleman be given two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the situation was this: The committee granted an automobile a year ago for the detection and prosecution of crimes in the District of Columbia. They discovered in the hearings before them this year that it was being used for other purposes. The automobile was already purchased; the price had been paid. It was needed for the purpose for which it was purchased, and the committee by this provision simply effectuates the intention of Congress when it purchased the automobile. It confines its use to the detection and prosecution of crime in the District of Columbia. That is the sole purpose of it, and that is the way in which it originated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Do I understand that the automobile was purchased solely for use in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DEMPSEY. For the detection and prosecution of crime.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was just wondering why the Director of the Bureau of Investigation of Crime needed an automobile in the District of Columbia, especially when he is on a $7,500 a year salary, any more than any other bureau chief in the city of Washington. I thought we had cut out the proposition of buying automobiles and furnishing them to bureau chiefs.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The District of Columbia is rather large. It is 10 miles square. You can not possibly walk over the District of Columbia and either detect or prosecute crime.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You know that that is a matter for the police of the city, and we know that the Director of the Bureau of Investigation has to do with crimes over the United States, and that his duties are almost altogether confined to that.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; that is not a matter exclusively for the police in the District any more than elsewhere in the country, but Federal officials are employed to do this work, and they and the local police act together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURTS.

Salaries: One hundred and twenty-five district judges, at $7,500 each, $937,500: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the salaries of all United States district judges lawfully entitled thereto for the fiscal year 1924.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 15, after the figures "1924," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this $937,500 shall be paid in salary to any district judge who willfully fails or refuses to enforce any Federal law under his jurisdiction."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment because it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this has been ruled upon several times. This particular matter was ruled on just the other day in the Treasury appropriation bill. Just such an amendment was offered under the appropriation for the salaries of revenue officers, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] who was Chairman at the time, presiding over the committee having under consideration that bill—and I think no one will deny he is a good parliamentarian—held that the point of order was not well taken, that this was merely a limitation. I offer his ruling in that respect. It was not appealed from, and I call attention to various rulings similar to it preceding it during the last five or six years, holding that it is a limitation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is not every limitation on an appropriation bill that is in order. The duties of the judges are prescribed by law.

Mr. BLANTON. It was this particular amendment, practically word for word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here an attempt is being made to change those duties by a substantive enactment in the way of a limitation on an appropriation bill. There are rulings which hold that you can restrict the appropriation when there is no legislation appertaining to the use of the fund, but these judges have their duties prescribed by law, and it is an attempt now to change the duties under the form of a limitation. Under the guise of a limitation you can not change existing law. That is what the gentleman is attempting to do.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to give the Chair the specific precedent. I call the attention of the Chair to page 221 of the RECORD for December 8, 1922, in the second column. This amendment was offered by myself:

Page 28, line 8, after the word "standing," strike out the period, insert a colon, and insert the following: "*And provided further*, That no part of this $9,000,000 shall be paid in salary or expenses to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who willfully fails or refuses to perform his duties connected with the enforcement of the laws mentioned in this paragraph."

Then the following occurred:

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment. I do not think anybody can justify it.

Mr. BLANTON. It is merely a limitation.

Mr. MADDEN. That is already covered in the law itself. The law provides that men who fill these places are under oath to enforce the law, and where a man willfully refuses to do that, of course the remedy is to put him out of office. If he willfully violates the law and commits a crime by so doing he ought to be prosecuted. I do not think this is a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this amendment is simply a limitation. Whether it is desirable or not is for the committee, and not the Chair, to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this is a limitation. It is true that if it were followed it might change the law to some extent, but it is a limitation nevertheless. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition on the amendment. In his message to the Congress last Friday the President of the United States intimated that he had determined upon one thing, and that is that the prohibition laws of the country shall be enforced by the courts, and in that connection I call attention to what he said. He said that such a course "would save humiliation of this Government and humiliation of our people before the world, and that it challenges the destructive forces engaged in widespread violation, official corruption, and individual demoralization."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Those are the words of the President. In the press, within the last 24 hours, we find that in the city of Baltimore, not 40 miles distant from this Capitol, there have been within the last few days nine policemen suspended because they were found under the influence of intoxicating liquor, and were found to have disobeyed orders to stop drinking in the saloons of Baltimore. Saloons under prohibition laws! These laws that are supposed to have put them out of existence! Why do they exist?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman is not addressing himself to the amendment under discussion. He is criticizing the enforcement officers of the prohibition service and not the judges of the United States. The very amendment is in itself a severe arraignment of the integrity of our judges.

Mr. BLANTON. It was the gentleman's President who arraigned them, not I.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that in yesterday's Washington Times, on page 4, it is shown that within 48 hours preceding last Saturday there were 43 drunken men arrested in the District of Columbia. Oh, they will arrest the poor drunk and put him in jail, but the bootleggers who violate the prohibition laws, who sell him the liquor, are turned loose or are permitted to pay a measly little fine that is merely a license.

In the same Washington Times, on page 15, it contains this statement:

The largest turnover of money for whisky and other liquors since prohibition began three years ago will be recorded this Christmas, revenue officers said to-day.

On the first page of the same paper yesterday evening was this: That Commissioner Oyster shows that 1,967 bootlegging cases are pending in court here in the District of Columbia, and here is Commissioner Oyster's statement:

What does make it hard, however, is to have so little court attention that the bootleggers and other liquor violators, realizant of the police department's helpless position, run rampant and make the job of running them down twice as hard.

Then Commissioner Oyster shows that since last August the policemen here in the District of Columbia have taken from bootleggers the following amounts of liquor:

Liquor.

Whisky	gallons	8,233
Gin	do	358
Alcohol	do	1,495
Cider	do	1,029
Champagne	do	7
Wine	do	3,494
Home brew	do	687
Cognac	do	160
Alcoholic beverages	do	523
Pela tonic	do	870
Brandy	do	10
Extracts	bottles	14,592
Beer	do	1,504
Mash	gallons	10,963

And have apprehended 130 stills here in the District of Columbia. This is in the Nation's Capital.

This exists because the law is not enforced, and if you will merely suggest to these district judges and the district attorneys throughout the land that their salaries are going to stop if they do not uphold their oaths to see the laws are enforced you will then see that they will pay more attention to the law of this land.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am as much in favor of the enforcement of the prohibition law as any man in this House, or any man outside of it, for that matter, but the manner in which the gentleman from Texas offers his amendment is not the way to proceed. His remarks have not been directed at the judges, but, rather, at certain officers of the law whom he claims have not been properly enforcing its provisions. If the gentleman from Texas has any evidence to present that any Federal judge is willfully refusing to enforce the law, I will join with him at any time in impeachment proceedings, and that is the only way to proceed under the Constitution by which a judge can be reached. The Supreme Court has recently held that even the taxation of the salary of a Federal judge, becauses it decreases his compensation during his term of office, is forbidden by the Constitution. We can not try him by any other method except by impeachment, and no officer of the United States is authorized to try him. This amendment, if it can be enforced, which I doubt very much, is absolutely unconstitutional.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I care to add anything to what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], except I agree with him in every enforcement law, and the enforcement of law, that this would leave the power in the Comptroller General to take all discretion away from Federal judges. For instance, I think there is some abuse of discretion by judges, and I think we should perhaps correct that by amending the law and the minimum punishment for the violation of law, but I do not think seriously we ought to adopt this amendment giving to the man who issues the pay checks final authority to pass on the qualification of district attorneys and judges. I would be more afraid that the time would come when an amendment like this would rise up to defeat the law enforcement rather than to help it. I think, however, it is a very good thing to have the attention of judges and district attorneys called to the fact that Congress is observing some of the sentences and lack of sentences being imposed.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is constructive; what plan would he offer to follow up the suggestion made by the President that the law must be enforced, and that it is not now being enforced?

Mr. TINCHER. An amendment just like that adopted by the dry State of Kansas, increasing the minimum punishment and taking from the judges——

Mr. BLANTON. The right to fine a man 1 cent and——

Mr. TINCHER. Absolutely; that would be my cure for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 1, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of necessary quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $7,000; books and periodicals, including their exchange; stationery, supplies, traveling expenses; heat, light, and power service; drugs, chemicals, cleansers, furniture, pay of bailiffs and all other necessary employees not otherwise specifically provided for; and for such other miscellaneous expenses as may be approved by the presiding judge, $3,965; in all, $10,460.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I ask to return to the last paragraph. I endeavored to secure recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment to correct a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 18, strike out the amount "$3,965" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For custodian of the building occupied by the Court of Claims, $500, to be paid on the order of the court, notwithstanding section 1765 of the Revised Statutes or section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was speaking a few minutes ago as to the expenses incurred by the Department of Justice for salaries of accountants. By turning to pages 136 and 137 Members will find a full statement in regard to that matter.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is in the hearings?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; it is in the hearings. You will find there that the full number of men employed is given at 32. You will find that their salaries are given. You will find that their salaries aggregate $108,980, and you will find that the average price per day paid to these accountants, instead of being $25 a day for simply the assistant accountants, is only $11.33 a day for principal and supervising and junior accountants.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have read that statement, and I think it was read by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. EVANS] during the discussion. I have read that statement to which the gentleman refers. But I was speaking of information which I had received, and I was asking if it was correct or not as to the employment of special accountants.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman would read a little further, on page 137 he will see that the special accountants referred to were also covered by the testimony. He will find that the special accountants are furnished not at the rate that the gentleman speaks of but at a specially low rate, and that the chief accountant had made a special arrangement in order to obtain those rates. I will condense the substance of his testimony. He says he has obtained the services of these accountants not at the regular prices but at very much reduced prices by means of a special arrangement that he was able to make. He has not only obtained the services of these accountants at less than the regular prices but also the services of the members of the great accounting firms on the same terms as those which they were regularly paid for assistants in their offices.

When you are building up a great force of that kind of accountants and engineers and experts you have to go through the process of elimination, and he has avoided that, and from these great firms in New York and Chicago and other large centers he has obtained the services of picked men, so that no process of elimination was or is necessary. In other words, he has secured, as he says in the subsequent part of his testimony, the services of men of national reputation, men whose reputation is so great that it is Nation-wide, in the Department of Justice on terms below the terms charged by ordinary accountants when the ordinary employer of accountants applies to such firms for their services from time to time. In other words, instead of these employments in the Department of Justice being a matter of scandal, instead of their being a matter of criticism, instead of being a matter to which objection could be made, it develops upon investigation that the man who has charge of this force, who is said to be receiving a fair sum for his services, is so skillful a man, is a man of such great executive ability, that he has been able not alone to render great service to the country in his personal capacity, but he has been able to build up a splendid force of experienced men at a minimum of cost. So that instead of receiving criticism here, the accountants and the chief accountant in partic-

ular are only to be praised for this one thing to which criticism has been directed in the discussion of this bill, and I think in fairness this should be stated, not only for the Department of Justice, but for the men immediately in charge of this work. I think a careful perusal of this testimony will show that not only what I have said is true, but true to a degree that it is not practicable to show here unless I should go into more minute detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee rose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the five minutes. I thought this discussion had closed. I will state to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] that I had read the hearings that appear in the volume before me. I am perfectly familiar with the testimony, and I presume the gentleman is familiar with the statements made there with reference to the permanent force. Mr. Cameron does say he has a permanent force of 32 men, his salary being $18,000, and others getting $7,500 and less sums; but the point of my inquiry a while ago was as to the employment of special temporary accountants.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not yield in the five minutes. Let me make this connected statement, and then if I have time I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The point of my inquiry a while ago was as to the special temporary accountants under this appropriation. The gentleman in charge of the bill stated that they could not give the information. I stated, and I state again, that I have information from a source which I believe to be perfectly reliable to the effect that temporary accountants are employed and that an accountant was employed in the Lincoln Motors case at $50 per day and that he employed junior accountants, paying for them $25 a day, whereas those junior accountants received only $200 per month from the firm by which they were employed, the firm receiving the difference between $200 per month and $25 a day. My inquiry was directed for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not that was true. The gentleman from New York has not controverted the statement. He has had opportunity to telephone to the Department of Justice and get the information. Why not get into telephonic communication with the Department of Justice and tell the House whether or not it is true? The point I make is that we should put an amendment on this provision, so that the Attorney General will be required to report the facts. When we attempt to do that we find the gentleman from New York and other gentlemen very vehemently insisting on a point of order to prevent the disclosure of such facts.

I do not see any reason why Congress should not be told how this money is being expended, and ascertain whether or not there are temporary accountants employed, not the men the gentleman from New York is referring to but whether one man who is drawing $50 a day and junior accountants $25 a day, whereas they are actually employed by a firm which pays them $200 a month. The country ought to be told the facts.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The latter half of the first long paragraph at the top of page 137, and the next paragraph, deal with exactly what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That refers to the permanent organization and does not say a word about temporary accountants.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think it refers to just this.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Read the language.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Cameron says:

I told them that I felt and had told the Attorney General that this organization, which was an organization of accountants and engineers, could not be had without a process of elimination, as we had known that to be a fact from our past 25 years' service; that he could not wait for the process of elimination and therefore I had an understanding with these men. I said: "I want you to say to me, as the principal member of this firm, that I can call on your services as a supervisor and principal accountant, and in many cases furnish you (me) my (their) own assistants," something rather unusual in their business, because you are taking away some of their profits.

Now, as I understand this language it means that he made an arrangement not only to build up a permanent force but he made an arrangement to call upon them for temporary supplies of help from time to time as they were needed, and by that arrangement he secured the services of the partners or the supervising accountants at the same rate at which you would ordinarily secure the services of junior accountants. That was the arrangement that he had made and that is the arrangement under which the investigations are being made.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not an answer to my inquiry as to whether or not there were special accountants employed in the Lincoln Motors case who were getting the salaries that I referred to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why does it not answer it? If he has a general arrangement, why are we to suppose that he has made an altogether different arrangement in the absence of any testimony at all to that effect and contrary to the existing testimony?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He does not make any statement which contradicts the information I have received.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed by order of the committee. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERRITORIAL COURTS.

Alaska: Four judges, at $7,500 each; 4 attorneys, at $5,000 each; 4 marshals, at $4,000 each; 4 clerks, at $3,500 each; in all, $80,000.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word with reference to the need for a requirement for reporting to Congress the expenditure of these lump-sum appropriations. I do not think that the Committee on Appropriations, except in very exceptional cases, ought to bring in a lump-sum appropriation without a legislative requirement of that kind. If I understand the policies of Congress, it is always desirable and it is the practice of Congress wherever possible to itemize these expenditures and to appropriate specifically for different items; but I recognize that that can not be done in all cases.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman will find an itemized detailed statement in connection with every lump-sum appropriation printed in the Budget.

Mr. BLACK. I have understood from the discussion this afternoon, which I have followed with a great deal of interest, that there has not been any detailed account of this $500,000 item, except in part.

Mr. MADDEN. Is the gentleman talking now about the $500,000 item for the Department of Justice?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman must know that to make a detailed itemized statement of that would be to disclose the hand of the Government to those whom the Government is prosecuting.

Mr. BLACK. I can not see how the Government would disclose its hand by making a statement from the Attorney General's department as to how it has expended money in the orderly process of the enforcement of the law.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. As a general principle I believe the most complete reports should be made as to every expenditure, and in the greatest detail. But here is a matter standing alone, where the country, through its Department of Justice, is endeavoring to prosecute those who are charged with frauds against the Government. To the extent that you disclose the action of the Department of Justice, to that extent you make it easier for the men charged with crime to escape.

Mr. BLACK. I do not insist and have not insisted that it be done at the time the expenditures are made; but after the expenditure of the money it seems to me it is the duty of the Department of Justice to make a detailed report. Perhaps the report will be made anyway, but there is no harm in making it a requirement of law. Here we have the case of an accountant in the Department of Justice, under an appropriation of $500,000, getting a salary of $18,000, when we pay the Comptroller General of the United States only $10,000. My experience as a Member of Congress has been that the indefensible extravagances of the Government have been out of these lump-sum appropriations. It is time that Congress required a detailed accounting as to how the money has been spent in each and every one of them, not only as to the Attorney General's department, but all other departments of the Government.

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman understands, does he not, that I read into the RECORD a detailed statement of exactly what was proposed to be done with this money?

Mr. BLACK. I understood the reading of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. EVANS. And also that the only objection made to the amendment was when you insisted on having certain things reported which might be prejudicial to the ends of justice?

Mr. BLACK. I understood the gentleman's attitude, but that still does not meet the objection I make, to wit, that the Attorney General may spend this $500,000 as he sees fit and make no detailed report of it to Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. No one in this Chamber is more insistent on detailed appropriations for employees of the various departments than I am, but it has been the invariable rule of the Congress that when we create a new agency, like the Federal Trade Commission—and there are many others that I might cite—Congress is necessarily compelled to vote a lump-sum appropriation to permit of its organization. It is never the policy of the Government to parcel out piecemeal appropriations for clerks and to schedule their salaries in advance when those who are organizing the bureau or the activity do not know in advance what will be required. When the Committee on Appropriations first considered this proposal to appropriate $500,000, they placed only one limitation upon that appropriation, and that was that not more than one person should be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $10,000. The Attorney General has not abused the confidence imposed in him by Congress in employing only one person at $18,000. The gentleman having this bill in charge called the attention of the committee in detail, place after place, to an exact statement of how it is proposed to expend this $500,000 in the ensuing year. They might just as well have written it into permanent law, but as this is merely a temporary activity which will expire in a year or two, the Committee on Appropriations, following the custom and practice, did not think it advisable to take that course, and accordingly it is a lump-sum appropriation.

I ask for the reading of the bill.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES COURTS.

For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies, including the office expenses of United States marshals in the District of Alaska, and hereafter the Attorney General shall pay the office expenses of United States marshals in the District of Alaska from the appropriation, "Salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies," services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise, services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when so specially directed by the Attorney General, and maintenance, alteration, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-driven passenger-carrying vehicles used in connection with the transaction of the official business of the office of United States marshal for the District of Columbia, $2,275,000: *Provided*, That there shall be paid hereunder any necessary cost of keeping vessels or other property attached or libeled in admiralty in such amount as the court, on petition setting forth the facts under oath, may allow: *Provided further*, That marshals and office deputy marshals (except in the District of Alaska) may be granted a per diem of not to exceed $4 in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 37, line 3, after the word "subsistence," strike out the period, add a colon, and then insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this $2,275,000 shall be paid in salary or expenses to any United States marshal who willfully fails or refuses to perform his duties connected with the enforcement of any Federal law under his jurisdiction."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, no one better than I recognizes the futility of trying to pass just now some amendment that would enforce the prohibition law when we now have the ever alert, ever active, able, highly intelligent, ever present, and ever working distinguished gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. STAFFORD] sitting at the head of the table in charge of this bill. While I differ with him on several subjects, I love the gentleman from Milwaukee. He is one of the hardest working Members in Congress. I do not know of a man in Congress who eternally works harder in cutting down expenses and saving the money of the people than does the gentleman from Milwaukee. But if there is one thing and one subject upon which his mind is absolutely fixed in protecting, it is that thing which made his home town famous. [Laughter.] You are not going to get any kind of an amendment through with him sitting at the head of the table. For instance, when I presented the last amendment it was the gentleman from Milwaukee who made the point of order against it. Then, when a vote was taken, in the hope of trying to show to his Milwaukee constituents that we had a wet Congress instead of the dry Congress, he forced a division of the question, knowing that we had but a little handful of men here, and everyone recognized, as I did, the futility of trying to pass such an amendment just now; he knew that the Members would not go to the trouble of rising to vote. He knew I was about the only one who would vote for the amendment, and this would be a good showing to Milwaukee, that the great House of Representatives on an amendment to enforce prohibition would vote 1 for prohibition and 52 against. [Laughter and applause.] Fifty-three Members here considering a bill which takes out of the people's Treasury $33,188,151.50 of the public money! Fifty-three men! With the full membership here results would have been different. I want to say that I want to see the President's recommendation carried out. It is a disgrace to this country that there is such a laxity in the enforcement of the prohibition laws. Do you know who is responsible, so far as this Federal Government is concerned? Three men in each district are responsible alone; one the district judge who charges the grand juries and who sits at the trial, the other is the marshal who collects the evidence for the court, and the third is the district attorney who is supposed to enforce the law. It lies with them as to whether the law is going to be enforced or not. It is according to their decision as to whether the law shall be enforced or not.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman must know that the marshal has nothing to do with the enforcement of the law. There is a prohibition enforcing corps, under Mr. Haynes.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I know during the eight years I sat as circuit judge in Texas it was within my power to enforce the prohibition law and to see that all laws were enforced. It was within the power of the district attorney, it was within the power of the sheriff to see that criminals were apprehended.

Every United States marshal in the United States has jurisdiction to apprehend these criminals, to bring the evidence before the district attorney, put it before the court that it may be submitted to the grand juries, and they could help to have the law enforced.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] says that it is a hit at the judiciary, that it is intimating that they are not doing their duty. He says that his remedy is to pass a law taking away their discretion in fixing the minimum punishment, to take away the discretion which permits them to fine a criminal who admits that he is bootlegging one cent and turn him loose. He says we must raise the minimum punishment. The very minute he uttered those words he admitted my argument; the very minute he uttered those words he admitted that the judiciary was not doing its duty in enforcing the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the present paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of United States district attorneys and expenses of United States district attorneys and their regular assistants, including the office expenses of United States district attorneys in Alaska, and for salaries of regularly appointed clerks to United States district attorneys for services rendered during vacancy in the office of the United States district attorney, $900,000: *Provided*, That United States district attorneys and their regular assistants may be granted a per diem of not to exceed $4 in lieu of subsistence, instead of, but under the conditions prescribed for, the present allowance for actual expenses of subsistence.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 37, line 14, after the word "subsistence," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of this $900,000 shall be paid in salary to any United States district attorney who willfully fails or refuses to enforce any Federal law under his jurisdiction."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, it is so patent that we can not pass this amendment, and in order to help the distinguished gentleman from Milwaukee in the dispatch of business, I move that all debate on the paragraph now close.

Mr. TILSON. I make the point of order that there has been no debate.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; I have debated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of clerks of United States circuit courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, expenses of travel and subsistence, and other expenses of conducting their respective offices, in accordance with the provisions of the act approved February 26, 1919, and the act approved June 1, 1922, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923: *Provided*, That per diem in lieu of subsistence not to exceed $4 per day may be granted to deputy clerks and clerical assistants to clerks of United States district courts, instead of but under conditions applicable to the allowance for actual expenses of subsistence, as provided in the above-mentioned act of February 26, 1919: *Provided further*, That hereafter the number and compensation of deputy clerks in Hawaii shall be fixed by the Attorney General as in other judicial districts, $1,400,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in the item on page 38, for salaries of clerks and deputy clerks, there is a provision for a per diem allowance in line 15 which is slightly different from the provision on page 36 for deputy United States marshal. I want to know the reason for this difference, and also to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for many years the deputy clerks have been underpaid, and to ask him if this paragraph just read will give to these clerks or deputy clerks some increased per diem allowance, to which I feel they are entitled.

Mr. EVANS. This was intended and will give them just the per diem that is mentioned.

Mr. SEARS. In other words, they may receive $4 per day now.

Mr. EVANS. Yes; if it is actually expended.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous expenditures, including the same objects specified under this head for the penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans. (including the special provision for motor car), and not exceeding $500 for maintenance and repair of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $130,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I observe that $659,000 is appropriated for the Leavenworth Penitentiary. Does this mean that it costs that much to run the penitentiary in addition to what the institution received from what the prisoners manufacture?

Mr. EVANS. Oh, no. That goes into the Treasury. This is the gross cost. As a matter of fact, inmates of Leavenworth and other prisons are producing commodities of considerable value, the proceeds of which are covered into the Treasury of the United States. This item is the entire cost, including the clothing, the maintenance, and subsistence of prisoners.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman able to tell the committee how much, or approximately how much, more it costs than is received from what the prisoners produce to carry on this prison?

Mr. EVANS. I could not tell the gentleman the difference at this time. It does cost more, but it is the fact that the Federal prisons are being most economically administered, and this is one set of institutions where I understand there is no complaint by reason of extravagance.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman. I never heard any complaint about extravagance. The only complaint I have heard—and I think possibly it may be well founded—is not against the prison officials, but, rather, because Congress has not authorized sufficient appropriations so that the prisoners may be kept at work and pay all of their expenses.

Mr. EVANS. One of the chief difficulties in keeping the prisoners employed is the subjects upon which they may work. There is a great prejudice against prison-made articles, and they have attempted at most of the prisons to have a farm in connection with it and thus reduce the expense for subsistence. I understand that complaint is being made by those in charge of the prisons because they have not been liberally provided with means of employment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Are the prisoners all kept at work that are able physically to do work?

Mr. EVANS. As a rule, yes; but there are exceptions. There are times when they do not have the means of keeping them all employed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it is a great mistake not to provide work for them, and I think that could be done without conflicting with the free labor in the country.

Mr. EVANS. The prison authorities are endeavoring to do everything within reason to comply with the wishes expressed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask the gentleman from Nebraska in regard to these appropriations for Federal prisons. The gentleman says, undoubtedly correctly, that there has been no complaint against the running of these institutions. I call his attention to the fact that in almost every item, beginning on page 42, there is a material increase, covering about four pages of items for the Federal penitentiaries. There is an increase in almost each individual item.

Mr. EVANS. The reason for that is the increase of the people who are convicted in the Federal courts. There is now no place in the United States in which they can confine female prisoners, because they are all full. There have been a number of additions to the Federal prisons, and, as I understand it, all of the Federal prisons are full, some of them more than is proper.

Mr. TILSON. Is this increase in the number of prisoners due to the enforcement of the prohbition act?

Mr. EVANS. The enforcement of the prohibition act has contributed to it. The violations of the narcotic act, and convictions following such violations, are among the chief causes; and there has been, as the gentleman well knows, what is known as the crime wave following a great war. While that is on the wane, the cases are just being tried.

All three causes to which I have called attention contribute to the prisons being crowded. Then there is another item to which I ought to call your attention which has furnished quite a number of penitentiary inmates, namely, the automobile thefts and unlawful transportation of stolen automobiles.

Mr. TILSON. But it is a fact there has been a very considerable increase in the number of inmates of the Federal penitentiaries during the last three years?

Mr. EVANS. It is not only true that there has been an increase, but the cost of subsistence per individual prisoner has been reduced. June 30, 1912, there were in the Atlanta Penitentiary 954 inmates. June 30, 1921, there were 2,091 inmates, and June 30, 1922, 2,334 inmates. In the Leavenworth Penitentiary, June 30, 1912, there were 1,165 inmates; June 30, 1921, 1,917 inmates; and June 30, 1922, 2,671 inmates. At McNeil Island, June 30, 1912, there were 221 inmates; June 30, 1921, 298 inmates; and June 30, 1922, 535 inmates. Those are the exact figures.

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS. Certainly.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I desire to ask the gentleman whether or not the number of anarchists and Bolshevists and people preaching the destruction of our Government, the so-called red drive in this country, has tended to increase the number of inmates of these prisons or not. We know they are in the country, and I was just wondering whether or not they are being apprehended, and thereby increase the number in our prisons.

Mr. EVANS. The gentleman is quite well aware of the fact that during the war there was as rigorous prosecution for offenses along the line suggested by him as could be made. Since that time there has not been the same tendency to prosecute these men; but the fact is, also, that the most of those persons who are not citizens of the United States, in place of being imprisoned, are being deported. There have not been, as far as I know, many convictions in the last year, but I can not be specific.

Mr. LINEBERGER. That has not materially increased the number of prisoners?

Mr. EVANS. It has not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment for the purpose of asking a question. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the revenue that has been coming from the various penitentiaries through the labor of convicts—for instance, our Post Office Department used quite a lot of ducking cloth, and much of that has been manufactured in our penitentiaries by convict labor.

Mr. EVANS. That is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not know what is doing now, but they used to manufacture shoes and other things at the penitentiaries by utilizing the time of the convicts. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact by that plan we derived some revenue to offset the expense, and that has been interfered with to a greater or less extent by the protests of organized labor that it is interfering with their business?

Mr. EVANS. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman positively; but this is a fact, there was a large stock of canvas on hand held by the War Department and it was used to some extent by the Post Office Department, which reduced the amount of canvas which would be called for from the penitentiary at Atlanta, where it was manufactured, to which I presume the gentleman from Texas alludes. There has also been, as the gentleman well knows, all over the country a protest against prison-made goods.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I am driving at.

Mr. EVANS. That has been presented for years. Now, that does stop these convicts from manufacturing stuff to compete with the same kind of product manufactured by free labor.

Mr. BLANTON. That competition has been stopped.

Mr. EVANS. I think there is no attempt on the part of Federal prison authorities to compete outside.

Mr. BLANTON. Outside of Government use?

Mr. EVANS. With any other activity.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask the gentleman if it had not been for that action in stopping this manufacture, or, in other words, if our friends, organized labor, would permit, the Government would grant us permission to manufacture ducking cloth, shoes, and other things, which convicts can manufacture in the penitentiaries, there will be just that much diminution of expense through the revenue derived?

Mr. EVANS. That is probable.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is because they will not grant us permission that we are rather forced to appropriate these extra sums?

Mr. EVANS. I would not want to agree to that statement.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not ask the gentleman to agree or embarrass him, but that is the situation.

Mr. EVANS. No; I do not understand they will grant us permission; that is the way the gentleman made his statement.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, if they have stopped us from manufacturing it is the want of their permission, and that is why——

Mr. EVANS. No; it is not a question of permission at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I am hopeful that some day organized labor will withdraw this objection and grant the United States Government permission to permit its convicts to be employed, which would be helpful to the men as well as helpful to the people.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13282) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. EVANS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—PORTS OF ENTRY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

The sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, contains the following provisions, viz:

"The President is authorized from time to time, as the exigencies of the service may require, to rearrange, by consolidation or otherwise, the several customs collection districts and to continue ports of entry by abolishing the same or establishing others in their stead: *Provided*, That the whole number of customs collection districts, ports of entry, or either of them, shall at no time be made to exceed those now established and authorized except as the same may hereafter be provided by law: *Provided further*, That hereafter the collector of customs of each customs collection district shall be officially designated by the number of the district for which he is appointed and not by the name of the port where the headquarters are situated, and the President is authorized from time to time to change the location of the headquarters in any customs collection district as the needs of the service may require: *And provided further*, That the President shall, at the beginning of each regular session, submit to Congress a statement of all acts, if any, done hereunder and the reasons therefor."

Pursuant to the requirements of the third proviso to the said provision, I have to state that the following changes in the organization of the customs service have been made by Executive order:

By Executive order, dated January 24, 1921, the port of Portland as then constituted was abolished and that place was created as a port of entry in customs collection district No. 29 (Oregon), the order defining the limits of the newly created port.

By Executive order, dated January 9, 1922, various ports of entry were abolished and several new ports of entry created in several of the customs collection districts as follows:

CUSTOMS PORTS OF ENTRY ABOLISHED.

In customs collection district No. 1, of which Portland, Me., is the headquarters port, Rockport, Me.; Deer Isle, Me.; Vinalhaven, Me.; and Castine, Me.

In customs collection district No. 4, of which Boston, Mass., is the headquarters port, Barnstable, Mass., and Holyoke, Mass.

In customs collection district No. 7, of which Ogdensburg, N. Y., is the headquarters port, Chaumont, N. Y.

In customs collection district No. 10, of which New York, N. Y., is the headquarters port, Greenport and Patchogue, N. Y.

In customs collection district No. 11, of which Philadelphia, Pa., is the headquarters port, Tuckerton, N. J.

In customs collection district No. 18, of which Tampa, Fla., is the headquarters port, Port Inglis and Punta Gorda, Fla.

In customs collection district No. 22, of which Galveston, Tex., is the headquarters port, Port Lavaca, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 23, of which San Antonio, Tex., is the headquarters port, Santa Maria and Roma, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 24, of which El Paso, Tex., is the headquarters port, Boquillas, Tex.

In customs collection district No. 25, of which San Diego, Calif., is the headquarters port, Campo, Calif.

In customs collection district No. 31, of which Juneau, Alaska, is the headquarters port, Fairbanks, Alaska.

In customs collection district No. 33, of which Great Falls, Mont., is the headquarters port, Plentywood, Mont.

In customs collection district No. 26, of which Duluth, Minn., is the headquarters port, Isle Royale, Mich.

In customs collection district No. 38, of which Detroit, Mich., is the headquarters port, Manistique and Petoskey, Mich.

In customs collection district No. 45, of which St. Louis, Mo., is the headquarters port, Cairo, Ill.

In customs collection district No. 46, of which Omaha, Nebr., is the headquarters port, Lincoln, Nebr.

CUSTOMS PORTS OF ENTRY CREATED.

In customs collection district No. 1, of which Portland, Me., is the headquarters port, Jackman, Frenchville, and Robbinston, Me.

In customs collection district No. 23, of which San Antonio, Tex., is the headquarters port, Hidalgo, Tex.

By Executive order dated September 30, 1922, the port of Carrabelle, in customs collection district No. 18 (Florida), was abolished.

By Executive order dated November 3, 1922, Seward, in customs collection district No. 31 (Alaska), was created a customs port of entry, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska.

All of the above changes were dictated by considerations of economy and efficiency in the administration of customs and other statutes with the enforcement of which the customs service is charged, as well as the necessities and convenience of commerce generally.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 12, 1922.*

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2984. An act to provide for the issuance to John W. Stanton by the Secretary of the Interior of patent to certain land, upon payment therefor at the rate of $1.25 per acre; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] if he has any requests for time?

Mr. OLIVER. I have a very limited number of requests for time, not exceeding 15 minutes. I feel that 15 minutes would be liberal to each side in the allotment of time. I am sure that the gentleman will concur in that view.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with general debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to dispense with general debate. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is an important provision in this bill dealing with immigration and the enforcement of that part of the law. The five-minute rule would not give a sufficient amount of time to explain to the Members of the House how this appropriation bill would affect the Immigration Service.

Mr. MADDEN. We will give the gentleman time to discuss that question.

Mr. CABLE. I would like to have an understanding that we will have as much time as we want.

Mr. MADDEN. That would not be reasonable. You might want a week.

Mr. CABLE. I want only a reasonable time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. MADDEN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 30 minutes, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much of that time would be allotted to anyone with reference to the provision on immigration?

Mr. MADDEN. That will be for the gentleman who has charge of the bill to decide.

Mr. OLIVER. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. CABLE. I would like to have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13316.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13316, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13316, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. CABLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule will start to-morrow or to-day?

Mr. SHREVE. Not to-day. It depends on how late the House runs this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] is recognized.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in submitting this bill, covering appropriations recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations for the fiscal year 1924 for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, I should like to call your attention before explaining the bill in detail to the attitude which governed our committee in making its calculations and recommendations and bringing the bill to you in its present form.

The committee has adhered strictly to the policy adopted by it in the handling of last year's bill by refraining from proposing any salary increases in this bill, proposing any additional statutory positions, or including new legislation, a good bit of which was found scattered throughout the estimates when our committee first took up their consideration. In only one instance has our committee exceeded the recommendations of the President in submitting his budget. This was occasioned by the estimate of $800,000 for carrying out the provisions of the act of November 23, 1921, entitled "For the promotion of the welfare and hygiene of maternity and infancy," which authorized an appropriation of $1,240,000 for a period of five years. The committee's action in adding $440,000 to the $800,000 estimate to make the total appropriation authorized will be explained later in detail. By making moderate reductions, however, throughout the bill where the committee saw fit, the bill carries $111,990 less than the original estimates.

This bill carries a total of $25,807,101, which is $100,407.69 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1923. It is $111,990 less than was proposed in the original estimate. So we have kept ourselves safely within the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Of this amount the Department of Commerce carries $19,163,545 and the Department of Labor carries $6,643,556.

We made some increases in the Secretary's office. It is really very remarkable the work that is being done by the Department of Commerce, and we found on investigation that the Secretary has been paying clerks out of his own pocket. He must have the help. As far as possible under the organic act we endeavored to give that help. That is, we gave them a few additional clerks of the $1,800 class and less.

It was necessary to increase some incidental expenses, for the reason that the department has been called upon to take charge of various activities in the last year that were really not connected with the department, such as the coal inquiry and numerous other things that we might mention. The housing proposition is one of them.

You will remember that a year ago, when employment was at a standstill all over the United States, the matter was taken up by the Department of Commerce, and undoubtedly they had much to do with placing the 5,000,000 men who were at that time out of employment. I might mention the Bureau of the Census. The appropriation for that bureau is about $5,000 less than it was last year. This comes about by reason of the use of some mechanical inventions by which they are able to save that sum.

There was a condition that arose which I desire to explain to the House, because otherwise it might be misunderstood. The Bureau of the Census asked the Bureau of the Budget for $272,000 more than they had last year. The Bureau of the Budget concluded that they could not see their way clear to make that recommendation. The director of the bureau, feeling that he needed that much money, thought he should make a lump-sum reduction of about $272,000, and he discovered that the last cotton census would cost about $272,000, and therefore it occurred to him that one sum offset the other and that they could dispense with the taking of the cotton census. The committee felt that that was a very serious mistake, and after taking it up again with the director of the bureau we received a letter from him in which he stated that he had gone over the matter very carefully and that he had allotted $272,000 for taking the cotton census. So that will go on in the usual way, notwithstanding the statement you may find in the hearing, and the cotton census will be taken as usual.

I wish to call attention to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. This is one institution that I feel Congress should have a great pride in. You will recall that last year we made some additional appropriations. We gave the bureau some trade commissioners and commercial attachés and helped them in various ways. It is a great pleasure to report to the House that that money was amply justified; they have spent it in a splendid manner. They have brought back millions in

trade to the United States with the use of a very small amount of money given them last year. For that reason we are going to make some slight increases this year—some that we feel that are justified.

I wish to call attention to the situation down in South America. There are increases there. While we increased the appropriation 70 per cent, their increase in actual trade inquiries is about 880 per cent. The same is true in the Far East. We increase their appropriation about 11 per cent and individual requests coming from manufacturers have increased over 400 per cent. In the same way the work from the field service has increased over 1,000 per cent. The exports have increased largely and inquiries have increased 419 per cent.

There is another matter of increase in the local office here to about 3,200 inquiries a day. You remember, before the war the principal export staples in the United States were wheat, corn, cotton, and tobacco—and not much corn. But to-day 47 per cent of the exports are manufactures and partly manufactured commodities, including manufactured flour, and so forth. This shows that we are reaching out among the small manufacturers, and it shows how they are informing themselves on the foreign trade. I might say that since the war we find that we require an entirely different kind of merchandise to what we did before the war. The inquiries come in from different parts of the country. Here is one from a paint manufacturer in regard to the restrictions on exports on English colors as compared with American colors. Here is a typographical concern asking in regard to the market for composing machines. Here is one from a bank wanting to know what effect the fluctuation of foreign currency has.

I think you all agree that export follows investment. That has been the secret of England's commercial success. The public utilities throughout the world are owned by British capital and that determines the amount of machinery that goes into these countries. British capital owns over $2,000,000,000 worth of railroads in South America, and they therefore dominate the railroad situation.

In the last year, 1921, foreign securities were sold in this country to the amount of $620,000,000. During the nine months of this year up to last month there were sold of foreign securities $1,200,000,000 in this country.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Does the gentleman mean securities of foreign governments?

Mr. SHREVE. No. They are government securities as well as municipal securities; all kinds of securities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman five minutes of my time.

Mr. LONDON. How do they keep track of the sale of these securities?

Mr. SHREVE. It is a system of follow up. The Department of Commerce is a clearing house. Suppose a commissioner in India notifies the department that they want to build a steel bridge. They first find out the amount of money that would be expended, who is going to pay it, whether the security is safe, and all the information is forwarded to the department at Washington. They notify the steel-bridge companies in the United States that there is going to be the letting of a certain bridge contract.

Mr. LONDON. I understand that so far as the business part is concerned, but I am speaking of the actual sale of securities. How does the Government keep track of the sale of foreign securities?

Mr. SHREVE. I think the only way is through the banks.

Mr. LONDON. They get their information through the banks?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. If there is a large issue, the matter is taken up by the Department of Commerce, but the information comes through the banks.

Mr. LONDON. The information probably is limited and is confined to that part of the information which is voluntarily furnished by interested bankers.

Mr. SHREVE. Not necessarily so.

Mr. LONDON. It is not complete.

Mr. SHREVE. It is as complete as it can be; I do not know how it can be more complete.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman speaks of some business secured in Rome. Who secured that?

Mr. SHREVE. One of our commercial trade attachés.

Mr. LITTLE. Connected with the embassy there?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. LITTLE. Connected with the consular service?

Mr. SHREVE. Not at all. He is one of the men sent out by the Department of Commerce from Washington, either a commercial attaché, or, in this case, a trade commissioner.

Mr. LITTLE. And he stops a while at one town and then goes on to another?

Mr. SHREVE. No. We have a man stationed at Rome. In nearly all of the important cities at this time we are asking for new trade commissioners. We want to place one in Budapest and another in Alexandria, Egypt, and another at Ottawa, Canada. And, by the way, we have $2,000,000,000 of invested capital in Canada. A great many Americans are wanting to invest in Canada and wondering if it is a good place to go and start a manufacturing plant. In some cases it is and in some cases it is not. Upon all of these things the department is called upon to advise the people of the United States.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there any report as to how these investments have succeeded?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, they are entirely satisfied with the investments. I know of a case down in South America where the South American government is selling $70,000,000 worth of bonds for the purpose of electrifying some of their street railways.

Mr. LITTLE. What government?

Mr. SHREVE. I can not tell the gentleman. It is one of the South American countries. Those bonds are being sold in the United States. The United States is getting the contracts for that electrical equipment.

Mr. LITTLE. We take the bonds and get the money back by selling the material.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; and that is something that we are doing in all of the countries. Over in Poland we helped out materially. We sold Poland this year the surplus of the war railway stock—that is, cars that could not be used in this country. We sold them several million dollars' worth of locomotives.

Mr. LITTLE. Did you sell the Government that?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; to the Government.

Mr. LITTLE. The material was sold to private enterprise?

Mr. SHREVE. No; to the Government, but sales were also made to private enterprises.

Mr. LITTLE. Does anybody guarantee the Polish Government?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no. It is getting on in fine shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. SHREVE was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. SHREVE. In this connection, I desire to call the attention of the Members of the House to a statement of the members of the British industries, which is as follows:

There is no organization in behalf of British firms or British associations more complete or up to date than the Commercial Bureau of the American Government trade department. No trouble is too great and expense is a secondary consideration to the securing of business to the United States of America. Whatever information an inquirer wants he gets at once, or it is obtained for him.

Without wishing to make any invidious comparisons as to the methods of America versus Great Britain—the British trade commissioners have an excellent reputation both for ability and enthusiastic devotion to duty, and British firms' representatives have a capacity and knowledge equally as great as the American—I am bound to remark that the emissaries from the United States of America carry out their missions, whether merely as investigators or actual seekers after orders, with a thoroughness, close application, and keenness that can not be denied.

The degree of American penetration into the South African field is not without its lessons.

Also, I desire to read an article published in the Times of Argentina of Monday, September 18, 1922. It is a British publication, printed in English in Buenos Aires, devoted to the interest of the British export and shipping.

The article follows:

[The Times of Argentina, Monday, September 18, 1922.]

By the miserly fashion of the upkeep of these foreign commercial services they have degenerated into something little better than a joke, while the American trade commissioners and other officials serving in the capacity of foreign trade investigators for the Department of Commerce at Washington have been increasing in numbers and usefulness. That the growth and support of American trade in Latin America owes much to the activities of American Government trade representatives abroad is now an absolutely established and recognized fact. * * *

American trade representatives acting in these Latin American countries under orders from Washington are going about their jobs in the right way. Where there is very strenuous competition in any given line the representative is very apt to be instructed to purchase a full collection of samples of the foreign articles with which the American manufacturer is required to compete. The article may, to take only one example, be shoes. * * *

Even if we had never before been disposed to attach any value to the services of commercial attachés and other Government representatives ostensibly employed for the furtherance of foreign trade our observations of the results of the strengthening of the American service of Government trade commissioners would be sufficient to convince us that if it is done properly the business has wonderful possibilities. But if British trade representatives were to attempt to keep pace with their American confrères and rivals they would have to learn first of all the gentle art of teasing money out of thin air. * * *

It is interesting to get these little tributes from our rivals. They appreciate the fact more and more that small American manufacturers are now taking advantage of our service and that the competition presented by the Americans is therefore much more than it was in the days when we just had a few larger export houses, and the following resolution was passed by the National Association of Credit Men, having a membership of 38,000, at their annual meeting at Atlantic City during the week ended September 30, 1922:

We recognize that liberal credits must be extended if we are to maintain a secure foothold in foreign trade. The exhaustion of facilities in other countries for buying of us other than on liberal credit terms must be appreciated and our arrangements accordingly made.

The intensiveness of our domestic commerce has diminished the understanding generally that an outlet is needed for some of our commodities in other countries. A careful survey, however, clearly reveals this potent fact that the maximum of our productive powers can not be absorbed in internal trade. Some of our production must find its way into other countries.

Granting the correctness of this thesis, it is desirable not alone but exceedingly wise for our Government to devote more attention and more of its resources to the cultivation of foreign trade. Congress in its appropriations should be reasonably generous to this end. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce should be granted sufficient resources for the carrying on of its various agencies and plans without financial restrictions that our foreign trade may be effectively assisted by this governmental agency. When taking into account the appropriations made annually for the conduct of various agencies of the Government it will be clearly seen that the proportion for this particular work is much too small.

Foreign trade is an important factor in the maintaining of our prosperity and the Nation at large should become more familiar with its direct relations to our commerce.

I desire to call the attention of the gentlemen of the House to a resolution from the American Manufacturers' Export Association, which represents some 700 of the leading exporters in the country, indorsing very emphatically the work of the bureau. This resolution was passed October 26 last:

Resolved, That the American Manufacturers' Export Association in convention assembled desires to express its deep appreciation of the assistance which the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce has rendered to its various members in the development of their foreign trade. This help in all its various phases has been a vital factor in the growth of American export business. The association has noted with satisfaction the gradual expansion of the facilities of this bureau, the broadening scope of its work, and the improvements in its organization and personnel brought about under the direction of Secretary Herbert Hoover and Dr. Julius Klein, and it now desires to record its emphatic opinion that this department should receive from the Director of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress most favorable consideration in the matter of the appropriation of funds for its maintenance and enlargement.

We urge that nothing be done to interfere with the normal expansion of the useful work of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and that the plans of its directors to increase its scope be accorded favorable consideration.

The Steamboat Inspection Service appropriation is $900,740, which is $5,400 less than the current appropriation. This decrease is due to the reduction of several steamboat inspectors which the service could do without.

The Bureau of Navigation's appropriation is recommended at $381,390, an increase over the current appropriation of $24,200, of which $15,000 is to be used for the enforcement of navigation laws and $9,200 for the enforcement of wireless communication laws. The bureau, however, is distinctly a revenue-producing unit, the amount of revenue for 1922 totaling $2,075,219.94, and the commissioner stated that with the $15,000 increase for enforcement of navigation laws the amount of revenue would be considerably increased next year.

The appropriation for the Bureau of Standards as recommended is $1,642,360. The estimates called for an increase of $195,000, of which the committee recommended $95,000. This increase is made up of small additions of $5,000 to $20,000 to different items in the bureau to enable it to handle the increased number of investigations and studies it has been called on to undertake, and also to start several new investigations.

The Bureau of Lighthouses carries $8,266,290, which is $85,500 less than the current appropriation, and $175,500 less than the estimates called for. Fifty thousand dollars was deducted under "salaries, lighthouse vessels," due to the reduction of salary scales. Under the item "Public works" the estimate called for a lump-sum appropriation of $738,500, with an itemized statement supplementing the request showing the estimate of one tender, three light vessels, and repairs to fifth lighthouse district. After careful deliberation the committee decided, in view of the fact that last year nine vessels suitable for making over into tenders were obtained from the War Department's mine-planter service, and five light vessels appropriated for several years ago are still being built, to make an itemized appropriation, as follows:

For the completion of one light vessel, hull of which was furnished by Standard Oil Co. in replacement of light vessel sunk by one of her tankers	$90,000
For one new light vessel	150,000
Construction and repairs to depot, Portsmouth, Va., fifth lighthouse district	154,500
Standard Rock Light Station, Mich	30,000
Repairs to Barnegat Lighthouse	100,000
Erie, Pa., and vicinity, aids to navigation	38,500
Total	563,000

For the Coast and Geodetic Survey the appropriation recommended is $2,186,275, which is $26,860 less than the current appropriation and $49,740 less than the estimate. This reduction was due to the amount of $36,160 for repairs of vessels which was added last year through a deficiency for alterations and not repairs to several vessels turned over to the Coast Survey by the Navy Department.

The Bureau of Fisheries appropriation is $1,222,590, which is $39,500 less than the current appropriation and $21,500 less than the estimate. This reduction was due to the elimination of an item for constructon and repair of stations carried in a deficiency of $40,000 which was not carried in this year's bill.

For the Secretary of Labor's office there is an increase of $40,663.89, making this year's appropriation $636,480. This is due to the addition of several commissioners of conciliation.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' appropriation remains the same, at $242,260.

The Bureau of Immigration appropriation is recommended at $3,176,766, which is $335,464 less than the current appropriation. Three hundred thousand dollars of this decrease was carried originally for the deportation of aliens. The Bureau of the Budget in making the reduction did so upon the premises that most of the seditious aliens had been deported, and that the balance of deportable aliens could be handled by the bureau at the port of arrival. The bureau did not convince the committee that they needed this amount back again.

The Bureau of Naturalization appropriation of $697,010 remains the same.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

Referring again to the maternity act you will all recall that the act passed in 1921 called for an appropriation of $1,240,000. The act also stipulated how this money should be divided among the States. Five thousand dollars was first to go to each State, and afterwards another $5,000, and then a division of all the funds between the States pro rata should follow.

As a matter of fact, only about $600,000 of this money was used, and when the Bureau of the Budget came to consider it they thought that if they estimated for about $800,000 it would probably cover all the requirements of this activity. But it was a very remarkable thing that no one seemed to understand the reason for this reduction, and everybody took it for granted immediately that that meant an entirely new distribution to the States and a new ratio of the money that was to be distributed, and the working out of an entirely new system. At first we thought we would like to keep within the recommendation of the Budget and keep this amount below $800,000, as recommended; but after giving the matter very careful consideration—and I will say that the whole committee are a unit on the subject—we concluded that it was a matter of such vital importance that inasmuch as we could make this appropriation of $1,240,000 and still keep within the total estimate made by the Bureau of the Budget for the two departments, it was a wise thing to do, because, when you stop to think about it for a moment, that act of Congress was a solemn and binding contract between the United States Government and the various States, and it was deemed unwise for us to begin to do anything in Congress that would look like breaking that contract. And while, as a matter of fact, we felt that the appropriation could be distributed in such a way that the act of Congress would be carried out in detail, yet, as I said, we were unable to make anybody see it, so we came to the conclusion that the wise thing under the circumstances was to include the appropriation as originally provided in the act to the amount of $1,240,000, notwithstanding we believe that a considerable portion of that money will not be used.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. How much of that money was used last year?

Mr. SHREVE. About $600,000.

Mr. LITTLE. How much do you anticipate will be used this year?

Mr. SHREVE. Around $800,000, or possibly more. Of course, there are a number of the States that have not been heard from. I think 35 States have submitted propositions

through arrangements made with their governors. Later on the legislatures may not ratify the arrangements made by the governors.

Mr. LITTLE. Can the States that have not been heard from draw the remaining $600,000 later?

Mr. SHREVE. I think there is no limit as to the States whose legislatures have not met since the passage of the act.

Mr. LITTLE. Does that mean that 10 years from now the States could take this accumulated fund, if they do not draw it now?

Mr. SHREVE. The act says six months after the adjournment of the legislature. Any State whose legislature meets this year that fails to act within six months after the adjournment of the legislature would seem to be barred from any further participation in the fund, although I am not an authority on the subject.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there anything in the law which indicates that they would be barred?

Mr. SHREVE. No; except the provision I have referred to.

Mr. LITTLE. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be a definite provision on that subject?

Mr. SHREVE. We understand that they will be barred six months after the legislature adjourns, if they have taken no action.

Mr. LITTLE. Does not the gentleman think there should be legislation providing that at some time the States can not draw any more money?

Mr. SHREVE. It would seem so. I think the gentleman from Kansas is absolutely right about that proposition.

The Woman's Bureau calls for an appropriation of $105,000, which is $5,000 over last year's appropriation.

The Employment Service carries $210,000, which is $15,000 less than last year.

There is a permanent annual appropriation of $25,000 added in the estimate to the Department of Labor.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the record vote in this House shows that the Members are overwhelmingly in favor of restricted immigration. A year ago the Committee on Appropriations saw fit to cut down the amount of money to be used by the Immigration Service to $3,300,000. As a result many employees were furloughed for one month without pay. Since March 4, 1921, over 400 employees have been released from the service. This year the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to make another cut in the Immigration Service, reducing the amount from $3,300,000 to $3,000,000, as appears in line 2, page 48, of this appropriation bill. The way to kill a law is to reduce the appropriation to so small a sum the object of the law can not be carried out. This appropriation will prevent the proper enforcement of the 3 per cent law. In the first place, 228 men in that service will have to be released from the service entirely. In the second place, the 3 per cent law creates more work, because of the numerous appeals by the immigrants excluded at the ports. In addition to that, from Canada, from Cuba, from Mexico, these immigrants who were or would have been excluded at the ports are now coming into the United States. If we cut this appropriation for the Immigration Service down it will also mean that aliens in this country who have no right to be here will remain, because the Government has no money to discover these aliens who should be deported and to deport them.

I also wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that a year ago we passed a law imposing upon the Department of Labor and the Immigration Service the duty of deporting aliens found guilty of violating the narcotic law. It will mean that with the proposed appropriation the law will stand on the statute books with no force and effect, and the aliens found guilty of violating that law will not be deported. That law went into effect since the last appropriation bill, but no appropriation was ever made to carry out its provisions. Further, when the aliens come to the various ports they must be given prompt attention. It is the duty of the immigration officials to determine whether the alien should be admitted. If you are going to cut down the number of inspectors and officials at these ports, it means that the immigrants will have to stay there many days or it means that the limited number of inspectors can not give them the kind of an examination they should have before permitting them to enter or to debar them.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. Yes.

Mr. SIEGEL. The important question involved here is this: Two years ago we had 731 employees at Ellis Island, where 85 per cent of all of the immigrants come into the country. With this cut we will reduce the number by 228, in addition to having had the whole force last year put off for one month without pay. The effect probably can not be realized by merely stating that 228 men will be laid off, but they are going to be put off at Ellis Island, and when you did not have the quota law and the visé law you had 731 men.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the number of immigrants two years ago when we had the larger quota of 731 as compared to the restricted number to-day?

Mr. SIEGEL. We are getting approximately now 300,000 and we used to get 600,000, but that does not mean half the proposition. You have the visés and the passports to be examined, the literacy test to be fulfilled, and the quota law to be enforced. You say to these men that you are getting $1,400 a month; that you will be put off for one month without pay; and the customs men get extra pay for extra hours, and these men often work seven days a week.

Mr. CABLE. Yes; and in addition to that there are more appeals coming up to the Secretary of Labor than before, and that requires additional expense. I want to call the attention of the House to this particular thing. The Bureau of Immigration is the only bureau that I know of that is a paying concern. The immigrant pays $8 head tax, and the steamship companies are assessed fines for bringing the immigrants here illegally, and a paying proposition is certainly entitled to some consideration. If you can not enforce the law you can not restrict immigration.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CABLE. I will.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What part of the immigrants will now come in during the first five months? I refer to the months during which the quota is exhausted from the countries which send in a considerable number of immigrants now.

Mr. CABLE. I will answer the gentleman. In some countries they exhaust their quota in five, six, or seven months. What kind of men do we expect to keep? If you are going to give them a job for six months and release them for the other six months, what kind of a service do you expect? We have to keep these men and keep them for the year around. The law should be amended to admit 10 per cent instead of 20 per cent a month.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CABLE. I will.

Mr. BOX. Is it not true that the House, on the theory that the volume of business handled by this department has been increased, created an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor?

Mr. CABLE. I am glad the gentleman called attention to that. The work has increased so much we needed an additional Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, that is for appeals; not the kind of work about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. CABLE. The Assistant Secretary of Labor gets a regular salary, but at the same time at Ellis Island they have to make up these appeal cases. They have to take testimony and it takes many additional inspectors and officials to attend to this business. The more aliens debarred the more the appeals and the more work as a result.

Mr. BOX. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. CABLE. I will.

Mr. BOX. Is it not true that these appeals are made at the point where this work is being done and, of course, the number of appeals represents an increased amount of business to handle at those places?

Mr. CABLE. That is correct, because the more immigrants who are refused admission, the more are the employees who are required to do the work. If you can not enforce the immigration law you are going to have this country overrun with aliens here unlawfully. We have 3,000 Chinese in the city of New York alone who are there illegally competing with American labor. The question for this House to determine is, Are you going to enforce the immigration laws or will the Committee on Appropriations break them down?

Mr. MADDEN. Why does not the Department of Labor insist that the shipping companies who brought these Chinese in carry out the conditions of the bond—all these people are bonded—and not let these men escape?

Mr. CABLE. They are following our law. These Chinese sailors have a right to 60 days in port, and they escape, and many can not be located there in New York. These aliens are coming over the Canadian border, they are coming from Cuba, and they are coming from Mexico. We have to rid this country of them or the law will be broken down.

Mr. MADDEN. If we were to prevent everybody who wants to come over the Canadian border from coming in we would have to have a million inspectors.

Mr. CABLE. You do not need a million, but you should not cut down the appropriation so the few guards on the border will be relieved from the service. Then, what good would the law do?

Mr. STAFFORD. We would need a million enforcement officers to keep the bootleggers from crossing the border.

Mr. CABLE. As far as the prohibition service is concerned, we have appropriated $9,000,000, and as far as this bill is concerned, you have appropriated but $3,000,000. Let us see that our immigration laws are enforced by a fair appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time for general debate has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

Salaries: Secretary of Commerce, $12,000; Assistant Secretary, $5,000; assistant to the Secretary, $2,750; private secretary to the Secretary, $2,500; confidential clerk to the Secretary, $1,800; stenographers to the Secretary—1 $1,800, 1 $1,600; stenographer to the Assistant Secretary, $1,800; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, $2,100; chief clerk and superintendent, $3,000; disbursing clerk, $3,000; chiefs of divisions—appointments $2,500, publications $2,500, supplies $2,100; assistant chief, division of publications, $2,000; clerks—10 of class 4, 9 of class 3, 13 of class 2, 20 of class 1, 14 at $1,000 each, 13 at $900 each; 2 telephone operators at $720 each; messenger to the Secretary, $1,000; 5 messengers at $840 each; 5 assistant messengers at $720 each; 9 messengers boys at $480 each; chief engineer and electrician, $1,400; assistant engineer, $1,000; skilled laborers—1 $1,000, 1 $900, 2 at $840 each, 5 at $720 each; 3 elevator conductors at $720 each; 3 firemen at $720 each; 16 laborers at $660 each; cabinetmaker, $1,200; carpenter, $900; chief watchman, $900; 9 watchmen at $720 each; 25 charwomen at $240 each; in all, $201,250.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13316 had come to no resolution thereon.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS OF CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with the business under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House dispense with the business under the Calendar Wednesday rule. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 13, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

819. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a schedule of papers and documents which are not needed in the transaction of public business and requesting that they be destroyed; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Documents.

820. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting statement showing the cost and distribution of the 13 publications issued by the Federal Trade Commission during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Printing.

821. A letter from the chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting statement showing the average number of employees receiving the increase of compensation at the rate of $240 per annum for the first four months of the fiscal year 1923; to the Committee on Appropriations.

822. A letter from the chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting report showing that the National Advisory Committee exchanged no typewriters, adding machines, or other similar labor-saving devices during the fiscal year 1922; to the Committee on Appropriations.

823. A letter from the chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting report showing the number of publications issued by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the fiscal year 1922 and the cost of the same; to the Committee on Printing.

824. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the annual inspection of the several branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12693) granting an increase of pension to Arthur N. Smith, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 13344) to create a waterways commission; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 13345) to amend and reenact the act approved September 21, 1922, entitled "An act to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 13346) providing for the recommissioning of certain officers eliminated under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1922, and placing them on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13347) relative to the naturalization and citizenship of children; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13348) making appropriation for payment of balance due certain postmasters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13349) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce' approved February 24, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 13350) authorizing promotion on the retired list of certain officers deprived thereof by the act of June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 13351) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of South Carolina the silver service which was used upon the battleship *South Carolina;* to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13352) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, store, and sell wheat, and to secure and maintain to the producer a reasonable price for wheat and to the consumer a reasonable price for bread, and to stabilize wheat values; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 13353) amending the act of April 26, 1906, with reference to expenditures from tribal funds for support of tribal schools; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 13354) granting a pension to Barbara Bever; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13355) granting a pension to Victoria Eager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13356) granting an increase of pension to Hyram Colwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13357) granting a pension to Susan V. Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13358) granting a pension to Salem Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13359) granting a pension to Mary Burdick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13360) granting a pension to John Nighswander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Howe School, Howe, Ind., one fieldpiece for the purpose of firing salutes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 13362) granting a pension to Flora Ella Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13363) for the relief of Almer Reichart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 13364) granting a pension to Nancy J. O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 13365) granting a pension to Jane Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13366) for the relief of John Hamill; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 13367) for the relief of the trustees of the Arcadia Charge of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 13368) for the relief of Louise Carroll Masterson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13369) granting a pension to James H. Arnold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 13370) granting a pension to Edwin F. Flanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 13371) granting a pension to Cloe Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 13372) granting a pension to Lizzie Leasure; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13373) to permit the correction of the general account of Robert G. Hilton, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6572. By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of August E. Lohr, Herm Berensdoff, and other citizens of Wausau, Wis., asking for the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms by amending section 900 of the revenue act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6573. Also, petition of L. C. Arps, Frank Erdmann, and other citizens of Tigerton, Wis., asking for abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms by amending section 900 of the revenue act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6574. Also, petition of the Citizens' Civic Council of Milwaukee, Wis., asking for governmental operation of coal mines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6575. By Mr. FESS: Petition of sundry citizens of South Vienna, Ohio, to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6576. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of B. M. Jennings and 41 other citizens, of La Salle County, Ill., protesting against a Federal tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6577. By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Resolution adopted by the executive committee of the New Jersey Department of the American Legion, Trenton, N. J., opposing the demotion of worthy veterans, and urging Congress to increase the present number of noncommissioned officers in the senior grade for the Army to provide suitable type of noncommissioned officers for duty with the National Guard and Organized Reserves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6578. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Brig. Gen. Brice Disque, Officers' Reserve Corps, New York State Association, New York City, N. Y., regarding the national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6579. By Mr. SPEAKS: Papers to accompany H. R. 13286, granting a pension to George W. Bowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

6580. Also, papers to accompany H. R. 13287, granting an increase of pension to William F. Gross; to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Thou hast made us for Thyself and we can not rest excepting we rest in Thee. Grant that our very restlessness may appeal unto us, exhorting us to find rest in Him who hath said, "Come unto me and I will give you rest," so that amid the tumult and anxiety, the perplexity and storm of life, we may find ourselves qualified for every duty as the soul finds its poise in Thyself. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

NOMINATION OF PIERCE BUTLER TO SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask to have read at the desk, so that it may appear in the RECORD, a short editorial which appeared this morning in the Washington Herald upon the recent appointment of Mr. Pierce Butler to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. This editorial quotes from an address recently delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], commends the portion of his address quoted, submits some general comment upon the decisions of the Supreme Court, and the need for removal measures in the public interest.

I also ask that it be printed in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The reading clerk read as follows:

BUTLER'S NOMINATION TO UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

[From the Washington Herald, December 13, 1922.]

"President Harding has again nominated Pierce Butler for the Supreme Court, and his nomination is again before the Senate for confirmation.

"What public service has Pierce Butler rendered? What is his real character? Whom has he served? Whom will he serve?

"Why was Pierce Butler selected to be a justice of that court which has become the most autocratic power in the world—a power that can nullify an act of Congress; a power whose decisions no other authority can overthrow?

"The leader of the bar in Pennsylvania, GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER, now United States Senator, said recently before a bar association:

"'It really should not surprise us if there are multitudes to-day who stand aghast when suddenly they realize the opinions of a bare majority of nine justices may nullify the expressed will of the National Legislature.

"'Two facts stare these earnest men in the face. One is that the Supreme Court recently declared the Federal child labor law unconstitutional. The other is that the Supreme Court recently declared the consequence of civic liability for torts attaches to unincorporated labor unions in the same way in which such liability would attach to groups of people associated for business purposes.

"'Such judicial decisions seem to many honest people symptoms of a judicial tyranny. Multitudes of people personify the judiciary and honestly think its functioning in some cases a usurpation as unjustified as any king ever attempted to do to a parliament.'

"It is true that the Federal judiciary is being attacked on many sides, justly or unjustly, and that the convention of an American organization having 3,000,000 members recently demanded practically unanimously that Congress shall be granted the same power to override a decision of the Supreme Court that it has to override a President's veto.

"Senator LA FOLLETTE has proposed a constitutional amendment to that effect.

"We firmly believe that some way must be found to curb the tendencies of reactionary judges who nullify progressive legislation simply because the judges do not approve such legislation.

"If some way is not found to curb such judges we shall all soon be in peril of revolution in this country, not from any band of 'reds' but from our judicial autocrats.

"Revolutionary acts are not less revolutionary if done by men at the top than if done by men at the bottom.

"There are three orderly ways of curbing judges who usurp the powers of legislators:

"1. By constitutional amendment.

"2. By making all judicial offices elective.

"3. By confiding to the people the power to recall reactionary judges.

"The only way to stop the present very insistent demand for one or all of these measures is to stop appointing as judges men of reactionary minds, or men so used to serving railroads, public-service corporations, or purse potentates generally that to them the rights of capital have become paramount to all other rights.

"All that the public yet knows of Pierce Butler is that he represented the railroads before the Interstate Commerce Commission in the effort to increase the so-called book value of the railroads as a basis for future rate making.

"It is entirely honorable for a lawyer to have a railroad among his clients, but no lawyer selected and recommended by the railroads or by other public-service corporations should ever be made Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

"It is, therefore, most important to know who are Mr. Pierce Butler's real sponsors and what are his real character and his fitness for the place."

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am informed that this morning there was ordered printed in the RECORD, by unanimous consent, a newspaper editorial containing, among other things, a statement attributed to me in the course of an address delivered by me in June last before the New Hampshire Bar Association. In order that a more complete statement of what I said on that occasion may accompany the comments that were made upon it, I ask unanimous consent to have that address in its entirety printed in the RECORD in the usual RECORD type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

LAWYERS AND SENATORS.

An address delivered by GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER before the Bar Association of New Hampshire, at Portsmouth, N. H., on June 24, 1922.

Senator PEPPER spoke as follows:

"Mr. President and members of the Bar Association, about six months ago I was as much absorbed in the practice of the profession as are any of you. There was the usual list of cases for trial and argument. If anybody had told me that I had a duty to discharge which outranked attention to these I should have laughed him to scorn. One day the Governor of Pennsylvania, without a moment's warning, drafted me for public service. Within a week thereafter I was sitting in the Senate of the United States endeavoring to discover whether I had been translated into a new world or whether I was looking at the same old world from a different point of view.

"Six months of observation have convinced me that it is the same world that I knew before, but that the angle of vision is altogether different.

"It has accordingly occurred to me that on this occasion it might be interesting to my professional brethren if for the discussion of a question of law I were to substitute a comment upon some of the points of agreement and difference between the work of a practicing lawyer and the daily task of a Senator of the United States.

"As far as one's colleagues are concerned, it is in the Senate much as it is at the bar. A picked body of American men is sure to be an agreeable group of people to work with. Of course, your intimates are apt to be men of the same political faith. Within the party there are naturally those to whom you are much more strongly drawn than others. Among those who have shown marked consideration to a new Senator and have impressed him as possessing in eminent degree all the most important senatorial qualifications I should like to mention the two distinguished Senators from New Hampshire, Senator MOSES and Senator KEYES.

"As to the manner of men who compose the Senate it would be highly improper for me to speak. I am aware of the existence of a widespread impression that Senators of to-day compare unfavorably with the great Senators of the past. This criticism has a familiar sound. We lawyers have been humbled since youth by the comforting assurance that the brightest ornaments of the bench and bar died about the time we were admitted to practice. In the case of Senators critics attribute our inferiority to the combined operation of direct primaries and the election of Senators by popular vote. Undoubtedly Senators are to-day within easy range of public opinion. They are therefore subject to powerful and constant pressure to abdicate the function of representative and to assume that of an instructed delegate. Even if at first the quick succession of campaigns has a tendency to make the senatorial mouth responsive to the popular bit, I am not at all sure that Senators are going to yield habitually to this pressure. If as a class they do not, their fiber will be the better for the test, and it is at least possible that the American people will respect and trust men with minds of their own even if the same American people choose to keep the power of direct selection in their own hands.

"In this connection it must not be forgotten that, if the senatorial type has changed, so has the world. The world of to-day differs at least as much from the world of 1850 as any present-day Senator differs from Daniel Webster. It seems to me useless to attempt comparisons between things that are so unlike. One characteristic of the earlier day was the prevalence of fixed beliefs on multitudes of subjects. This implied reverence for authority and respect for law. I remember having heard my father-in-law, Prof. George Park Fisher, say that when in his youth in Massachusetts a public question presented itself most people would hold their judgment in suspense till Mr. Webster had pronounced his opinion. To-day there is less reverence for authority and still less respect for law. Instead of being proud of yourself when you agree with your Senator you are proud of your Senator when he agrees with you.

"The truth is that dogmatism is to-day in at least partial eclipse. Relatively few people are content to accept experience at second hand. And there are multitudes whose unhappy first-hand experiences with things as they are make them most hospitable to all sorts of schemes for changing everything for the better.

"Now, this does not indicate to me that the bottom is dropping out of civilization or that there are no ultimate truths. It indicates to me that the world has changed too fast for our capacity to interpret it. The world of 1850 has been fairly well explored by able men of thought and action. They had become qualified guides because they knew the woods. They could tell you what course to follow, where to find water, and how to make camp. If you followed them, they would lead you on to civilization. But to-day the woods have changed. Scientific discovery and industrial development have made the old wood signs worthless. We have plenty of men who have the quality which makes guides reliable. But they are not yet guides; they are explorers. The public man of 1850 was the captain of a trans-Atlantic liner sailing a well-charted sea. The public man of 1922 is a Champlain feeling his way along the stern and rock-bound coast with nothing but the lead and compass to depend upon.

"All of which means that dogmatism is in eclipse because no human mind has yet comprehended the twentieth century. Therefore nobody is qualified to tell the world with valid authority just how to solve its problems. A man with fixed beliefs should reexamine them fearlessly in their application to the new environment and commend his conclusions to others, not as demonstrable but as probably true. He must be patient with those who refuse to accept them or who in the meanwhile are proclaiming their opposites. Columbus must have sympathized with his boatload of skeptics although he knew there was land ahead. I often remind myself of a wise saying of Leslie Stephen, which Mr. Balfour prints at the beginning of one of his books. 'A doctrine,' says Stephen, 'is first received as an intuitive truth, standing beyond all need of demonstration; then it becomes the object of rigid demonstration; afterwards the demonstration ceases to be conclusive and is merely probable; and, finally, the effort is limited to demonstrating that there is no conclusive reason on the other side. In the later stages of our belief the show of demonstration is mere bluster, or is useful only to trip an antagonist.'

"To us lawyers many things are self-evident which to others are far from clear.

"I try to bear this in mind as I sit in my place in the Senate and hear perhaps an attack upon the Supreme Court of the United States. You and I have what we regard as a just appreciation of the place of the judiciary in our national life. We think we know what the Supreme Court of the United States has meant to us from the beginning. Knowledge in our case has brought reverence. When somebody attacks American courts in general, or the Supreme Court in particular, we are moved to resent it almost as we would blasphemy.

"If we pause to think for a moment it would occur to us that the doctrine of Marbury against Madison is one of the doctrines to which Leslie Stephen might have applied the language which I have just quoted. Every organized government must place its ultimate trust either in the executive, or in the legislature, or in the judiciary. Germany deified the executive, with the consequences that are familiar to us. England has placed her supreme trust in Parliament, and Parliament has proved to be the palladium of English liberty. The wisdom and courage of Marshall, more than any other factors, account for the way in which we as a Nation have pinned our faith to the court. It is clear to us that nine selected men, with life tenure of office, and a written Constitution to guide them, can safely be trusted to determine the conformity or nonconformity of legislative enactments to the prescriptions of the Constitution, and may be allowed the authority to invalidate legislation found to be in conflict therewith. Yet I keep reminding myself that in the first instance it took a long while to reconcile many men trained as we are to assent to this proposition, and that it really would not surprise us if there are multitudes to-day who stand aghast when suddenly they realize that the opinions of a bare majority of nine justices may nullify the expressed will of the National Legislature. We ought not to become emotional as we read the proceedings of the last few days in the convention of the American Federation of Labor at Cincinnati. Two facts stare these earnest men in the face. One is that the Supreme Court recently declared the Federal child labor law unconstitutional; the other is that the Supreme Court recently declared that the consequence of civil liability for torts attaches to unincorporated labor unions in the same way in which such liability would attach to groups of people associated for busi-

ness purposes. These judicial decisions, which seem to us so normal and inevitable, seem to them like symptoms of a judicial tyranny. They personify the judiciary and honestly think of its functioning as if it were just as much of a usurpation as anything that king ever attempted to do to parliament. Accordingly, they propose an amendment to the Constitution giving to Congress the right by a two-thirds vote to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court.

"To me as an American lawyer this is almost a challenge to fight. To me as a Senator of the United States this is a warning that I must not resort to dogmatism to win acceptance for my fixed beliefs. It is my business to reexamine the whole subject and to interpret judicial supremacy to my fellow citizens as on the whole the best solution of an inherently difficult governmental problem. Even as a practicing lawyer it seemed to me that most members of the bar were unintelligent and perverse in their refusal to see the conditions which gave rise to Theodore Roosevelt's proposal of a recall of judicial decisions. When it comes to a congressional veto of decisions of the Supreme Court I hope that American lawyers will act like statesmen with convictions rather than like old-fashioned orthodoxy in the presence of heretical utterance.

"As I sit in the Senate I am called upon from time to time to consider the possibility of political relationships with Russia. If I were to think only as an American lawyer it would be hard for me, with the precedents of our own Revolution and of the French Revolution clearly in my mind, to reach any other conclusion than that recognition of the Soviet Republic is the logical course to pursue. I must remind myself, however, that possibly a controlling consideration is in this case neither political nor legal, but economic. To what extent is international intercourse possible between a government which has nationalized property and a government in which the many are content to recognize the private property rights of those who can acquire them?

"I find myself of the fixed belief that a recognition of private rights in property has been a concomitant of the world's progress. I find myself unable to imagine satisfactory relations of any sort between those who hold this view and those who agree to Proudhon's assertion that private property is theft. Therefore I find myself approving the attitude on the question of recognition taken by our Government. At the same time I am bound to realize, if I am to understand all of my constituents and not merely some of them, that there are multitudes of people in the United States to whom you can not dogmatize in regard to private ownership. I should not be surprised to find our colleges fairly well provided with teachers and students to whom the relative advantages of property privately owned and property nationalized is a mere matter of probable opinion, together with a very considerable number who are convinced that capitalism is always and everywhere an evil. Outside of the colleges we know how widely held these opinions are. Three factors enter into the formation of such opinions. The one which the champion of private property rights delights to emphasize is coveteousness, or the desire to get something for nothing. But the other two factors are the ones which it is more wholesome for me to emphasize, namely, the tyranny and selfishness which have too often characterized the dominion of the private owner. As lawyers, we know that ownership is the word we use to describe the combination of control and enjoyment. When the lawyer in me is irritated by the propaganda of communism I try to force the Senator to remember that exaggerated control is tyranny and that immoderate enjoyment is selfishness.

"The question of law enforcement is popularly thought of just now in connection with prohibition enforcement. In considering this aspect of the matter there are three people to be taken into consideration, and not two. In addition to the lawyer and the Senator, there is the man with the thirst. It is said to be hard to stay honest when you are hungry. I am certain that it is difficult to think clearly when you are thirsty. The adoption of the eighteenth amendment by a strictly constitutional process has produced a situation with which the lawyer and the Senator ought to be content, but which is extremely unwelcome to the thirsty man. Accordingly, the thirsty man produces statistics to show the failure of prohibition, and the man who is only a lawyer remembers his oath to support the Constitution and laws, and stands committed to the policy of enforcement. It seems to me to be the business of the Senator to do what he can to insure such a long continued and honest experiment in prohibition and law enforcement as will make it reasonably possible to decide whether the thirsty man sees things as they actually are, or only as he would like to see them. It is likewise the duty of the Senator to keep his mind open for a fair consideration of any concrete proposal to amend existing enforcement legislation. I say frankly, however, that so far no concrete amendatory proposal that has been brought to my attention seems to be deserving of adoption or support.

"In this imperfect way I am rehearsing to you what has gone on in my own mind as I have sought to relate my training as a lawyer to the discharge of my duty as a Senator. I pass over without mention various minor contrasts, which have interested me greatly, between the procedure to which we have been accustomed in court and the procedure to which I suppose I shall become accustomed in the Senate. Such things are subordinate to my main purpose, which is to assert three propositions, as follows:

"My first proposition is that merely because dogmatism is for the time being in partial eclipse is no indication that there are not ultimate truths. Astronomical theories may at a given time be discredited, but the stars keep on shining.

"My second proposition is that during the eclipse of dogmatism those of us who are in senatorial office and hold fixed beliefs will do well to reexamine them for the purpose of interpreting them reasonably to people by whom they are not shared, instead of scolding vociferously those whose life problem is different from ours.

"My third proposition is that such fixed principles as the doctrine of Marbury against Madison, the right of private property, and the obligation to respect an unwelcome law, have had a sufficiently long trial in America to justify the hopeful belief that when the period of eclipse is passed the American people will announce with no uncertain voice their intention to stand fast in the ancient ways."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAGEE, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House on House bill 13180, the Treasury Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair) laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, grant the request of the House for a conference, and that the Presiding Officer shall appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BROOKHART presented resolutions adopted by Carpenters' Local Union No. 948, of Sioux City, Iowa, favoring prompt action by the Federal Government to remedy faulty condition of railroad operating equipment, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Agricultural Legislative Committee of California, at Sacramento, Calif., favoring the passage of the so-called Capper Federal agricultural credits bill, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Franklin Farmers' Equity and Cooperative Union, of Geneseo, Kans., protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

TRANSFER OF PROHIBITION AGENTS TO CLASSIFIED SERVICE.

Mr. STERLING, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 3247) to transfer to the classified service agents and inspectors in the field service, including general prohibition agents and field supervisors appointed and employed pursuant to the national prohibition act, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4160) to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a commission for the purpose of securing information in connection with questions relative to interstate commerce in coal, and for other purposes," approved September 22, 1922; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (S. 4161) granting a pension to Alwilda Flannery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4162) making available until December 31, 1923, certain sums appropriated to prevent loss of timber from insect infestation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4163) for the relief of the Moran Towing & Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 4164) for the relief of the American Trust Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4165) to provide compensation for accidental injuries to employees in certain occupations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4166) to erect a public building at the city of Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) for the relief of sufferers from fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 256) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2921) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the Senate may resume the consideration of House bill 12817, the shipping bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, the pending amendment being, on page 3, line 14, to strike out the word "such."

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Keyes	Sheppard
Ball	Fernald	Ladd	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	La Follette	Smith
Borah	George	McCumber	Smoot
Brandegee	Gooding	McKellar	Stanley
Brookhart	Hale	McLean	Sterling
Calder	Harreld	McNary	Sutherland
Cameron	Harris	Nelson	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Nicholson	Underwood
Caraway	Heflin	Norris	Wadsworth
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Johnson	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Warren
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Watson
Curtis	Kellogg	Reed, Pa.	Weller
Dial	Kendrick	Robinson	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. JONES of Washington resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon just before I concluded I had, in response to questions by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], made some statements with reference to the discriminating-duty policy of our country and also with reference to section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920. While the statements then made, I think, were substantially correct, I have prepared a clearer and more comprehensive statement with reference to those two propositions, and I ask unanimous consent that I may place it in my remarks, in the nature of a revision and addition to the statements made on those particular subjects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

"For the sake of accuracy I should like to add a little to what was said last evening on the subject of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues. In the initial tariff act of July 4, 1789, provision was first made for the application of discriminating duties, first by a discount of 10 per cent of the duty on imports in American vessels, but the next year, as previously stated, this method of applying the policy was reversed, and thereafter the regular duty was collected of imports in American vessels, but in addition to that an increase of 10 per cent of the duty was added to imports in foreign vessels. The effect of this change was to prevent any depletion of the National Treasury through the operation of the law. Subsequently, and the same year, 1789, the tonnage dues imposed on American vessels was 6 cents per gross ton and on foreign vessels 50 cents a ton, or more than eight times more on foreign than on American vessels. For a time this foreign rate was made $1 per ton, and during Jefferson's first administration for a brief time the rate on foreign vessels was fixed at $2 a ton, but all the while it remained constant at 6 cents a ton on American vessels.

"When this policy was first applied, American vessels were carrying but 23 per cent of the foreign commerce of the United States. But with the application of the discriminating-duty policy in five years American vessels were carrying 90 per cent of our imports and exports, and but for the brief period of the War of 1812 American ships carried 90 per cent of the foreign trade of the United States until 1830, a period of 35 years.

"It should be said that the early tariff laws provided particularly heavy discriminatory rates on imports of teas of different kinds, and so great was the disparity between the duties on imports of teas in American vessels as compared with the rates on foreign vessels that the report of the American Institute in 1826 declared that not a single pound of tea had entered the ports of the United States except in vessels of the United States since the first discriminating duty was applied, 37 years previously.

"In respect to the commercial convention exchanged between the United States and Great Britain in 1815, it is worthy of note that its adoption effected practically no change in the proportion of carriage of American foreign commerce in American vessels. That is explained in this way: The convention confined the suspension of the application of the discriminating duty policy merely to imports into the ports of the United States from 'His Brittanic Majesty's possessions of Europe'—practically speaking, Great Britain—and, vice versa, in the ports of Great Britain no discrimination was made against American vessels carrying from the United States goods, wares, and merchandise that were the growth, production, and manufacture of the United States. In short, the convention limited the 'reciprocal liberty of commerce,' which was the reverse of the discriminating-duty policy, merely to the direct trade between the United States and British European ports.

"The fact that the discrimination was lifted from imports from British ports of Europe when brought in British vessels, it should be recalled, was applicable only to imports from such possessions that were the growth, production, and manufacture thereof. As Great Britain then was, even more so than now, the great transshipment country of the world, from which goods that were the growth, production, and manufacture of all parts of the world were reexported, it followed that large quantities of the goods brought to this country in British vessels were not the growth, production, and manufacture of British possessions of Europe, and were not, therefore, entitled to exemption from the discriminating duty. It is this fact that accounts for the convention of 1815 doing so little—nothing at all, in fact—to increase British proportional carriage of our imports and exports.

"In 1828 Congress passed an act providing for the suspension of the collection of discriminating duties through a proclamation to be issued by the President whenever he became satisfied that the ships of other nations had ceased to discriminate against American vessels and their goods in the ports of other nations. From time to time other nations took advantage of that act of 1828, and not only was this followed by the issuance

of the President's proclamation suspending the collection of discriminating duties in all such specific cases but this was followed by the exchange of trade treaties—all terminable trade treaties, by the way—by which this Nation bound itself no longer to discriminate against foreign ships and their goods in our ports in respect to all such nations as agreed to treat our vessels and their goods in their ports the same as they treated their own.

"It is worth noting that British ships during all of the years from the adoption of our first tariff act in 1789 until 1840 carried an average of 80 per cent of all of the imports and exports of the United States carried by foreign vessels; and even after 1840 the share of our foreign trade carried by foreign ships was three-fourths British and but one-fourth in other foreign ships. British ships were unable to take advantage of our act of 1828 until 1850, because Great Britain did not cease to discriminate against American ships and their goods—except in the direct trade as provided in the convention of 1815—until January 1, 1850. At that time American ships were carrying nearly 75 per cent of the imports and exports of the United States. As a matter of fact, from 1789 until 1861 the average of our foreign commerce carried in American ships was 80 per cent. For 72 years four-fifths of the entire foreign commerce of the United States was carried in American vessels.

"At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 American ships were even then carrying two-thirds of all of our imports and exports. The reason there was not a greater decline in the proportion of our foreign commerce in American vessels after Great Britain ceased to discriminate against our ships and their goods from all parts of the world was due to the great impetus given to our shipping during practically 61 successive years of the application of protection to our shipping through the policy of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues. In addition, there was a great demand for the fine clippers of the United States during the decade from 1850 to 1860, because of the discovery of gold in California, afterwards in Australia; and, besides, British merchant ships were diverted during the period of the Crimean War from commercial to war service. All of these different circumstances prevented a more rapid decline of the proportion of our foreign trade carried in our own ships.

"Another factor that helped to disguise our proportional losses of our own foreign carrying was the fact that there was during the last decade before the outbreak of the Civil War a large increase in our tonnage in foreign trade—it nearly doubled, in fact—although we were steadily but gradually losing out in percentage of our own foreign carrying in our own ships.

"Even in those ante-bellum days American ships cost more to build than the ships of most other countries; but they sailed faster and made much quicker voyages, and they carried their cargoes so free from damages that for many years American ships enjoyed higher freight rates than their foreign rivals. Our ships always cost more to operate than foreign ships cost. But the protection the discriminating-duty policy gave to our ships more than offset all of the losses due to higher cost of construction and operation under the American flag.

"Of course, it is but proper to say that beginning in 1847, due to an act passed in 1845 and subsequent acts of the same kind, subsidies were applied to regular liners under the American flag in trans-Atlantic trade until just before the outbreak of the Civil War, and American ships quickly achieved and thereafter maintained a superiority that their foreign rivals vainly sought to equal. The early subsidy acts, of course, materially helped our ships during the last dozen years preceding the outbreak of the Civil War. But their great backlog of protection had been due to discriminating import duties and tonnage dues.

"A word or two in respect to section 34 of the merchant marine act, 1920, is desirable in order to make the record accurate and clear. That section did not provide for the abrogation, denunciation, or cancellation of our terminable trade treaties and conventions; it merely provided for their modification in so far as such treaties restrained this country from readopting the discriminating import duty and tonnage dues policy of the fathers of the Republic. All that was intended by section 34 of the merchant marine act, 1920, was to clear the decks, so to speak, for congressional consideration thereafter of the wisdom of the readoption of the old discriminating duty policy, unhampered by any restraining provisions of trade treaties and conventions, which latter, in fact, have been the great drawback during the past 25 years to the readoption of that early successful American maritime policy. President Wilson approved of the merchant marine act on June 5, 1920, and section 34 gave him 90 days in which to give the notices to other countries of our intention so to modify—not to abrogate—existing trade treaties and conventions, as to relieve us of restraint in respect to our readoption or not as we thereafter saw fit of the policy of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues. But when the 90 days expired Secretary of State Colby announced that the President declined to give the notices to other nations required by section 34 of the act he had approved of on June 5, 1920, on the ground that Congress exceeded its rights in attempting to direct Executive action in the matter of treaties. It is worthy of note, however, that the seamen's act, which President Wilson approved of on March 4, 1915, also required the modification of these self-same trade treaties and conventions, and he was given 90 days in which to give other nations notices of our intention to modify them. This President Wilson proceeded to do, and in due course the provision in the several trade treaties and conventions that it was necessary to remove to give full effect to the seamen's act were all removed through diplomatic arrangement. It was not until 1920 that President Wilson found Congress encroaching on his prerogatives in respect to treaties.

"As a matter of fact, Title III of the bill we are now advocating—sections 301, 302, 303, and 304, pages 21 and 22—contemplates the possibility of our provision in respect to 50 per cent of the immigrants coming in American vessels being in conflict with these very same existing commercial treaties and conventions, and the President is directed to remove the conflict wherever he discovers it; that is to say, to proceed to have the treaties and conventions so modified as to give this country the right to require that 50 per cent of the immigrants entering the United States shall come in American vessels. It may be and I hope it will be that, when this bill becomes law and the President proceeds to remove the conflict between commercial treaty provisions and that of Title III of this bill, he will, at the same time, give notice as required in section 34 of the merchant marine act, 1920, of our intention so to modify the treaties to leave us free, if we wish to, to readopt the early successful policy of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues."

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, when I was interrupted on yesterday afternoon by the Senator from Ohio, I had just started to read an extract from a work by Bernard N. Baker, a leading shipping man, reminding our people of the condition that confronted us in 1916 and in prior years and after the war began by reason of our lack of a merchant marine. As I said on yesterday, it is unnecessary to remind Senators of these facts; our recollection is, no doubt, very vivid with reference to the conditions of the country at that time; but we are forgetful of such things, and with the lapse of years we do not recall them unless they are brought especially to our attention; we overlook them; and the people of the country often overlook those conditions that affected their interests so vitally, even when legislation for the benefit of their interests is before the Congress for consideration. So this morning I wish to read an extract from Mr. Baker's book and to call attention to the fact that it was written in 1916, when the conditions were fresh not only in the minds of the people but when the people were actually passing through the conditions that the author describes. Mr. Baker says:

> The distressing experience of American business during the two years past—and American business is the very life of the American Nation—has brought home to us the blundering policy of the past. It has demonstrated the supreme folly of placing our foreign trade at the mercy of alien ships. It has shown us what a loss we sustained when we surrendered our merchant marine and retired as a factor in the world's overseas shipping.
>
> For many years it was difficult to arouse widespread interest in this question. The interior element of our people regarded it as a sectional problem.

And there are indications, Mr. President, that this question is being treated as a sectional problem now. We hear on this floor and we see in the press and in interviews statements that certain sections of the country are very much opposed to this legislation. I was told the other day by a prominent man that the West is substantially solid against it. Mr. Baker continues:

> They left its solution to the seaboard States. The farmer was unable to see wherein it concerned him. The merchant and the manufacturer of the midsections had a like point of view. They refused to be concerned about the ocean transportation so long as the goods they bought or the products they sold were delivered. Ways and means were questions too remote to enter into their calculations.
>
> When, however, the shock of a world war came, paralyzing almost over night the trade channels of two continents; when every vessel flying the German or the Austrian flag was withdrawn from the seas; when half a thousand British ships were commandeered for military purposes; when grain and cotton, and even manufactures were refused bottoms at our ports; when domestic stagnation followed and financial ruin threatened the tens of thousands of producers within our borders; when these things came to pass, all because we had no merchant marine of our own, only then did the question of shipping become a personal matter at every fireside on this continent.

Mr. President, my contention is that this question is one that affects every fireside in the country; it means something

to every home in this land; and the settlement of it means more of benefit or more of woe than almost any other question that confronts Congress.

Mr. Baker continues:

It touched the pocketbook of every American citizen and involved the prosperity and happiness of every American home. It is that circumstance which has compelled a reopening of the question with a renewed effort to find a remedy and to put that remedy into immediate effect.

Mr. President, there was another book published in 1916 which also dealt with the conditions of that time. It is entitled "The Heritage of Tyre." It is very interesting, in fact almost fascinating, because of the manner in which it deals with the merchant marine of the country. I wish to read an extract from it with reference to the conditions of business in the country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Who is the author?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The author is William Brown Meloney. I read, beginning at page 9:

No nation can endure half free and half slave commercially any more than it can socially. In the sixties we had to prove for ourselves the social side of that theorem in the hell-fire of fratricidal strife. Since 1914 nearly a half of the rest of civilization at death grips has been proving the commercial equation.

No sooner had the United States burst the bonds of physical slavery 50 years ago than she supinely submitted herself to the gyves of a commercial serfdom equally as intolerable.

Mr. President, some may think that statement is stronger than the facts will warrant; and yet it seems to me that in the light of history and in the light of our experience it is not too strong a statement of the situation.

We freed a section only to enslave the whole Commonwealth. No hour, no day has passed since then that has not beheld the forging of some new rivet, some new link in the shackles. In this year of 1916 the United States, without a merchant marine, bereft of ships, is more than half the slave that she was in 1861. What boots it that labor is free if the products of its industry and enterprise are denied their market?

Mr. President, that is a suggestion which, it seems to me, labor should carefully consider. We receive communications indicating that labor is against this bill. The American Federation of Labor, one of the great organizations of labor, one of the greatest instruments of benefit to labor, in my judgment, in the country, has taken a position against this measure. I shall not discuss its position at this time; I will probably do that later on in a discussion of the measure; but, as I said in the beginning, I believe that this proposed legislation is peculiarly of benefit to the laboring people of this country, and the question asked here, "What boots it that labor is free if the products of its industry and enterprise are denied their market?" is one that labor should well ponder in making up its judgment on this legislation.

Turn where one will and it is to behold the evidence of this vassalage. Leave any one of our glutted seaports, with piers and warehouses and freight terminals burdened beyond capacity by an immovable commerce, and follow the railroad lines into the interior, across the continent; go North, go South, go East, go West, and there is not a mile that has not a chapter to contribute to this tale. All of the conceivable products of a hundred millions of people lie along those steel arteries arrested by embargoes. What moves is what the warring nations choose to buy and will receive from the railroads at tidewater. All else must abide its time or rot; for, as Europe controls the world's deep-water tonnage, so our market is limited to her will. It matters not that there are other markets in which we could sell and intrench ourselves to the advantage of future trade and expansion. We haven't the ships to reach them.

Turn from the railroads and go into the orchards of the West and Northwest, and it is to find the fruit of last season mattressing the earth against the shaking down of the worthless crops of the coming one. Hearken for the sound of ax and saw in the lumber regions of Oregon and Washington and California, and hearken in vain. An army of labor stands idle; its accumulated product lies shipless in gorged outposts.

This condition, Mr. President, continued until we entered the war and the imperative necessities of war directed our people into the channels of production, where, under the control of the Government, all processes and avenues of transportation were centered upon conveying to the battle front those materials which were necessary to carry on war and maintain our troops.

Nor are there cars to move a cutting for domestic use. The Middle West and the South are utilising the rolling stock of our rails as granaries and warehouses, and New England's depleted forests—the conservations of 25 years—are being slaughtered to supply the needs of the eastern seaboard.

* * * * * * *

Turn from field and plain and orchard and forest to the manufacturing centers, and it is to find the same paralysis of industry, for industry lives by import as well as by export. Here a factory stands silent because it can not get tin from England; there a silk loom lies manacled because it can not obtain the raw product from China. As Britain controls her shipping, so does Japan control hers. Japan has but to say to her merchant marine, "Our ships will carry Japanese exports from December to May and imports for Japanese consumption only from June to November," and that is sufficient. The rest of the world may whistle. What is true of those two nations is likewise true of all others.

As this is being set down comes news that Britain is promulgating an order in council prohibiting, among other things, the importation of automobiles for private use, fruit, musical instruments, cutlery of all kinds, hardware, yarns, chinaware, fancy goods, and even soaps. And it is explained that this is being done, not as a matter of policy, but because of a shortage of ships; that Britain must have American wheat and corn and meat and that other things can not be permitted to take up the space of her vessels. Yet wheat and corn and meat and munitions of war are but a part of American commerce.

At peace and neutral though we are, belligerency in the present situation could exact no more of us.

Mr. President, I submit that our memories will verify this statement of the conditions of that time. It is really not overdrawn.

As I said yesterday, it is stated that the farmers of the country are opposed to this proposed legislation; that the farmers of the Middle West are practically solid in opposition to it. That may be true, but in my judgment, when the farmers of the country understand and appreciate what an adequate merchant marine means to them and when they recall the conditions that confronted us when the war broke out in 1914, they will not only be perfectly willing but will urge that whatever steps are deemed necessary to establish a merchant marine upon a permanent basis shall be taken.

Mr. President, it may be that the farmers do not favor this particular measure. That may be true, but they want us to do something. I do not believe that the farmers of the country take the position that nothing should be done by Congress to establish upon a permanent basis, in private hands, in private operation, an American merchant marine.

This is the only concrete proposition that is submitted to the Congress. In another body through which this measure has passed no suggestion of another proposition was presented. As I said yesterday, I am in favor of this proposition because it seems to be the only concrete suggestion made to bring us a permanent American merchant marine to meet the demands and the needs of our commerce. If anyone will present anything that is better than this, that holds out better hopes of establishing a permanent American merchant marine, I will gladly welcome it; I will gladly favor it. As I say, however, this is the only concrete suggestion, and I believe that the farmers of the country, recognizing what an American merchant marine means to them, would prefer that we pass this measure than to pass none at all under the present condition of things, especially if the condition that confronts us is made plain to them.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. DIAL. I understood the Senator yesterday to say that the railroads had contracts with foreign shipowners. What is the tendency now? Are they disposed to patronize our own ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. My understanding now is that practically all the railroads have abrogated the contracts with foreign ships to which I referred. In the case of one or two of the railroads crossing the continent, I do not know that they have done so yet, but they are anxious to do it; and those companies, if they are satisfied that American ships will connect with their lines and carry imports and exports and furnish them the business as they have had it heretofore, will be ready to abrogate those contracts.

One thing that I should like to see under this bill is this: I should like to see some of the railroads of the country actually interested in shipping lines across the sea, so that every railroad agent would be interested in furnishing cargoes for American ships. I believe that one of the surest ways for us to maintain an American merchant marine on a permanent basis, especially on the Pacific, is to have some of the great continental lines interested in shipping companies for the transportation of products across the sea. Then they will get cargoes, they will maintain the ships, and they will maintain them permanently in the American trade.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. A moment ago the Senator said that no other concrete suggestion had been made with reference to this shipping problem, and I think he is right about that; but I inferred, from the way in which the Senator made that statement, that he perhaps had some other suggestion or plan in mind, though it may not have been matured. Am I right about that, or not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President. I had considerable to do with the framing of the merchant marine act of

1920, and I am going to say frankly that I believe that if that measure had been carried out and could be carried out as it was passed, there is very little of this bill that we would need; but that, apparently, can not be done.

Mr. POMERENE. In the judgment of the Senator—and I know he has given many months of very careful, close study to this problem—if that plan had been carried out, would it be necessary to provide for these subsidies?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think so.

Mr. POMERENE. I assume that because the Senator suggested the plan which is contained in the commerce act of 1920, he at that time thought that that plan would meet the situation, and that it would be preferable to the subsidy plan.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did, although that bill was not like I wanted in many particulars. I want to say frankly to the Senator that I never have been very friendly to subsidies as such. I have felt for many years that the policy of discriminating duties would be far more effective toward building up the American merchant marine than subsidies; but it seems that it is impossible to get that, and I am so earnestly in favor of doing something to build up the American merchant marine that, as I said yesterday, I have reached the point where I will vote for any measure that gives any reasonable promise of establishing upon a permanent basis an adequate American merchant marine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I never have voted for a subsidy, and I do not favor subsidies, largely for the reason that if you start to give a subsidy to build up one institution you have to follow it to others; but I am in thorough accord with what the Senator says about building up an American merchant marine. I was as far back as 1913, when the last tariff bill was written; and on my motion a discriminating duty was placed in that tariff bill, as the Senator knows.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes, sir.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It was an amendment in the Senate that prevented it from becoming effective. The Senator, in the act of 1920, followed that plan, and I was glad to support him in that plan to give discriminating duties; and he provided for the cancellation of foreign-trade contracts that interfered with its taking effect. The Senator still believes, does he not, that it is perfectly legitimate for this Government by law to wipe out those foreign-trade contracts that are sometimes called treaties?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And the only reason why it has not been done is because the Executive would not follow the will of the Congress. Is not that all?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, it seems to me it is time for the Congress to assert itself again and see if we can not convince the Executive that he should cancel contracts that are subject to cancellation when it is the will of the representatives of the American people that they should be canceled. I agree with the Senator thoroughly in the proposition that when you give a subvention by giving discriminating duties to ships that are carrying American cargoes there is nothing wasteful about it. You only pay as you go, and no ship gets anything that it does not earn; but when you enter the domain of a subsidy very often you pay for something for which the American people do not get value received; and I think there is where the very grave distinction comes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I agree absolutely with the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may follow out a step further the suggestion made by the Senator from Alabama, when you have these preferential duties on cargoes that come over in American bottoms, the benefit of those preferential duties goes to all importers and to all buyers of those cargoes, whether sold at wholesale or at retail. Under the scheme provided for in this bill, whatever subsidy is granted goes directly to the shipowner. It may be that it will trickle out through his fingers to somebody else, but we have some mental reservation as to the extent to which that may go.

I am not saying this as indicating that I am going to vote either for or against this bill, but I am seeking light on this subject. If there is any other way to bring about this merchant marine than what we have here, I should like to know what it is; and it has been my hope that in the course of this debate some other concrete plans may be suggested.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have them suggested. As I said awhile ago, if any other concrete plan is suggested that gives us better promise than this of building up a merchant marine, nobody will welcome it more cheerfully and gladly than I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, why not single out or ascertain these treaties or contracts and put them in the bill, and specifically put an end to them, as the Congress has a right to do?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not want to be diverted into that now, because I consider it a closed proposition so far as the present is concerned, and I consider it imperative that some early and prompt action shall be taken. I think we are going to suffer millions and hundreds of millions of loss if this bill fails. I am going to point out, probably, before I get through, why I think that.

Now, just a word about this other matter. We have to give from six months' to a year's notice, under the terms of these treaties, before they can be canceled—that is, before the abrogation takes effect.

I think there are about 25 or 30 of those treaties—25 or 37; I do not remember the exact number, but it is something like that. As I say, if we were to provide for their abrogation in this bill we would have to give from six months to a year's notice. That of itself would not put into effect the discriminating duty policy. Congress would then have to enact the legislation, which would have to originate in the House of Representatives, and Senators know what a time we would have over a proposition like that, involving the tariff and the discriminating duty question. If it were not for that fact, I believe that plan could be worked out in a very efficient way, and, as the Senator from Alabama suggested, they would not get the benefit unless they rendered the service, and the shippers of the country would distinctly get the benefit from it, probably in the reduction of freight rates, in addition to the general benefit that comes from having an agency of transportation always ready to carry off their products. That will be the great benefit that will come to the shippers of this country if this bill is enacted—to insure that we will not be confronted again with the condition that we had in 1914, where they will suffer tremendous loss through not having the necessary transportation facilities.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, the Senator has just suggested that notice of six months or a year would have to be given to the other signatories to these various treaties before we could have any discriminating legislation with respect to our tariff; also, that it would be necessary to enact additional legislation. All of that is granted. But the Senator has made it very clear to the Senate, I think, that he prefers the scheme contemplated in the marine act of 1920, which bears his name. If the Congress should adopt this legislation before the Senate as it now appears, as I understand it, it would fasten the system upon this country for a period of at least 10 years; that is, the bill provides for these subsidies for the period of 10 years. If this seems to the Senator to be an unwise scheme, or if there is some other plan that is better, it seems to me we ought to hesitate a good while before we adopt a plan whose life will be 10 years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think it is unwise from the standpoint of the situation that confronts us now. I anticipate that it will probably take us 10 years to get rid of these treaties and to enact legislation under them—judging the future by the past. I frankly say that I prefer the other policy, but I think this is the best policy at the present time that we can put into effect under the present conditions and in the present situation.

We could abrogate those treaties, and I think the chances are that the only way they will ever be abrogated will be through direct action by Congress. It is not a partisan proposition either. The Senator knows that a Democratic President refused to carry out the mandates of Congress. Maybe he was justified in that position. I think he took the position that Congress did not have any right to give him that direction; that it was purely an executive, diplomatic matter which the Congress had no power to control or interfere with. Of course, I do not think there is any question about our having the right to pass legislation contrary to treaties, if we see fit to do it; but we did not want to do that. That is the harsh remedy. So we took the other course, and the Democratic President said he would not follow that mandate. Then a Republican President said he would not. So there we are.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I presume these treaties provide by their own terms a method by which they may be denounced, so there would not be any bad faith on the part of any government in terminating the treaties according to the very expressed language of the pacts.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think not. Some of them, I will say to the Senator, do not provide for notice of termination, say nothing about termination, and I think there is some contention as to whether or not those are not agreements which can not be abrogated without the consent of both parties. I

can not conceive, however, that our Nation is absolutely tied up by a treaty or agreement the termination of which rests wholly with some foreign country. But there is some contention about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is largely a question, probably, of our departments not wanting to take the trouble to negotiate new contracts and make new arrangements. It is largely a question of detailed work in thrushing out new arrangements. But it seems to me clear, and I have always contended, that those treaties, those conventions and agreements, commercial or otherwise, ought to be gotten rid of, so that we shall have the right of free action in respect to discriminating duties.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In 1896 the Republican Party declared emphatically for the discriminating duty policy, and, as far as I can find, the only reason given in the Gallinger report why we did not adopt it was the existence of these treaties, the time it would take to abrogate them, the difficulties, and so forth. I never sympathized with that myself.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I agree entirely with what the Senator has said to the effect that these were merely trade agreements which this Government has a right to cancel whenever it pleases; and most of them have a date of termination. But whether they do or not, if there is one principle that is fixed in international law, about which there is no dispute, it is that on proper notice a trade contract can be canceled by either party.

A year ago, when the armament conference was meeting in Washington, and the question of the cancellation of the trade contracts with China in reference to her tariff was before that armament conference, although we renewed the contracts about the Chinese tariff, because China desired to have us do so at the time, I took the position before that conference that a trade contract could be canceled and abrogated on notice, and that China had a right to cancel and abrogate these trade contracts in reference to her tariff whenever she desired to do so, which position was not disputed or challenged by a single member of that conference; and they had great questions involved.

So I do not think there is any reason in the world, from an international standpoint, why we can not, on proper and just notice, cancel these contracts. The real truth about it is that there is a vast number of American citizens who are interested financially in British ships, and they have always stood in the way of any legislation which would build American ships and maintain American ships, owned by Americans, and flying the American flag.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in order to get something practical, I am wondering if the Senator from Washington would be willing to accept an amendment to this bill, as far as he might do so, setting out these contracts, giving the proper notice, and abrogating them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That, Mr. President, I will consider when it is presented. I do not know whether it would be a practical proposition now in the situation which confronts us. I doubt it very much. Under the conditions which confront us, in the situation we must meet, and in view of the legislation already passed, and in the face of the failure of both administrations to carry it out, I do not feel that we ought now to complicate this proposition with a discriminating duty matter.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, we did not hesitate to denounce a treaty with Russia a few years ago because they were not treating some of our citizens properly; and now, in view of the fact that discriminating freight rates are given foreign manufacturers who ship their goods in export trade, I see no reason why we might not do something looking to the denouncing of these treaties, which at the present time are seemingly tying America's hands.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is another phase to that question, of course. There is a lot of difference of opinion upon what might be termed the merits of the proposition. We have at once the cry of retaliation raised against us, the assertion that other countries would retaliate, and there are many who believe that they would follow a retaliation policy which would be very injurious to us. Personally, I believe there is no country on the face of the earth that is better situated to engage in a war of retaliation than we are. I do not think we have much to fear from retaliation. But that is a debatable proposition, and I do not propose to take it up.

As far as the abrogation of the treaties is concerned, in the seamen's act we expressly provided for the abrogation of certain treaties at the expiration of a certain time, so that the provisions of that act should go into effect. There was no question raised by the administration at that time as to that provision. We have a provision in this bill for the abrogation by the President of provisions of certain treaties with reference to immigration, and so on. Of course, I do not think there can be any question but that Congress can by legislation abrogate a treaty, but it is not the diplomatic way to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will prepare an amendment along that line providing for the abrogation of these trade conventions, and I trust the Senator will consider it, in view of what has been said here, and I hope to have his approval when the matter comes up for a vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Personally, as I have said, I am in favor of it; but I might not be willing to have it cumber the pending bill. Of course, I could not prevent the Senator from offering the amendment.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. It has not been stated, but is it not a fact that these so-called clauses in treaties by which we agree that there shall be no discriminating duties are contained in our commercial treaties covering many other subjects, and exist in treaties with practically all the countries in the world?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think these treaties perhaps contain other provisions, of course; but the idea was that there would not be any difficulty about framing a treaty reiterating those questions about which there was no controversy. But, as I said awhile ago, I do not care to go into that question myself. I think it is not involved here. I think the situation is such that we can not from a practical standpoint take it up. It would lead to all sorts of discussion, of course.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is involved here if it is a very simple matter for us to abrogate those treaties and pass a discriminating duty.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think anybody has suggested that it is a simple matter to do it.

Mr. KELLOGG. It seems to have been suggested that it is a very simple matter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I stated awhile ago that I thought it would take probably about 10 years, judging by the past, to put it into effect.

Mr. KELLOGG. As a matter of fact, every other country would be at liberty to impose the same kind of discriminating duties.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. In which event they would offset ours.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not agree to that; but I am not going into the argument of it at all.

Coming back now to the thread of my discussion, I pointed out yesterday many of the disastrous results that came to our farmers by reason of a lack of ships when we got into the war, quoting statements from Secretary McAdoo. I am not going to reiterate those at this time, but I have another statement here which goes a little bit into detail and calls attention to the actual facts which confronted us at the various periods, which I am going to read to the Senate. I have put it in the form of a memorandum, because I find I can generally make a statement much more concise in that way than in any other way, and wherever I have had the opportunity and time to do it I have done that.

The Boer War came on in 1899, and during the summer of 1899 the withdrawal of ships by the British first began. We were almost wholly dependent on the British for the transportation of our commerce at that time. The Boer War was many miles away from Great Britain, of course, but they had to take their ships to carry troops, supplies, and provisions there, so they took many of those ships from the lines of transportation upon which our farmers were dependent.

During the summer of 1899, when the withdrawal first began, the grain rates ran from 1 shilling 9 pence to 2 shillings 3 pence. By January, 1900, the requisitioned fleet had reached a total of 1,200,000 gross tons, and the grain rate was 2 shillings and 10 pence. By February the rate had gone up to 3 shillings. The farmer had to pay that, very largely, and it was reflected in reduced prices for his grain. While he had been getting, as I said yesterday, probably cheap transportation before that, the losses that he sustained more than overbalanced the many years of cheap rate.

By February the rate had gone up to 3 shillings 3 pence, and by the 1st of March the British Government had absorbed an additional 200,000 tons, making a total of 260 vessels, aggregating 1,400,000 gross tons. The grain rate continued to mount until on the 1st of March it reached 3 shillings 4 pence halfpenny. The great British shipping journal, Fairplay, in its issue of August 2, 1900, states:

We can scarcely remember a time when there was such an all-round inquiry for boats, now emanating from every quarter of the world. No sooner does a slightly easier tone come over this direction than

America wakes up, coming into the market for August and September grain tonnage at a good advance over what was obtainable a few weeks previously. This demand has yet to be satisfied, but at present there are not the boats in sight to meet it, so rates will have to be advanced until tonnage is drawn from other directions.

At that time the grain rate was 3 shillings 6 pence. A month later it had gone to 3 shillings 8 pence, and by October it was up to 3 shillings 10 pence half penny. This was a hundred per cent advance in about a year. This was caused by a relatively slight withdrawal of tonnage.

I have taken an extract from a statement by Hon. Carl Vrooman, who, I think, under the Democratic administration was Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and who is now, I understand, especially looking after the interests of the farmers of the country, representing the farmers of the country in various associations and organizations and expressing their views upon various questions, a very fine man, a very able man, an earnest and sincere man, earnestly and sincerely working for the interests of the farmer. What does he say with reference to the conditions when the World War began and how they affected the farmer? The quotation is from Senate Document No. 395, first session, Sixty-fourth Congress. It is entitled "The farmer and the shipping bill," relating of course to the shipping bill pending at that time; but the conditions so far as the farmer is concerned are the same and the interests of the farmer are just as great now as they were at that time. This is what he said:

At the beginning of the war it cost about 5 cents a bushel to ship wheat from New York to Liverpool, but during the last few months it has cost over 40 cents. The rate is now 48 cents.

There was an increase of almost 800 per cent, an actual increase of over 700 per cent.

Mr. POMERENE. In what year was that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This was during the Sixty-fourth Congress, about 1915 or 1916, I think.

At the beginning of the war it cost about one-fourth cent per pound to ship cotton across the Atlantic. To-day it costs in the neighborhood of 3 cents a pound. Other products of our farms and factories are paying similar extortionate freight rates.

As the world price of wheat is determined by the law of supply and demand and is established at Liverpool rather than at your local market or mine, it is clear that if the cost of ocean transportation were to-day 8 cents instead of 48 cents, the wheat growers of this country would receive a substantial part of this difference in a higher price for their wheat.

Conversely, by reason of the lack of ships our wheat growers lost that difference in the price of the wheat which they received.

It is a highly significant fact that on February 15, 1916, the cash price of No. 2 hard winter wheat was 49 cents higher in Liverpool than in New York, while on the same day the ocean freight rate for wheat from New York to Liverpool was 47.9 cents. With facts like this staring us in the face it is not difficult to see the close connection existing between ocean freight rates and the price the American farmer gets for his wheat.

Yet it is contended that the American farmer is not interested in legislation of this sort.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will pardon me for another interruption, I would like to say that, although I am not for the subsidy proposed in the bill, I have a great deal of sympathy for what the Senator is striving to accomplish. I want to call to his attention that which he undoubtedly knows, that in the summer of 1914, when the great World War broke, cotton was selling for 14 cents a pound. In October of 1914 it had fallen to 5 cents a pound and below, and to a large extent it could not be sold at all. It cost the cotton farmers of the South not less than a billion dollars, due entirely to the fact that the ocean liners of Great Britain were diverted from our ports and we had no ships in which to carry our cotton crop to the markets of the world.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true, and it seems to me it is pertinent to say right here that if it cost the farmers of the South a billion dollars because we did not have American ships, unless it is clear that the expenditure of $300,000,000 will not produce a permanent American merchant marine, is not that sufficient warrant for us to take a chance and vote for a bill which will impose, if you please, a subsidy of not more than $30,000,000 a year and see to it that the cotton growers of the South and the grain growers of the West and the business interests of the entire country shall not be confronted by a condition like that in the near future? Why, Mr. President, we do not know when war is going to break out. We hope it will not break out to involve this country, but we do not have to be involved directly to suffer the consequences. If England should be involved in war it would affect us. We have already seen the effect upon us. It seems to me that no more striking argument could be presented to the Congress for the enactment of this legislation, or something better if anybody can suggest it, to help build up a permanent American merchant marine than the fact stated by the great Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. A billion dollars was lost by the farmers of the South. I called attention yesterday to that condition and to the fact that on the floor of the Senate southern Senators were urging legislation authorizing the Government to make loans directly to the cotton growers of the South because they could not market their cotton.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. One of the main troubles with us at that time was that England had issued an embargo against cotton going to Germany. The year previous to that Germany had bought about 3,000,000 bales of cotton from us. The war conditions brought on that situation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I dislike to take issue with my colleague, but the facts do not sustain him. During the summer of 1914 and up to October, 1914, cotton dropped from 14 cents a pound to 5 cents a pound. Up to that time there had been no embargo issued. It is true that it was said by all that this condition was due to war conditions, and we swallowed it, but we afterwards found out that war conditions stimulated the price of cotton, and under war conditions it went from 5 cents, to which it had dropped in 1914, to 40 cents a pound when we got transportation before the war was ended, so that it was not war conditions that brought on that situation. It was due solely and alone to the fact that we did not have ships in which to carry our cotton to the markets of the world. Of course, I agree that later on there were other causes that affected it, but up to October, 1914, there was no cause in the world except the diversion of the ships.

Mr. HEFLIN. What I meant was that we did not have the ships to carry our cotton because of the war. The allied Governments were using the ships that in peace times had carried our cotton and other products to foreign countries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If we had had ships of our own, then we would have had transportation facilities all right. But because we did not have the ships, and the other countries had ships and used the ships somewhere else or in something else, we were compelled to sustain that enormous loss.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. It might be well to say in this connection that the amount which the bill would call for annually from the Treasury of the United States would not be more than $25,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Or possibly $30,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Say $25,000,000 in round numbers. The loss on cotton alone for the one year was $1,000,000,000, and it would take 40 years at $25,000,000 to equal the loss upon that one item alone to the farmer.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Washington will permit me——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not want to be discourteous, but I asked when I started that I be not interrupted except for a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Just one moment, if the Senator will permit me. We had 6,000,000 tons of coastwise tonnage at the time this thing occurred of which the Senator speaks, and that shipping could have been applied in the carriage of the cotton crop if they had not been afraid to go into the overseas business on account of German submarines.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no, Mr. President. The Senator does not mean that, or if he does he has not looked into the matter. There were very few of the coastwise vessels that were suitable for ocean transportation trade. They were not built for that purpose and could not be used for that purpose at all.

That, Mr. President, illustrates the difficulties under which we are trying to legislate to build up our shipping—the lack of real practical knowledge with reference to shipping and the shipping business. That is one reason why I expressed my regrets in the opening of the discussion that we did not have some practical shipping men here on the floor of the Senate, so they could speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. President, I want to say that I am considering the legislation not from the standpoint of trying to find objections to it, not from the standpoint of trying to find reasons to oppose it or to vote against it, but I am trying to find the valid reasons

for supporting it and enacting it. It is not a perfect measure. There is no doubt about that. It is not probably what any one of us would approve in every particular. I think probably I could have written some provisions which I would like better than some of the provisions now in the bill; but, Mr. President, as I expected to state a little later on, it represents the combined views of practical, experienced shipping men and operators and experts, and of men who are honestly seeking a concrete solution of the problem. Probably it does not satisfy any one of them in every particular. So, Mr. President, I am trying to find a justification for supporting the measure rather than a justification for defeating it.

Now, I wish to read further from Mr. Vrooman:

It is true that we are getting good prices for wheat now, but, as Liverpool is paying enormously higher prices, there seems to be no good reason for allowing the international shipping combine—

Note that, Mr. President, the international shipping combine—

to take advantage of the crop shortage in Europe and the ship shortage on the high seas to boost the freight rates 100 to 1,600 per cent.

Call to the attention of the farmers of the Middle West that by reason of the lack of our shipping the foreign combine increased the freight rates from 100 to 1,600 per cent on their wheat and their grain of every character and their products of all kinds to go to the foreign markets, and then tell me that those farmers would be against legislation that gives fair promise to meet a condition of that kind. I do not believe it. I would not fear to stand before any audience of farmers and explain the conditions and explain the provisions of the bill and the purposes to be attained.

As a result of the present effort on the part of the Federal Department of Agriculture to popularize and render practical and efficient its scientific teachings, the agricultural output of this country is already appreciably on the increase. This means that if the farmers are to continue to get good prices for their products they must find foreign markets. It is hard to say what the price of wheat would have been during the past two years had we not been able to dispose of several hundred million bushels each year to foreign countries. The farmers of the Middle West are especially interested in securing foreign markets, since the southern farmers, who in the past have taken millions of dollars' worth of northern crops every year, gradually are learning to raise their own corn, oats, hay, and live stock. Last year the South put in 1,827,000 acres of oats, 8,751,000 acres of corn, and 400,000 acres of hay more than the year before, which resulted in an increase in production of 44,709,000 bushels of oats, 201,132,000 bushels of corn, and 1,696,000 tons of hay over the year before. If this process continues, it will mean that the Middle Western States must find a foreign outlet for a portion of their grain or pay the penalty in lower prices.

Now, listen to what Mr. Vrooman says:

In the past the average farmer has not considered a merchant marine necessary to his happiness or his financial welfare. Our farmers have never been slow to make use of the most up-to-date agricultural implements, of the automobile, or of the tractor. Nor have they been at all backward about fighting for what they considered to be their rights in the matter of railway freight rates. But up to date most of our farmers, particularly in the Middle West, have paid little or no attention to their commercial rights and requirements in the way of ocean transportation. This is not because the question is not to them a vital one, but merely because the facts about it have not been brought to their attention.

I agree with Mr. Vrooman *in* that respect.

If for any unforeseen reason Congress should fail to take steps at this session to provide the country with an independent American merchant marine, it would pay the farmers of America, and "pay them big," to chip in and build a merchant marine for themselves. Our farmers could readily afford to spend not merely the $50,000,000 called for by the pending shipping bill but $100,000,000 or even $200,000,000 in such an enterprise. If it were necessary, which it would not be, they could run such ships at a yearly loss of from 5 to 10 per cent on the last-named sum and still profit by the undertaking.

In other words, Mr. Vrooman contends that they could run the ships at a loss and still have a profit on account of the increased prices for the grain which they would receive by being able to get it to market.

In other words, it is a fact capable of demonstration that the most crying need of agriculture in this country to-day is for an independent American merchant marine.

During the World War almost all ocean carriers of belligerent nations were controlled by their governments. For this reason freight rates are difficult to cite. House of Representatives Report of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry, No. 408, first session, Sixty-seventh Congress, gives, on page 372, part 3, Table I-6, typical freight rates during the period of 1912–1921. For flour, for instance, between the North Atlantic ports and United Kingdom the rate per hundred pounds was 15 cents in 1912, 17 cents in 1913, 19 cents in 1914. During the war rates are not quoted for the reason above given. In 1919 and in 1920 the rate of $1 per hundred pounds is given. In 1921 it had dropped to 19 cents per hundred pounds.

Why had it dropped from $1 a hundred pounds to 19 cents? The reason for this drop in cost was that an American merchant marine was on the seas and that the British merchant marine was released from its Government control, under which it had been rigidly directed for the purpose of repatriating the troops gathered from all parts of the British Empire. This is the difficulty when depending upon foreign carriers. In time of their national need it is but natural that the foreign producers, even though entirely dependent for their markets upon such carriers, must be left to shift for themselves while the national tonnage is used to the best advantage of its own government.

If we lose our shipping, in the near future the farmer will feel the effects in lower prices by reason of advanced freights, and this loss in one year, in my judgment, will be far greater than the entire amount paid out under this bill if the maximum should be paid each year. Will the farmers of the country approve standing by a political fetish that means such a probable loss to them? I may be mistaken, but I do not think they will; at any rate, I so firmly believe that this bill is in their interest that I am willing to leave my action to their good judgment at any time it may be questioned.

Mr. President, I called attention yesterday to the condition that confronted the Nation when the Spanish-American War was in progress and when we wished to send our fleet around the world, and also the condition when we became involved in the World War; but I have here a little memorandum that speaks volumes to me as to the needs from a national standpoint of an American merchant marine.

Mr. President, if we had had to depend upon American ships and upon American-built ships when we entered into the World War, in my judgment the outcome of that war would have been very different from what it was. I do not believe that it is an overstatement to say that the German merchant marine won the World War for the Allies.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does not the Senator mean the English merchant marine?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I mean the German merchant marine won the World War for the Allies. I will tell Senators why I make that statement. All our troops were transported to Europe by merchant ships. The seized German tonnage after we became participants in the war transported over 600,000 of our soldiers to Europe. The fleets of the world were taxed to the utmost to carry our troops over there, and to carry supplies, and so on, and if we had not had those German ships on which to transport 600,000 of our soldiers over there the outcome of the World War might have been very different. That is the reason why I say that possibly the German merchant marine won the war for the Allies. Oh, Mr. President, it was a mighty fortunate thing for civilization that German merchant ships were in our ports when the World War broke out, that they were interned there until we got into the war, and that they were available to us to carry our troops across the sea.

The result of the war would have been different if we had had to depend upon American ships alone. How did we get our troops across the sea to the battle front? One million six thousand nine hundred and eighty-seven were carried in British ships; 68,246 in British chartered ships; 51,866 in other foreign ships. In other words, over 1,127,000 men of the 2,079,000 that we sent across the sea were transported in foreign ships other than German ships. Taking the number of troops transported entirely by foreign ships there are left only about 248,000 who were transported in our own ships. Oh, Mr. President, if we had only sent 240,000 men to Europe in the crucial period of the war in my judgment the result of that war would have been different from what it was. See what it meant for this country to lack American ships and to be absolutely dependent upon foreign ships to carry our troops across the sea to fight the battles of the Republic and the battles of civilization.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record at this point the memorandum from which I have taken the figures which I have called to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

Statement of American Expeditionary Force troops carried to Europe by vessels under American and foreign flags.

Under foreign flags:		
British ships		1,006,987
British chartered ships		68,246
Other foreign ships		51,866
		1,127,099
Under American flag:		
Seized tonnage—		
German	566,921	
Dutch	36,949	
	603,870	
Subsidized under act, 1891	44,365	
Transferred under Panama Canal act	44,326	
Other	148,680	
	237,371	

Statement of American Expeditionary Force troops carried to Europe by vessels under American and foreign flags—Continued.

Under American flag—Continued.		
Men-of-war and Army transports (including 28,081 carried on Great Northern and Northern Pacific)	76,812	
Shipping Board—		
Requisitioned under construction	34,671	
Contract built	52	
Purchase	5	
	34,728	
		952,781
Total carried to Europe to Nov. 11, 1918		2,079,880

Statement of American Expeditionary Force troops carried from Europe by vessels under American and foreign flags.

Under foreign flags:		
British		795,908
Other foreign		3,976
		799,884
Under American flag:		
Seized tonnage—		
German	437,066	
Assigned German (German vessels allotted to United States in payment for D. A. P. G. tankers. These were afterwards awarded to England by the Reparations Committee)	67,628	
Dutch	50,605	
	555,299	
Private tonnage—		
Subsidized under act, 1891	44,989	
Transferred under Panama Canal act	25,310	
Other	327,409	
	397,708	
Men-of-war and Army transports	196,274	
Shipping Board—		
Requisitioned under construction	97,011	
Contract built	6,773	
Purchased	40	
	103,824	
		1,253,105
Total carried from Europe to Jan. 1, 1922		2,052,989

Mr. JONES of Washington. The memorandum also shows how our troops were brought home. It sets forth that we brought back, on purely foreign ships, 799,000 of our men. If we had been compelled to depend upon our own American-built ships, it would have been a long time—much longer than it was—before we got our men home. We brought back, in German and Dutch ships, 555,000 of our soldiers. The great *Leviathan*, which is now being reconditioned at Newport News, brought back to this country more of our troops than all other ships under the American flag.

Mr. President, this bill seeks to aid in the building up of a permanent American merchant marine. I am not for this bill because it may help the shipowner; I am not for this bill because it may help the ship operator. Not at all; I am for this bill because I believe that it will be of tremendous benefit to the farmer, to the laborer, to the business man, and to the Nation as a nation. If no one were to get benefit out of it but those interested directly in shipping I would not be for it at all. It is the great resulting good which I have in mind. If the expenditure of a few million dollars, even though that money may go to some private individuals, will result in bringing billions of dollars of benefit to the people as a whole, it seems to me that, as a representative of the people, I am fully justified in supporting such legislation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator take the position that the farmer's difficulty in selling his surplus to Europe now is due to the lack of shipping?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, not necessarily now. It is not the present situation that we have in mind by this bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Is it due to high freight rates?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The freight rates are coming down.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not quite see the point, then, of the Senator's argument.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; that is the trouble. I may be very deficient in expressing myself, but I am not considering the present so far as the farmer and the business man are concerned, because this bill is not intended to accomplish so much for the present, except in this way—and I will come to that a little later on—namely, to expedite placing in private ownership the ships that we now have. That is one purpose of the bill; but its main and primary purpose is to promote the establishment of a merchant marine upon a permanent basis for years to come, so that if our country should be confronted by the conditions which confronted us in 1914, we will not be lacking in ships. That is the primary purpose of the bill, and that is principally what I have in mind. I do not know that this bill will affect present ocean freight rates; I have not that in mind; but I do have in mind that under this bill we prepare for and guard against the future; that we prepare for and guard against an increase in ocean transportation rates such as was brought about in 1914.

So far as the present situation is concerned, ocean freight rates do not go up now on account of the lack of transportation, because it is known that American ships are ready, when the conditions warrant, to go to sea. We have those ships now; that is true; it cost us $3,000,000,000 to acquire them; they were built under the stress and needs of war, but, as I said yesterday, they are not going to last forever; they are wearing out; they are deteriorating, and the process of deterioration is proceeding more rapidly with the ships tied up at the docks than if they were in active operation.

It is estimated that the life of a ship is about 20 years. We are doing nothing looking toward the replacement of these ships; and if we do not do something that will lead to their replacement when the ships are worn out, we will have no merchant marine and we will have no ships. One of the primary purposes of this bill is to adopt a policy under which these ships will be replaced by private enterprise. Of course, they could be replaced by appropriations out of the Government Treasury, but I think Congress is determinedly opposed to the appropriation of any more money for the building of merchant ships unless we embark upon the governmental policy of building and operating the merchant marine.

I do not know that I can make this any clearer, but I do hope that that will be understood by those who are considering this measure. It is not intended as a temporary proposition. It is not intended to meet the present situation with reference to shipping, except as we hope through this measure to get into private hands the ships that the Government owns. Then, further, when they get into private hands we will have such a policy as will encourage these private owners to replace them as they need replacement, and not only to replace these ships but to build additional ships to round out our fleet and make of it what the shipping men refer to as a well-balanced fleet. There is no rebuilding of ships now. There is no replacement of ships now. Why, it was announced in one branch of Congress two or three years ago that not another dollar should be appropriated for the building of ships by the Government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, taking the Senator's statement that the life of a ship is 20 years, these ships have been in existence only a few years. There is no great hurry, is there, about replacement at this time, considering the fact that there is not enough commerce to keep busy those that we now have?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, all the shipping people say that these ships are deteriorating very fast. I do not know whether the Senator is in favor of the Government continuing in the operation of these ships as a Government or not. If he is, well and good; that is his belief as to what is the wise thing to be done. I have come to an opposite conclusion, and I want to adopt some policy that will induce private parties to take these ships just as fast as possible. I do not expect them to take the ships right away. The Shipping Board people estimate that it will take about three years to dispose of the good tonnage that we have. I am not a practical shipping man, but I doubt if we will get these ships disposed of for five years.

I remember that when we first began to work on this problem, after the war, I was working on the proposition of constructing legislation to provide for the disposition of these ships. I had the idea that it would take 10 years to dispose of these ships without serious loss to the Government. My idea was that we should handle these ships in a businesslike way, as it seemed to me; that we should handle them as a solvent firm or company would handle property that it wanted to dispose of, but did not have to dispose of as a bankrupt. I thought it would take about 10 years to do it. I talked with some very experienced shipping men, and I remember a conversation with one of them, I think one of the best shipping men in this country. He said: "Why, Senator JONES, we will get rid of these ships in two years." Here it has been very nearly five years now, and we are not through with them yet—nothing like it. We can not sell them to private parties now. So, Mr. President, in my judgment we will not have these ships out of the hands of the Government for four or five years, unless world conditions

should get such that there is a tremendous demand for all the shipping that may be available. Then, of course, if that time arrives they will be disposed of rapidly and at good prices; but there are not many indications of that condition of things coming about.

Now, Mr. President, I want to refer briefly to some contentions that are made about this bill.

It is contended that we are going to pay out $30,000,000; that it is going into the hands of private shipowners to enrich their coffers, and apparently an appeal is made to the prejudices of the people. This is true: The experts who have worked out this bill, and who framed it, estimate that by the expenditure of this $30,000,000 we will have 7,500,000 tons of shipping under the American flag, privately operated, and that that is sufficient to carry one-half of our commerce, imports and exports. That is the primary purpose of the bill—to develop an American merchant marine that will transport at least half of our commerce. We do not seek to take all the commerce of the world. We do not seek by this bill to take all the commerce of this country and carry it in American ships. It was the declared policy of the merchant marine act of 1920, which is really taken as the foundation of our policy, that we should have an American merchant marine sufficient to carry at least one-half of our commerce. That is the purpose of this bill; and under the terms of the bill, as worked out by the experts, they figure that if the time comes when we spend under the provisions of the bill $30,000,000 in a year we will then have 7,500,000 tons of shipping under the American flag.

This is true, Mr. President: If we do not have that 7,500,000 tons of shipping, we will not spend $30,000,000. This is true, Mr. President: We do not spend the money unless we get the service; we do not spend the money unless we get the ships; and I hope the people of the country will get that statement. Unless these experts are all wrong, unless those who framed this bill are all wrong, then when we spend thirty millions a year we will have an adequate American merchant marine.

If that is true, I want to ask any Senator if it is not worth the price? I want to ask Southern Senators if it is not worth $30,000,000 to insure to your cotton crop tonnage sufficient to make you independent of the world's tonnage and save you from the loss of a billion dollars within the period of a few months, as mentioned by the Senator from Alabama awhile ago? I want to know from the wheat farmers and raisers of the country if it is not worth $30,000,000 out of the Treasury to insure to them a merchant marine that will protect them from the exorbitant prices of the combine of international shipping of the world?

This is true, Mr. President: While prices of freight may be low now, if the time comes when the American shipping is gone—as it will come unless we provide some way or some policy under which it will be replaced—when that times comes, freight rates are going up, and the American farmer and the American business man, and the American laborer will have to pay the price, just as we had to pay it in the early period of the World War when we were not in it. We will not have to wait 20 years for it either. Our ships will be outclassed long before 20 years by up-to-date and more efficient ships.

As far as I am concerned, I firmly believe that if we get this shipping—and, if we do not, we will not have to pay out the $30,000,000—if we get this shipping into private hands and under the American flag, we will have gotten it very, very cheaply.

Mr. President, let us pass this bill. It may not give us an American merchant marine. It is only a matter of opinion. Nobody can issue any guaranty, but we believe that it will give it. We believe that it will aid in providing for a permanent merchant marine, but, as I said a moment ago, and I want to emphasize it, if we do not get the American merchant marine—if we do not get, for instance, 7,500,000 tons under this policy in the hands of private parties—then we will not spend the $30,000,000 a year, and we will spend only the proportional part corresponding with the shipping that we get. Refuse to pass it, fail to pass it, and our shipping may disappear. It probably will disappear unless we can get, very soon, some other policy. Then all of our war expenditures will be gone, failure will be written on one of the most important pages of our history, and we will have become the laughingstock of the people of the world.

Do the American people want that? I do not think so. Does any class of the American people want that? I do not think so. They all want an American merchant marine, and I believe that they are willing to have enacted and will sustain any measure that reasonably promises to bring about an ample American merchant marine.

Who prepared this bill, Mr. President? I did not prepare it. The committee did not prepare it. It was prepared by the Shipping Board, men that we have charged with the custody of American shipping, men that we have intrusted with that great power and that great responsibility and that great task, and men who know the situation and have been in direct contact with our problems for the last two years. I am not going to take the time to point out the difficulties that confronted the Shipping Board. I may take occasion to do it some time in the future if it is considered necessary, but I want to say that in my judgment no body of men in the history of this country ever were placed in charge of such a difficult task as the Shipping Board had to face. Whether or not they worked out their problem and solved their problem as well as anybody else would have done it I shall not say, but I believe that when we understand what they have accomplished and the difficulties under which it has been done, the wonder will be that they have really done so well rather than that they have done ill.

But who are the men who prepared this bill? They are honest men. They are sincere men. They are men of high character. They are men of fine ability. They are men of experience in business affairs and in legislative affairs. They are men acquainted with the needs of the Government from the standpoint of the national defense. They are men acquainted with the needs and the hopes and the aspirations of labor, and they are men just as patriotic and sincere as any men in this Chamber or elsewhere. They have had only the interest of the American people and the American Government and the merchant marine at heart

How did they prepare it? Mr. President, they did not depend upon their own knowledge, upon their own wisdom, upon their own experience, but they called together representatives of labor, representatives of business, representatives of the farmer, practical shipping men, operators, shipbuilders, shipowners, and experts in these various lines. They conferred with them and counseled with them, and worked with them for weeks and weeks. Then they conferred with members of the committees of the two Houses of Congress and with the President of the United States to harmonize their differences, and this bill is largely the product of that study, work, and effort.

Mr. President, the bill probably does not suit any one of those men in every particular, but it is presented to Congress with the unanimous recommendation of that board—Democrats and Republicans alike. The board treated this measure as a nonpartisan measure. It seems to me that under those circumstances the bill ought to come to us with the presumption, at any rate, that it is a pretty good bill; with the presumption, at any rate, that it is an honest, sincere effort to do what everybody professes to want done; and with the presumption that it is needed.

I have treated this measure from the broad standpoint of the need and importance of an American merchant marine. As I said awhile ago, to my mind the primary, fundamental purpose of this bill looks to the future; it is to aid in the establishment of a permanent merchant marine.

There is another very important purpose of this bill, of more immediate concern, although, as I said, I do not consider it the most important; that is, it looks toward the profitable disposal of the present shipping which the Government has, getting that shipping into private hands, and bringing to the people of the country just as much of the war cost as possible.

The President of the United States covered this phase of the question fully and splendidly, far better than I can. I can only emphasize what he so well and clearly presented. What have we? We have something like 1,400 ships; 400 of them, in round numbers, are in trade now, running upon the sea on routes of trade. The other thousand ships are tied up at the docks; they are idle; there is no business for them; they are not running; they are depreciating very rapidly; they are deteriorating more rapidly than if they were in actual operation. We have to guard them and protect them at expensive rates.

What did that shipping cost? It cost us over $3,000,000,000. During the war we built over 12,000,000 tons, built under war stress and war needs. Much of it is not really suitable for commercial purposes, and will not do to put in competition with the fleets of the world.

I have no reason to question the figures of the Shipping Board, and they estimate that of this 12,500,000 tons of shipping there are about 5,000,000 tons of good, high-class ships, which probably will compete fairly well with similar types and similar shipping of the world. There are about two million and a half tons running upon routes established by the Shipping Board. There are about 80 of those routes. Those ships are

running to-day at a loss to the Government of $50,000,000 a year, not taking into account depreciation and deterioration.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. Is not one reason why they are running at such a great loss the fact that our operators of ships have not tried to get cargoes for Government ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There may be something in that, because this is the situation; they are running under contracts under which the operators have but very little responsibility. They are paid a commission whether the ship makes money or not.

The Senator is a great business man, and he knows that if men are not especially interested in making a profit they are not going to make extra efforts. I know that the Shipping Board has taken away Shipping Board ships from some companies which have large fleets of their own because they felt that they would naturally favor their own ships every time they had an opportunity. But the general proposition which the Senator suggests I do not think is correct.

Mr. DIAL. My understanding, from reading the report of the Shipping Board, was that the idea was not to let Government ships compete with individual operators; that they were holding their ships back to let the individual operators carry the cargoes, wherever there were individual operators to do that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is not exactly a correct statement of the situation. I think it is true that the Shipping Board has not followed the policy of putting Government ships in direct competition with private lines and private ships, because they felt that that would drive the private shipping out of the business and that we would have a great loss in that way. I think Congress has intimated to them very clearly, not by positive declaration of Congress, yet through discussion on the floor and in other ways, that Congress is very much opposed to the Shipping Board using the Government Treasury and the Government ships to drive private shipping out of business. We want to encourage private shipping as much as possible, because it is through the private ship companies that we expect to sell our ships, and if we drive them out of business, then we will have no private people we can expect to buy our ships.

I think I saw in the minority report, at least I saw it somewhere, a criticism of the Shipping Board because they are continuing the contracts known as the MO 4 contracts for the operation of ships, and it is pointed out that Chairman Lasker denounced that form of contract soon after he first took charge of the Shipping Board. It is true, he did denounce it in unmeasured terms. Mr. Lasker was not a practical shipping man. He was a good business man, and he knew that, as a general proposition, it was not good business to handle ships or anything else in that sort of manner. But when he came down to the practical proposition he found that he could not operate them in any other way. He came to us and frankly told us why he did not stop those contracts.

Briefly, the MO 4 contract is something like this: The operator does not assume any responsibility about losses and profits, but he gets a commission for operating a ship, and the Government takes care of the expense, very largely. Of course, the operator has no inducement to hunt up cargoes; he has no inducement to make special efforts to supply cargoes for his ships, because he knows that he gets his commission whether he gets a profit or not. But the board tried to let these ships out to people who would take them on what is called a bareboat charter plan and could not get anybody to take them. I think only about 20 charters of this kind were made. People would not take our ships and run them that way. So Mr. Lasker and the board found that if they were going to maintain any of these routes the only way to do it was under these contracts, much as they disliked to operate under them.

Mr. President, I want to give an illustration which came under my own personal observation. One who had operated Shipping Board ships came to Washington from Seattle. I think he had made either 14 or 16 voyages, and he had made a profit for the Shipping Board on every voyage except two. He wanted to get another ship, or some more ships, from the Shipping Board; I do not know how many. He wanted to get more liberal terms than they thought they could offer, and he came to my office. I had had the same impression Mr. Lasker had; I thought we ought to get these ships into the hands of people who would have some responsibility, who would have an interest in making them profitable, who would have to share the loss in case there was a loss, and so forth. So I said to this man, "Suppose the Government would give you its ship, tell you that it would keep it insured, and not charge you any fees for running it, give you everything you could make out of it until your profits came up to 5 per cent, and then above that divide the profits; would you not take the ship?" He said, "No; I would not."

Mr. President, there is no way to make him do it. He was a practical shipping man. Do not Senators think that if he had thought there was any money in it for him he would have done it? He felt that under the policy of this country and under the conditions which confront American shipping he could not afford to do it, and he did not propose to take the risk of running the ship in that way, notwithstanding the fact that he had made a profit for the Government on nearly every voyage he had undertaken.

I have just briefly told what interest the Government had. We have these 10,000,000 tons of shipping, in round numbers, 5,000,000 tons of it fine shipping. It is wasting away. The whole 12,500,000 tons cost us $3,000,000,000. Who owns this shipping? The Government of the United States. Who is the Government? The citizens of the country—the laborers, farmers, and business men. They own this shipping. They paid for it. They put up this $3,000,000,000. It is their property. We are their agents. We are their representatives. We are charged with the duty and responsibility of handling this property in the best possible way for them. It is our duty and our responsibility to do whatever we can to bring the greatest possible return to these farmers and laborers and business men, the citizens of this country, whose property we are handling.

What is the purpose of this bill? One of the purposes of this bill is to dispose of this property, if possible, as quickly as we can, in a reasonable and businesslike way, and get it into private hands and bring back just as much of that $3,000,000,000 as we can possibly get, and put it into the Treasury of the United States, thereby relieving the people of the country of that much of the burden of taxation.

Of course we do not expect to take the money we get for these ships and go around and distribute it to each citizen of the country to put in his pocket; we do expect to put it into the Treasury of the United States and thereby diminish the demands upon the taxpayers of the country for money to defray the expenses of the Government.

Ah, every farmer in my State, every laborer in my State, every business man in my State, is interested in the benefits which may come from this legislation. He is interested in having this property bring just as great a return as possible. He expects me to do what I think is for his best interest. He has a right to assume that I know more about these conditions, the details of these conditions, than he does. I would not be fit to be here if I did not. It is part of my sacred duty to look into these things. He is plowing his field, putting in his crop, he is tired at night, and has not the means to acquaint himself with the details of this situation. He expects me to do it.

Mr. President, it is in the discharge of that duty and that responsibility that I am urging the passage of this measure. As I said yesterday, if I did not believe that it was beneficial to him, if I did not believe it would be beneficial to every one of my constituents and all the constituency of the country, I would not be in favor of it. I may be wrong, but there is no man who opposes the bill who is any more sincere with reference to it than I am in favoring it. I want to discuss the measure and I want to consider the measure in that spirit and in that way. It seems to me, Mr. President, it is not a time to appeal to prejudice or passion or anything of that sort. We are all seeking, or at least we all ought to be seeking—and I think we are—the best interests of our constituents and the people of the country. Of course, if there is any man who has given it a careful, unbiased study and consideration who thinks it is an unwise measure, that it is not a good measure, it is his duty to vote against it, and I would think much less of him if he did not vote against it than I would if he voted for it under those circumstances.

Mr. President, we could not give our ships away now under the condition that they be operated under the American flag. There is no man in the country who would take the ships, unless it would be for some special route, with the condition imposed that he must operate them under the American flag, even though they did not cost him a cent. That is true, probably, largely because of world conditions. Not only do present conditions hinder and interfere with the disposal of those ships, but so would the conditions that would confront us even if business conditions would get better. They know that without legislation of this kind they would have to come in competition with the ships of the world, and as Americans did not go into

this business prior to 1914, we have no reason to think they would make a success of it now. But if we put upon the statute books legislation under which American shippers would feel that under normal conditions they could compete with their competitors in the world trade, then they would be willing to pay more for the ships in order to have them.

It seems to me that is a business proposition. It seems to me a ship man would look at it in that way. Through that principle we believe that if the legislation is put upon the statute books, whenever we can sell the ships we will get a better price for them than if we do not enact the legislation. In my judgment, though I may be entirely wrong about it, we would recover in increased prices for those ships when they are sold more than enough money to compensate for the subsidy that we would pay out. Of course that is only an opinion; that is only a judgment; and it may be wrong. I think we can well afford in handling this great property of the people to take the chance. Every one of the ships we are operating now that we can get in private hands relieves us of a part of the $50,000,000 loss we are bearing now.

We often hear of men saying, "I do not propose to send good money after bad," and it may be the wise policy to lose what has been put in rather than to put some more money in. That may be wise for the Government. It may be wise for us to say, "Oh, it is $3,000,000,000 worth of property, but let it go. Do not sink any more money in it." If that be thought the wise thing, if that be thought the best for our constituency, let us do it. The framers of the bill and the supporters of the bill do not think that is the wise thing to do. We believe that by putting a comparatively small sum of money—because $30,000,000 is very small compared with $3,000,000,000, $300,000,000 in 10 years is very small compared with $3,000,000,000—we will get even that much more out of it.

As I said—and I do not want this to be overlooked—we will not spend the $30,000,000 if we do not sell the ships and get them into private hands and operating under the American flag. So, Mr. President, it seems to me we take very little chance in the matter; that it is almost a sure thing that we shall not lose any money.

That is the way it seems to me. We take the chance of bringing back to our people millions of dollars that they otherwise would not get and we have the absolutely sure thing that we will not spend this money if we do not get the ships under private operation under the American flag. There are no other ships to go under the American flag than the ships which the Government now owns. Of course the measure is so favorable that it may induce people to build some new ships, which would be a great thing, and get them under the American flag. That is where they will go. There is where they will have to go to get any of the benefits of the measure, and under our law they could not transfer ships from the American flag to any other flag without the Shipping Board's consent.

So, Mr. President, from the standpoint of logic and reason and what appears to me to be good business sense, our constituency would deem us recreant to our duty if we should not try to make something for them out of the tremendous expenditure of $3,000,000,000 which they have invested in these ships. Of course they expect to charge off a great deal of it because of war conditions or war profits. There is no doubt about that. But that is no excuse for us not to try to get everything we possibly can out of it for them.

Now, Mr. President, I want to discuss just a moment the subsidy feature. This, in my judgment, is no new thing in governmental action. If what we are doing in the pending bill is a subsidy, then all parties have favored subsidies at one time and another. To call one thing a subsidy and a similar thing governmental aid or governmental encouragement does not make the latter any less a subsidy any more than calling a cow in one pasture a cow and calling a cow in another pasture a horse makes the latter cow a horse.

When a great public good is sought we do not hesitate to use some of the taxes paid by all the people to pay a few to bring about that good, and I think we are justified in doing it in all proper cases. I have voted for those things when they appealed to me as necessary to accomplish a great governmental good for the people of the country.

Call it subsidy or whatever you please, to my mind it is the exercise of one of the great responsibilities of government to promote the good of the people. We took the money of all the people and put it in the reclamation fund to reclaim desert lands which we turned over to a few upon the repayment of the cost of reclamation, without interest and without charge for the use of the land pending repayment. If that is not a subsidy, I do not know what it is. I was heartily in favor of such legislation and of such a policy and I think it has fully justified itself. A great public good has been served through a comparatively small outlay of the people's money and all the people of the country have gotten tremendous benefits out of it.

I called attention some time ago to the condition out in some of the Western States. I had the good fortune and the pleasure to begin my life in the West in a desert section of that great country. The Government came in by and by, put in a few millions of dollars to reclaim the desert land which was producing nothing, which was absolutely just as barren as the desert of Sahara. When the World War came on thousands of boys went to the front from that desert territory who would not have been there if we had not reclaimed the land, and millions of dollars now come into the Treasury in income taxes that would not come if that land had not been reclaimed. There is wealth and property producing taxes to defray the expenses of county, State, and National Governments that would not have been there if the Government had not put its money in to reclaim the lands.

Special benefit to that community? Yes. Special benefit to the individuals and farmers who went in there? Yes. But the tremendous benefits to the Nation, to the State, and to the county are benefits, Mr. President, which in my judgment fully justify the action of those who voted for that policy.

Second-class mail matter is carried for publishers at less than cost. It is estimated that they get a benefit of millions and millions of dollars a year, more than the $30,000,000 which we propose to provide for shipping. Why? While this is a direct benefit to the few, there is a resultant public good that is thought to justify it, and which the Congress clearly believes justifies it, because we make no effort to do away with it. But, Mr. President, we consider that the enlightenment and education of the people far outweighs and outmeasures the little money we might get in as revenue if we charged them the full cost of transportation.

We take from the taxes of all the people to build public roads that serve a few of the people. The direct benefit is to the few and to some particular community, but there is a public good that justifies our action. How those who oppose this measure, designed as it is to serve a great public good, and how one standing upon principles can justify voting for these other things I can not understand. I do not question their honesty or their sincerity, but I do not want them to charge me with being in league with the shipping trust and the shipping interests because I support the measure.

We donated hundreds of millions of acres of land to aid in the construction of railroads across the country. We may now think it was unwise to have done so, but those who did it did so to induce men to put their money in an uncertain enterprise, because of the great national good to be served; otherwise no plans would have been made. I believe that history has justified that legislation. The building up of the country and the development of our resources would have been delayed many, many years had not that great thing been done.

Mr. President, we are now paying out $50,000,000 a year more than we receive for the service rendered for the running of about 400 of our ships.

These ships are operated on routes to serve particular communities and a particular portion of our people; but a great public good is served, however. It is strange to me, however, that those who oppose a subsidy in principle favor continuing this policy. This $50,000,000 annual outlay, to my mind, is just as much a subsidy as is the proposal in this bill, without accomplishing nearly so much as we think the bill, if enacted, will accomplish. This $50,000,000 outlay simply serves to keep the service going while the ships last. When the ships play out, as they will soon, there will be none to take their places; that is, there will be none unless we provide legislation of this kind or unless out of the Public Treasury we appropriate money to build ships to replace them as they wear out. They will be dropped, and a great disaster will come to communities and to individuals and to business. Under this bill, if the money is paid out, not only will the service be rendered and the ships be put under the American flag in private ownership but provision will be made to replace the worn-out ships with new ones. That will be a public good that will more than justify the expenditure of this money.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is an honest, patriotic effort to save to the people of the country as much as possible of the $3,000,000,000 war expenditure for shipping and at the same time permanently to establish and maintain a merchant marine under the American flag sufficient to carry one-half of our foreign commerce and thereby aid in the development and expansion of our foreign trade, protect our people and industries from the exorbitant and ruinous freight exactions to which they have been subjected in the war emergencies of the past, provide greatly for the national defense, and thus avoid

the humiliating as well as the dangerous situations which have confronted us in years gone by. We propose to expend in 10 years but little, if any, more than we shall spend in one year on our Navy; for if we expend this sum we shall have a merchant fleet that will make unnecessary the expenditure of many millions of dollars for naval ships alone, guarantee our farmers and business men against the exactions of foreign shipping, and put the Nation upon an equality in naval strength with Great Britain.

I am not a naval expert, but I understand from naval men, and I think everybody understands, that we must in time of war or in case of a national emergency of that sort have some fast merchant ships in order to take care of the fleet battleships, cruisers, and other naval vessels that may be necessary. We have ratified what is known as the "four-power pact"; I was for it; I believe it is a great thing for the peace of the world, though some do not; but it is certain that unless we have a merchant marine we shall practically be helpless on the sea. Talk about equality of navies! Unless we establish and build up our merchant marine we shall be absolutely at the mercy of some navies of the world. Many of the British merchant ships can be transformed into agencies of war almost overnight; and unless we have an adequate, well-balanced fleet not only will England dominate the navies of the world but she will dominate the merchant fleets of the world, and thus our commerce and business and the commerce and business of the world will be at her will. We must have ships of that kind not only for our foreign commerce but in order to meet national emergencies, to make it possible to defend ourselves and to protect our rights among the nations of the world and upon the sea.

Mr. President, the writer from whom I have quoted well said that a nation without a merchant marine is "half slave and half free." If we expend $30,000,000 under the pending bill, we shall guarantee 7,500,000 tons of merchant shipping under the American flag. With that, then, indeed, will we cease to be "half slave and half free" commercially. Then we shall take our rightful place and our independent place among the nations of the earth.

Mr. President, to-day special legislation is being pressed for the farmers of the country. Agriculture is in a deplorable condition; there is no question about that, and Congress is going to pass whatever legislation it may deem necessary or that it may consider necessary in order to aid agriculture; but agriculture is in no more deplorable condition than is shipping in the country. While we gladly and cheerfully aid agriculture and the farmers of the country, why should we not also help and aid this other great handmaiden not only of agriculture but of business of every kind and character as well as a great instrument of national defense?

Mr. President, I wish to close this general discussion of the pending measure with this language:

> If the shipping bill is objected to by our opponents, what practical suggestion or remedy have they to offer? The American people will not be content with academic objections. They do not want a practical plan rejected unless a better substitute is offered. Let the opponents of this bill present such a substitute, or let them hold their peace.
>
> Will the Republicans, Democrats, and Progressives in Congress meet the cry of the American manufacturer, the American business man, and the American banker by immediately passing this measure, which will set our great country upon a new career of world influence? Will they vote now to carry out their long-neglected pledges to the people?

And I might add, will they vote now to provide a means of realizing the greatest possible sum out of the three billions of taxes paid into the Treasury from the pockets of the people of every class and of every section of our country?

> Will they emancipate American commerce from the dependence upon foreign vessels and set it safely on the highway of peaceful conquest, under the American flag, of the open markets of the world?

The language I have quoted, Mr. President, is that of Hon. William G. McAdoo before the Commercial Club at Chicago on January 9, 1915.

Mr. President, I wish to note briefly one or two of the points made in the views of the minority, prepared by my good friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who I know is just as devoted to the upbuilding of an American merchant marine as I am. I regret more than I can say that he and I could not agree in support of the pending measure. I remember how in the framing of the act of 1920 Democrats and Republicans worked in the utmost harmony, and I remember how a subcommittee, composed of Democrats and Republicans, unanimously agreed upon the terms of that measure. I recall also that it came from the Commerce Committee with practically the unanimous support of all that committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator also remember that at that moment the whole world was engaged in a great war?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, Mr. President; the war had been concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it devolved upon the Government to transport troops and munitions of war across the sea?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was referring to the act of 1920, when, as the Senator knows, the war had closed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Great War had barely ceased.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It had been over for a couple of years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Efforts to help the American merchant marine did not begin in 1920.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But I am for the moment talking about the act of 1920.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator was talking about the merchant marine.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was at the time the Senator interrupted me paying a very nice compliment, I thought, to my friend from Florida. Does not the Senator want me to do that? I was also trying to pay a compliment to my Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber. Does not the Senator from Mississippi want me to do that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am afraid the "hand is the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think, Mr. President, anybody but the Senator from Mississippi would so think. I believe my friends, at least those on the Committee on Commerce, know that I have acted in a patriotic sort of a way, and I have, I think, treated them with absolute fairness and with the greatest consideration, which is no more than they were entitled to. In the consideration of the measure to which I referred politics were set aside and we worked together, framed that measure, reported it out, and it passed the Senate practically without any party division. I had hoped that, as a Democratic administration and a Republican administration had failed or refused to carry out what I consider one of the most fundamental features of the law, we could go on now and frame this legislation entirely free from partisanship, for there ought not to be any partisanship in a measure that deals so vitally with the property and the future prosperity and happiness of the American people. However, we could not agree, and so we in a friendly way disagreed with reference to it.

I have not had the time to go into detail in reference to the views of the minority submitted by my friend from Florida, but I notice therein some statements which I think are wrong. I know that he does not intend to mislead the Senate or the country, for there is not a more conscientious man on this floor than is the Senator from Florida; but hurriedly last night I examined the views of the minority, and there are two or three statements contained in that document to which I desire to call attention. The Senator from Florida states in the minority views on the shipping bill which were published December 10:

> Regarding the alleged losses now experienced by the Shipping Board from operations we have no accurate data.

Mr. President, the Senator, I am sure, is mistaken about that. I have here a letter from Mr. Sinclair, comptroller of the Shipping Board, dated November 24, 1922, addressed to Hon. GEORGE W. EDMONDS, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., which gives in detail the expenses and receipts from the operation of ships by the Shipping Board. The letter demonstrates beyond controversy that we are losing over $50,000,000 a year. The letter has been printed in the RECORD in the proceedings of the House of Representatives, but I think that it would be wise to put it in the RECORD here, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD, together with the table which accompanies it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NOVEMBER 24, 1922.

Hon. GEORGE W. EDMONDS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to your telephone request, I herein beg to inclose statement of estimated operating results of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for the four months from July to October, 1922, inclusive.

The word "estimated" is used only because certain portions of certain voyages which have been terminated have not, as to their expenses, yet been confirmed by vouchers which must be received from abroad. That amounts to a very small percentage of the total, and

our experience is such that we can very closely gauge what it should be, but for purposes of accuracy we term the statements as "estimated." In fact, they are actual.

You will note that the total loss (without, of course, taking into account anything for capital charges, to wit: Interest, insurance, or depreciation) amounts to $13,058,593.37. Out of this, however, there is a general and administrative expense not directly applicable to operation of vessels of $2,197,513.24 for the period. This general and administrative expense is in connection with the liquidation of the assets that remained over in plant and material from the previous board, as well as expense in connection with settlement of tens of millions of dollars of construction claims.

You will note from the summary that this total loss is divided as follows:

	Loss on operations	Total loss.
July	$2,242,714.14	$2,783,096.13
August	2,662,728.62	3,268,507.76
September	3,140,860.53	3,652,789.81
October	2,814,776.84	3,354,219.67
Total	10,861,080 13	13,058,593.37

For purposes of round figuring, we will say that the loss for the period of four months has been $11,000,000. As this is one-third of the year, should the loss keep on this basis it would be $33,000,000 for the year, but anyone who estimates that the loss of the Shipping Board for the year will be $33,000,000 deceives himself. In the first place, the four months covered are the most favorable months in the year as to passenger earnings. I estimate within that period almost half of the passenger earnings of the whole 12 months accrue. It must be remembered that the summer is the great ocean passenger traveling period. The result is that, while in so far as cash outlay goes the operations of passenger ships have shown very little loss in the period covered, for most of the ensuing eight months of the fiscal year the loss will be, we estimate, $1,800,000 more than it was for the first four months.

Our total loss of the Shipping Board has been $13,058,593.37 for the first four months. During that period we not only had the peak of passenger earnings, but we spent practically no moneys in extraordinary repair of ships. We now find that there are absolutely necessary structural changes which must be made in our twenty-three 535-foot passenger ships within the next four months which will amount to $3,000,000. These extraordinary structural changes are imperative. There were no sums expended for extraordinary changes in any of our ships in the first four months; thus this constitutes an additional loss.

Because of adverse operating conditions during the next six months, our monthly operating loss will increase by $500,000 for that period. The months of May, June, July, August, September, and October are favorable to operation. From November 1 to May 1 are the months of storms on the seas, when the operating expenses increase. So that for the six months' period to come, if we operate on the same economical basis as the last four months, the normal increase for the six months in loss for this item will be $3,000,000.

Our fuel-oil contract on the eastern coast expired November 11. We advertised for bids and had all companies in America bid for renewal of the contract for a year. Beginning with November 12, we had to make a new contract at the lowest price we got as a result of advertised bids, wherein our cost for oil was increased 50 cents per barrel. We are using 1,000,000 barrels of oil per month, so you see that even with the same economical operations as the last four months the increased cost at the increase of 50 cents per barrel will amount to a total of $4,000,000.

Thus we came to the following totals:

Our loss for the first four months, including $2,197,513.24 for expenses not directly applicable to operation, was		$13,058,000
The immediate expenditures for structural changes to be made within the next four months on the twenty-three 535-foot passenger ships will be		3,000,000
Additional losses due to adverse operating conditions for the six months, at $500,000 per month		3,000,000
Increased cost of oil, based upon increase of 50 cents per barrel, and the use of 1,000,000 barrels monthly for eight months		4,000,000
Decrease in passenger earnings for winter months, six months at $300,000 per month		1,800,000
Estimated losses for eight months, November to June, inclusive, on the basis of the loss for the past four months, but not including the four added items immediately given above		26,116,000
Total estimated losses for the fiscal year 1923		50,974,000

Of course, in this loss is included the general and administrative expense not directly applicable to operation of vessels. As this was $2,197,513.24 for the first four months, if it kept on at the same rate it would be approximately $6,600,000 for the year. So, taking this off of the total estimate of $50,974,000, the total loss for the year would give us an operating loss of approximately $44,000,000. However, the loss for the current fiscal year will come nearer to $50,000,000 for the reason that freight rates are constantly dropping. Our total estimated loss of $44,000,000 for operating alone is based on the experience now of recorded results to such an extent that as comptroller I do not hesitate to aver that it can not be less, and that the estimate constitutes the only proper and correct forecast obtainable for the Shipping Board's operations for this year. I do not allow myself any appreciable latitude to be wrong.

However, what the decrease in freight rates will be is not within the purview of a comptroller. The figures I am about to give come from our operating officials, who, after we arrived at the forecast of losses given above, brought to my attention the constant drop in freight rates and insisted that we must allow an additional $6,000,000 to $10,000,000 for decrease in this direction.

To give you some actual figures, let me state that in July of this fiscal year the Shipping Board ships carried 794,447 tons of freight, for which they received $5,693,012.86, or $7.18 average revenue per ton.

In August we carried 976,236 tons, for which we received $6,524,620.57, or $6.68 average per ton. In September, the last figures available, we carried 1,029,185 tons, for which we received only $5,614,665.58, or merely $5.45 per ton.

The most interesting part of this is that in the months of August and September of this year we carried the same number of tons, practically, as last year. We received almost $22,000,000 for the tonnage carried for the two months last year, as against a little over $12,000,000 for the same tonnage this year.

You can thus see that with the constant monthly drop in freight rates the loss for the next eight months, even with increased efficiencies in management, must be larger than for the four months actually given here.

The Shipping Board is not cutting rates. Most of the rates are the same on all lines. The decrease in freight rates is due to decrease in general cargoes offered though the Shipping Board fortunately has been able, in face of these hard times, to maintain its volume of business carried.

To sum up, the four months just passed were extremely favorable to the best possible showing, for passenger earnings were at their peak, the season of the year was favorable from weather conditions for ship operations, oil was being purchased at two-thirds of the price on the east coast that will be paid for the balance of the year, and there were no extraordinary expenditures for structural repairs. Further, fortunately in those four months we had not felt the full effect of declining freight rates. So that, based on the actual losses during the four months just closed, a conservative estimate of the losses for the fiscal year still remains at $50,000,000, in spite of every effort in efficiency that may be made or retained to hold same low.

That the board is making every effort to make the losses as small as possible is evidenced by the fact that the losses from April to September of this year, the last figures available, are something over $30,000,000 less than the losses for the same six months of last year. Of the six months covered last year, three months were under the present board, and the major share of the losses occurred under the prior board. Thus the board's record of successful endeavor to curtail losses is attested in the actual audited figures of results. But even with this aggressive curtailment, the present fiscal year will show a loss of at least $50,000,000.

It might be of interest for me to call to your attention that the losses in the last fiscal year, November to June, inclusive (during which period the present Shipping Board has gotten operations pretty well in hand), were approximately $30,000,000. The loss for the same period this year must be greater, because of the unbelievably unfavorable freight market now operating—the lowest, possibly, ever known in modern ship operations. It is obvious to see that no economies, no matter now great, can overcome the more than 40 per cent decline in freight rates this year as against last year. When rates will harden is not to be estimated; the disjointing of world trade, the excess of tonnage existing through the war, Germany's present building program, and the extensive Government operations by the United States are all given by expert shipping men as contributing to the unfortunate situation.

Of course, even if freight rates should improve some time within the next 24 months, the losses of the Shipping Board would not be comparably reduced, for it must be remembered that the fleet is constantly getting older and that the Shipping Board has not spent nearly enough in upkeep and repairs. Upkeep and repairs have been neglected, because the board had to operate within its appropriations, and the entire appropriation it received from the Congress has been used in operations. As soon as freight rates get at all better, the board must spend large sums in keeping up its ships, if the deterioration is not to be ridiculously fast. Thus, for some period to come, if the assets under the board are to be properly cared for, there is no relief in sight from the losses now being recorded.

If there is any further illumination or explanation needed by you or any Members of the House, it will be my pleasure to promptly furnish same.

Very truly yours,

P. SINCLAIR, *Comptroller.*

Results of cargo-ship voyages terminating by months. Includes cargo on passenger ships, but excludes tankers.

Month	Number terminations.		Total		Tons per ship.		Freight revenue.		Average revenue per ton.	
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922
April	208	132	1,007,700	800,117	4,844	6,061	$16,777,231.69	$5,978,361.55	$16.64	$7.47
May	168	173	788,542	896,479	4,693	5,181	10,643,862.01	6,663,488.30	13.49	7.43
June	160	143	773,307	699,468	4,833	4,891	9,961,333.47	6,764,908.78	12.88	9.67
July	139	131	729,572	794,447	5,248	6,049	7,719,663.22	5,693,912.86	10.58	7.18
August	238	140	1,261,987	976,236	5,302	6,973	12,866,488.22	6,524,620.57	10.19	6.68
September	159	128	712,789	1,029,185	4,482	8,040	9,085,350.95	5,614,665.54	12.74	5.45
Total	1,072	847	5,273,897	5,195,932	.....	.....	67,053,933.56	37,239,957.60	.....	.....

Results of cargo-ship voyages terminating by months. Includes cargo on passenger ships, but excludes tankers—Continued.

Month.	Passenger revenue.		Tanker revenue.		Total revenue.	
	1921	1922	1921	1922	1921	1922
April	$332,036.92	$1,183,619.88	$2,479,405.88	$422,043.55	$19,588,674.49	$7,584,024.98
May	645,549.31	2,467,263.69	1,109,868.78	666,694.46	12,399,280.10	9,797,446.45
June	352,903.05	1,857,024.39	749,246.40	327,911.50	11,063,482.92	8,949,344.76
July	742,080.26	1,656,894.20	1,114,558.14	433,473.33	9,576,301.62	7,784,080.30
August	585,168.15	2,131,675.75	630,220.30	296,715.41	14,081,876.67	8,953,011.74
September	868,455.14	1,527,164.17	330,835.14	382,360.51	10,287,650.93	7,524,190.23
Total	3,526,192.83	10,823,442.08	6,414,134.64	2,529,198.85	76,997,266.73	50,592,598.53

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator from Florida, when he examines that, will see that that statement is hardly correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I want to say in that connection that I am perfectly willing for the letter to go in the RECORD again, although it has already gone in the RECORD; but I differ with the Senator in his conclusion that it shows beyond question what the losses are, and I defy anybody to read that letter and do any more than does the author of the letter—guess at what the possible losses may be. The letter speaks for itself. I am going to discuss it when my time comes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The letter will speak for itself. I do not profess to be an expert. I do not know anything about the operation of these ships and the revenues that come in. Of course, if the comptroller in charge of these things can not give us any definite information I do not know where anybody can get it. I think the letter will speak for itself:

> One thing is certain, and that is there is no occasion for continuing these losses.

That is the conclusion of my friend from Florida, and I suppose he will amplify it when he presents his argument to the Senate. If it is certain that there is no occasion for continuing these losses, then, indeed, the Shipping Board is recreant to its duty and has demonstrated its absolute unfitness for the place it is in. Not only that, but it shows that it is probably willfully wasting the people's money. I can not think that that is true, Mr. President, especially in view of the record that, I think, its members have made of a far more efficient organization and more economical operation of the Shipping Board than had ever been carried on before they went into office.

> If the Shipping Board can not escape them, then let them turn the ships over to the Panama Steamship Co. or to the United States Line, under Mr. Rossbottom, these two concerns alone now being guilty of the offense of Government operation, and we have no doubt we will share in the experience which these lines have enjoyed up to this time, namely, a profitable and successful business.

Mr. President, what are the facts about that? Let us see about this "profitable and successful business."

The Panama Railroad Steamship Co. has just published its annual report for the year ended June, 1922. I have this report here. It states, on page 23:

> The operations of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, although more favorable than for the preceding year, resulted in a deficit of $587,332.45 after charging to operating expenses $358,429.44 account of depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs.

It is to be borne in mind that this statement does not include the charges for taxes, interest, and insurance which have to be borne by all privately owned American steamship companies operating to the Panama Canal region. It does cover depreciation, which is usually not taken into account by the Government. These charges, if allowed for, would increase the deficit to several hundred thousand dollars more.

Mr. WATSON. How many ships do they operate?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not know how many ships they operate.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, the deficit of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line, as stated in its annual report for that year, was $700,810.22. That does not look like a very "profitable and successful business," as stated in the report. It is explained in this year's report that the carriage of Government freight and passengers, a virtual monopoly of this company—and that must not be forgotten; the Panama Railroad Steamship Line has practically a monopoly of the Government business between this country and Panama—was conducted "at material reductions from the regular tariff rates. Had the steamship line received tariff rates for such services, its deficit of $587,332.45 would have been reduced to approximately $125,000." But this available Government business would normally have to be divided with the privately owned American steamship lines to Panama instead of being monopolized, under the present arrangement, by the Government line alone. That the Government owns and operates the Panama Railroad Steamship Line not as "a profitable and successful business" but at a very heavy present annual loss it seems to me is sufficiently demonstrated by these figures.

As to the United States Lines, operating passenger ships from New York to Bremen, also described by the Senator from Florida as conducting "a profitable and successful business," those are the lines under Mr. Rossbottom. An official communication signed by T. H. Rossbottom, general manager, and his colleagues to Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, is published on page 228 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, November 28, 1922. Here is what they state about it:

> It must be borne in mind that the results of the present operations of the United States Lines would show a loss of items of insurance, depreciation, and interest were charged against operating income. This situation would be aggravated if the anticipated reduction in passenger rates takes place.
>
> We can not impress upon you too forcibly the necessity for the enactment of the "alien" provision in the shipping bill in order to accomplish the purpose of the Shipping Board to have a privately owned, permanent merchant marine established and in successful operation upon the North Atlantic.

It must not be forgotten that the ships referred to are operating in probably the most profitable line across the Atlantic Ocean. They have every possible advantage to make them a success, and yet—

> Unless that or some equivalent method is adopted, the steamers at present being operated by the United States Lines must continue to be run by the Shipping Board, with a probable drain on the Treasury until the vessels become obsolete, when the United States Lines will automatically retire from the North Atlantic passenger trade, leaving that service to be maintained by steamships of foreign registry.

And yet the proposal of my good friend from Florida is to turn all these Shipping Board vessels over to that line because it is so "profitable"; and yet this is signed:

> Respectfully submitted.
>
> UNITED STATES LINES,
> By T. H. ROSSBOTTOM,
> *General Manager.*
> MOORE & MCCORMACK (INC.),
> By A. V. MOORE, *President.*
> By E. J. MCCORMACK, *Treasurer.*
> ROOSEVELT STEAMSHIP CO. (INC.),
> By KERMIT ROOSEVELT.
> By A. E. CLEGG,
> *Operating Managers, United States Lines.*

Mr. President, this would appear to be an authoritative and convincing statement of the present condition and prospects of the United States Lines without some such powerful national encouragement as this bill provides.

The Senator from Florida, in his minority report, refers to cargo ships and liners, and he says:

> It is alleged that the subsidy is intended for the benefit of a suitable fleet to carry American grain and provisions and cotton to markets in foreign lands. These are described as "the farmers' kind of ships."
>
> It is perfectly plain, on the other hand, that the ships which would chiefly be benefited are not the cargo ships at all, but passenger ships and those of other types.
>
> For instance, a cargo ship of 5,500 gross tons, such as those vessels built at Hog Island, would receive a minimum compensation. Such a ship, along with practically 1,200 others, composing our cargo carriers, would have about 200 steaming days a year, and make about 200 miles a day, and receive the one-half cent rate, which would amount to about $11,000 per annum.

Mr. President, it is true that the rate specified for the cargo ships is not as great in figures as that specified for the liners, and yet the experts before the committee testified that proportionately and relatively a greater benefit goes to the cargo ships than to the liners because they are less expensive to operate, have smaller crews, and take less coal or oil, and so forth; so the fact that there is a higher rate of cents per ton for the

liners than for the cargo ships does not show that more favors are rendered to the liner than to the cargo ship. As I said, the experts say that there is less favor to the liner proportionately and relatively than to the cargo ship; but the purpose of the subsidy payment to cargo ships is entirely to meet the difference in wages between the American ship and her foreign, particularly her British, competitor of like type and tonnage, because that is the main difference.

The following is an exact comparison of wages paid on the American steamer *Hog Island* and the British steamer *Cornish Point*, of nearly equal dead-weight tonnage, the American ship being an economical oil burner and the British ship a coal burner, the American ship having a speed of 10 knots and the British ship a speed of 13 knots.

Mr. President, I ask permission to print this table here. It shows the specific charges and rates. It shows that the difference in cost of American wages over the English wages per month is $735, or per year $8,820. In other words, it costs that much more to operate that American ship than it does to operate that corresponding British ship.

There being no objection, the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of American and British ship wages.

DECK DEPARTMENT.

[Pound sterling equals $4.50.]

United States, "Hog Island," 7,800 dead-weight tons, oil burner, 10 knots.				England, "Cornish Point," cargo, 8,200 dead-weight tons, coal burner, 12½–13 knots.				
Rate.	Number.	Pay per man.	Pay per month.	Rate.	Number.	Pay per man.		Pay per month.	
						£	s.	£	s.
Master	1	$270	$270	Master	1	48	10	48	10
First officer	1	165	165	Chief officer	1	23	10	23	10
Second officer	1	145	145	Second officer	1	17	0	17	0
Third officer	1	130	130	Third officer	1	13	0	13	0
Carpenter and boatswain	1	65	65	Carpenter	1	12	10	12	10
				Boatswain	1	11	10	11	10
Able-bodied seamen	6	55	330	Able-bodied seamen	8	10	0	80	0
Ordinary seamen	2	40	80	Apprentices	2	0	0	0	0
Total	13		1,185	Total	16			157	10

ENGINE DEPARTMENT.

Chief engineer	1	$240	$240	Chief engineer	1	30	10	30	10
Assistant engineer	1	165	165	Second engineer	1	23	10	23	10
				Third engineer	1	17	0	17	0
Second assistant engineer	1	145	145	Fourth engineer	1	13	0	13	0
				Donkeyman	1	11	10	11	10
Third assistant engineer	1	130	130	Greasers	2	11	0	22	0
Oilers	3	65	195	Firemen	12	10	10	126	0
Firemen	3	57½	172½						
Wipers	2	50	100						
Total	12		1,147½	Total	19			243	10

STEWARD'S DEPARTMENT.

Chief steward	1	$105	$105	Chief steward	1	14	10	14	10
Chief cook	1	90	90	Assistant steward	1	9	5	9	5
Second cook and baker	1	70	70	Mess room steward	1	9	0	9	0
Mess boys	3	35	105	Chief cook	1	13	10	13	10
				Second cook	1	10	0	10	0
Total	6		370	Total	5			56	5
Wireless operator	1	90	90						
Grand total	32		2,702½	Grand total	40			457	5

RECAPITULATION.

Deck department	13		$1,185	Deck department	16	157	10	$708½
Engine department	12		1,147½	Engine department	19	243	10	1,095½
Steward's department	6		370	Steward's department	5	56	5	253
Wireless operator	1		90					
Total	32		2,702½	Total	40			2,057½

Difference in cost American wages over English:
Per month $735
Per year 8,820

Mr. JONES of Washington. Now, what about the subsidy? If, as is stated in the minority report, the *Hog Island* under this bill were to receive a subsidy of $11,000 a year, this would adequately cover the annual difference in the pay of the crew, which would be $8,820, and a further difference that exists in the cost of feeding the officers and seamen. This is all that would be required, for American and British cargo ships purchase their fuel and general stores and supplies on the world's level of markets. The higher wage and subsistence cost of the American crew is, therefore, the only factor that needs to be covered by a subsidy or compensation. There would be hundreds of American cargo steamers, like the *Hog Island*, afloat and in active service in the hands of American owners if they were given a rate of compensation of $11,000 a year; that would virtually equalize their wage-operating costs with the costs of their British competitors. This $11,000, it is true, is not a large subsidy, but it is all that the distinctive cargo steamer needs. It covers the difference in the cost of operation and a little bit more; but that is all that we ask for. That is all that anybody could expect.

The minority report emphasizes the fact that the great fast ships will receive a higher rate of subsidy because of their superior size and speed combined. The truth is that because of their size and speed and, therefore, of the larger crews which they demand, especially for the proper care of passengers, they actually require a very much larger compensation from the Government in order to be able to meet their foreign competitors on anything like equal terms. In other words, the differential is greater, and, of course, a larger subsidy in amount must be raised to cover that differential.

The minority report cites the steamers *George Washington* and *America*, of the United States lines, declaring that the *America* would receive a "gift of $300,000 under this bill." But, again, it is easy to demonstrate from official facts that the higher compensation for the large, swift American passenger ships is necessary and justifiable. In a comparison of the wage roll of the *America* and of a similar British steamer, the *Baltic*, both well-known mail, passenger, and cargo carriers in the trans-Atlantic trade—the *America*, of 21,114 gross tons, 17 knots, burning coal, and the *Baltic*, of 23,884 gross tons, 17 knots, also burning coal—the differential in the American pay roll over the British pay roll for each month is $19,451.50, or, for the entire year, $233,468.

As in the case of the *Hog Island* and the *Cornish Point*, there must be also an allowance for the difference in the cost of subsistence of the American and British crews. Allowing for this subsistence of the 300 or 400 men usually carried on the *America* and *Baltic*, it is manifest that a compensation of the $300,000 a year mentioned in the minority report will approximately put the American liner on an equality with the British liner, exactly as the $11,000 a year would place the American freight ship on approximately even conditions with the British freight ship. Therefore, in proportion to the requirements of the case, the American cargo ship is just as well protected by a subsidy of $11,000 a year as the American mail, passenger, and freight liner is protected by a subsidy of $300,000.

The shipping bill does not discriminate against the cargo ship. It gives that ship exactly the same good, fair American chance that it gives the liner. As a matter of fact, it gives it a little bit better chance, and we can well afford to give more to the liners as a measure of national defense. We will be fully justified in doing that.

Another point of the minority views as presented by the Senator from Florida on the shipping bill is to this effect:

> It is argued that we must have a subsidy because our competitors subsidize shipping and shipyards.
>
> These competitors are named as Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.
>
> The entire aggregate provision made for subsidies, subventions, and other aids in those countries amounts all told—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—to approximately seventeen million dollars per annum.

It happens that Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, long the United States Commissioner of Navigation, and still connected with the Department of Commerce in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, has lately completed a compendium of the subsidies, subventions, and other national aids to shipping now being provided by foreign governments. This compendium, as published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Tuesday, November 28, 1922, pages 224–225, which I hold in my hand, shows that the present aids to shipping of the various governments of the world have been authorized at the rate of several times $17,000,000.

Manifestly foreign governments have learned out of the Great War to realise more vividly than ever the commercial and defensive value of a strong merchant shipping industry.

Following is the compendium of foreign subsidies and subventions at the present time as presented by Mr. Chamberlain:

British Empire.

[Pound sterling, par $4.86, current $4.49.]

	Amount.	At current exchange.
GREAT BRITAIN.		
British foreign and colonial packet service (budget, 1922-23)	£672,200	$3,018,178
Naval reserves (budget, 1922-23)	543,300	2,439,417
Royal reserve of merchant cruisers, 1922-23	130,000	583,700
Merchant ships (budget, 1922-23)	45,000	202,050
Total	1,390,500	6,243,345
CANADA.		
Mail subsidies and subventions (budget estimate for 1922)	$1,033,800.00	1,033,800.00
Loss on Canadian Government Merchant Marine Co. (Ltd.), to Dec. 31, 1921	9,116,144.00	9,116,144.00
Total	10,149,944.00 (£2,260,566.59)	10,149,944.00
AUSTRALIA.		
Contract ocean mail payments (1922)	£176,500.00	792,485.00
Fiji Islands	12,000.00	53,880.00
Commonwealth Government Fleet (first cost of fleet to June 30, 1922, was £14,518,789; net earnings without allowance for interest and depreciation, £7,371,053):		
Difference	7,147,736.00	32,093,334.64
Completion shipbuilding program	2,100,000.00	9,429,000.00
Total	9,436,236.00	42,368,699.64
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.		
Castle mail contract, October, 1922	9,171,000.00	767,790.00
Grand total	13,258,302.59	59,529,778.64

Mr. FLETCHER. Under that Australia item alone, see how absurd and ridiculous is the statement, when we know that charged against subsidy there is the amount of $32,093,334, which the statement itself specifies as what the Government fleet cost Australia. That is the total cost of the fleet.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is the Government aid, just like the $50,000,000 we are paying out now. It is "subsidies, subventions, and Government aid." That is the way I read it, and that is the way I put it, and that is what it is. I will ask to have this printed in the RECORD, and it will speak for itself.

Mr. FLETCHER. We are talking now about paying out so much a year as subsidy, compensation, or whatever you call it——

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator says in his minority report:

> The entire aggregate provision made for subsidies, subventions, and other aids.

Mr. FLETCHER. Indirect aid. I do not mean to include in that the total cost of the fleet to Australia. She paid out so much and built so many ships. That is not to be classed here in the statement of what countries are paying out as subsidies.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What does the Senator say about Italy, with $28,576,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. I say that the evidence which I have here clearly and absolutely contradicts that, and shows that Italy has not only made smaller appropriations for subsidies recently than she ever made before but that she is abandoning the whole policy of subsidies.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not that information, I must say. I ask that this may be printed in the RECORD. Although it is in the RECORD in the House proceedings I think it would be well to have it in here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REED of Pennsylvania in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

France.

[Franc, par=19.3 cents; current exchange=7.2 cents.]

	1914	1923	1923
	Francs.	*Francs.*	*Current exchange.*
Construction bounties	18,000,000	Nothing.	
Navigation bounties	18,500,000	3,000,000	$216,000
Mail subvention to Corsica	550,000	2,500,000	180,000
Mail subvention to Far East, Australia, New Caledonia, Madagascar, East Coast of Africa, Eastern Mediterranean	17,587,860	40,000,000	2,880,000
Mail subvention to New York	6,000,000	2,500,000	180,000
Mail subvention to French West Indies, Mexico, Central America	4,878,000	4,366,000	316,656
Mail subvention to Algeria, Tunis, Tripoli, Morocco	1,459,000	Nothing.	
Mail subvention to Brazil, Argentina, and River Plate	3,218,280	16,000,000	1,152,000
Total	70,194,140	68,366,000	4,924,656
Fisheries fleet	1,800,000	1,000,000	72,000
Encouragement of fisheries	3,050,000	1,534,000	110,448
Grand total	75,044,140	70,902,000	5,107,104

$14,483,519, franc at par=19.3 cents.

Norway.

[Krone, par 26.8 cents, current 18.4 cents.]

	Kroner.	Converted at current exchange.
Subsidies (budget estimates, 1922-23)	15,000,000	$2,760,000

Denmark.

[Krone, par 26.8 cents, current 20.3 cents.]

	Kroner.	Converted at current exchange.
Mail contracts, 1920-21	1,120,341	$229,256

Sweden.

[Krone, par 26.8 cents, current 26.8 cents.]

	1920	1921	Converted at current exchange.
	Kroner.	*Kroner.*	
Loans to shipowners	3,230,000	4,058,000	$1,087,544
Refunds to shipbuilders of duties on imported materials	873,094	(1)	
Mail subsidies	80,000	80,000	21,440
Total	4,183,094	4,138,000	1,108,984

[1] Not stated.

Italy.

[Budget estimates 1922-23. Lira, par 19.3 cents; current 4.7 cents.]

	Lire.	Converted at current exchange.
Closing combined navigation and construction bounties under war legislation	308,000,000	$14,476,000
Mail and navigation bounties to Italian contract lines	160,000,000	7,520,000
Mail and navigation bounties to Italian lines formerly Austro-Hungarian	140,000,000	6,580,000
Total	608,000,000	28,576,000

Japan.

[Budget 1922-23. Yen, par 49.8 cents; current 43.5 cents.]

	Yen.	Converted at current exchange.
Mail and navigation contract subsidies	9,965,797	$4,333,411

Brazil.

[Budget 1922-23. Milreis, par 32.5 cents; current 12.8 cents.]

	Milreis (paper).	Converted at current exchange.
Mail and navigation subsidies	23,005,000	$2,956,160

Spain.

[Peseta: Par, 19.3 cents; current, 15.3 cents.]

	Pesetas.	Converted at current exchange.
Mail contracts and subsidies, 1921	21,570,025	$3,300,214

The Spanish cabinet in March, 1922, decided to increase subsidies to an amount not to exceed 50,000,000 pesetas ($7,650,000), and as Spanish subsidies are revised every two years, it is assumed that the revision is under consideration and will take effect in 1923.

Belgium.

The Belgian Government, by the act of July 16, 1916, is authorized to guarantee interest and amortization on 100,000,000 francs of bonds issued by the Lloyd Royal Belge Steamship Co. and to take over 75,000,000 of these bonds issued in 1920 and 25,000,000 francs issued in 1921.

Germany.

[Mark: Par value, 23.8 cents; current exchange fluctuation at between one and two hundredths of a cent.]

The German Government appropriated in February, 1921, 12,000,000,000 marks to German shipowners to pay for their ships surrendered, on the basis of the subsidy law of November, 1917. At the time it was believed this amount would rebuild in German yards 2,500,000 gross tons. Since then the Government has printed paper marks so fast that shipowners and shipbuilders, through the bank which distributes the fund, demanded, in September, 1922, an additional 24,000,000,000 marks, and the arbitration court has decided the Government must add 18,000,000,000 marks to the shipowners' subsidy between September, 1922, and March, 1923. This additional amount, however, has not yet been voted by the Reichstag and printed by the presses. The Berliner Tageblatt says German shipowners insist on freight rates and passenger fares being paid in foreign exchange, while they pay wages and general costs of operation, where possible, in paper marks.

Summary.

In the following summary of the above item it should be noted:

1. That the amount for Australia is very large, because a main item is a statement of the difference between the first cost of the Commonwealth fleet and the amount of net earnings from 1916 to July, 1922, used by Premier Hughes to show the fleet could probably be sold for the amount of the difference. The actual loss or subsidy could be determined only by selling the fleet.

2. The largest Canadian amount is for losses on the Government fleet for several years, carried to the account for the past year.

3. British naval reserve appropriations are included in naval estimates.

Great Britain	$6,243,345	
Canada	10,149,944	
Australia	42,368,199	
South Africa	767,790	
British Empire		$59,529,278
France		5,107,104
Norway		2,760,000
Denmark		229,256
Sweden		1,108,984
Italy		28,576,000
Japan		4,831,411
Brazil		2,956,160
Spain		3,300,214
		108,398,409

Mr. JONES of Washington. This compilation shows for the British Empire total national aid to shipping of all kinds for the current year of $59,529,778, including, as it should, the losses paid out of the public treasury for the Government-owned British fleets of Canada and Australia. France in this current year had subsidies of $5,107,000; Italy, $28,576,000; Japan, $4,833,000; and so on. Included rightly also is the $2,760,000 of mail subsidies paid to Norwegian coastal steamers. The total amount made available in this current year for shipping aid of one kind and another by the British Empire and other nations is stated by Mr. Chamberlain to be $108,398,409.

I want now briefly to point out what the bill provides for, and then I will be through. I shall not go into it at any great length.

TITLE 1 CONSISTS OF AMENDMENTS TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1920—SALES.

The amendment broadens the power of the board to make sales, but limits the minimum rate of interest to 4½ per cent, the maximum period of time over which payments are to be distributed to 15 years, and provides that the payments must at all times cover the depreciation of the vessel. The *Leviathan* may not be sold for less than the cost of reconditioning.

That is one provision put in in the House. There probably will be considerable discussion about that. It is going to cost about $9,000,000 to recondition the *Leviathan*. Her sister ships were reconditioned by the British Government and turned over to the British companies for $4,000,000. How we can hope anybody would take the *Leviathan* and pay the $9,000,000 for her and then compete with these sister ships I do not know, but the Senate committee did not see fit to strike out that provision.

The sales policy is also amended to emphasize the desirability of maintaining routes from outports and of giving the domestic communities primarily interested the first opportunity for two years to purchase such routes. Domestic communities are defined. The bill affirms the purpose of discouraging monopoly in shipping.

INSURANCE.

Purchasers on the deferred-payment plan are required to keep the equity of the United States insured, protected by hull insurance, and, if the board so requires, by protection and indemnity insurance. The board may create an insurance fund in which it may insure any plant or materials owned by the board or the equity of the United States on any vessel or in which a purchaser may insure the equity of the United States if he is unable to insure such equity in the American insurance market at as low a price as it could be placed abroad.

CONSTRUCTION LOAN FUND.

The act of 1920 is amended so that the construction loan fund of $125,000,000 may be created as the money becomes available instead of at the rate of $25,000,000 per year. The loan may be used for the construction of the most efficient types of vessels or the installing of efficient machinery in existing hulls.

The loan is limited to an amount of two-thirds of the value of the ship constructed or reequipped, and may not be loaned for longer than 15 years nor at less than 4½ per cent interest.

The Senate committee reported a proviso prohibiting the loan of this money to companies or corporations for the building of ships for the carrying of their own products. The committee thought it was wise to make that limitation on that fund.

MAIL.

The act of 1920 is amended by withdrawing the power which it gave to the Postmaster General in conjunction with the chairman of the Shipping Board to make contracts for the carriage of ocean mails. The ocean mail act of 1891 is repealed.

Title 2 of the bill concerns taxation, and there were two provisions in that as it passed the House providing for an exemption from income tax on the operation of the ship and on the sale of ships. Those were provisions which were in the act of 1920, and it was hoped that under the conditions existing at that time many new ships would be built under those provisions, but for some reason the Treasury Department rules and regulations authorized in that act have not yet been made and approved, and so those provisions have not been put into operation. It was stated by the experts that there would be no practical benefits from those provisions at this time under the present laws and in present conditions, and so the committee struck out those two provisions from the bill as it passed the House.

TONNAGE DUTIES.

Tonnage taxes are doubled for all vessels of such size as to make them, if otherwise eligible, recipients of direct aid.

TITLE 3 CONCERNS IMMIGRATION.

This title declares the policy of the United States to be that one-half of our immigrants shall be carried in American bottoms. The President is directed to take such steps as may remove treaty stipulations conflicting with this policy. When no conflict exists, the policy is to be carried out under regulations approved by the Secretary of Labor and Secretary of State.

TITLE 4 CONCERNS DIRECT AID.

MERCHANT MARINE FUND.

A merchant marine fund is created from all tonnage taxes, 10 per cent of all customs duties, and the direct aid refunded by owners who have made 10 per cent profit or more in any one year. Appropriation is to be sought annually for the necessary amount of direct aid.

THE CONTRACT.

Section 403 authorizes the Shipping Board to enter into contracts for the payment of compensation. The contracts may run for 10 years and compensation shall be paid at reasonable intervals, not exceeding six months. The board may refuse for good reasons to enter into a contract on a vote of not less than five members.

The committee put in a proviso to that amendment relating to contracts, expressly providing that no contract shall extend beyond a period of 15 years from the enactment of this act. It was pointed out that under the language of the bill a contract might be made for 9½ years, and then renewed for 10 years, so that a contract might run for nearly 20 years. The committee inserted a proviso stating that no contract shall extend beyond the period of 15 years from the enactment of this act, which cuts out that possibility.

DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.

The amount of compensation is based upon the distance steamed and the rate allowed per hundred nautical miles. The rate depends upon the size of the vessel and the speed of which she is capable, in the case of power-driven vessels, and upon the size alone in the case of sailing craft. Mileage is based upon chart distance between ports, except that a different distance may be allowed in special cases if the board deems it necessary.

The following requirements must be met by the vessels:

She must be maintained in the highest classification in the American Bureau of Shipping.

Two-thirds of her unlicensed crew must, after three years, be composed of American citizens, and the remainder must be eligible for citizenship. In the case of passenger vessels this does not extend to the steward's department.

She must be self-propelled over the mileage covered, except in cases of distress or in navigating harbors or inland waterways.

She must be built in the United States, except that certain vessels built before the enactment of the act may be admitted to compensation if registered under the American flag within three years and if five members of the board so vote.

She must be engaged in foreign trade as defined by the bill.

Certain feeder ships primarily serving the foreign trade of the United States are also eligible.

Three-fourths of the total fleet, owned, operated, or chartered by an owner receiving compensation, must be American.

VARIANCE OF RATE.

The board may vary the rate of compensation set by the bill within limits of 100 per cent either way upon a vote of not less than five members of the board.

OBLIGATIONS OF COMPENSATED OWNER.

An owner receiving compensation agrees that his vessels may be requisitioned in time of emergency upon a fair preemergency value. Sale of the vessel carries this obligation with it to the new owner. All repairs and renewals, other than distress repairs, are to be made in American ports.

The owner contracts to repay to the Treasury half of the amount by which in any one year his net income exceeds 10 per cent on his invested capital until the amount of aid received by him in that year shall have been refunded. Detailed provisions are included for the administration of this section.

That, briefly, explaining it a little more, means this: Of course, it is not desirable, and it ought not to be the case, that compensation would be given to a vessel owner who is making a large profit in the operation of the ship. The committee does not desire that to be done. So we have provided that where the profit of the ship operator exceeds 10 per cent in any year one-half of the excess comes back into the Treasury of the United States up to the amount of the compensation that may be paid.

Mr. POMERENE. Ten per cent figured on what?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We tried to work it out upon the actual value of the property invested. In other words, the experts have tried to devise every possible way to prevent evasion or what you might term inflation.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me put a hypothetical case. Suppose a man buys ships from the Shipping Board which cost him $5,000,000, and then proceeds to organize a company, and in having these ships appraised it develops that it would cost him $10,000,000 to duplicate that $5,000,000 worth of ships. Would he be limited to 10 per cent on the five million he paid for the ships, or would he get 10 per cent on the $10,000,000 worth of ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. As I understand, under the bill he would be entitled to 10 per cent on the $5,000,000 actually invested.

Mr. POMERENE. Not on the actual worth of the ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No, not on the actual worth of the ships as may be determined from time to time in the market, but on the actual money invested in the ships.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me put another question. Is there anything to prevent his turning the ships over to a corporation, assuming they were worth $10,000,000, and issuing therefor $10,000,000 worth of stock in the new shipping company?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think there is, and if there is not, if the Senator from Ohio will frame a provision covering that I will not object to its going in the bill. But I asked the experts particularly if they had tried to cover every possible means of evasion, and they said they had. They studied the matter for weeks, and tried to anticipate every possible way which might be taken to evade.

Mr. POMERENE. Let me put another question which has occurred to me, but which is not directly related to what the Senator is now discussing. There is a provision in the bill which prohibits any member of the Shipping Board from having any interest in these ships which are sold.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It goes further than that, I think, covering not only a member of the Shipping Board but anyone who has been employed by it. It is broader than that.

Mr. POMERENE. I think the Senator is right about that. Suppose a man buys $5,000,000 worth of ships and organizes a $10,000,000 corporation to take over the ships. Is there anything in this bill which would prevent that corporation from employing a member of this Shipping Board after the holidays, or electing him as an officer, or permitting him to become a stockholder in that company?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not sure that it goes as far as would be indicated by the Senator's question; but here is the language of the bill:

Provided, however, That no employee of the Government shall in any way be interested as a vendee in any purchase made from the Shipping Board.

Mr. POMERENE. He is not interested in the purchase, but he might be after the purchase is in fact made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The question would be how far we would want to go with that proposition.

Mr. WATSON. I suppose the language limits it to the purchase made from the Shipping Board, because it says so. It would not mean subsequent sales.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I suppose not.

Mr. POMERENE. But, assuming that the purchaser of the ships organized his corporation and transferred the property to the corporation, of course the corporation is a different legal entity, but in effect the owner is one and the same, whether it is the individual who made the original purchase or the individual who organized the corporation and has the stock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That would certainly be a fraud upon the law. Whether or not the court would hold it a fraud that would bring it within the terms of the proviso, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not believe it was the intention of the committee to permit such a palpable evasion of the law to be made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it was not the intention of the committee to permit that.

Mr. WATSON. But, after all, permit me to suggest, if the original purchases were made for $5,000,000 and no person connected with the Shipping Board was connected with the corporation that made the purchase, it would not matter after that if a $10,000,000 corporation were organized to take over the vessels, because the 10 per cent is to be paid on the original purchase.

Mr. POMERENE. No; it would not make a great deal of difference, because, under the statement made by the Senator from Washington, only one half of the excess above 10 per cent would go to the Government and the other half would go to the stockholders. It is possible that a member or employee of the Shipping Board might anticipate some future relation to some shipping company. I do not know about that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the same reason that would prevent him from being interested in the original company would prevent him from being interested in the other company, as stated by the Senator from Ohio. That is, the same reason would apply.

Mr. POMERENE. I think so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It would be a palpable fraud simply to evade the law. Whether or not the language prevents that, I hope Senators will consider very carefully. Personally, I would be perfectly willing to accept, so far as I could, any amendment that would prevent any such thing as that.

Mr. POMERENE. There is a Federal statute which prevents any employee of a department of the Government from acting as attorney or agent for anyone who may have a claim before that department which originated during the time that he was in that department. I think that is prohibited for a period of two years, as I now recall.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so.

Mr. POMERENE. It would seem to me there ought to be some similar safeguard in this measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Something of that kind, I think, might be provided.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. I hope Senators do not take that provision very seriously. It might as well be stricken out. We would be very innocent, indeed, if Senators believed it would be enforcible. Often stock is purchased by the ladies in the family or by friends, and thereby such a provision evaded. It would not be very difficult for some member of the family or friend to purchase in this case, as is often done in order to evade similar provisions of the law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is one further provision over which there will probably be considerable controversy. The House put in a provision that no money could be paid out on a contract except upon direct appropriation by Congress. That looked all right on its face. I suppose there is no Senator here but that believes Congress would ap-

propriate the necessary money to carry out any contract that is made pursuant to law, but investors who put their money into these matters do not understand the situation as we do, and they would no doubt have a fear that Congress might fail or refuse to appropriate the money to carry out their contract, and if so they would not invest. Therefore it was urged very strongly and very earnestly by the Shipping Board people, and by persons interested in the success of the legislation, that the provision would practically nullify the act, and that no investment would be made under it. So the committee struck out that provision. We did, however, put in a proviso with reference to the increase of compensation after a contract was made, which is in the discretion of the Shipping Board, so that no such increase could be paid except upon appropriation by Congress.

TITLE 5 PERTAINS TO THE ARMY AND NAVY TRANSPORT SERVICE.

Section 501 provides that where adequate commercial transportation exists military services may be discontinued by the President. The military departments are authorized to contract up to 10 years with commercial organizations for such services.

TITLE 6 PERTAINS TO RAIL AND WATER TRAFFIC.

CREATION OF THE JOINT BOARD.

The creation of a joint board from the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Shipping Board is authorized. Such board is to make recommendations looking to the correlation of rail and water traffic.

I will say for myself that I feel that that is one of the most important provisions in the bill. I feel that if we are going to have a merchant marine upon a permanent basis, even with the aid here given, we must coordinate and bring into close cooperation the railroad and water lines of the country.

EXPORT BILLS OF LADING.

The Shipping Board is to authorize the form of bills of lading for the water-borne portion of a through shipment of goods where the Interstate Commerce Commission establishes the form for that portion of the shipment over American railroads.

RAIL-OWNED WATER LINES.

This section amends paragraph 9 of section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Commission act to the end that railroads may own steamship lines where the latter do not come into possible competition with any rail lines.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS.

Section 605 amends the shipping act of 1916 so as to amplify the power of the board to investigate agreements between common carriers or between common carriers and terminals.

JOINT OR PROPORTIONAL RATES.

Section 607 amends section 28 of the merchant marine act by making it mandatory on the Interstate Commerce Commission to invoke or suspend section 28 as the Shipping Board certifies adequate or inadequate American transportation is available. Where the board and the commission are of the opinion that section 28 will cause congestion or will deflect unduly the natural channels of trade, the section shall be suspended.

TITLE 7 COMPRISES MISCELLANEOUS DIVISIONS.

OFFICIAL TRANSPORTATION.

Section 701 provides that the transportation of passengers and commodities paid for by the United States Government shall so far as practical be in American bottoms.

REPORT BY THE SHIPPING BOARD.

The shipping act of 1916 is amended to include in the required annual report a complete report of the board's transactions with regard to the merchant-marine fund and the construction-loan fund.

One of the principal objections I have seen urged to the bill has been the failure to require the board to make these reports, but that provision was put in on the floor of the House, I think, and came over as a part of the House bill requiring them to submit the report.

HOME PORTS OF UNITED STATES VESSELS.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to designate the port of documentation of American vessels, and such ports shall be the ports where the greater part of the vessels' business is conducted.

SURRENDERED DOCUMENTS.

The shipping act of 1916 is amended so that documents can not be surrendered in time of peace without the approval of the board.

REGULATIONS.

Section 703 authorizes the Shipping Board to make the necessary regulations to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. President, I think that is all I care to say at this time. I appreciate very much the patient and considerate hearing the Senate has given me.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Glass	McNary	Spencer
Bayard	Harris	Nicholson	Stanley
Brookhart	Harrison	Norris	Sterling
Calder	Heflin	Overman	Sutherland
Cameron	Johnson	Page	Swanson
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Townsend
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Trammell
Couzens	Kellogg	Pomerene	Underwood
Curtis	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.	Wadsworth
Dial	Keyes	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Ladd	Sheppard	Warren
Ernst	La Follette	Simmons	Watson
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith	Weller
George	McKellar	Smoot	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, who has just closed his argument in support of the bill, made reference to a disposition in some quarters to question the motives of Senators who are supporting the bill and also to some attacks that had been made upon those who are opposed to the bill. I wish to say at the outset that I do not for a moment question the motives of the Senator from Washington in connection with his attitude regarding the bill. I am absolutely satisfied that he is entirely conscientious about the matter, as he is as to all measures he passes upon in this body. I am satisfied he was entirely conscientious in 1914 and in 1915 when he opposed legislation looking to the creation of a merchant marine at that time. He frankly admits now that he was mistaken then, and I think he is mistaken now.

It is not a question of motive; it is not a question of a conscientious discharge of duty that is involved in this discussion at all. I freely accord to the Senator from Washington, with whom I have been associated for so many years on the Commerce Committee, absolute purity of motive and I know that his conscience and his best judgment have controlled him in this matter, as in other matters with which he deals. Primarily, the question here is whether the pending measure will accomplish what the Senator from Washington so earnestly urges is important, namely, the establishment of an adequate American merchant marine. The question here is one of ways and means; it is simply whether this is the proper course to pursue in order to achieve the end which the Senator from Washington and all of us desire, or whether, on the other hand, it is more likely to circumvent than to defeat its own object, to retard rather than to help in the development of an American merchant marine.

My contention is that there is no justification whatever for launching now upon a policy which has heretofore been rejected over and over again by Congress, and planting ourselves upon a principle which is unwise, unsafe, and unsound even as a temporary expedient, and to write into law that policy and that principle which in the whole history of shipping have never created a merchant marine in any country; an undertaking which, in our own experience, has been a total failure when we have approached it in the past; from which those countries which have adopted it have experienced the least accomplishment; in fact, those which have been the most liberal with subsidies make the poorest showing as to merchant shipping; while the great maritime powers of the world long since abandoned and threw overboard the policy and practice as wasteful and ineffective, affording no reliable or worthy dependence upon which to base any hope for benefiting their shipping.

The Senator from Washington need not spend two minutes, although three-fourths of his argument apparently was addressed to that one point, to impress upon the Senate the importance, and I will go further and say the necessity, of having a merchant marine under our flag carrying our commerce, serving our trade and the interests of all our people, adequate in its extent and efficient in its operation. For 10 years, here and elsewhere, I have argued over and over again for the creation and establishment of an adequate American merchant marine. Back in 1914, in 1915, and in 1916 I recall perfectly well what was then taking place here in the Senate and throughout the

country and throughout the world. Perhaps I may be pardoned if I indulge in a little reminiscence, even to the extent of making some slight personal reference.

I recall the time when former Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo was making those strong arguments to which the Senator referred and was pointing out the necessity for action by Congress to build ships and to provide carriers. I remember also the time when the Senators on this side of the Chamber, such Senators, for instance, as the senior Senator from Missouri at that time, Mr. Stone, the senior Senator from Virginia at that time, Mr. Martin, and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and I night after night had conferences with the then Secretary of the Treasury and the former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, in an earnest effort to devise some way, some plan, some means for providing merchant ships for this country. We contended then—and that was undoubtedly the case—that, so far as our overseas shipping was concerned, not only had private enterprise failed to increase it during the past 50 years but that it was actually decreasing; that in 1914 we were only carrying in American bottoms, overseas, 9.7 of the commerce of the United States, covering our exports and imports; that instead of accomplishing anything toward the building of a merchant marine, as I say, by private enterprise we were losing ground in that direction. It was perfectly plain that something had to be done; that the Government had to devise some way or some means of building ships. So the shipping bill was then introduced.

I recall that the then chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the late Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Clarke, was really opposed to the principle at the time; that he himself felt that this was a field for private enterprise, and he was opposed to the Government undertaking anything which, in his judgment, individuals ought to do.

Finally he said, "I will make no opposition, but you must take charge of the bill; you will have to take the responsibility; I shall not interfere; do the best you can." That threw the responsibility upon me, and I remember perfectly well the Senator from Washington spending some nine hours in an address here, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] spending some eight hours on one occasion in opposition to the bill when I was able to keep the Senate continuously in session for 65 hours without recess or adjournment in an effort to secure a vote on the bill which was aimed and intended to lay the foundation for the establishment of a decent merchant marine, but there was a filibuster inaugurated, as great as was ever conducted in the Senate, to prevent a vote upon and the passage of the bill. The result was that the bill failed of passage.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida does not mean to say that the bill to which he refers was a ship subsidy bill? That bill provided for the purchase of some German ships. I do not know that it is necessary to go into details of why Senators on this side of the Chamber opposed the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I was opposed to the graft that was in it. There were millions and tens of millions of dollars of graft in the bill. That is the kind of bill it was.

Mr. FLETCHER. There was not a single provision in the bill looking to a subsidy, of course. Nobody ever said there was; nobody ever claimed there was. There was, however, authority in the bill to build, construct, acquire, or purchase ships. The primary purpose was to build ships.

The Senator from Utah ought to know, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who was the chairman of the committee which investigated the matter of the purchase of the German ships, would tell him if he were present, that it was testified before his committee that there was not a German ship for sale; that we could not if we wished have bought a single German ship. Where was there any graft in the proposition when no one could purchase German ships, because there was nobody who had any authority to sell them and nobody wished to sell any of them?

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator from Florida must know that the whole object of the bill was to purchase the interned German ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not at all.

Mr. SMOOT. And not only that, but I have information in my possession that it was all agreed as to how the ships should be disposed of later. It would not be a very nice story to tell.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to the Senator from Utah telling it. I do not believe anything more about it than what I have read in the record and what was testified to by witnesses under oath. The testimony of record is that there was not one German ship for sale; that there was nobody here who was authorized to sell German ships; and that they could not be purchased if anybody had desired to purchase them.

Mr. POMERENE. It seems to me if there was any crookedness or graft connected with that proposition, the Senator from Utah owes it to the American people to make it public.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is all beside the question. I am not raising the point that the Senator from Utah was wholly in error in opposing that bill. I am simply referring to this little history by way of emphasizing the fact that in those days I was quoting from Secretary McAdoo, just as the Senator from Washington has done to-day, and I was using identically the same arguments that he has used here in support of the proposition that this country ought to have a decent and adequate American merchant marine; and I take the same position to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that I have always been in favor of a ship subsidy bill; I was in favor of it long before the war.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not question that.

Mr. SMOOT. I supported every proposition that was ever presented to the Senate since I have been a Member of the Senate with the exception of that vicious bill that was brought in here for an un-American purpose. I know what I am talking about, and I never would have stood upon this floor and spoken for over 13 hours against it if I had not known what I was talking about.

Mr. FLETCHER. I gave the Senator credit for only eight hours. I am sorry I missed it by five hours.

Mr. SMOOT. I was perfectly ready to talk 13 hours more, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. And it provided an appropriation of $50,000,000, creating a Shipping Board for the purpose of building ships, because private enterprise would not build them.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if there was anything crooked in that proposition, I should like to know what it was, because it might help me to vote for this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it would, because of the fact that this bill has no more comparison with that measure than the heavens and the earth.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course it has not.

Mr. SMOOT. Not a particle. There was no ship subsidy provision attached to it. There was no question of that kind at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly not. Nobody ever imagined that that was so. Nobody ever claimed such a thing. I know that there was no subsidy attached to that bill. That was a bill to build ships. This is a bill to operate ships.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill never would have come before this body in the world if it had not been for the purchase and sale ultimately of those interned German ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. That question came up after the bill was introduced. I was present at the beginning of discussions on the subject, and I know the purpose was to have the Government begin the creation of an adequate merchant marine by constructing ships. It was thought enough to cover acquiring ships by purchase, but I never heard German ships mentioned until the bill was under debate; and the Senator draws on his imagination.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it.

Mr. FLETCHER. The friends of the measure were willing, if we could acquire ships by purchase, that the Government might acquire some wherever they could get them. We needed ships. The proposition was to appropriate $50,000,000 to begin the construction of ships and for the purpose of having the Government create somehow, either by building or by purchase, some merchant ships that we saw the country was in desperate need of, and we knew that in every probability what did subsequently happen would happen. We did need them in a most pressing way.

That was the purpose of the bill, but what happened was this: It was the short session ending on March 4, 1915. This filibuster was on. The appropriation bills had not been passed. Finally, the chairman of the committee rose and moved to recommit the bill. By a majority of one or two, he was able to accomplish that. Senators on the other side unanimously, without any exception so far as I know now—certainly not more than one or two—opposed the bill from start to finish and conducted that filibuster against it, and this was the result: On the heels of that short session the bill was about to be recommitted and would have been recommitted, which meant its death; and upon the announcement of so many speakers upon the other side who expected to discuss it, showing that all the rest of the session would have been taken up in debate, the further consideration of the bill was postponed.

What followed? The war was declared in July, 1914, in Europe. Soon thereafter the German ships were out of commission, tied up in our ports and other ports all over the world. The British ships were largely commandeered for war uses. The French and Italian ships were confined to their own waters. Our manufactured goods and the products of our farms burdened and loaded down our warehouses and docks upon the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Gulf, and the Great Lakes, unable to reach the waiting markets overseas at all. Congress met in 1916. That condition became so alarming, and all over the country the pressure became so great upon Congress to do something in that emergency, that practically the same bill was introduced in 1916 and, with some extensions and enlargements as to scope, but upon the same principle as that involved in the bill introduced in 1914, was passed in September, 1916; and Senators on the other side, responding to the pressure of overwhelming public demand, ceased their opposition. They saw that this country needed ships and that there was no way on earth for it to get them except to pass that legislation and enable the Government to build or acquire ships in any way we could.

We went on under that act, proceeding to construct the ships that we now have on hand, and we spent millions and millions of dollars. If that legislation had passed in 1914, or even in 1915, this country would have saved $100 a ton upon every ship that has been built since. Having to build in war times, under war conditions, paying enormous prices for labor, with the transportation of material hindered on every hand, unable to make contracts except on the cost-plus basis because the people who took the contracts did not even know when they could get the material to go into the ships by reason of the complication with reference to transportation, the cost has been something like $200 a ton where the ships could have been built in 1914 under contract for $75 or $80 a ton. Still there was nothing to do but to build the ships, build them without regard to economies, build them simply with the one idea, namely, speed, at the sacrifice of every ordinary business consideration.

Very well. The same arguments which the Senator has employed in connection with this bill we had to make with reference to that legislation. There was that opposition I have mentioned to the first bill; and there was that relaxing of opposition in response to public opinion and in recognition of the public need, and the bill of September, 1916, was passed.

So I say that there is no use in arguing with this side of the Chamber or with anybody, so far as I know, as to the importance of having an adequate merchant marine. There was demonstrated just exactly what we predicted in 1914 would happen. Our products could not move. Freight rates went up 1,000 or 1,100 per cent subsequently; and it was also demonstrated during that war that merchant ships are just as essential in time of emergency as are cruisers and battleships and floating batteries generally. Without merchant ships England could not have remained in that war, by reason of the depredations of the German submarine.

I concede all that. I admit that we do need these ships. I admit that we need them in time of peace to serve our commerce. I admit that we need them in time of war as a part of the Navy. This bill does not create any shipping. We have the ships. They talk about the importance of having a merchant marine. The first step in achieving that end is to have ships. You can not have a merchant marine without ships. The first proposition is to build the ships or to get them somehow. We have built them at great expense, at great cost, at terrible waste, under conditions which are wholly unbusinesslike, I admit; but they had to be built under those conditions or not built at all. We have the ships. This bill does not propose to build ships, except possibly it may provide aid to that end as an incidental matter. This bill proposes to pay people to operate our ships. It offers a subsidy, a direct drain upon the Treasury of the Government, to induce people to take over these ships that we own, which we have built, and operate them under our flag. That is the proposition.

Is it necessary to do that? Is it wise to do that? Is it not perfectly plain that that is simply placing a premium on inefficiency? Is it not perfectly plain that it is a demoralizing, unsound, self-defeating proposition to pay people to do what they have to learn to do and ought to learn to do without that, especially when you are offering them the ships at about one-tenth what they cost?

Again, I want to say that I indorse fully every argument the Senator has offered in support of the proposition that this country ought to have a merchant marine. The only difference between us is the question of how to establish that merchant marine upon a permanent basis.

The old argument for a subsidy—and I have heard it ever since I came here—was, first, it was claimed the cost of construction in this country was a great deal higher than the cost of construction in foreign yards. There was some force in that argument. The facts were that you could build ships on the Clyde or in Germany or in Belfast for about $45 a ton that would cost you from $60 to $75 a ton to build in the United States.

There was a difference in the cost of construction. There was a difference in the capital required to be invested in the business; and in order to equalize that difference between the foreigner and the American it was argued that we must compensate the American so as to cover it. There was something rather plausible in that argument. I always believed it was fallacious, in the last analysis, but it had some basis then. The basis for that argument absolutely fails in this case, because we are offering these ships at $30 a ton, when they were never built in any country, in any yard, anywhere, at that price, and never will be built in any yard, in any country hereafter at that price. We are offering them 10,000,000 tons of them at $30 a ton—and I suspect that you can get them for less if you want to make a real big business transaction—and on terms of slow pay, with a very low rate of interest on the balance of the payments and a proportionately small amount of cash.

I am perfectly willing that the board should make any sort of terms with reference to the disposition of these ships—I mean by that, take as low as 25 per cent cash and spread the balance over a period of 5 or 10 years and let it bear a rate of 4 or 4½ per cent—just so the Government is not out anything on the proposition as far as the rate of interest is concerned. Let us give them ample time. These are good, new, steel ships, the finest fleet that ever floated on the seas. There never were such offers made before at $30 a ton. They are not any of them five years old. They are steel ships.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Is there authority under the present law to sell these ships on the terms indicated by the Senator?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator that that is another reason why I oppose this legislation. The Senator from Washington labored most earnestly and diligently and intelligently in shaping up the merchant marine act of 1920, and when we finished that bill we thought we had solved this whole question and laid down a law which gives to the Shipping Board the absolute power and authority to dispose of these ships on practically any terms they might see proper. The merchant marine act of 1920 does not restrict them, except that we suggest that they ought to exercise business judgment; but really it is a matter of discretion in the board as to price and as to terms with reference to the sale of these ships. We settled this question then. There is no need to do any more about it. There is no need of this legislation. That board has full authority to sell and dispose of these ships under the act of 1920.

As I said, having that authority, let them go on with it. If for some reason or other they do not exercise the power and will not execute the law, the remedy is not to enact new legislation. We must find some other way of accomplishing results. They have ample authority to dispose of these ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, what is the change in the proposed bill from the law of 1920 as to the disposition of the ships? What material change is made? The Senator says they are practically the same.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not consider that there is any material difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, this bill is just a repetition of the law of 1920 on that subject?

Mr. FLETCHER. Let us see. I will refer to the act of 1920 so as to make no mistake about it. Section 5 provides:

That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof—

And that is our policy still. We are not modifying that policy, I take it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will follow the Senator with the pending bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. The act reads:

That in order to accomplish the declared purposes of this act, and to carry out the policy declared in section 1 hereof, the board is authorized and directed to sell, as soon as practicable consistent with good business methods and the objects and purposes to be attained by this act, at public or private competitive sale, after appraisement and

due advertisement, to persons who are citizens of the United States except as provided in section 6 of this act, all of the vessels referred to in section 4 of this act or otherwise acquired by the board. Such sale shall be made at such prices and on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe.

Mr. McKELLAR. The only difference is that in the pending bill it is provided that—

(b) Any sale under this section shall be made at such prices.

Now, the Senator may go ahead.

Mr. FLETCHER. It continues:

Such sale shall be made at such prices and on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe, but the completion of the payment of the purchase price and interest shall not be deferred more than 15 years after the making of the contract of sale. The board in fixing or accepting the sale price of such vessels shall take into consideration the prevailing domestic and foreign market price of, the available supply of, and the demand for vessels——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is left out.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is simply something they ought to do anyhow. That is simply common sense. It does not really change this act of 1920. They ought to take into consideration the world market, and the supply and demand of shipping, when they sell the ships, whether they are told by law to do it or not. They shall take into consideration—

existing freight rates and prospects of their maintenance, the cost of constructing vessels of similar types under prevailing conditions, as well as the cost of the construction or purchase price of the vessels to be sold, and any other facts or conditions that would influence a prudent, solvent business man in the sale of similar vessels or property which he is not forced to sell.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is left out.

Mr. FLETCHER. They ought to consider those matters, anyhow. It is a good part of the law, but is merely directory and recites what they ought to do and, I think, they will do, whether it is expressed in the act or not. It only shows that under the act of 1920 they have all the authority proposed to be given them now. The act continues:

All sales made under the authority of this act shall be subject to the limitations and restrictions of section 9 of the "shipping act, 1916," as amended.

That is the whole of that section.

The restriction mentioned refers to sales to aliens, which must have the consent of the board.

Mr. McKELLAR. There are two additional provisions here. One is:

Interest on the unpaid purchase price shall be payable at least annually at a rate of not less than 4½ per cent per annum.

The other is a proviso:

That no employee of the Government shall in any way be interested as a vendee in any purchase made from the Shipping Board.

There seems to be very little difference.

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no material difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Except for the proviso, which apparently is without force, because if an employee desired he could resign and immediately buy all the ships he wanted to.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill was really introduced in the House without that provision in it. It was put in in the House as an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. A valueless amendment, apparently.

Mr. FLETCHER. Apparently valueless. There is no need to discuss the merit of it. We have not changed it. It is in the bill, so we need not go into that. I think certain conditions arose, and there were rumors and statements in the newspapers—I have a clipping in my pocket—showing that certain gentlemen connected now with the fleet corporation were about to become associated with others to form a trust or syndicate to take over the United States Line and probably get benefits under this legislation. There was talk of that sort. I do not say it was true, I do not know what the foundation for it was; but that was the reason, I surmise, why the House thought it well to put that provision in the bill, so that gentlemen could not be going around advocating the passage of this bill with the expectation and the opportunity of benefiting by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, this would not have the effect of preventing what it is desired to prevent, evidently, but the proviso could be very easily changed so as to prohibit anyone who has anything to do with the Shipping Board in the sale of these ships from hereafter, within a certain period, acquiring an interest in them, which ought to be done.

Mr. FLETCHER. I hope the Senator will think that out, and offer his suggestion, if we come to that in the consideration of this bill.

One other ground for subsidy heretofore urged by those who favor the establishment of that system, and the adoption of that policy in this country, was that the cost of operating ships under the American flag was a great deal higher than the cost of operating ships under a foreign flag. So they said, "Why should we invest our money in American ships, and fly the American flag, when it costs us a good deal more to operate those ships than if we invested our money under the British flag, or the flag of some other foreign country? We then could have our costs of operation less."

That argument has been wholly exploded. In the first place, the effect of the seamen's act, which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], whom I see sitting here now, so ardently championed, and with such success, has been to raise the standard of wages on foreign ships to American standards, instead of allowing American standards to be reduced to foreign standards, which would have been done without that law. The effect of it is that to-day, as we have shown in the minority views, there is practically no difference between the cost of operating vessels under the American flag, as far as wages are concerned, and the cost of operating under foreign flags.

In the minority views on this bill we refer to statements by the chairman of the Shipping Board himself. I always like to refer to the testimony and statements given by gentlemen on the other side of a question if I can, because then they can not argue the thing any further. They ought to be precluded by their own assertions, and we reach an end of the discussion, if we are ever going to reach it, when we can cite their own statements to sustain what we are claiming.

Mr. Lasker himself stated at the hearings before the joint committee of the House and Senate, when this bill was before them, on page 43, volume 1 of the hearings, as follows:

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand from the President's address to Congress, and also from the statement that you have made, that you do not undertake to recommend or urge any material change in the seamen's act that now exists?

Mr. LASKER. You are right. I want to take occasion to say here that I think the seamen's act has been one of the most misrepresented acts of which I have ever heard. I came down to Washington believing, as most people in my part of the country do, if you repeal the seamen's act you would have a merchant marine. That is pure bunk.

Mr. POMERENE. That is Mr. Lasker's statement?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is his statement. I read further:

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the reason I asked the question, because for a long time those who were undertaking to give reasons why we could not operate successfully with our foreign competitors based their assertions exclusively on the discrimination caused by the seamen's act.

Mr. LASKER. I think they have gotten worn out on those representations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad to hear that.

At these hearings Captain Furuseth, who knows more about this subject of wages than perhaps any other man in the country, a man who devotes his whole life to that problem, testified. The Shipping Board had made certain reductions in wages and certain reductions in numbers of men on their ships, as they show in their last report. They boast of it very pointedly in their last annual report, which Senators have recently found on their desks, showing the savings they have made by reducing wages and reducing the number of men on vessels. Captain Furuseth refers to that in this language:

As a result of these reductions the wages of American seamen are now much lower than the wages of Canadian and Australian seamen; are practically on a level with British wages; and are substantially higher than the wages only of Japanese among the principal maritime nations.

So that the other argument for a subsidy proves absolutely valueless, because there is practically no difference between the cost of operating vessels under the American flag and the cost of operating them under foreign flags.

Mr. POMERENE. As I understand, the Senator just read from the testimony of Mr. Lasker?

Mr. FLETCHER. And of Mr. Furuseth.

Mr. POMERENE. Have any of these shipping companies taken issue with those statements?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is a very involved and long statement set forth in these hearings, and I would not venture to analyze that whole statement now, but I presume the effect of it is to raise some question about that. Perhaps in some instances the wages are higher for certain officers and men on the vessels. But taking the whole operation through, the thing evens up about as stated by Mr. Furuseth and as admitted by Mr. Lasker.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. Does that have reference to competition with England or with other nations?

Mr. FLETCHER. It has reference to the whole question of wages on American vessels and foreign vessels. He said that they are about on a level with British vessels, less than Australia, and only greater than practically one country of the maritime powers of the world, and that is Japan.

Mr. WATSON. What is the difference relatively between this country and Japan in the cost of operating vessels of equal tonnage?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not figured that out and I do not know that I can. I think perhaps I might look over the tables and investigate the question, but I was contenting myself with Mr. Lasker's assurance that the whole proposition was bunk, practically stating there was nothing in the claim that there was a difference on American and foreign vessels.

Mr. WATSON. There is some difference, is there not?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is so immaterial that it cuts no figure really in the total cost of operating ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield to me for a moment, I can explain just what Mr. Lasker meant. While the Japanese wages were lower, the Japanese employed more men on their ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the resulting cost is about on a level. The Americans employ fewer men and pay slightly higher wages. The Japanese employ more men to the ship and pay less wages, but it about evens up. The wage question is practically the same.

While I am on my feet I will ask the Senator from Florida if it is not also true that the cost of subsistence on the ships is practically the same?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is quite true. I think we have generally better accommodations for officers and crews on our ships, but supplies are always purchased where they can be had at lowest prices, and there is practically no difference in that respect. Originally, according to the best authority on the subject, the wage cost of operating vessels under the American flag was about 2 per cent of the total cost of operation. Now the difference in the wage cost on the foreign ship and the American ship was the difference between 2 and 1, or 1½, or something like that, that it cost the foreigner in wages as a part of his operation. The total wage cost of operating a ship is about 2 per cent of the total or aggregate cost of operation. The difference in the wage cost between an American ship and a foreign ship was the difference between 2 per cent of the total cost and whatever the foreigner had to pay, whether it was 1 or 1½ per cent. So that the whole difference sums up practically negligible when it comes to considering the total operating expense of a ship.

Mr. WATSON. In order that I may get the Senator's viewpoint, am I to understand him to say that there is no difference in the cost of construction as between this and competing countries?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not said that. What I said was that it cuts no figure with reference to the pending bill, because we are offering ships, new ships, steel ships, at a figure at which they never were built in any country, and never will be built hereafter in any country, namely, $30 a ton. So there can not be any difference in the capital cost to the purchaser of those ships and the capital cost to the builder of such ships abroad except in favor of the American purchaser.

Mr. WATSON. But, of course, that would not apply if those ships were to be worn out or because of depreciation become useless in a little while. However, I merely wanted the Senator's idea as to whether or not there was a difference in the cost of construction between this and competing countries. The Senator is familiar with the subject, and I ask him as an expert.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think likely that the wages are higher in the shipyards in this country than they are abroad. I think also that the people in our shipyards are more efficient, that we can accomplish more in an American shipyard than can be accomplished in any other shipyard anywhere when our people set in to do it. The reason why I say that is that we laid down a keel at Hog Island of a 7,500 dead-weight ton ship on one day and we launched that ship on the twenty-seventh day thereafter.

I have before me at this moment the last annual report of the Shipping Board in which, at page 158, it is stated:

The last keel was laid March 15, 1921; the final launching took place September 19, 1921; and the construction was completed with the delivery of the steamship *Western World*, a 13,000-ton passenger and cargo vessel, on May 9, 1922.

The number of ships and dead-weight tonnage delivered during each fiscal year of the corporation's existence follows:

Year.	Number of ships.	Dead-weight tonnage.
1917-18	214	1,374,406
1918-19	854	4,553,298
1919-20	1,002	5,694,567
1920-21	218	1,737,550
1921-22	23	267,490
Total	2,311	13,627,311

We have sold probably 100 of those ships. A little later on I shall place in the RECORD a statement with reference to that, but most of those vessels we still have on hand. The report continues:

A general summary of keels laid, ships launched, and ships delivered for each month and year will be found in the appendix.

Among the many notable records—

This is on the point about which the Senator asked and to which I call his particular attention.

Among the many notable records achieved by the shipbuilders during the war, perhaps none is more worthy of mention than the building of the steamship *Crawl Keys*, a 3,350-ton steel cargo vessel constructed on the Great Lakes by the Great Lakes Engineering Works. Keel was laid on July 11, 1918, and the vessel was launched just 16 days later on July 27, 1918. The completed ship was delivered to the corporation on August 14, 1918, 34 days after work started.

Closely rivaling the above-mentioned event was the performance of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation in the construction of the steamship *Tuckahoe*, a 4,900-ton steel collier, on which the keel was laid April 8, 1918. The vessel was launched 27 days later, on May 5, 1918, and delivered to the corporation on May 15, 1918, 37 days after the keel was laid.

A wonderful record was also established in wood ship construction by the Grays Harbor Motorship Corporation in building the steamship *Aberdeen*. The keel was laid September 9, 1918, and the vessel launched 19 days after, on September 28, 1918. Delivery was consummated October 6, 1918, just 27 days after keel laying.

I am simply referring to that to show that we can, in my judgment, accomplish in American shipyards, by the use of machinery and appliances and the skill and energy and efficiency of our workmen, sufficient to offset any difference in the cost of wages in yards abroad and in this country. These achievements show it because we absolutely set the high marks for the world during our construction of ships in the time of the war.

The American shipyards are not idle. It is said that one thing wanted in connection with the subsidy is to keep the yards open and to help them, because they are not doing anything of any consequence in the way of construction of ships. In that connection let me quote from Commerce Reports, of the Department of Commerce, of December 11, 1922, at page 675, where is given the following statement with reference to current American shipbuilding:

On November 1, 1922, American shipyards were building or under contract to build for private shipowners 197 steel vessels of 258,373 gross tons compared with 198 steel vessels of 255,431 gross tons on October 1, 1922.

These figures do not include Government ships or ships building or contracted for by the United States Shipping Board.

Then follows a summary of the report giving the names of the yards now busy. Of course, we can not build an American merchant marine and we can not have shipyards operating successfully in the United States if for some minor reason, some reason that ought not to obtain, American citizens patronize foreign ships and foreign shipyards with their business and their work. In the report we recite that Wilson & Co., of Chicago, for instance, and no doubt the same thing applies to other large packers in Chicago, are shipping trainloads of goods to New York by rail and thence by Cunard Lines to Liverpool. Why not patronize American ships? Why should American citizens patronize foreign ships when American ships are at the docks idle? There may be some reason about which I have no knowledge in that connection.

It may be possible that the purchasers of goods in Liverpool specify that they should come in British bottoms. There may be a reason of that sort. But if our people would do what the British do, in their spirit of cooperation and in their effort to stand by their industries, that would be a good way to solve the question—not by appropriating money out of the Federal Treasury. That will not accomplish it. We have to cooperate. For instance, the United Fruit Co. is building a motor ship on the Clyde. The Bethlehem Steel Co. is building a motor ship now in Germany. Why not patronize American shipyards, even if it costs a little more to do it?

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. And yet they are doing that. That is what is happening in this country. American citizens are shipping their goods in foreign ships, constantly patronizing foreign ships, and now the excuse is offered that the foreign ship is wet and the American ship is dry as a reason for having the passenger business go the same way. Then, too, there are American people in the shipping business building their own ships in foreign yards instead of building them in yards in the United States, equipped as they are with skilled workers and with a record such as I have indicated here behind these yards.

I yield now to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. Is it not true that a great number of the officials of the United States Government, perhaps a majority of them, travel on the ships of other nations in preference to traveling on our own ships?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it is a quite common practice. We have not yet learned the game. A merchant marine is something that we can not create by appropriating money out of the Treasury. We have to build up from the ground. There is something more fundamental, something deeper than the question of a subsidy. That is a merely superficial treatment. It is a stimulant that does not create life or restore health. It is a temporary thing, an external application when the trouble is an internal disease. Underneath all this are the basic principles upon which a merchant marine must be built, and the spirit of cooperation is one of them, the spirit of standing together and helping the industries of our own country. Mr. Ferguson goes to the root of the matter when he says: "England's superiority in maritime affairs is due to her shipowners and traders being expert in all branches of the shipping business, while ours are not." We can and must have the branches as well as the main business. You can not purchase that knowledge or those facilities by money out of the Treasury.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I am assuming it is safe to say that American citizens are building ships abroad for the reason that they can build them more cheaply there than they can here. Is that the fact?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know what the fact is; I am only citing it as an instance of the absence of the public spirit or patriotic spirit that it seems to me ought to actuate American citizens in connection with their shipyards, their shipping, and this great industry generally. I say that that is something we have never yet learned in this country. It is possible that a few hundred dollars can be saved to American owners on ships built abroad. We ought to cultivate a different spirit, in my judgment.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield to me, I have a quotation here from Mr. George J. Baldwin, chairman of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation and president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., which will answer the question of the Senator from Indiana. I read as follows:

AMERICAN YARDS MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION.

Mr. George J. Baldwin, chairman of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation and president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., recently pointed out some of the encouraging points sometimes overlooked by American shipbuilders in these days of depression, which it will be well to bear in mind.

"Our yards," says Mr. Baldwin, "attract the best type of workmen at high wages; gives them the most modern tools to work with, and can now successfully meet the low-wage competition of foreign countries by the greater speed and, therefore, lowered unit cost of production. The result is that the American yards can turn out ships capable of the most economical operation and can deliver them with a promptness which is a valuable asset in the calculations of the owner or operator."

In this connection it is noted that a British oil-transport company that formerly placed all its orders at home found construction so slow in England that it contracted for six tankers from American shipyards. And, better still, the results have been so satisfactory, both as to quality and speed of delivery, that other orders are likely to come to this country.

One of the past handicaps—the lack of a bureau of shipping—has been happily solved by the rejuvenation, expansion, and modernization of the American Bureau of Shipping, which now bids fair to be the best of the classification societies, and, moreover, a thoroughly American institution. (From Bulletin of the Atlantic Coast Shipbuilders' Association, July 15, 1921.)

I think that answers the question of the Senator from Indiana, and from a very high authority.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am obliged to the Senator from Tennessee for referring to that matter. My recollection is that Mr. Baldwin's statement was made before the Committee on Commerce when we were acting under a resolution directing us to look into the affairs of the Shipping Board.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] referred to people in high places, as he said, being guilty of making statements which had misled the public. I can not imagine just what statements he had in mind, but he will excuse me if I mention an activity which has had the effect of shaping the opinions of people in this country and which has been very persistent and, I might say, pernicious, in its character; that is the propaganda which has been conducted through Mr. Lasker, of the Shipping Board, and spread throughout the length and breadth of this country in support of the pending measure. The Shipping Board have filled the newspapers, they have distributed speeches, and they have resorted to every possible means of creating an opinion in support of the bill, and much of their solicitation and much of their propaganda have not dealt with the fundamental facts underlying the measure.

The Senator from Washington also has stated that he believes in protection, and that the pending bill is a means of protecting ships. I do not agree with him on the subject of protection, but I fail to see how this bill even measures up to that sort of a principle.

I can understand how Congress may impose duties, for instance, on lemons so high as to force the American consumer to buy only American-grown lemons; I can see how Congress may impose duties so high on oranges that everybody in this country will have to buy the American-grown oranges, because we should thereby shut out the foreign-grown oranges or lemons, as the case might be; but Congress can not pass any law that will compel American citizens to transport their products in American ships; Congress can not pass any law that can compel American citizens to build their ships in American shipyards; Congress can not pass any law that will exclude foreign ships from our ports and harbors and upon the high seas. There is no character of legislation which Congress can enact which will accomplish any such result. Treaties and international maritime laws as old as the seas make abortive any such attempt even if one so foolish can be found to propose it. I do not see that it is possible for Congress to enact legislation certainly of that kind or of any kind operating in the manner in which protection is claimed to operate under the tariff laws.

The Senator from Washington has also referred to the enormous amount which has been paid for freight to foreign ships on goods which are brought into this country. Of course, that has not all been thrown away; it is not as though we were estimating money which was lost or wasted, because if the freight had not been paid to foreign ships it would have been paid to our own ships; a good deal of that money it would have been necessary to pay for freight, no matter how the goods were brought in or how they were shipped.

I have no doubt that in many instances the ocean freight rates imposed by foreign ships have been exorbitant, that they have been high, for one reason or another. I have no doubt that American commerce and business have been taxed very heavily by reason of the fact that prices and rates have been fixed by conference agreement and have been enforced by fighting ships, just as the Senator from Washington has stated. We tried to get rid of such practices in the shipping bill, as far as possible, and in the merchant marine act of 1920. I do not know whether it would be possible to inaugurate such practices as have obtained in years gone by, but we can prevent that sort of thing happening without paying any subsidy or without paying anybody any money to prevent it. We have the ships here; the people own them.

I have stated in the views of the minority that the losses incurred by the Shipping Board, which they have estimated at $50,000,000 a year, can be stopped. I have not contended that all losses might be stopped, but I have stated that any such losses as they have set up could be stopped. They could be stopped by tying up the ships; that would be one way of doing it. They could also be stopped by turning the ships over to the Panama Canal Co., a Government-owned and operated corporation, or they could be turned over to the United States Line, which has an organization for operating ships and is a Government-operated line. Let Mr. Lasker get rid of the ships that are causing the loss in that way. Certainly, at least some of the losses could be obviated by tying up the unprofitable ships. However, the fact that these ships are here in our harbors, fit to go to sea upon short notice, capable of carrying our commerce as they may be needed, is a consideration worth while.

The latest demonstration of that fact occurred a few months ago, when the coal mines were closed down and the railroads could not move coal to the markets, when, indeed, it looked as if our people would suffer from the cold, and perhaps many of them die. In that emergency we had to bring coal from England. Think of it! This great country with enough coal to last a million years lying right here at our doors, and yet our people being put in such a position that it became necessary to import coal from England. Of course, the British ships immediately raised the rate of freight on coal. What did we do? I am very glad that the Shipping Board was prompted to take the action which they did take. I do not know who stirred them up and got them to take it, but their action was commendable. Immediately there were brought out 108 of the idle ships that are such a curse, according to Mr. Lasker's view, and those ships were put into that coal-carrying trade. On yesterday I asked Mr. Merrill, who was here on the floor at the invitation of the Senator from Washington, to give me the facts about that. I knew some of the vessels of the Shipping Board had been put in that trade and had rendered a very important service. This is what Mr. Merrill says:

Complying with your oral request of yesterday afternoon, I have pleasure in submitting the following facts with regard to the coal import movement during the recent coal strike in this country.

A total of 2,500,000 tons of coal were brought into this country, which employed approximately 400 steamers. One hundred and eight of these were Shipping Board vessels, and the greater part of the remainder were British. The Shipping Board itself transported in its vessels 702,000 tons. This movement was accomplished in a large measure with the ships regularly on the United Kingdom berth, but an additional vessels and in order to substitute for vessels on regular

lines who had lost their position on the schedule by reason of this movement, approximately 40 Shipping Board vessels were drawn from spot; that is, inactive vessels ready for an immediate assignment to trade.

Although less than one-third of the tonnage was moved by Shipping Board ships, these ships controlled entirely the rates charged.

That is the important thing. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in the pending bill, from which its authors expect and hope so much, there is not a line that gives any authority or power to the Shipping Board or any other board or agency of the Government to regulate or control freight rates, routes, or anything of that sort. So if these ships should pass eventually into the hands of a few lines, those lines would focus the routes of trade for the world into certain ports of this country, and they would charge what they pleased and what the traffic would bear, without any sort of regulatory control on the part of the Shipping Board. Some provision covering that matter ought to be put into the bill. It should not be simply a question of paying people to operate these ships in their own way and at their own will and allowing them to charge what they please, and saying that is going to serve American commerce. It may or it may not do so.

It does not avail us simply to pay people to put ships under our flag unless those ships are going to do business and unless they are going to transport our commerce at reasonable rates. There is not anything with reference to rates in this bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, as the Senator is discussing rates, I think, with his permission, I should like to read a paragraph or two from a letter written to me by a prominent manufacturer in Ohio. Under date of December 6, 1922, he writes this letter. I will read only a short paragraph or two.

The Shipping Board not only go in to get all that the traffic will bear, but have the audacity to quote us a $10 special rate, when our agent already had a rate of $8 from New York to Rio. Some time since the Shipping Board carried freight from Hamburg to Rio for $4.50 per ton and demanded $9 per ton from New York, thus compelling the American manufacturers and taxpayers to make up the deficit for the benefit of the German manufacturers.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know just how they are operating now. My understanding is that they have a conference arrangement with most of the lines now—the Shipping Board and these other lines—but I am trying to make the point here, and emphasize it, that the possession of these ships, even if they are tied up in our harbors, is worth while; and this is an illustration of it:

During the recent coal strikes, although less than one-third of the tonnage was moved by Shipping Board ships, these ships controlled entirely the rate charged. At the beginning the coal rate was 7 shillings. As the demand grew, it was run up by the foreign owners rapidly to 14 shillings.

This occurred in a very few days. To meet this the Shipping Board threw its ships into the trade at 10 shillings, and announced its readiness to charter an almost unlimited number at that rate. Naturally, the rate on foreign ships had to come down to 10 shillings. As soon as this occurred, the Shipping Board reduced its rate to 9 shillings, and finally 8 shillings and 6 pence. The average freight charge was somewhere between 9 shillings and 9 shillings 6 pence.

The effect of this action of the Shipping Board was twofold: First, it insured the delivery of the coal from abroad at very reasonable prices at the seaboard; and, second, it kept from being attracted to the business a number of tramp steamers which, after reaching the United States and discharging their coal cargoes, would have looked for eastbound cargoes, and would have utterly demoralized the outward movement of our regular line steamers.

That was a very excellent service. It was a very fortunate thing that we had these ships here to move that coal, and it was very fortunate that we were able to keep down those rates so that our people should not pay double the freight on the coal that they had to have that they otherwise would have paid; and I am not grieving very much if some of these ships must remain tied up for a time. The fact is that there never was a period when there was greater depression in foreign trade than at present. I say there never was—there has not been in a great many years, anyhow. I think these periods of depression come and go in cycles, and they are due to natural economic causes that can not be overcome by paying money out of the Treasury.

Mr. POMERENE. That statement applies to the foreign trade of all nations.

Mr. FLETCHER. All nations—not only our trade, but it applies to the foreign trade of all nations—and we are at that period of depression now. We are not going to stay there. The world is not going to remain under present conditions. There will be a swing of the pendulum up, and then these ships will come out as that trade develops.

I ask unanimous consent to put this letter in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 13, 1922.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: Complying with your oral request of yesterday afternoon, I have pleasure in submitting the following facts with regard to the coal import movement during the recent coal strike in this country.

A total of 2,500,000 tons of coal were brought into this country which employed approximately 400 steamers. One hundred and eight of these were Shipping Board vessels and the greater part of the remainder were British. The Shipping Board itself transported in its vessels 702,000 tons. This movement was accomplished in a large measure with the ships regularly on the United Kingdom berth, but as additional vessels, and in order to substitute for vessels on regular lines who had lost their position on the schedule by reason of this movement approximately 40 Shipping Board vessels were drawn from spot; i. e., inactive vessels ready for an immediate assignment to trade.

Although less than one-third of the tonnage was moved by Shipping Board ships, these ships controlled entirely the rates charged. At the beginning the coal rate was 7 shillings. As the demand grew it was run up by the foreign owner rapidly to 14 shillings. This occurred in a very few days. To meet this the Shipping Board threw its ships into the trade at 10 shillings and announced its readiness to charter an almost unlimited number at that rate. Naturally the rates on foreign ships had to come down to 10 shillings. As soon as this occurred the Shipping Board reduced its rates to 9 shillings and finally to 8 shillings 6 pence. The average freight rate charged was somewhere between 9 shillings and 9 shillings 6 pence.

The effect of this action of the Shipping Board was twofold: First, it insured the delivery of coal from abroad at very reasonable prices at the seaboard; second, it kept from being attracted to the business a number of tramp steamers which, after reaching the United States and discharging their coal cargoes, would have looked for eastbound cargoes and would have utterly demoralized the outward movement of our regular line steamers.

Yours very truly,

R. T. MERRILL,
Director, Bureau of Research.

Mr. FLETCHER. Look at the situation now. Here is a report from the Commerce Department, just in, which shows, on pages 16 and 17, as follows:

CURRENTS IN FOREIGN TRADE.

During the 12 months ended June 30, 1922, our foreign trade suffered in common with the general world depression. The monetary value of our exports and imports during the period in question, in comparison with the previous fiscal year, is shown in the following table:

	1920–21	1921–22
Imports	$3,654,459,346	$2,608,079,008
Exports	6,516,510,033	3,771,286,428
Total foreign trade	10,170,969,379	6,379,365,436
Balance of exports over imports	2,862,050,687	1,163,207,420

And my recollection is that in 1918–19 the imports and exports amounted to over $13,000,000,000. So that our foreign trade has fallen off to nearly one-third—that is, the value of our imports and exports is about one-third what they were at the beginning of 1920, and necessarily there is less demand for carriers of cargoes. The cargoes are not there. The trade is not moving. There are ships tied up in the ports of every country now, and especially in this country, where we have built enough tonnage to answer our needs in prosperous times, while we are now at the very lowest depths of depression, and some of it is necessarily idle.

That, however, is not the way to figure on legislation looking to the future. Take the conditions as they are now, and realize, as the facts are, that the exports and imports amount now to about one-third of what they did two years ago or three years ago. That itself shows a reason for idle ships, but it is not any reason for giving them away. It is not any reason for expecting that they will remain idle indefinitely unless something is done to pay somebody to take them over.

I ask leave to print in the RECORD another table, found in this report on page 19, showing the quantitative movement of major agricultural exports, pre-war and for the last two fiscal years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The following table shows the quantitative movement of major agricultural exports, pre-war and for the last two fiscal years:

	1913	1921	1922
Grain and grain products (bushels)	258,343,629	543,375,523	544,220,934
Meats, dairy products, animal and vegetable fats (pounds)	1,610,053,715	2,384,517,262	2,192,174,230
Tobacco, leaf (pounds)	418,796,906	496,878,830	451,555,221
Cotton, raw (bales)	8,724,572	5,408,986	6,541,841
Fruits (pounds)	620,423,027	675,992,388	491,227,140
Oil cake and meal (pounds)	2,049,361,136	857,606,407	1,099,246,797
Total values	$1,029,967,344	$2,192,335,101	$1,557,372,997
Total values at 1913 prices	1,029,967,344	1,126,682,282	1,168,521,140

About 55 per cent of our total exports are agricultural produce and raw materials and 45 per cent are manufactured and partly manufactured goods (excluding manufactured foodstuffs).

About 75 per cent of our exports of agricultural produce and raw materials go to Europe and about 25 per cent to the rest of the world.

About 26 per cent of our manufactured exports go to Europe and 74 per cent elsewhere.

Our exports of agricultural produce comprise, roughly, 15 per cent of the entire crop value on the farm, while our exports of manufactured goods comprise less than 4 per cent of our production. Our exports of agricultural produce to Europe comprise 11 per cent of the value of our agricultural production, and our exports of manufactures less than 1 per cent of our manufactured production.

Mr. President, I have now reached a point where, if the Senator desires an executive session, I am willing to yield the floor and resume to-morrow.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to run until 5 o'clock; but I appreciate the situation of the Senator and so I am glad to yield for several matters calling for an executive session.

I wish to say, however, not because of anything that has happened in connection with the consideration of the bill for there has not been any unnecessary delay in connection with it, that there is some legislation which we expect to be brought forward before very long which we had hoped to get through and which I know there will be no disposition upon the part of those handling the pending bill to interfere with. I should like to get the shipping bill along just as far as possible, and I feel that probably by day after to-morrow I shall have to ask that the Senate meet a little earlier. This is not definite, but I thought I would give that notice. Probably on to-morrow I shall ask the Senate to meet the next day about 11 o'clock.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to report back favorably, with amendments, from the Committee on Appropriations, House bill 13232, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 941) thereon. I give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the routine morning business is concluded, I should like to call up this bill for action. There are very few amendments, and it is unanimously reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 14, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 13, 1922.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Octavius M. Spencer to be assistant surgeon.
Richard B. Norment to be passed assistant surgeon.

To be surgeons.

Robert L. Allen.
Ora H. Cox.
Marion S. Lombard.
Carl Michel.
William F. Tanner.
William C. Witte.
James F. Worley.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Charles J. Alden, Globe.

IDAHO.

Caleb W. Berry, Craigmont.

ILLINOIS.

Laura M. Gieseking, Altamont.
Edgar H. Chadwick, Ashton.
Frithjof T. E. Kallum, Blue Island.
Guy W. Astell, Brondlands.
John Mackler, Chicago Heights.
James E. Seabert, Dwight.
Evan Harris, Gillespie.
Bertha Gray, Griggsville.
Edwin R. Erickson, Media.
Thomas J. Jordan, St. Charles.

INDIANA.

Hugh R. Henderson, Fulton.

IOWA.

Arthur P. Hoskins, Milton.
George W. Kennedy, Montrose.
Harry McCall, Washington.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Walter G. Gay, Farmville.
Walling D. Vrecland, Fort Bragg (late Camp Bragg).
Roy F. Shupp, New Bern.
John W. McLean, Rowland.
Wiley B. Knowles, Wallace.
Lunda V. Owen, Winton.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William E. Crowe, Dunbar.
Henry Bourns, Ellsworth.
John W. Howes, Fayette City.
Harold D. Lowing, Linesville.
Charles H. Howard, Masontown.
Smith M. McCreight, Reynoldsville.
Carrie A. Fritz, Rimersburg.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Parnell Meehan, Chesterfield.
Everett C. Rye, Eastover.
Horace M. Watkins, Ridge Spring.

VIRGINIA.

Baxter W. Mock, Damascus.
Troy D. Rorrer, Dublin.
Harvey P. McCary, Esmont.
Samuel G. Allen, Front Royal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 13, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, blessed Lord, for Thy promise which tells us that Thou wilt never leave nor forsake us; truly it has never failed of fulfillment. Verify Thy presence unto us this day. Let all knowledge be seasoned with wisdom and all strength be mingled with kindliness. At all times and in all situations enable us to withstand criticism without showing bitterness. Continue to help us to be the quality of men that our country needs and on which it depends for its stability and growth. In sickness and in disappointment help us to look for the light the shadows prove. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which, with the report thereon (No. 1271), was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas reserves all points of order on the bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, it Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill just reported from the Senate be taken from the Speaker's table and that the House disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. GARNER. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman whether or not the Senate disturbed in any way what is known as the Madden amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. That is, in relation to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It made a slight amendment to it, but it does not affect it materially.

Mr. BLANTON. It is still intact?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection; and the Seaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MAGEE, and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

PAYMENT OF DECEMBER SALARIES ON DECEMBER 20.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 408 authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, the legislative drafting service, and employees paid on vouchers under authority of resolutions, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MADDEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will resume the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13316, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13316, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

For contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the offices and bureaus of the department, for which appropriations for contingent and miscellaneous expenses are not specifically made, including professional and scientific books, law books, books of reference, periodicals, blank books, pamphlets, maps, newspapers (not exceeding $2,500); stationery; furniture and repairs to same; carpets, matting, oilcloth, file cases, towels, ice, brooms, soap, sponges; fuel, lighting, and heating; for the purchase for the use of the Secretary of Commerce, at a cost not to exceed $5,000, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof; purchase and exchange of motor trucks and bicycles; maintenance, repair, and operation of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and of motor trucks and bicycles, to be used only for official purposes; freight and express charges; postage to foreign countries; telegraph and telephone service; typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, including their repair and exchange; repairs to buildings occupied by offices of the Secretary of Commerce; rental of water-cooling plant in Commerce Building, not to exceed $1,400; first-aid outfits for use in the buildings occupied by employees of this department; street car fares, not exceeding $300; and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $89,500, and in addition thereto sums amounting to $128,750 shall be deducted from other appropriations made for the fiscal year 1924 and added to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of Commerce," in order to facilitate the purchase through the central purchasing office as provided in the act of June 17, 1910 (Stat. L., vol. 36, p. 531), of certain supplies for bureaus and offices for which contingent and miscellaneous appropriations are specifically made, as follows: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—promoting commerce (Europe), $12,000; promoting commerce (South and Central America), $15,000; commercial attachés, $6,000; promoting commerce in the Far East, $10,000; export industries, $33,000; maintenance district and cooperative offices, $15,000; restrictions and regulations on trade by foreign countries, $2,000; directory of foreign buyers, $1,000; general expenses, Lighthouse Service, $8,500; contingent expenses, Steamboat Inspection Service, $7,500; contingent expenses, shipping service, $500; instruments for measuring vessels, $500; instruments for counting passengers, $250; enforcement of wireless communication laws, $1,000; Bureau of Standards—equipment $1,000, general expenses $1,000; general expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey, foreign countries, $4,000; commercial economist, $2,750; chiefs of sections—1 $2,500, 1 $2,000; translators—1 $2,000, 1 $1,800, 2 at $1,400 each; editorial assistant, $2,000; clerks—14 of class 4, 12 of class 3, 2 at $1,500 each, 22 of class 2, 35 of class 1, 20 at $1,000 each, 14 at $900 each; 2 messengers, at $840 each; 4 assistant messengers, at $720 each; laborer, $660; 2 messenger boys, at $420 each; in all, $232,510.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLANTON. How much increase has been allowed to the department under this provision ending on page 5?

Mr. SHREVE. About $50,000.

Mr. BLANTON. About $50,000 increase over last year?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman think that that is absolutely necessary?

Mr. SHREVE. It is absolutely necessary. If there is any one department in Washington that needs help and assistance it is the Department of Commerce. Their activities have increased over 300 per cent and there is a great deal more work to do in the office than ever before, and even now we are not giving them the assistance which they ought to have.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the same extravagance continued in this department now as was exhibited during the war-time food administration?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. I happen to remember one little incident connected with this particular head of the department, when as food administrator he rented his first building here in Washington. It was reported that he had paid many thousand dollars for rent more than was being paid at the time he took it over, and that in addition to that he permitted the owner to remove every bit of furniture out of it from the top to the basement, and then he replaced it with new Government furniture. When that report was going around as a criticism, coming from the gentleman's side of the House, against the then Democratic appointee, to get the facts I wrote to the gentleman, and I asked Mr. Hoover if that accusation against him was true, so that if not I could defend him, and I came to find out from his own words, over his own signature, in a letter which I have, that it was even worse than the reports indicated. That was an extravagance that ought not to have been countenanced, and I was just wondering whether or not he was continuing that extravagance since he has become a regular Republican appointee as the head of one of the departments.

Mr. SHREVE. We must remember that that was during war times, and there were a great many things happened during war times that possibly would not happen under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman is slowly ascertaining that they are continuing during peace time, four years after the armistice was signed.

Mr. SHREVE. There is no department of the Government that is managed so economically as the Department of Commerce to-day.

Mr. BLANTON. I can not agree to that.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn and the gentleman from Virginia moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take advantage of the statement that was made yesterday that the committee would be a little liberal in the consideration of this bill. I wish to mention a matter that I hope will have the attention of my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

On page 4, in parentheses, reference is made to the Statutes at Large, volume 36.

The public laws of this country at this time are found in 43 large volumes, the code which was adopted in the seventies, and 42 volumes containing the Statutes at Large. So, speak-

ing not with reference to private publications but official publications, all of the statutes of the United States are now so printed or published that various sources of information have to be consulted by any committee that is making up a bill, by the House itself when it is considering a bill, and by all of the officials and courts of the country.

In the last Congress the House adopted a codification embracing all of the laws in force as of the 4th of March, 1919. The bill failed of passage in the Senate. Just after this present Congress came in that codification was adopted again, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] several months ago with good cause congratulated the country and the House upon the action of approving the codification, which was reported in by the committee of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] is chairman. I call attention at this time to the matter of the failure of the other body to act, for the purpose of expressing my regret, in view of the general demand and general desire throughout the country that a codification shall be provided which may be had at a comparatively small expense. It ought to be done, as everybody admits. I call attention to it for the further purpose of expressing the hope that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] will exert his great influence in order to have action taken in the Senate which will insure the final approval of the codification, which was most laboriously and carefully gotten up, so that it may be enacted into law before the final adjournment of the present Congress. It is perhaps not one of the most important matters that we are required to consider, but it is an extremely important matter. I happen to belong to a committee which is undertaking to frame legislation, and when it wishes to ascertain what the law is on a certain point we have to range around in a most extensive field. That is the experience of other committees. It is the experience of the officials in the executive departments. It is the experience of the courts, as the judges told us when they appeared before the Committee on the Revision of the Laws, of which I was a member when I first entered this House. I do respectfully urge the gentleman from Wyoming to make a resolute effort to secure action in the other body before the expiration of the present Congress.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] gives me credit to which I fear I am not entitled when he suggests that I have any considerable amount of influence at the other end of the Capitol. The gentleman is entirely sound in what he says with regard to the importance of the legislation revising the statutes. I think it is most unfortunate that that legislation has been so long delayed in the Senate. I have not been able to find out why it is delayed there. I know of no good reason why the legislation should be held in committee unacted upon. It is tremendously important that action be had. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is influential, I am sure, at least with the Senators from his State. I suggest that he take the matter up with them and interest them in it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have made some little effort, not with the Senators from Virginia but with a member of the committee that is supposed to be in charge of the bill in the Senate, and I have not been able to ascertain that there is a real prospect of anything being done. It is not worth while for me to quote the expressions of any Senator on that subject, but I have reached the conclusion that unless there is some effort to speed up the work or rather to start the work at the other end of the Capitol so as to give a possibility of action during the present Congress this Congress may end with the statute law of the country left in the same condition in which it now is as far as relates to codification.

Mr. MONDELL. Has any one given to the gentleman from Virginia any good or valid reason for failure to act?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Absolutely not; and I can not understand it. I am at as great a loss as the gentleman is to know why there has been this great delay and why no step is being taken now.

Mr. CARTER. May I suggest to the gentleman from Wyoming that he interview the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], who probably can give some reason why the codification is not reported in the Senate. I do not know whether the reason will be for the RECORD or not, but I think he can give the gentleman some information.

Mr. MONDELL. I have talked with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], who is good-natured and tries to be patient. I think he has been exceedingly patient in this matter. I am glad that the gentleman from Virginia has referred to this particular piece of legislation. I think the gentlemen in the other body should either act in this matter or let the country know why they do not act. If there is any good and valid reason why there should not be a codification of the statutes, they should let us all know about it. If there is no good reason, why does that legislation remain unacted upon for more than a year, with the entire country demanding that action be had? There is very great loss and very great injury to the country by reason of this delay. I am sure no one is being benefited by it. I would suggest to all of the gentlemen here who are interested in this matter that they use their best efforts to get the Senate and the Senate committee to act in this matter. They are in the habit of acting very promptly on codifications when they get around to it, when they are ready.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman know of any particular Member of the House who should be more interested than any other in this subject? This is under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, you may say. No special interest being involved, it does not seem that anybody is taking any interest in it.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to say that "the gentleman from Wyoming" has taken an interest in it, and I know the gentlemen from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] have.

Mr. GARNER. What I mean is that nobody has delegated to himself a continuous effort to get this matter on the statute book. The gentleman's criticism this morning is long past due, and it ought to have come from the other side. Coming from this side, it will be put on partisan grounds, and I think the criticism that the gentleman has put in the RECORD is a proper one.

Mr. DOWELL. Has not there been a persistent effort on the part of some parties to prevent its consideration?

Mr. GARNER. That may be; but if the gentleman knows anything about it he ought to let the House know who it is.

Mr. MONDELL. I think if the gentleman from Iowa does not know he ought not to make that suggestion. I would not want to make that suggestion, but I do say that I am unable to understand why action has not been taken. I know of no one who is opposing action. I know of no earthly reason why action should not be taken. We all know multiplied reasons why action should be taken. Either the codification which we sent to the Senate is a good one or it is not; and if it is not good, it ought to be amended, and as amended it ought to pass.

Mr. DOWELL. My suggestion to the gentleman is that if he will make an investigation of the matter I think he can get information that he does not now seem to have. It seems to me that after this length of time the gentleman from Wyoming could secure some information on the subject, and I suggest that before the matter is presented again the gentleman from Wyoming make a slight investigation and he will find where the trouble comes from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commercial attachés: For commercial attachés, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, after examination to be held under his direction to determine their competency and to be accredited through the State Department, whose duties shall be to investigate and report upon such conditions in the manufacturing industries and trade of foreign countries as may be of interest to the United States; and for the compensation of a clerk or clerks for each commercial attaché at the rate of not to exceed $2,500 per annum for each person so employed, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers, for necessary janitor and messenger service, rent outside of the District of Columbia, purchase of reports, books of reference, and periodicals, travel to and from the United States, and all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing; such commercial attachés shall serve directly under the Secretary of Commerce and shall report directly to him, $225,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed two commercial attachés employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned for duty in the Department of Commerce without loss of salary.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against this paragraph to get some information. I would like to ask the chairman to what extent has there been an increase in this bill?

Mr. SHREVE. Twenty-five thousand dollars this year. The commercial attachés of the Department of Commerce is one of the most efficient bureaus that we have.

Mr. BLANTON. Over the fiscal year of 1917 can the gentleman state how much this $225,000 is an increase?

Mr. SHREVE. I would not be surprised if it was an increase entirely, because this system was not in vogue way back there. Now, let me state a few cases as an illustration of what these commercial attachés have done. One of them secured a contract for $7,000,000 in Rio Janeiro for American goods. Another $100,000 to American exporters in Great Britain. Another $200,000 saved in Latin America by advance information

in the consular office—for exemptions. Another one was $500,000 in an order for bridge steel placed with an American firm by the intervention of an attaché.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Was this money saved to the United States Government or to private individuals?

Mr. BLANTON. It is to private individuals.

Mr. SHREVE. Let me say that as soon as it is learned that there is to be a development—in South America, for instance—the commercial attaché gathers all the information in regard to it. He finds out when it is to be let, how it is to be let, how the property is to be paid for if bonds are for sale, and then all this information is transmitted to the Department of Commerce in Washington, and is broadcasted to every man in that business in the United States, and he has an opportunity to bid on this information.

Mr. KING. Do all American citizens have an opportunity to come in?

Mr. SHREVE. Every man that is in the business.

Mr. KING. It is not to a favored few?

Mr. SHREVE. No.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. I will.

Mr. LONDON. Is it not in effect a commercial agency for the people?

Mr. SHREVE. It is a commercial agency for all the people.

Mr. LONDON. A sort of commercial socialism.

Mr. BLANTON. If there is any socialism attached to the question, of course the gentleman from New York is heartily in favor of it, but for that reason I would be against it. I would like to call attention to the fact that it has not helped the farmers whose crops have been rotting in the field for want of getting them to a market in this country. If they had proper transportation facilities they could find plenty of markets in this country.

Mr. SHREVE. If it were not for the foreign market for wheat, flour, and other staples the United States would be in a serious condition.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that the warehouses of the Northwest are bursting open with grain that they can not find proper cars to transport. If they could get the cars and the transportation facilities they could find a market for the grain in this country. It is the want of transportation facilities that keeps the wheat in the elevators and prevents the producers from getting the benefit of their crops. Mr. Chairman, I think this is too great an extension unauthorized by law; there is no law whatever authorizing the provision in this paragraph, and I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the law:

670. Powers and duties of department: It shall be the province and duty of said department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, the mining, manufacturing, shipping, and fishery industries, the labor interests, and the transportation facilities of the United States; and to this end it shall be vested with jurisdiction and control of the departments, bureaus, offices, and branches of the public service hereinafter specified, and with such other powers and duties as may be prescribed by law. All unexpended appropriations, which shall be available at the time when this act takes effect, in relation to the various offices, bureaus, divisions, and other branches of the public service, which shall by this act be transferred to or included in the Department of Commerce and Labor, or which may hereafter in accordance with the provisions of this act be so transferred, shall become available, from the time of such transfer, for expenditure in and by the Department of Commerce and Labor and shall be treated the same as though said branches of the public service had been directly named in the laws making said appropriations as parts of the Department of Commerce and Labor, under the direction of the Secretary of said department.

This is the particular point to which I desire to direct attention—special investigation under paragraph 678:

He shall also from time to time make special investigations and reports as may be required by the President, or by either House of Congress, or which he himself may deem necessary and urgent.

In this case the Department of Commerce is making these special investigations, is making them all over the world, in the centers of civilization and in localities where it is possible to find American business. I wish the gentleman would read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday and see what some of the commercial people of the United States have to say about the matter, and it may also be worth his while to read what the people of other countries have to say of this service. It is one of the most valuable services the department has.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's discussion has been upon the merits and not upon the point of order. If the gentleman's citation is law for this particular $225,000, then it would be authorization for the Appropriations Committee to appropriate $225,000,000, and the Chair knows that. This general authorization with respect to the Department of Commerce does not authorize the Secretary to establish all over the whole world just as many commercial attachés as the Appropriations Committee sees fit to give him money to do. It requires special authorization by law.

I call the Chair's attention to the precedents. The Chair will remember that in 1918, I think it was, the proposition came up to grant a certain number of million dollars to the employment bureau director. It was held when a point of order was made that under the general authorization given to the Department of Labor it would not have the right to have these employment agencies established without affirmative law. That question came up directly and is directly in point with the present question. Three very distinguished Chairmen who have presided from time to time, when those questions came up—one of them the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, and another the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CRISP—held that it did not come within the general authorization of the enabling act; that it required special legislation; and I submit to the Chair that the country and the Congress would absolutely be without power to stop it, if this general enabling act authorized the $225,000. I repeat that the Committee on Appropriations could bring in here a bill for $225,000,000 if they saw fit, and we could not then stop it by a point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. The amount is immaterial, so far as the legal proposition is concerned. How is this investigation to be made unless appointments are made and agencies created?

Mr. BLANTON. It is to be made whenever the Congress sees fit by affirmative law to establish certain particular branches and functions of the department, and the Committee on Appropriations, based on that authorization, appropriates the money.

Mr. DOWELL. But when the investigation is authorized by law——

Mr. BLANTON. But that is not done by the enabling act. That is not a legislative authorization. The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not read anything that is substantive law authorizing the expenditure of $225,000 for commercial attachés.

Mr. DOWELL. No; the amount was not specified, but the authorization for the investigation was made by the provision of law read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order for just a moment? It seems to me clear that there is authorization in the law for the appropriation carried in this paragraph. I think there can be no question that this kind of work is authorized by law. It is also true that the commercial attachés and other officials provided for in the paragraph constitute a legitimate and perfectly proper means of carrying out the investigation and performing the work authorized in the law. This brings it within the rule. We are proposing here to appropriate for a purpose which is authorized by law. The work is authorized, and this is a proper way to perform it. The paragraph is proposing neither legislation on an appropriation bill nor an appropriation for a purpose not authorized by law, and therefore is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard for a moment, I want to speak from the standpoint of a man who has never had the advantage of legal training. I am a business man. I have been in foreign countries seeking American business, and I certainly hope that the American Congress will not stand in the position of hamstringing business outside of the bounds of the American Republic simply because there is not something in the bill about the farmer.

I have many farmers as constituents. I am in sympathy with everything that is for the benefit of the farmer. It is necessary for the American workingman, for the clerks, for the American business man, on all of whom the prosperity of our country depends, that we have attachés in foreign countries who can give us, when we go abroad seeking business, information at least through the most direct routes for getting business. Let us make America a world-wide institution. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman that this splendid bureau is doing a great service for the farmer, as well as for the commercial activities of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This point of order has been directly passed upon. In March, 1920, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SISSON], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, brought this language before the committee as an amendment to the bill. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] offered the same objection that is now

made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. The proposition was very fully debated, and ably debated. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] was in the chair, and after the close of the debate sustained the point of order that was made by the gentleman from Indiana. In other words, he held as Mr. BLANTON is now asking this Chair to hold. Thereupon an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and the Chair was overruled in the first instance by a vote of ayes 50, noes 80; tellers were then ordered and a second vote was taken, and the Chair was overruled by a vote of ayes 63, noes 105.

So, by the very highest authority, the action of the committee itself, the proposition has been passed upon. The Chair does not feel at liberty under the circumstances to overrule that decision.

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. It was a case of force overriding parliamentary precedents.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promoting commerce, South and Central America: To further promote and develop the commerce of the United States with South and Central America, including the employment of experts and special agents in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, reports, plans, specifications, manuscripts, documents, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, $200,000: *Provided*, That not more than two trade commissioners employed under this appropriation may be recalled from their foreign posts and assigned to duty in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How does this amount compare with the appropriation for this fiscal year for the same purpose, for promoting commerce in South and Central America?

Mr. SHREVE. There is a small increase I think of $29,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Can the gentleman outline some of the beneficial results that are flowing from this and the work being done under this appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. I would be very glad to mention a few, and I would like to mention a large number. Let me give one illustration. The commercial attaché at Buenos Aires assisted in closing a contract at Montevideo for an entire American telephone system in that city of 350,000 people. It is the first fully equipped all-American proposition that there is in South America.

Of course, that means the trade will follow on for years and years, and things of all sorts will come from America.

Mr. LANHAM. I want to say that I am in sympathy with this work and realize its importance. What method do they use in giving the information that is obtained in reference to trade conditions in Central and South America to the various sections of this country?

Mr. SHREVE. The information, and it is very valuable, is immediately cabled to the central office here in Washington, and from this office it is broadcasted all over the United States to all concerns engaged in the same line of business.

Mr. LANHAM. They have access to it?

Mr. SHREVE. They have access; that is, every manufacturing plant in America, if they are in communication here, can get in touch with this department and have the benefit of their wide experience in South America, and, in fact, the whole world.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman the particular section of the country in which I live is much interested in the establishment of a mutually satisfactory trade relationship with Central and South American countries. Does the gentleman think it is functioning properly?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, absolutely. There are a great many bulletins on various lines of trade in Central America. It will but take a postal card to the department to get the information desired, and it will be most valuable, telling what the particular opportunities are and telling how to close such contracts.

Mr. LANHAM. I have gotten a good deal of information for concerns in my country. Do I understand this information is broadcasted?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the gentleman think the appropriation provided for is adequate for the purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. No; I would like to see it very much larger.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. If the gentleman will permit, it always seemed to me that consuls were appointed to get a good deal of this information, and I do not know how the department keeps the work of these two branches working together when separately they report to different departments.

Mr. SHREVE. They are two separate institutions. We find a consul is not a man going out seeking trade or trade opportunities. He is engaged in viséing passports and taking care of people who desire to come into this country. These men of the Department of Commerce are simply trade experts seeking business for the United States of America.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. How do they cooperate; the consul does a great deal of the work?

Mr. SHREVE. He is not doing that work. There is no conflict between the two at all.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. If the consul is not doing it, he used to do it.

Mr. SHREVE. Not much of it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. How do they keep the consul in touch——

Mr. SHREVE. There is no conflict whatever.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Do they work in touch with each other?

Mr. SHREVE. They work in harmony with each other.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. How?

Mr. SHREVE. By being in close contact, if one has information he furnishes it to the other. If there is information obtained worth while, then it is passed out.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They do not put the two organizations together.

Mr. SHREVE. They are, in a way.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to the gentleman's question, if he will permit, that while I was in the Orient seeking American business I was very nicely received by the American consul. The American consul in the places I visited was a very busy man, and he could give me practically no information whatever along definite and specific lines that I as a commercial man seeking business felt I must have. The Department of Commerce does that very thing.

Mr. SHREVE. I wish to thank the gentleman for the very complete statement he has made.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Is it not true that the American consul transacts business that may come to him, while the representative of the Department of Commerce is a solicitor? He goes out and finds where business is and seeks to bring the two together. He is a solicitor in that sense, but wherever he strikes the line of the Consular Service then the consul assists and transacts such portion of the business as comes properly under him.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Does not England get her trade through her consuls?

Mr. SHREVE. They have an association which is very much larger than ours that comes under the Federal Trade Council. If the gentleman will read the statement in the RECORD of yesterday, an article taken from the Times at Buenos Aires lately, he will see something in regard to competition.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of much of the time of the consuls being taken up by their social obligations. May I ask the gentleman, How does the social standing of these commercial attachés rank with that of the employees of the consuls?

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I am really unable to answer that question, because the commercial attachés are just plain business men going about the country looking for business.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman does know that some little amount of their time is taken up in fulfilling social obligations?

Mr. SHREVE. No; I do not know it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I have not control of the time. If I had the time I would yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the restrictions and regulations of trade imposed by foreign countries, $25,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of inquiring what has been done under this China trade act. What has been accomplished? What work has already been done?

Mr. SHREVE. The organization is just being completed now. The bureau estimates that the funds will all come back and more, too. This simply provides for the expense of the operations here in Washington. The bureau is very hopeful, and they say this service is very much in demand in China, and people are inclined to take advantage of it at once, and it will be a source of remuneration to the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. What lines of trade have they taken up?

Mr. SHREVE. I do not think the country has availed itself yet of the full opportunity offered here. It is a line of work which has just recently been taken up.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS.

Salaries: Director, $6,000; 5 chief statisticians, at $5,300 each; chief clerk, $3,300; geographer, $2,400; 14 expert chiefs of divisions, at $2,250 each; private secretary and stenographer to director, $2,100; clerks—60 of class 4, 70 of class 3, 100 of class 2, 200 of class 1, 80 at $1,000 each, 50 at $900 each; skilled laborers—3 at $1,000 each, 1 at $900; 3 messengers, at $840 each; 5 assistant messengers, at $720 each; 5 unskilled laborers, at $720 each; 4 messenger boys, at $480 each; in all, $802,340.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to make inquiry about the paragraph at the bottom of page 10. I have not been able to hear how far the Clerk has been reading. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee the necessity for all of the expense of $802,340 in this department? For what purpose is it now being used that would require this expenditure?

Mr. SHREVE. This seems to be a necessary requirement of the department that has been determined by actual service running along for a period of years. There is a slight reduction in the expenses of the Bureau of the Census at this time; I think it is about $5,000. That comes about, I think, by reason of the adoption of certain mechanical devices. Otherwise the appropriation is substantially the same as last year.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not simply because it has been "running along," and for no good reason?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no. We went into the matter very carefully last year and made a very careful analysis of the situation. We found that there are perhaps more hard-working men employed over there in the Bureau of the Census than in almost any other department.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman explain what they are doing?

Mr. SHREVE. They are working on the tabulation of the various censuses they have to take; for instance, a census of manufactures, over and above what they take every 10 years. Take the question of vital statistics as one illustration; there was $106,000 appropriated for that last year. We have increased that $10,000. Here is an inquiry including hides, sugar, and so forth. Here is another—wealth, debt, taxation. Then here is a census of electrical industries, and cotton, tobacco, fats, and oils, and marriage and divorce. All these things come under that department.

Mr. DOWELL. Is this work done each year, or is it separate work done in different years?

Mr. SHREVE. Under the acts of Congress some of these things come up every two years, as, for instance, the manufactures census. The cotton census comes up every year.

Mr. KING. What good does all this do to the general country? Why not cut out some of these things and save some of this money? That could be done by the leadership of this Congress, and then we could get down to a pre-war condition. There is no attempt to cut down anything. Here are these fellows who sit down over there and compile great masses of figures, and they are published in elaborate reports, and nobody reads them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think almost everybody gets every few days a report from the department as to the condition of the cotton industry, for example. Congress passed a law requiring the department to do that, and they are simply carrying out the law.

Mr. KING. I will bet that the gentleman never read one of them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Far be it from me; I never made a bet with the gentleman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Commissioner of Navigation to secure uniformity in the admeasurement of vessels, including the employment of an adjuster of admeasurements at not to exceed $2,260, purchase and exchange of admeasuring instruments, traveling and incidental expenses, $3,760.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. After the word "instruments," on page 14, line 23, insert "For purchase and repair of instruments for counting passengers." Then when we arrive at lines 24 and 25 I shall ask to strike out those two lines. The item is very small. The traveling and incidental expenses are $3,760. I do not see why we should add another paragraph to this.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, Mr. Chairman, this is a very small matter. I will say that we have made only a couple of increases in this department. One is $15,000 for the enforcement of the navigation laws, and that money will all come back in the way of fees, and so forth. Another one is in the matter of wireless communication.

We have provided for the purchase and repair of instruments for counting passengers, $250. These instruments wear out. If we allow the amendment offered by my colleague from Pennsylvania we simply reduce the amount in the former paragraph to secure uniformity in the admeasurement of vessels, and we really feel that this sum is not sufficient now. I therefore reluctantly will have to object to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON: Page 14, line 23, after the word "instruments" insert the words "For purchase and repair of instruments for counting passengers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Commerce to employ, temporarily, such persons as may be necessary, of whom not more than two at any one time may be employed in the District of Columbia, to enforce the laws to prevent overcrowding of passenger and excursion vessels, and all necessary expenses in connection therewith, $10,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee the difference in the employment of the persons in the two paragraphs just read, aside from the one for the District of Columbia?

Mr. SHREVE. The men employed in the enforcement of the navigation laws are usually connected with the ships. A revenue cutter, or whatever they call the ship, will go out and locate in a certain point, and then from that point the boats go out in the vicinity and make an examination as to how the laws are being enforced. Where they find violations of the law, for instance, where a boat is carrying too many passengers and has not on it enough life preservers, and so forth, that matter is handled in a different way. The other matter that the gentleman referred to, as I understand it, is simply a matter of a man who stands on the pier and checks up the people who go on the boat.

Mr. DOWELL. That is $75,000.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. That is the permanent law.

Mr. DOWELL. The other item apparently is temporary?

Mr. SHREVE. That is during the summer season. I suppose that refers to the excursion business. That applies at the height of the season, when it is necessary to provide for them.

Mr. DOWELL. This is an extra employment?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. The bill has provided for the same thing for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wireless communication laws: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to enforce the acts of Congress "to require apparatus and operators for radio communication on certain ocean steamers" and "to regulate radio communication" and carry out the international radio telegraphic convention, and to employ such persons and means as may be necessary, this employment to include salaries of employees in the District of Columbia not exceeding $17,600, traveling and subsistence expenses, purchase and exchange of instruments, technical books, rent and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $139,200.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking my colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. SHREVE], regarding this appropriation of $139,200 for purposes connected with wireless

communication. I see the statement is made in the hearings that there are 564 broadcasting stations in the United States, which shows the growth of this wonderful method of communication. I wish to know just what authority this bureau has for the regulation of radio communication, as to these broadcasting stations?

Mr. SHREVE. This department has had charge of this matter for some time. I am not familiar with the law that was passed in the beginning, but it is undoubtedly a fact that the department would not take up the work without sufficient authorization of law. If the gentleman will notice this appropriation from year to year, he will see that it has been increasing. Last year we found that after the bill had passed the House and before it passed the Senate certain matters of information came before the Department of Commerce which made it absolutely necessary to increase the appropriation at the other end of the Capitol. For instance, there was the interference that was going on. It requires a great deal of tact and skill to prevent interference. The experts who are sent abroad must be real experts in their line and must know how to regulate these instruments and must know how to detect interference.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. May I ask my colleague right there how they regulate communication? Is it through licenses?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; entirely.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Every broadcasting station must have a license?

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is there anything in the complaint I have heard from some sources that there is discrimination in favor of the large electrical companies in allowing them to secure broadcasting licenses rather than the smaller broadcasters?

Mr. SHREVE. No; I think there is nothing whatsoever in that statement. I am sure that any person who desires to use the service will be accommodated in some way.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How can they all be accommodated where there are only a certain limited number of meter lengths that can be used?

Mr. SHREVE. They try to average it. For instance, if you want to broadcast in your neighborhood and there are several others working on the same meter lengths, you will be allowed a certain number of hours, or certain periods during the day during which you can be accommodated. They can not give a man all-day service, but by making allotments, by parceling the time out in this way they are able to handle the situation quite well under the present wave lengths.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Have there been any cases where a large company would have the entire day for broadcasting?

Mr. SHREVE. Only in a case where a large company might use a wave length requiring such power that nobody else could compete with it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. What is the wave length in use by the ordinary broadcasting station? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not a scientific man, and I regret that I can not answer that technical question.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think a wave length of 500 meters will carry between Chicago and Washington.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Suppose a broadcasting station in McKeesport, Pa., wants to broadcast on 360 meters and they find that the wave length of 360 meters is already preempted by a large concern and therefore they can not get any time at all. I know my colleague is very familiar with the entire situation, and I ask him what legislation we could pass here which would assure justice to the amateur broadcasters who have done a great deal in the development of this art?

Mr. SHREVE. I would be very glad if my colleague from Pennsylvania would give study to that matter, because there is room for improvement.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been working on this proposition ever since the conference was held which was called by the Secretary of Commerce, and the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE], has been working on a bill which is practically ready for presentation; but it is a very complicated and difficult subject to handle in such a way as to satisfy everybody. I think it is very clear that the matter of broadcasting can not be left entirely to the whim or wishes of individuals. There must be some regulation, and that is coming.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk hire: For compensation, to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce, of not to exceed $1,600 per annum to each person or clerk in the offices of shipping commissioners, $70,000: *Provided*, That one clerk may be employed hereunder at a compensation not to exceed $2,200 per annum.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I note in this paragraph an appropriation of some $70,000 for clerk hire. This is the same appropriation that was made last year. I take it that it is a permanent appropriation. May I inquire why these clerks are not placed in the same status as those in the other paragraphs of the bill, and why, if they are permanent employees, they are not classified in this paragraph and the lump sum omitted?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman that, as I understand it, these are purely statutory places. This law was passed some time ago, and we have followed it from year to year. It is just the same thing that we have had. It has been tried and found all right, and it provides for the same number of clerks.

Mr. DOWELL. But the statutory employees are specified in the appropriation bill. This has no specification whatever, and I am doubtful if the gentleman is correct in supposing that these are statutory clerks.

Mr. SHREVE. I think the gentleman is right. This is a lump-sum appropriation. This is for personal services. The clerks are employed in the various cities—Baltimore, Boston, Newport News, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and so forth. They all draw moderate salaries, only $960 a year.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand that; but is there any reason why this bill should not state the salaries that they draw? These are permanent clerks?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Why should not the bill state the salaries that they draw and omit, as far as we can, the lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. I think the gentleman is right about that; and I will say that the committee have been endeavoring to get away from lump-sum appropriations, but we have not been able to dispose of all of them yet.

Mr. DOWELL. Are you doing all you can to get away from it?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Here is a case where you have definitely stated what ought to be paid, and it ought to be specified. Under a lump sum they may pay any sum they please.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are limited to $1,600.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; it is limited in a way.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it one reason for carrying it in this form is due to the fact that it is desired to leave the number of clerks for each shipping commissioner flexible, in order to permit the Secretary of Commerce to detail a clerk to this commissioner or that commissioner when they are needed and not needed at some other point.

If one is needed here and not needed in another place he can be detailed for that commissioner. I agree with the gentleman as to his opinion of lump-sum appropriations because I think lump-sum appropriations are something that ought to be cut out as far as possible. But the gentleman will notice that this lump sum is safeguarded by limiting the amount that can be paid to a clerk to the sum of $1,600, except one clerk, who can receive $2,200, if the Secretary of Commerce deems it wise.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. DOWELL. I yield.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is not probable that if this were made a statutory provision the expenditure would be very largely increased?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think that is very probable.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If they were permanent employees they would come under the rating so that they could have an increase in salary and eventually you would have a much larger expenditure than you do under this appropriation.

Mr. DOWELL. It is not necessary to make them statutory, but only to designate what they receive.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are limited to a salary of $1,600.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For apparatus, machinery, tools, and appliances used in connection with buildings or work of the bureau, laboratory supplies, materials, and supplies used in the construction of apparatus, machinery, or other appliances, including their exchange; piping, wiring, and construction incident to the installation of apparatus, machinery, or appliances; furniture for laboratories and offices, cases for apparatus, $75,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. The amount of $75,000 includes appropriations for laboratories for all structural material?

Mr. SHREVE. For the laboratories in Washington. There are different laboratories for various services.

Mr. WATSON. There are several laboratories under the Bureau of Standards making investigations for structural material testing, and so forth. Does the $75,000 cover all of the buildings and apparatus necessary for these investigations?

Mr. SHREVE. All that are enumerated in this paragraph. The gentleman will find in another place there is another item for different kinds of laboratories.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For grading, construction of roads and walks, piping grounds for water supply, lamps, wiring for lighting purposes, and other expenses incident to the improvement and care of grounds, including foreman and laborers, in the District of Columbia, $10,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in this paragraph a provision of $10,000 for grading, construction of roads and walks, and so forth. I would like to ask whether there is a highway construction service in the Bureau of Standards or in the Department of Commerce which occupies itself in building roads.

Mr. SHREVE. I am inclined to think not, but this is what they do do: Out at this splendid institution known as the Bureau of Standards they are working on the roads. The work is done by their own men. The cinders that they produce in the wintertime are used for a base. With their own facilities they make the roads, and they thought with a slight appropriation they would be able to get along and build a new road. With this small appropriation they will get $30,000 or $40,000 worth of roads.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. They really build new roads?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; they build them entirely themselves, and I think it is a very commendable practice.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How many departments have the same kind of operation?

Mr. SHREVE. I do not know of any other.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. We have a Bureau of Roads in the Agricultural Department, one in the Indian Bureau for road building, and I think there are a great many others. I did not know but there might be coordination, but the gentleman states that this department is getting 300 cents for every dollar, so I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1924 the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government having funds available for scientific investigations and requiring cooperative work by the Bureau of Standards on scientific investigations within the scope of the functions of that bureau, and which the Bureau of Standards is unable to perform within the limits of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, transfer to the Bureau of Standards such sums as may be necessary to carry on such investigations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer on the books of the Treasury Department any sums which may be authorized hereunder, and such amounts shall be placed to the credit of the Bureau of Standards for the performance of work for the department or establishment from which the transfer is made.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice under the Bureau of Standards section there are many investigations and some scientific ones. I would like to inquire if all the men employed to make these investigations, whose names are on the salary list, are experts?

Mr. SHREVE. This is the main office that we are referring to at this time.

Mr. WATSON. I know, but in making these investigations they require experts?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. They are not indicated in the salaries of this list. You employ other men?

Mr. SHREVE. It is absolutely necessary to employ experts in highly technical service.

Mr. WATSON. But the words "personal service" mean extra help.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; but we keep ourselves within the appropriation. We can not use any more money than is actually appropriated. We get the best help we can under the appropriation.

Mr. WATSON. The bureau employs the men that are named?

Mr. SHREVE. There may be more men or less men, but it must all come within the appropriation that is made.

Mr. WATSON. In making the scientific investigations the bureau employs such men as it desires, providing it does not exceed the amount of money mentioned in the appropriation?

Mr. SHREVE. That is exactly right. For instance, the Navy Department during the war found that they were short of optical instruments. They took the matter up with the Bureau of Standards. In a short time the Bureau of Standards developed a glass which they found to be equal to that of Germany, and as a result they are furnishing nearly all of the glass that is used in the Navy Department. Yet the Navy Department is paying for that, paying sufficiently so that it might be necessary to take on additional experts, but the money is not paid out of this appropriation for the work of outsiders. Of course we do the Government work, but specific matters of that sort are all paid for and must necessarily entail the employment of a large number of people.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES.

Salaries: Commissioner, $5,000; deputy commissioner, $4,000; chief constructing engineer, $4,000; superintendent of naval construction, $4,000; chief clerk, $2,400; clerks—1 $2,000, 2 of class 4, 2 of class 3, 3 of class 2, 5 of class 1, 7 at $1,000 each, 2 at $900 each; messenger, $840; assistant messenger, $720; messenger boy, $480; assistant engineers—1 $3,000, 1 $2,400, 1 $2,250, 1 $2,000; draftsmen—1 $2,200, 1 $2,000, 2 at $1,800 each, 1 $1,600; in all, $68,290.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if this item and the items carried under the heading the "Bureau of Lighthouses" is in consonance with the Budget estimates?

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely.

Mr. HICKS. You do not increase or decrease the amount that the Budget recommended?

Mr. SHREVE. We confine ourselves to the estimates made by the Budget. All through the bill, as near as possible, we confine ourselves to the estimates made by the Budget. They happen to correspond with our own bill of last year, so that we have not only the authority of the Budget but the figures of our own bill last year, which established that the figures are about right.

Mr. HICKS. I am glad to know that there has been no reduction, because I have been under the impression that there has been a little shortage in the funds for the Lighthouse Bureau. This bureau is one of the most important bureaus that we on the seaboard and on the Gulf coast and Great Lakes have in our districts. I know in my own district, which is situated at the northern approach of the city of New York, the Lighthouse Service is of prime importance. Its field work is in the hands of men of courage. Its administration is in the hands of experts. It has come to me a number of times in regard to these light beacons and aids to navigation on Long Island Sound and on the Atlantic, where, because of our immense commerce, the need is great. When we have tried to get them, the answer invariably has been "lack of funds in the appropriation." It seems to me that with the vast merchant marine that we now have, we should not economize in this item which means the salvation of not only the ships but of the people on the ships. I am glad to know that the committee has not cut the items down. I would prefer to have it increased.

I feel that the head of the Lighthouse Bureau, Mr. Putnam, the commissioner, is one of the ablest men we have in the public service to-day, a man of vast experience, well informed, conscientious, a man who is doing his duty as we expect a public servant to do it; and I want to pay my tribute as one who comes from a marine district. I believe all of the marine districts of this country owe a debt of gratitude to Commissioner Putnam.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. KING. I know that the gentleman has taken general interest in matters of that kind, in the Navy and in navigation. Is it possible that the Budget committee has taken the power out of Congress entirely to say what shall be appropriated for lighthouses, and, if so, do they have any hearings as are held by the committees of Congress on these subjects.

The gentleman used to be an active member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I would like to inquire wherein the Budget committee has usurped the powers of Congress.

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, absolutely it has not done anything of the kind. The Budget committee is performing an important function, which is all its own, and it is in no way conflicting with the duties of Congress.

Mr. KING. In what way does it investigate about these lighthouses?

Mr. SHREVE. They have made their investigation and made the recommendation in a lump-sum appropriation and said to go ahead and do what we pleased with it. That is what the Bureau of the Budget has said, and we have said no, that we did not intend to let go of the authority and right that Congress has to specify and say where the money shall be expended. It is the policy of this committee to rebuild the whole system. We are going about it gradually. Let me call attention to what we did last year. We provided for an improvement to aids to navigation at the entrance to Delaware Bay, $138,000; for establishing new aids to navigation and for improvements in Alaska, $125,000; and for improving aids to navigation in Calumet Harbor, $66,000; and so on. It is the policy of this committee to keep this service up to the top notch. We were not inclined, however, to place six or seven hundred thousand dollars in the hands of anyone to spend as he might see fit.

Mr. KING. I understood the gentleman to say that every item in the bill was recommended by the Budget.

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no.

Mr. HICKS. The Budget makes an estimate of what they think a certain amount should be, and it is up to the Committee on Appropriations to have before it men who also testified before the Budget committee as to need for these different items, is it not? Do you bring those men up and question them also?

Mr. SHREVE. I am not in a position to say how the Budget or the Bureau gets this information, but we derive our information from the heads of the various bureaus, from the men in charge, the men who know all about it.

Mr. HICKS. Working entirely independent of the Budget people?

Mr. SHREVE. We are finding out in our own way, and the Budget people work out their own system.

Mr. HICKS. In line with the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] it does seem to me curious that your figures should agree in every instance. If the Committee on Appropriations works along its lines and the Budget along its lines, one would think that once in a while they would not always agree.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They do not agree.

Mr. SHREVE. The Bureau of the Budget had the advantage of the figures of the committee over a year ago.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think there has been a bill reported here that has not reduced the figures submitted by the Bureau of the Budget on the whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Keepers of lighthouses: For salaries of not exceeding 1,800 lighthouse and fog-signal keepers and persons attending lights, exclusive of post lights, $1,300,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph makes an appropriation and limits the number of lighthouse and fog-signal keepers to 1,800. Is there a decrease or an increase in that number?

Mr. SHREVE. That number remains practically the same as last year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is the same.

Mr. SHREVE. Of course, there might be an increase or a decrease at any time. A storm might wipe out one of these aids to navigation, and it is somewhat elastic, but in the main it remains the same as last year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says it is practically the same and indicates that there will be no reduction unless some lighthouse is destroyed. If that is so, then the number in the next fiscal year will be just the same as the number for this, except in the case of accident or catastrophe.

Mr. SHREVE. We have a table here showing just what they are doing with these men. If the gentleman would like, I can insert it in the RECORD. It covers engineers, assistant engineers, clerks, and so forth. It covers the entire service.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, the reduction of one lighthouse keeper or the keeper of the fog signal might be very important in the district I represent. The one dropped might be one in operation now in the district. I would like to know whether it is contemplated to make any reduction?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, absolutely not. On the contrary, if anything happens it will be an increase. I realize we must necessarily increase this force, and there is nothing going to be dropped or any man lose his position by reason of this appropriation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A number were dropped two years ago, and by inquiry at the office I learned it was on account of the decreased appropriation. Those who were to be dropped were not named in the bill or by any action of Congress, and those in charge of the work acted in accordance with their own judgment, and arbitrarily discontinued certain lights and stations; and it happened that a number of them in my district were taken off. I have a district which extends some 150 miles along the shore of Lake Michigan, where there are a number of lighthouse stations. Some which were discontinued it was sincerely thought ought not to have been discontinued; and the gentlemen in charge down town say they would have been continued and in their judgment ought to have been continued, but the amount of money was so reduced they could not continue them.

Now, I wish to say a word on the line just pursued by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] when he says that this Budget proposition has disturbed the rights of the Congress. It seems to me there is not the opportunity there used to be for Members of Congress to reach the first source of supply or recommendation of legislation and appropriation. It is more or less a secret proposition now in the hands of the Budget people, and those who are heard outside of the office of the Budget are exclusively employees of the Government whose duty it is to operate in the business of the Government and expend the money. Those on the outside who are interested have no opportunity whatever to be heard. It is true that sometimes later on——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I ask permission to proceed for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is true that in the matter of appearing before the Committee on Appropriations, so far as I have been able to learn, few if any opportunities are given by that committee for the old style hearing which prevailed before this Budget system was adopted.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will yield.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is it not a matter of fact the present operation of the Budget system, wherein subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations deal with the Budget system instead of specific committees handling certain legislation—as, for instance, river and harbor legislation—is it not a fact that we are practically under the government of the Budget committee rather than the government of Congress? Does it not operate to that end?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to operate in that direction, certainly. It is a sort of close corporation. These gentlemen of the Budget make the investigation and they have practically before them only officials of the department who have to do with the administration of the law and expending the money. There is little opportunity for the old style of hearing by which outside parties or Members of Congress can appear and make a showing and ask for money for the continuation of work at the time in force. It may be that this results in economy, but I do not consider it is real economy merely because appropriations are lower than they were in former years, and I submit in the particular matter of which I am speaking, about light houses and fog signals and Coast Guard stations which have been abandoned, there has been a saving of money as the result of that abandonment. But it is not real economy because those stations have been and now are needed, and there has been no opportunity under the present system to recommend the making of appropriations or for those directly in interest to be heard.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just exactly what methods the Bureau of the Budget pursues in reference to determining what estimates shall be submitted to the Congress by the President, but I do know the very efficient Director of the Budget Bureau and I know that he is a fair man, a man of very wide experience in the fiscal affairs of the Government, and I have always understood that the Bureau of the Budget gives full opportunity to anybody who wishes to be heard before the bureau in behalf of any particular estimate or appropriation.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In just a moment. As a matter of fact, the various departments submit their estimates to the

Bureau of the Budget, and the director through his experts conducts such investigations as he thinks are necessary to determine whether or not the amounts recommended by the various departments or its bureaus will be required to carry on the activity of the Government in a proper and economical way during the year for which they are submitted. Now, I am quite sure that anybody who wants a hearing before the Bureau of the Budget can get it upon application, and that the director would welcome valuable information. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINEPERGER. The gentleman undoubtedly recalls, in the last river and harbor bill, the fact that in spite of the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and in spite of the River and Harbor Committee, who had given long and considerate study to that bill, the amount was cut from $42,000,000 in round numbers to $27,000,000 and only by appeal of the membership of this House, which appeal was responded to, we got the $42,000,000, the minimum amount necessary to develop the rivers and harbors of this country.

Now, I understand that in the War Department bill, which is to come up in a few days, practically that same thing has happened again, and I understand that such an appeal will again have to be made to the membership of this House. Now, is not that fact indicative, to say the least, that the Director of the Budget is somewhat out of touch with the sentiment of the House on these vital legislative matters carrying appropriations?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I recall, of course, the circumstances to which the gentleman refers, and I will say that I joined him in his effort to increase the appropriation to $42,000,000——

Mr. LINEBERGER. I congratulate the gentleman——

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because I have always heartily favored river and harbor improvements. In reply to the last statement of the gentleman, I do not think that the Director of the Budget, acting as he does for the President of the United States, should take into consideration what he may believe the Congress wants with reference to any particular appropriation. The law creating the Budget system makes it the duty of the President to submit to Congress what he thinks is the proper estimate for the appropriations to be made by the Congress, accompanying his recommendation with a statement of the revenues, and then, if they fail to balance, to offer such recommendations as he may think necessary to make them balance.

Mr. MADDEN. Another thing that should be taken into account is this: The President of the United States, the responsible head of the Government in making the recommendation, is the man who makes it, not the head of the Budget Bureau. When he recommends the activities in which he thinks the Government should be engaged, that recommendation should be taken into consideration.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; and as the gentleman from Illinois says, the President is responsible for the estimates submitted, and therefore should act solely on what is needed and not what Members of Congress may want.

Mr. LINEBERGER. But the gentleman must remember that the President has not time to go into all these matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. So far as we are concerned, we only know that the President is the man who submits the matter to us.

Mr. HICKS. We all recognize the eminent position occupied by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] on fiscal matters. I am interested in asking him about some of the details of this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HICKS. And we all recognize the standing of General Lord and appreciate his qualifications as a fiscal expert. But here is the Department of the Navy, we will say. They want certain things; they want certain amounts of money. When they come before the Budget Committee is opportunity given for those outside of the department to present their case?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You mean the Budget Bureau?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; the Budget Bureau.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not say exactly what method the Budget Bureau follows, but I take it that the director would be glad to get any information he could from any source.

Mr. HICKS. He probably takes only the information that comes to him from the head of a department.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be true or not; I do not know just what method he follows in making up his estimates. I assume, however, that he would accept information and be glad to get information in order that the President may make the proper estimate to Congress as to the needs of the various bureaus and departments for the succeeding year, because he is acting, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] says, for the President, and the President is responsible for the estimates submitted.

Mr. HICKS. I recognize that; but where can those outside be heard? Can they be heard by the Budget Bureau, or when these estimates come to the Committee on Appropriations can those outside the departments have an opportunity to present their case anywhere along the line?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am sure the Bureau of the Budget would hear any Member of Congress or anyone else who has information to submit. But when the estimates get to the Committee on Appropriations—and I want to say this particularly to the gentleman from New York and also to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN]—there has never been any curtailment on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in so far as hearings are concerned. The Committee on Appropriations conducts the same kind of hearings and calls the witnesses before it in the same way as formerly in order to establish whether or not the estimates submitted ought to be allowed or whether a different appropriation should be made. If the gentleman will examine the hearings on this bill and other bills he will find that those hearings are as wide and as searching as were the hearings that were conducted by the Committee on Appropriations before the Budget law was passed.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations has adopted—and I am subject to correction on the part of the chairman, who is present, if I am mistaken in my statement—I was about to say that the Committee on Appropriations has adopted a general rule, not rigidly fixed, but a general rule, that it will not report appropriations in excess of the amount estimated by the Budget Bureau. But the gentleman or anyone else who applies for a hearing, anyone who wants a hearing, can come before the Committee on Appropriations in support of a particular appropriation and be heard to the fullest extent. There has been no change in that respect, and no Member of Congress or citizen of the country is cut off from proper hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. And then, after the appropriation bill gets to the floor of the House, as in the instance cited by the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER], the House has the opportunity to increase it if it so desires. So that I do not see that the House is prevented by the Budget law from making such appropriations as the majority of the Members of the House think necessary for any particular activity.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations follows exactly the same rule as has always been followed by other committees of this House in gladly hearing anybody from the outside who may come with information.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. What other committee of the House adopts the rule that it will refuse to increase any estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. OLIVER. This particular bill illustrates that the gentleman is in error.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But the gentleman from Tennessee says that they have a rule not to increase the estimates submitted by the Budget.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I said it was a general rule.

Mr. OLIVER. This particular report likewise shows that the committee exercises full discretion, and in some cases has increased the amount over what the Budget has recommended.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. HUCK). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Madam Chairman, may I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Possibly I used the wrong word when I said "rule." It is the general policy of the Committee on Appropriations not to report appropriations exceeding the amount of the estimates, and that is done in the interest of economy; but that does not cut off the gentleman or any other Member of this House from offering amendments, and if a majority of the House wish to increase an appropriation, of course they always have that power.

Mr. MONDELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not true that the primary purpose of the Budget would be defeated unless the Appropriations Committee did proceed on the theory that the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget were not to be exceeded unless there was some special and very compelling reason for exceeding them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Wyoming is clearly correct, and that is one of the reasons which influenced the Committee on Appropriations in adopting this general policy.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman from Tennessee mean that each item recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is to be kept as it is, or does he mean that the aggregate of the appropriation is not to be increased?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was referring to items of appropriation. As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] pointed out a moment ago, there are instances in this bill and other bills where, for special reasons, estimates have been increased, and the proposed appropriation is greater than the estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I ask unanimous consent, Madam Chairman, that the gentleman's time be extended one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], whom we all recognize as an authority on matters affecting appropriations, whether he considers that the theory of the Budget would be upset if the Director of the Budget were to appear directly before the special committees created by this House for the consideration of these different problems, to wit, on matters relating to naval affairs, the Budget officer appearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and on matters relating to the Army, the Budget officer appearing before the Committee on Military Affairs, and so on down the line? Does the gentleman consider that the theory of the Budget would be upset by such a proceeding?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean to suggest that the Budget officer appear before separate appropriating committees, such as we had under the old rule?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes; but with the Budget officer in liaison with those committees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Budget officer now appears before the appropriating subcommittees.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman misunderstands me, I think. Perhaps I have not made myself clear. I am suggesting that the Budget officer appear before the specific committees which report out legislation now.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That matter was thrashed out very thoroughly when the new rule was adopted placing the appropriations under one committee.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does the gentleman consider that that would upset the Budget?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not so sure but what it would, for this reason: One great trouble was that there were so many committees, instead of having the appropriations all under one committee. We found duplications occurring every year in appropriations in spite of every effort upon the part of the Members of the House to prevent it; but since the Committee on Appropriations has taken charge of all of these bills it has cut out many of these duplications.

Mr. LINEBERGER. How could duplications occur with the same Budget officer appearing before all of the different committees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because with some 10 or 11 different appropriation bills, and with the thousands of items in them, it would be impossible to prevent duplications.

Mr. LINEBERGER. He could certainly keep track of them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But the appropriations now have been placed under departments, so that any gentleman can in a moment's time ascertain just what each department is carrying for a particular year. Formerly the appropriations were scattered throughout half a dozen different appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee—and I ask the question for the purpose of bringing the answer before the committee—does not the gentleman think that the Budget plan has the universal approval of the people of America?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is no question about that, and I think it has resulted in the saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. It has the approval of the people of my country.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Every committee has the benefit of the Budget now. The Budget transmitted to Congress by the President is filed here and is the guide for every committee. Why should the Budget officer go before them?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I think the people of the country recognize that this is an honest, earnest attempt on the part of the Government to put the affairs of the Government on a business basis.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the gentleman think this is one of the outstanding accomplishments of the Republican Party?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. It is the biggest thing that has been done here for many years in the way of business.

Mr. BEGG. It was done by the Republican Congress, was it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was the result of the efforts of both sides of the House.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. The world's biggest business is transacted here in this room, and it is now being transacted on a business basis.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do not think the gentleman has been here long enough to appreciate how this thing operates.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Perhaps not.

Mr. LINEBERGER. It depends entirely upon the application you give to the Budget law. The vast majority of the Members of this House, I think, are highly dissatisfied with some of the operations of the present arrangement.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I am not thinking so much what the Members of the House think about it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. They represent the people of the country.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I am referring to what the people of the United States think.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is it not the desire of the people to have businesslike methods in the appropriating of their money?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Nearly all the States have adopted or are adopting the budget system, as well as many of the larger and more progressive municipalities.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. I agree that that is true.

Mr. SHREVE. Madam Chairman, just a word in answer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN]. I will say that it has been the policy of this committee to hold unlimited hearings. Last year our hearings ran for 31 or 32 days. They covered 900 printed pages of the book that lies on this table. We gave everybody an opportunity to come before us, and many, many Members of Congress did appear. Now, as to the lack of funds for certain aids to navigation referred to by the gentleman, I want to say that it seems rather remarkable that at times when important matters are being considered and appropriations are reduced we are told by the heads of bureaus that there is a lack of money. Now, the bureau head has charge of the money, and he can use the money where he deems it advisable for some meritorious object, and it seems in that case the head of the bureau should be informed. I will say this: I am not sure but there is something growing up in the Government among the heads of departments, a sort of feeling of superiority that they desire to control the situation over and above Congress. If we find that to be true, it may become necessary to do away with the making of more lump-sum appropriations and specifically state just what they are for.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I call the gentleman's attention, in view of the colloquy that has just taken place, to the estimate for the Children's Bureau; that it was raised by the committee $440,000 over and above that of the estimates of the Budget.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from California will not leave the Chamber. He says that the most important business of the country is being transacted here all the time. Mr. Chairman, I am always glad when a Daniel

comes to judgment. I have noticed since I came to serve in this House that the most interesting thing is that it gives to me an opportunity to study the evolutionary process of men who come here and believe that the business of the Government is transacted on this floor. The gentleman from California looks like a business man, a very charming and delightful man, and I hope he will stay here and help us discharge our duty. And I hope he will get relieved of the idea that the Representatives of the American people are incapable of attending to the public business and have to delegate that right to some distinguished functionary or organization, call it the Budget or whatever you will.

Now, I am not deceived about the Budget. You know the pendulum swings to and fro. The other genial gentleman from California reminded his colleague that he had not been here long enough to understand how it works. The time is not ripe, the people have not found out that they bought a gold brick when they got the Budget. Now, I will advise the gentleman from California.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Which one?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. MACLAFFERTY, the gentleman who took the discussion on the floor with unusual seriousness. [Laughter.] I will advise him that he has something else to learn, and that is if there is any credit to be given for the Budget he can not claim it exclusively for the Republican Party.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. If the gentleman will yield, I did not make any such claim; I do not know or care where it comes from.

Mr. WINGO. I discovered that. That is the trouble with some of the American people. Some one told them if they got this Budget system it would relieve them of all their tax trouble, and without looking in the poke they bought the pig and think they have something. That is one of the faults in the operation of popular government. They have the right to do it; they have the right to do as they please, which they do when they send the gentleman from California and myself to Congress. But some Member said it was a great achievement of the Republican Party. I suspect that about as hard work was done in its behalf by the Democratic Members of Congress as by anybody else. A Democratic President recommended it twice. Oh, I know somebody will be popping up like a tomtit on a pump handle and saying that he vetoed it. Yes; he did veto it because a lot of ignoramuses did not know anything about the Constitution, and in the terms of that bill violated the Constitution, and the President had some respect for the Constitution.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to know if the gentleman from Arkansas is not one of the ignoramuses who voted for the bill which was vetoed?

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman thinks so? Well, if I took the time to correct all of the mistakes of ignoramuses, I would not have time to attend to anything else. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, yes; I have been expecting to get a rise from the gentleman from Kansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. Does the gentleman want to include the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, I gave the gentleman from Tennessee an oratorical spanking, and he was so put out that he would not smile at me for a week. But this claim that the Budget is the work of the Republican Party is all "bunk." The people in both parties were told that they would save money, and that was the great thing. Here you were going back to a system which was abandoned years ago because a certain other gentleman from Tennessee, I believe it was, they said had become more powerful than the President of the United States.

A MEMBER. From Illinois, wasn't he?

Mr. WINGO. Well, I was trying to pay a compliment to the gentleman from Tennessee, but whoever it was I remind you that during that time you had the present system when one great appropriation committee made all the appropriations, and the cry went up from all over the land that here was an autocratic committee that would not give the people what they wanted. They said they were going to bring about a reform, so it was put back where it was before. Years after the pendulum swung back, and now the people are told that if you have a Budget, have one big appropriation committee to do it all, the problem will be solved.

Has the millenium come through establishing a Budget? You have a lot more clerks and stenographers on the pay roll, and you have at the head of the Budget one of the finest men in the Nation, and one of the best you can get for the job; but I want to tell you that I have tried it out, time and time again. I started it during the last session of Congress, when I asked the gentleman on the Appropriations Committee about a certain item. He replied to me that he did not know a thing about it, because he was not on that particular subcommittee that had to do with it. I would go to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] or to some of the gentlemen on the other side and ask them about something not before their particular subcommittee, and they would tell me to see So-and-so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WINGO. From Arkansas, Mr. Chairman, not Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the Chair's most natural mistake reminds me of an incident which occurred not very long ago. A very distinguished gentleman in this administration, occupying a very superior place, was at a function one evening and was introduced to one very charming lady from Kansas and another equally charming one from Arkansas. He said, "Now, do you know, I am a little bit confused. Some of you call it Kansas, and some of you call it Arkansas." [Laughter.] That is but an illustration of some of the particular brand of intelligence that you have in some of the departments. I hope the Chairman does not think that I am trying to reflect upon him in any way; but, to get back to the proposition about which I was talking, I have asked Members, practical business men, such as my friend from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY]—and he looks like a very practical man—questions in respect to certain matters, and I have been told to go and see somebody else. The longer the gentleman from California stays here the more he will be resolved to be guided by common horse sense and less by theory. It is physically impossible for any one committee to absolutely go into every detail that is necessary in every department of the Government, involving $4,000,000,000 of expenditure. I hope my people will let me stay here long enough to see you all go back to the system of having the people's Representatives hold the purse strings, and seeing you divide all of this labor among various committees, so that we can be guided intelligently in appropriating for the various needs of the Government, and know how the funds are to be expended. Oh, of course, I know that some people will say that is heresy to this great god that you worship—the Budget.

Not long ago my little boy came home from school, and he had some questions to answer. One of the questions was, What is the Budget? He asked me, and I told him to take his pencil and that I would dictate the answer to the question. Here is what I told him to write: "Something that everybody is for and that nobody understands."

Mr. Chairman, that is true. Ride on the trains, get into conversation with people there, and hear them talk about the Budget. Frequently I have asked some of them, "Just what do you understand by the Budget?" And the popular theory is that the Budget is something to do what? To meet the failure of popular government to function. They have the idea that the American people's representatives in Congress have not the intelligence to spend the people's money properly, and that we have set up a supermachinery over them called the Budget to decide how much money they should spend for particular purposes. They think that if Congress dares to go behind the findings of the Budget that something is wrong, and they immediately say, "What is that bunch of ignoramuses doing up there on the hill? Have we not a body of business men to decide what they shall spend?"

Mr. Chairman, we have gotten so that we utterly ignore the philosophy of our Government. For one, I have faith in popular government. Whenever an appropriation goes through this House and runs the gantlet of gentlemen on this floor, in ninety-nine times out of a hundred it is a deserving appropriation. It is much easier for a camel to get through the eye of a needle than it is for an unworthy appropriation to get by the committees of Congress and the Committee of the Whole on this floor under the five-minute rule. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to that motion, that it close at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 50, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion as amended.

The motion as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Lighthouse vessels: For salaries and wages of officers and crews of light vessels and lighthouse tenders, including temporary employment when necessary, $1,650,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I hope the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY] will not take seriously the spanking that has recently been administered to him by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Oh, I was not spanking the gentleman; I was caressing him.

Mr. BLANTON. In the usual way of caressing a new Member. That is something that every new Member must expect when he comes here if he takes any part in the proceedings. I want to commend the gentleman from California, with whom I consider it an honor and a privilege to serve, for his action in exercising the right the Constitution of the United States and the people of California have bestowed upon him in sending him to Congress. He has a perfect right to take part in the proceedings. He has a perfect right to be heard. He has a perfect right to extol the Budget. He has a perfect right to call the attention of Congress to and remind the country of the fact that there are people back at home expecting certain things to be done here. I want to say to him that he ought to continue that practice. We need new blood brought into the transactions of the business of this Congress. There is too much of transacting its business by a little handful of men, however able they all are, who fill the big committees. It is understood by some that because we have a Budget, and that the committee is supposed to follow their estimate as a maximum for their appropriations, that everything in economy and retrenchment has been accomplished, but I want to remind the gentleman from California of the fact that no matter how much of the very best talent we have in this country to exert its best efforts in recommending economies through that Budget system, sound in its intent and purposes to save the money of the people, there is but one place after all to save the money and effect economies and that is right here on this floor in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, through action taken by us, when the bills are under consideration under the five-minute rule.

Oh, it is awfully easy for these departments, for the chief and bureau heads, who come before these 35 men who constitute the various subcommittees of the main Committee on Appropriations and bring influence from every quarter of the earth to bear upon them to get what they want.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield? I would just like to say this, if the gentleman will permit me, that there is not a man living anywhere in America, either in the departments or the executive branches or up to the presidency, that has any influence upon the Committee on Appropriations unless that influence is fortified by the facts.

Mr. BLANTON. If that is true, then the laws of human nature have changed. [Laughter.] If the gentleman from Illinois, whom I follow so frequently in his efforts sometimes to save money, has become so cold-blooded that all the human ingenuity of the land can not bring influence to bear upon him on certain questions, then the laws of human nature have changed. Remember the history of the civilian bonus.

Mr. MADDEN. I would say this——

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield unless I have five minutes more, because I want to let our new friend from California know that there is one Member who has been here for several years behind him in his efforts to get up here and take part in the affairs of this Congress. I want to let him know I am backing him up in it. I have seen this committee bring in this bill with $100,000 increases more than the expenses for these departments during the last fiscal year, and they have not explained to my satisfaction any reason for increasing the appropriations in that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I want two more minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] in charge of the bill is genial and courteous and we all like him, but he just gets up here and says they saw fit to increase the appropriations over the present fiscal year $100,000, which shows that one department has convinced them, and they put in increases that the Budget committee did not approve of, and I repeat to my friend from California if he expects to save the money of the people, do not depend altogether on the Budget, depend on himself, make his own investigation, look into the necessity of these appropriations, and if he finds out they are not proper, come in here and make a fight against them. Oh, it is a tremendous undertaking to fight a man like our able friend from Arkansas, who is a parliamentarian, a good speaker, with the prestige here of years, but fight him just the same. Stand up here and fight him to maintain your rights. Others will back you up ultimately. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, I have refrained from saying anything about the Budget Bureau during all of this discussion, but I want to point out to my friend from Texas and some other gentlemen who entertain the same views that the fact that an appropriation bill carries an amount in excess of that estimated by the Budget Bureau does not necessarily convict the Appropriations Committee of extravagance. In some instances it is essential to the proper administration of governmental activities that it be done. When it is necessary I am glad that it is done. I know that I have taken the position on the subcommittees upon which I serve that whenever a representative of a department desires to present a case for an appropriation in excess of the amount estimated by the Bureau of the Budget he should be allowed to present his case, because even though the Committee on Appropriations should refuse to appropriate an amount in excess of the Budget estimate the House of Representatives has the final decision as to the amount of the appropriation, and the only way in which you can intelligently decide that question is for the department head to be permitted to present his case and then you read the hearings and learn the facts. I have never agreed and will never agree to surrender to the Budget Bureau one-half of the power vested in me to fix the amount of appropriation for a given activity of the Government. [Applause.] If we say that the Committee on Appropriations will not increase the estimates of the Budget Bureau in any instance we surrender one-half of the power we ought to exercise. We transfer to the employees of the Budget Bureau the right to fix the maximum and claim only the right to make a reduction. I can not agree to that. My friend here, Mr. HULL, of Iowa, was selected by his people to represent them because they believed he knows the needs of the great agricultural country from which he comes. The estimates for the Agricultural Department may be prepared by an employee of the Budget Bureau who may have been an Army officer or a successful business man, but is absolutely unacquainted with the conditions that exist in your country. How can he be regarded as infallible in determining the relative importance of the activities of that department? How can his decision deprive you of the right to argue for an increased appropriation for some activity? I can not agree to that and I never will.

There are instances where bills now being prepared by the Committee on Appropriations when amounts have been increased and the righteousness of the increase must be debated here on this floor. Thus far I have been satisfied as to the increases made by the committee. They were necessary; and I am satisfied that that is true here.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at the time the Budget law was passed, when we changed the rules of the House and increased the Committee on Appropriations to a membership of 35, this whole question was thrashed out; and, so far as I know, there was not a single Member of the House who voted to change the rules—making the committee consist of 35 members and giving that committee jurisdiction of all appropriations—who supposed that the House was surrendering its control over appropriations.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is true. The Committee on Appropriations in conducting hearings should secure the facts whenever a department head believes he has a case that should be presented to the House. The increases may all be refused, but the membership of the House is entitled to the facts whenever the head of a department believes it a matter of sufficient importance to ask to present his case. I have no quarrel with the Bureau of the Budget on that score. My quarrel with the Budget Bureau is based on the fact that they have taken the view expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], that it is a partisan agency, and instead of administering it as a great business bureau of the Government they have sought to play politics by creating the impression

that they are responsible for savings which in fact are not saved at all. This is true even as to the expenses of the bureau itself.

For example, the Director of the Budget first announced that the Congress had given him only $225,000 with which to run the Budget Bureau, and that it was "like giving a man a toothpick to dig the Panama Canal." That was picturesque language. But six months later he appeared before the department heads and said, "Gentlemen, we have got to economize. Just to show you how economical I am, I will turn back a considerable part of my own appropriation of $225,000.

That sounded fine. He did turn back a small part of his appropriation. But how did he do it? The naval hearings show that he drafted for work in the Budget Bureau 10 of the most efficient officers in that department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. May I have two or three minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I say he took from the Navy Department 10 of its experts. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], sitting in front of me, and I, sitting on that committee, asked as to the average compensation, including allowances, of those men who were assigned to the Budget Bureau from the Navy Department and it totaled $50,000. He acquired the services of those naval officers who were assigned to the Budget Bureau, and that made possible this reduction in his fund for civilian employees. But it gave him ten $5,000-a-year men. I asked the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY], in charge of the Army bill, to ascertain how many Army officers have been assigned, so that when we get through we will know what the Budget Bureau is actually costing.

It draws on the War Department for employees and it draws on the Navy Department for employees. If they would come here and state the truth as to the cost of their own administration, and then present to the Congress the cost of the administration of the various departments, so that you would know it, it would be well; but you would have to be a Sherlock Holmes or an unusually expert accountant to know what government is costing if the bureau continues its present policy.

Estimates are sent in here by the Budget Bureau making immediately available certain sums. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations does not approve of that. People talk about the skilled administration of the Budget. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is in favor of a policy whereby these appropriations on their faces shall indicate what they are. If there is a deficiency needed, a deficiency should be asked for. But under the policy of the Budget Bureau, instead of asking for a deficiency, they ask for an additional amount for next year's appropriation, and then ask that a portion of that appropriation shall be immediately available; and if such a bill passes before the 4th of March, and the sum is made immediately available, it has the same effect as a deficiency appropriation. You or I may want to know if there was a deficiency in a certain appropriation. If you look at the deficiency bills, you will not find it, but it will be carried in the appropriations for next year with a provision that a certain amount shall be made immediately available.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. You can stop it if you want to, can you not?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. How?

Mr. DOWELL. The chairman of the committee in conjunction with the gentleman can easily stop those instances.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I confess I can not stop it. If I could, I would force the bureau to stop that practice and its indirect appropriations and I would have every bill show exactly the amount it carries, so that every man could understand what a particular service is costing the people of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I tried to assist the committee in expediting the consideration of this question, but I find I can not make much headway, so I want to talk a little about it myself. [Laughter.]

I am in accord with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] have said in reference to the operation of the Budget system. I happened to be on the Select Committee on the Budget, and we discussed all these questions in the committee before the Budget bill was reported, and we had a free discussion here on the floor before the bill was passed. It was never suggested at the time of the passage of the bill that either the Committee on Appropriations or the Members of the House were abdicating their functions at all on the question of appropriations.

Mr. MADDEN. They are not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that is the alleged assertion or alleged formula by which we proceed, but in practice I do not know whether it is true or not. I want to get this proposition cleared up, and I want the assistance of the chairman of the committee in doing it. I find that there seems to be an impression on the part of the heads of the various bureaus and departments themselves, when submitting their estimates to the interdepartmental board or the Budget, that if the Budget estimates an amount lower than the amount which they feel is required for a fiscal year it amounts almost to an act of heresy or insubordination for them to come up to the Committee on Appropriations and present the real facts and merits of their necessity. Is there any justification for that?

Mr. MADDEN. There is not any justification for that. But here is what the Budget law provides. The Budget law provides in definite language that no person except the President may submit an estimate or make a request——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not talking about estimates. I am talking about the evidence that may be submitted before your committee in connection with the estimates.

Mr. MADDEN. No person except the President may submit an estimate or make a request of any committee of either House for an appropriation without first having a request made upon them to do so by either House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Now, let us take a concrete illustration in the appropriation for the rural sanitation service that came up a few days ago, which some of us tried to increase. The chairman of the committee said that they had the chief of the bureau before his committee, and he said that the amount recommended by the committee was all that he demanded. I happened to find out that that bureau did claim that they estimated a minimum of $150,000 instead of $50,000, as recommended by the Budget, to carry on their work.

Would the head of that bureau have been at liberty before your committee to present its real claims in his testimony?

Mr. MADDEN. He did present the very comprehensive case of the activities of the bureau.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But does the chairman construe the law to mean that he was estopped in his testimony from demanding more than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. MADDEN. He could state all the facts connected with the case, and then it would be left with the Committee on Appropriations to decide whether or not he made a good case.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But if it is the practice to limit them absolutely, and they know that it will be regarded as possibly a discourtesy or infraction of law for them to go any further, if that is the practice, it is really denying to the Members of the House and the Committee of the Whole information that we legitimately ought to have.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no denial of information, because I am sure the gentleman from Alabama will concede that we did go comprehensively into the question of rural sanitation in the hearings.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not denying that.

Mr. MADDEN. So there was no denial there; and it is not the purpose of the committee to deny any opportunity to present every fact in every case. On the other hand, we invite, and we insist that all facts connected with every case submitted to us shall be disclosed, and if those who appear before us are reluctant to disclose the facts, we pry around ourselves and try to get the facts, and we put them on the witness stand in such a way as to compel them to give us the facts. So we are not trying to cover up or evade any facts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But they are justified in saying to your committee that although the Budget recommend a certain appropriation they feel that they need more?

Mr. MADDEN. We do not foreclose their right to do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I want to get cleared up.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not foreclose their right to do that; but as I understand the function of our committee, as the servant of the House, it is to get every activity in which the Government is engaged conducted at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am in thorough accord with that proposition, provided it does not cripple the legitimate and necessary activities of the public service.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is the policy of the committee.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The late lamented James R. Mann, in speaking of the Budget, repeatedly said that everybody in the United States was in favor of the Budget, but that not one out of a thousand of the intelligent business men of the country who favored the Budget had any conception either of what the Budget meant or of what they meant by favoring the Budget.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just let me make my statement first, and then I will yield. So far as the United States is concerned, and so far as a Budget has been established, what it means is this, that the various departments of the Government, instead of sending their estimates separately from each department to Congress, send them all to the Budget Bureau, which is a clearing house. Now, what is the object of the Budget Bureau? It is clearly twofold: First, to prevent duplications; and, second, to see that the appropriations for one department are not out of proportion to those for the other departments, and that they are kept substantially on an even basis, so that they will all be practicing economy in the same measure and to the same degree. Those are the two purposes. We have been discussing this question here to-day as though having a Budget system meant that Congress was in some way fettered, and particularly that it was fettered in keeping down appropriations. Why, we must remember that the House of Representatives is the place where appropriations must originate, and that in nine cases out of ten, with a budget or without a budget, the struggle here will be not to increase appropriations but to decrease them. The unending struggle between the executive and the legislative departments always has been and always will be for larger appropriations on the part of the executive and for smaller appropriations and for economy on the part of the legislative department. That has always been true, and that always will be true, and we should bear that in mind and remember it, and remember that we are the ones who must economize and the ones who must fight appropriations as suggested by the executive departments. Rarely indeed will the occasion arise for increasing appropriations.

Now, having seen what the object of the Budget is, so far as the two branches of the Government are concerned, the executive and the legislative, let us see whether the change made in the House had anything to do with the Budget. Why, all there is to the Budget system, as adopted by us here, is that these appropriations come to us in a new form. They come to us through one officer instead of coming from all these several departments, and that has no relation at all to the way in which we deal with them when they reach here.

Did we do a wise thing in abandoning the old system of appropriations, under which we had men who had spent 15 or 20 years of service in studying all the questions relating to those different departments of the Government, and substituting in their stead one committee, where it was impossible that they should have that profound knowledge gained from long study and experience in connection with each particular department? I am not seeking to say anything in criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, for the members of which I have the very highest and most profound respect. But where could you find men like JULIUS KAHN, like MCKENZIE, like FRANK GREENE to deal with military affairs? Where could you find any of them, except DAN ANTHONY, and he is alone, functioning on the Appropriations Committee? Where could you find men who had the experience and the knowledge of military affairs that those men had? Why, every man in this House knows that the name of JULIUS KAHN will go down in history as the great civil hero of the World War on this side of the Atlantic. [Applause.] Men here know that he had courage, but he had back of it knowledge and experience and all of the things which went to make him fitted to fight, on the civil side, a great war in behalf of this country. So you can take every one of the seven former appropriating committees and you will find the same results. Now what do they claim for the new system?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TOWNER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. When the gentleman spoke of what Mr. Mann said it occurred to me that it might be a good thing to call attention to what the late lamented Champ Clark said about the Budget.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not know what he said. I will let the gentleman state that in his own time.

Mr. TINCHER. Wait until I finish my question. He said that the selfish interests of the chairmen of legislative committees that had the power to appropriate would no doubt hinder the Budget for a long time after it was enacted into law; and that has proven true.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am not going to charge selfish interests on the part of any Member. I do not believe it is necessary to cast stones at any Member of Congress. So far as my observation has been—I am sorry if it has differed from the observation of the gentleman from Kansas—men on this floor have but one object to serve.

That is the interest of the House and the interest of the country which they are concerned to protect and conserve. I have not found any departure from that rule, and if the gentleman's observation has been otherwise it differs totally and wholly from mine. The working out of this system has developed two serious defects. I served one year on the Committee on Appropriations, and although I worked earnestly I found that it was impossible for the whole committee, made up of 35 men, to consider even in a surface way, to consider even in a general way, the items of the supply bills. In effect it is legislation by a committee of three, nominally five, but you will find that three attend the meetings and that is all, and you generally have one man who knows something about the subject and only one.

Mr. MADDEN. I deny that in toto.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am talking about my observations and experience, and I am talking about what I saw and observed while I was on the committee. You do not have but one man on a subcommittee, as a rule, who has any training in that matter. I am not saying these men are not all able men; I am not saying they are not all high-minded men; I am not saying they are not all intelligent men; I am not saying that they are not all praiseworthy men and men of the highest character; but I am simply saying one thing which is a matter of criticism. I do not intend to say anything but what is kindly of these men; I am saying that they have only one on each of these subcommittees who has had experience, and they do well if they have him. And then I say there is no coordination in the work, that the subcommittees function separately just as much as the general committees functioned separately before, and instead of having 7 committees, as you formerly had, you have 13 subcommittees. You simply multiply by two instead of dividing them up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall object to that. I hope that we will be allowed to proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I want five minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. I shall object to that, Mr. Chairman; if you will not let them talk on the other side, I shall object to any further remarks. I do not see any reason for railroading this bill through; we have plenty of time.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think that is a fair statement; we are not railroading anything through.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman I have not taken any time heretofore and I do not think the gentleman ought to object to these general statements. The gentleman will notice I have attended constantly the sessions of the Committee of the Whole on the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to get into any quarrel with anyone. I am anxious to get along with the bill. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, every man in the House has been urging our committee to do everything possible to expedite the consideration of the appropriation bills. We have been acting upon the suggestion of the Members of the House. If you do not want the bills considered, if you do not want the work expedited, we can take it easy; we are not anxious to work any more than you are. But why not help us to help you to do the things you seem to want to do? What we are trying to do is to be good servants of the House. We are not trying to dictate any policy to the House; we are trying to do the thing you are urging us to do. We have been fairly

responsive to your demands. We have not known any hours, we do not know days, we work nights, Sundays, and holidays; we work when everybody else is playing. Now, help us. That is all we want—encourage us to do the things you have told us to do. If we did not respond to your request we would feel that we were derelict in the performance of our duty. It is for you to say whether we have performed our duty, whether we have performed it efficiently and expeditiously, or whether we have been laggard in the performance of that duty. It is for you to say whether we have been honest in the performance of the duty. The responsibility is yours and it is not ours. We are your servants, your doormat, if I may term it so, and now wipe your feet on us all you want, but when you get through, quit and help us to proceed. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Superintendents, clerks, etc.: For salaries of 17 superintendents of lighthouses, and of clerks, and other authorized permanent employees in the district offices and depots of the Lighthouse Service, exclusive of those regularly employed in the office of the Bureau of Lighthouses, District of Columbia, $400,000.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now that we have quit talking about the Budget and have gotten the ship back on its course, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about the development of the wireless in the various lighthouses. As the gentleman knows, in some lighthouses we have wireless installed which enables the ship by shore triangulations to get its latitude and longitude irrespective of its own instruments—one of the most important maritime developments of recent years. I know that the department is anxious to have the important lighthouses so equipped, but I know that when it comes to installing them the department can not get the money for the work. In the interest of navigation, in the interest of commerce, it seems to me that the money should be appropriated so that the important lighthouses and important light vessels shall be equipped with this apparatus, because it means the safety of the merchant marine. Can the gentleman enlighten the committee at all as to what the department would like for the equipment of the ships and the lighthouses with wireless?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say to the gentleman we have had this matter up before the committee and the department is making as rapid progress as possible. I have forgotten the number of lighthouses that have been equipped.

The commissioner said:

In addition to the three radio fog-signal stations on Ambrose Channel Light Vessel, on Fire Island Light Vessel, and at Seagirt Light Station, all in the vicinity of New York Harbor, radio fog-signal stations were placed in commission during the year on San Francisco Light Vessel, California, and on a relief light vessel in the third district. Radio fog-signal apparatus was also installed on light vessel *No. 105*, which was completed during the fiscal year, and was placed on station August 31 on Diamond Shoals off Cape Hatteras, N. C. So we have five radio fog signals in operation, and a great deal of interest has been taken in these, and we believe that they are going to result in one of the greatest advances in safeguarding navigation in fog which has yet been made.

There is a total of nine new stations established last year.

Mr. HICKS. My point is not in relation to fog signals, but radio apparatus for giving ships their position.

Mr. SHREVE. They work together. I am not speaking about fog signals. I am talking about the radio service which has been extended to nine different stations in the United States in the last year, and it is constantly being extended and will be extended as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HICKS. Then the Committee on Appropriations is friendly to this development.

Mr. SHREVE. Certainly. We realized that it is one of the finest inventions that has ever been discovered. It is a greater relief to ships than anything else that we know of.

Mr. HICKS. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. SHREVE. I may say that I think it is going to revolutionize things right along.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of one light vessel, $150,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I suppose it is not possible that the Shipping Board could construct a vessel that could be used for this or any other good purpose.

Mr. SHREVE. I am very glad that the gentleman has raised that question. The question of lightships and light tenders seems to be very dear to the heart of the man who is at the head of this bureau. In this appropriation he was asking for one tender, one light vessel, the completion of another light vessel, and another light vessel at $150,000 and at $200,000. We had this same demand last year for light vessels, and at that time I asked the gentleman in charge of the bureau if he would not go up the Hudson River or somewhere else and get some ships. He contended that it would not answer his purpose. However, we persuaded him to try it out, and he succeeded in getting nine mine sweepers. Of these nine mine sweepers six are of the large variety and three of the small variety. One of the mine sweepers has already been converted into a lighthouse tender and I saw the picture of it, and it is one of the most beautiful ships you ever saw. So that satisfies us that a large number of those ships can be converted to the use of the Lighthouse Service. Of course, when you come to a light vessel, that is quite a different proposition, because it requires particular machinery. The ship must be built in such condition as to hold the machinery. It should have self-propelling arrangements about it. I can readily see that the Shipping Board or the Navy would hardly have ships to take the place of a real light vessel. The gentleman will find a little further on that we have made some changes here, for the reason that there are six light vessels now under construction. The bureau secured nine last year from the various departments. That makes 15, and they were asking for the construction of 4 more. That made 19 vessels in one year, which I think the House will agree was a very substantial building program for one year. We have reduced that. We have given them $90,000 to help rebuild a lightship that was destroyed by the Standard Oil Co., that company furnishing the hull and we equipping it with machinery. We are also giving them another light vessel.

Mr. DOWELL. Has the committee made investigation of the report from the department relative to the utility of the vessels of the Shipping Board for this purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, yes; we have gone carefully into that. We are satisfied and the department is satisfied now that many of these vessels can be used for tender purposes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is the committee insisting on the use of all that can be used for this purpose?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes. The only thing we did this year was to make appropriations for the vessels used at sea, vessels that are anchored at sea. All others, tenders of every description, in my opinion, can be secured from the Government.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I find nothing in reference to the $150,000 item, but the $90,000 item is treated on page 134. That vessel is one for the navigation of the Mississippi. I understand that the Government owns 12 boats there in the civil service. Why can not some one of those boats be detached for that service?

Mr. SHREVE. It is no more to be used on the Mississippi River than in any other place, except as the director of the bureau determines in his own mind where it will be used. He said he wanted it to use it there, but that does not make it necessary that he should use it there if it can be put to better uses elsewhere.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But I suppose the committee was guided by the testimony?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the testimony is that it is for service there, and it being intended for service there, my question is directed to why they can not use one of those vessels they now own?

Mr. SHREVE. I think they can.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Why should we build another vessel?

Mr. SHREVE. We are not building that type of vessel; we are only building light vessels, that are stationed permanently at sea, because we feel that they can use these mine sweepers that the Government has.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. These mine sweepers were obtained by the Navy Department?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Has the Lighthouse Service been able to make use of the vessels built by the Shipping Board?

Mr. SHREVE. We have used just nine vessels, as I stated. They have only tried to use nine vessels, and I saw the picture of one of them which was converted, and they said it was going to be a splendid vessel. It was secured from the War Department.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. It was my impression that the mine sweepers were specially constructed and could be used for lighthouse purposes, and that the ordinary Shipping Board vessels could not be utilized for that purpose.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Of course, the gentleman must realize that these boats for Lighthouse Service must be all of shallow draft, because they have to replace the light vessel which may be on

an 18-foot contour line. They can not use these vessels of the Shipping Board to any extent, because the draft is too great.

They have got possibly to slide into the shallow places and look up buoys that are placed there, and if they draw too much water they will be the victims of the very thing the buoys are put there to prevent—that is, strike bottom. Therefore the Shipping Board boats are of very little use.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enlarging and improving the lighthouse depot at Portsmouth, Va., $154,500.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, line 2, after the word "Virginia," insert "in the first lighthouse district or establish a new depot."

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is this: It will enable the commissioner to build a new depot at that station if it is thought desirable. The old station is in a very dilapidated condition, and it may be when they come to make repairs they will find it in such condition that it should be built entirely new. I simply offer the amendment so as to enable them to do one or the other. This comes in the line of the policy of the committee to make these improvements constantly so as to keep the service in fine shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairs to Barnegat Lighthouse, Barnegat City, N. J., $100,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am advised that the lighthouse at Barnegat is about to be washed away. This is the most important lighthouse along the New Jersey coast. Is the $100,000 appropriated here merely for temporary repairs or looking forward to building a new lighthouse?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no; I will say to the gentleman this is a completion of the project. Now, the Barnegat Lighthouse is not in danger of being washed away. There has been some erosion around the lighthouse, although during the last year I am told by Members of Congress who have visited the lighthouse that the sand had formed again. However, I will say that this lighthouse is one of the ancient structures, more than 60 years old. It is a stone structure standing more than 140 feet high, one of the finest lights on the Atlantic coast. It has a light that is seen at sea more than 20 miles. It is one of the old landmarks to which the people in that vicinity and mariners are accustomed. It is the estimate of the engineer that it can be made an absolutely safe structure for the amount appropriated. The reason I am so confident is we have an estimate from one of the engineers who was doing the same work at Atlantic City and Cape May and other places, and he said the work could be done for $100,000.

Mr. WATSON. What is the nature of the repairs?

Mr. SHREVE. Simply a jetty.

Mr. WATSON. Stone?

Mr. SHREVE. A stone jetty extension there.

Mr. WATSON. And it will cost $100,000?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. It is estimated that it will be a permanent improvement?

Mr. SHREVE. It will be a permanent improvement and remain forever. There is a great deal of sentiment in regard to this lighthouse, I will say, and the people of New Jersey are very anxious that this light should be preserved, and there is no reason why it should not be.

Mr. WATSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing magnetic observations and to establish meridian lines in connection therewith in all parts of the United States; magnetic observations in other regions under the jurisdiction of the United States; purchase of additional magnetic instruments; lease of sites where necessary and erection of temporary magnetic buildings; continuing the line of exact levels between the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts; establishing lines of exact levels in Alaska; determination of geographical positions, by triangulation or traverse, for the control of Federal, State, boundary, and other surveys and engineering works in all parts of the interior of the United States and Alaska; determination of field astronomic positions; for continuing gravity observations; and including the employment in the field and office of such magnetic observers, at salaries not exceeding $2,200 per annum, as may be necessary, $134,500.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do so with a great deal of hesitation. I have not the temerity to move to strike out the paragraph, even though I feel constrained to do so in the absence of the self-constituted watchdogs of the Treasury. I presume they have been called from "labor to refreshment," and that is the reason that they have not done so. I want to say that they sat silently while we provided $100,000 for the restoration of an old landmark and the watchdogs of the Treasury did not bark, but this provision—with all due deference to these aged gentlemen—I do not know in the present condition of the Treasury—maybe I am not advised—but it looks like it is not necessary "for continuing magnetic observations and to establish meridian lines," as provided in this paragraph.

I was laboring under the delusion that these magnetic lines had all been established. There is also a provision for "temporary magnetic buildings." But here, I suppose, is the important provision:

Continuing the line of exact levels between the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts; determination of geographical positions, by triangulation or traverse, for the control of Federal, State, boundary, and other surveys and engineering works.

And so forth. Of course this provision here, "determination of field astronomic positions, for continuing gravity observations," those provisions constrain me from moving to strike out the whole paragraph. Under this administration, Mr. Chairman, we have $134,000 that we can appropriate from a busted Treasury in the face of the coming deficit for the purpose of "determining field astronomic positions" and for "continuing gravity observations" of this administration, but not a cent for adjusted compensation for soldiers. Thus worketh the Budget. Is that absolutely essential work? Can not these meridians rest a while, and can not these "gravity and astronomical observations" remain suspended for a while?

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely not, for the reason that the earth's magnetic changes require that these maps be redrawn.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, yes, Mr. Chairman; that reminds me. This is, I guess, an emergency appropriation, because I was reading a few days ago a very learned treatise discussing this question of magnetic changes and one also on the loss of time suffered under the present calendar. There has been a loss of time going on under the established calendar that in 3,284 years will become serious, but measured by the progress of this administration I think it might be wise at this particular time to appropriate $134,500 out of the Public Treasury for this useful and necessary work. It is provided that these officials shall have a salary not exceeding $2,200 per annum. Now, seriously, is not this "$2,200 per annum" the most pressing part of this paragraph? [Laughter.]

Mr. SHREVE. I think not, for the reason that our navigators have to be supplied with this information. I will read to the gentleman——

Mr. WINGO. No; I do not want the gentleman to read that in my time, for I fear I shall get an oratorical spanking from the watchdog of the Treasury on my side of the House for questioning this item that he and the lords of the Budget have approved. But, seriously, I do not think navigation will be affected by our failure to make more accurate "astronomical observations" than those we now have. I feel that the "meridians" now established might well be followed for a time, and we could economize in that.

I would move to strike it out were it not for the fact that the Budget has made the estimate, and "the men who ride on white asses" have approved it. Great was Diana of the Ephesians, but greater still the lords of the Budget. Where is the gentleman who a little while ago dramatically proclaimed to the radio that the "most important business under the Government is being done in the House of Representatives"? I know it would go through if I moved to strike it out, so I do not, economy of time being the only possible economy. The lords of the Budget have spoken. The watchdog sleepeth, and who am I that I should question their infallibility on this momentous item?

Mr. SHREVE. For the encouragement of the gentleman from Arkansas, I will say that we did make quite a drastic cut. We cut out about $40,000.

Mr. WINGO. How many "observations" did you cut out? It would take one of those $2,200 per annum sages to tell you, would it not? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary employees to man and equip the vessels, including professional seamen serving as mates on vessels of the survey, to execute the work of the survey herein provided for and authorized by law, $535,200.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee about this item of $535,200, on page 33. Is that an item just thrown in, just to see that everybody gets his share, or is it a serious item?

Mr. SHREVE. We will give you the hearings on that in just a moment. It is itemized under the statement given to the committee by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. DOWELL. But the wording of this is very peculiar.

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. It is just a lump sum, put in after apparently everything else has been appropriated for. Here is $535,000 given as full measure.

Mr. SHREVE. We will give you in a minute what that is used for. That is used in various ways. It is used for the payment of the salaries of the chief engineers, at from $125 to $170 a month; deck officers, $2,000; mates, $115 to $250; surgeons, $100; watch officers, $140.

Mr. DOWELL. Have you not provided for these in the other items in the bill?

Mr. SHREVE. No. That is in another part. This is for the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. DOWELL. This is in addition to those already appropriated for?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; this is in addition to those already appropriated for.

Mr. DOWELL. Then I would like to inquire why this item can not be specified, so that we shall know what this is being used for. Five hundred and thirty-five thousand two hundred dollars is not so great a sum, but could not the committee get into the habit of giving us the items for which this is expended?

The members of the Committee on Appropriations speak of ways in which they will try to get away from lump-sum appropriations, and yet after the concrete items we have items, amounting to several thousand dollars or several million dollars, of lump-sum appropriations in addition to what has been appropriated. Is there not some way of getting away from this? Can not the committee give an exact specification as to the way in which this money shall be expended?

Mr. SHREVE. I fully agree with the gentleman. I wish there were some other manner in which we could furnish to the House the exact information. I have the exact information in my hand, an itemized statement; but the trouble is people do not take the time to look up what the situation is. It is all in the hearings.

Mr. DOWELL. Aside, however, from the subcommittee, no one knows for what purpose this $500,000 is used.

Mr. SHREVE. I can not tell to what extent the reports are read.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The salaries and wages for men on board the ships that make the surveys are dependent upon the conditions at sea?

Mr. SHREVE. Entirely.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. You may get a mate to serve on a ship with one salary to-day, and next month, or next January, or next April you would probably have to pay him a different salary. I do not see how you can specify the salaries paid to these men.

Mr. DOWELL. How can you get at the exact amount, $535,200? Why is it not $600,000?

Mr. SHREVE. Because we have, as I say, an itemized statement of what was paid last year. We know exactly what was paid.

Mr. DOWELL. But it seems to me if you know the aggregate you should know the items by which that aggregate is obtained.

Mr. SHREVE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman help us to get that into this bill?

Mr. SHREVE. I will see what can be done.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. In regard to this Coast Pilot item of $5,000, does that include the total expense of publishing that book?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes; that seems to be the total expense. It has gone along that way for a number of years.

Mr. HICKS. The book is not sold, is it?

Mr. SHREVE. I think it is sold. I think the money for it goes into the Treasury.

Mr. HICKS. How much is received from the sales of that book?

Mr. SHREVE. That is stated in the hearings.

In reference to the question raised by the gentleman from New York a little while ago concerning the availability of the ships received from the Shipping Board and from the War Department for lighthouse purposes, I wish to say that we have found that these ships are splendidly equipped just about as they are for the purpose of wire dragging. The ships will be a mile apart with a cable extending from one to the other, and these mine sweepers make the finest ships that can be found to drag the cable. So instead of building new ships the Coast and Geodetic Survey are taking these mine sweepers and putting them to some useful purpose.

Mr. HICKS. That is undoubtedly true.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations herein made for the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall not be available for allowance to civilian or other officers for subsistence while on duty at Washington (except as hereinbefore provided for officers of the field force ordered to Washington for short periods for consultation with the director), except as now provided by law.

Mr. STEVENSON. I move to strike out the last word. I want to inquire who is the head of the Coast and Geodetic Survey at this time?

Mr. SHREVE. Colonel Jones.

Mr. STEVENSON. Col. E. Lester Jones?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the gentleman who was appointed in 1916, and whom a prominent candidate for the Presidency in his campaign in 1916 designated as a horse doctor. He is not a doctor now, but a colonel, is he?

Mr. SHREVE. I will say that he is a colonel, and that he is highly efficient.

Mr. STEVENSON. Then Mr. Hughes was mistaken when he said he was a horse doctor when President Wilson appointed him. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Inquiry respecting food fishes: For inquiry into the causes of the decrease of food fishes in the waters of the United States, and for investigation and experiments in respect to the aquatic animals, plants, and waters in the interests of fish culture and the fishery industries, including expenses of travel and preparation of reports, $40,000.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this item seems rather useless. It is a crime the way the fish in the streams of the United States are being destroyed by stream pollution, but it is not necessary to appropriate any money in order to secure information about it. Information upon the subject of stream pollution is available to anybody who wants to read it. I have here a list of 38 different publications, or rather books, upon stream pollution and fish destruction. It is a discredit to the United States that we have permitted this condition of things to exist so long. There is no provision in the statutes of the United States with reference to stream pollution, and that is what causes the death of fish. Perhaps the Government of the United States has no jurisdiction. Perhaps we could not enact any legislation. The Bureau of Fisheries have informed me that the executive branch of the Federal Government has no authority to prevent stream pollution except when it interferes with navigation, and, of course, the death of the fish could not interfere with navigation.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I was wondering whether the Government had any jurisdiction over interstate streams. They surely have in the building of bridges.

Mr. MACGREGOR. I think myself we could pass some legislation with reference to the pollution of interstate streams causing the death of fish. But why spend this money to find out something that we know already? Anybody can go to a library and get all the books he needs on the subject.

Mr. SHREVE. There was an item in the bill in regard to pollution of streams, but it was taken out. If you will read this item very carefully, it is for an inquiry into the causes of the decrease of food fishes in the waters of the United States and for investigation and experiments in respect to the aquatic animals, plants, and waters in the interests of fish culture and the fishery industries. It is entirely in the interest of fish culture. It is not a matter of public health at all, but these men are trying to find out why it is that certain fishes die in certain waters, or do not thrive there.

Mr. MACGREGOR. You can get all that information by reading books that are now in existence.

Mr. SHREVE. New diseases appear every little while. We must keep up with the study of these things. The gentleman would not want a lot of diseased small fish planted in the waters in his district which might be the means of destroying all the rest of the fish there.

Mr. MACGREGOR. This is a new item.

Mr. SHREVE. I know, but they must take care of it, under the organic act, for the purpose of saving and protecting the food fishes of the United States of America.

Mr. MACGREGOR. We are saving at the spigot and wasting at the bunghole. We are doing nothing to prevent the pollution of streams.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; we are doing a great deal. The Public Health Service are making a most thorough research into the matter, and they have done marvelous things, and they are communicating to every section of the Nation the information which they obtain through their research work.

Mr. MACGREGOR. We have researched and researched, and done nothing tangible.

Mr. MADDEN. We will have to continue research work as long as the world lasts, because science is advancing all the time, and we are in a very much better condition than we were.

Mr. MACGREGOR. The gentleman knows as well as I do that if they put pollution into these streams it will kill the fish.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. And they are not doing anything to prevent it.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; they are.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that if the States will do what California has done to prevent the pollution of streams they would not have to come to Congress. I believe that every State should take care of its own business, and instead of coming to Congress if the gentleman would go to his own legislature and have the matter fixed up there, there would be no need for Federal legislation. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioners of conciliation: To enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 8 of the act creating the Department of Labor, and to appoint commissioners of conciliation, for per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding $4, traveling expenses, and not to exceed $12,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and telegraph and telephone service, $200,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Are the salaries of these commissioners fixed by law?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What salaries do they authorize for the commissioners of conciliation?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not know that he referred to the commissioners of conciliation. They are paid by a lump sum.

Mr. BLANTON. Why is it that their salaries are not fixed by law?

Mr. SHREVE. Each salary is itemized.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it is not in the bill. Is there anything in the law that fixes the maximum over which the Secretary of Labor can not go in fixing the salaries?

Mr. SHREVE. The commissioners of conciliation receive all the way from $7.50 a day up to $15. There are a few expert individuals, depending upon the difficulty of the job they are to take care of, but I will say that they are not working all the time. They work only when they are sent out on a job.

Mr. BLANTON. In this day of high salaries, where we have at least two Government officials drawing $35,000 a year, a number drawing $25,000 a year, others at $18,000 a year, and so on down the line, does not the gentleman think that we ought in all cases not to leave a $200,000 lump-sum appropriation unrestricted without fixing the salaries to be paid under it?

Mr. SHREVE. It is pretty hard to handle a situation of that kind. You are unable to determine what use you are going to have for these commissioners next year. It would only result in high salaries and high wages—men would be put on the permanent roll whether they had any work to do or not.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman has investigated—I do not know whether he has or not—but if he investigates he will find several men drawing $15 a day when at work and in addition to that drawing $4 a day for subsistence and traveling expenses, and that these are men who until they entered the Government service—at least some of them—were not able to earn over $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

Mr. SHREVE. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that; these men are very high-class men.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; high-class men; and yet some of them before they went into the Government service were not earning over $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

Mr. SHREVE. You might say the same thing of some Members of Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the time when they left private business and entered into the Government service.

Mr. SHREVE. Well, I can not say about that.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope the gentleman's committee and other subcommittees will do away with the lump-sum appropriations as rapidly as possible and provide fixed salaries. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Regulating immigration: For enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens into the United States, including the contract labor laws; cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner General of Immigration; salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed to enforce said laws, including per diem in lieu of subsistence when allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914; enforcement of the provisions of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," and acts amendatory thereof; necessary supplies, including exchange of typewriting machines, alterations and repairs, and for all other expenses authorized by said act; preventing the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto; expenses of returning to China all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expenses of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaboard for deportation; refunding of head tax and maintenance bills upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that collection was made through error of Government officers; all to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That the purchase, exchange, use, maintenance, and operation of horse and motor vehicles required in the enforcement of the immigration and Chinese exclusion laws outside of the District of Columbia may be contracted for and the cost thereof paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of those laws, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe: *Provided further*, That not more than $12,000 of the sum appropriated herein may be expended in the purchase and maintenance of such motor vehicles: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein made for the enforcement of the immigration laws shall be available for carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to exclude and expel from the United States aliens who are members of the anarchistic and similar classes," approved October 16, 1918, and acts amendatory thereof.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CABLE: Page 48, line 2, after the word "labor," strike out $3,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof "$3,300,000."

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment fails Uncle Sam will be somewhat in the same position as the man who locks the front door, retires for the night, leaves his back door open, and when some one enters his house he is not able to obtain help to exclude the person. The appropriation bill for the present year is $3,300,000, the same as the amount asked for in this amendment. A year ago, under the first year of the 3 per cent law, the appropriation was $3,000,000, and a deficiency bill was brought in for $300,000. The object of this amendment is as follows: Under the 3 per cent law we are excluding many immigrants from our ports, but because of the strict law there are many undesirable immigrants coming in from Canada, from Mexico, and they are being smuggled in from Cuba. In my time I would like to have the Clerk read a letter from the Commissioner General of Immigration explaining in a way what confronts his department under the present $3,300,000 appropriation, showing it should not be cut $300,000 as this bill seeks to do.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION,
Washington, December 12, 1922.

Hon. JOHN L. CABLE, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CABLE: Referring to your inquiry as to specific instances in which there is now a need for increase in the immigration force in order to more adequately enforce the law, I beg to quote the following from a report of R. A. Scott, inspector in charge, Tucson, Ariz., with respect to the outcome of a number of prosecutions against smugglers of aliens in the United States court at a recent term. This illustrates in a general way the inadequacy of the force available for guarding the Mexican border:

"It may be stated for your information that Judge Sawtelle expressed marked dissatisfaction with the absence of immigration officers or guards at the regular crossing places at border ports. In this connection he went so far as to remark from the bench, in substance, that if the Immigration Service allowed aliens to enter and pass back and forth without restriction through regular channels at ports of entry, he doubted that the court should burden itself with prosecutions involving such aliens. Such remarks from Judge Sawtelle were undoubtedly significant, hence the importance of you being aware of the court's attitude."

Richard L. Halsey, inspector in charge, United States Immigration Service, Honolulu, Hawaii, has just made an urgent request for authority to employ two additional guards for service at that station. He states that at the present time 18 regular passage vessels are being operated through that port by different steamship companies, and that it is reported two other lines are about to begin operations. He states that with the limited number of guards assigned to his station at the present time it is impossible to guard vessels in such a manner as to avoid entrance of aliens without inspection and to properly care for aliens detained at that station.

Commissioner Luther Weedin, of the Seattle district, has recently urged the assignment of five additional officers to his district for service at four main traveled roads crossing the border which are

not guarded by immigration officers, but we have been compelled to deny the request. Requests of a similar nature are being received almost constantly from various districts, and while every effort is being made to distribute the available force to the best advantage, it is utterly impossible to meet the demands without corresponding weakening of important barriers elsewhere.

It may be of interest to you to know that there was a considerable increase in the percentage of applicants debarred at United States ports during the fiscal year 1922 as compared with the two preceding years or before the outbreak of the World War. The number and percentage debarred during the last three years is given below:

Year.	Number debarred.	Per cent of applicants debarred.
1920	11,795	1.9
1921	13,779	1.4
1922	13,731	3.1

Very truly yours,

W. W. HUSBAND,
Commissioner General.

[During the reading of the foregoing letter the time of Mr. CABLE expired, and, by unanimous consent, he was granted an additional three minutes.]

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is not a question of dollars and cents—that is, the saving of any money—because if these aliens sneak into this country over the border the Government will spend more money in caring for many of them. The records of our country show that we are expending $22,000,000 a year to take care of aliens in penal and other institutions. The records show that we have 13 per cent alien population in this country but 25 per cent alien population in these institutions. The Budget submitted by the President for this next year shows that the total income from the Immigration Service will be $3,440,000, or $140,000 more than we are asking for in this amendment. We simply ask to have the same amount of money for the next year that we have for this. The testimony before the committee shows that 228 men, at an average of $1,440 each, will have to be discharged, and what good is any immigration law if we stop them at our ports and permit them to come in from Cuba and the other places and permit them to remain? It means simply that the Appropriations Committee of the House can for itself and the Budget Committee can for itself determine what laws that have been passed by Congress shall be enforced or shall stand on the statute books as a nullity.

I call attention to the fact that the report of the Commissioner of Immigration goes into detail in respect to the way that men are making money smuggling Chinese into this country. Twenty-five thousand were at one time in Cuba, and there are but 2,500 there now. The rest of them have come to the United States. They are coming in all over the borders, and if you cut out the $300,000 it simply means that the people who desire to come to this country will come in unlawfully and be permitted to remain. [Applause.]

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in sympathy with the amendment. I hope it will be adopted. No member of the House Committee on Immigration, so far as I know, believes that the present appropriation is adequate. There are two ways to nullify any law. Our friends who are opposed to the eighteenth amendment and its enforcement sometimes adopt one of those methods, and that is to oppose the appropriation for sufficient funds to enforce the law. One way to destroy the immigration law, and a very effective one, is to refuse to enforce it.

The law is not enforced but is shamefully abused. If the amendment is adopted, the organization will still not be adequate. Many employees in the service at the stations are not adequately paid. There are watchmen and guards in the service of the Government at New York and other ports where rents and living expenses are high now receiving $75 per month, plus the bonus of $20, who have families and are trying to live upon that money. It is no wonder that several of them have been indicted and convicted of bribery. You force a weak man to live on tips, which are akin to bribes, and you will retain only the kind of men who will take tips and bribes. The force at Ellis Island is utterly inadequate; it is not adequately paid. The adoption of this last act restricting immigration does not relieve the country of the pressure upon it by people who should not come in. That pressure has been increased. Men from every land are trying to get in—the very kind of people we do not want. When they find themselves barred by the new provisions of our immigration law then they find some new method of entering. At New York they have adopted one or more dangerous lines of procedure. There they often tip and bribe their way in. Along the Canadian border they are trying to break in in another way. From Mexico they are walking over the border, where there are not sufficient guards, and also they are coming in from Cuba, as the gentleman from Ohio has told you.

I have given my best attention to this subject, and I am sure the other members of the committee have. I am not at all satisfied with the present immigration law. There are many points at which it ought to be strengthened, but it is weaker in its enforcement than at any other point.

I do not assail the bureau that is trying to enforce the law, for I believe Commissioner Husband is doing his best under many disadvantages to enforce the law. I believe his forces are inadequate, and if the country understood the conditions under which he is performing those duties it would demand that he be provided necessary funds and supported in his efforts to enforce this vitally important law. If the country understood it, the House would not dare to refuse to adopt this amendment, by which it is sought to add $300,000 to the amount named in the bill, and that is not a large addition and only brings it up to the figures for the present year. It is for the enforcement of a law that the country is deeply interested in, a law that is necessary for the protection of those things that we regard as important in American life. I sincerely hope that this amendment will be adopted. If the Members of this House understood the conditions under which the Bureau of Immigration is laboring, they would not hesitate to make this addition to this appropriation and make it at least what it has been heretofore.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. It seems to me that if this Committee on Immigration would bring out a bill requiring registration of aliens it would go a long way toward solving the difficulty.

Mr. BOX. The gentleman makes a suggestion in line with what the committee has been considering for more than a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOX. If the gentleman will reflect a moment, he will know that the registration of aliens will not meet the cases of those who slip in by our guards or where there are no guards. The registration of aliens might enable us to keep up with lawless ones who entered with our knowledge, with those who have entered illegally after their unlawful presence was discovered, but it will not reach the case of those seeking to come in unlawfully and undetected, and will not provide for the deportation of those who have come in unlawfully and have been detected.

There are great numbers of aliens in the United States who are subject to deportation under the laws, and your bureau can not do it for lack of funds. That embarrassment has hampered the work of that bureau since I have been a Member of Congress, under the former administration and under this administration. While the registration which the gentleman suggests has had the attention and will continue to have the attention of the committee, it will not meet this question of their entering secretly and unlawfully or the case of our inability to deport them for lack of expense money provided for the purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. If they have to register and carry registration cards, they would either have to produce registration cards or subject themselves to deportation. That is a certainty.

Mr. BOX. That is true, it being assumed that their presence has been detected, but they come in in four or five ways in violation of our laws. We must keep them out or detect them soon after they get in and put them out.

Alien seamen have a right to come ashore, and they do come ashore under our regulations, and then merge themselves into the body of the population and remain unlawfully. No force is provided by which they can thereafter be watched, and many of them remain in the United States, having remained illegally after the expiration of their shore leave and having mixed with the body of the people and been lost among them. Many others come in as visitors under a legal regulation that permits the men to come and go for temporary purposes and have remained contrary to the law. Many diseased, criminal, and dangerous aliens get in by such methods.

There is no way to follow each one of them. It will probably never be possible to follow every one of them as closely as would be desirable. There is now no organization adequate to the task of keeping up with that class of aliens. Then there are some of those who come, as has been stated, across the borders, from Cuba, from Mexico, from Canada; then there are some who are creeping in through the ports, getting in by

bribery, fraud, and otherwise. This House will make a mistake if it does not adopt this amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOX. I will.

Mr. BLACK. As I understand it, certain aliens are subject to deportation, even though they may have entered lawfully. For instance, if an alien had entered lawfully so far as the immigration laws are concerned and then advocates the overthrow of Government by violence, and things of that kind, advocates the assassination of public officials, under a law passed by the Congress he should be deported on those facts being shown to the proper officials of the Labor Department, and it requires an investigation of a judicial character.

Mr. BOX. The gentleman is correct and the fact he states is important. Many violent anarchist aliens remain in the United States because adequate funds are not provided for their deportation. The country wants them to go; they are dangerous trouble makers. There is yet another class; those who go into penal and charitable institutions and become public charges within five years of their entrance are subject to deportation. The plainest proof has been submitted to your committee that large numbers of undesirables from other countries have come here in such numbers as to suggest that some foreign countries are trying to unload on us not only their surplus but the most undesirable and most objectionable part of their surplus. The study made by the committee shows that there is a much greater per cent of foreign-born aliens and their immediate descendants among the inmates of those institutions than of other classes of people. Until after they have been here a certain length of time, five years, they are subject to deportation, but unless they can be caught by a survey made of those institutions and deported, they simply remain here and our law is made futile. The location and deportation of aliens of this class involves expense, which must be provided by appropriation.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman submit to a question?

Mr. BOX. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Husband, Commissioner General of Immigration, on December the 5th, testifying before the House Committee on Immigration, said, in reference to the pay of employees at Ellis Island:

Mr. HUSBAND. I think we have people working at Ellis Island for wages, men with families working for wages, who have to live in New York and about New York, that it is a crime, in the beginning, to ask them to work for.

Since yesterday afternoon, when the question first came up here for discussion, I have been able to obtain confirmation of my facts. They are contained in the statement showing vessels which docked July 1, 1922, and the number of passengers thereon who were inspected by the boarding division:

Vessel.	Inspectors and number of hours on duty.	Passengers.	
		First class.	Second class.
Latvia	Jankovski, 16.21		35
Aquitania	Abbott, 18.15; Coyne, 17.45; Wood, 11.45; McKee, 12.30; Olding, 15.15; Feder, 18; Lipski, 13.30.	344	295
Vasari	Tuller, 11.30; Murphy, 11.35	80	97
Argentina	T. R. King, 17.20; Stern, 12.05; Daly, 13.30.		120
Presidente Wilson	Kaba, 9.45; Marsh, 11.10; Henn, 17.05	51	350
Vestris	Cowen, 18.45	5	43
Conte Rosso	W. Montgomery, 17.05; Sorrentino, 17; Scarinzi, 13.45; Ferro, 16.20; Jankovski.[1]	123	413
Nieuw Amsterdam	Henry, 15; English, 15.30; Watts, 9.45	83	198
Paris	McGlynn, 18.15; Young, 18.10; Walsh, 18.25; Feder,[1] Abbott,[1] Olding,[1] Coyne.[1]	140	277
Seydlitz	J. R. Montgomery, 16.40; Feistyner, 16.50.		356
Monterey	T. R. King,[1] Henn[1]	54	18
Total		850	2,202

[1] Assigned to this ship after completion of work at another.

The crews of the above-named vessels totaled 3,649 persons, who were also inspected.

There is a long list showing that these inspectors of immigration have been working inside the 24 hours of one day 18 and 19 hours, and that many of these men have worked 7 days a week. I have here a list of steamships showing that men started to work and worked until 1.30 a. m. from the month of November up to and including December; that during the month of July many of these men did not have 1 day off inside of 14 days in succession. Let me read you another bill of particulars, as follows:

Steamship *American Legion*, Munson Line, arrived in quarantine at 7.55 p. m. November 15, leaving there at 9.47 p. m. The inspectors finished their work on this ship at 1.30 a. m. next day.

Steamship *Cedric*, White Star Line, arrived in quarantine on Sunday, November 26, at 7.12 p. m. and left at 8.49 p. m. Inspectors finished work at 1.30 a. m. next day.

Steamship *Olympic*, White Star Line, arrived in quarantine at 3.19 p. m. on November 28 and left at 5.26 p. m.

Steamship *Aquitania*, Cunard Line, arrived in quarantine at 3.54 p. m. December 1 and left at 6.40 p. m. The work was completed at 1.30 a. m. next day.

Steamship *Adriatic*, White Star Line, arrived in quarantine on Sunday, December 3, at 3.36 p. m. and left at 4.54 p. m. The men on this ship finished their work at different hours from 10 to 11.30 p. m.

Steamship *Paris*, French Line, arrived in quarantine at 5.18 p. m., 9th instant, and left at 7.02 p. m. The inspection of these passengers was discontinued at about 10 p. m., being resumed yesterday (Sunday) morning and finished.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will yield, a good many periods during the year they did not have anything to do.

Mr. SIEGEL. They have worked every working-day during the year, except when the men at Ellis Island were laid off one month without pay because there was not any appropriation for them. They are men with families, men who had a service of from 20 to 25 years, and some men were paid $900 a year as watchmen, and inspectors from $1,600 to $1,800.

Mr. VAILE. If the gentleman will yield, those men paid $1,600 and $1,800 determine who shall be the future citizens of the United States, do they not?

Mr. SIEGEL. Every one familiar with the law knows that. They determine whether the immigrant shall be admitted, and unless an appeal is taken they act as the final court in the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the use of keeping anarchists out if when they are deported anyone from Mexico and other places can come here and violate the laws and are convicted and then they hold memorial exercises for them here in Washington?

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentlemen holding those memorial exercises should search their own consciences whether they are performing the duty resting on their shoulders. That is not the question before us, however.

That is for another forum and another place. It is for public opinion to treat with those gentlemen as seriously as public opinion desires. What I am trying to point out is this: Our committee was unanimous in its belief that there should be an appropriation equal at least to what was given last year. We say to the House, unless this amendment goes through, that 228 men urgently needed will be put out of the service, when the number of men at Ellis Island now is entirely inadequate to handle the work properly and efficiently, not only in justice to the Government but in justice to the men themselves who work these extraordinary hours.

I am going to read to you, if I may, some of the testimony offered before the committee as to the consequences which are bound to follow in the event that this $300,000 is not granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. This testimony is given by Mr. Wixon. He says:

The estimates as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for 1924 amounted to $3,500,000. For the present fiscal year we have, as you stated, an appropriation of $3,300,000. This is now reduced to $3,000,000 under the estimates as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to operate the service for the fiscal year 1924.

If we are compelled to operate under an appropriation of that amount it will be necessary to reduce our force by 228 persons, whose average salaries must be at least $1,440 a year. We must also curtail activities in connection with the ridding of the country of undesirable aliens who are found to be unlawfully resident therein.

During the fiscal year 1922, in order to keep within the appropriation, we were compelled to furlough field employees from 15 to 30 days each, aside from the officers in charge. This resulted in a saving of approximately $100,000. We were also compelled during that year to practically serve notice on the field that they must keep within their allotments, even though it meant curtailing the deportation of aliens found to be unlawfully in the country.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I notice that the gentleman mentioned undesirable aliens. I would like to ask him this ques-

tion: I believe that there are a lot of undesirable aliens, anarchistic minds, engaged in publishing seditious and pernicious literature in this country and scattering it all over this country at this time. Does the gentleman know whether the Department of Labor is taking any steps to expel or deport those people?

Mr. SIEGEL. The Department of Labor is in this predicament: They have not sufficient money even to deport those aliens that have been convicted of most dangerous crimes and sent to prison.

Mr. VAILE. All that is given in the hearings.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does not the gentleman believe it would be money well expended if it were used for this purpose?

Mr. SIEGEL. The House Immigration Committee, regardless of whether or not we believe in this quota law, is unanimous in believing that while we have this immigration law it should be properly enforced and arriving immigrants treated fairly and decently.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I have received in the last few days many copies of publications and magazines that are published by aliens, of an anarchistic nature. It seems to me that the Department of Labor should round up these men and send them out of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. SIEGEL. You have to have the money first with which to do it.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes.

Mr. BOX. Does not the gentleman believe that if more caution and care were exercised in keeping out these aliens who are in the country our expense account in deporting them would be smaller?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes. The evidence acquired in the investigations shows that most of our troubles have come from those who have not come through the regular ports of entry. They have gotten in without examination. We ascertained that at the time we shipped some of them out of the country. Let me read you a few lines more from Commissioner General Husband's report just issued:

> Lack of funds has prevented the bureau from conducting an active campaign against aliens unlawfully resident here, and many such who were proper subjects for deportation under our laws have been permitted to remain for this reason. In fact, it may be stated that the bureau has been careful to see that the activities in this direction of its field officers have been confined to the more extreme cases where, for peculiarly good cause, deportation should be accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, I could continue to present evidence before this committee showing the urgent necessity for this additional $300,000, and even for more money than that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question? I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box].

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. FESS. Passing over the question of the importance of keeping the undesirables out, would it not be a saving to the Government to make the appropriation of $300,000?

Mr. SIEGEL. It would be a saving in two respects. It would expedite hearings and give proper treatment both to arriving immigrants and Government employees, who have worked honestly and faithfully for a long number of years. [Applause.]

Mr. VAILE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, some one asked awhile ago if it would be a saving if we could relieve the Government of the enormous expense of taking care of socially inadequate people who get into the United States. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] gave some very interesting figures of the total expense of taking care of undesirables in penal, charitable, and reformatory institutions, an expense which for aliens alone is roughly reckoned at some $25,000,000 annually. Let me call your attention to this point, which distinguishes the situation at the present moment. A year ago we had a law, the then 3 per cent quota law, which provided that aliens residing in adjacent islands must reside there a year before being admitted to the United States. Under that provision many aliens came to Cuba and the West India Islands from all parts of the world expecting, no doubt, many of them, to live there for a year before trying to get into the United States, although most of them were looking for a chance to get in before the year expired. Immediately after that we extended that provision, making it five years, so that those people who had banked up there, many, many thousands of them, saw that they would have to remain there for five years before they could get into the United States legally, and the result is that there has been a regular bootleg trade in aliens from the West Indies to Florida and other parts of our coast. The evidence is overwhelming that it is a large, regular, and very lucrative trade, and one involving great danger to the United States.

Now, then, the kind of people who try to get into the United States clandestinely are, of course, those who can not get in in the regular way. It includes primarily those who can not get in under the quota requirement, but it also includes others, people who are excluded under the general provisions of the law—the criminal, the diseased, the anarchistic, and the dependent. Those are many of the people who try to get in here by other than the regular channels. We had before us the other day in our committee a gentleman who had made a very extended study into what he calls the "socially inadequate."

He divided them into 10 classes, namely: Feeble-minded; insane; criminalistic; epileptic; inebriate, including drug addicts; diseased; blind; deaf; crippled; and dependent, including paupers and orphans. Then he took all the people of those classes who were in penal and reformatory institutions in the United States, natives as well as aliens, and he made a table showing the proportionate number which each alien group should have in each of these penal and reformatory institutions, based on the number of aliens of that nationality in the United States and their ratio to the total population, and it resulted in some very interesting figures. For instance, the insane, all foreign born, show a proportion of 192 per cent; that is to say, nearly twice their proper proportion, their normal proportion, if they had the same ratio as all of the inhabitants of this country.

All of the Balkan States together show 275 per cent, or nearly three times their normal proportion of criminals. Serbia and Bulgaria show 1,400 per cent, or fourteen times their normal proportion in our penal institutions, put there as punishment for crime. Spain has 750 per cent. Now, of, course, these figures do not represent the proportions of the criminalistic and the insane in those countries. They do not even prove that the governments of those countries are trying to dump their criminals here, but they do show that somebody has been trying to dump their undesirable people here, and the people who will be dumped are those who can not get through our ports in the regular way. They are the people who, if they get in at all, must be slipped in clandestinely; and they are the people who will be bound to get in if we do not have inspectors enough to keep them out.

This bill as it stands will lose to the service 228 employees of the department, nearly all of them inspectors. It seems to me it would be nothing short of a crime not to allow this extremely modest appropriation, in view of the reasons I have given, with the tremendous pressure that there is upon this service at this time. The total appropriation asked for by the pending amendment is $1,400,000 less than the estimated receipts of this bureau, the receipts from the head tax for the next fiscal year. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. The gentleman gave some very interesting figures about crime a moment ago. Has the gentleman any figures showing the percentage of crime on the part of aliens from those countries whose quotas are not full? How do they compare with the countries whose quotas are full?

Mr. VAILE. I have not those figures with me, but I know they are very much less than the figures I have given. I will say to the gentleman that the tables giving the statistics as to the whole matter will shortly be printed in one of the hearings of the Committee on Immigration, and I have no doubt that the information therein contained will repay the study of Members of the House, because it spreads the whole subject out so that he who runs may read. I shall ask leave to extend my remarks and will insert more complete data on this subject as soon as it is available.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, now that we are on this immigration subject, I want to call the attention of the members to a movement now on foot in reference to a lowering of our immigration bars in order to meet the deplorable situation in the Near East growing out of the recent conflict between Greece and Turkey. There are thousands of refugees, and the suggestion has been made that over in Europe that not only these refugees but that thousands of others should be sent to America. It has even been proposed that portions of Turkey be depopulated of Greeks and Christians and that all of them be sent over here at our expense.

Such a proposition would necessarily involve a setting aside of our present immigration restrictive legislation involving what is known as the 3 per cent quota law. The condition of these unfortunate people is such that it is not to be wondered

at that this suggestion has been made here in America, and that there is more or less agitation to-day for a modification of this law to meet the situation. This country as a Christian nation is not without its responsibility in the premises. However, if we should make an exception to meet this situation it would thereupon become a precedent that we would be asked to follow in every situation where any country, either for political, racial, or religious reasons, persecuted any minority group in that country. If we should adopt this as a principle, it would mean that any foreign country could force a minority group upon us that they did not happen to like by persecuting or mistreating them. The Committee on Immigration in the House is giving some real thought and consideration to this matter, and it seems to me that the people of this country ought to withhold judgment upon that until they have had the benefit of the recommendations of that committee. We must bear in mind that there is a limit in the power of assimilation and that this country has already not only reached that limit but gone beyond it. This fact therefore should be most thoroughly considered while we are also considering the other proposition as to what shall be done with these most unfortunate and mistreated refugees of Armenia and other portions of Asia Minor.

Mr. Chairman, my interest in immigration matters is well known in this House, and I think we would be making a grave mistake if we should follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and overrule the estimates of the Bureau of Immigration and also cut down the amount they had this last year. I want to call your attention to the hearings from page 251 on, and to some of the specific statements made by those who know something about immigration. We have heard from the members of the Committee on Immigration here in the House who unanimously desire to maintain this appropriation intact at not 1 cent less than it was this last year. As against that we have the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations enforced by the estimates from the Bureau of the Budget.

But the Appropriations Committee is necessarily confined to two sources of information—the estimate from the Bureau of the Budget and the statements from the Bureau of Immigration in support of those figures. Now, I submit that the Bureau of the Budget do not know anywhere near as much about this immigration question as the Members of Congress who have wrestled with it time in and time out upon the floor of this House. We passed the quota law because we wanted to restrict immigration into this country. We know the way the law is being violated. We know how persons are being smuggled across the border. About one year ago we had 100 prisoners whom we could not deport to Russia because we had no diplomatic relations with Russia, men who had been smuggled into this country from Mexico across the Rio Grande. That condition is even worse to-day. They are coming in from other sources. Yet here, in the face of that condition, we have a cut in their appropriation, without any reason for it and without any basis of facts behind it.

Let us look at the sources of information. I want first to call your attention to the statement made by Mr. Wixon, who apparently appeared for the Bureau of Immigration. If you will turn to page 253 of the hearings you will see what he says:

> With an appropriation of $3,000,000 I feel compelled to state that we will be impotent to carry out the will of Congress as expressed by the statutes, and must confine ourselves more or less to an examination of alien applicants for admission.

That means that they will confine their efforts to the stations and the efforts to keep people from being smuggled into this country will be practically suspended. The condition will be just as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CABLE] when he first spoke upon his amendment.

Now, we have provided one Assistant Secretary of Labor for the purpose of hearing appeals. It developed during the hearings that since the 3 per cent quota law came into effect we have had twice as many appeals as we had under the previous restrictive law. It developed that there are more deportations. We have to hold people more at the various immigration stations in order to investigate their cases, and that entails an additional expense. Mr. White, the Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of immigration matters, made a statement on page 263 of the hearings which I commend to your consideration. He says:

> In view of your attitude that no increase is to be considered in the appropriation I do not know that I have any statement to make.

That is the way he felt about it.

> I know that these amounts have been cut to the bone and, I think, to the detriment of the Immigration Service. It has compelled the immigration officials or the immigration executives, rather, to spread their officers over the territory in a manner that hinders good administration and good work. One man is placed where there should be two or three. There are hundreds of places along the border where no one is placed. Every port of any importance, every station, is crying for help. Many complaints and criticisms of the Immigration Service, emanating from New York principally, probably could be done away with if we had appropriations sufficient to give them enough help to handle the aliens expeditiously instead of detaining them sometimes several days before they can receive their examination. This condition prevails in almost every port and at every station. In the city of New York alone the officials have brought to our attention something like 2,000 or 3,000 Chinese seamen who should be deported, who have overstayed their shore leave, and have accepted employment and thus come into competition with American labor—our appropriation is insufficient and we can not deport them. The Department of Justice is constantly referring matters to the Immigration Service where men should be deported, and yet we are compelled to pass them up for lack of appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks an extension of two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. White calls attention to the demand made for the prosecution, the ferreting out of those who are smuggling in these people who have no right to come in, and he calls attention to the inadequacy of the appropriation.

Now, whom have we heard from? We have heard from the members of the Immigration Committee. We have had our own experience here with this problem, and all we have heard against it is the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, because every witness who appeared before this committee in support of this appropriation asked for $3,300,000 instead of the $3,000,000 that was granted.

It seems to me that this is an instance when we can very well override the Budget, because of the increased knowledge we have and because in the last analysis, as in the first, we are the policy-making branch of the Government. We make the laws, and here is the Bureau of the Budget coming in against the advice and counsel of everybody that knows anything about it and simply slashes off $300,000. I for one want to do everything in my power to see that our immigration laws are enforced in every possible way. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with those who feel that this appropriation should be increased. However, the facts stated by members of the legislative committee suggest the importance of further legislation on this subject. The President has urged the passage of a law requiring all immigrants to register, and its enactment will correct many of the abuses now complained of, and make the enforcement of existing law easier and more economical. No reason has been given by the Immigration Committee for longer delaying the consideration by the House of this legislation, which all seem to agree is important and urgent. The committee has had ample time to consider and report out some of the bills now pending before the committee on this subject.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Speaking for myself and not for the whole committee but with some knowledge about it, I want to say that there are three registration bills pending before the committee, that extensive hearings have been held, and that it is really difficult to determine how you are going to get an enforcement of registration, what shall be the penalty. That is not an easy problem to work out.

Mr. OLIVER. If the importance of this legislation is recognized by the committee, and the matter has had the attention of the committee for more than a year, as I understand, the committee owes it to the House to take action thereon. Surely the committee, composed as it is of members of great ability, should be able to immediately report out a bill on the subject, even if certain details are left open for the House to decide.

But, coming back to the action of the subcommittee in accepting the Budget recommendation as to this item, I wish to submit this suggestion. While in full sympathy with the idea expressed by many that the action of the Bureau of the Budget should not preclude this House from exercising its own judgment, yet we must recognize a difference between appropriations for carrying on public works or establishing policies from those providing funds to the executive branch of the Government for the enforcement of law.

It is proper and right as to this last class of appropriations that the President, who is charged with the duty of enforcing laws, shall submit estimates of the amount needed for law enforcement, and in the absence of bad faith or willful neglect of duty on his part his estimates should be followed. Why give the President more money for the enforcement of this law

than he asks for? He alone is responsible for reducing this appropriation from $3,300,000 to $3,000,000, and until he indicates to Congress that a larger sum is needed we should not provide it. The responsibility for the proper enforcement of this law is on the President, and he has given unqualified approval to the amount allowed and proposed in the pending bill, and should he find the amount insufficient, Congress will no doubt supply promptly any additional sum which he may state is needed. We must not forget that the Budget Committee was organized to advise the President, and he, after careful consideration of this matter, requested a reduction in this appropriation. Not to accept his advice in this purely administrative matter would be unjustified and would establish a dangerous precedent.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. VAILE. Could not we say with equal fairness that the President's Cabinet officers speak for him, and when the department asks for an appropriation that is the voice of the President? The Department of Labor asks for $3,500,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The law provides how the President shall make known his recommendations to Congress, and he has followed the law in this instance.

The increase asked for in the pending amendment simply provides the same amount as was provided for the current year, and yet all of the laxness, delays, and abuses detailed by the gentlemen who have spoken in favor of the amendment occurred, notwithstanding the current amount carried, and if they are correct in assuming that lack of funds is alone responsible for the complaints they register, then they should ask for a much larger increase to insure efficient enforcement.

I think we can well be charged with extravagance if we refuse to follow the President's recommendation as to the amount needed in the enforcement of this law. Under our system of government he alone is charged with the duty of enforcing the law, and Congress will not deny the necessary funds to uphold his hands, and I think we can safely rely on his calling for further funds if needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, I am intensely interested in the enforcement of the prohibition law, but I would hesitate long before voting an increase in the enforcement fund of this law over the protest of the President.

Why, he says this is all the bureau needs. I am willing to accept his estimate. He evidently has in mind the passage of helpful legislation, which, all seem to agree, is needed, and which this Congress should pass, and he may contemplate a reorganization of his enforcement forces along sane, economic, and efficient lines which gives assurance that $3,000,000 will prove adequate.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman takes the position that the committee relied upon the recommendations of the President, primarily and practically, beyond anything else?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no question as to that.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The testimony before the committee was directly to the contrary, and I am unable to find any cross-examination of the witnesses which would disapprove any of their contentions.

Mr. OLIVER. I have endeavored to point out that it is proper for the House to differentiate between appropriations which seek to provide funds to the executive branch of the Government for law enforcement and appropriations for other purposes. In other words, where the appropriation relates only to the enforcement of existing law, the President being charged with such enforcement, he is in better position than anyone else to state what funds are needed for that purpose. Certainly we are not justified in providing more money than he asks, unless it can be charged and shown that he is not in sympathy with the enforcement of the law and is likely to disregard or neglect the solemn duty imposed on his high office. Until you can show the President that he is wrong, or can offer some proof that he is unwilling to ask for sufficient funds to enforce an important law, I question the propriety of overriding the President's recommendation as to an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then, what is the use of hearings at all upon purely administrative matters?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. OLIVER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. RAINEY of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requests of these gentlemen to extend their remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. RAINEY of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the general bill, H. R. 13316, calling for an appropriation of $300,000 per annum to aid in the enforcement of the immigration laws, is a sum inadequate and insufficient to properly police the borders and ports against the entry of undesirable aliens. The annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, 1922, sets out the following:

Canadian border smuggling operations: The past year has been the foremost in history in increased attempts to smuggle from Canada into the United States.

Mexican border: During the early part of the present calendar year a number of Hindu aliens were apprehended in the vicinity of El Paso after they had entered without inspection, and investigation disclosed what appeared to be carefully devised plans for the importation on a large scale of contrabands of that race who were thereafter to be employed by fellow countrymen operating ranches in California. Certain of these domiciled Hindus came to the border from California, and in El Paso, Tex., and Juarez, Mexico, perfected arrangements with several Mexican smugglers whereby the contrabands were unlawfully brought into the United States and thereafter transported by automobile and train toward their interior destination.

Florida coast: Smuggling operations between Cuba and points on the Florida coast having assumed alarming proportions, in the month of May the bureau selected and sent two experienced officials to Florida and Cuba for the purpose of making a thorough investigation into and study of the situation in order that the most effective measures possible might be adopted to cope with it.

Lack of funds has prevented the bureau from conducting an active campaign against aliens unlawfully resident here, and many such who were proper persons for deportation under our laws have been permitted to remain for this reason. In fact, it may be stated that the bureau has been careful to see that the activities in this direction of its field officers have been confined to the more extreme cases where, for peculiarly good cause, deportation should be accomplished.

In this report the commissioner makes the following statement, which should arouse every patriotic American to action:

It is fully appreciated that dope, liquor, Chinese, and alien smuggling has become a lucrative business and is being carried on by international gangs in which there have been found the hardest, most daring, and cleverest criminals, backed by no limit of funds and possessed of the highest-powered vehicles, boats, etc., the automobile predominating as a means of traveling.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind the American Republic has reached the apex, or the turning tide, and we must now determine whether we shall enforce law and order or surrender ourselves to lawlessness, violence, and the absolute destruction of constituted authority. Upon the enforcement of two cardinal laws, in my judgment, rests the security, the safety, and the perpetuation of the life of the Republic. One of these laws is the restriction of foreign immigration, the other is the constitutional provision and prohibitory statutes relative to intoxicants. Upon deep analysis you will find that the lax enforcement of these two laws works hand in hand; that many undesirable aliens are engaged in smuggling liquor and dope into the United States; that the big bootlegger is opposed to restricted immigration, and that the undesirable alien is uniformly wet. There is a reason for the coordinating functioning of these two evils, and I invite you to a close study of the subject and thereby aid us in the preservation of the most sacred inheritance of the American people—good government. For the first time in my life I raise my voice on the prohibition issue, and I come not as a candidate seeking political preferment, nor am I driven on by any ulterior or selfish motive, but inspired solely by an ardent desire to preserve the integrity of my country and its citizenship. Heretofore I have deprecated running for office on a prohibition platform, regarding the issue then, as now, a moral question. In my judgment, prohibition is not an issue at this time, but the enforcement of the law merits your highest attention. Too long have I beheld the corruption of statutory law, too long have I seen the executive departments in Nation, State, and municipalities sidestep and avoid the enforcement of prohibition statutes. It is my desire and purpose to be liberal and tolerant, but when liberality and toleration consummate themselves into licentiousness, debauchery, and unbridled violation of law, then it is high time

that the constituted authority of State and Nation assert the sovereign prerogative of law enforcement. Disrespect for and violation of one law is but the forerunner of the violation and disrespect of all law; it is the handmaid of anarchy, the boon companion of communism, the breeder of lawlessness, and the mother of a degraded, impotent, supercilious citizenship.

I have watched with careful vision the invasion of the sanctuary of law by the enemies of prohibition in concert with a weak, vacillating, bribe-taking, "bought and paid for" contingent of executive authority. In every part of the Nation prohibition is a by-word and a joke—and why? It is because of the laxity in the enforcement of the prohibition laws, and the inability to effectively enforce the immigration laws. I need advance no argument in this enlightened age against the evils of alcoholism. The dread is not alone against the poisonous, illicit distillations which inflame the minds of men, driving them to deeds of hellish import, destruction of homes, and devastation of every manly virtue, but I speak of that awful dread and dire consequence of the growing tendency of disrespect of law. This spirit must be arrested in its march whatever the cost may be to the Nation. What may we apprehend of a citizenship schooled in law violations, perjury, and a brazen disregard for law enforcement?

It were undoubtedly better for the Republic had no prohibitory statutes ever been enacted, or constitutional amendments adopted, than that we should fail in the strict enforcement of the law, and thereby command the respect of the people for law. Therefore, it is imperious that every power and resource of the Republic be drafted into the service of law enforcement. The failure to do so corrupts youth, breeds disregard of law, fosters bribery and graft, encourages perjury, and renders the Constitution itself an object of contempt. Hence I, for one, call upon the Chief Executive to carry out his well-timed, appropriate injunction—that the prohibition laws must be enforced. The amendment calling for additional funds to aid in the enforcement of the immigration laws meets my hearty indorsement, and I trust that its passage is secure. Recently I introduced a bill calling for a restriction in immigration. Heretofore we have admitted 3 per cent of immigrants from other nations, basing such per cent upon the resident aliens from the respective nations according to the census of 1910. The most undesirable aliens emanate from southern Europe and those hot climes bordering the Mediterranean. Up to 1890 few aliens from these countries resided in the United States, whereas those constituting what is known as the pure Caucasian races, England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and others, were almost as numerous here in 1890 as in 1910. Therefore I framed a bill, which I am constrained to believe, from my knowledge of the sentiments and expressions of the members of the Immigration Committee, will meet the approbation of a majority. However, such a law if enacted will not entirely meet the present conditions. Aliens are being continuously smuggled in, as shown by the report of the commissioner. An alien registration law, advocated by the President, and which I propose to introduce at this session, will not fully meet the exigency. The pressing need of the hour is an ample appropriation to more strictly guard the ports and borders, to detect and deport undesirable aliens who have surreptitiously or otherwise gained admission into the United States. Inadequate as the amount called for in the amendment is I shall heartily support the measure, trusting and hoping that it may be a driving wedge, and hereafter we may procure such appropriation as will effectively and efficiently carry out the immigration laws.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, some gentleman in the course of the debate remarked that he could find no reason for a reduction in this appropriation. I think I can find a very substantial reason, and find it from the record itself. It is not necessary to call any witnesses on this subject. In 1920 and 1921 there was an appropriation of $2,450,000. Afterwards they came in with a deficiency of $150,000, which made a total of $2,600,000. What did they do with that appropriation? They deported 4,517 undesirable aliens, and you must remember that this was during the time when these seditious aliens were in the United States, shortly after the war, when the situation was being watched carefully, when it was necessary for them to comb and find every last alien. Yet in that period for $2,600,000 they were able to deport 4,517 aliens. In 1921–22 they received the same amount, $2,600,000, and were allowed two deficiencies, one of $336,000 and another of $150,000, which gave them all told $3,086,000. What happened as a result of that increase? We find that there were only 4,366 aliens deported. I mention this to let you see that it was not entirely a question of money. A large part of this money, if granted, would be used for traveling purposes, and the real amount of money that would be had for the salary list would be really very small.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. CABLE. Does not the gentleman believe that the immigrants who come in here unlawfully, contrary to the 3 per cent law, should be ascertained and deported just the same as they have been in the past?

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely; and that is what we are doing, and the reason why we are able to do it is because the money can be diverted from other channels now and used for the one purpose in New York.

Mr. CABLE. Do not the hearings disclose the fact that if you add the $300,000 they will be able to look after only the immigrants that come to the ports and will not be able to ascertain the aliens that come in here unlawfully?

Mr. SHREVE. Oh, no. Let me say a word to the gentleman about what Mr. Husband says himself about immigrants coming in unlawfully. Some reference has been made to Chinese. There was a time when there was a very large number of Chinese who came in; they were not able to reship. There was a good deal of laxity in that law, but, as Mr. Husband himself says in his report—

> Effective on September last, there was put in operation a regulation requiring the Chinese seaman shipped in foreign ports or places to furnish bonds in the penalty of $500.

Then, on the next page he says:

> It is not necessary here to narrate the various and successive steps adopted to mitigate the evil, but suffice to say that with the close of the fiscal year 1921 the traffic had all but ceased.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Commissioner General of Immigration, in his report which was out yesterday, states that over 20,000 Chinese have been smuggled in from Cuba, and that because of the lack of funds they are not able to ascertain them and deport them.

Mr. VAILE. At pages 15 to 17 of his current report, out yesterday.

Mr. CABLE. Does not the gentleman believe that we should have a sufficient appropriation to deport these Chinese?

Mr. SHREVE. Absolutely. The Immigration Service I want to see sustained. There is no desire upon the part of this committee to rob them, but if they can use this same amount of money or less money and accomplish greater purposes in 1921, why can they not do it in 1924?

Mr. CABLE. I have read the hearings carefully, and all I could ascertain was that if they could not get this $300,000 additional they would have to quit discovering the aliens here and these thousands of Chinese and simply look after the aliens coming into the ports or seeking to come in lawfully.

Mr. SHREVE. Was that the fact in 1921, when they got along with $2,600,000?

Mr. CABLE. Was not the appropriation $3,000,000 for 1921, with $300,000 additional appropriated, and for last year $3,300,000?

Mr. SHREVE. The appropriation last year was $3,300,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHREVE. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman refers to the year 1921.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that was before the 3 per cent quota law was passed, and that law has entailed a lot of additional work and labor.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, just a very brief statement in answer to another question. Here is what Mr. Henning said before our committee. Mr. Gompers had called his attention to long hours. Mr. Henning said:

> Mr. Gompers has called my attention to the length of hours of immigration employees. I think the hours will average all right, although sometimes, at these big ports, they work 16 and 18 hours a day, but it is not every day, and I think they try to keep them down to the lawful hours. Our boys on the border sometimes travel all night to catch these smugglers, but we try to make it up to them by a shorter day the next day.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In 1920–21 this activity had $2,600,000.

The 3 per cent law was not then in force, so that more people came into the ports as aliens than now; a very much larger number. For 1922, including deficiencies, there were $3,086,000.

More people came in then than now. It is true they have $3,300,000 for 1923, but that was because we believed we ought to make an extraordinary appropriation to meet the new conditions for the time being, but there was no intention that this appropriation should be made permanent and that it should last forever and be increased from year to year. We are getting less people now than ever before. Why increase expenses with a smaller number? Now, we talk about the Chinese coming here and of a large number being in unlawfully, but that condition exists no longer, because they are under bond and we have perfect control over them.

Mr. VAILE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman means those who are lawfully here are under bond?

Mr. MADDEN. All these people who come here are under bond.

Mr. VAILE. Those who come unlawfully are not.

Mr. MADDEN. If you want to prevent men from passing across the border of Mexico or Canada you will be required to put 1,000,000 men on the pay roll. Now, you can not prevent them from coming in over the border line, no matter how much you appropriate, and it is impossible to provide the means that you propose to provide. We are as much in favor of the enforcement of the law as you are, but the President of the United States is responsible for the enforcement of the law. He says he can enforce the law with $3,000,000 for 1924. That is what the President says. Does the gentleman deny it? That is all he asks, and we ought not to give him more.

Mr. SIEGEL. I want to read——

Mr. MADDEN. Let him assume the responsibility for the enforcement of the law with the amount of money he asks and which we give.

Mr. SIEGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Henning, page 307——

Mr. MADDEN. I am talking about the President of the United States.

Mr. SIEGEL. I am talking about the man who is in charge of this work.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Likewise the President of the United States says he is going to see that the prohibition laws are enforced, but they are not enforced.

Mr. MADDEN. He has the responsibility, it rests with him. Failure to enforce the law will be placed upon his shoulders and not upon ours.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. But when we give the President every dollar he asks we are to assume that he knows what he is asking and why he is asking it, and when he says he can enforce the law with a given sum, why do we want to force him to take more out of the Treasury of the United States. I submit the question on the President's request with the full understanding on my part that I am willing for him to assume the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 52, noes 30.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For refund to collector of customs, Los Angeles, Calif., for payment to Manuel Abarca of passage money deposited by the agents of the Mexican State Line, Los Angeles, Calif., on account of the alien Manuel Abarca, $66.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee. I notice some provisions for refund of fines deposited by steamship companies. Was there any information given to the committee of the amount of fines collected from the steamship companies during the course of the last fiscal year for violations of the immigration laws in the bringing in of immigrants who were not entitled to come in?

Mr. SHREVE. I think there is nothing in the record as to how much that amounted to, but I think it amounted to a considerable sum, $2,900,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Most of these fines which are imposed on the steamship companies are due to some port irregularity. They must deposit the amount of the fine when it is imposed. The case is tried later, and the money is refunded; but it must be appropriated for. If it is found on the trial of the case there was no such irregularity, and the fine has been imposed, this appropriation will take the money out of the Treasury which they have put in and which ought not to have been imposed.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. These are to correct mistakes?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but there is no way of accomplishing the purpose until there is an authorization of Congress.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And this is a bookkeeping proposition and could not be handled in any other way? I understand the amount for the last fiscal year was something like $2,900,000?

Mr. SHREVE. That seems to be our record.

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a pro forma amendment. I do this for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if the appropriation of $4,200,000 for lighthouses and other aids to navigation, found on page 29, will be ample to provide $5,500 for four gas buoys for the Toledo Channel? The field men have estimated the cost of these buoys at $5,500.

Mr. SHREVE. I am satisfied that the provision in the bill in reference to lighthouses will take care of all the aids to navigation, say some 16,000, all told.

Mr. CHALMERS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for this assurance. I wanted to get this statement in the RECORD.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for a separate vote, Mr. Speaker, on the item of $300,000 additional for the regulation of immigration.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will submit them in gross. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABLE: Line 2, page 48, after the word "Labor," strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,300,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 25.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on account of the lack of a quorum. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to the vote on account of there not being a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 138, nays 81, not voting 211, as follows:

YEAS—138.

Ackerman	Bland, Ind.	Collier	Dowell
Abernethy	Box	Connally, Tex.	Driver
Arents	Briggs	Cooper, Ohio	Dupré
Aswell	Buchanan	Cooper, Wis.	Elliott
Barbour	Bulwinkle	Crisp	Ellis
Barkley	Cable	Crowther	Favrot
Beedy	Cantrill	Dale	Fess
Bell	Chalmers	Dallinger	Fields
Black	Clarke, N. Y.	Doughton	Fish

Fitzgerald	Ketcham	Newton, Minn.	Sinnott
Gahn	Kissel	Norton	Smith, Idaho
Garner	Lanham	O'Connor	Speaks
Gensman	Lankford	Parker, N. J.	Steagall
Gernerd	Larson, Minn.	Parks, Ark.	Stephens
Gifford	Lazaro	Perlman	Stevenson
Gilbert	Lea, Calif.	Quin	Strong, Kans.
Goldsborough	Lineberger	Radcliffe	Summers, Wash.
Greene, Mass.	Little	Rainey, Ala.	Swank
Greene, Vt.	Logan	Raker	Swing
Hadley	London	Rankin	Taylor, Colo.
Hardy, Colo.	Lyon	Rayburn	Taylor, Tenn.
Haugen	McArthur	Reece	Thompson
Hawley	McDuffie	Reed, N. Y.	Thorpe
Hill	McSwain	Ricketts	Timberlake
Hooker	MacGregor	Roach	Tyson
Hudspeth	MacLafferty	Robsion	Upshaw
Hull	Maloney	Rogers	Vaile
Humphreys, Miss.	Mapes	Rouse	Weaver
Jacoway	Miller	Sanders, Tex.	Webster
Jeffers, Ala.	Moore, Ohio	Sandlin	White, Kans.
Johnson, Ky.	Moore, Va.	Scott, Mich.	Wilson
Johnson, Miss.	Moores, Ind.	Scott, Tenn.	Woods, Va.
Jones, Tex.	Morgan	Sears	Wright
Kearns	Mott	Shaw	
Kelly, Pa.	Nelson, A. P.	Siegel	

NAYS—81.

Andrew, Mass.	Colton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Robertson
Appleby	Coughlin	Jones, Pa.	Rose
Bacharach	Cramton	Kelley, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.
Benham	Curry	Kendall	Shelton
Bird	Darrow	King	Shreve
Blanton	Davis, Tenn.	Kline, Pa.	Sinclair
Bowers	Deal	Kraus	Snyder
Bowling	Denison	Kreider	Sproul
Brennan	Dickinson	Lampert	Stafford
Brooks, Ill.	Drewry	Larsen, Ga.	Taylor, N. J.
Brooks, Pa.	Echols	Leatherwood	Temple
Burroughs	Evans	Lehlbach	Tilson
Burtness	Fisher	Lowrey	Towner
Byrns, Tenn.	Fordney	McLaughlin, Mich.	Turner
Campbell, Kans.	Glynn	Madden	Vestal
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Michener	Voigt
Cannon	Green, Iowa	Mondell	Ward, N. Y.
Chindblom	Griest	Mudd	Wason
Christopherson	Hicks	Nelson, Me.	
Clague	Hoch	Oliver	
Cockran	Huddleston	Reed, W. Va.	

NOT VOTING—211.

Almon	Free	Lee, Ga.	Rossdale
Anderson	Freeman	Lee, N. Y.	Rucker
Andrews, Nebr.	French	Linthicum	Ryan
Ansorge	Frothingham	Longworth	Sabath
Anthony	Fuller	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Atkeson	Fulmer	Luhring	Schall
Bankhead	Funk	McClintic	Sisson
Beck	Gallivan	McCormick	Slemp
Begg	Garrett, Tenn.	McFadden	Smith, Mich.
Bixler	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Smithwick
Blakeney	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snell
Bland, Va.	Gorman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stedman
Boies	Gould	McPherson	Steenerson
Bond	Graham, Pa.	Magee	Stiness
Brand	Griffin	Mansfield	Stoll
Britten	Hammer	Martin	Strong, Pa.
Brown, Tenn.	Hardy, Tex.	Mead	Sullivan
Browne, Wis.	Harrison	Merritt	Sumners, Tex.
Burdick	Hawes	Michaelson	Sweet
Burke	Hayden	Mills	Tague
Burton	Hays	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Butler	Henry	Montoya	Ten Eyck
Byrnes, S. C.	Herrick	Moore, Ill.	Thomas
Carew	Hersey	Morin	Tillman
Carter	Hickey	Murphy	Tincher
Chandler, N. Y.	Himes	Nelson, J. M.	Tinkham
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Newton, Mo.	Treadway
Clark, Fla.	Huck	O'Brien	Tucker
Classon	Hukriede	Ogden	Underhill
Clouse	Husted	Oldfield	Vare
Codd	Hutchinson	Olpp	Vinson
Cole, Iowa	Ireland	Osborne	Volk
Cole, Ohio	James	Overstreet	Volstead
Collins	Jefferis, Nebr.	Paige	Walters
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Park, Ga.	Ward, N. C.
Copley	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Watson
Crago	Kahn	Patterson, Mo.	Wheeler
Cullen	Keller	Patterson, N. J.	White, Me.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Perkins	Williams, Ill.
Dempsey	Kiess	Petersen	Williams, Tex.
Dominick	Kincheloe	Porter	Williamson
Drane	Kindred	Pou	Wingo
Dunbar	Kirkpatrick	Pringey	Winslow
Dunn	Kitchin	Purnell	Wise
Dyer	Kleczka	Rainey, Ill.	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Kline, N. Y.	Ramseyer	Woodruff
Fairchild	Knight	Ransley	Woodyard
Fairfield	Knutson	Reber	Wurzbach
Faust	Kopp	Rhodes	Wyant
Fenn	Kunz	Riddick	Yates
Focht	Langley	Riordan	Young
Foster	Lawrence	Rodenberg	Zihlman
Frear	Layton	Rosenbloom	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Brand.

Mr Ackerman with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Byrnes of South Carolina.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Henry with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. McFadden with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Olpp with Mr. Rucker.

Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Anderson with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Gallivan.

Mr. Hukriede with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Sisson.

Mr. Kline of New York with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. McPherson with Mr. Bland of Virginia.

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Fulmer.

Mr. Morin with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Magee with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Free with Mr. McClintic.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Lawrence with Mr. Oldfield.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Garrett of Tennessee.

Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Stedman.

Mr. Foster with Mr. Sumners of Texas.

Mr. Longworth with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Newton of Missouri with Mr. Bankhead.

Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Anthony with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Wingo.

Mr. Williams of Illinois with Mr. Ten Eyck.

Mr. Atkeson with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Focht with Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Yates with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Treadway with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Begg with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Tincher with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Bixler with Mr. Gilbert.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Faust with Mr. Sabath.

Mrs. Huck with Mr. Hayden.

Mr. Keller with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Hardy of Texas.

Mr. Purnell with Mr. Kincheloe.

Mr. Ransley with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Smithwick.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The amendment is agreed to. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHREVE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted—

To Miss ROBERTSON, for three weeks, on account of business.

To Mr. WISE, for 10 days, on account of illness in his family (at the request of Mr. CRISP).

To Mr. ALMON, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, December 14, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

825. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the

Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, Panama Canal, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for civil government, Panama Canal and Canal Zone, $75,200 (H. Doc. No. 499); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

826. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for repairs to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater and Chapel, $35,000 (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

827. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting request for an amendment to the naval appropriation bill for 1924, which will allow the department to confirm enlisted men in the lowest ratings without the necessity of requiring them to undergo three months' active service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs and Appropriations.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BRENNAN: A bill (H. R. 13375) supplemental to the national prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13376) amending the revenue act of 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 13377) to amend paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code as amended by the act of November 23, 1921, entitled "An act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13378) to transfer Chicot County in the eastern judicial district in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 13379) for the purchase of a post-office site at Waverly, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13380) for the purchase of a post-office site at Dickson, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13381) for the purchase of a post-office site and the erection thereon of a suitable public building at Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 13382) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act fixing the compensation of certain officials in the customs service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 13383) to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13384) to amend section 7 of the act of February 6, 1909, entitled "An act authorizing the sale of lands at the head of Cordova Bay, in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 13385) to transfer certain lands of the United States from the Rocky Mountain National Park to the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 409) for the relief of the sufferers from the conflagration at Astoria, Oreg.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HICKS: Resolution (H. Res. 466) providing that during the consideration of H. R. 13374, making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1924, it shall be in order to consider without intervention of a point of order provisions of the bill or amendments thereto relating to appropriations for additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 13386) granting a pension to Xaver Becherer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13387) granting a pension to Frank West; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13388) granting a pension to William H. Scahill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 13389) granting an increase of pension to L. Ethel Bolton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 13390) for the relief of the Pacific Steamship Co., of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13391) granting an increase of pension to Jerry Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: A bill (H. R. 13392) for the relief of John C. Hines; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13393) granting a pension to Lilly Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 13394) for the relief of Albert Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 13395) for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, and the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13396) for the relief of the Maryland Casualty Co., the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., of Baltimore, Md., and the National Surety Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 13397) repealing so much of an act approved September 22, 1922, granting pensions to certain soldiers and sailors and their widows, as grants a pension of $24 per month to Carl Olsen, late of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 13398) granting a pension to Annie R. Twaddle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13399) granting a pension to Lafayette R. Kincaid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13400) granting a pension to Levi Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 13401) granting a pension to Kittie M. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THORPE: A bill (H. R. 13402) granting a pension to Louisa E. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6581. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of New York State Waterways Association, regarding port improvement in the New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6582. Also, petition of New York State Association, Officers Reserve Corps Association of the United States, favoring an amendment to the national defense act regarding National Guard training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6583. By Mr. FENN: Petition of Hartford Gun Club, Hartford, Conn., to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6584. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of E. S. Breunig and sundry other citizens of Somonauk, Ill., favoring repeal of the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6585. Also, petition of the National Hardware Association, favoring bills for 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6586. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by L. H. Snyder and other citizens of Canton, Ill., urging abolition of small-arms ammunition and firearms tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6587. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Charles V. Vickrey, general secretary Near East Relief, New York City, N. Y., concerning the relief situation in the Near East and America's part in meeting it; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6588. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of Del Norte County, Calif., protesting against the small-arms ammunition and firearms tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6589. By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Mr. J. Charles Ross and 21 other residents of Kalamazoo, Mich., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6590. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of J. H. Putnam and others, of Rome, N. Y., favoring the abolition of the tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6591. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of F. W. Smith and a hundred other citizens of New Haven, Conn., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6592. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution adopted by the Pomona Grange, No. 22, of Bucks and Philadelphia Counties, Pa., in favor of changing the system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast ordained the bounds of our habitation, the number of our months is with Thee, but amid the changing scenes of life we rejoice that Thou art from everlasting to everlasting God. Unto Thee can we come at all times, whatever may be the distress or the responsibility. We humbly ask that this day may find us fulfilling Thy good pleasure. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

WILLIAM H. KING, a Senator from the State of Utah, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR ASHURST.

Mr. CAMERON. I present the credentials of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and ask to have them read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF ARIZONA,
Office of the Secretary.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of Arizona, ss:*

I, Ernest R. Hall, secretary of state, do hereby certify that on December 7, 1922, I made an official canvass of the returns made to this office by the boards of supervisors of every county in the State, and I find that HENRY F. ASHURST, Democratic candidate for United States Senate, at the general election held on November 7, 1922, received the highest number of votes for said office, as appears by the official returns and approved by the official canvass and now on file in this office, and was, therefore, elected United States Senator from Arizona.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal. Done at Phoenix, the capital, this 7th day of December, A. D. 1922.

[SEAL.]

ERNEST R. HALL,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CAPPER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Board of Farm Organizations in opposition to the ship subsidy measure. I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the semiannual conference of the National Board of Farm Organizations, held at Washington, D. C., October 11–13, 1922.

Whereas it is apparent that the question of granting subsidies to our merchant shipping will soon be brought to a vote in Congress; and

Whereas the farmers of the United States have been traditionally opposed to the granting of such subsidies; and

Whereas the plan embodied in the Jones-Greene bill which is now under consideration contains many provisions that are extremely objectionable and would, in our opinion, be detrimental to the best interest of the country as a whole if enacted: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body record an emphatic protest against the passage of this proposed legislation.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Federated Shop Crafts of Parsons, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented the petition of C. P. Sites and sundry other citizens, of Dallas, Tex., praying that prompt help be extended by the Federal Government to the suffering peoples of the Near East, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LADD presented petitions of Herman Huhn and 3 others, of Anamoose; Ferdinand Novak and 3 others, of Lankin; Alfred Strokchein and 3 others, of Elgin; John S. Behan and 2 others, of Mohall; Thomas M. Fleming and 4 others, of Ellendale; Paul Paulsen and 10 others, of Powers Lake; J. A. Dittman and 9 others, of Ray; Ole C. Kjerheim and 8 others, of Olsen; Joseph Martineau and 7 others, of Leroy; and A. H. Hammond and 37 others, of Grand Forks County, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REGULATION OF OPTOMETRY IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2822) to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 942) thereon.

LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4031) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county, and I submit a report (No. 943) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of Illinois, the county of Cook, or the city of Chicago, separately or jointly, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the village of Riverdale, in Cook County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KANKAKEE RIVER BRIDGES, ILLINOIS.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4032) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east, of the third principal meridian, and I submit a report (No. 944) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4033) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian, and I submit a report (No. 945) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county

of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLORADO RIVER BRIDGE NEAR YUMA.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4069) to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Colorado River near Yuma, Ariz., and I submit a report (No. 946) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation of the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Colorado River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between School Hill, in the Yuma Indian Reservation, in Imperial County, State of California, and Penitentiary Hill, in the town of Yuma, Yuma County, State of Arizona, such bridge to be upstream and easterly from the present highway bridge across the Colorado River between said points, and to be constructed and maintained in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMORIAL BRIDGE ACROSS DELAWARE RIVER.

Mr. CALDER. I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Commerce the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 240) providing for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Delaware River at the point where Washington and his troops crossed said stream on the night of December 25 and the day of December 26, 1776.

The amendment to the joint resolution was, on page 3, line 5, after the numerals "1926" and before the period, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the bridge shall be so located and built as not to unreasonably obstruct navigation, and to secure this object the structure shall not be commenced until the plans and location have been approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas on the night of December 25 and the day of the 26th, 1776, Washington crossed the Delaware and won the Battle of Trenton, and as December 25 and 26, 1926, will be the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this significant event in the Revolutionary struggle for the cause of liberty, and as there has meanwhile been no fitting memorial erected at this spot; and

Whereas the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania have commenced the establishment of suitable historical parks on the two sides of the Delaware River and have developed a plan which contemplates connecting these parks by a memorial bridge which will be composed of 13 sections which will suitably commemorate the part performed by each of the Colonies; and

Whereas the other Colonies share equally with New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the glory and benefits of this notable Revolutionary victory; and

Whereas it is estimated that the memorial bridge will require the expenditure of $800,000; and

Whereas it is proposed that the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania shall each contribute one-quarter of this sum: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That Congress hereby indorses the foregoing project and hereby appropriates, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $400,000 toward the construction of a memorial bridge across the Delaware River at the point where Washington and his troops crossed the said stream on the night of December 25 and the day of December 26, 1776, the above sum to be available in four equal parts during the intervening years to secure the completion of the bridge prior to December 26, 1926.

SEC. 2. That a National Washington Crossing Commission be, and is hereby, authorized, to consist of 15 members, 5 to be appointed by the President of the United States, and 5 each by the Governors of the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, with full powers to develop the plans and proceed with their completion and execution and with instructions to use all reasonable expedition so that the work may be finished and ready for dedication on December 26, 1926: *Provided*, That the bridge shall be so located, etc.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator from New York if all these bridges are not constructed under the act of Congress?

Mr. CALDER. That clause is in all bridge bills, but the introducer of this joint resolution omitted it, and so we put it in.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator whether it is to be a toll bridge or free?

Mr. CALDER. They are all free.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The amendment to the preamble was in line 2 of the second whereas to strike out the word "establishmest" and insert "establishment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4167) to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, in order to extend the benefits of said act to certain employees in the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4168) to extend for one year the powers of the War Finance Corporation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4169) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Kane County, Ill., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 4170) granting a pension to Lewis V. Boyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4171) for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Canal from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. BROOKHART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we ought to have a quorum. There are a number of Senators absent who are interested in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I was going to ask for a quorum after we got the bill up for consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. ROBINSON. If there is to be a quorum call, I suggest that that action be taken before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the bill, so that Senators who are not now present may have an opportunity to object to the consideration of the bill if they see proper to do so. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lodge	Simmons
Ball	George	McCumber	Smoot
Bayard	Glass	McKellar	Spencer
Borah	Gooding	McKinley	Sterling
Brandegee	Harreld	McNary	Sutherland
Cameron	Harris	Nelson	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	New	Underwood
Colt	Heflin	Nicholson	Wadsworth
Couzens	Johnson	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Warren
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Weller
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Williams
Dial	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	
Dillingham	Ladd	Robinson	
Ernst	Lenroot	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence on official business of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART].

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] has asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13282, making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be considered first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 14, line 9, to increase the appropriation for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers from $150,000 to $200,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment carries an increase of $50,000 over the appropriation authorized by the House of Representatives. I think the Senator in charge of the bill should make an explanation of the necessity for the increase.

Mr. CURTIS. There was a very full and complete hearing before the House Committee and also before the Senate Committee in reference to the matter. After hearing the Secretary of State, in view of the fact that there was an appropriation for this purpose last year of $200,000, the demands upon which were so great that there may be a deficit reported, and inasmuch as $200,000 were estimated by the department for this year and that estimate was allowed after careful consideration by the Budget Bureau, and as the official who appeared before the committee stated that it would be impossible to get along without the $200,000, the subcommittee recommended to the full committee that amount; and the full committee, after considering the matter very carefully, also recommended the increase.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the provision is somewhat exceptional in character. It reads as follows:

> To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned.

As the committee proposes the sum of $200,000 is fixed, while as passed by the House of Representatives $150,000 were allowed. This provision, if enacted into law, would give the President unlimited authority within the amount of the appropriation to fix salaries. I wonder why the committee did not go into the matter in detail and adjust the salaries and specify them in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. The practice of fixing salaries by Executive regulation and Executive discretion is, on the whole, not to be approved. It adds a very difficult burden to the Executive and one which, under the Constitution and practice which have heretofore prevailed, has not ordinarily been imposed on the executive department. The responsibility is upon Congress, under the Constitution, to safeguard all expenditures necessarily imposing burdens in the form of taxation upon the people of the country; and I apprehend that any Chief Executive of the Nation would much prefer that Congress should discharge its functions and fix salaries and make the appropriations which are necessary in order to meet the obligations thus imposed upon the Government.

When the Executive enters into the field of fixing salaries he is necessarily exposed to pressure and to influence from those who feel that their salaries ought to be increased; and experience has shown that practically every employee of the Government, both at home and abroad, has found justification, not to say necessity, for an increase in the compensation which he is receiving from the Government. That condition grows out of circumstances with which we are all familiar; some justification, in fact, exists for it; but I am curious to know why the Congress finds it necessary to adopt what appears to be the permanent policy in regard to the matter of at least from year to year requiring the Executive to adjust salaries and of providing a lump sum of $200,000 for that purpose. Now I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to state that I agree fully with the Senator from Arkansas, and as chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this bill I gave the matter very careful consideration, hoping that we might return to the old method of fixing salaries, and that conditions might be such that we could readily do so. This policy, however, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows, was adopted because of the war and of conditions growing out of the war. In many foreign countries those conditions still exist. The showing before the committee was very strong that in a number of cases it was utterly impossible for the Government officials to live on the salary which was provided. Allowances under this fund are only made after careful investigation and upon the recommendation of the State Department.

I wish to state to the Senator that if I shall remain chairman of the subcommittee having charge of this bill, just as soon as conditions are such that we may do so, I shall recommend to the subcommittee and the full committee that the salaries of these officials be fixed and that this item shall be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say, in addition to what has been stated by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], that the conditions sought to be covered by the amendment arose, first, on account of the difference in the exchange values of money in foreign countries, where the fluctuations were frequent and where the cost of living mounted so high that nobody ever anticipated or could anticipate it. It is a temporary matter. If those countries ever get back to normal conditions it will not be necessary to increase the salaries of our officials who are stationed there, but at the present time, under conditions existing in the world, many of our diplomatic and consular officials can not live on the salaries which are regularly appropriated for them in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me inquire of the Senator from Utah if he sees an early prospect of the stabilization of exchange, particularly in relation to the countries to which he refers?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I can not say how soon that will happen or how soon conditions will right themselves; and no other human being can do so.

It does seem to me, however, that it would be better now to adopt the method proposed in the bill of meeting these unheard-of and heretofore unknown conditions than to try to fix rigidly the salaries of our officials in various foreign countries, though it may later be possible to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. May I make a suggestion right there?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the showing which was made, I think it is perfectly evident that the State Department is trying to have the appropriation which they are allowed for this purpose reduced just as fast as possible. For instance, there was appropriated for this purpose in 1919 the sum of $700,000; in 1920 there was appropriated $600,000; in 1921 there was also appropriated $600,000; in 1922 there was appropriated $250,000; and this year the department is only asking $200,000 for this purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I presume the hearings will disclose in detail the manner in which this fund is disbursed by the Executive. Of course, we all know that the President himself can not give any attention whatever to the disbursement of a fund of this nature. It would be interesting to know just exactly how the adjustment of allowances out of this fund are made, upon what evidence and through what influences. In order that Senators who desire to do so may have an opportunity of looking into the record and ascertaining a little more definitely the facts, I ask that for the present the item be passed over and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of other amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. There is no objection to that. I may say to the Senator that the matter is discussed on pages 14 and 58 of the House hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 15, line 15, to strike out "$25,913.50" and insert "$15,000," so as to read:

> To enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906 between the United States and Mexico, including not to exceed $900 for rent, $15,000.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I should like to reserve the right to offer an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand, the amendment which the Senator desires to offer is to the proviso.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. If it is desired I have no objection to passing over the committee amendment until the other amendments shall have been concluded. Then the Senator may offer his amendment.

Mr. CAMERON. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 20, line 2, to increase the appropriation for the expenses of the arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain, from $60,000 to $66,370.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 13, to increase the appropriation for furniture and repairs, contingent expenses, Department of Justice, from $6,000 to $6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 8, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous expenditures, contingent expenses, Department of Justice, from $40,000 to $45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 2, to increase the appropriation for defending suits in claims against the United States from $60,000 to $65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for the Department of Justice, on page 31, line 14, after the word "duties," to strike out the additional proviso in the following words:

Provided further, That the automobile purchased from the appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes for the fiscal year 1923 shall hereafter be under the exclusive control of the Director of the Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, let us have an explanation from the Senator in charge of the bill of the purpose of that amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. There was nothing in the hearings on the item, and when the committee found the clause in the bill it was as much surprised, I think, as was the Senator from Arkansas. All the property of the Department of Justice is under the control of the Attorney General, but this item took from his control a motor vehicle and put it exclusively under the control and direction of the chief investigating officer.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is Mr. William J. Burns?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Why the House put it in, of course I can not say, but the committee thought, as all the property now used by the Department of Justice is under the control of the Attorney General, that this proviso ought to be stricken out, and that the department ought to be able to make proper disposition of the vehicle.

Mr. ROBINSON. I apprehend that there was some mysterious, not to say secret, purpose as the provision was originally inserted, but, that reason not being disclosed, I am unable to offer any resistance to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 31, line 22, to increase the appropriation for enforcement of antitrust laws from $200,000 to $230,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for Territorial courts, on page 37, line 23, to increase the appropriation for salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals and their deputies from $2,275,000 to $2,300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 14, to increase the appropriation for salaries of United States district attorneys and expenses of district attorneys and their regular assistants from $900,000 to $950,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 3, to increase the appropriations for salaries of clerks of circuit courts of appeals and district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, from $1,400,000 to $1,450,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 5, to increase the appropriation for bailiffs and criers from $275,000 to $300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 11, to increase the appropriation for miscellaneous expenses, Department of Justice, from $650,000 to $700,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I understand that completes the committee amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. There are two amendments which have been passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the item under the heading "Post allowances for diplomatic and consular officers," on page 14, line 9, after the word "assigned" it is proposed to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$200,000."

Mr. ROBINSON. Let that be passed over for the present and proceed with other amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be further passed over in the absence of objection. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Under the heading "International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico" on page 15, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$25,913.50" and to insert "$15,000."

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, that is an item that was passed over upon the suggestion of my colleague [Mr. CAMERON]. I inquire of my colleague if he is ready at this time to take up the matter?

Mr. CAMERON. I am ready, right now. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senate on page 15, line 15, to disagree to the Senate amendment, and strike out all after "$25,913.50" down to and including the word "commission" in line 20.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has stated two separate amendments.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if my colleague will yield to me, if I understand aright, he has moved to strike out on page 15, commencing with line 15, the word "Provided" on said line 15, and all of lines 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20. Am I correctly advised?

Mr. CAMERON. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I hope that motion will prevail; if my colleague will yield to me——

Mr. CAMERON. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I believe a point of order will lie against that language. Therefore I make the following point of order—that the committee in violation of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of Rule XVI, has added new legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I think when the Senator realizes that this is an item that was put in in the House, he will see that a point of order will not lie against it in the Senate. The only thing we can do is to pass upon the amendment, and either agree to it or reject it.

Mr. ASHURST. If this language was inserted by the House I am of opinion that a point of order would not lie. The Mexican border is 1,400 miles long. I need not now recite any of the turbulent history of the Mexican border. We are striving for peace and friendship with our southern neighbor—Mexico. She is on her feet; her commerce is entering into the markets of the world. She is tranquil and orderly. By treaty with Mexico, executed on March 1, 1889, there was created the International Boundary Commission, and it was agreed that the United States and Mexico should each have and appoint one commissioner, one consulting engineer, and one secretary, but this bill refuses to appropriate money with which to pay the salary of the consulting engineer to be appointed by the United States. I admit that Congress can repeal a treaty, but here, with no explanation, this bill attempts to dislocate and disregard that part of the treaty by which we agreed to maintain a consulting engineer. The problems of the Mexican border are of dignity and importance to this country.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say we do not furnish a consulting engineer?

Mr. ASHURST. The language on line 16 says:

Provided, That none of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of a consulting engineer.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; and then it goes on to provide for one. The treaty does not say that we must furnish a consulting engineer who is not an officer of the Army. It does not say how he shall be furnished or paid.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LODGE. We furnish a consulting engineer, but we furnish an Army engineer. That is our business, since the treaty does not provide how he shall be furnished.

Mr. ASHURST. We can, of course, select some Army officer. The problems of the Mexican boundary are of importance and while I commend all efforts at retrenchment and reform this border treaty should be observed. We do not want a consulting engineer who will ruffle the papers and pass on to some other subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, we can appoint anybody we choose as consulting engineer under that treaty. If we choose to appoint an Army engineer we have a perfect right to do it under the treaty, and we are doing it in this provision. It does not concern Mexico the least in the world.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator please explain why it is now necessary that the office should be practically abolished, and an Army engineer designated?

Mr. LODGE. The object, of course, is to save the engineer's salary.

Mr. ASHURST. To save the engineer's salary?

Mr. LODGE. Why, of course, and to have the duties performed by one of our Army engineers. There are no better engineers in the world.

Mr. ASHURST. In other words, the Mexican border or 1,400 miles, must be content to be served by a man who acts without salary for that particular duty.

Mr. LODGE. It would not make any difference if it was 14,000 miles long.

Mr. ASHURST. Fourteen hundred miles long; not 14,000.

Mr. LODGE. I say it does not make any difference whether it is 1,400 or 14,000 or 14. The point is that in carrying out the treaty we are required to furnish a consulting engineer, and we do. We do not need to have another one and pay him a salary.

Mr. ASHURST. We do not want the sort of man who is willing to serve without compensation.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator think that any competent consulting engineer can be found except a civilian at a high salary? The Army engineers built the Panama Canal.

Mr. ASHURST. Very true.

Mr. LODGE. It has nothing to do with the treaty. It is a matter for us to settle.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, we can probably settle this. As far as I can, being in charge of the bill, I will accept an amendment, which I think will be agreed to, to strike out "$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000," and to strike out the balance of the paragraph from the word "Provided" in line 15 to the word "commission" in line 20.

Mr. CAMERON. I will accept that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the committee amendment on page 15, line 15, it is proposed to amend, in lieu of the sum proposed to be inserted by the committee, "$15,000," by inserting "$20,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is also proposed to strike out the provisos beginning on line 15 after the numerals "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas is not ready to take up the committee amendment that was passed over, we can pass it over again and take up individual amendments.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggested that a moment ago.

Mr. CURTIS. I was authorized by the committee to propose two amendments. I should like to offer them, if I may.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 45, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following paragraph:

For construction of physician's residence, $4,000.

And to change the total in line 19 by striking out "$659,000" and inserting "$663,000."

Mr. ROBINSON. What page is that?

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Page 44, after line 18.

Mr. CURTIS. I will state to the Senator that that is to build an official residence. There are some 2,700 prisoners there, and there are no accommodations for the physician on the grounds. He has to live in town and pay his own rent, and the street cars are not run at night, and with 2,700 inmates they frequently have illness at night that requires the attendance of a physician, and it is almost impossible to get him. This was recommended by the department and recommended by the Budget, and was left out by the House. I should like to put it in and take it to conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well. I see no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. On the part of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 38, line 7, after the word "subsistence," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That the Postmaster General or the coordinator of the General Supply Committee is authorized and directed, upon the approval of this act, if available, to deliver to the office of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia, without payment therefor, two passenger-carrying motor cycles.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as it is understood that there is only one committee amendment pending, I ask that that be passed over until we dispose of the other amendments.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Secretary will read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 13, after line 7, insert:

To Leonore M. Sorsby, daughter and only child of William B. Sorsby, late envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Bolivia, the sum of $4,200 as reimbursement for extraordinary expenses incurred for medical attendance, nurses, hospital treatment, and transportation to the United States following a stroke of paralysis suffered by said William B. Sorsby at his post of duty, La Paz, Bolivia, from which he remained wholly disabled until his death.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, this amendment was added by the Senate to the deficiency appropriation bill last summer. It was stricken out in conference, but it has since been submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations and approved by them. It was omitted from this bill by an oversight, I am told. It has also been submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and I understand that it is satisfactory to them.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this item was added on the deficiency appropriation bill at a former session, which bill I did not have charge of, and I have not had time to look into it. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am personally concerned, to accept the amendment and let it go to conference and then look into it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I merely want to suggest that from the reading of the provision as submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania it appears to be in the nature of a claim, and under the practice of the Senate such provisions usually have gone to the Committee on Claims. That observation would appear at first thought to have additional force in view of the new rule adopted by the Senate. There is a question, on the line of the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania, as to the authorization of this sum. It may be that no serious question is involved; nevertheless, the new rule of the Senate segregates authorizations from appropriations, and contemplates that the Committee on Appropriations shall confine its action to allowances of sums already investigated by other committees and authorized by act of Congress.

I do not want to put myself in the attitude of opposing the provision offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania if the Senator in charge of the bill states that the committee has investigated it and is satisfied that it should be included.

Mr. CURTIS. It was added to the deficiency bill of the previous session of Congress. I was not on the subcommittee in charge of that bill, and I do not know about it.

Mr. ROBINSON. It was added to that bill?

Mr. CURTIS. It was.

Mr. WARREN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON. How is it that it is necessary to add it to this bill then?

Mr. CURTIS. It was stricken out in conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. That would seem to indicate that there is necessity for an authorization. If an Appropriation Committee once incorporated the item in a bill, and it went out in conference, it would seem to call for an investigation.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated a moment ago that the matter had been presented to the House, and that certain members of the committee said that it had been left

out of the bill by mistake; that they had intended to take it up, but had not done so. With that understanding, I thought we could let the provision go into the bill and take it into conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. How does the Senator escape the effect of the rule which he so boldly and courageously championed and had the Senate adopt some time ago? Does the Senator intend now to commence the policy of relaxing that rule in cases the merit of which appeals to him, and of enforcing the rule in other cases where the merit does not appeal to him?

Mr. CURTIS. I have not passed on the merits of this matter, and I did not raise the point of order for the reason——

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows that if he permits this provision to go into the bill without invoking the rule it will be a relaxation of the rule.

Mr. CURTIS. I fully realize that a point of order would lie against the amendment, and the Senator from Kansas did not raise the point of order simply because the item had gone through the Senate at a former session of Congress. I felt that as the Senate had accepted it then, I would hardly be justified in raising the point of order at this time. It is a claim, I think, and I believe it is subject to a point of order, but personally I do not care to raise it without knowing the facts.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has given me the information I asked for. He now announces the policy of declining to invoke points of order under the new rule of the Senate in cases wherein he is satisfied merit exists.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I did not say that. I said I knew nothing about the merits of this case. I should have stated further that in the session of Congress preceding the last and in a number of Congresses——

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, of course, realizes that what happened in the Senate has no relationship to the rule of the Senate which denies to the committee the right to report an item of this nature.

Mr. CURTIS. But this item was not reported from our committee; it is offered upon the floor, and——

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand that fully.

Mr. CURTIS. Any Senator can make a point of order against it.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senators permit me to explain my view of my own amendment? I do not think it is a claim. It is a gratuity, which has already been submitted to and approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations. If it were a claim, properly it should go to the Committee on Claims, but it is a gratuity, exactly of the same sort as those provided for in the paragraph which precedes the point at which I propose to insert this amendment.

Mr. SMITH. May I ask the Senator under what conditions did it fail to become a part of the bill in the House?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It was passed upon by the Senate last summer in the deficiency appropriation bill. This claim should have been presented by one of the Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Appropriations Committee of the House. He was unable to be there in time; the bill moved with a great deal of speed, and while the committee had already passed upon the merits of the claim, as I understand it, it had not the item called to its attention before the bill was reported out of the committee in the House. It is an entirely meritorious case.

Mr. SMITH. So the House did not reject it; it just did not have the subject matter under consideration?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. That is exactly the case.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to say a single word at this point. This is not a claim; as the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, it is in the nature of a gratuity. A point of order undoubtedly would lie on the ground that it was not estimated for; but it has been the practice, where ministers and consuls have died at their posts of duty, to insert provisions in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill giving their representatives six months' salary. It has been done repeatedly by the Senate, and this I take to be a precisely similar case. Undoubtedly it would be put out on a point of order, but I think it is a very deserving case. It was before my committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to say, as I stated in the beginning, that I do not elect to make the point of order. I merely wanted to define the practice of the Committee on Appropriations touching such matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 12, line 17, after the figures "$300,000," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be paid for transportation on foreign vessels without a certificate from the Secretary of State that there are no American vessels on which such officers and clerks may be transported.

Mr. CURTIS. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I will not say what I was about to say in regard to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "counselor for the department," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Undersecretary of State."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There remains to be acted upon the first committee amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 36, after line 6, insert the following paragraph:

For printing and binding for the Court of Claims, $35,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate for a minute, there is really no money involved in this amendment, because should the amendment be adopted it will be necessary to strike $35,000 out of the bill in another place. It is only that I stand for maintaining the action of the judiciary independent from the executive departments.

If Senators will turn to page 33 they will see the appropriations in the bill for the salaries, and so forth, for the Supreme Court, from lines 14 to 19. Then, on line 20, they will see, "for printing and binding for the Supreme Court of the United States, $21,000," and then there is a provision for some other printing and binding.

If Senators will turn to page 35 they will find the provision for the salaries of the Court of Claims, and heretofore there has always been a provision for the printing and binding for the Court of Claims, but the committee at this time have stricken out the provision for printing and binding for the Court of Claims, where it was controlled by the Court of Claims, and have inserted it under the Department of Justice.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator, of course, means that that was done in the House and that the committee of the Senate agreed to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course; it is a House provision. If it were a Senate committee provision, I think it might be subject to a point of order and I would make the point, because it is a change of existing law without being reported by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

The Committee on Appropriations is now proceeding to change existing law, but as it was changed in the House of Representatives and came over here tied in the bill by the House of Representatives, I can not make the point of order. All I am saying is that the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate have agreed to it.

Mr. President, there is not a dollar involved. Of course, if this amendment of mine is adopted, then I have no doubt the committee will go back to the item making appropriations for the Department of Justice and strike $35,000 from that appropriation.

I do not understand why Senators of the United States insist that one of the great courts of this land, the court of the people of the United States, shall be treated as a side show to some other institution.

Except for the limited jurisdiction of the district courts, into which the people may go for small claims, the people of the United States have only one court in this land that belongs to them, and that is the Court of Claims. The Government can not be sued except by its consent, and we have set up the Court of Claims in order that citizens of the United States who have claims against the Government may go into that court and establish their claims. It is the court of the people of the United States, and it should be respected and treated as such. It is not a side show for the Department of Justice to determine whether it will allow claims or not. It is a court, and the plaintiff in that court is entitled to as much recognition and standing as the defendant, the Government of the United States.

I realize that those who desire to make the change say that it does not mean anything; that all the printing and binding to be done by the Court of Claims would be promptly O. K'd by a subordinate clerk in the Department of Justice whenever the clerk of the Court of Claims sent down what the court wanted done in the way of printing and binding, and I have no doubt probably in most cases it would be done. But the great delay in this court does not come from the court itself. It is not that the court does not dispatch its business. The court itself is up with its business. The trouble in the Court of Claims is that the Department of Justice does not prepare its cases. The delays occur in that branch of the Department of Justice which handles claims.

Whenever a case is submitted to the court, it is decided by the court in a few weeks, but the delays the people of the United States have in the Court of Claims come from the Department of Justice itself in preparing the cases ready for submission to the court. How can a case be prepared unless there are printed the briefs and testimony and the other necessary printing required by the court? I am not going to charge that the Department of Justice would delay the consideration of a case or that the Attorney General and the men who control the Department of Justice would delay the trial of a case by postponing the printing; but the Attorney General and his assistants and those high up would have very little to do with it, and when somebody got pressed in the preparation of a claim it would be easy to have a subordinate of the Department of Justice question the printing bill.

It is said that that would not be done. Well, it might not be done, but this is an independent court. One might as well say that the Department of Justice shall determine when the crier shall report and open the court as to say that the judges themselves can not determine when their printing bills shall be paid.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama what economy would be worked by any such indirect procedure or what expedition of business would be brought about by it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is no economy that I know of, because I understand it was said in the hearings that $35,000 would be paid out whenever the clerk of the Court of Claims asked the Department of Justice for it. If the amendment which I have proposed is agreed to they can not ask for more than $35,000. If there was going to be any economy outside of that limitation by law, the Attorney General could tell the Court of Claims that they could not print his brief. That is all there is to it.

There is no economy that is proposed to come out of the proposition, because all the printing goes to the Public Printer, and costs exactly the same. It is just a question of the Department of Justice viséing the right of the Court of Claims to act. That is all there is in the matter. It is a reflection on the judiciary of the land. It is an attempt to give an executive department of the Government the right to control the functions of one of the great judicial courts of the land, and I say it is wrong; it is improper; and it means in the end no economy.

Suppose it did mean two or three thousand dollars economy, which it will not; are we going to invade the jurisdiction of the court, its right and standing before the community as an independent court, for the purpose of saving two or three thousand dollars, when it will not really save a cent if a statement in the testimony coming from the Department of Justice is correct that they are not going to visé it? On the other hand, if they do visé the question then the judges of the court would have to go with bated breath and ask one of the litigants in the court whether they could print the testimony in order that the other litigants might proceed to business. That is what is proposed, and it is in my opinion entirely without justification.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senate ought to know the reason why the House pursues this policy and intends to do it in the future, if, of course, the Senate agrees. Every appropriation bill hereafter will have but one item for printing under a department. In the past every bureau and every division of every department and every independent establishment in the Government has had a separate item for printing in the appropriation bills. They have spent the money for printing in their own way. There has been no special estimate made for it other than simply the amount that they desired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does not the Senator draw any distinction between the bureaus of a department under an executive head of the Government and a court that is independent of the executive departments?

Mr. SMOOT. I will come to that in a moment. The only change from that policy that has been adopted by the Budget or placed in an appropriation bill for the maintenance of the departments was in the item for the printing for the Supreme Court of the United States. I see no objection at all to giving $35,000 to the Court of Claims. It will not make one penny of difference. It is only a question of having a direct appropriation for the Court of Claims the same as is made for the Supreme Court of the United States. It would be taken off the item of $200,000 appropriated for the printing for the Department of Justice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator; I do not think it will effect a dollar's difference in the Treasury; but why should we make the Court of Claims go with hat off and humble knee to the Department of Justice and ask if they can proceed to business? There is no reason in the world for it.

Mr. SMOOT. The estimate was made by the Budget Committee just as the bill carries it now. In the amount of $200,000 provided for printing in the Department of Justice one of the items—and there are about 20 or 25 of them—was $35,000 for the Court of Claims. The House made the appropriation in conformity with the Budget report. I do not think there will be any hesitancy on the part of the House in agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, but there was the idea in view that we could turn to an appropriation bill at any time in the future and by looking at one item of printing tell what was the amount of money that had been appropriated for the printing for that department. That is all there is to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Right there, if the Senator will allow me, is where I object. The Senator spoke of the appropriation for printing for the department, but I insist that the Court of Claims is no more a part of the Department of Justice than is the Supreme Court of the United States, and it ought not to be considered as a part of that department.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator could say that of every independent establishment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; the Constitution of the United States recognizes the distinction between the executive departments of the Government and the judicial departments of the Government.

Mr. SMOOT. I realize that, but that is not what I meant.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The court is set up to protect the people of the United States in the presentation of their claims. I seriously object to the Department of Justice having any hand in controlling its action.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Department of Justice would never do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Probably it would not, but it ought not to be allowed to have the opportunity to do it even on paper.

Mr. SMOOT. It is a mere formality, and that is all.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to state that what influenced me in the matter was the fact that the estimates for the Court of Claims have been going to the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, since that bureau was organized, through the Attorney General's office, and it was the idea of the Bureau of the Budget, I understand, to get the items affecting the same class of work into one appropriation. For that reason this item was put in with the others. There was no intention to revise or change the practice that has always been followed, and, as I have showed to the Senator from Alabama in the hearings on page 196, it was stated that it was not the intention in any way to try to control the printing of the court. I will state that so far as I am concerned, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Is the matter now to come to a vote?

Mr. CURTIS. I said that so far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment, and I hope there will be no objection raised to it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I simply desire to express my hope that the amendment will be agreed to. There is absolutely no economy in the way the bill reports these appropriations. On the other hand, it will incur an additional expense. If, as the witness testified in the House hearings, the Department of Justice does not intend to control the expenditures of the Court of Claims, then the question simply involves the additional expense of having some clerk in the Department of Justice O. K. the vouchers which may be presented by the Court of Claims.

I certainly agree with everything the Senator from Alabama has said. The clerk of the Court of Claims came before the Committee on Appropriations yesterday and protested vigor-

ously against the arrangement which was made in the bill as it passed the House. Of course, I shall take up no further time if the Senator in charge of the bill is willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. In view of the amendment just agreed to, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 28, line 21, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$165,000," so as to read:

For printing and binding for the Department of Justice and the courts of the United States, $165,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. In order to correct a clerical error in the printing of the bill I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 34 it is proposed to strike out line 20 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Porto Rico: District judge, $7,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is not really an amendment, but is merely to correct a mistake in printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

Mr. LODGE. I have an amendment which I desire to offer to come in on page 6, line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 6, line 16, after the word "citizens," it is proposed to insert the words "whenever hereafter appointed."

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts explain that amendment and what it proposes to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the case is a very simple one. The provision in the bill, which is a very proper one, indeed, requiring the clerks to be Americans and to be appointed under civil-service rules and regulations, will compel the dismissal of five valuable foreign clerks who have served this Government for many years in the missions at Berlin, Berne, Madrid, Buenos Aires, and Quito, and to whom it would work great hardship. My amendment is proposed simply for the purpose of permitting those clerks to be retained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the committee amendment which was passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee amendment passed over is on page 14, line 9, after the word "assigned," to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to diplomatic and consular officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, $200,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, since this amendment was before the Senate I have taken occasion to read all of the testimony which is available in justification of the appropriation. I shall not now repeat the suggestion made when the item was previously before the Senate relative to the policy involved in lump-sum appropriations and the fixing of official salaries by the Executive. That policy is condemned by both the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. Their statements, however, in justification of this proposed increase are much more persuasive than is the testimony in the record; and yet I apprehend that their information is derived exclusively from the record.

Mr. CURTIS. No, Mr. President; I thought I stated to the Senator that upon yesterday we sent for Mr. Carr, who is in charge of this work, and heard him very fully before our committee, and the subcommittee, Republicans and Democrats alike, after hearing him fully were unanimously of the opinion that this increase ought to be made.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator from Kansas made that statement, I did not hear it.

Mr. CURTIS. I intended to make it, and I thought I had made it.

Mr. ROBINSON. In any event, the hearings before the Senate committee are not available for the consideration of the Senate. The testimony submitted before the House committee is found at pages 14 and 15 and 53 and 56, inclusive, of the House hearings on the bill. The justification for Executive increases of these salaries is principally based upon the condition of foreign exchange in the countries where these Government representatives live. My understanding has been that, as a rule, a depreciation of foreign money operates to diminish the cost of living of persons who are paid in United States money. I know that is true in Germany, where the mark has a very low value compared with its normal value, and I have found that to be true in other foreign countries where the money of the foreign government involved is depreciated as compared with American money. So the depreciation of foreign exchange would give the American representative who is paid in United States money an advantage in the matter of the cost of living and instead of being a justification for an increase in salary might, under some circumstances, be accepted as a justification for a diminution of salaries.

The statement of Mr. Carr is, however, exceedingly indefinite. I do not understand why some committee of the Senate or of the other House, intrusted with the consideration of the matter, has not asked for an itemized statement of the expenditure of the fund during previous years. An itemized statement of the expenditure would give definite information as to how the executive authorities have adjusted the compensation of these various employees.

The information that is furnished the Senate in the hearings before the House committee—and I have had no opportunity of seeing the hearings before the Senate committee; those hearings were held only on yesterday and I presume have not yet been printed—the information that is available is of the most general character. It is so indefinite as to affect only the conclusions of the witness rather than the facts upon which the witness reached his conclusions. All Senators know the value of definite and detailed information in so far as the same may be calculated to affect the expenditure of Government money.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not had time to go over the statement and itemize it, but we have a statement showing the allowances made and the officials to whom they were made. I suppose it was not printed in the report because it is in the Budget.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the Budget was not followed by either committee.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; the Budget was followed by the Senate committee; we followed the estimate of the Budget.

Mr. ROBINSON. Did either the House committee or the Senate committee follow the estimate of the Budget?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senate committee did, but the House committee reduced the estimate by $50,000. The Senate committee increased the appropriation by the House $50,000 and put it back to the Budget recommendation.

Mr. ROBINSON. What was the amount appropriated last year?

Mr. CURTIS. It was $200,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. And the amount requested by the department was $200,000 this year?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and the amount recommended by the Budget this year is $200,000, which is the sum the Senate committee allowed.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senate committee followed the Budget but the House committee declined to follow the Budget and recommended a reduction of the amount by $50,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it the contention that the cost of living is increased because of high exchange rates?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; as to certain countries.

Mr. CARAWAY. As to what countries?

Mr. SMOOT. China is one country where living is very expensive. Then there may be mentioned Tampico, Mexico; Colombo, Ceylon; and Johannesburg, South Africa. The consuls at the places indicated receive a post allowance of $1,500, and to certain consuls in Brazil and other countries in South America an allowance of $1,200 is made.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is a proposition that I was coming to. It may be and probably is true that the salaries and the allowances as fixed by the legislative department are too small;

it may be that there is justification for an increase in salaries; but, as I said earlier this morning, such increases ought to be made in specific instances where the Congress finds the necessity to exist, and the duty ought not to be imposed upon the President and be by him relegated to some person in the State Department whose interest, of course, is identical with or inseparable from the interests of those who desire the increase.

I have no sympathy with any penurious policy on the part of this Government toward any of its employees; but I do object to the practice of perpetuating lump-sum appropriations for the payment of increases in salaries at the discretion of the Executive; not that I am lacking in confidence in the President in that particular but that the President has nothing whatever to do with the actual discharge of that duty, and it must be done by some subordinate upon whom the responsibility can not definitely be located.

The testimony in the record is exceedingly indefinite and lacking in detail. On page 53 the question was asked by Mr. HUSTED:

How have the exchange conditions affected the necessity for this?

To that question Mr. Carr replied:

Well, I do not see any signs of it becoming any cheaper for an officer to live. In some places exchange has gone down, but prices have not gone down; in other places exchange has gone up, and prices have in some cases followed it; and in other cases they have not followed it. The sum total of it is, as far as I can make out, that it is at least as expensive to live now as it was last year.

I point out that that statement is just as applicable to officers of the Government living in the United States as it is to diplomatic employees of the Government of the United States who reside in foreign countries; in fact, it is even more applicable. So that the argument breaks its force in that it becomes general and not definite.

So far as index numbers are concerned, the index number in the United States is higher, I believe, if I remember correctly, than it was this time last year.

There he makes the point that in the United States the cost of living has gone up during the last year, and therefore the salaries and allowances should be increased.

In England, I think, it is about the same. Of course, in Germany it has gone very high. I believe in Japan, if I remember correctly, it is about what it was. I have not made any tables, such as I presented last year, of the purchasing power of the dollar, etc., because the statistics on their face seem to bear out the statement I have just made to you.

I am going to put in the RECORD all of the statement of this witness, because I think it fair to him and to the department that it be incorporated in the RECORD, but I call attention particularly to a further statement, as follows:

Mr. HUSTED. We went into this quite carefully last year, and we came to the conclusion that it was pretty difficult to determine the amount of increase which should be given to the representative at any particular post.

Mr. CARR. Well, there certainly is no scientific method devised by which it can be done to satisfy everybody. In a matter of this kind it is a question of using one's best judgment. There is no formula that can be applied, as in the case of some scientific adjustment. We have to take into consideration the men's own statements as to what the prices are in their regions. Those statements are supported by documentary evidence wherever possible, as to the local prices, and the Government statistics, and the Government price index numbers. Then, in that connection we use the Federal Reserve Bulletin and its comparative price levels in all the different countries, and the Federal Reserve Bulletin statements of exchange rates in the different countries. The result obtained in that way is modified by the judgment of what you want done. Conceivably, in one place a man, if he were held down to a low compensation, might not be able to accomplish the things that we want done. So that might make a change in some few individual countries. But from that statement you will see that in a matter of this kind there is no hard-and-fast formula that can be designed which will fit every case of post allowance. I think the post allowance is very necessary. For my own comfort, I wish it had never existed.

There is a statement that in determining the amount of these allowances the department takes into consideration what it desires to accomplish; in other words, it determines the question of policy, and that determines the amount of the allowance to be made out of this lump-sum appropriation. It, therefore, gives evidence to the necessity for more definite action upon the part of the committees of Congress which deal with this matter.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the testimony of Mr. Carr, to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST ALLOWANCES.

Mr. HUSTED. Now, the item for "Post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers," I see, is the same as the appropriation for last year, which is $50,000 less than the appropriation for the year before.

Mr. CARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUSTED. How have the exchange conditions affected the necessity for this?

Mr. CARR. Well, I do not see any signs of it becoming any cheaper for an officer to live. In some places exchange has gone down, but prices have not gone down; in other places exchange has gone up, and prices have in some cases followed it; and in other cases they have not followed it. The sum total of it is, as far as I can make out, that it is at least as expensive to live now as it was last year. So far as index numbers are concerned, the index number in the United States is higher, I believe, if I remember correctly, than it was this time last year. In England, I think, it is about the same. Of course, in Germany it has gone very high. I believe in Japan, if I remember correctly, it is about what it was. I have not made any tables, such as I presented last year, of the purchasing power of the dollar, etc., because the statistics on their face seem to bear out the statement I have just made to you.

Mr. HUSTED. Who gets this $1,500 increase in salary out of this fund?

Mr. CARR. I can not tell you that from memory. I can give you the places, but not the names.

Mr. HUSTED. That is all I want; not the names.

Mr. CARR. I can give you that. The consuls at Tampico, Mexico; Colombo, Ceylon; and Johannesburg, South Africa, receive post allowances of $1,500 each, because they are junior officers whose salaries are inadequate for their expenses in these unusually expensive posts. Likewise, for a time the consul at Penang received a post allowance of $1,500, until he won a promotion in class, which enabled the department to reduce his post allowance. Similarly two vice consuls of career stationed at Buenos Aires receive post allowances of $1,500. The district is an unusually expensive one and these young men are married and could not live there in a respectable manner without an additional allowance. The consuls at Vladivostok, Chita, and the vice consul of career at Santos, Brazil, receive post allowances of $1,200 each, because of the high cost of living at those posts and of the additional facts that the men are junior officers with low salaries and are married and have families. It is to be understood that in the case of transfer from the posts where they are now stationed the officers would not carry with them the same post allowances, if, indeed, they would carry any at all.

Mr. HUSTED. We went into this quite carefully last year, and we came to the conclusion that it was pretty difficult to determine the amount of increase which should be given to the representative at any particular post.

Mr. CARR. Well, there certainly is no scientific method devised by which it can be done to satisfy everybody. In a matter of this kind it is a question of using one's best judgment. There is no formula that can be applied, as in the case of some scientific adjustment. We have to take into consideration the men's own statements as to what the prices are in their regions. Those statements are supported by documentary evidence, wherever possible, as to the local prices, and the Government statistics, and the Government price index numbers. Then, in that connection we use the Federal Reserve Bulletin and its comparative price levels in all the different countries and the Federal Reserve Bulletin statements of exchange rates in the different countries. The result obtained in that way is modified by the judgment of what you want done. Conceivably, in one place a man, if he were held down to a low compensation, might not be able to accomplish the things that we want done. So that might make a change in some few individual countries. But from that statement you will see that in a matter of this kind there is no hard-and-fast formula that can be designed which will fit every case of post allowance. I think the post allowance is very necessary. For my own comfort, I wish it had never existed.

Mr. HUSTED. I can understand that. You do not think the time has arrived when we can wipe that appropriation out?

Mr. CARR. No, sir; I do not. I think it would be a most unfortunate thing to reduce that appropriation $1 below what it is now.

Mr. HUSTED. Do you not think the men that are getting these post allowances are better off than they were under the old salaries?

Mr. CARR. No; they are not as well off.

Mr. HUSTED. Does not the increase more than offset the advance in living cost?

Mr. CARR. No; the increase does not reach the living cost.

Mr. HUSTED. You do not think it does in any case?

Mr. CARR. I would not say it does not in any case. Conceivably, there may be cases in which it does; but as a general proposition, I am certain the salary plus the post allowance does not put the men in the position in which they were in 1914 or anywhere near it.

Mr. HUSTED. What effect does the payment of these post allowances have upon the morale of the service where they do not receive any post allowance?

Mr. CARR. Of course, there is dissatisfaction among men, as there is bound to be dissatisfaction in any organization, whether it is on account of distribution of post allowances or on account of distribution of office-expense allowances or of promotions in the service. You can not administer anything in a way that will satisfy everybody in which there is the element of judgment involved.

Mr. HUSTED. Do you pay any part of this fund to ministers?

Mr. CARR. No.

Mr. HUSTED. You pay it to secretaries?

Mr. CARR. We pay it to diplomatic secretaries, to consuls general, to consuls and vice consuls of career.

Mr. HUSTED. What is the highest salaried man that receives a post allowance?

Mr. CARR. The highest-salaried men that receive post allowances are Mr. Gale, consul general at Hongkong; Mr. Cunningham, consul general at Shanghai; and Mr. Hurst, consul general at Habana. Those are special cases where the men on assignment receive a grade salary less than the salary usually paid to the man at that place and where the living expenses are extraordinarily and abnormally high. For example, we have been paying a post allowance of $1,000 to Mr. Hurst in Habana, whose salary is $6,000. That is because of the peculiarly high cost of living in Habana at the present time, and because of the fact that usually the officer there has been an $8,000 man. The same is true in Shanghai, where the consul general receives an allowance of $600. That is true also of Hongkong. The officers usually assigned to those posts are $8,000 men.

Mr. HUSTED. But most of it is paid to the low-salaried men?

Mr. CARR. Yes. That has always been the case. The major part of the post allowance has been confined to low-salaried men.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I repeat that my sympathy goes out to the representatives of this Government in a foreign

land; I would be the last member of this body to stand on this floor or anywhere else and advocate any policy which would work injustice or oppression to any representative of our flag wherever uplifted, but underlying this appropriation is a policy that can not be justified.

This bill contains many lump-sum appropriations. There is, for instance, the appropriation of an additional sum of $500,000 for the prosecution of war frauds, that sum to be expended absolutely at the discretion of the Attorney General of the United States. Congress has very little, if any, knowledge of what use has been made of the $500,000 appropriated last year for this purpose. Certainly no Senator or Representative would rise in his place and oppose any appropriation necessary or justified for the exposure and for the punishment of fraud or crime against the Government of the United States; but therein lies the danger in lump-sum appropriations. No details are given, substantially no information is furnished to the Congress of the United States, as to what use is to be made of the enormous sum, and very little information is furnished the Congress as to what has been done with the $500,000 heretofore appropriated.

The object of the appropriation, of course, is laudable. The detection and prosecution of fraud and crime against the Government of the United States must be commended; but the Congress ought to know that the funds that it appropriates for this laudable purpose are being wisely and properly expended. We ought to ascertain, so far as such information may be consistent with the public interest, what use has been made of the $500,000 of public money appropriated last year to be expended absolutely without limit or restriction at the dictation of the Attorney General. Five hundred thousand dollars is a large sum of money. I have no information upon which to base an assertion that any part of that fund has been wasted; neither have I any information upon which to base the conclusion that the fund has been wisely, fairly, or justly expended. Five hundred thousand dollars was appropriated last year, $500,000 is appropriated in this bill for the prosecution of war frauds; and, so far as I know, so far as the information goes, the results thus far accomplished have been the effectuation of an organization in the Department of Justice for the supervision of the activities of the district attorneys of the United States and for the institution of suits.

Of course, we all realize that the questions involved in such prosecutions are necessarily complicated, that investigations designed to expose crimes of the nature contemplated by the suits heretofore brought by the Attorney General present difficulties, and I have no disposition to withhold from the Government of the United States any dollar that is necessary to expose and punish any criminal who, when this country was in peril, wrongfully and unlawfully sought to enrich himself at the risk of endangering his fellow countrymen.

I can not find language adequate to express the indignation that all loyal citizens feel toward persons who robbed the Government, if such exist, when they ought to have rendered their services in patriotic spirit; but why is it that we do not know what conditions make necessary this extraordinary annual contribution of $500,000 to be expended by an executive officer, the only restriction being as to the purchase or furnishing of buildings, and perhaps one or two other unimportant restrictions?

Reverting now to the amendment immediately under consideration, the House committee heard the same witnesses that the Senate committee heard. I have not the slightest doubt that the item adopted at the other end of the Capitol was influenced by the desire to eliminate lump-sum appropriations of this character and to get back to the basis of the adjustment of salaries by congressional rather than by executive action. While I have no disposition further to delay the Senate in the consideration or determination of the matter, I do not find from the record as submitted to me persuasive proof that the increase carried by the Senate committee amendment is justified, and I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 14, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] has an amendment which he desires to offer. I want to state that I have not had time to look into it. If the Senator will offer it, if it is in the nature of a gratuity, as was the one offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], I shall be perfectly willing that it go to the committee of conference, and have the Senator submit to the conferees upon the part of the Senate any data he may have which we may use in conference to sustain the amendment.

Mr. STANLEY. Very well. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in after the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Following the amendment heretofore agreed to, on page 13, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

For Louise Carroll Masterson, widow of William W. Masterson, late consul to Plymouth, England, $4,500, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of House bill 12817, the shipping bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harris	Nicholson	Smoot
Bayard	Harrison	Norbeck	Spencer
Brookhart	Heflin	Norris	Stanley
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Capper	Kendrick	Page	Sutherland
Caraway	Keyes	Phipps	Townsend
Curtis	Ladd	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	La Follette	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	McCumber	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Ernst	McKellar	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	McKinley	Sheppard	Walsh, Mont.
George	McNary	Shortridge	Warren
Glass	Nelson	Simmons	Weller
Harreld	New	Smith	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BROOKHART. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, when we reached the point of adjournment yesterday afternoon, I was approaching some further questions raised by the Senator from Washington, and among them I might refer very briefly to one statement he made in connection with the consequences of the absence of merchant ships under the United States flag at the time of the breaking out of the war. He observed, as I recall, that one result was that cotton went down to something like 6 cents a pound. It is not very material in this connection, but for the sake of having the matter placed historically right it seems to me it is worth while to observe that the cause of the low price of cotton was not the absence of ships at that time but it was the fact that the war had broken out in Europe and the demand for American cotton had for a time been suspended.

I remember perfectly well, being in Europe at the time war was declared, that the general opinion over there—and when I reached the United States the general opinion here—was that that war would not last over four or five months. It was believed that the countries involved would be bankrupt by that time, and financially and otherwise exhausted, and that therefore it must end within four or five months. England had very good stocks of cotton on hand, Germany had some cotton, France had quite a good supply of cotton, and the market for American cotton fell down; hence the price dropped. It was not so much the absence of shipping facilities as it was a combination of economic conditions as the result of the declaration of war. Those countries undoubtedly felt that they could cease buying for the present and would be able to come into the market just before their supplies were exhausted—and they would not be exhausted ordinarily within four or five months. So they did not attempt to buy the cotton.

It must be remembered, too, that a ship, say, of 8,800 gross tons, has a cargo capacity of about 7,000 tons of freight. It takes 4 bales of cotton to make a ton, so that a ship of that size could carry 25,000 bales of cotton. It does not take many ships to carry the cotton to supply the markets possible to develop, particularly at that time. These bales of cotton are always compressed and shipped in that compressed condition, so that the ship can carry a great many bales of cotton. Ten to twenty thousand bales of cotton is not a large estimate for one of the ordinary cargo ships. That was the condition, and that unquestionably had to do with the low price of cotton. There were no more ships available for the movement of cotton when the price was 30 cents a pound than there were available when the price was 6 cents a pound.

As to the movement of our troops, it is true that none of these ships were actually constructed in our yards in time to take any material part in the movement of troops, but we requisitioned ships in pursuance of the law, and those requisitioned ships, those ships which were in process of construction and were completed, did take a very material part in the movement of our troops, and especially in the movement of supplies.

It was, however, to be expected that the countries to whose relief we were going made no sacrifice, were extremely anxious, on the other hand, to supply the necessary ships to bring our troops to their assistance. I think the figures referred to by the Senator from Washington are scarcely accurate as to the participation of American ships, both in the movement of supplies to Europe and the return of our soldiers after the armistice.

It will be recalled, too, that there was very urgent and very proper demand not only by every politician in the country but by the mothers of the country that our troops should be hurried home at the very first opportunity, and the administration would have been most severely criticized if they had not availed themselves of foreign ships and every sort of means of bringing the boys home.

Mr. W. J. Love, vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the present Shipping Board, testified at the hearings before the Appropriations Committee of the House, which had under consideration H. R. 9981, making appropriations for the Executive and for sundry executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and officers for the year ending June 30, 1923, as follows:

> We transported overseas 2,104,230 of our troops, of which 951,803 were transported across in American bottoms, and of the 2,057,269 brought home, 1,705,379 were brought home in American vessels.

Of course, in addition to our troops, a tremendous amount of supplies for our troops and the Allies were transported overseas, and likewise a large amount of equipment and supplies were brought back in our ships.

Furthermore, in a speech delivered at Charleston, S. C., before the annual meeting of the South Atlantic Ports Association, November 15, 1920, Admiral Benson declared as follows:

> Think of the farsighted policy which brought about the shipping act in the latter part of 1916, which piece of legislation made possible the huge undertaking that helped in a large measure to solve some of the most trying situations this world ever faced. The shipbuilders of the United States made possible the carrying overseas of approximately 95 per cent of the supplies for the American fighting forces at the front. More than 900,000 men went across in American bottoms.

I submit that these figures are scarcely in harmony with the statement furnished by the Senator from Washington upon that question.

The Senator challenged specifically three statements in the minority views on this bill, and I wish to refer to those. The first was with regard to the losses arising from ship operations being indefinite and uncertain. The report said:

> Regarding the alleged losses now experienced by the Shipping Board from operations, we have no accurate data.

The Senator expressed some surprise at such language as that in view of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 25, 1922, which, at pages 225–226, carried a statement by Mr. P. Sinclair, comptroller of the Shipping Board. It will be recalled that Mr. EDMONDS, who attaches the statement as a part of his speech, had leave to print, and this did not appear in the RECORD at the time of Mr. EDMONDS's speech, but appeared some days later. When the minority report was actually written I confess that I do not recall having seen the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which I have referred. I did see it, however, before the report was filed, and I saw no reason for revising the language. It does seem to me now, upon a careful examination of the letter and the statement, that the language of the report is not only correct but is rather mild in giving out the thought that there was not accurate data before any committee of Congress or before Congress as to the actual losses suffered by the Shipping Board in the operation of the ships. I submit that any reasonable man who will read the letter of the comptroller must reach the conclusion that two-thirds or three-fourths of it comprises mere estimates, mere guesses, which are based upon possible conditions that may arise in the future. It is full of "ifs" and "ands." "If" freight rates continue to decline, then the losses for the next six months must be increased so much. "If" passengers cease to travel on our ships, then the losses in the next six months must be increased so much. "If" this or that happens, we must reasonably expect that the losses will be so-and-so. But the figures finally reached of $50,000,000 a year loss are based upon those "ifs," those conditions, and not upon actual experience.

I have tried in every way I could to get the actual figures as to the losses. When the bill was under consideration and the hearings were being held by the committees of the House and Senate, efforts were made by the minority Members to have the operating agents produce itemized statements of their earnings and expenses and submit them to the committees in order that we might have the information upon which to base calculations as to the exact losses or gains in the operation of the ships, and where and how the losses were taking place, if there were any such. But we were unable to get the agents there. We were met with a refusal to summon the operating agents and have them make the statement. The information was denied us, and now we are furnished with this statement appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let us consider that statement for a moment. It is addressed to Hon. GEORGE W. EDMONDS, House of Representatives, and is dated Washington, November 24, 1922, and reads:

> Pursuant to your telephone request, I herein beg to inclose statement of estimated operating results of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation for the four months from July to October, 1922, inclusive.

This is all the definite certain statement we have based upon data limited and confined to "each of the four months." The rest of it is all based upon supposition.

> You will note that the total loss (without, of course, taking into account anything for capital charges, to wit, interest, insurance, or depreciation) amounts to $13,058,593.37.

Now listen:

> Out of this, however, there is a general and administrative expense not directly applicable to operation of vessels of $2,197,513.24 for the period.

Why include that in the operating losses and in the next breath say it does not belong there? Then we have the itemized statement showing the summary of total losses, divided as follows:

July, loss on operations, $2,242,714.14.
August, loss on operations, $2,662,728.62.
September, loss on operations, $3,140,860.53.
October, loss on operations, $2,814,776.84.

This makes a total for the four months of $10,861,080.13. I think it will hardly be disputed that we have to multiply that by three in order to get the annual loss; assuming that the same losses would continue, the 12 months would show three times that sum, which would be about $32,000,000 for the year. Anyone can multiply $10,861,080.13 by 3 and they will get the actual loss. Then why call it $50,000,000? Why keep insisting that it must be $50,000,000? All we know is that in the four months named the actual loss has been $10,861,080, and yet they put alongside of that a total loss which they estimate at $13,058,593.37, admitting in the same statement that in those figures are included $2,197,513.24 which ought not to be included under the head of operating losses.

The communication then continues:

> For the purposes of round figures, we will say that the loss for the period of four months has been $11,000,000. As this is one-third of the year, should the loss keep on on this basis it would be $33,000,000 for the year, but anyone who estimates that the loss of the Shipping Board for the year will be $33,000,000 deceives himself. In the first place, the four months covered are the most favorable months in the year as to passenger earnings. I estimate within that period almost half of the passenger earnings of the whole 12 months accrue.

He "estimates" that. That is a mere guess. That is not based upon experience or upon facts. That is an estimate. So I say we have not accurate data as to the total amount of the losses per annum in the operation of the ships.

He continues:

> It must be remembered that the summer is the great ocean passenger traveling period. The result is that while in so far as cash outlay goes the operations of passenger ships have shown very little loss in the period covered, for most of the ensuing eight months of the fiscal year the loss will be, we estimate, $1,300,000 more than it was for the first four months.

There is an admission that there has been very little loss in the operation of the passenger ships. Most of the loss, therefore, must have come from the operation of cargo ships. Passenger lines must have been doing fairly well. He admits there has been very little loss, but he says:

Ahead of us are losses which we estimate to be $1,800,000 more than for the first four months.

That is a mere estimate.

Our total loss of the Shipping Board has been $13,058,593.37 for the first four months.

He puts that in again, and reiterates and reasserts it, when he knows and in the very next breath states that in that item is $2,197,513, which arose "out of and in connection with general and administrative expense not directly applicable to operations of the vessels." And yet they keep repeating the losses of the Shipping Board and admit that they include items which ought not to come under that head at all.

Then we come to the following details in his statement:

Our loss for the first four months—

Just listen to this, Senators. Is it the purpose to deceive Congress or to deceive the public? Why can not these people be frank and open and candid and square in the matter? We are now talking about operating losses:

Our loss for the first four months, including $2,197,513.24 for expenses not directly applicable to operation, was $13,058,000.

Why include that? They admit it is not applicable to operation, so why include it in the statement and repeat it and reiterate it?

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. Some of these expenses, I understand, were for salaries for employees disposing of other property that belonged to the Shipping Board.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; and all that sort of thing.

Mr. DIAL. Settling claims and other matters not incident to operation of the ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely, and they say it was not, and yet they keep repeating it under the head of operations.

Mr. McKELLAR. What was the exact amount of the operation losses?

Mr. FLETCHER. Loss on operations, $10,861,808.13.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was that for the year?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; for the four months, July, August, September, and October. They have nothing for the other months. They do not give us any information as to November, nor for previous months, for that matter.

Mr. POMERENE. What was the reason for selecting those four months?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know, except that perhaps that is the only data they have worked out sufficiently about which to make any sort of statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would not be $50,000,000 a year, as stated by the President in his message.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course not. It would be not over $33,000,000, as they admit in one statement; but if we include a lot of other things that do not belong to operation it can be run up to $50,000,000. For instance, in the same itemized statement it is said:

The immediate expenditures for structural changes to be made within the next four months on the twenty-three 535-foot passenger ships will be $3,000,000.

Why charge that to operation? Can anybody find any reason for charging structural changes in ships to the cost of operation? Here are 23 ships, some of which will from time to time be taken out of the service, carried to shipyards, and may be changed from coal burners to oil burners or from oil burners to Diesel engines, and the expenditures so incurred are to be charged as operating expense. It is perfectly absurd. It might be decided upon the return voyage of one of these vessels to say, "We will sink the vessel." The whole vessel would then be lost. In such a case is the value of that vessel to be charged to operating expense? Or it might be concluded to cut the vessel in two, add another section to it, or to change it entirely from a sailing vessel to a steam vessel, and charge that to operating expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might be well said that during the four months which are taken to illustrate the cost the shipping of all the world has been in a like desperate state, has it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. Shipping all over the world has been in the most depressed situation that has existed for years and years.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a matter of fact, there is no nation in all the world but has ships tied up just as we have. They have not so many as we have, for we built a great many during the World War.

Mr. FLETCHER. That is quite true.

The next item of this loss is:

Additional losses due to adverse operating conditions for the six months, at $500,000 per month.

On what is that based? It is a mere guess, a mere estimate. Nobody knows whether or not that loss will follow. Mr. Sinclair does not know; it is an estimate for the six months to come; and he is merely expressing his opinion about it; that is all. Therefore I say in the report there are no accurate data as to the amount of the loss. It presents a mere opinion, based upon nothing except upon the supposition that freight rates will continue to decline and that people will stop traveling across the ocean.

The next item is:

Increased cost of oil, based upon increase of 50 cents per barrel and the use of 1,000,000 barrels monthly for eight months.

I dare say the Shipping Board has not made contracts for eight months; that is not an actual, binding, fixed loss.

Mr. McKELLAR. When was that statement made?

Mr. FLETCHER. This statement was made on November 24, 1922, and is found on pages 225-226 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If the Senator will keep it before him, he can follow my comments. That is another item that is not based upon actual facts. It is merely an estimate. My information is that they are doing fairly well with oil burners and that they are making oil contracts now that are quite satisfactory. I do not believe that item belongs in this statement of losses at all.

The next item is:

Decrease in passenger earnings for winter months, six months, at $300,000 per month.

How do they know they are going to lose that much money? That is a mere supposition; that is a guess and nothing more.

The next item is:

Estimated losses for eight months—November to June, inclusive—on the basis of the loss for the past four months, but not including the four added items immediately given above, $26,116,000.

So Mr. Sinclair adds up the total loss for 1923 as being $50,974,000. Then what does he do? The statement says:

Of course, in this loss is included the general and administrative expense not directly applicable to operation of vessels.

Then, why put it in? He admits that it is not applicable to operation, and yet includes it in this estimate which I have just read. What does that amount to? The statement continues:

As this was $2,197,513.24 for the first four months, if it kept on at the same rate it would be approximately $6,600,000 for the year. So, taking this off of the total estimate of $50,974,000, the total loss for the year would give us an operating loss of approximately $44,000,000.

Yet, as the statement proceeds, the supposition continues that we are bound to lose this; we are bound to lose that; and if we do the result is going to be different.

Mr. EDMONDS, who is well informed regarding this whole situation and subject, in some observations made in the other House during the debate stated that the loss was probably well stated at about $3,000,000 a month; and that is, perhaps, nearer correct; but the Shipping Board insists on putting out this statement and claim that it is clear and definite and certain, spreading it before the country, and showing that the annual loss is $50,000,000. When the statement comes to be analyzed, however, according to their own figures, the loss will not exceed $44,000,000, and included in that are the structural changes and repairs and that sort of thing. The estimates of losses in the months to come are mere guesses. The sum of $33,000,000 is perhaps as near as we can get at the facts in that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida had better watch out, for if he shows that our losses are not over about $30,000,000 a year he will remove the principal reason that is advanced for the passage of the pending bill; that is, if we tax the people some $30,000,000 a year, it will be cheaper than the loss now incurred in handling the ships as we do.

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely. The claim the Senator from Tennessee has in mind is being made that even if this proposed subsidy amounts to $30,000,000 a year, inasmuch as we are losing $50,000,000 a year, we would save $20,000,000 a year if we passed the bill. That is the argument, but, of course, it

is perfectly ridiculous and absurd, because these expenses are going to continue whether we pass this bill or not. It will be simply piling up $30,000,000 a year on top of the $30,000,000 or $50,000,000, or whatever the amount may be which represents the losses of the Shipping Board.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Florida will not forget the old illustration about the camel getting his nose under the tent. If these special interests ever get a hold on the Public Treasury they are going to continue to ask for the amounts which the American people will have to pay from time to time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Undoubtedly. Once they get this policy written into the law, it will be there to stay. We will not be able to get away from it. It will be cumulative, as it was in the case of the old Collins Line. When we gave them a subvention of so much a year, when their contract expired they came back to Congress and asked to have their subvention doubled, and Congress doubled it. After awhile, when that contract expired, Congress decided to go back to the original appropriation. What then happened? The Collins Line threw up the sponge and went out of business. That was the end of the subsidy and that was the result of its operation.

There is only one hope we have, if it may be called a hope—of course it involves going through mire to get there—but it may eventually come, just as it did in the case of the Pacific Mail scandal years ago. This bill offers all sorts of opportunities for the rankest scandal that ever was exposed in this country. It may be when that comes that we shall be able to repeal this sort of legislation and get from under it, just as we did years ago.

I quote from pages 40 and 41 of Jones's Government Aid to Merchant Shipping as follows:

> In 1872 the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. proposed the establishment of another monthly mail steamship line to China and Japan for an additional subvention of $500,000 per year. After much debate Congress adopted the proposal and a contract to that effect was entered into. This contract, however, was abrogated by act of March 3, 1875, after it was discovered that the law had been passed as a result of corruption and the company had failed to carry out its part of the agreement.
>
> During this period, however, the policy of granting mail subventions received a deathblow.

Why? Because of the scandal.

> The disclosures as to the maintenance of a corrupt lobby to secure congressional approval of the second Pacific Mail contract left such an unfavorable impression upon the popular mind that no serious attempt was made to institute subvention payments for at least 10 years.

Mr. Meeker in his History of Shipping Subsidies, on pages 160 and 161, discusses the same subject as follows:

> In 1872 the Pacific Mail Co. offered to run another monthly service to China and Japan for an additional $500,000 a year. With considerable difficulty a bill authorizing such a contract was passed by Congress June 1, 1872. In 1874 it was discovered that bribery had been employed to secure the passage of the measure. It was proven that the company had spent about $1,000,000 to push the bill through Congress. The new contract was abrogated by the Government because of the improper methods used in gaining the necessary legislation, and the subsequent failure of the company to fulfill the conditions of the said contract.

That was one way to get rid of that subsidy. The information which leaked out to the public that a million dollars had been used to pass the bill, and the absolute failure of the shipping company to keep the contract, spelled its doom. It may be that some such thing as that may develop in connection with this character of legislation should it ever be passed, because it will open the door for people all over the country to come flocking here to Washington and to the Shipping Board for governmental favor. This bill provides that the board shall have absolute discretion within its own sweet will to double the subsidies provided for and set forth in the compensation, direct-aid fund, which is permanently appropriated to the extent of $30,000,000 a year for 10 years, with the privilege to the Shipping Board of extending it five years further.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I assume that any shipping company to be prosperous must have cargoes to transport. How will the payment of a cash subsidy increase the cargoes of any shipping company? The Senator is on the Committee on Commerce, and I will ask him what statement has been made in the hearings or what evidence has been adduced to show that the mere payment by the Government of a cash bounty will increase the cargoes of any particular shipping company?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator has put his finger on the very spot that is the most tender to our subsidy friends and important in this whole question—that is, that in order to have a prosperous merchant marine we must have cargoes. It avails us nothing to have ships sailing the ocean empty. We must have cargoes in order to make possible the development of a merchant marine. There must be demand for the ships, and that means cargoes. This subsidy does not create any cargoes anywhere. It does not reach that point at all. It simply encourages a few people to buy these ships, and then it is assumed that because they have ships they will go out and hunt cargoes, I suppose; and a loan fund of $125,000,000 is provided for here, to be loaned at 4½ per cent. The intention of that is to encourage people to build more ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why build more, when we now have, according to Mr. Lasker, twice as many as we need?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is a pertinent inquiry. The argument that is made in reply to that suggestion is that we need some more of a different kind and type; but, for the life of me, I can not see how appropriating this money permanently, as this bill does, during the whole period of 10 years, with a possible extension, and a very probable extension, of five years more, I can not see how permanently appropriating $30,000,000 a year out of this one fund, outside of other benefits carried in the bill, is going to create cargoes or, in their absence, a demand for ships.

The most that might be hoped for would be that in some three years several hundred of our best and most profitable ships might be purchased leaving us with some 800 others on hand and the enormous overhead flourishing as usual.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me again, carrying out the idea that I have in regard to cargoes being necessary in order to build up a merchant marine, as I understand this bill it does not give bounties to the ships of the Standard Oil Co., the ships of the Steel Corporation, or the ships of the United Fruit Co. They are excluded, as I understand, under this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; they get compensation. They get some benefits, too, under the provision with reference to the reductions allowed on depreciation of ships in their income tax.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but I am talking about cash subsidies.

Mr. FLETCHER. They get the subsidy as the bill was reported to the House. There was an amendment which excluded earnings from carrying their own commodities, from tax exemption, and the Commerce Committee amendment excludes them from participation in the loan fund. That committee likewise purposes to strike out the income-tax exemptions except they permit deductions for depreciation.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are excluded from them?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not from compensation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know of no better illustration of the view that it is necessary to have cargoes to make good business. All of these three concerns have a large number of ships. Those ships have cargoes. They are carrying their cargoes to every port in the world perhaps—not the United Fruit Co. but the other two companies are.

They are carrying their goods everywhere. They are busy. They have business. They are making money. They do not need a subsidy. It does seem to me, therefore, that Congress should direct its efforts toward getting business for our merchant marine, not toward paying subsidies for no work being done.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, the Senator is correct about that; but instead of doing that, instead of encouraging the development of trade, Congress passes a tariff law which will have the effect of decreasing imports and therefore lessening the amount of goods to move into this country, and certainly that will be reflected in a decrease of exports as well. Congress has not only done that but it put an amendment upon the tariff bill which obliges American ships, if they have to be repaired in foreign yards, to pay 50 per cent of the cost of those repairs as a tax. There are no other ships that do that. We have ships sailing around the world, tramps going from one port to another, perhaps gone 8, 9, or 10 months from home. They may be forced to have repairs made in foreign ports. What is the result? The American has to pay 50 per cent in addition as a tax upon the cost of those repairs, whereas the foreigner has no such obligation at all. That is the way in which Congress encourages our ships, as far as that is concerned. I say that we ought to spare our shipping burdens and taxes of that kind and not seek to encourage a few shipowners to get more ships and come to the Government for special favors to be compensated by direct payments out of the Treasury for what they claim to be the difference in operating under our flag and under a foreign flag.

On this question of losses, the old saying is that figures will not lie, and I presume that is true; but there are a great many

people who know how to manipulate them in such a way that they bring about inaccurate results. I do not know how these figures were compiled. We were unable to get that information before the committee, but it is certainly inconsistent with other reports from the same Shipping Board.

I happen to have before me a copy of the speech which I made August 20, 1921, in the Senate, and I quote from that:

Mr. Tweedale then stated—

Mr. Tweedale was the comptroller—

Mr. Tweedale then stated, on May 9, 1921, that—

"From the beginning of the operation of this fleet to May 1, 1919, we paid all the expenses of the fleet, the operation of the fleet, and in addition to that declared a profit of $48,325,000, and also laid up $33,000,000 for depreciation, making a total of $81,325,000. From that point, May 1, 1919, down to March 1, 1921, the fleet was operated at a profit of $17,000,000."

That is a statement from another comptroller of the Shipping Board, made at the time I have mentioned, and covering the dates set forth.

Then Mr. Tweedale further says:

If depreciation on original cost (average, $200 per dead-weight ton) on a 10-year life basis, which we have been using, were added, it would amount to $149,451,725. This, if added to the operation loss, would increase the total loss to $179,289,322.

Of course, it is absurd to figure 10 per cent depreciation on a cost of $200 a ton when we are offering these ships at $30 a ton.

If figures above used to cover insurance, repairs, and depreciation were reduced from January 1, 1921, to a figure more commensurate with present conditions, insurance and repairs would be reduced by $16,798,838 (divided: Insurance, $11,199,188, and repairs, $5,599,650). Depreciation would be reduced by $41,996,980.

If the reduced figures mentioned were used, and I think they are considered ample, the results shown above would be changed and appear as follows:

Gross revenue	$379,254,708
Expenses, including repairs, insurance, and overhead	396,053,546
Net loss from operation	16,798,838

That is the statement of that comptroller; and, in any event, these losses ought not to amount to any $50,000,000 a year. There is certainly no excuse whatever for continuing any such losses.

The next proposition is with regard to the amount of subsidies paid by other countries. The Senator from Washington calls my attention to this same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to a statement made by Mr. E. T. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, appearing therein at page 224. The minority report says—which is, of course, general language—that our belief is that the entire subsidies and subventions and aids given to shipping in England, France, Italy, and Japan will not exceed $17,000,000 per annum.

The argument is made here in support of this bill that we ought to have subsidies because our competitors are paid such enormous subsidies; that we must be put in position to be on an equal footing with them; and that is a reason why we should come to this policy of granting subsidies. We have said in the minority report that in our judgment the total subsidies paid by all those countries annually will not exceed $17,000,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator suggest what classes of vessels receive these subsidies? I ask that question because, as I understand, in Great Britain subsidies are granted only to the fast liners; and I should like more detailed information upon that point.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; I propose to go into that subject a little more fully. I will say to the Senator generally, however, that the subsidies provided in all countries to-day are practically confined to subventions in the way of postal contracts, ocean-mail pay. That is practically what they have all come to. Great Britain has come to that, and there are a few other countries paying some bounty for constructing ships, and that sort of thing; but they have come practically to that one thing—subventions in the way of mail contracts—and we have done that since 1891. We are doing it now. The estimate this year is that the cost of carrying our ocean mail will be something over $6,000,000. We propose in this bill to require that that mail shall move in American ships.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, during the past year the cost of carrying the mail in our own vessels was $4,000,000, whereas in round numbers we paid foreign ships about $2,000,000 for carrying another portion of our mails.

Mr. FLETCHER. Exactly.

Mr. McKELLAR. And we are virtually the only nation in the world that hires the ships of other nations. Here we have, as reported by the chairman of the Shipping Board, over a thousand vessels tied up, and four hundred and twenty-odd vessels of our own running, and yet we are paying over $2,000,000 a year to the ships of other nations for carrying our mail under the contracts we have with them. I took the trouble to look up and see what other nations were employing American ships to carry mail for them, and I found that the new kingdom or republic of Esthonia and the new kingdom or republic of Finland were paying some small sum, probably less than $1,000, to American ships for carrying the mail of those two countries alone. Great Britain does not employ, and has never at any time employed, American vessels to carry her mail.

Mr. FLETCHER. On this subject of subsidies the Senator inserted a statement by Mr. Chamberlain at page 405 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am astonished that Mr. Chamberlain should make this statement. I can not understand for a moment how he manages to so arrange these figures as to make this sort of showing. I would guarantee to discredit that whole statement from beginning to end by just analyzing one item in it.

Take Australia, for instance. Under the head of subsidies, mind you, he says:

Contract ocean mail payments (1922) were $792,485.
Fiji Islands, $53,880.

Great Britain and Australia, and perhaps Canada, generally provide these subventions for carrying the mails not only to foreign countries, strictly speaking, but to their different colonies or dependencies or outlying islands.

We do not provide them for such service. Our ocean mail contracts refer to the foreign movement of mails entirely. They do not apply to mails to Porto Rico or Hawaii or Panama.

I read further from Mr. Chamberlain's statement. Under the head of "Subsidies" he says:

Commonwealth Government fleet (first cost of fleet to June 30, 1922, was £14,518,789), net earnings without allowance for interest and depreciation, £7,371,053.

Leaving as subsidies $32,093,334.64.

The next item is:

Completion shipbuilding program, $9,429,000.

The Senator from Washington has it appear, and it is set forth in this summary, that the subsidy paid by Australia is $59,529,784.64 a year, whereas included in that item is the total cost of the fleet built by Australia and another shipbuilding program which she has now under way. That is classified as a subsidy. Australia is building her own ships. The Government is operating the ships, and successfully operating them. Last year she made a net profit of $33,000,000 operating her fleet; yet they say this Government can not do anything like that; that we are impotent; that we are incompetent; that we are incapable. Australia is doing it; and they want to charge as a subsidy the total cost of the fleet—$32,093,334—and $9,429,000, to go to make up the subsidy of $42,000,000.

I would like to know, if Mr. Chamberlain were called upon to report to Lloyd's, for instance, what subvention or subsidy the United States pays to her shipping annually, whether he would say we paid $6,000,000 for carrying our mails on the ocean and $3,000,000,000 the cost of our fleet. If he were to report the subsidy paid by the United States anually, he might with equal justification report $3,000,000,000, and $6,000,000 more for carrying the mails. Think of putting out a statement on the subject of subsidies and including in it the total cost of the ships for Australia and her present program of construction as well.

That ought to discredit that whole statement, and I should not take up a minute's time in reading any other item in it. We find that when he gives what Italy is paying, $28,576,000, he says Italy pays that as subsidies. I venture to say that is two-thirds construction. If not construction, it is for some purpose outside of real, bona fide subsidies. Italy can not pay any such money as that for subsidies. She never has paid such an amount.

I want to quote from Mr. Chamberlain himself. I do not know when he made this statement just quoted and appearing in the RECORD of November 28, as it does not seem to bear any date, but undoubtedly he must have made it before December 4 because it appears in the RECORD of November 28. On December 4, 1922, this is what the same Mr. Chamberlain said under the title "The Italian Merchant Marine," appearing in the Commerce Reports:

Indeed, even in July the Government explanation of the budget estimate for 1922 and 1923 seemed to forecast reductions or abandonment of the construction and navigation bounty system.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chamberlain well knows that the new Government in Italy has to-day practically abandoned those bounties to which he refers here, and no government in Italy will call upon the people or can call upon the people of

that country to pay any such subsidies as he set forth in this statement. He knows that. It is perfectly ridiculous.

You may estimate $5,000,000 as the subsidy paid by Italy, and you will be very liberal in your estimate. You may estimate $2,500,000 for England, $5,000,000 for France, and $5,000,000 for Japan, making $12,500,000, and give $5,000,000 to Italy, and you will not be much above the figure given in the report of the minority on this bill, $17,000,000, for these four competing nations, against which we must protect ourselves by appropriating $30,000,000 to our shipowners.

There is a statement on that subject appearing in the hearings at page 89, a statement prepared by the Shipping Board, put out by the Shipping Board, printed by the Shipping Board, but just as soon they had a chance to thoroughly examine it they suppressed its circulation, because it did not suit their views; it did not support this bill. It was, however, entitled as coming from the Shipping Board and was prepared at their request. Here is the statement at page 89:

By the law of 1900 changes in the navigation bounty were made. Foreign-built vessels were excluded and the rates were greatly reduced, namely, from 80 centimes to 45 for steamships and 20 centimes for sailing vessels, with a limitation on the mileage for which bounties could be received from 40,000 to 50,000 miles for steam and 10,000 for sailing vessels. The tonnage also was limited so that bounties could not be received for the excess over 20,000 tons in any year, nor over 40,000 tons in any year after 1903, during the operation of the law of 1896. The maximum tonnage entitled to bounty was limited to 200,000 gross tons and the annual expenditure to 10,000,000 lire.

Of course, the amount of lire paid for subventions and bounties and aids in Italy appears very large, but we know the value of the lire has come down from 14 cents and something to very little over 4 cents in our money. I read further:

By the law of 1911, which slightly changed the provisions, a limitation on bounties is fixed by statute, the limit being 6,200,000 lire annually.

That is the limitation, 6,200,000 lire annually, not dollars. I continue reading:

The total construction and navigation bounties in 1910 amounted to $1,200,000, divided about equally between construction and navigation.

They acquired some ships. They got some Austrian ships, and they built some ships, and I presume Mr. Chamberlain has charged in this statement of the subsidy what it has cost the Government to acquire, construct, build, and purchase ships. I read further:

By the law of 1913 a new form of bounty for Italian-built ships was inaugurated, namely a yearly payment of 2½ per cent of the value of the ship. To receive the bounty the ship must be operated at least 160 days in the year, the amount being proportionately reduced for operation for a shorter time. The total appropriation under this law can not exceed in any one year 2,300,000 lire.

The total under that law can not exceed 2,300,000 lire, each lire being worth now about 4 cents. I continue reading:

Individual lines receive annual subventions for particular services. For example, the Italian-Brazilian lines, for two voyages monthly, receive about $5,000 per round voyage, or $636,000 for a period of five years.

Maybe Mr. Chamberlain has estimated a five-year contract in these figures; I can not say. But the statement is given out as to an annual subvention. This continues:

Two-thirds is paid by the Brazilian Federal Government and one-third by the State of Sao Paulo, which has much Italian labor. Whether this contract is still in force is not known. It expired originally in 1917.

An agreement between Italy and Chile provides for a payment of about $100,000 annually for a service between Genoa and Valparaiso and other Chilean ports. The purpose was to move the nitrate direct to Italy.

Postal subventions are paid by Italy to the amount of about $2,500,000 annually for various services, mostly to far-distant ports.

Taking the statement of this expert who examined the whole question of subsidies and reported for the benefit of the committee considering this bill, entitled "Appendix A to the hearings, report of the history of shipping discriminations and on various forms of Government aid and shipping," we must reach the conclusion that the total postal subventions paid in Italy annually amount to $2,500,000, and the statement is made that as to construction bounties they were to be discontinued in the recent budget.

I have allowed for Italy $5,000,000 for subventions and aids, and I do not believe she will pay more than $2,500,000. I have made an excessive allowance for Italy, therefore.

As to all these countries, the principal aids are subventions. For instance, take Great Britain. I referred a moment ago to the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee about what we are doing to really bring about the establishment of a merchant marine and looking toward providing for cargoes. We have gone on and repealed the Panama Canal act admitting foreign-built ships to American registry. That does away with what we might call free-ship policy. That was done in the merchant marine act of 1920.

Great Britain has never granted general navigation bounties—

Said this author—

nor construction bounties, with the exception of the early European subsidies above mentioned. Practically the only money aid given by Great Britain to its marine is in the form of postal subventions.

The first of these subventions came in 1838 for a mail service between Liverpool, Halifax, and New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. What did it amount to, all told?

Mr. FLETCHER. The postal subvention, after reductions, amounted to about $2,500,000.

I do not care what has been said; that statement I believe. It was made by a student of the subject who prepared it for the guidance and help of the committees considering the bill.

All the writers seem to agree that the growth of the British merchant marine is in no sense due to the small subsidy paid, admitting that the payments are in excess of the postal service rendered. The growth of the British marine was probably due to the early development of British industry, the acquisition of extensive colonial possessions, and the monopolistic or preferred position in colonial trade. The cheapness of construction and the concentration on the business account for most of its success.

The various Provinces of Australia grant postal subventions, including the Commonwealth, amounting to about $225,000. New Zealand pays small amounts based on the weight of the mail carried.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the United States now pays through postal subventions virtually as much as England, as she pays in the neighborhood of $2,000,000 now as postal subventions, and if the figures of the Senator from Florida are correct as to the amount to be paid next year being $6,000,000, we will pay more in postal subventions than Great Britain is now paying.

Mr. FLETCHER. Undoubtedly that is true.

We come next to the reference to France at page 86 of Appendix A in the hearings:

France appears to be the country of subventions par excellence, although in 1910 its merchant marine was outranked by Great Britain, the United States, Germany, Norway, and Japan. In 1881 its enlarged program of direct subventions began. From 1870 to 1913 its net tonnage ranged as follows:

Year.	Sail.	Steam.	Total.
1870	917,633	154,415	1,072,048
1880	641,539	277,759	919,298
1913	601,983	980,433	1,582,416

This simply shows that the most liberal country in the world in granting subsidies made no material progress whatever in the creation of its merchant marine. It is perfectly well known that it was a scandal, world-wide almost, how French ships sailed about the ocean empty simply to draw the subsidy. It did not help the commerce of France one bit, and did not build up any trade, and did not establish a merchant marine. That is a thought worth while in considering the bill. The total postal subsidies in 1911 paid by France amounted to about $5,500,000. They have remained in the neighborhood of $5,000,000 since 1889.

I am willing to accept the statement of Mr. Chamberlain as to the subventions allowed France without taking up the time to go into that any further, which is $5,107,104 per annum. Granting that and assuming Great Britain, France, and Italy, at the figures which I have mentioned, and Japan, at the figures Mr. Chamberlain gives of $4,831,411, we are well within the $17,000,000 for all four of the countries.

Mr. Merrill, an official of the Shipping Board, at page 634 of the hearings, said:

No, sir; practically no subsidy was ever given by England.

Mr. Lissner, one of the commissioners of the Shipping Board, at page 635, referring to Great Britain, said:

They have never given anything, so far as I know, purely as a subsidy to build up a merchant marine.

The report to which I just referred, Appendix A, states:

Great Britain has never granted general navigation bounties nor construction bounties, with the exception of the early Elizabethian subsidies above mentioned.

Those were in 1662 and 1694. The report further states:

Bounties had no noticeable effect on ship construction. Practically the only money aid given by Britain to its marine is in the form of postal subvention.

I have referred to the language in the report.

All the writers seem to agree that the growth of the British merchant marine is in no sense due to the small subsidy paid, admitting that the payments are in excess of postal services rendered.

Referring, as some people do, to the assistance to the Cunard Line by England as if that were a tremendous subsidy, Mr. Jones, in his work on Government Aid to Merchant Shipping, said:

The only instance of a loan to a steamship company by the British Government was the loan made to the Cunard Steamship Co. under the mail and Admiralty subvention contract of 1903. Under this contract the British Government loaned the steamship company £2,600,000 ($12,652,900) for the building of two steamers (the *Lusitania* and the *Mauretania*) that should be faster than any afloat and suitable for the use of the Admiralty. The loan was made at the rate of 2½ per cent, which is about 2 per cent lower than the rate at which the company could have borrowed a similar amount in the open market.

It is very likely the British Government could borrow money at a very low rate of interest at that time. Then the author further said:

The British Government is a stockholder in the Cunard Co. to the extent of one share and has a mortgage on its fleet and other property as a security for the loan. The Government has, moreover, the right to charter or purchase at agreed rates all or any of the company's vessels at any time, and requires that the company shall remain a purely British undertaking; that its management shall be in the hands of, and that its shares and vessels shall be held by, British subjects only; that it shall not give preferential rates to foreigners; and that it shall not unduly raise freights.

I think I have shown from the hearings, from an analysis of this statement, from the authorities which I have cited, even from Mr. Chamberlain himself, that the report is well within the limits when we estimate that the total subventions and aid to these so-called chief competitors of ours on the seas—England, France, Italy, and Japan—were $17,000,000 a year. If that is true, of course there can be no support for the claim that we must contribute two or three times that amount and donate that sum out of our Treasury in order to put us on an equal footing with those countries.

Referring to the Commerce Report of September 19, 1922, at page 837, anyone further interested in the subject of Japanese shipping bounties will find an interesting article by Mr. Chamberlain. It confirms the estimate which we have made at what he sets forth in his statement. We have made it in round figures, in our judgment, at $5,000,000, while he makes it at $4,831,411. Japan is not being very well pleased with the result of her subsidy even to that extent. Practically all aid nowadays made by the maritime powers to their shipping is in the way of mail subvention or postal contracts for carrying their mails overseas, and that we have been doing right along ever since 1891. As has been mentioned by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the amount which we pay in that direction is far in excess of that paid by any other country in the world.

Now I pass to the next question raised concerning the success of the Panama Steamship Line and the United States Lines. In our report we have referred to those two Government-operated lines as doing a successful business. I have based my belief in the accuracy of that statement upon the testimony of witnesses taken before the committees of Congress. If we have come to a time when we should pay no more attention to the people who come here and appear before these committees and give their statements, then we might just as well abandon all hearings on bills referred to committees. We might cease to pay any attention to what witnesses say, and particularly when witnesses come here voluntarily and offer their statements in solemn hearings while we are making an earnest and conscientious effort to get at the truth and seek the development of facts.

If we can not depend upon the statements which appear there—which are uncontradicted, mind you—then I am at a loss to know upon what we can depend. I do not own any ships; I am not connected with the Panama Railroad Steamship Line and know nothing about its business; I am not connected with the United States Lines and know nothing of personal knowledge about them; but I have a right to ask information on the subject; and when the subject is under consideration by a committee of Congress I think I am justified in depending upon the uncontradicted statements of people who are supposed to be and who are reputable citizens.

What do we claim as the basis for the statement that those lines have been doing a successful business? I wish to call attention to the hearings. I will merely refer to page 363 and ask that the statement appearing there, which is entitled "Tentative statement of revenue and expenses of United States Lines, by services and by vessels, for four months ending December 30, 1921," with the note attached, may be inserted in the RECORD. I shall not take time to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The table referred to is as follows:

Tentative statement of revenue and expenses of United States Lines, by services and by vessels, for four months ended December 31, 1921.

	Weeks in service.	Revenue.	Expenses.	Net operating revenue.
New York-Bremen service:				
Potomac	4	$276,270.00	$47,075.34	$229,194.66
America	3	300,377.90	179,751.94	120,625.96
Hudson	5	106,512.87	113,320.93	*6,808.06*
George Washington	2	505,558.24	267,519.70	237,668.54
Princess Matoika	5	100,056.63	104,521.99	*4,465.36*
Potomac	5	108,890.84	110,441.72	*1,550.88*
America	4	240,150.08	191,012.99	49,137.09
George Washington	3	369,760.32	245,722.68	124,037.64
Hudson	6	117,862.97	114,470.46	3,392.51
Princess Matoika	6	79,917.85	101,504.07	*21,586.22*
America	5	215,934.95	182,540.94	33,393.91
George Washington	4	387,134.13	238,201.05	148,933.08
Potomac	6	76,660.66	102,311.12	*25,650.46*
Total		2,684,687.04	1,998,394.93	686,292.11
New York-London service:				
Old North State	2	18,909.50	15,267.44	642.12
Centennial State	3	69,914.91	89,932.17	*20,017.26*
Old North State	10	64,378.41	70,203.41	*5,825.00*
Centennial State	4	56,713.15	70,813.03	*14,100.48*
Panhandle State	9	28,306.45	85,403.50	*57,097.05*
Centennial State	5	30,459.54	69,705.10	*39,245.56*
Panhandle State	10	42,480.97	66,870.42	*24,389.45*
Total		320,262.99	471,315.07	*151,052.68*
Total both services		3,004,970.03	2,469,710.00	535,259.43

NOTE.—The expenses do not include any charter hire, insurance, interest, depreciation, nor repairs made by United States Shipping Board, but do include all expenses incurred by United States Lines; also coal, oil, and advertising paid by United States Shipping Board as well as office rent and wharfage billed by United States Shipping Board.

Mr. FLETCHER. I now take the subject up at page 361 of the hearings. Mr. Rossbottom is on the witness stand, and he states:

The United States Lines is the creature of the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board owns the steamers. They were the steamers that had been chartered and sold on partial-time payments, I believe, to the United States Mail Steamship Co., to be operated between New York and European ports. Then when the United States Mail went into the hands of a receiver these steamers were thrown back on the Shipping Board, and the Shipping Board requested the Secretary of War to transfer me from the Panama Line to the United States Lines to manage the United States Lines until such time as the lines could be sold.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Are they really being operated then by the Shipping Board at the present time?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. They are being operated by the Shipping Board; yes. The names of the steamers are the *George Washington*, the *America*, the *Princess Matoika*, the *Hudson*, the *Potomac*, the *Lone Star State*, the *Peninsular State*, the *Susquehanna*, the *Centennial State*, the *Old North State*, the *Blue Hen State*, the *Granite State*, and the *Panhandle State*.

Mr. BANKHEAD. These represent about the best types that the Shipping Board own, do they not, Mr. Rossbottom?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Some of them represent the best and some of them represent the very worst.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In what particular do they represent the very worst?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. In plain language, I have what you might call a horse and a mule and a jackass team. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what we call a "spike" team down in my country.

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. It is the worst kind of a team you could possibly have. I have got the *George Washington*, which is a real steamer; the *America*, which is a real steamer, and would be a real steamer today had it not been for the fact that the United States Mail Steamship Co., instead of restoring her to the condition in which the Germans left her, felt that they knew more about the steamship than the Germans did, and reconditioned her to such an extent that she is a mule now.

I have the *Peninsular State* and the *Lone Star State*, which are of the 535-foot type. Those steamers are very well adapted to South Atlantic trade, because they have fine accommodations first class, no second-class accommodations, and open steerage for third class. I have induced the Shipping Board to put in closed rooms for the third class. Those two steamers, which cost something like $7,000,000 apiece, are not fitted for the North Atlantic run. Their speed is satisfactory but they carry too few first cabins, no second cabins, and too few third class. The result is that I have the operating expense of a big ship and the operating revenue of a little ship.

Now, the five steamers that we operate in the London service, such as the *Granite State* and the *Centennial State*, they were in exactly the same situation. They are smaller. They operated at about 14 knots instead of 18, but they had luxurious first-class accommodations and no third class. Really they were cargo steamers and then the passenger accommodations were installed as sort of an afterthought.

The operating expense of those steamers is just about as heavy as the operating expense of a first-class passenger steamer, but the operating revenue is reduced from a passenger standpoint, because they can not accommodate the passengers. To offset that we have induced the Shipping Board to allow us to install additional berths in these first-class accommodations, so that all these London steamers now are what is known as the cabin type of steamer. Then also we are installing third-class accommodations. We are doing that with the idea of increasing our operating revenue.

The other steamers that I am operating to Bremen and to Dantzig, such as the *Princess Matoika* and the *Hudson* and the *Potomac* and the *Susquehanna*, are the old German tubs.

Mr. BANKHEAD. They are the jackasses?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Those are the jackasses. They are full fledged. Their operating expenses are enormous and I can not get any operating revenue out of them because people will not travel in them. The third-class accommodations are not fit for pigs to be stowed in, and the ships are old, the steel is crystallizing, and I have all kinds of expenses for repairs on them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has your Shipping Board got any vessels that they could put at your disposal that are superior in equipment to those?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Unfortunately they have not. Before I came with the United States Lines they assigned a number of these 535-foot steamers to the trans-Pacific run. If I had 535-foot steamers instead of the German tubs I could make some money in the Bremen run, even with the 535's, but I can not make enough money now out of the *George Washington* and out of the *America* to carry along the rest of my invalids.

Mr. BANKHEAD. You are making money with the *George Washington* and the *America*?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes; there is no question about that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is there a pretty good profit on those two ships under present conditions?

This is what Mr. Rossbottom says. He is testifying here as to the practical results of the operation of this line, of which he is general manager—

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes. Of course, in my operation I am not charged charter hire, interest, or depreciation. Those ships are owned by the Shipping Board.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is your average profit per run on those two first-class vessels, not charging in those items that you suggested?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Well, not charging in the interest, insurance, or depreciation, I can tell you just what they have been.

On voyage No. 2 of the *George Washington* my net operating revenue was $237,638; on voyage No. 3 it was $124,000; on voyage No. 4 is was $148,000.

On the *America*, voyage No. 3, the operating revenue was $120,000. I am just giving you round figures. On the next voyage of the *America* it was $49,000. On the next voyage of the *America*, $33,000.

My total operating revenue, for instance, for the four months ending December 31, for all the steamers in the Bremen service, was $686,292.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is that a statement that you have there of the operation of these vessels?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Then follows the statement which I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD. It will be seen that that statement covers "all expenses incurred by the United States Lines; also coal, oil, and advertising paid by the United States Shipping Board, as well as office rent and wharfage billed by United States Shipping Board"; and it shows a net operating revenue of $535,259.43.

Mr. Rossbottom further, at page 376, referring to these tubs, as he calls them, says:

They ought not to be in the business, because their earning capacity is not sufficient.

Mr. HARDY. In other words, you can not make a profit out of the use of utensils or implements that are not fitted for the service and not proper to have in it?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. That is right. The angel Gabriel could not operate those steamers and make a profit out of them.

Mr. HARDY. You could not make a profit out of them, whether they were operated by the Government, by private owners, or public owners, or not?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. No. No man could make a profit out of them. It would be a crime to turn them over to a private operator until they are in a position to make a profit. Any private operator would go bankrupt in trying to operate them now.

Mr. HARDY. Then, your position is, so far as those steamers are concerned, they ought to be dropped out?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. The ones that we can not operate profitably?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes. But now there are reasons of policy, of course, why they should be continued for the time being, until they secure other ships to take their place. For instance, the inauguration of an American line to London; there is no American line to London, excepting the United States Lines, and the policy of the Shipping Board, as outlined to me by Mr. Lasker, is that the Shipping Board, in compliance with the Jones Act, is quite willing to incur a loss to maintain a line of that kind until it can be operated profitably. As far as the Bremen service is concerned, if we gave up operating these three or four lame ducks, instead of operating a weekly service to Bremen we would be operating a service only about every 12 or 15 days.

Mr. HARDY. You said three or four of those lame ducks; can you name the ones that are not fitted?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes. The *Potomac*, the *Princess Matoika*, the *Hudson*, and the *Susquehanna*.

Mr. HARDY. Those four?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Those four.

Mr. HARDY. And they are of a kind that you do not think could be repaired and put in shape to make them profitable?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes, they can be; but it would be an enormous expense, and I doubt very much whether that expense would be justified, in view of the age of the ships.

Mr. HARDY. They are old and probably would cost more than they would be worth after they were repaired?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Those steamers, I think, are 20 or 21 years of age. It would cost you easily $300,000 to put them in a proper condition; and, after that is done, you could not sell them for $300,000.

Mr. HARDY. About what size are they?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. They are about—they range from 9,000 to 12,000 gross tons and are about 500 feet long.

Mr. HARDY. That would be about 15,000 dead-weight tons, would it not?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. About that.

Mr. HARDY. And it is your theory that we had better keep up some of the lines, even at a loss, than to abandon the vessels that are continually in service?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I am not prepared to dispute the wisdom of that, unless other ships of those the Government possesses, some 1,400 steel vessels, can be found that are more adapted to that. How about that; are there any more suitable ships in the list of our some 3,000,000 tons of first-class shipping——

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY (continuing). That could be substituted in place of these unprofitable ships?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Are any of those ships now idle?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. They are.

Mr. HARDY. Is there any reason in the world why they should not be substituted and made to earn something, instead of using those that are earning nothing—that are losing money?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. The only reason is the cost of fitting them for the service. There are three steamers that I have in mind that if I had them in the United States Lines with the *America* and *George Washington* I would not take off my hat to anybody.

Mr. HARDY. You could run those ships under the present laws and make money out of them?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. If I had the *Mount Vernon* fitted for first, second, and third class passengers, the *Agamemnon* and the *President Grant* fitted as cabin steamers, those three steamers, with the *George Washington* and the *America*, would give the Shipping Board a real American fleet in the North Atlantic, so that when the time came to sell to private owners they would have something worth selling and the owner would have something worth buying; but it is going to take money, you know, to fit those steamers up. I do not know how much, probably $5,000,000 or $6,000,000.

Mr. HARDY. And you would have a record that could not be poohpoohed as showing the utter incapacity of our merchant marine under Government operation, would you not?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Either in Government operation or private operation those steamers would make money.

Mr. HARDY. They will make money if operated rightly?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Either under one or the other?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Did I understand you to say those ships that were profitable—the *George Washington* and two or three others, several others that you named—that you had helped to see they were properly equipped and fitted out?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. No. The *George Washington*—we have made some changes in her since I have been here. I have induced the Shipping Board to appropriate a sufficient amount of money to convert the open third-class steerage into closed rooms. That improvement will pay for itself in four months. I have also induced the Shipping Board to install third-class accommodations in the *Peninsular State* and the *Lone Star State*. I am only going to have those steamers for some four or five months, until they can turn over two other steamers to take their place. With open third-class steerage, I could not get one steerage passenger to sail on them, and I induced the Shipping Board to expend about $75,000, which I told them they could charge to my operating costs, and inside of four months we will have paid back the cost of installing those rooms and have about $50,000 to boot.

That is the result of Government operation, as stated by a man who knows the business. In his testimony he shows absolutely upon his own knowledge that they are making profits, even in spite of the fact that they have four old tubs which are 20 or 21 years of age, and for which he has been appealing to the Shipping Board to substitute good ships which are now in their possession. Why do they insist upon causing losses arising by the operation of unfit, improperly equipped ships when they have idle ships which could be put into that service? As Mr. Rossbottom says, if that were done, even without a subsidy, he would not take his hat off to anybody or to any country anywhere.

That is the plain language of Mr. Rossbottom's testimony. You can not escape it. He is as emphatic as he can be about it, and he knows what he is talking about. In spite of what appears to be an effort to make a failure out of that line by denying them the proper ships and insisting upon their operating these 20 and 21 year old tubs, and by playing politics in other ways with that line, he testifies that they are paying. Notwithstanding that every part and every branch and division of their bureau apparently is trying to make a failure of this line, they can not do it if they will only give this man a chance. He has already demonstrated and he says emphatically and positively that he can operate ships at a profit in that business without any question whatever, without any subsidy, if the ships are at all suitable for the business.

On page 377 he is asked:

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. That is making no charge for interest or depreciation or insurance.

Mr. HARDY. Making no charge for interest, depreciation, or insurance?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Or charter hire. I forgot to put that in. Of course, charter hire would take care of interest and depreciation, anyway.

Mr. HARDY. Yes. If you have interest, depreciation, and insurance, you would not put in the charter hire also?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. No.

Mr. HARDY. Making no charges for those items, in four months you had a net profit of some $635,000?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Net operating revenue; yes.

Mr. HARDY. And that notwithstanding you had some of those ships that were lame ducks and costing you money?

Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. That is right.

Do you say that is not a successful business? Do you say we have no right to claim that these people have been doing a profitable and successful business, in view of the testimony of Mr. Rossbottom?

On page 378 he gives this testimony:

Mr. HARDY. In this result you also counted in your depreciation, did you not?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. No.
Mr. HARDY. Nothing for interest, repairs, or depreciation?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Well, repairs.
Mr. HARDY. Nothing except the repairs you had done?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. The repairs we make are included in that. The repairs the Shipping Board make, through their engineer of maintenance, those are not included, because I do not get those until about six months later on. They will be charged up to me in the regular course, but I have not received them yet.
Mr. HARDY. They are part of your regular charges?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

That is with reference to the United States Lines; and it is the statement of Mr. Rossbottom, directly made in these answers to questions put to him, that justified, I contend, the averment in the minority report that these lines were being successfully operated.

With reference to the Panama Line, I quote Mr. Rossbottom again. Bear in mind that, upon orders of the War Department, Mr. Rossbottom was taken away from the Panama Line and put in charge of the United States Lines across the Atlantic. I refer to his testimony in these same hearings bearing on the Panama Line, at page 364:

Mr. BRIGGS. What experience did you have with reference to making money on those lines or losing money?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. We made money in the Panama Line up to about two years ago, when the depreciation in traffic and the reduction of rates resulted in a deficit, as it did with all other companies operating in that particular trade.
Mr. BRIGGS. Did you mean foreign as well as American lines?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Foreign as well as American.
Mr. BRIGGS. To what extent did you make a profit on the operation? Just give us an average; I don't care for details.
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. I think year before last—I am a little bit hazy as to the exact figures—I think the Panama Railroad Steamship Line made something like about $1,400,000 or $1,500,000.
Mr. GREENE. I can hardly see what is to be gained from these questions, what few of them I have heard.
Mr. BRIGGS. I simply want to ask some of these questions, Mr. Chairman, of the steamship operator's experience and his ability and what he has done along these lines—what the lines he has been connected with have earned, etc.—just general terms. I am not asking for details, but simply asking for a few of the facts in connection with his operations, his experience as a steamship operator, and whether he has conducted his lines successfully or not.
Mr. HARDY. It is a constant statement here that the Government can not make any profit out of anything.
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Last year I think the steamship line lost something like $500,000. The year before the profit was $1,500,000.
Mr. BRIGGS. How did it run prior to that time, if you recollect, prior to two years ago? Can you give the committee a general idea as to that?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes; the Panama Railroad Steamship Line ever since it started, with the exception of probably two years, always made a profit ranging from $89,000, which I think was the lowest, up to $400,000, which I think was the highest, up to the time of the beginning of the war.
Mr. BRIGGS. The profits were higher during the war period?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes, sir.
Mr. BRIGGS. About what return was that on the investment? Have you any idea?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. I think the average return on the investment of the Panama Railroad Co. in its ships ranged from 3 per cent up to probably 6 per cent, except during the war, when the return was higher.
Mr. BRIGGS. What was it then?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. It was then about 10 per cent.
Mr. BRIGGS. In figuring this per cent, do you include depreciation, interest charges, repairs, and things like that?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Oh, yes; we carried every charge that every other steamship line carries.

That is the language of Mr. Rossbottom with reference, now, to the Panama Steamship Line. He was the general manager. Do you say they were not successful? For the past 20 years, every year except two—one during the recent unprecedented depression, and the other several years ago, when they had a rate war on, and they came out with a deficit—18 years out of 20 they made a profit of all the way from eight or nine thousand dollars to $400,000 a year. Is not that a successful business? Nobody should question that, it seems to me.

With reference to the further testimony of Mr. Rossbottom on that subject, he was asked by the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], a member of the committee:

Mr. Rossbottom, you said a moment ago, as I recollect it, that the Panama Canal Line is operating at a profit?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

Not "yes, if" or "yes, and," or "yes, but," but "yes."

Senator CALDER. Did you take into consideration the capital cost of the ships?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.
Senator CALDER. And the interest upon the capital cost?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.
Senator CALDER. In other words, you made a profit, allowing for interest charges?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Interest, depreciation, insurance, and repairs.
Mr. CULLEN. That was always a good money-making line, was it not, Mr. Rossbottom?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. It was.
Mr. CULLEN. The Panama Line, even before the war?
Mr. ROSSBOTTOM. Yes.

In the face of that testimony are we justified in saying that they were doing a successful business? There is the man who had charge of it. Who wants to try to discredit the United States Lines and the Panama Line by saying that they have been failures, and thereby conclude that the Government is incapable of conducting a successful business or managing these ships without enormous loss and waste? These people seem to pride themselves whenever they can possibly demonstrate that they are burdening the people with insufferable losses, or making a most absolute and total failure of their efforts. I never before knew people to brag about their incompetency; and I can not understand, either, what prompts them on every occasion to try to pull down, underestimate, and undervalue this vast property which has been built up by the money of the taxpayers of this country.

If I have a horse for sale and I advertise him, and a purchaser appears, it is incumbent on me to let him look at the horse and tell him the facts about the horse, but if I say to him: "This is my horse, but he is one eyed, he is winded, he is wheezy, he can not eat anything, and he is liable to balk and stall the minute you start anywhere with him; what will you give me for him?" I am not likely to get many bids for a horse like that. These ships are only five years old, steel ships, with wonderful records of efficiency back of them—all of them, so far as I know, and I know the records of many of them—and yet these people want to say they are unfit and that about half of them are not good.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. If the Government shall grant these people these subsidies that they say will make the business so profitable, do they propose to give full price for the Government ships or do they demand that the Government ships shall be turned over to them for a bagatelle in comparison with what they are worth?

Mr. FLETCHER. They propose, then, to let them have them practically on their own terms. If they can not get $30 a ton they will probably take $20, and then they will give the purchasers all the time they want within 15 years to pay for them. They do not propose to ask anything like the real value of the ships. If they get approximately 10 per cent of the cost of each ship, I expect they will be satisfied. That is, of course, absurd—to insist that the Government shall give away the ships and then pay people to run them.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. I wonder if the remedy would not be to get somebody else to sell them?

Mr. FLETCHER. Well, of course, they have not been doing very much in that direction. I am not disposed to be very critical about that. I know that the world conditions are such that we found ourselves, as every other country did, with an excessive tonnage on hand, and we could not sell them; but what is the sense of sacrificing absolutely temporarily unsalable property? You often have property that you can not sell at once, but that does not mean that it is worthless. You may have to hold it for a while. We have idle ships because commerce is not moving. The ships are intended to carry commerce. This United States Lines is doing well. It has been carrying passengers and making a profit, as Mr. Rossbottom has said. The Government line to Panama is making a profit. They carry passengers. They are mixed cargo and passenger ships. A number of cargo ships are idle because there are no cargoes; and putting $50,000,000 into the pockets of a few shipowners will not create cargoes.

With reference to the compensation provided in this bill, I want to call attention to part of the minority report dealing with that matter. I do not believe that that has been questioned. So far as I am advised, this statement which we make in the report goes unchallenged:

For instance, a cargo ship of 5,500 gross tons, such as those vessels built at Hog Island, would receive a minimum compensation. Such a ship, along with practically 1,200 others—

The Associated Press carried that out as "12" all over the country—

with practically 1,200 others, composing our cargo carriers, would have about 200 steaming days a year, and make about 200 miles a day, and receive the one-half-cent rate, which would amount to about $11,000 per annum.

That is the amount of compensation allowed for these cargo ships, what may be termed ordinarily as "tramps."

I want to call attention to a resolution passed December 7, 1922, by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York. The report of the Chamber reads:

Your committee on the harbor and shipping is strongly impressed with the conditions confronting our merchant marine and is of the opinion, substantiated by the experiences of the world's most successful maritime nations, that no nation can create and maintain a merchant marine worthy of its standing as a first-class power without an adequate fleet of tramp ships; and that the establishment and upbuilding of tramp operation and management is the only apparent employment for the vast amount of Government-owned tonnage suitable in type for tramp-ship operation. Furthermore, a merchant marine based upon liner or semiliner service exclusively will not afford the flexibleness in ships necessary to meet adequately the seasonal demands for ocean transportation.

* * * * * * *

The commerce from our shores includes transportation of full shiploads of wheat, coal, oil, lumber, and other commodities of a similar nature. The commerce of our ports includes full shiploads of sugar, coffee, nitrate, etc. These commodities, because of our lack of tramp ships on the deep seas, are now largely carried by foreign vessels. These commodities, with others in part, form the backbone of a good many of our Nation's industries, and tramp ships should be operated to insure their proper and prompt movement.

* * * * * * *

Resolved, That the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York unqualifiedly urges the creation, maintenance, and management of tramp operations as an integral part of our merchant marine, and it recommends that the United States Shipping Board take immediate steps to develop tramp shipping; and, be it—

That is the very point I am making with reference to this bill. It is full of weaknesses. It is impossible as a whole. The weakness of its compensation provision, if we adopt any system of compensation at all, is that it takes care of passenger ships, liner service, and does not take care of the tramp ships, the ships we need.

I want to call attention to the Shipping Board's report, just issued, the Sixth Annual Report of the Shipping Board, page 99. Perhaps that was one thing which called forth this expression from the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York. Just as a preliminary statement, it would be of interest to quote this:

At the beginning of the fiscal year there were 97 managing agents operating 744 vessels. Owing to the falling off in export business and the tremendous losses involved as a consequence it was found necessary to reduce the number of vessels in operation and the active fleet was cut down during the year to 394 vessels as of June 30, 1922. This, of necessity, involved the elimination of a number of managing agents, who at the end of the fiscal year numbered 39.

In the interests of efficiency every effort was made to continue the same vessels as far as possible in the hands of the same managing agents in order that the agents, as well as the ship personnel, might become fully acquainted with the vessels and work them to their maximum earning capacity. There were times when substitutions were necessary by reason of vessels being forced out of position owing to accidents, delays, etc., but these substitutions were avoided wherever possible.

At the beginning of the fiscal year the above fleet was divided into two services, viz: The regular line service and the so-called tramp service. There were approximately 400 steamers operating in the regular line service and approximately 300 steamers in the so-called tramp service. It was evident from the beginning that these so-called tramp steamers were losing considerable money, and as no definite results could be attained in the interests of the American merchant marine by keeping these steamers in service they were promptly withdrawn and laid up, the board restricting its operation to the building up of regular trade routes considered essential to the future of the American merchant marine, as required by the merchant marine act, 1920.

Perhaps it was because of that announced policy on the part of the Shipping Board that this chamber of commerce awakened to the situation, and now make appeal to them to reverse that policy, or at least to be certain to take care of the "tramps," which they have laid up and taken out of the service. We had 300 of them in the service, they say. They are the ships which carry cargoes. They are the ships which do the world's trade. They have been from the very beginning of time the ships that carried the commodities of the world from market to market. They never were subsidized by any nation on earth, from the days when Tyre was a great Phœnecian port, up to this time.

Those ships are the very ships about which the Shipping Board does not seem to care anything at all. They are the ships upon which we must depend to take care of our trade. They take them out of the service and tie them up. The "tramps" carry nearly 80 per cent of the world's trade. They are the ones about which apparently this board cares nothing, and they are the ones which would get practically no benefit under this compensation clause. Who is going to buy a ship for hundreds of thousands of dollars simply because he has a prospect of getting $11,000 a year subsidy from the operation of that ship? That is all that is allowed the cargo carriers, about $11,000. I read from the minority views:

It is not conceivable that this amount would induce purchasers to acquire those ships or be a very material figure in their operations.

On the other hand, for instance, the *George Washington*, 25,000 gross tons, would receive approximately $300,000 per annum.

This ship on a recent voyage, just completed, made a profit over expenses of $140,000.

Think of that. We are asked to pass legislation putting in the pockets of the owners of the *George Washington* $300,000 a year, when on her last voyage, just completed, she cleared $140,000. They do not dispute that fact. Yet here are the idle cargo carriers lying at our docks, which may get only $11,000 a year under this compensation clause. I read further:

Is there any need for taxing the people $300,000 a year to be paid out of the Treasury to this particular ship directly when she is, even in present circumstances, able to make a profit of $140,000 per voyage?

I am dealing with figures which are down to date, not something which happened in 1919, 1920, or 1921, but in the present. I have been trying to get these people to bring the actual losses from operation down to date, not make guesses as to what is going to happen after September or October. These are actual figures. I read further:

Her sister ship—*America*—made a net profit of $45,000 on her last voyage, and she would receive out of the Treasury annually a gift of $300,000 under this bill.

These ships are 18½ knots, and it is estimated that they would sail 400 miles a day and have 220 sailing days, and they would receive 1.3 cents per gross ton for each 100 miles.

Does anybody question that? I have not heard anybody question it.

If these passenger ships carried mail they would receive the mail subsidy in addition to the compensation mentioned.

The Standard Oil Co. has approximately 100 ships, aggregating 700,000 gross tons. Even at the minimum rate they would receive, as the bill was introduced and reported—

That is what has been indorsed all over the country, and that is what the committee reported—

a subsidy in the shape of direct compensation, it is called, of about $1,500,000 a year, notwithstanding they are engaged primarily in carrying products of their own. The bill was amended so as to eliminate this particular contribution to them as respects their own goods.

That is all. They get benefits besides that, but they are not allowed to enjoy this compensation, so much a ton per 100 miles, on their own goods. They were built to carry their goods. I read further:

The United States Steel Corporation has 35 ships, aggregating 200,000 gross tons. They are engaged in carrying their own products primarily, but they would receive out of the Treasury, as the bill was reported, and from this direct compensation, approximately $500,000 a year. This, too, was eliminated by amendments, as applied to their own products.

The United Fruit Co. has 22 ships, 100,000 gross tons. On this compensation basis they would receive, as the bill was reported, about $250,000 a year, although they were built and are operated primarily for the transportation of their own commodities. The amendment applied to these vessels respecting their own commodities.

The *William Penn*, 7,600 gross tons, our only ship equipped with the Diesel engine, recently made a voyage to the Orient, and her net profits were $30,000—her speed 10 knots.

The operating expenses of these ships equipped with the Diesel engine is about two-thirds of the oil or coal burners. The oil burner is generally cheaper than the coal.

Under this bill the *Minnekahda*, 17,281 gross tons, 16½ knots, would have a rate of compensation 1 cent, and her subsidy would amount to $150,000 a year. She is owned by the Atlantic Transport Line, affiliated with the International Mercantile Marine. We never understood they were in need of a subsidy or of any direct aid by way of compensation.

The Pacific Mail has 12 ships. They are rather slow and small, and they aggregate 60,000 gross tons, and the amount of compensation or direct subsidy for the entire fleet would be about $150,000 under this bill.

It will be seen that one ship of 17,281 gross tons would receive as much compensation as an entire fleet of 12 ships of the aggregate gross tonnage of 60,000 would receive.

The *Leviathan* will be entitled to receive of this direct compensation $1,250,000 per annum, which may be doubled.

That is the latitude they would have. Starting out with a contract on the *Leviathan* for $2,250,000, make that contract for 10 years and before it expires make it for 5 years more, and you have $2,250,000; for 10 years, $22,500,000, given to the *Leviathan*, and possibly half as much in addition within the 15 years.

The liners—the passenger ships—are most liberally provided for, but even under the theory of the bill there is a neglect of the cargo carriers—the trading ships—the ships which move the world's commerce and have done it from time immemorial and are continuing to do it to-day, as this resolution which has just come to my hands to-day from the Chamber of Commerce of New York recites. Yet the Shipping Board is deliberately tying up every one of those ships, taking them out of the trade, and confining themselves to liner operations.

I think I have clearly demonstrated that what we have said in the minority report with reference to the successful business of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line and the United States Lines is fully borne out by the testimony before our committees; that what we have said about subsidies in that report is likewise borne out, as is what we have said with regard to the losses from operations not being clearly stated. However, I want to make one other reference in connection with the operation of the Panama Steamship Line, and that is found on page 2452 of the hearings. A statement

there appears showing the result of the operation of the Panama Steamship Line from 1911 to 1920, inclusive, and I ask to have that statement included in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

Statement showing result of operations of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line from 1911 to 1920, inclusive.

Year.	Net revenue.		Net income.	
	Profit.	Deficit.	Profit.	Deficit.
1910	$166,272.73		$166,272.73	
1911	76,416.09		76,416.09	
1912		$305,742.85		$305,742.85
1913	221,489.92		125,921.59	
1914	314,293.36		218,646.67	
1915	499,853.42		586,066.53	
1916	1,004,373.05		1,055,584.90	
1917	1,162,800.46		1,161,734.00	
1918	1,359,208.00		1,262,764.49	
1919	3,125,812.24		2,444,004.61	
1920		117,676.56		278,521.70

Mr. FLETCHER. There are some statements in the hearings, made a part of the hearings, with reference to that subject, but they would be merely cumulative. I have already put in the RECORD the positive statement of Mr. Rossbottom, and I do not need to burden the RECORD by referring to other hearings at different times where the subject was considered and which simply bear out and confirm what he said before the committee which was considering this particular bill.

Yes, Mr. President, we need a merchant marine, but that is not the same thing as saying we need to give a subsidy of at least $30,000,000 a year for 15 years to induce a few people to own and operate it. Emphatically, we need a merchant marine. With equal emphasis I say a subsidy bill will not give it to us. It never has given it to us or to any other country. One way we may judge of the future is by the past. One lesson we ought to remember is the one we learned by experience. Another way of getting knowledge is by the study of the experience of others. These lessons are the same. Subsidies never established a permanent, substantial merchant marine for any country. There are many factors essential to establishing a merchant marine—banking facilities in foreign countries, competent commercial agencies, energetic representatives, proper organizations, representatives at all important ports with power to adjust differences, settle claims, speed operations, handle papers, place insurance, conduct financial arrangements, men who know the business. Much deeper than subsidy we must go to develop competitive strength in our shipping. A temporary stimulant will not accomplish the object.

But there are people who say we must do something. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] said, "If you do not like this, propose something else." My contention is that we did propose something else in the merchant marine act of 1920, and that all that is needed is to live up to and enforce the provisions of that act. When departure in policy is proposed it is not incumbent upon those who propose it to demand of those who believe it unwise and vicious and unsound that they shall compromise with it by offering amendments. The only answer is its opposition and defeat.

But there are others who say, "You ought to do something. We are in a bad situation." All right; we are doing something. We have the act of 1920, as I have said. We have the ships. About one-third of them are being operated. Some of those are making a profit. They are earning considerably more than their expenses. Their earnings exceed every legitimate charge against them. They are not interfering with privately owned ships. Let us continue them in that service.

Others are losing money. Unless they are employed on new routes which give promise of a growing trade which will soon show a profit of transportation, they should be tied up. If they can be chartered on a bare boat basis, let us do that. It is an inexcusable waste to employ 100 vessels to do the work of 10. The vessels tied up are available to meet the demand when it comes. As sure as time elapses there will be an increase in foreign trade. We are now at a low ebb, if not the lowest ebb, and there is an excess of tonnage. There were two successful Government organizations, as we have shown—the Panama Steamship Co. and the United States Lines. The ships that are causing losses so loudly proclaimed should be turned over to them. Stop the losses in that way. If that is not feasible, let the Government directly operate those ships just as it is doing the United States Lines, which is not suffering losses. It is a question of proper administration and efficient management.

As to idle ships, it is a question of cargoes, and they will not be forthcoming by paying money out of the Treasury to a few owners or operators. It is folly to tax the people to pay a few owners to sail empty ships flying our flag. When trade revives, overseas business improves, and commerce increases there will be a demand for those ships, and we can then dispose of them to advantage. I venture the prediction that within three years the ships we now offer at $30 per ton will be worth $70 per ton.

This will come about by natural and economic causes, not by any subsidy. Unless that happens before November, 1924, the party in power need not go to the trouble of putting up a ticket in the next national election. If they add this subsidy to the tax already bearing down the taxpayers, they may make the false claim that such a step hastened and increased the revival of commerce and of business prosperity, in which case the taxpayers may well say, "We are paying for that increase in good money, and we see nothing gained by taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other." There will be an increase in trade, but it will not be due to any subsidy, no matter what it may be made.

I have said there is no need of keeping up the losses which it is claimed we are suffering. Nothing but stupidity, or determination to see failure, or reckless disregard by interests or bad management or some unnecessary condition could produce any such losses as are asserted.

We could tie up every vessel we own, care for them, keep up their classification, and insure them for not to exceed $12,000,000 a year. That would then be the outside maximum loss if every ship the Government so owned was put out of commission and tied up. We could apportion them to the 22 or more deep-water ports of the country, keep them in fresh water, and have them properly cared for, ready for charter or sale or use on short notice, at a total cost not exceeding $12,000,000 a year. As cargoes offered, as merchants, shippers, or others develop the business the vessels would be available for profitable employment. We showed a condition like that on yesterday when we discussed the use of our ships at the time of the great emergency in bringing coal to our people from England.

All the while we would have the satisfaction of knowing that we were not dependent upon any foreign country to move our products, commodities, or goods to foreign markets, or to bring to us the things we need. Nor would we be wanting in merchant ships should they be needed to serve with our Navy. When opportunity arose, as demand developed, when conditions warranted, the vessels would come out, enter upon employment, serve our commerce, and make profits which would go into the Treasury to be credited on the expense of the care and upkeep of the fleet. There are numerous ways to stop the loss so loudly proclaimed if those in charge of affairs would only see something besides the MO 4 contracts.

Mr. President, I have heretofore made some reference to those contracts; they are mentioned in the views of the minority on the pending bill; but there is a feature of them which I have not before mentioned and as to which I beg to use the name of a distinguished Member of the other House, a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, who attended very diligently to the hearings, Judge DAVIS. In his able speech on this bill he mentions a matter which had escaped me until I read it again to-day and which adds to the enormous cost of the MO 4 contracts. I beg leave to quote from his speech at page 147 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 4. Referring to Chairman Lasker not having changed the MO 4 contracts, he says:

> He has not only made such change but he called the managing agents of Shipping Board vessels together in Washington, June 21, 1922, and voluntarily adopted and announced a policy of paying such managing agents additional compensation in the shape of husbanding fees, under which since that time operators handling 5 vessels or less receive $400 per month per ship in addition to the regular commission previously paid, and operators handling up to 10 vessels receive $400 per month per ship for the first 5 ships and $250 per month for each additional ship. It was announced by the Shipping Board at the time that this allowance of husbanding fees would add $1,200,000 annually to the cost of operations, but it was estimated that more than this amount would be saved by new arrangements for subsistence—the allowance for subsistence being reduced from 80 cents to 65 cents per day per man at that time—stevedoring, and general supplies.
>
> Why should not the taxpayers have been given the benefit of such savings? Why were these additional voluntary bounties given to the

managing agents, and by what authority? Was it done for the purpose of preventing a showing of profits, to the end that they might make out a stronger case for this ship subsidy bill?

There we have a continuance of the iniquitous MO 4 contracts by which the Shipping Board stands all the losses, the operating agents get 5 per cent commission on the business, and they are given here this additional amount, which is called "husbanding fees," besides. That is a monstrous thing. While I have Judge DAVIS's speech before me in connection with the testimony of Mr. Rossbottom, I wish to quote from his speech also, at page 137, November 24, as follows:

The Shipping Board is operating but 13 ships directly, or at least that was the number operating at the time of the hearings. They are operated in the name of the United States Lines, of which Thomas H. Rossbottom is manager on a salary of $10,000 per annum. He is managing it for the Shipping Board, and although he has been operating these vessels in the North Atlantic trade, which is recognized as embracing the sharpest and the most pronounced competition of any section of shipping in the world, and although in part he was operating some "old German tubs," as he termed them, 21 years old, which he said no man could operate at a profit anywhere, yet with a few good vessels he has been operating the fleet at a substantial profit, and that, too, under the worst depression in the history of shipping and in competition with the strongest maritime nations on earth.

Mr. EDMONDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Oh, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to say that that did not include interest on the investment.

Mr. EDMONDS. And depreciation and advertising.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. It included advertising. Mr. Rossbottom said that it did include advertising, but the profits he reported did not deduct anything for interest and depreciation. But the profit was sufficient to count and overcome interest and depreciation and still leave a profit, and he said if they would give him all the fleet like some of the ships he had he would not take off his hat to any nation on earth under any conditions. [Applause.]

You will find these facts fully stated in the hearings, and in this connection I want to say that if every Member of the House would read the hearings from beginning to end I know that this bill would not have any more chance of passage through this House than the proverbial snowball.

I have already referred to these alleged losses, and without going into that any further I desire to say that it seems to me we must appreciate that in any case these losses, whatever they may be, need not continue. They furnish no argument of justification for any subsidy whether they are maintained or lessened or not.

With reference to some other provisions of the bill, for instance, that with regard to the Army and Navy transports, I desire to say that one would suppose the Shipping Board had enough ships on their hands; one would suppose they would shy at taking over any more. They groan over the burden of tonnage which they wish to get rid of; they fairly boast of the terrific losses incurred in operating the ships; apparently the greater the loss the greater the glee; and yet they ask in this bill that with respect to the Army and Navy transports which have been rendering splendid service, economically and efficiently, the President be authorized to transfer to the board or to place out of commission any of the vessels now or hereafter engaged in either of such services.

I wonder if this board will not next ask us to have the Panama Steamship Line turned over to them. The audacity and assurance of an organization which shrieks its inability to operate ships without tremendous loss and enormous drains on the Treasury, and proves it to the satisfaction of the public, wanting to take over ships from the Army and Navy, both of which deny that they are incapable or incompetent, and certainly do not confess and establish and publish that they are, makes one gasp and wonder what next.

The joint committee sought to prove, and their information was it could be clearly shown, that the discontinuance of the Army and Navy transport service and the making of contracts with private parties, which such a discontinuance would bring about, would cost the taxpayers $5,000,000 a year. The majority of the committee refused to summon the witnesses by whom it is believed these facts could be fully established. Title V, section 501, of the bill will work that benefit to private shipping concerns at a cost to the Treasury approaching $5,000,000 per annum.

CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM.

There are those who say: "Propose something to help us get rid of or utilize these idle ships; suggest some constructive program." Very well; I have done that in what I have said. Abolish this organization that proclaims its failure and turn the ships over to real Government operators who have demonstrated their ability to make a success of what they undertake in the use and management of merchant ships. Otherwise reduce the enormous and unnecessary overhead; discontinue the MO 4 contracts, and operate directly the profit-producing ships and tie the others up for the present. Otherwise distribute them to the different ports, care for them, and encourage the ports to take advantage of them, and get them in service as soon as possible. Either of these processes will put a stop to the harrowing losses which are stressed as a basis for subsidy raids.

Let us consider what has been taking place while subsidists have been engaged industriously in circulating and publishing propaganda to support their designs on the Treasury. They have deterred investment in shipping securities for years past by proclaiming that Americans can not compete with foreigners in the operation of ships; they have discouraged people from buying our ships now by saying that many of them are poorly constructed and will have to be readjusted and reequipped and refurnished; they have for years discouraged and restrained financial interests from assisting in any way in the development of the shipping industry and the shipping business in this country, waiting, and laying the foundation for their appeal for governmental aid and subsidies.

Without any subsidy whatever—and this is what we have seen—the privately owned American mercantile marine has been making progress unequaled by any maritime power in the world. Apparently no one knows that. According to the arguments and the advertising statements of the subsidists, America is in a pitiable plight respecting her shipping interests. Let us look at the statistics on that subject for a moment. Referring, for instance, to the sixth annual report of the Shipping Board, we find under the head "Total United States merchant marine and tonnage employed in foreign trade," at page 111, that in the year 1800 our total merchant marine was 1,458,738 dead-weight tons, of which in the foreign trade 1,000,661 tons were employed. Of course, those were years when American ships were carrying a very large proportion of our trade. In those times American ships were about 30 or 40 tons, and they sailed around the Horn—brave, energetic fellows—and pushed our trade into China, where the most we had to offer was ginseng and rum, and brought back from China tea, silk, and like commodities. In other words, our trade in those days was comparatively small and the American ships carried a relatively large proportion of it.

I wish to put the whole table in the RECORD, not the illustrations, but merely the figures as to the total merchant marine and tonnage in foreign trade and the years as the figures are given on page 111 of the report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total United States merchant marine and tonnage employed in foreign trade.

Fiscal year.	Total dead-weight tonnage, merchant marine.	Dead-weight tonnage in foreign trade.
1800	1,458,738	1,000,661
1810	2,137,175	1,471,529
1830	1,920,251	874,486
1840	1,787,664	808,345
1860	3,271,146	1,144,257
1850	5,303,181	2,159,544
1860	8,030,902	3,569,094
1870	7,309,761	2,173,269
1880	6,102,051	1,971,903
1890	6,636,746	1,392,093
1900	7,747,258	1,225,193
1910	11,202,123	1,173,776
1917	13,306,556	3,661,104
1920	25,027,342	15,602,631
1921	27,538,464	16,819,943
1922	27,784,989	16,279,371

Mr. FLETCHER. In 1922 our total merchant marine was 27,784,989 dead-weight tons, and in the foreign trade 16,279,371 dead-weight tons were engaged. That means, I take it, that we have that amount of tonnage registered and documented for the foreign trade; it does not mean that that tonnage is actually engaged in the foreign trade, and, to that extent, the statement may be a little misleading.

Then, on page 117 of this report we have a statement showing United States shipping in foreign trade. The black lines indicate the percentage by value carried in American bottoms and the white lines the percentage by value carried in foreign bottoms. Without the illustrations, I should be glad to insert this table in the RECORD, giving the years, the value in millions of exports and imports, and the percentages marked "Foreign" and marked "American."

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States shipping in foreign trade.

Year.	Value in millions, exports and imports.	Percentage by value carried in American bottoms.	Percentage by value carried in foreign bottoms.
		Per cent.	*Per cent.*
1789		24	76
1800	$159	89	11
1810	151	92	8
1816	231	70	30
1820	142	90	10
1830	144	90	10
1840	239	83	17
1850	330	72	28
1860	762	66	34
1870	991	35	65
1880	1,483	17	83
1890	1,573	13	87
1900	2,089	9.3	90.7
1910	2,953	9	91
1914	3,785	9.7	90.3
1919	8,960	27.8	72.2
1920	11,875	42.7	57.3
1921	8,910	39.8	60.2
1922	5,523	34.6	65.4

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, on the subject of the growth and development of the American merchant marine I wish to put in first the statement by Mr. Lasker, as chairman, dated December 2, 1922, in answer to certain questions which I propounded to him at that time. Among other facts it shows that they are operating now 410 vessels, with a total dead-weight tonnage of 3,348,619. That is the dead-weight tonnage of the Shipping Board now being operated. Therefore, assuming that all that is engaged in foreign commerce—it is not, but just for the moment let us suppose that it is—we may be able to reach a more or less definite conclusion as to how much privately owned American tonnage is engaged in foreign trade.

Referring to the report of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Navigation, November 1, 1922, giving American documented seagoing merchant vessels of 500 gross tons or over, we find, at page 40, a table headed, "Comparison of trade of vessels in the preceding list on specified days." It gives the total number of American seagoing vessels in foreign trade as 2,219; tonnage, 9,717,356. Total number in the coasting trade, 1,391; gross tonnage, 2,542,923. The total number of American vessels, therefore, registered and documented, is 3,610, with a gross tonnage of 13,200,279. If we should deduct the 3,348,619 dead-weight tons operated by the Shipping Board, we would have in foreign trade American vessels of 9,717,356 tons less 3,348,619, being 6,368,737 tons of American shipping engaged in foreign trade. That, however, is somewhat misleading, I am afraid, and it is very difficult, if not impossible, to know exactly what tonnage we have under our flag in foreign trade; but all of those vessels so registered and documented are not engaged in foreign trade. Some of them are engaged in coastwise trade, although they are qualified to engage in the foreign trade.

I offer this complete table, furnished me by the Shipping Board and carrying the information that it purports to carry in response to the questions propounded, showing the situation to-day concerning the Government-owned vessels. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, marked with the initials of the Shipping Board, "S. B.," together with the letter of transmittal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the table and letter will be printed at the close of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I offer, to be printed in the RECORD, a copy from the Bulletin of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Navigation, November 1, 1922, showing the list of American-documented, seagoing merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over. Without troubling to read it, I ask that that be inserted in the RECORD, following the other statement, marked "A"; also "B," attached; also "C," attached; also "D," attached.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then a further statement showing world tonnage at different dates—world tankers, world oil burners—and a comparison of ownership of documented vessels on specified dates; and attached to that is a copy of the statistics furnished in this Commerce Report, which I ask also to be attached as a part of my remarks at the close.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, they will be incorporated as requested.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I submit that these data contradict any sort of inference that the United States is in a bad way regarding the American merchant marine; and all this has been built up without any subsidy, if we may for the moment disregard the mail-contract subvention which we have heretofore referred to. There has been no subsidy policy adopted by the Government. These statistics will show what our shipping was in 1914 and what it is to-day. They will show the development in a really marvelous way of American shipping interests. The American mercantile marine privately owned in overseas trade, I submit, has been "doing fairly well, thank you," and winning its own way standing on its own sea legs, and, I am persuaded, needs to ask no favors. All it wants is for Congress to cease hindering and hampering it by such provisions as the amendment to the tariff bill whereby it is proposed to tax American ships 50 per cent on repairs they may make in foreign yards, thereby increasing their insurance and adding to their operating cost.

Most of the American lines, coastwise and foreign, have increased their fleets out of the profits they have made. I know that is denied in some quarters. It has been claimed that many of these private lines are losing money, and have been losing money for some time past. An illustration was made of a certain line that was claimed to have charged off to profit and loss $1,500,000 last year, or something like that. The truth about it is that that line did not lose that money in operating ships at all but in respect to some oil speculations and pipe lines in France.

The facts in connection with how these American privately owned lines are succeeding appear pretty well in these hearings. Eight men owning ships testified before the committee. Not one of them claimed that they were losing money. No one asserted any such thing as that. I have here, in response to that statement which has been made and published in the RECORD, a letter from Mr. Philip Manson, dated December 13, which has just reached me, in which he refers to some of these statements, and particularly a statement made by Mr. Craemer, who is the special assistant to the vice president in charge of finance, I believe. He analyzes Mr. Craemer's statement, and I think I will take the liberty of quoting from what Mr. Manson writes, because he has been a student of this subject for years; he has had experience in shipping and keeps thoroughly well posted about what is going on. He writes:

Craemer says that "the profits earned by American shipowners during the war were restricted by governmental action, so that the return on his investment was very materially less than that earned by his foreign competitors." Governmental restrictions on the earnings of American shipping took place only after we entered the war. For nearly four years American ships were totally unrestricted as to earnings, and the highest rates were charged by American ships. Great Britain's shipping, the only competitor we need consider, was restricted all through the war and was commandeered by the British Government upon terms very much less favorable to the owners than was the case with American shipping when our Government, functioning through the dollar-a-year advisors, consisting of the principal steamship owners themselves, fixed the compensation for their own ships. One could write volumes on this, and it is particularly aggravating to have a Shipping Board official now falsify the facts in aid of the infamous subsidy bill. He says further that "during the period of the highest freights all American ocean-going tonnage was under requisition to the Government and the owners' return limited thereunder to the comparatively moderate charter rates established by the Shipping Board." This statement is misleading in two respects: The highest rates prevailed during the period prior to our entry into the war, and the charter rates established by the Shipping Board, as I have already stated, were far from being moderate.

Craemer says that "Government taxation reduced the earnings of the American owner to a point far below that of his foreign competitors." Our taxation never approached in severity that of Great Britain.

In his attempt to show the meagerness of the earnings of American steamship companies Craemer shows that during the last six years, including the bad year of 1921, the Atlantic, Gulf & West Indies Steamship Co. averaged only 8.52 per cent on its "invested capital," in which he includes over $28,000,000 stock, all water. The actual invested capital of that company would fall far short of its bond issue, which totals only $24,000,000 in round figures.

Craemer also repeats the buncombe regarding the change in the par value of the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. stock from its former utterly fictitious figure of $100 a share to $5 a share, and says that this was done to wipe out a deficit. This is utterly false. The cash distributed by that company to its stockholders from the proceeds of the sale of its fleet of ships to the I. M. M. Co. was far more than the real worth of that stock, reckoned on a basis of invested capital, and the changing of the par value of that stock afterwards was purely a bookkeeping transaction. In fact, the stock sold for more than $40 a share for a long time after the change to $5 par. This company also averaged a "beggarly" return of only 18.50 per cent during the last five years, including the bad year of 1921, when most companies showed losses, this being true for 1921 of practically all commercial companies as well as steamship companies.

Then Craemer says, referring to the earnings of the I. M. M. Co., that its earnings during the last four years averaged 8.01 per cent on its "invested capital," and the value of his statements is indicated by the fact that he includes in the "invested capital" of the I. M. M. Co. a total of about $100,000,000 common and preferred stock, all of which is sheer water.

Then, after showing average earnings of 16.38 per cent for the United Fruit Co. during the last seven years, he undertakes to belittle that by saying that it is mostly from other than shipping operations. The fact, however, is that its shipping business, no matter what proportion it bears to the whole, is its most profitable business.

He winds up his bunk statement, to use one of Lasker's characteristic expressions, by saying that other industries earned larger profits during the war, as if that made any difference, even if it were true. He also attempts to make capital of the fact that the common stock of the I. M. M. Co.—all the most worthless water, having value only for its voting rights—has never paid a dividend, and the dividends of the preferred stock of this company being 42 per cent arrears, although that stock is also all water. He makes similar argument in regard to the common and preferred stock of the A. G. W. I. Lines, which, he says, have had dividends for only a few years, the fact, however, being that these stocks are also water and represent no actual money investment. Of the Luckenbach Line he says: "The Luckenbach Steamship Co. has never declared a dividend." This must be a trick play on the word "declared," because everyone knows that the Luckenbachs have made millions during and after the war, and are constantly adding new ships to their extensive fleet even now, notwithstanding that subsidists say that it is impossible to operate ships under the American flag. The recent hearings before the joint committee contain evidence as to the very large earnings of the Luckenbach Steamship Co. The statement regarding the Luckenbach Line in Craemer's letter is, however, characteristic of the dishonest character of nearly everything else stated in that letter.

He (Craemer) also refers to the fact that the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. has paid dividends during only 9 of 49 years of its existence—that is, the last 49 years. As you know, I have several times exposed, before committees of Congress and in the public press, the manner in which the stockholders were swindled out of their dividends for many years by the Pacific Mail Steamship Co. when it was controlled by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., so I will not take the time or space to repeat it again here.

That bears on the question of disabusing the mind of the public regarding these losses, or claimed losses, that private shipping has been enduring. As a matter of fact, the shipping business has been a very profitable business in this country, and many of these lines have made enormous amounts of money. They did before the war. However, I am putting in this material to show that American shipping has developed and prospered wonderfully in the past years, since 1914 particularly, and that without any subsidy whatever. Just now some of them feel the depression. In some instances they must pass dividends, but that is the case all over the world. "Normalcy" approaches with divers' weights, but conditions ere long will become either very much better or very much worse. In either case subsidy will not be effective.

It has been charged by ardent advocates, propagandists, and subsidy-soliciting beneficiaries that opponents of this measure are actuated by partisan political motives or prejudices. This is really unworthy of notice. The chairman of the committee has stated that the bill raises questions about which honest men differ, and which are clearly controversial in their nature. I have advocated for 10 years the importance, and, as I saw it, the necessity, of building up and establishing an adequate American merchant marine. It is simply a question of the ways and means of accomplishing that end. We all agree on what is desired. How to do it is the question.

I have always opposed subsidy as a policy. I do not believe in the principle. I am convinced, and have always been of that thought, that subsidy will retard, not establish, a mercantile marine. I have studied the history of subsidies, and in my judgment the countries which have done most in that direction have accomplished least. Farmers' organizations throughout the country are against subsidy, and have declared against this measure. That confirms and enforces the views I hold. The American Federation of Labor is strongly against the bill. That, again, does not change my view of the matter; it accords with the conception which I have formed.

Neither is it because the Democratic Party in its platforms has repeatedly declared against subsidy as a policy of the Government that I hold to the view expressed in a speech here last July, and to the minority views set forth regarding this very bill. Numerous disinterested newspapers earnestly oppose this measure and protest against it. All these forces simply tend to confirm my conviction that the policy is wrong.

In that connection I noticed recently in the Washington Times of December 11, 1922, what appears to be a sort of change of heart or mind. Heretofore this publication has been urging the passage of this subsidy bill. In this editorial they say:

> The Government of the United States should establish the first navy of democracy and go into public ownership of seagoing vessels on the most gigantic scale.

How are you going into public ownership of vessels when the purpose here is to have all vessels pass to private hands? I read further from this editorial:

> This Nation should do its own carrying, and the carriers—great ships of high power and high speed—should each of them have on shore a sufficient number of cannon and movable steel decks to be used in case of attack.
>
> The Government should have on lakes and rivers boats of the highest speed, earning a living. They could carry passengers, carry the mail. They should be equipped with torpedo tubes.

That does not sound like what they have been heretofore advocating, it seems to me; at least, that is what I claim. We are not losing anything when the United States Government has and owns these ships, and until the time comes when they can be reasonably and properly turned over to private hands we are in position to be independent as to our shipping, protect ourselves in time of trouble, and take care of our commerce in time of peace.

I believe the principle asserted by the bill is unsound and unwise, and that the legislation will result in harm to our shipping industry. It itself defeats the purpose of its advocates, and it will hold back rather than help the progress and proper development of our merchant marine. It will cause the concentration of ships in a few hands, where they will be used to enrich their owners rather than serve American commerce.

It will cause the focusing of routes of trade in a few selected ports against the interests of interior shippers and to the destruction of other important ports along our stretch of ocean and gulf coasts. It offers a premium on inefficiency. It vests the power of life and death over ports and terminals, over routes and shipowners and shipbuilders, in a board which might exercise that power in a way that would be destructive of the general good and the public interest. It contains provisions particularly vicious and indefensible, in that it permanently appropriates (page 25 of the bill, subdivision (d)) all moneys in the merchant marine fund for the purpose of making payments for compensation contracted for within the limits of $30,000,000 a year, and the refunds of overpayments as mentioned in the bill.

In this merchant marine fund will be all the tonnage duties, tonnage taxes, or light money, amounting to approximately $4,000,000 a year; also 10 per cent of the amount of all customs duties paid under law, which will doubtless approximate $45,000,000 a year; also 50 per cent of the earnings in excess of 10 per cent net, the amount of which is questionable. These funds are by this bill permanently appropriated for 10 years with authority in the Shipping Board to continue it for five years more, to be expended on the orders of the Shipping Board, with no power or right or authority reserved to Congress over such funds during that period. Thus $450,000,000 are, in effect, appropriated and placed at the disposal of the Shipping Board, to be disposed of as it sees fit in the making of contracts for subsidy with the various applicants.

Another provision allows the board to double the subsidy contracted for, and in case the subsidy is increased outside the contract, or without a contract, Congress will have the poor privilege of making appropriations to cover such increases.

The House provision, at page 23 of the bill, line 18, provides:

> No expenditures shall be made from the "merchant marine fund" except out of the appropriations made annually therefrom by Congress for carrying out the purposes of this act.

That the committee proposes to strike out. A very substantial and vital change is reported by the committee in that respect. It destroys all control by Congress over the disposition of that merchant marine fund. Striking that amendment out makes it necessary to insert, on page 25, line 16, the word "permanently," and to strike out the words "authorized to." Then inserting the proviso in section 410 "that no expenditures shall be made from the merchant marine fund because of any increased compensation granted under the terms of paragraph (c) of section 410, except out of the appropriations made annually therefrom by Congress," is really a species of camouflage. There is nothing substantial in that amendment. All the Shipping Board has to do to make it utterly a nullity and valueless is to put in their contracts provisions for such increases as they think they may be possibly prompted to make hereafter. This simply provides for such increases as are made outside of the contract or where there is no contract; but where there is a contract which in itself provides for increases that provision does not apply, and all the Shipping Board has to do is to put into each contract a specification as to the amount of compensation and then provide for such increases as the board may think in the future it may make. So there is nothing of any value in that amendment. No substantial change of any material moment is made by the adoption of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator permit an observation there?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I just want to say to the Senator that I do not agree with his construction of that provision, but if his construction is correct, or if there is any doubt about it, I am in favor of making it perfectly plain, because it was not my intention, at least, that that provision should be gotten around by a mere provision in a contract. If there is any doubt about that I am in favor of making it perfectly clear.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am glad to hear the chairman say that. I am quite sure that if he studies it very carefully he will reach the same conclusion I have reached about it, and I hope he may be able to modify the amendment so as to reach the view he has of it, but as it is framed at present it seems to me utterly worthless.

The appropriation is permanently made for 15 years to take care of such increases as they may decide to make and as they could make if they make mention of them in the contracts. Other benefits of the bill I will not take the time now to review. I call to mind, first, the mail monopoly, $5,000,000 benefit to American ships. Second, the loan fund at 4½ per cent. Third, insurance; a good deal of help is provided under that provision. Fourth, reduction of taxes by reason of depreciation, wear and tear, and obsolescence. It is unusual to make an allowance for obsolescence, which may be deducted. Then the most extraordinary provision under the head of depreciation is that allowance may be deducted for decline in value of the ships. In other words, AB bought ships in 1914, we will say, and paid $200 a ton for them.

To-day the market value of those ships is $30 a ton; and it will not be over that, because we are fixing the market price of ships when we are offering our tonnage at $30 a ton. Now, AB comes in and says, "My income this year was $100,000, but the depreciation in the value of my ships from $200 a ton down to $30 a ton wipes out that $100,000." That is the meaning of that provision.

Fifth, direct compensation. Thirty million dollars a year is appropriated out of that fund, and it may amount to $45,000,000 from duties and $4,000,000 from tonnage dues, making $49,000,000. Besides that there may possibly be some further excess profits above 10 per cent. I do not figure much on that, because they can well manipulate that by increasing salaries and otherwise.

Sixth, immigration. That is a very helpful provision in the bill if we can carry it out, and I can see no reason why we could not. Mr. Rossbottom in his testimony regards that as the one essential thing. That is the only help he has ever suggested to American shipping—to provide a way whereby American ships should bring immigrants to this country.

Seventh. Officers and supplies of the Government must all be carried in American ships. That is another provision of a helpful nature—the Army and Navy transport provision providing that hereafter those transports must be taken out of that service and turned over to the Shipping Board or tied up and all supplies, officers, men, and so forth, must be carried hereafter in private ships under private contracts. There would be $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 a year more.

Ninth. Through routes by rail or water from shipping point to destination and the foreign bills of lading provision are of value to American shipping.

I have no objection to things of that kind; that we ought to provide for and I think we have done so in the merchant marine act of 1920. Then we ought to stop, as I said, hindering and hampering and interfering with our merchant ships by imposing such duties as 50 per cent of the cost of repairs in foreign ports on American vessels, and other things of that sort.

Mr. President, I may have a few observations to make a little later on with reference to some phases of the question which have escaped me in the discussion up to this time, but at present I feel that I ought not longer to tax the patience of the Senate, and therefore I yield the floor.

APPENDIX.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, December 2, 1922.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I regret that I have not been able earlier to furnish you with the information requested in your letter of November 25. I was anxious for you to have just as complete information on the questions raised as possible, and the necessity for compiling this information, together with the demands on the departments concerned to furnish information to Members of the House who were actively directing the shipping bill during the last several days, has occasioned the delay. I hope it has not inconvenienced you.

The answers are given on the attached sheet.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. D. LASKER, *Chairman.*

1. How many ships of the various kinds have been built by the Shipping Board, together with the tonnage of each kind?

Total construction program (including all types).

	Number vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Steel	1,603	11,614,961
Wood	589	1,885,250
Composite	18	63,000
Concrete	12	73,500
Total	2,312	13,636,711

(Details of number and dead-weight tonnage of each type constructed are shown on attached sheet marked Question No. 1.)

2. To be answered by Ship Sales Department.

3. To be answered by Ship Sales Department.

4. How many vessels are now being operated, and the kind?

	Number vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Steel:		
Vessels	398	3,348,619
Tugs	12	.....
Total steel	410	3,348,619
Wood: Tugs	10	.....

(Details of types of active vessels, showing number and dead-weight tonnage, shown on attached sheet marked Question No. 4.)

5. How many vessels are now tied up, and the kind?

	Number vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Steel	897	6,441,666
Wood	8	24,386
Concrete	9	54,861
Total	1,004	6,520,913

(Details shown on attached sheet marked Questions 4 and 5.)

6. How many of the total number of steel ships that we own are passenger ships?

	Number vessels.	Dead-weight tonnage.
Passenger vessels	40	472,922

(Three coolie carriers, of a total of 11,395 dead-weight tons, not included in the 40 passenger vessels.)

7. How many ships and the kinds has the board acquired by purchase and otherwise?

The number of vessels acquired by the board since its beginning to date by seizure (ex-German and Austrian vessels) and by purchase have been as follows:

Type.	Number vessels.	Dead-weight tons.
SEIZED VESSELS.		
Cargo	48	279,837
Passenger and cargo	36	347,018
Sailing vessels	9	24,570
Colliers	7	32,392
Motor	1	.....
Barge	3	.....
Total	104	683,817
PURCHASED VESSELS.		
Cargo	45	289,453
Passenger	5	22,904
Colliers	12	39,888
Tugs	13	.....
Total	75	352,244
Total seized and purchased vessels	179	1,036,061

Attached, for information, is copy of statement showing number and dead-weight tonnage of vessels at present controlled by the United States Shipping Board, segregated according to type and form of acquisition.

Questions answered by ship sales department.

2. How many ships of the various kinds have been sold to which title has passed finally?

Vessels sold or transferred and title finally passed.

	Sold.	Transferred to other departments.	Total.
Cargo	242	14	256
Passenger and transports	21	9	30
Tankers	54	12	66
Refrigerators	1	3	4
Tugs and barges	34	8	42
Total	352	46	398

3. How many ships of the various kinds have been sold under contract where the vessels have not been taken back?

Vessels sold, on which title has not finally passed, and still in hands of purchasers—cargo, 2.

QUESTION NO. 1.

Construction program of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

1. VESSELS DELIVERED.

	Number.	Deadweight tons.
A. REQUISITIONED STEEL.		
Cargo	300	1,929,739
Tanker	53	519,030
Refrigerator	11	80,200
Transport	9	71,975
Collier	9	70,350
Passenger and cargo	2	9,972
Total	364	2,687,266
B. CONTRACT STEEL.		
Cargo (United States)	1,086	7,296,205
Cargo (Japan)	30	243,280
Cargo (China)	4	40,000
Tanker	73	713,000
Tanker (Navy)	12	131,000
Transport	13	107,800
Refrigerator	8	75,200
Passenger and cargo	23	299,000
Barge	6	22,200
Total	1,255	8,927,695
Total steel vessels	1,639	11,614,961
C. CONTRACT WOOD (according to original design).		
Cargo	304	1,121,350
Barge	28	71,000
Subtotal	332	1,192,350
CONTRACT WOOD (according to altered design).		
Tanker	1	4,700
Finished hull	115	447,700
Sailing vessel	10	34,500
Barge (converted)	56	206,000
Subtotal	132	692,900
Total	314	1,885,250
D. CONTRACT COMPOSITE.		
Cargo	18	63,000
E. CONTRACT CONCRETE.		
Cargo	4	13,500
Tanker	8	60,000
Total	12	73,500

QUESTION NO. 1—Continued.

Construction program of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation—Continued.

1. VESSELS DELIVERED—continued.

	Number.	Deadweight tons.
F. TUGS.		
Steel ocean	46	
Steel harbor	8	
Wood ocean	13	
Wood harbor	62	
Total	129	
Grand total	2,312	13,636,711

QUESTIONS NOS. 4 AND 5.

Status of vessels controlled by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, from data received as of November 25, 1922.

STEEL VESSELS.

	Number.	Deadweight tons.
ACTIVE.		
Cargo (operating in specified services, United States ports to foreign ports)	297	2,491,108
Passenger and cargo (operating in specified services, United States ports to foreign ports)	24	296,759
Cargo (United States coastwise)	4	16,716
Cargo (between foreign ports)	14	91,731
Coolie carriers and cargo (between foreign ports)	3	11,395
Cargo (intercoastal)	6	52,503
Tankers (United States to foreign ports)	11	102,823
Tankers (United States coastwise)	1	9,909
Cargo (at sea assigned for tie-up (includes 1-3525 B/B))	8	60,662
Cargo (Army service)	1	10,013
Cargo (chartered to independent companies)	9	80,717
Tankers (chartered to independent companies)	2	15,665
Tugs	12	
Total active	392	3,190,001
TEMPORARILY INACTIVE.		
Cargo (repairing or awaiting repairs)	10	82,262
Passenger and cargo (repairing or awaiting repairs)	3	33,636
Cargo (in port, awaiting tie-up)	1	9,740
Cargo (awaiting cargo)	2	17,240
Cargo (idle account pier congestion)	1	5,740
Tanker (in port awaiting tie-up)	1	10,000
Total temporarily inactive	18	158,618
INACTIVE.		
Cargo (tied up)	874	5,551,238
Passenger and cargo (tied up)	12	127,527
Cargo (tied up but assigned)	5	49,870
Cargo (awaiting assignment)	9	69,545
Tankers (tied up)	64	587,808
Tanker (awaiting assignment)	1	9,799
Cargo (delayed ship sales)	1	5,610
Passenger and cargo (reconditioning)	1	15,000
Cargo (custody United States Shipping Board as mortgagee)	2	15,821
Tugs (tied up)	17	
Cargo (contract unfinished)	1	9,400
Total inactive	987	6,441,616
CONCRETE VESSELS.		
Cargo (tied up)	2	6,078
Tankers (tied up)	7	48,783
Total concrete vessels	9	54,861
WOOD AND COMPOSITE VESSELS.		
Cargo (tied up)	6	24,386
Tugs (active)	10	
Tugs (tied up)	2	
Total wood and composite vessels	18	24,386
Grand total, all vessels	[1] 1,424	9,869,482

[1] Total does not include 7 Army transports of 49,235 dead weight, title to which is vested in board, although physical delivery to board has not been effected

The bulletin of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Navigation, November 1, 1922, shows the list of American documented seagoing merchant vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over to be—

Total steel vessels, 2,362; giving 11,352,082 gross tons.
Total wood vessels, 324; giving 792,687 gross tons.
Total steam and gas vessels, 2,686; giving 12,145,669 gross tons, or 17,419,734 dead-weight tons.

To this should be added the sailing vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over, American documented seagoing vessels, to wit—

Total steel vessels, 103; giving 204,287 gross tons.
Total wood vessels, 325; giving 527,651 gross tons.
Total sail vessels, 428; giving 731,938 gross tons.

On June 30, 1914, we had—

242 wood sailing vessels and schooner barges, giving	gross tons	387,485
76 steel vessels, giving	do	140,918
Also steam and gas vessels—		
8 wood vessels, giving	do	10,595
429 steel vessels, giving	do	1,589,733
755 vessels (total)	do	2,128,731

On October 31, 1922, we had sailing vessels and schooner barges—

325 wood vessels, giving	gross tons	527,651
103 steel vessels, giving	do	204,287
Steam and gas vessels—		
324 wood vessels, giving	do	792,687
2,362 steel vessels, giving	do	11,352,682
3,114 vessels (total)	do	12,877,607

In addition to the above there are American documented seagoing merchant vessels of 500 to 999 gross tons.

Total steam and gas, 111 vessels; 82,329 gross tons.
Sailing vessels of 500 to 999 gross tons, 385 vessels; 299,343 gross tons.

On October 31, 1919, American documented seagoing merchant vessels engaged, there were—

2,174 vessels (in foreign commerce)	gross tons	7,708,105
840 vessels (in coasting trade)	do	1,628,075
3,014 vessels (total)	do	9,336,180

On October 31, 1922, of these vessels, American documented seagoing merchant vessels, there were—

2,219 vessels (in foreign trade)	gross tons	9,717,356
1,391 vessels (in coasting trade)	do	3,542,923
3,610 vessels (total)	do	13,260,279

QUESTION NO. 7—SUPPLEMENT.

Vessel property owned and controlled by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

(Compiled as of November 25, 1922)

	Total.		Contract.		Requisitioned.		Purchased.		Seized enemy.	
	Number.	Dead-weight tons.	Number.	Dead-weight tons.	Number.	Dead-weight tons.	Number.	Dead-weight tons.	Number.	Dead weight tons.
STEEL VESSELS.										
Steam:										
Passenger and cargo	43	484,317	26	287,900					17	196,417
Cargo	1,230	8,457,896	1,001	6,873,799	199	1,357,223	17	143,585	13	83,289
Tankers [1]	80	736,002	66	628,718	13	106,134	1	1,150		
Refrigerators	14	102,620	5	41,967	9	60,653				
Tugs	29		29							
Cargo (unfinished)	1	9,400	1	9,400						
Total steel	1,397	9,790,235	1,128	7,841,784	221	1,524,010	18	144,735	30	279,706
CONCRETE VESSELS.										
Steam:										
Cargo	2	6,078	2	6,078						
Tankers	7	48,783	7	48,783						
Total concrete	9	54,861	9	54,861						
WOOD AND COMPOSITE.										
Steam:										
Cargo	6	24,386	6	24,386						
Tugs	12		12							
Total wood and composite	18	24,386	18	24,386						
Total vessels [2]	1,424	9,869,482	1,155	7,921,031	221	1,524,010	18	144,735	30	279,706

[1] Includes 2 molasses tankers, dead-weight tonnage, 15,665.
[2] Does not include 7 Army transports, dead-weight tonnage, 49,235; title transferred to Shipping Board but no delivery made.

I.

World tonnage.

(100 tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1914.					
	Steam and gas.		Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American [1]	1,692	4,287,349	1,408	1,035,699	3,100	5,323,048
British [2]	10,123	20,523,706	1,205	521,343	11,328	21,045,049
Dutch	709	1,471,710	97	24,745	806	1,496,455
French	1,025	1,922,286	551	397,152	1,576	2,319,438
German	2,090	5,134,720	298	324,576	2,388	5,459,296
Japanese	1,103	1,708,386			1,103	1,708,386
Norwegian	1,656	1,957,353	535	547,369	2,191	2,504,722
Other countries, making gross total	24,444	45,403,577	6,392	3,635,673	30,836	49,039,532

[1] Including vessels on Great Lakes.
[2] United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, Canada, and other dominions, including vessels on Great Lakes.

All figures are taken from Lloyd's Register.

II.

World tonnage.

(100 tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1922.					
	Steam and gas.		Sail.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American [1]	4,234	15,732,544	1,147	1,253,652	5,381	16,986,195
British [2]	10,263	21,615,009	1,058	427,511	11,321	22,042,520
Dutch	1,100	2,617,485	64	15,228	1,164	2,632,713
French	1,723	3,537,382	371	308,410	2,094	3,845,792
German	1,533	1,785,767	190	101,641	1,723	1,887,408
Japanese	2,026	3,586,913			2,026	3,586,913
Norwegian	1,716	2,417,680	136	183,181	1,852	2,600,861
Other countries, making gross total	29,255	61,342,952	4,680	3,027,834	33,935	64,370,786

[1] Including vessels on Great Lakes.
[2] United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, Canada, and other dominions, including vessels on Great Lakes.

All figures are taken from Lloyd's Register.

III.

World tankers.[1]

(500 gross tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1922.					
	Steam and gas.		Sail and barge.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American	243	1,362,964	73	105,369	316	1,468,333
British	243	1,224,791	5	16,345	248	1,241,136
Dutch	33	93,863	5	4,728	38	98,591
French	6	21,311	1	3,203	7	24,514
Japanese	2	2,552			2	2,552
Norwegian	21	107,484			21	107,484
Other countries, making gross total	582	2,929,521	91	138,609	673	3,068,130

[1] Exclusive of Navy, Admiralty, and other Government tankers.
All figures except for American tankers are prepared from Lloyd's Register.

IV.

World tankers.[1]

(500 gross tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1922.					
	Steam and gas.		Sail and barge.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American	385	2,344,738	79	115,824	464	2,460,562
British	318	1,716,648	5	16,345	323	1,732,993
Dutch	39	121,179	3	2,171	42	123,350
French	17	86,951			17	86,951
Japanese	5	24,668			5	24,668
Norwegian	32	173,564			32	173,564
Other countries, making gross total	852	4,662,618	98	143,786	950	4,806,404

[1] Exclusive of Navy, Admiralty, and other Government tankers.
All figures except for American tankers are prepared from Lloyd's Register.

V.

World oil burners.[1]

(500 gross tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1920.					
	Steam engine.		Oil engine.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American[2]	1,251	5,923,767	75	135,506	1,326	6,059,273
British	282	1,664,631	53	157,813	335	1,822,444
Dutch	74	221,258	18	20,202	92	250,460
French	14	60,738	7	15,098	21	75,836
Japanese	4	33,930	3	3,140	7	37,076
Norwegian	46	231,102	51	107,635	97	338,737
Other countries, making gross total	1,731	8,345,913	290	663,384	2,021	9,009,247

[1] Exclusive of Army, Navy, Admiralty, and other Government oil burners.
[2] Including oil burners on Great Lakes.
All figures, except for American vessels, are prepared from Lloyd's Register.

VI.

World oil burners.[1]

(500 gross tons and over.)

Flag.	June 30, 1922.					
	Steam engine.		Oil engine.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.	Number.	Gross.
American[2]	1,720	8,710,935	70	146,152	1,790	8,857,087
British	530	3,143,816	71	316,612	601	3,460,428
Dutch	128	533,349	25	59,229	153	592,578
French	47	226,599	10	19,162	57	245,761
Japanese	29	202,381	4	5,171	33	207,552
Norwegian	104	511,096	71	157,723	175	668,819
Other countries, making gross total	2,694	13,838,178	416	1,166,370	3,110	15,004,548

[1] Exclusive of Army, Navy, Admiralty, and other Government oil burners.
[2] Including oil burners on Great Lakes.
All figures, except for American vessels, are prepared from Lloyd's Register.

VII.

Comparison of ownership of documented vessels on specified dates.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

(500 tons and over.)

Months.	Steel.		Wood.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.
July 1, 1917	814	2,807,266	738	756,894	1,552	3,564,160
Nov. 1, 1922	1,110	4,769,082	850	1,028,843	1,960	5,797,925

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

(1,000 tons and over.)

Months.	Steel.		Wood.		Total.	
	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.
July 1, 1917	19	76,160			19	76,160
Nov. 1, 1922	1,413	6,833,092	237	629,262	1,650	7,462,354

Grand total.

	Number.	Gross tonnage.
July 1, 1917	1,571	3,640,320
Nov. 1, 1922	3,610	13,260,279

Comparison of ownership of documented vessels on specified dates.

	Private ownership. (500 tons and over.)						United States Shipping Board. (1,000 tons and over.)						Grand total.	
	Steel.		Wood.		Total.		Steel.		Wood.		Total.			
	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.	Number.	Gross tonnage.
July 1, 1917	814	2,807,266	738	756,894	1,552	3,564,160	19	76,160			19	76,160	1,571	3,640,320
July 1, 1918	829	2,955,516	820	867,809	1,649	3,823,325	231	929,140	4	9,918	235	939,058	1,884	4,762,382
July 1, 1919	815	2,995,224	861	932,427	1,676	3,927,651	792	3,312,713	192	514,490	982	3,827,203	2,658	7,754,854
July 1, 1920	888	3,364,108	886	1,011,505	1,774	4,375,613	1,347	6,146,612	283	756,516	1,630	6,903,128	3,404	11,278,741
July 1, 1921	1,032	4,195,206	893	1,045,424	1,925	5,240,630	1,519	7,247,284	279	746,487	1,798	7,993,771	3,723	13,234,401
February 1, 1922	1,077	4,528,206	872	1,025,790	1,949	5,553,996	1,485	7,080,610	269	718,629	1,754	7,799,239	3,703	13,353,234
March 1, 1922	1,054	4,516,210	862	1,018,004	1,916	5,534,214	1,487	7,109,426	266	707,484	1,753	7,816,910	3,668	13,341,123
April 1, 1922	1,053	4,515,510	867	1,025,494	1,920	5,541,004	1,495	7,099,444	254	704,542	1,749	7,803,986	3,669	13,344,967
May 1, 1922	1,058	4,549,926	866	1,031,010	1,924	5,580,936	1,481	7,080,921	260	694,457	1,741	7,775,378	3,665	13,356,314
June 1, 1922	1,062	4,583,770	865	1,030,714	1,927	5,614,484	1,479	7,087,116	255	677,991	1,734	7,765,107	3,661	13,379,591
July 1, 1922	1,075	4,640,345	858	1,023,978	1,933	5,664,323	1,465	7,084,296	246	662,677	1,711	7,696,973	3,644	13,351,216
August 1, 1922	1,090	4,708,905	858	1,027,889	1,948	5,736,794	1,456	6,982,872	244	647,909	1,699	7,629,781	3,642	13,366,575
September 1, 1922	1,094	4,719,855	854	1,027,374	1,948	5,747,229	1,436	6,921,998	243	645,061	1,679	7,567,059	3,627	13,314,288
October 1, 1922	1,102	4,735,311	850	1,028,094	1,952	5,763,405	1,423	6,875,601	240	636,955	1,663	7,512,466	3,615	13,275,871
November 1, 1922	1,110	4,769,082	850	1,028,843	1,960	5,797,925	1,413	6,833,092	237	629,262	1,650	7,462,354	3,610	13,260,279

United States Shipping Board documented vessels, by material and rig.

On—	Steel.						Wood.						Grand total.	
	Steam.		Sail.		Total.		Steam.		Sail.		Total.			
	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.
July 1, 1917	15	66,237	4	9,923	19	76,160							19	76,160
July 1, 1918	225	914,812	6	14,328	231	929,140	3	8,451	1	1,467	4	9,918	235	939,058
December 1, 1918	444	1,776,233	6	14,328	450	1,790,561	90	245,556	1	1,467	91	247,023	541	2,037,584
July 1, 1919	784	3,298,385	6	14,328	790	3,312,713	188	509,073	4	5,417	192	514,490	982	3,827,203
July 1, 1920	1,341	6,132,284	6	14,328	1,347	6,146,612	280	751,071	3	5,445	283	756,516	1,630	6,903,128
July 1, 1921	1,513	7,232,956	6	14,328	1,519	7,247,284	274	735,413	5	11,074	279	746,487	1,798	7,993,771
February 1, 1922	1,481	7,071,260	4	9,350	1,485	7,080,610	265	709,761	4	8,868	269	718,629	1,754	7,799,239
March 1, 1922	1,484	7,102,736	3	6,690	1,487	7,109,426	262	700,812	3	6,672	265	707,484	1,752	7,816,910
April 1, 1922	1,482	7,092,724	3	6,690	1,485	7,099,414	261	697,877	3	6,672	264	704,549	1,749	7,803,963
May 1, 1922	1,478	7,074,231	3	6,690	1,481	7,080,921	257	684,785	3	6,672	260	691,457	1,741	7,772,378
June 1, 1922	1,476	7,080,426	3	6,690	1,479	7,087,116	252	671,319	3	6,672	255	677,991	1,734	7,765,107
July 1, 1922	1,464	7,031,514	1	2,782	1,465	7,034,296	243	646,005	3	6,672	246	652,677	1,711	7,686,973
August 1, 1922	1,449	6,979,090	1	2,782	1,450	6,981,872	242	643,454	2	4,455	244	647,909	1,694	7,629,781
September 1, 1922	1,435	6,919,216	1	2,782	1,436	6,921,998	241	640,606	2	4,455	243	645,061	1,679	7,567,059
October 1, 1922	1,422	6,872,819	1	2,782	1,423	6,875,601	238	632,410	2	4,455	240	636,865	1,663	7,512,466
November 1, 1922	1,412	6,830,310	1	2,782	1,413	6,833,092	235	624,807	2	4,455	237	629,262	1,650	7,462,354

Total United States Shipping Board tonnage documented.

(1,000 tons and over.)

	Steam.				Sail.				Total.	
	Steel.		Wood.		Steel.		Wood.			
	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.	No.	Gross.
Shipping Board vessels lost	56	218,917	31	88,194			2	3,186	89	310,297
Shipping Board vessels sold to aliens	40	130,947	13	38,582					53	169,529
Shipping Board vessels sold to citizens	192	850,432	15	43,176	5	11,546	38	57,179	250	962,333
Shipping Board vessels transferred to United States	38	251,706							38	251,706
Shipping Board vessels abandoned (scrapped)	1	2,391	15	39,131					16	41,572
Shipping Board tonnage reduced by readmeasurement or rebuilding		189,868		1,144						182,012
Total documented tonnage removed from Shipping Board list	327	1,635,261	74	210,277	5	11,546	40	60,365	446	1,917,449
Documented tonnage in list November 1, 1922	1,412	6,830,310	235	624,807	1	2,782	2	4,455	1,650	7,462,354
Total Shipping Board tonnage documented prior to November 1, 1922[1]	1,739	8,465,571	309	835,084	6	14,328	42	64,820	2,096	9,379,803

[1] These figures do not represent the whole tonnage owned by the United States Shipping Board prior to November 1, 1922, because a few vessels were sold, lost, transferred to the Navy, etc., before documents issued to them, and therefore they are not included in this statement.

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF EUROPEAN STATES (S. DOC. 274).

Mr. LODGE. There was sent in by the President in response to Senate Resolution 208, of January 16, 1922, information regarding the revenues, expenditures, and deficits of the European States. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is a very valuable and important collection of statistics relating to the revenues, expenditures, and deficits of European States. I report it back and move that it be printed as a Senate document.

The motion was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 947) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

MEMORIAL BRIDGE ACROSS DELAWARE RIVER.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There was passed to-day Senate Joint Resolution 249, which I think was passed under the apprehension that it was an ordinary bridge bill. It is in fact a bill appropriating $400,000 for the Government of the United States to act in conjunction with New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the building of a memorial bridge. The introducer of the joint resolution has agreed that the vote be reconsidered and that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. So I ask that the votes by which the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and passed may be reconsidered and that the joint resolution be referred back to the Committee on Commerce, and then that the Committee on Commerce be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the votes will be reconsidered and the joint resolution referred to the Committee on Commerce. Without objection, that committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution and it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I introduced April 20—calendar day, May 9—1922, the bill (S. 3578) to provide credit facilities for the preservation and development of the agricultural industry, including live stock, in the United States; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to create an agency for the liquidation of commercial assets owned by the United States, for acting when required as depository of funds belonging to the United States, and otherwise performing services as fiscal agent of the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill was referred to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee has never taken any action upon it. The Committee on Banking and Currency is now having hearings with reference to the various credit bills which have been introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3578 and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR REED OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Pennsylvania, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and filed, as follows:

IN THE NAME AND BY AUTHORITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1922, DAVID A. REED was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness his excellency our governor and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Harrisburg this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.] WM. C. SPROUL, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

BERNARD J. MYERS,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR-ELECT LYNN J. FRAZIER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of North Dakota, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and filed, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

At an election held on the 7th day of November, 1922, LYNN J. FRAZIER was duly elected to the office of United States Senator to represent the State of North Dakota for the term of six years commencing the 4th day of March, 1923.

Given at Bismarck this 7th day of December, 1922.

R. A. NESTOS, *Governor.*
THOMAS HALL, *Secretary of State.*

Attest:

JOHN STEEN,
Member of the Board of Canvassers.

BREEDING OF RIDING HORSES FOR THE ARMY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the Secretary of War, transmitted pursuant to law, relative to expenditures under the appropriation for the encouragement of breeding suitable riding horses for the Army, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there is an appropriation bill on the calendar which we would like to take up to-morrow, and I would like to get a little more time to be given to the shipping bill. So I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning instead of 12 o'clock. We will have the morning hour, and hope to pass the appropriation bill in that time, and to reach the consideration of the shipping bill by 1 o'clock at least.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not disposed to raise any question about that suggestion. I do feel, however, that the Senator must concede that we have not interfered with the progress of the shipping bill in any way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

Mr. FLETCHER. I know there are a number of committees meeting now considering very important measures, and they meet about 10 o'clock, though they usually do not get started until half past 10. If we meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow we might as well abandon the committee meetings.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought probably there might not be many Members especially concerned in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill and that we could take that up in the morning hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not believe the Senator will save any time by meeting at 11 o'clock. I think if we began at 12 we would get along just as well.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator that there are hearings now going on before the Committee on Banking and Currency which are very interesting, and quite a number of Senators who I know are interested in that class of legislation, and who are not members of the committee, are attending the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Would there be any objection to recessing until 12 o'clock and possibly laying the shipping bill aside in the hope of passing the Departments of Commerce and Labor appropriation bill? Then there might be other matters that could be taken up. I feel that we should give more time to the shipping bill under the circumstances. There is other legislation that will be coming in, and I would like to get as far along with the bill as possible. I do not want to press the bill unduly, however.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator what appropriation bill he expects to come up to-morrow?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Are there many controverted questions in the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think there are any controverted questions in it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know of any. I presume it will pass as quickly as the appropriation bill which we had under consideration to-day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think probably more quickly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall not make any objection to taking a recess until 12 o'clock.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session to-day it shall take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, December 15, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Lee M. Otts, Greensboro.
Walter T. Cowan, Orrville.

ARIZONA.

Winchester Dickerson, Ashfork.

GEORGIA.

William L. Black, Allenhurst.
Afley M. Cherry, Donalsonville.
Dana M. Lovvorn, Richland.
Frank H. Moxley, Wadley.

KENTUCKY.

Charles A. Bickford, Hellier.
Robert B. Waddle, Somerset.

MAINE.

John C. Arnold, Augusta.
Cleo A. Russell, Bethel.
Thomas R. McPhail, Thomaston.

MARYLAND.

Mary B. Workman, Fort Howard.
Elwood C. Orrell, Greensboro.
Elwood L. Murray, Hampstead.
Anna B. Bowie, Kensington.
Leslie W. Gaver, Middletown.
Milton D. Reid, New Windsor.
David S. Hickman, Snow Hill.
William Melville, Sykesville.
Harry L. Feeser, Taneytown.
Elias N. McAllister, Vienna.
Ernest W. Pickett, Woodbine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Lora T. Smith, Feeding Hills.
Alice D. Robbins, Littleton.
Xavier A. Delisle, Lowell.

NEW JERSEY.

Alfred O. Kossow, Cedargrove.
Caroline A. Cowan, Haworth.
Ralph D. Childs, Rochelle Park.
Luther S. Van Fleet, Three Bridges.

OKLAHOMA.

James L. Lane, Kiowa.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James M. Graham, Alcolu.
Robert L. Henderson, North Charleston.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 14, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Father in heaven, about Thy name cluster all the sacred hopes of the human breast. In the unfolding mystery of Thy power and compassion are hidden the aspirations and joys of future years. Each day-dawn marks the extended hand of Thy mercy. As Thou dost thus minister unto us, may we minister unto others. O bless us for the good that we may be able to do. Help us to do with all faithfulness the duties that are set for us. Fill us with all good purposes and send us forth in the service of our beloved country. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, on to-morrow I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] intends to call up the contested-election case of Paul against Harrison, seventh district of Virginia. A considerable amount of debate is desired on that case, and I wondered if gentlemen on the other side would have any objection to beginning the session an hour earlier than usual in view of the fact that about five hours of debate is desired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if that inquiry is addressed to me, I will say to the gentleman that I know of no reason why we should meet at 11 o'clock to take up that matter. If the gentleman wishes to consider the appropriation bills and meet at 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock, I have no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. We desire to give as much opportunity for discussion as possible, and yet we desire and expect to close the case during the day. Gentlemen of course prefer to conclude the day's business at a reasonbly early hour.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion? To relieve the mind of the man who is to be murdered, he is asked to arrange to get a pistol. The gentleman wants this side of the House to arrange to cut off one of its Members' heads. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. On the contrary, I simply desire to have an opportunity to present the arguments in the case and give gentlemen on the other side an opportunity to present their arguments. If they can prove that the Member was elected, of course, he will retain his seat. If we prove that our man was elected, we shall seat him. I know of no reason why we should not begin early in order to get through at a reasonable time. It will accommodate gentlemen on that side as well as gentlemen on this side.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman submit any request?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not want to embarrass anyone, but I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the House is not going on with the important business before the committee—that is, the appropriation bill—but is going to take up another matter that could have been settled long ago if the majority wished to. I object.

THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, the naval appropriation bill, and pending that motion I wish to ask unanimous consent that there be three hours of general debate, one hour and a half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and one hour and a half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that there be three hours of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were 46 ayes and 2 noes.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present; the Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 277, nays 2, not voting 151, as follows:

YEAS—277.

Abernethy	Bell	Briggs	Byrns, Tenn.
Ackerman	Benham	Brooks, Ill.	Cable
Andrew, Mass.	Bird	Brooks, Pa.	Campbell, Pa.
Andrews, Nebr.	Bixler	Brown, Tenn.	Cannon
Anthony	Black	Browne, Wis.	Cantrill
Appleby	Bland, Va.	Buchanan	Carter
Aswell	Blanton	Bulwinkle	Chalmers
Atkeson	Boles	Burdick	Chindblom
Bacharach	Bowers	Burroughs	Christopherson
Bankhead	Bowling	Burtness	Clague
Barbour	Box	Butler	Clarke, N. Y.
Beck	Brennan	Byrnes, S. C.	Clouse
Cockran	Hawley	McPherson	Shreve
Cole, Iowa	Hayden	MacGregor	Siegel
Collier	Hays	MacLafferty	Sinclair
Collins	Henry	Madden	Sinnott
Colton	Hersey	Magee	Sisson
Cooper, Ohio	Hickey	Maloney	Smith, Idaho
Cooper, Wis.	Hicks	Mansfield	Smithwick
Copley	Hill	Mapes	Snyder
Coughlin	Hoch	Merritt	Speaks
Crago	Hooker	Michener	Sproul
Cramton	Huck	Miller	Stafford
Crisp	Hudspeth	Mills	Steagall
Curry	Hukriede	Mondell	Stedman
Dale	Hull	Montoya	Stephens
Dallinger	Ireland	Moore, Ill.	Stevenson
Darrow	Jacoway	Moore, Ohio	Strong, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	James	Moore, Va.	Strong, Pa.
Deal	Jefferis, Nebr.	Moores, Ind.	Summers, Wash.
Dempsey	Jeffers, Ala.	Morgan	Sumners, Tex.
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Morin	Swank
Dickinson	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd	Sweet
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Murphy	Swing
Dowell	Jones, Pa.	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Colo.
Drewry	Kearns	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, N. J.
Elliott	Kelley, Mich.	Nelson, J. M.	Temple
Evans	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Minn.	Thompson
Fairfield	Kendall	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Favrot	Ketcham	Norton	Timberlake
Fenn	Kiess	O'Brien	Tincher
Fess	Kincheloe	Oldfield	Towner
Fields	King	Oliver	Turner
Fish	Kissel	Paige	Tyson
Fisher	Kline, N. Y.	Parker, N. J.	Underhill
Fordney	Kline, Pa.	Parks, Ark.	Upshaw
Foster	Knutson	Patterson, Mo.	Vaile
Free	Kopp	Patterson, N. J.	Vestal
French	Kraus	Porter	Vinson
Fuller	Kreider	Pou	Voigt
Fulmer	Lampert	Quin	Volstead
Gahn	Lanham	Radcliffe	Walters
Garner	Lankford	Raker	Ward, N. Y.
Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Ramseyer	Ward, N. C.
Garrett, Tex.	Larson, Minn.	Rankin	Wason
Gensman	Lawrence	Rayburn	Watson
Gernerd	Lea, Calif.	Reece	Weaver
Gifford	Leatherwood	Reed, N. Y.	Webster
Gilbert	Lehlbach	Rhodes	White, Kans.
Glynn	Lineberger	Ricketts	Williams, Ill.
Goldsborough	Logan	Robsion	Williamson
Goodykoontz	Longworth	Rogers	Wingo
Graham, Ill.	Lowrey	Rose	Woodruff
Greene, Mass.	Lyon	Rouse	Wright
Greene, Vt.	McArthur	Sanders, Ind.	Wyant
Griest	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.	Yates
Hadley	McCormick	Sanders, Tex.	Young
Hardy, Colo.	McDuffie	Sandlin	
Hardy, Tex.	McKenzie	Scott, Mich.	
Haugen	McLaughlin, Mich.	Scott, Tenn.	

NAYS—2.

Huddleston	London

NOT VOTING—151.

Almon	Faust	Lee, N. Y.	Rucker
Anderson	Fitzgerald	Linthicum	Ryan
Ansorge	Focht	Little	Sabath
Arentz	Frear	Luce	Schall
Barkley	Freeman	Luhring	Sears
Beedy	Frothingham	McFadden	Shaw
Begg	Funk	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shelton
Blakeney	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Pa.	Slemp
Bland, Ind.	Gorman	McSwain	Smith, Mich.
Bond	Gould	Martin	Snell
Brand	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Steenerson
Britten	Green, Iowa	Michaelson	Stiness
Burke	Griffin	Montague	Stoll
Burton	Hammer	Mott	Sullivan
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison	O'Connor	Tague
Carew	Hawes	Ogden	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, N. Y.	Herrick	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler, Okla.	Himes	Osborne	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Hogan	Overstreet	Thomas
Classon	Humphrey, Nebr.	Park, Ga.	Thorpe
Codd	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker, N. Y.	Tillman
Cole, Ohio	Husted	Perkins	Tinkham
Connally, Tex.	Hutchinson	Perlman	Treadway
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Petersen	Tucker
Crowther	Jones, Tex.	Pringey	Vare
Cullen	Kahn	Purnell	Volk
Davis, Minn.	Keller	Rainey, Ala.	Wheeler
Dominick	Kennedy	Rainey, Ill.	White, Me.
Drane	Kindred	Ransley	Williams, Tex.
Driver	Kirkpatrick	Reber	Wilson
Dunbar	Kitchin	Reed, W. Va.	Winslow
Dunn	Kleczka	Riddick	Wise
Dupré	Knight	Riordan	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kunz	Roach	Woods, Va.
Echols	Langley	Robertson	Woodyard
Edmonds	Layton	Rodenberg	Wurzbach
Ellis	Lazaro	Rosenbloom	Zihlman
Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Rossdale	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Treadway with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Roach with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Purnell with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Faust with Mr. Overstreet.
Mr. Begg with Mr. Driver.
Mr. Vare with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.
Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Rucker.
Mr. Anderson with Mr. Wise.
Mr. Reed of West Virginia with Mr. Hawes.
Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stoll.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Riordan.
Mr. Snell with Mr. Kunz.
Mr. White of Maine with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.
Mr. Stiness with Mr. McSwain.
Mr. Olpp with Mr. Kindred.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Ten Eyck.
Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. Kitchin.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Jones of Texas.
Mr. Winslow with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Campbell of Kansas with Mr. Tague.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Brand.
Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.
Mr. Beedy with Mr. Woods of Virginia.
Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Connally of Texas.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Montague.
Mr. Keller with Mr. Dupré.
Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.
Mr. Shelton with Mr. Gallivan.
Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Hammer.
Mr. Bland of Indiana with Mr. Almon.
Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Lee of Georgia.
Mr. Dyer with Mr. Tucker.
Mr. Ransley with Mr. Cullen.
Mr. Gorman with Mr. O'Connor.
Mr. Crowther with Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi.
Miss Robertson with Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Shaw with Mr. Lazaro.
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tillman.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Barkley.
Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma with Mr. Linthicum.
Mr. Osborne with Mr. Williams of Texas.
Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Smith of Michigan with Mr. Sears.
Mr. Focht with Mr. Drane.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to proceed for a short time with a general statement relative to the bill, and later on I shall be very glad to yield to interruptions for information.

There are three factors that largely determine the amount of money to be carried in the bill. When those three factors are determined the sums carried are almost wholly a matter of mathematical calculation. The first is the number of ships to be kept in commission. The second is the number of men and officers, and the third is the amount carried for new construction.

As to the number of ships to be kept in commission during the coming year the list is almost identical with the list of ships presented to the Congress last year by the Committee on Appropriations, as required for a well-balanced 18-battleship fleet. Some 324 vessels have during the current year been kept in commission, constituting the so-called 18-battleship fleet. All other ships have been put out of commission. During the coming year the same fleet is to be kept in commission as was provided for last year. That being the case, the amount carried in the bill for repairs and for fuel and general upkeep of the ships is almost identically the same as that carried in the bill for the current year.

As to the personnel, the committee has provided in the bill for the present personnel, 86,000 men, and the officers that are in the Navy at the present time, plus those to be added from the Naval Academy in June. The committee, in deciding on the strength of the personnel, were moved by the fact that the question was thoroughly gone into only a few months ago by the Congress. Probably no question has been more completely canvassed than that was at the time the current bill was under consideration. The Committee on Appropriations recommended an enlisted force of 67,000 men, but the House, exercising its right in the matter, after full and complete consideration and debate, fixed the number at 86,000, and the Committee on Appropriations has accepted the judgment of the House as final until the House determines otherwise.

I think perhaps it may be a matter of some interest, however, to the House to know the disposition of the 19,000 men which the Congress allowed in addition to those recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Gentlemen will recall that the number recommended by the committee last year for the fleet was approximately 50,000 men and about 17,000 men for the shore activities. The contention was made that the number was insufficient, particularly for the fleet, and that a larger number should be supplied for the ships. On the 30th of September last the number of men carried upon the ships of the fleet, the 18-battleship fleet, about which there is no dispute, amounted to 52,538. The number suggested by the committee last April was 50,000. So that there are on the ships of the Navy at the present time out of the 19,000 extra men allowed only 2,538 men. It is only fair, however, to state in this connection that there are 3,889 men on ships that are being decommissioned, destroyers and other ships not any part of the battleship fleet; and on the 30th of September there were 1,700 men on transports being transferred from one ocean to the other. It is the intention, we are advised by the Navy Department, that those 5,589 men shall be added to the ships of the battleship fleet, and when added will make a total of approximately 58,000 men for the fleet and 28,000 men for the shore activities.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I note that on page 4 of the report there are listed among the number in excess of that which the committee was disposed to allow, 700 prisoners, 1,841 hospital patients, and several others. It does not seem to me that it is fair to charge this excess, and figure that these prisoners and hospital patients should all be chargeable to the excess.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman will possibly recall that we allowed nearly 10,000 men for the regular shore establishments in the report last year, and then an additional 7,000 men were allowed to cover those in hospitals, in prisons, in transit, and under training. The number in the hospitals, the number in training, the number of prisoners, and the number in transit were lumped together as amounting to about 7,000.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. But of course that was an estimate on the part of the gentleman, and apparently his estimate was wrong, at least in so far as the number in the hospitals and the number in the prisons is concerned. It has no relation whatever to the excess.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; I think we included the number actually in the hospitals and actually in prison.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. As I gather from the gentleman's report, he is seeking to justify the stand of the committee by charging up to this excess all of the men in the prisons, all of the men in the hospitals, all of the men in the recruiting service, and so on. It does not seem to me that that is quite fair.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have no desire to justify anything. I was simply furnishing the information as to the disposition of the additional men allowed.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I rather read from the report that it is in the nature of a justification.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think it is. I think the gentleman has stated the case very well, but that was not in the mind of the committee. As I say, there were some 10,000 men assigned to the particular stations, and then an estimate was made of the number who would be in prisons and hospitals and under training and in transit amounting to about 7,000 men.

We find, however, that this list of unavailables and unassigned men amounts to 23,754. This is a vast expense which brings no adequate returns to the Navy, and the committee believes it unnecessarily large.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. That is true; but there are some of these items that are properly chargeable to shore duty, it seems to me.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. And that would tend to justify the gentleman's position; but at the same time it would seem to me that items such as in transit and hospital patients have nothing whatever to do with it. There is no way of figuring in advance how many men may be taken out of the fleet to be placed on shore because of illness, or how many men may be taken out of the fleet to be put in prison.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; there is. The averages are pretty constant. The number of people who become sick out of a given number, whether in civil life or in the Navy, is very constant.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think that the increasing of the fleet had anything to do toward increasing the number of prisoners and the number in the hospitals more than the proportionate increase that would come from the increased number?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would not think so; no.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Why charge that up to the excess?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was just locating the 19,000 excess men for the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Can the gentleman tell us the number of men on the ships and the very large number on land, the number on land being practically the excess that was forced on the committee last year, and will the gentleman tell us something about what these land sailors are doing on land except to wear a uniform, draw their salaries, and consume their allowances?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, there are a good many of these matters that hinge on the policy which is being pursued. For example, take on page 4 of the report, you will find practically 7,000 men in the training schools, or were on the 30th of September, 1922. You can readily see that that number could be greatly increased or diminished, depending upon the length of the course given to the boys in the training school. For instance, if they are given one month's training, just long enough to be sure they would not communicate the mumps or the measles to the fleet, if you had 7,000 men in the training schools and graduate them every month you would have a supply of 84,000 men in the course of the year, whereas the net shrinkage of the Navy during the coming year is only 21,000 men. If you train them two months, 7,000 men, it would mean 42,000 men supplied to the Navy, and so on. So it is quite apparent that boys are being kept about four months on shore for training in order to require 7,000 men in training to fill 21,000 vacancies. If you graduate them three times a year, 7,000 at a time, that would be 21,000 men. Of course there are two schools of thought about that in the Navy. During the war the custom was to keep the boys in the training schools on shore only long enough to see that they did not come down with these communicable diseases, and then put them in the fleet where they could serve in the lesser positions, mixed in with a large number of trained men. But in time of peace, when the necessity for men is not great, the boys are given about four months training on shore.

That policy makes it necessary to keep in training a much larger body of men with a correspondingly increased cost. If the Navy Department adopted a policy of keeping boys in the training school a shorter length of time, say two months instead of four months, this number of 7,000 could be cut in two, or making a saving of 3,500 men on that one item.

Again, former experience indicated that there is a loss on account of training, sickness, prison, and so forth, of about 7 per cent of the enlisted force. This percentage has kept growing and growing until now there is 11 per cent shrinkage or loss. Eleven per cent of all the men in the Navy are unavailable for duty all the time, instead of 7 per cent, as was the case only a year or two ago. A close study of this situation, I am certain, would result in a great economy of men. So you go down through this list and other economies of men can readily be pointed out. The committee, however, did not present this table for the purpose of raising anew the controversy of last year, but simply to show the disposition of the 19,000 men which the Congress allowed in addition to those allotted by our committee. But 2,500 of these on September 30, 1922, had found their way onto the ships.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I note here in the analysis of the table of appropriations for the current year and for the next fiscal year there is an increase of a few hundred thousand dollars in the total amount. I imagine that might be largely increased by the personnel, is it not? I am asking that question for this reason: I will state to the gentleman we have been having some assurance that, on account of the operation of the reduction of our capital ships put into effect by the terms of the arms conference, it would result in a reduction of the total expenditure for our naval program, but there is not very much encouragement in the total increase here for the fiscal years 1923–24.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. As I stated at the beginning, if you had 86,000 men last year and 6,615 officers, and retained 86,000 men this year and 6,615 officers, and you keep in commission 324 vessels, the same vessels kept in commission last year, nearly all the elements of cost, of course, will be repeated. You can not reduce the bill unless manufacturing costs are reduced or unless provision prices decline below last year unless you reduce the size of the Naval Establishment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Does not the Navy in order to keep up the commissioned personnel have to have so many men; in other words, if the men are decreased the commissioned personnel decreases?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is not quite accurate, because the commissioned personnel is based upon the authorized strength and not upon the actual strength.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, in that connection, let me call the gentleman's attention to one practice that has continued in the department. Say the recruiting officer goes through the country and gets young men, young boys, of 15, 16, or 17 years of age to run away from home without the knowledge and consent of their parents; they enlist in the Navy, and the parents come along and send us affidavits showing that the boys were under 18 years of age and enlisted without their consent and knowledge. The department, instead of releasing those boys as the Army does, and sending them back home, intimates to the parents that their boy may be dishonorably discharged and prosecuted for making a false representation, and sometimes thus scares the parents into letting the boys serve on. Does not the gentleman think that the time has come for the Congress to indicate to the department that in cases of that kind the boys should be released and sent home?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman is quite right about that, and I was under the impression that that was the policy of the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course there are questions of discipline that must be taken into account in individual cases.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. While it is true that there has been an increase in the appropriation for this year over that of last year——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it is less this year.

Mr. TOWNER. Less this year?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The total, as I find here for 1923, is $294,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is the direct appropriation. The gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. TOWNER. Now, I was going to call attention to this: Notwithstanding that fact, there is a reduction in the Budget estimate of a few thousand dollars in the appropriation recommended for this year.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That comes about in this way: The Committee on Appropriations, of course, followed the Budget very carefully in the main, but where we were convinced that an error of judgment had been made, as I will point out directly, we increased the Budget recommendations.

Mr. TOWNER. I note that particularly in one instance—and I think the committee is deserving of credit—in the estimated appropriation for the completion of the 56 vessels which under the terms of the treaty we are to complete in order to make our quota what it ought to be under the agreement, the Budget estimate amounts to a total of $41,000,000, but the showing was made, as I understand it, before the committee that more money could be expended during this next year to advantage by increasing the appropriation, and with that in view the committee did increase the appropriation, as I understand it, $14,000,000. Is that correct? And, notwithstanding that increase in the estimate, the total which is reported in the bill is less than the Budget estimate by some thousands of dollars.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I merely wanted in a way to challenge the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I propose to answer it when I have an opportunity.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Let me go on. I think that is a question open to more or less controversy, and I fear I may be taking time I have promised to others.

Mr. ROGERS rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I can give many specific instances.

Mr. HICKS. And I can give many specific instances where the gentleman is in error.

Mr. BLANTON. Not as to boys from my district.

Mr. ROGERS. That is what I wanted to inquire about. But I do not want to open up the question.

Mr. SNYDER. The question is whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] agreed with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] in the statement that the recruiting officers did deliberately enlist boys under 16 years of age. The gentleman from Michigan did not intend to agree with it, I am sure, but the way he answered the question might indicate that in a measure he agreed with it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What I intended to say was that in cases where a young lad had been induced by prospects of travel and other attractions to misstate his age I have somewhat doubted the advisability of giving the boy under those circumstances a dishonorable discharge.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said a moment ago that there is no substantial reduction as yet by reason of the work of the disarmament conference.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am coming to that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is going to cover that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Now, as to new construction, I think the committee will be interested in knowing the situation as to the ships that are to be completed under the terms of the treaty. On the 1st of July, 1922, it was estimated that $131,000,000 would complete those ships—54 ships. When the officers were before the committee this time the estimates had grown to $150,000,000 from the same date, or an increase of $19,000,000, required to finish the ships that the treaty permits—$150,000,000 instead of $131,000,000—and they said that the increase had come about by reason of changes in the plans, by reason of increased cost due to the slowing down of construction, and by reason of the fact that the officers who made the first estimates had made them too low. But be that as it may, the amount remaining after the current year's appropriation is exhausted will be $88,500,000, based on the new figures, and this bill carries $55,000,000, which will leave to be appropriated hereafter $38,500,000 to finish the ships we are completing under the treaty.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman tell what officers they were who made the estimate of $131,000,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think Admiral Taylor made the estimate in July, 1922, and he is really one of the best officers in the Navy and is one of the best ship constructors in the world. Of course it is pretty difficult. These contracts are on the old cost-plus basis, I will say to my friend from Wisconsin, and they are not an economical kind of contract. It is very difficult for the department to regulate the cost under that sort of contract.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have always understood that Admiral Taylor, who, as everyone knows, is one of the most prominent and one of the most reliable and one of the most competent officers of the Navy, is the one who made that estimate of $131,000,000, which has now been increased to $150,000,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. When were these cost-plus contracts entered into?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, these ships were contracted for, some of them, prior to our entry into the war, or about the time of our entry into the war. Some of them are contracts of long standing.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me for a question? I dislike very much to take his time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman has reported a great deal of useful legislation to the House which will live for many years to come. I should like to ask the gentleman about this naval reserve. It seems to me it is costing the Government about $800 per year per man. The gentleman is very familiar with it, and it will be interesting and instructive to us to have it explained.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will my friend allow me to finish the discussion of the particular matter to which I am now referring, and then I will be glad to come to that later?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that of this $55,000,000 there is a direct appropriation of $20,000,000 from the Treasury, and the remaining $35,000,000 is a transfer of funds from what is known as the naval supply fund and the clothing and stores fund. It was possible to transfer this money from those funds because they are revolving funds, which, owing to the purchases made during the war to meet the needs of the Navy, have become abnormally large. As various bureaus since that time have drawn supplies they have paid for them out of their appropriations, so that there is an accumulation of cash at the present time in the naval supply fund amounting to $22,000,000, and there are in the fund also stores to the amount of $250,000,000 more. Of course, there is no need whatever for any of the cash in that fund, and there is no need of carrying such a large stock of stores. We took this method of reducing the revolving fund of the naval supply account by $30,000,000 during the coming year, and by the same reasoning reduced the clothing fund by $5,000,000, making $35,000,000, which will be transferred to the building fund in order that the overhead may stop and that the ships may be completed at a much earlier date.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. In years gone by it was called to the attention of the House that the Navy Department had funds available on hand which could be utilized for various purposes that had been appropriated 50 or 75 years back. I wish to inquire whether the committee has attempted to check the utilization of those funds, and how many funds of the character just instanced by the gentleman are now available?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We went into the matter of the available funds with a good deal of particularity. I have forgotten just the pages of the hearings on which that appears, but these two funds I am speaking of are revolving funds. There are two or three sources of supply open to the Navy where they simply draw. For instance, if appropriations were made last year or during the war for the purchase of certain supplies for a particular bureau and such supplies have been purchased and are on hand, the various bureaus can draw from such stock without using their current appropriation. Of course, it is like every other business. You could not from day to day go out and purchase what you need. You must have a stock on hand from which to draw and then you replenish the stock. Otherwise the Navy, designed for the defense of the country, might find itself in a position where it could not function if any emergency arose. But because of the war and because of the scrapping of ships, from which supplies have been put in storage, these stocks have grown enormously, and the various bureaus of the Navy Department have access to these stocks, goods which are not carried in this naval supply account at all. The bureaus simply draw what they need. Last year the Bureau of Engineering drew about $5,000,000 worth of material on hand for which it did not have to part with any of its appropriations. In a sense, of course, it augmented its appropriations to that extent. Now, those are about all the different methods I know of in which the Navy Department can supply itself with goods without paying for them out of current appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. The constitutional provision with which the gentleman is acquainted limits the availability of appropriations for armament, making them available for only two years. I assume that limitation does not apply to the Navy as such. Otherwise this case that I instanced where funds dating back nearly a century were still available for use of the Navy would not have been applicable for the purpose for which they were appropriated.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that I know of no such funds. Of course, the gentleman can see that there are in store goods which may have been carried for a great many years.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as the available supply is concerned; yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And the longer they have been carried, of course, the less valuable they are.

Mr. STAFFORD. As far as available supply is concerned, that is one thing. I am calling attention to appropriations that have not been expended and which are still available.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am referring to current working stock, goods that have been drawn perhaps out of the naval supply account but not used, or perhaps turned back. For instance, they might turn back guns, use them on a ship for a while and then take them off and turn them back into the general stores of the Navy. The same thing might be true with ammunition of all sorts.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was not directing my query to the case of supplies that had been purchased. I was directing my attention to the availability of appropriations passed many years ago, particularly during the war period.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not believe that the Navy has access to any cash that I have not mentioned.

Mr. BUTLER. Right there will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, these figures are very large, amounting to about $1,000,000,000 for the naval supply fund. Is it not a fact that a good deal of that is made up of material that is either obsolete or will be in a short time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; no doubt a good deal of it is obsolete, but the large sum which the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentions includes guns and all sorts of ordnance. We carry surplus guns for all the ships, so that if anything should happen to a gun we would have in store another gun to take its place; and if you inventory all of that stock. I think in ordnance alone it amounts to something like $400,000,000 or $500,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Four hundred and forty million dollars.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. But really that is a part of the Navy.

Mr. KNUTSON. That should be carried as a part of the armament and not as stock.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They have access to it.

Mr. BUTLER. The amount carried is what has been paid for by the Navy, on hand to be used if there is any demand for it, but in the meantime a great deal of it is bound to become obsolete.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman would not want the impression to go into the RECORD that the Navy is carrying a billion dollars' worth of surplus stock.

Mr. BUTLER. Whatever I have said I am perfectly willing to have go into the RECORD.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As a matter of fact, for much of this stock there is no general market value.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would not say that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We might sell it to other nations, but there is no market for it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What the gentleman says is true about the ordnance; but we have large quantities of salable merchandise on hand, and the Navy Department is selling it as fast as it can when the market is right for such goods, and the proceeds of those sales revert to the Treasury.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If we carry the ordnance at cost price it makes an unfair representation as to market value.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It would have to be understood that a great deal of the ordnance is simply reserved guns and reserved ammunition, which any sensible government would carry, so that if its ships were in an engagement and a gun was put out of action there would be another gun available to be put aboard. In addition to that there are a good many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of stores which are valuable and can be converted into cash.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want to ask the gentleman whether the dismantling and destruction of the vessels on account of the four-power pact will not result in a good many surplus accessories, and would not it be possible, for the benefit of the Government, to transfer them to other departments? I have in mind particularly the customs service throughout the country, which is largely handicapped by lack of equipment, small boats, and so forth, in order to carry on the service. I know of a great many boats of that character in storage, and this service is sorely in need of those boats, as well as other departments. Yet it has been impossible to acquire them on account of the red tape existing which prevents the transfer.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I doubt whether the Navy Department would have the authority to dispose of property in that way without being authorized to do so by Congress.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Have not transfers been made?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Only where there has been some provision of law authorizing them to do so. When the time comes for scrapping the old battleships I imagine that the Navy Department will have to have an enabling act from Congress brought in by the proper committee.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I want to bring the situation to the attention of the gentleman's committee that there are in various navy yards throughout the country boats of the character I have referred to which for many months have been surplus. Attempts have been made, but have proved absolutely futile, to get them for other departments, and I think it is a question that ought to be looked into.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact, and do not the hearings show, that the Navy Department has shown excellent business ability in disposing of the surplus stock?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; they have disposed of it to excellent advantage.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. As to the sale of the surplus guns, I believe we have a statute covering that, and the Navy Department can not sell those guns to foreign nations or to individuals who might use them for speculative purposes such as occurred a few years ago.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think that is true.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. When this bill was before the House those who opposed the increase in personnel of the Navy were under the impression that there was at least an implied intention to use these extra men in operating something like 100 smaller craft—destroyers—which we thought would be in violation of the treaty growing out of the disarmament conference. I would like to ask the gentleman what has been done.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Navy Department has not operated the 200 extra destroyers. We have about 300; 103 are in commission, and the balance are entirely out of commission. They are oiled and greased and are kept in first-class condition, but have not been operated and will not be the coming year.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to ask the gentleman if he will state before he concludes his remarks just what has been done in reference to scrapping these vessels provided for in the treaty.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Nothing at all, because the treaty has not been ratified.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I remember when the last naval bill was before the House the gentleman from Michigan made a speech, which to my mind was unanswerable, setting forth the fact that the Navy needed a number of thousand men less than was provided for in the bill. I understand that since then the Navy has acquired additional men, and I would like to ask how much the personnel of the ships in commission has been increased as the result of the increase in the personnel.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. About 2,500 men of the 10,000, on the 30th of September, had been added to the number allowed in the bill for the personnel of last year for the fleet, or in all 52,500.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Presumably all the rest of the thousands of men are on shore duty.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the four-power pact should be ratified, how much of the appropriation in this bill will be spent on any of the ships which we are to mutilate and destroy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I did not get that question.

Mr. BLANTON. If the four-power pact is ratified, we will destroy certain specified ships?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. BLANTON. And some are yet under construction?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Are we proceeding with the construction of those ships?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; the construction has been suspended on all ships not to be finished under the treaty.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, we are not spending any money at present on those ships?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. The gentleman referred to certain saleable stock possessed by the Navy. What stock is that?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It is a vast quantity of all sorts of things. For instance, I think they have a good many million dollars' worth of copper on hand, but the copper market is not

very good at the present time and the Navy Department does not think it is the right time to sell it. I merely use that as one illustration.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. With reference to the appropriation for the Bureau of Aeronautcis, being a lump sum of $6,290,000. Will the gentleman give me some information as to what amount of that is intended to be used for helium?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. FESS. Has the gentleman discussed whether we will realize anything out of the salvage of these vessels that are to be disposed of?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think that it will not cost the Government anything. Just how much we will get out of the old battleships and others to be destroyed I do not know.

Mr. BUTLER. Some information will be sent here in a few days which will perhaps give us some light.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The treaties have not been ratified, and legislation with reference to the destruction of these ships comes from another committee. I have never inquired about the matter.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, part of these stores on hand include about 1,700 Liberty motors manufactured for war purposes. We are constantly drawing on that surplus fund to equip our new airplanes, and by an expenditure of $3,500 for new improvements we are bringing those old-type motors up to standard type and are gradually using those motors from stock without purchasing new ones.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. I am interested in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS]. I understand that recently in the State of Florida airplanes equipped with Liberty motors which had never been unpacked were sold for from $400 to $600 each. Could we not have saved some money by taking those motors and not making such a large appropriation?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan will permit, I would say this to my friend from Florida, that much of the aviation material, for instance, stored at Pensacola, is obsolete at the present time.

Mr. SEARS. But this is not stored at Pensacola.

Mr. HICKS. I mention that only because we have it stored at Pensacola, Brooklyn, Norfolk, and it does not make any difference where it is stored, it becomes obsolete just the same.

Mr. SEARS. The point I am making is that this has never been unpacked, had been there about three years, and I did not believe it would become obsolete so soon.

Mr. HICKS. It becomes obsolete not merely because it loses its efficiency because of type but because of deterioration due to time. The glue in the fabric will become almost useless in two or three years, and all of the fabric has to be ripped off and renewed. There is a bug that gets in under the fabric and destroys it.

Mr. SEARS. These planes to which I refer had evidently been operated upon by some bug, because those who bought them from the Government at the price I have mentioned made very nearly $3,000 apiece after killing the bug.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] inquired about the Naval Reserve Force. The amount carried in the bill for the Naval Reserve Force is the same as the current year. The Navy Department and the Bureau of the Budget suggested a million dollars more, and the committee was heartily in accord with the policy of promoting the Naval Reserve, and yet we could not escape the conviction that it was not organized as thoroughly as it should be, and that there must be great waste of money in connection with it. This was particularly brought to our attention when we asked the officers in charge to give us the location of the various units of the Naval Reserve.

I think gentlemen will find that on page 151 of the hearings. That shows that the Naval Reserve is scattered all over the United States. Sometimes a unit is made up of five or six officers and one or two men. In many cases there are more officers than men. It seemed as though we ought not to increase the amount for the Naval Reserve until legislation had been adopted putting it on a different status. For that reason we left the appropriation as it is at the present time. It is an enormously expensive thing to have the Naval Reserve in such small units far back from the water, consisting of four or five officers and half a dozen men.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it the policy in the Navy to pay the reserve officers in the Navy any salary other than that which they would receive when attending school or maneuvers?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They have not been doing it, but they expect to put them into the pay class—I forget the number—on the 1st of January, so that the officers and men will get pay for the balance of this year upon the basis of one month.

Mr. McKENZIE. The gentleman understands, of course, that in the Army a reserve officer receives no compensation except when attending the reserve officers' school or while on duty.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think there was some discussion and dispute perhaps about the two services, and it all convinced me that the Naval Reserve had not been perfected to such an extent that we ought to add another million dollars to the appropriation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is interested particularly in this Naval Reserve, and is in sympathy with it, and he has had for some time, I think, an idea of connecting it up in some way with the merchant fleet, which would seem to be more effective, but in any event legislation is pending in his committee.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, it is my great regret that the gentleman from Michigan will not be here to assist some of us in providing for a better naval reserve.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, there will be plenty of good men left.

Mr. BUTLER. But none better fitted for the work than the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just a word about the last five or six lines in the bill, and then I desire to conclude. The committee put into the bill a request that the President enter into negotiations with the nations that were here in conference upon the limitation of armament, with a view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of types of ships of 10,000 tons and less. Of course, you all understand that the Conference on the Limitation of Armament did not go any further than to limit capital ship construction. That left the nations of the world free to go ahead and build without restriction or limitation ships of 10,000 tons or less.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Just a moment; let me finish this item and then I will be glad to yield. We put this request in the bill, actuated by the belief that unless it is done much of the splendid effort of what has heretofore been done will be nullified or at least actuated by the fear that much of the former effort would be nullified.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Just a minute. The last information that we had before the Conference on the Limitation of Armament as to the cost of completing the 1916 program, if no conference had intervened, was $353,000,000. Under the terms of the treaty we will finish ships whose cost will aggregate $150,000,000, so that we made a saving in cost of construction of $203,000,000 by discontinuing the program, less some $75,000,000 which it will cost to settle with the contractors. So we made a net saving in cost of construction by the treaty of $128,000,000.

Mr. HICKS. Has the gentleman figured the cost of the new airplane carriers taken from the old battle cruisers?

Mr. BRITTEN. What will the country gain by the saving of $120,000,000 if through that armament conference we slide back into second place, while England is modernizing all the old ships, placing heavy guns on them, deliberately taking advantage of the situation, which is going to be costly to us?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We save $128,000,000, and we probably have saved in the annual cost of the Navy, supposing all the ships when finished would be put and kept in commission, in addition to the fleet we now have, which is hardly likely, but if it were done we will save perhaps a couple of hundred million dollars a year. On the other hand, if when the new ships are completed we put out of commission or put in part commission the older ships the saving in annual cost would be largely reduced. Now, then, there was no limitation as to the ships that could be built below the line of the battleships, and I understand from what I have read in the papers and from official information that the Navy Department recommends the construction of sixteen 10,000-ton ships at a cost of $10,500,000 apiece, making a total of $168,000,000. That it recommends that the battleships that we retain under the treaty be remodeled at an estimated cost of somewhere about $30,000,000; that it recommends three mine-laying submarines at a cost of $4,000,000 apiece be constructed, or $12,000,000 in all for mine-laying submarines. That three scout submarines be built at a cost of $4,000,000 apiece, making $12,000,000 more.

That an additional airplane carrier be constructed at a cost of $22,000,000; that six gunboats be constructed at a cost of $8,100,000; and that additional aircraft be constructed at a cost of $19,000,000 more, making a projected program of $331,000,000 as against a saving of $128,000,000, which we make by discontinuing the 1916 program.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think that they had better meet again?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. So the committee was strongly impressed with the necessity of a limitation being placed upon the construction of the smaller ships by international agreement, if the fruits of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament were not to turn to ashes on our lips.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will yield.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I know that the gentleman was very successful last year in placing legislation of this kind on an appropriation bill when he attached the so-called Borah amendment to the naval bill——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is wrong about that; that was a Senate amendment.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Well, it was adopted by this House through the instrumentality of the gentleman's efforts which he put forward in that direction requesting the President of the United States to do something that he had been in the process of doing for four or five months; in other words, stealing his thunder. That is a matter of history. It was adopted and the conference was held.

I want to say the gentleman is again requesting the President of the United States to do something which we and everyone knows that he has been engaged in doing for several months past. Would it not be much better verbiage to approve that which the President of the United States is now doing rather than to request him to do something that he has been doing for several months past. I do not like the verbiage of that portion of the bill. I think that it carries with it a false implication to the country and to the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am not interested at all in any particular language. I only hope the gentleman agrees with me in the idea.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do agree with the gentleman in the idea.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Then all is well.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. The disarmament treaty has not been ratified by any other nation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, yes; it has been ratified by Great Britain and Japan.

Mr. LONDON. And they are carrying out the terms of the treaty?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Under the terms of the treaty, it does not become effective until the exchange of ratifications. That can not take place until France and Italy join.

Mr. LONDON. In other words, the acceptance by Great Britain and Japan is conditional upon the acceptance by France and Italy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Just what the United States, Great Britain, and Japan would do in the event that France and Italy should finally refuse to ratify the treaty I can not say.

Mr. LONDON. Have Great Britain and Japan carried out the reduction of the program?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They have not. I do not think any nation has undertaken to destroy any of its ships, although possibly Great Britain has scrapped some of its old ships which she had already begun to scrap before the conference.

Mr. LONDON. In other words, there have been no results thus far?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No ships have actually been destroyed, but in many cases construction has been suspended.

Mr. BLANTON. In view of what the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] says, I think the gentleman should incorporate in the provision a congratulation to the President for having stopped bootlegging in the United States.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. In reference to the question propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], have we not accomplished by this agreement just this: We have traded the 16-inch gun off for two 8-inch guns?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; and we have lost the opportunity to become the first naval power on earth. We shall probably be the second or the third.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not agree to that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the hopes entertained by the whole world are to be realized and permanent benefits are to follow the work of the peace conference, this hole will have to be stopped through which 10,000-ton ships can be constructed by any nation without any limitation. Otherwise competition in building of armament will not be suspended but merely directed into a new channel. It is to prevent this that the committee has asked the President to take the action indicated.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman from Michigan, in response to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], said that so far as he knew none of the nations were carrying out the terms of the naval treaty. As I understand it——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is as to scrapping.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; as to scrapping. But as to new construction and continuing construction of those ships prohibited by the treaty, that has ceased, has it not?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, of course no nation is constructing ships that the treaty forbids.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Then that has been accomplished?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. But the information that comes to the Committee on Appropriations relative to the proposed construction of other ships not forbidden by the treaty is sufficient to give an ordinary citizen the nightmare.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to make a statement of 30 seconds right there in his time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The information desired by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NEWTON] is likely to be furnished to this House by next Monday. Last Friday the House agreed to a resolution making inquiry of the Navy Department, or of the Secretary of the Navy, as to how much scrapping has been done by the United States and each other nation since the conference. Cablegrams have been sent abroad which will obtain the information, I hope, before the gentleman reaches the end of the bill, so that he will be able to answer the question in the House.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Referring to the provision at the end of the bill, in order to make that provision effective would not all the nations have to be in accord with it, and would not legislative action be required on it?

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that question repeated.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to know whether, in order to make effective the limitations in this paragraph, it would not be required that all the nations mentioned cooperate, and if they cooperated, would it not require legislative action? Such being the case, how long would the gentleman think it would take before we could act upon the suggestion contained in the paragraph?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How long it would take to reach such an agreement, of course, can not be forecast by anyone.

Mr. WATSON. But before we acted we would have to have the action of the other countries?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. The United States will not proceed to scrap its ships or take any action reducing our naval strength until we have received assurance that the other nations are ready to do the same thing. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] stated that if he should give to the committee all of the information that the Committee on Appropriations had received as to the status of naval construction the world over it might give some the nightmare. I do not wish to give the nightmare to any one, but in the time that I shall consume it is my purpose to give some information which I have received that causes me to believe not only in the wisdom of the appropriation that is carried in this bill but also in the wisdom of the last paragraph, which has just been discussed by the gentleman from Michigan.

Before doing it, however, I wish to refer to one question which was asked of the gentleman from Michigan, with regard to the changed estimate of the department as to the cost of the construction authorized under "Increase of the Navy." The increase in the estimate of $19,000,000 more than the estimate of last May is due to many causes. After the estimate of last May was submitted, certain construction was authorized upon the *Maryland;* after the estimate of last May improvements were determined upon, increasing the cost; $6,000,000 of the

increased estimate was for payment of obligations due in the settlement of past contracts. Fire control is to be installed. And then the increased costs due to overhead which have occurred by reason of the suspension of activities. There has been a revision of the estimates of the contractors, most of the contracts being on the cost-plus basis. Consequently the officials who come before us now have to present this revised estimate.

Now, I want to call attention to the cost of the Navy, because it bears directly upon the request for another conference on the limitation of armaments. This morning I read in the Washington Post that the House Committee on Appropriations had reported its $290,000,000 naval bill. There is no reason why the Congress and the country should not know the facts. The facts are that instead of it being a $290,000,000 naval bill it is a $325,000,000 naval bill. Gentlemen of the committee know, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] very frankly stated in his report, that the Budget Bureau in submitting its estimates followed the unfortunate policy of asking for indirect appropriations, and indirect appropriations amounting to $35,450,000 are carried in the bill. That $35,000,000 comes out of the Treasury. It is not segregated in a separate vault somewhere in the city of Washington. It comes out of the Treasury and is just as much an appropriation as the $290,000,000. So that the appropriation for the next fiscal year is $325,000,000 as against $343,000,000, which was made available last year. I say I favor it, notwithstanding the fact that it is so enormous, because conditions existing among the naval powers demand that we maintain our fleet, and I am unable to see how it can be done for less.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman explain to some Members here, who, like myself, may be unaware, the significance of indirect appropriations?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I thought the gentleman from New York was familiar with it.

Mr. COCKRAN. Some others here may not be.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. A provision is carried in this bill making available for the expenditure of the department, in addition to the direct cash appropriations, an amount of $30,000,000 now credited to the Navy, in what is known as the naval supply account, and $5,000,000 in the clothing account, making a total of $35,000,000. That $5,000,000 in the clothing account has accumulated by the sale of clothing to the enlisted men. It is to the credit of this clothing account. It ought to be covered into the Treasury, but instead of being covered into the Treasury it is made available here for ship construction by the simple provision that this $5,000,000 in the Treasury to the credit of the clothing account shall be used for the increase of the Navy. Such appropriations make it possible for the Budget Bureau to claim a reduction in appropriations, but the money comes out of the Treasury and finally out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

This $35,450,000 ought to be covered into the Treasury, and the provision for the increase of the Navy ought to carry a specific appropriation for the amount needed. I must say, in justice to the officials of the Navy Department, that they have no objection to the bill carrying on its face the amount that is actually appropriated. On the contrary they ask that the naval appropriation bill shall carry direct appropriations for the Navy so that the people of the country may know the cost of maintaining the Navy. I hope some day that will be done.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the gentleman included all of the indirect appropriations? The $35,000,000 is the one that goes for new construction, and of course that added to the total in the bill makes $328,000,000. In addition to that there is approximately $450,000 authorized to be used by the Ordnance Bureau. In addition to that the Bureau of Steam Engineering estimated that they would use $5,000,000, perhaps, from their reserve supply, and authority is also vested in the Ordnance Bureau to use an additional sum from their reserve supply.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is correct. The bureaus have available material of which they can use a considerable amount without reducing their current funds. For the information of the House I am going to put into the RECORD a complete statement showing the amount of appropriations, direct, indirect, and of all characters that are made available by this bill. That statement is as follows:

	Appropriated, 1923.	Estimated, 1924.	Proposed, 1924.	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with 1923 appropriation.	Increase (+), decrease (−), bill compared with Budget estimates.
Navy Department, direct appropriations	$3,499,400.00	$3,666,530.00	$3,585,730.00	+$86,326.00	−$80,804.00
Naval Service:					
Direct appropriations	290,857,073.25	291,137,445.00	290,221,612.00	−635,461.25	−915,833.00
Indirect appropriations—					
Cash	[1] 8,000,000.00	18,150,000.00	35,450,000.00	+27,450,000.00	+17,300,000.00
Stores		5,000,000.00			−5,000,000.00
Total, indirect, cash and stores	298,857,073.25	314,287,445.00	325,671,612.00	+26,814,538.75	+11,384,167.00
Less stores		5,000,000.00			
Total cash, direct and indirect	298,857,073.25	309,287,445.00	325,671,612.00	+26,814,538.75	+16,384,167.00
Unexpended balances carried forward	45,000,000.00		[2]	−45,000,000.00	
Total cash available	343,857,073.25	309,287,445.00	325,671,612.00	−18,185,461.25	+16,384,167.00

[1] Department estimates that not more than $5,000,000 will be realized.

[2] Negligible.

Principal reductions, bill compared with 1923 appropriations:

Engineering	$855,000
Construction and repair of vessels	215,000
Pay of the Navy	298,534
Provisions, Navy	3,075,355
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	189,260
Freight	750,000
Medical Department	640,000
Maintenance, Yards and Docks	150,000
Public works	1,151,000
Marine Corps	650,800
Scrapping	5,000,000
Total	12,474,949

Explanation of increase of bill over estimates:

Indirect cash, bill	35,450,000
Indirect cash, Budget	18,150,000
Increase	17,300,000
Net reduction in direct appropriations proposed in bill	915,833
Total of increase	16,384,167

I want to devote the rest of my time to discussing the necessity for the last paragraph of the bill. I did not know what my friend from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] tells us, that the President is now at work upon some plan for the calling of another conference for the limitation of armament. I assume that the gentleman has that information from the President. I would be delighted to know that it is true. I must say that I would value the information more, and that I would feel more confident about it if only I could have the gentleman state that he did receive it from the President. But I do not see the gentleman from California on the floor. So far as I am concerned it is my earnest hope that he is correct. I say this because I approach this question without any partisanship. I know that no man was more interested in the success of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments than I was. The conference met and it was our earnest hope that as a result of it there would be an end to naval competition. We did not believe that it would prevent war. We knew that men fought long before the battleship was invented; but we hoped that it would eliminate the competition in naval construction which was exhausting the taxpayers of the nations of the world. We believed, too, that in eliminating this naval rivalry we would lessen the causes of war.

There is no doubt that great good resulted from that conference. Why, if it had accomplished nothing more than bringing around the table the representatives of the various nations

and demonstrating that they could meet in a helpful spirit of cooperation to lessen naval competition, it would have accomplished unbounded good. But we need not deceive ourselves. Some people in America believed the adoption and ratification of the treaty would for all time end naval competition. They believe it to-day. Therefore it behooves us to let the people know exactly what the status of naval competition is. The duty rests upon us to provide for the common defense. In order to do that intelligently we must inquire as to the existing conditions, and when we make this inquiry we are forced to the conclusion that it is absolutely essential that there be another conference for the further restriction of naval armament.

It must first be understood that the United States made a greater sacrifice than any other nation in agreeing to the treaty for the limitation of armament. Why, we sacrificed by that treaty the completion of 13 capital ships then under construction. Work upon these ships is now suspended and it is costing us something every day that work is suspended. If they are finally scrapped, it will cost us $75,000,000 to pay claims growing out of the cancellation of contracts. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] says, undoubtedly those 13 capital ships, if they had been completed, would have given to the United States the overwhelming naval strength of the world. The agreement required of Great Britain the scrapping of only two capital ships, which had progressed only to the blue-print stage, and it required the scrapping by Great Britain of 22 old battleships, many of which were obsolete. In addition to the 13 under construction, which we have to scrap, we must scrap 17 older ships, some of which were obsolete. Notwithstanding this sacrifice our people gladly welcomed it because we believed it would put an end to naval competition. The treaty has not been ratified by France or by Italy. My information is that there is some doubt about its ratification by France and that it is certain that, if it is not ratified by France, Italy will not ratify, and that Italy awaits action by France.

It is difficult for me to believe that France will not ratify the treaty. I must assume for the purpose of my statement that France is going to ratify the treaty, but assuming that she does and Italy follows and the treaty goes into effect, then let us see what is the result. I have been forced to the conclusion as the result of investigation that the treaty will effect no material reduction in naval expenditure; that it means only a change in the character of naval competition and to the disadvantage of the United States of America. To all intents and purposes the treaty is in operation in Great Britain, Japan, and the United States—that is, the construction prohibited by the treaty is now suspended. And yet the budget of Great Britain for the present year for the Royal Navy is $338,000,000 at the prevailing rate of exchange. This bill makes available $325,000,000. There can be no greater evidence of the fact that it has not resulted and will not result in any material decrease of naval expenditures unless there is further restriction on the modernization of ships now permitted by the treaty and a limitation upon the construction of all ships as originally proposed by the United States.

Let me call attention to this fact bearing on the question of expense, that when we consider the $338,000,000 to be expended by Great Britain this year and $325,000,000 authorized in this bill, it must be borne in mind that our naval bill for 1915 carried only $145,503,965.48.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. CHALMERS. Will the gentleman give us some figures of what England's appropriation amounted to in that year?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I wish I had it, but I only looked up these figures as to the United States a few minutes ago.

Now, as I say, the treaty has changed the character of the competition. Let me call attention to the fact that under the terms of the treaty few restrictions are placed on modernizing the older ships.

Provided it does not exceed 3,000 tons, additional protection can be provided against air attack and also protection against submarine attack. Ships can be equipped with fire control, a very expensive equipment, and if desired they can be converted into oil burners. Other modern equipment which will tend to make the older ships retained under the treaty more effective naval weapons is permissible. As a result we find Great Britain spending from one to four million dollars on the older ships she has retained. It is manifest to any man here that if we are allowed to keep 18 capital ships and Great Britain is allowed to keep 20, and while we spend nothing upon our 18 ships, Great Britain spends from one to four million dollars to modernize her older ships, she immediately secures an immense advantage. The equality contemplated by the ratio of 5–5–3 is immediately destroyed. That is exactly what is taking place to-day.

Let us compare the strength of our Navy in each of the various types going to make up an all-around fleet with similar types of Great Britain and Japan. First comes the capital ships. For the next 10 years or until the completion of the two new Hoods now authorized for construction by Great Britain, and which will be laid down this month, the United States will have 18 capital ships with a total of 500,000 tons. Great Britain will have 22 capital ships with a tonnage of 580,450 tons, and Japan will have 10 capital ships with a total tonnage of 301,320 tons. Tonnage figures, however, do not tell the whole story. At the present time the United States has three vessels capable of shooting at ranges of 25,000 yards or above, whereas Great Britain has 16 vessels. The number of United States turret guns over 12 inches in caliber is 148; the number of British turret guns over 12 inches in caliber is 188; weight of United States turret broadside, 262,500 pounds, and weight of British turret broadside, 315,200 pounds.

Great Britain has 9 vessels capable of steaming 25 knots and greater, and Japan has 4 vessels capable of doing the same. The United States has none. Of the vessels capable of steaming 23 knots or better Great Britain has at present 14 and with the completion of the two new vessels, the Hoods, will have 16. Japan has 10, and the United States has none. The question naturally suggests itself as to why we have in our Navy no vessels of this speed, and the answer is that the naval experts do not agree as to the importance of this speed. Our Navy has stuck to the idea of a fleet with a speed of 21 knots. The speed of the fleet is fixed by the slowest ship in the fleet, and apparently they have not attached such great importance to the speed of the battleships. That is the view of the experts. I am submitting the facts.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. In making his comparisons did the gentleman take into consideration the two ships, the *West Virginia* and the *Washington*?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I am speaking only of those to-day in commission.

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman has referred to what England would have when ships of the Hood type were completed, and it seems to me if he is going to refer to them he ought to refer to these others.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But I specifically said that Great Britain had at the present time 14, and that when the two were completed there would be 16. I did not include them without calling attention to them.

Mr. MONDELL. Can any comparison be made that is accurate that does not include the two very large and fine ships that we have almost completed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, I think so. I can eliminate the two Hoods and compare only those in commission, the figures being 14 to none for us. I do not refer to the *West Virginia* and *Colorado* because I do not know what speed they will have. But I would say to my friend that I am satisfied those ships will not have that speed. It will be nearer 21 knots. It does not necessarily involve criticism, because our naval experts do not believe that the speed of the ships to which I have referred in other navies is essential. The contention of our experts is that a 21-knot fleet is a superior fleet.

Mr. MONDELL. I thought the gentleman was emphasizing speed and disparaging our Navy.

I simply called attention to the fact, saying at the time that there was a difference of opinion on the part of the naval experts, and so far as I am concerned I have enough confidence in the wisdom of the experts of our Navy to believe a 21-knot fleet is all that we need. But I am calling attention to the facts, so that the House may know the exact situation. First, I call attention to the four battle cruisers that Great Britain has and the four that Japan has under the terms of the treaty, while we have none.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to make an observation in that connection?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure that the gentleman does not intend to state that all of the American naval experts are in agreement that speed amounts to but little.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. OLIVER. The fact is, I would say that the majority of the naval experts are strongly in favor of speed, and recognize that it is a most important element.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will only say this, that the fact is, whatever opinion the majority may have entertained, that the experts who have governed the policy have not constructed battleships of greater speed than I have called attention to. If they are in the minority, they are an influential minority, because we have not got battleships of greater speed, and they continue to assert to-day that they believe in the 21-knot fleet. That is the explanation they give to me for not saving ships of greater speed. Of course, I am speaking of battleships.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That must have been the position taken by our experts in the recent conference; otherwise the results would not have been reached that were reached by that conference.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And otherwise the result would not have been reached that has been reached in our Navy. I intended, however, to refer especially to the cruisers.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point in corroboration of his position? The *West Virginia* just now under construction, I suppose the last word so far as our naval experts are concerned, has a speed of 21 knots and a fraction.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I was not certain of it and did not make the statement.

Mr. OLIVER. There are, however, two battleships that will be scrapped under the treaty with a tonnage of 43,000 each, and each of them would have had a speed of 23 knots, showing that 21 knots is not the last word in naval construction from an American standpoint.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If they scrapped the 23-knot ship and kept the 21-knot, the experts must have thought the 21-knot was more desirable.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The *West Virginia* is given as a 21-knot ship, and that is the last ship under construction.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If our naval experts agreed to scrap the 23-knot ship and keep the 21-knot ship, that is sufficient to convince most of us that they believe in the 21-knot ship. But I want to talk about the cruisers, because that is what first started me on this investigation. Every layman like myself knows that the cruiser occupies a very important place in the fleet. I can well imagine from what occurred during the World War that five days after we became engaged in any conflict fast cruisers could operate to our great injury upon our commerce on the seas. And if we have no vessels—and we have none—of sufficient speed to operate against enemy cruisers engaged on such duty, it is a serious deficiency in our naval strength.

Against such cruisers we have only our destroyers and we are in a very inferior position, because the destroyers, while they have the speed, have not sufficient offensive and defensive power to attack the cruisers. One of our destroyers meeting the modern light cruiser of Japan or Great Britain would simply retreat. Her only hope of attacking a cruiser would be to attack by night, by stealth. I am told that we have not a single cruiser of a later date than 1908 in commission. We have been building since 1916 ten light cruisers, each of 7,500 tons displacement, and they are armed with 6-inch guns, capable of cruising at a speed of 33 knots. The appropriations carried by this bill make it possible to complete most of these ships within the next year. It will advance by some months the time within which they will all be completed. Great Britain to-day has four cruisers of 8,000 or more tons, capable of 27 knots. The total tonnage of her four cruisers is 56,700 tons, and two of them, known as the *Courageous* and the *Glorious*, are armed with four 15-inch guns. We have nothing to offset these cruisers.

Of the capital ships, Great Britain has four battle cruisers, Japan has four battle cruisers, and the United States has none. In case of conflict with either of these two nations these cruisers could, for at least a few days, do untold injury to our commerce, and our Navy has no vessels of sufficient speed to operate against an enemy battle cruiser force engaged in such duty, except the destroyers which have not sufficient offensive and defensive power to attack a battle cruiser, except by a stealthy night attack.

But it is in cruisers that we are particularly deficient. We have not now in our Navy a single cruiser of later date than 1908. We have been building since 1916 ten light cruisers each of 7,500 tons displacement, armed with 6-inch guns and capable of cruising at a speed of 33 knots. The appropriations carried by this bill will make it possible to complete most of these ships within the next year. Great Britain has four cruisers of 8,000 tons or more, capable of 27 knots, or better. The total tonnage of these vessels is 56,700 tons, and two of them, the *Courageous* and the *Glorious*, are armed with four 15-inch guns. We have nothing to match these cruisers.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman from Florida kindly excuse me? I must decline.

In light cruisers of 3,000 to 8,000 tons, all of 27 knots or more, Great Britain has 40, for a total tonnage of 161,690, and Japan has 10, with a total tonnage of 51,100 tons. In ships building and projected Great Britain has 2, totaling 15,100 tons, and Japan has 11, totaling 66,520 tons. Of larger cruisers Great Britain has building and projected two, totaling 19,500 tons, and Japan four, of 40,000 tons total, all of which will make 27 knots or more, and armed with 8-inch guns. Practically every ship enumerated here for Great Britain and Japan is one authorized since 1913, and therefore incorporate the features of construction learned from war experience.

In cruisers, therefore, of 3,000 tons and upward, of modern type, it will be seen that built, building, and authorized the United States has 10, of a total tonnage of 75,000 tons; Japan has 25, of a total tonnage of 157,730 tons; and Great Britain 48, of a total tonnage of 252,990 tons.

Naval experts insist that we can not have a well-rounded fleet as long as we are deficient in this class of vessels. They describe the functions of the light cruiser as—

(1) The service of information, scouting; in other words, searching for the enemy fleet and finding out what he is doing.

(2) Screening; that is, guarding our fleet against surprise and keeping off the enemy scouts.

(3) In battle supporting our destroyers in their torpedo attacks against enemy battleships and beating off the enemy destroyers attempting to torpedo our battleships.

(4) Operating against enemy shipping and protection of our own shipping against enemy raiders.

When the fleet is cruising they are flung well in advance of the main body to locate the enemy and prevent enemy scouts from locating our main fleet. A scout to get its information must be prepared to fight for it; it must be expected that enemy scouts will be in position to prevent our scouts from breaking through their lines and obtaining information regarding enemy fleet. It will be readily seen, therefore, that only a scout of equal or greater power will be able to fight its way successfully through a line composed of enemy scouts.

These are the functions of the cruiser. I entertained the opinion that this function could be exercised by our destroyers, in which class of vessels we have such superiority over other powers. But I am told and am convinced that the destroyer can not adequately perform the functions of the cruiser. The destroyer scout upon meeting the enemy scouting line, composed of light cruisers, can not engage them, but must fall back upon supporting vessels or be sunk. Naval authorities insist that a scout must be prepared to fight for its information. The destroyer can not match the cruiser in fighting strength, and must therefore return without information. The destroyer lacks the cruising radius, the seagoing qualities, the offensive power, and the long-range radio facilities, in the opinion of our naval experts. They have the speed, but only in smooth water. The cruising radius is limited by the smallness of the vessel.

In view of this situation as to cruisers the question arises why our Navy has neglected to build cruisers and constructed so many destroyers. The explanation is that the destroyers were constructed during the war. Then all of our efforts were devoted to the one object of destroying the submarine and making possible the transportation of men and supplies to Europe. We can recall the time when the world believed the outcome was dependent upon the success of the allied nations in transporting supplies to Great Britain to enable them to hold out until our armies could be placed upon the battle fields. Because the destroyer was the most effective weapon against the submarine all of our energies were devoted to building destroyers. Great Britain concentrated upon the building of cruisers more than destroyers.

Our small destroyer has a cruising radius of 3,000 to 4,000 miles. Assuming that in case of offensive operations against Japan, our scouting force should leave Honolulu and steam to the vicinity of Japan, a distance in a direct line of approximately 3,400 miles. It can readily be seen that with a cruising radius of only 4,000 miles they are unsuited. The same is true in case of operations against Great Britain; they would have to cross the Atlantic and would have no means of replenishing their fuel supply.

No one likes to assume that it is possible to conduct operations against either of these powers with whom we are now on friendly terms, but we are also on friendly terms with all other nations, and if we are not to assume such operations there

really is little excuse for maintaining a fleet at all. Japan and Great Britain are not maintaining navies because of the naval strength of Brazil or Chile.

Let us see what Japan is doing. Recently the press carried Baron Kato's announcement as to their cruiser program. It created the impression that he was making a great reduction in the proposed building program. But the facts are different. Japan discontinued construction of 9 cruisers of a total of 59,500 tons, and substituted for them 8 cruisers totaling 70,000 tons. For 22 first-class destroyers totaling 30,800 tons, she substituted 24 destroyers totaling 13,500 tons. She discontinued the building of 46 submarines of 40,300 tons total, and substituted 22 totaling 28,165 tons, averaging over 1,200 tons each, with several over 1,500 tons, and some over 2,000 tons. The size of the light cruisers of 5,500 tons was increased to 7,500, and those of 8,000 tons were increased to 10,000 tons. Therefore, while Japan's post-treaty program announcement shows a slight decrease of tonnage, or 12,335 tons, from a total of 144,100 tons, there is a very marked increase in the total military value of these ships. In other words, Japan properly has taken her cue from the naval treaty.

She is violating no part of it, but she is so modifying her program as to build up the maximum fleet strength permissible within the limits established by the treaty. It is significant, too, that she is modifying her vessels so as to give them greater radius of action, better sea-keeping qualities, and greater offensive power. She is changing from small vessels specially adapted to home defense to vessels capable of carrying on an offensive operation at great distances. Manifestly, these changes are not made to provide for defensive or offensive operations against China; she can have in view only the two other great naval powers—Great Britain and the United States. I have no criticism to make of her plan to have the most efficient navy within the terms of the treaty. The treaty limited the size of cruisers to a tonnage of 10,000 and to a maximum armament of 8-inch guns. Several of the ships of her new program will be up to this allowed limit.

Great Britain already has several light cruisers practically at this limit and is building others, as shown above.

The nearest approach of the United States to these programs is the 10 cruisers authorized in 1916, which will have a tonnage of 7,500 and carry a 6-inch battery. It takes several years from the date of authorization by Congress before a vessel of this type is commissioned, and therefore our inferiority in cruisers will continue for some years.

I have said that heretofore I had looked upon our destroyer force as offsetting in great measure the superiority of the other powers in cruisers. In destroyers alone are we superior in strength. We have 281 destroyers, totaling 330,917 tons. Great Britain has 185 destroyers, totaling 210,000 tons; and Japan has 53 destroyers, totaling 54,985 tons. In addition to destroyers, Great Britain has 16 flotilla leaders, of 27,810 tons. In destroyers, building or projected, Great Britain has 5 of 6,525 tons total, and 2 flotilla leaders totaling 3,500 tons. Japan has 39 destroyers, totaling 49,975 tons. Totaling these, therefore, we find 333,917 tons for the United States, 247,546 for Great Britain, and 104,960 tons for Japan.

Prior to the war it was accepted that for every battleship six destroyers were necessary for the proper organization of the fleet. During the war it was discovered that they were the only means by which submarines could be combatted successfully; and with this new use, to which they are peculiarly adapted, naval experts hold that the number can no longer be regulated by the number serving with the capital ships of the fleet. For years destroyers must serve our Navy in performing the duties performed by light cruisers in the other navies. Their effectiveness, however, can be best judged from the statement that a 32-pound shell is thrown by their guns, as against the 105-pound shell and the 250-pound shell thrown by the light cruiser guns of 6-inch and 8-inch caliber.

The flotilla leader to which I have made reference is an enlarged size destroyer more nearly meeting the requirements for the scout than the destroyer can with its small tonnage. Such a vessel is made the leader and administrative flagship of a flotilla of 18 or more destroyers, and should prove of great value to the destroyer force. This type of destroyer has been developed by Great Britain in recent years.

In submarines the United States has 59, with a total tonnage of 37,142 tons; Great Britain has 36, totaling 29,157 tons; and Japan has 28, totaling 23,374 tons. Building or projected, the United States has 35 of 29,553 tons total; Great Britain 6 with a total tonnage of 5,500 tons, and Japan 21 with a total tonnage of 18,340 tons. The totals in fleet submarines are not included in this statement. They are as follows: Built, building, or authorized, the United States has 6 of a total tonnage of 9,698 tons; Great Britain 8, totaling 15,180 tons; and Japan has 25, totaling 32,665 tons.

While the United States has considerable tonnage in submarines, we are deficient in certain types. Our submarines were authorized and laid down during the war. In the main they embody pre-war designs, but have been modernized so far as hull construction would permit.

They are necessarily restricted in great measure to defense because they have comparatively low surface speed and comparatively low cruising radius. In time of war the submarine with sufficient radius of action can be of great value. As a scout it is the one which does not have to fight for its information. At present we have no submarine of sufficient cruising radius to reach an enemy port from her nearest base, stay on patrol there the necessary time and get back to its base. Such vessels are needed also as the war has shown for mine-laying. They should be able to reach the enemy coast, drop mines at the entrance to ports and then have sufficient fuel to return to their own base.

In the announced program of Baron Kato it was stated that Japan would discontinue the projected building of small submarines of 800 or 900 tons and substitute for them those ranging from 1,000 to 2,000 tons which will have the necessary cruising radius for any campaign in the Pacific.

From this statement as to the status of the three navies in ships built, building, and projected, it is evident that the treaty has not succeeded in stopping naval construction. In battleships, while new construction is limited, Great Britain is spending millions in modernization of old ships to be retained, making them up-to-date fighting ships. In airplane carriers the limitation will not be effective for some years. In cruisers we find the United States a poor third, and the other two nations carrying on building programs which will each year make us slightly more inferior. In destroyers we maintain our superiority but Great Britain is building larger destroyers, of which we have none and none projected. In submarines we have not made the progress we should in developing new types, and both the other great naval powers are spending considerable money in construction of the most modern types.

As I stated at the outset, there is but one conclusion that I can reach, namely, that another conference should be held. Therefore I am in hearty accord with the provision of the bill respectfully requesting the President to invite the Governments of Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy to such a conference. A year has passed. We have all had opportunity to ascertain the effect of a treaty so limited in its scope, and I have no doubt that the taxpayers of other nations, who see as we do that no material reduction in expenditures has resulted, will be just as anxious as we are to consider a proposal to reach an agreement along the lines first proposed by the Government of the United States.

You can not limit naval power by an agreement as to naval expenditures because of the varying purchasing power of the currency of the different nations. Nor could you base an agreement solely upon men, because it would not be sufficiently comprehensive; it would not lessen naval construction with its burdens. Nor could you arrive at any fair agreement as to men because of the varying policies of the nations, some using civilians to perform duties ordinarily performed by the enlisted men. But we can limit the modernization of the ships retained under the present treaty and the construction of ships not now included in the treaty.

The responsibility rests upon us to provide for the common defense. The Navy is our first line of defense, and the people of the United States rely upon our maintaining an adequate Navy for the protection of the country. We hear much of the 5-5-3 ratio. No two men agree as to what it means. Hardly any two naval officers agree. I do not see how anyone can read into the 5-5-3 agreement anything more than an agreement as to the ratio to be maintained in capital ships and aircraft. But though not in the treaty, the people of America have believed that this 5-5-3 ratio should apply to naval strength, to the strength of the entire fleet and not solely to battleships. It is their belief that the United States should have a Navy the equal of any other navy.

Now that it appears that we have not such a Navy, another conference should be held. And if further limitation along the lines suggested can not be agreed upon, then we should immediately proceed to the construction of such fighting units permitted by the treaty as will enable us to maintain the ratio set for capital ships. Fighting units must be met by similar fighting units. We must enter upon the construction of cruisers that will enable us to meet the cruiser strength of the other powers.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I regret that I can not.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. You do not believe you have to construct new cruisers anyhow?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We must, unless by agreement other powers scrap the cruisers they have in excess of ours. I still have hope, a hope based upon the progress thus far made, that if the representatives of the powers named can again gather around the table an agreement can be worked out whereby the necessity of building them can be avoided. But it takes time to build them, and unless within a reasonable time there is some hope of securing such an agreement I certainly would favor authorizing the construction of cruisers to match the cruiser strength of other powers and would also advocate that the example of the other nations be followed in modernizing, in so far as is permitted by the treaty, the capital ships retained, to the end that our Navy shall in fighting strength be the equal of any other navy. That is my attitude. But my hope is that the President will extend such an invitation as is respectfully suggested in this bill; that the invitation will be accepted, and that the same spirit of cooperation which made possible the agreement as to capital ships will make possible a further agreement that will effectively put an end to competition in naval construction, removing a fruitful source of conflict and lessening in all nations the burden of taxation which now threatens to exhaust the rich and beggar the poor.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I feel at liberty to take a few minutes of your time because our view is across the western ocean, the Pacific. It is perfectly natural that more consideration should be given in this House to affairs to the eastward than to the west. It is reasonable to expect that, because there are so few of us from the West in this House. Nevertheless, gentlemen, I think there is no one who will deny this, and that is that the world's great activity in the future is to be upon the Pacific Ocean. I do not mean in 5 years, or 10 years, or necessarily 20 years, but I mean in the future. And we, therefore, whose front doors are exposed to any trouble that might occur there, naturally feel a little more solicitous than some of you who perhaps live along the Mississippi River. You will pardon us for that.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the exposition by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. I believe that I agree with 99 per cent of what he says. And yet I can not help asking myself this: What if another world conference is called, and if the lower grades of ships are limited by agreement, if indeed all the warships could be wiped off the face of the seven seas to-day, would not the power then rest with the nation that owns the biggest merchant fleet which can carry guns upon its decks?

It seems to me we have got to go a great deal deeper than we have yet gone before strife is banished from the world. My reading of history leads me to believe that at some time or other every nation gets into a quarrel, and that therefore it is well to be prepared. It seems our Nation has found itself unprepared more times than it ever should have.

I believe that because we lacked some ships a power now friendly to us burned our Capitol. I believe that once because we lacked ships we paid tribute to the pirates over on the Barbary Coast, a thing that will always be to our disgrace. I believe that because we lacked ships of the merchant variety we found it necessary to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to other powers within the last six years to carry our men overseas to help save the world from perdition. And it occurs to me in passing to remark this, that it was a most fortunate thing for us that our enemy in that war was not Great Britain or was not Japan.

Now, gentlemen, we upon the Pacific coast of this country fear that the day will come when one of the world's greatest struggles will be upon the Pacific Ocean. I do not wish to say anything here that would be offensive to any branch of our Government, but there are some things that I feel I must in justice say, and I am going to say them, and I hope I will not be misunderstood.

In mentioning the three great naval powers we hear of Great Britain, we hear of the United States, and we hear of Japan. Those are the three great naval powers of the world. It is believed by many people that if we have any serious trouble on the Pacific Ocean in the future, it will be with the last-named nation. That may never come. God grant that it may never come. Nevertheless, it may come; and we recognize that we may have trouble here and there, or else we would not have a Navy and we would not be taking the time of this House to-day in discussing affairs relative to the good of the American Navy.

I admire the Japanese nation. I admire the Japanese people. I have friends in Japan. I know many Japanese personally and esteem many of them. But I want you also to remember that Japan as a nation has her grave and serious problems, and I want you to remember also that it is not always the rulers of a nation who make the war, but that it is sometimes the mob in the streets that makes the war and that pushes the leaders to a point where they have to go into war. That has been history more than once. Now, I speak of the problems of Japan. What are they? Let me remind you of a few of them. The Japanese Archipelago is about the size of the State of California. When I make that comparison, do not immediately get into your minds the picture of some wonderful valley like the San Joaquin and the Sacramento Valleys in California, which, it is claimed, could support easily a population of some 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 people. Do not get that thought into your mind, and do not think of the hundreds of other valleys in California that are wonderful in very deed; but remember that only one-seventh of Japan is arable land, and remember that Japan has a population of about 50,000,000 people. And remember also that the birth-rate increase in Japan is in the neighborhood of 700,000 a year. Now, it seems to those who think they know the most about the Japanese that the last thing the Japanese ever thinks of is limiting the birth rate. Any of you who have ever been in Japan or in certain parts of California will realize that the Japanese have a thoroughly Rooseveltian idea, because their children begin knee-high and go up like a flight of steps. That is Japan's serious problem. That is the problem that confronts her people—how to take care of her surplus population. The Japanese coolie can not live in China, because the Chinese coolie works more cheaply than he does. The Japanese coolie can not live in Korea, although Japan to-day absolutely dominates that country in a way that I believe is a shameful history, because the Korean coolie works more cheaply than the Japanese coolie.

The Japanese coolie can not live in the island of Formosa for the same reason, and I for one know California well enough and love it well enough so that I am not going to blame the Japanese for wanting to live in the State of California, although I am not now discussing the Japanese situation in California. But I do say this, gentlemen, that when you remember the facts I have just stated, and remember that it is a part of the religion of the Japanese—I am speaking literally when I say it—it is a part of the religion of Japan that the world belongs to her, that she has a right to any part of the world's surface if she needs it, and that the Japanese are descendants of the sun goddess and of divine origin, then you can easily imagine that some time in the future, under stress of complicated conditions that we to-day can not even anticipate, we on the Pacific may find ourselves in conflict with Japan. I say again, God grant that that may never be.

Now, gentlemen, if that day ever comes, it must be that we of America have learned enough of the past and have learned enough of the wisdom of the present to see to it that this institution which we are considering this morning, this branch of the defense of our Government, is amply supported in every way possible, and that no advantage is taken of us, and that we shall not fail to do anything that is necessary to be done for the honor of our country and for the cause of civilization.

When the discussion was going on here about the Budget yesterday I could not help but think that I had a right to feel sore at that Budget, because there is an appropriation that ought to be in this bill to-day, gentlemen. In justice to our country it ought to be there. I am here to say, because perhaps no one else will say it if I do not, that there ought to be at least $100,000 in this bill to provide for something being done on the proposed naval-base site at Alameda; because the city of Alameda has given this Government a deed conditional upon its doing certain things within a time that, I think, expires next year. It has given it a conditional deed to over 5,000 acres of wonderful water-front property in the city of Alameda, which has been approved by commissions appointed by this Government, and which, while I have no authority to say it, I will say is approved by the Navy Department and wanted for a naval base on San Francisco Bay.

The important thing is this, not that that $100,000 will give us anything more than a start, but that a naval base must be developed on the Bay of San Francisco eventually that will take care of the largest fleet that can be assembled on the Pacific. To-day there are 12 of our capital ships there, with all the other ships that are necessary. Yet there is no real naval base on the Pacific coast. I bear in mind the wonderful

plant at Mare Island, with which I am more or less familiar, having lived in that neighborhood since 1874. I bear in mind the navy yard at Bremerton. I bear in mind what there is at San Diego.

Mr. LINEBERGER. And at Los Angeles.

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Yes; and at Los Angeles; but I do say that this Nation must build a naval base upon the Pacific that will care for all time for the biggest fleet that this Nation can maintain on the Pacific Ocean.

Gentlemen, 25 years is nothing in the scheme of things. I was speaking of Japan a moment ago. Do you realize that the same dynasty has sat upon the throne in Japan in unbroken line since 500 years before Christ was born? That is true.

The Japanese is not an individual; he is a nationalist. I wish we Americans were more nationalist than we are. The Japanese sinks himself into oblivion for the good of Japan. I have mentioned Alameda not with the expectation of getting anything in this bill for it but simply because it is my duty to my country to mention it, and because I think the time will come when Congress will take steps to acquire that base.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want the gentleman to read that fine report of the Alameda base by his colleague [Mr. CURRY].

Mr. MACLAFFERTY. Mr. CURRY, my colleague, is all right, and some day he will be for the Alameda base. I am for Mare Island. Mare Island, when we are both gone, will be no less than it is to-day. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak during the time allotted to general debate, but the very informing and interesting speech of my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], suggests to me the submission of some supplemental facts.

In August, 1916, Congress authorized the construction of 10 battleships and 6 battle cruisers. We now have in the fleet but one of these ships, and under the treaty we are not allowed to add more than two more of the capital ships then authorized to our fleet. In other words, of the 16 capital ships authorized in the building program of 1916 we are allowed under the treaty to retain only three. The treaty requires seven of the battleships and all of the battle cruisers authorized in 1916 to be scrapped. Four of the seven battleships to be scrapped are by far the best and most powerful that were authorized in the 1916 program. Each of these four battleships now to be scrapped would have had a displacement tonnage of 42,000 tons. Each would have carried twelve 16-inch guns and have had a speed of 23 knots or better.

No navy in the world had any battleships like these, either built or building, and it is questionable whether any other country would have been financially able to lay down for many years vessels of this type. In 1916 our Navy had no battle cruisers. We now have none, and under the treaty we will not be allowed to build any until after 1937. Notwithstanding this, our best naval experts have for several years been in full agreement that the most important, the most urgently needed capital ships for the fleet are battle cruisers. Under the treaty we will be permitted to convert two of the battle cruisers into airship carriers, but these two carriers can only be provided with 8-inch guns, whereas the original program provided that, as battle cruisers, they should carry twelve 16-inch guns. If these cruisers had been completed according to the original program they would have had a speed of more than 33 knots.

In order that you may understand the military difference between a battleship of 42,000 tons displacement, carrying twelve 16-inch guns, with a speed of 23 knots, and some of the battleships which the treaty allows us to retain, it may be well to take a brief inventory of the 18 battleships, which until 1937 will constitute the capital ships of our Navy. Eleven of the 18 will be ships carrying from eight to ten 14-inch guns, with an average speed of 20 knots, capable of throwing a projectile weighing 1,400 pounds about 20 miles. Three of the 18, one of which is now with the fleet and two—the *West Virginia* and *Colorado*—will probably be added to the fleet within the next 18 months, will have a displacement of 33,000 tons, a speed of about 21 knots, and will carry 16-inch guns, capable of throwing accurately projectiles weighing 2,100 pounds more than 25 miles.

Of the remaining 18 battleships all will be ships of less than 21,000 tons displacement, with an average speed of from 18 to 19 knots, each carrying 12-inch guns capable of throwing a projectile weighing 870 pounds about 15 miles. In other words, any one of the battle cruisers which under the treaty we are to scrap in point of military value would have been far more effective than all of these six remaining battleships. One of the battleships or one of the battle cruisers which under the treaty will be scrapped could have destroyed all of these six battleships, which will hereafter constitute a part of our fleet, without even getting within gun range of any of the ships so destroyed.

You will see from this how generous our country was in surrendering naval power in order to secure the treaty, yet there has been no complaint, because our people have felt, from assurances given, that under the treaty we are reasonably immune from war for at least 10 years. I am not without faith, and hope that this will prove true.

It is interesting to recall that Secretary Hughes first proposed a limitation not only on capital ships and aircraft but also on the smaller craft. Unfortunately, as the discussion advanced, some of the powers seemed unwilling to place any limitation on submarines or other auxiliary craft. Our representatives were more than liberal in consenting to surrender seven battleships and six battle cruisers, the most powerful of such types ever designed by man, and in agreeing to retain in lieu thereof old battleships of but little military value in their present condition.

Military experts who have given study to the subject estimate that in point of military value, measured by tonnage, gun power, and speed, the six battle cruisers and seven battleships which we are to scrap under the terms of the treaty more than doubled the 18 ships which we will retain.

Information given to the committee justified the inclusion, in the pending bill, of a request to the President to call the powers together again for the purpose of having them consider placing limitations on all types of naval ships. The committee was in possession of facts tending to show that one of the great naval powers which signed the treaty, without violating the letter of the treaty, is now building a large number of small craft; that still another power is expending large sums of money in modernizing its capital fleet. It is easy to see that if we continue the policy of providing no money for new construction we can neither hope to reach nor maintain the 5-5-3 ratio, as contemplated in the treaty. Some naval authorities insist that even now we are third in naval strength, although the treaty contemplates that our naval power shall be equal to the greatest. It will be well for this Congress to thoughtfully weigh the present value of the ships in our Navy with those in the Japanese and British Navies.

In this connection I deem it proper to state that our best naval advisers have strongly urged a large appropriation by this Congress for the purpose of modernizing ships, which the treaty permits us to retain, and for building additional aircraft carriers and types of smaller craft. Their recommendation is accompanied with the statement that such an appropriation is necessary to give us an effective and well-balanced fleet.

It is not fair to our people to lead them to believe that we can longer refuse to make appropriations for new construction and retain our present rank as to naval strength with either Japan or Great Britain. Both Japan and Great Britain are spending money in modernizing their capital ships and in building new auxiliary craft.

In my judgment the most imperative demands now are for additional aircraft carriers and larger subcraft. There are many naval officers who believe that the battleship will not be the most effective weapon in future wars. It will be a supporting arm to the effective weapons, but the submarine, aircraft, aircraft carriers, and light cruisers will play the most important rôle. The gentleman from South Carolina stated that some of our naval officers discounted speed in capital ships. What ships, may I ask, have we in our Navy, or what ships will we have under the treaty, that could endanger or drive from the sea any of the fast battle cruisers owned by Japan and Great Britain? These cruisers have a speed of more than 30 knots, a gun range equal to that of our largest battleship, and yet none of our battleships will have a speed exceeding 21 knots. Naval experts are further agreed that, owing to the fact that sea battles in the future will be fought at long ranges, heavy side armor is no longer of such great importance, and that more attention should be paid to deck protection. Battles in the future can be fought effectively at ranges of from 25 to 30 miles. At such ranges projectiles are thrown high into the air and as a result the decks rather than the sides of ships are open to greatest danger.

Under the treaty Great Britain is permitted to build two additional capital ships, and my prediction is they will not be battleships of the old type but rather capital ships of the Hood type, with speed of more than 30 knots, light side and heavy deck armor, carrying not exceeding four large guns, with large space for aircraft. Speed, aircraft-carrying capacity, with sup-

porting large guns in small numbers will be, in my judgment, what the latest naval thought hereafter will urge in the building of large ships. [Applause.]

[By unanimous consent Mr. OLIVER was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I can not hope to add anything to the very informing discussion that we have had on the problems of the future, those that are not here, but those we fear may come some day. I want, then, to talk a little about some of the problems that are here.

One of them in particular we have heard a great deal about is agricultural relief, short-time credits for the farmer. We have heard a great deal about them, and we have so much conflict as to what they should be, and so many statesmen who desire to solve the problem, that it looks to me as if we are going to get nothing. We have in another body the Lenroot bill, and I believe the Ladd bill and the Simmons bill and various others, and a conflict as to what one shall be considered. Then we come over here and we have half a dozen bills in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, and the Lenroot bill has been designated here as the Anderson bill, which is the latest, I think—or is it the McSwain bill—and we have been here since the 20th of November. There has not been a meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency in all that time, except an hour to hear some stock raisers. It is time to seriously consider the question of asking the appointment of a committee to determine where the chairman is and why he does not do something, and I am asking to-day that that committee either be given an opportunity to meet and act or that it do something and find the chairman and ask him to perform.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes; I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. He has been in attendance on the sessions of the House a goodly portion of the time since we convened.

Mr. STEVENSON. I admit he was, but he has not called a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me——

Mr. STEVENSON. I have only got eight minutes, and I want to say something.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the chairman of the committee wants you gentlemen of the committee, all the gentlemen of the committee, to formulate their plans somewhat in advance of the meeting.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes, sir. The chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee on that subject at the beginning of this Congress, and appointed as the chairman of that subcommittee the gentleman from Buffalo [Mr. MACGREGOR], and he was to have a hearing and take up this matter to formulate. I am saying, why did not they formulate, and why did not they do something?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I can not yield now. The whole thing reminds me of this very beautiful parody on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in the Saturday Evening Post of this week.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield for just one question? Have you a plan of your own?

Mr. STEVENSON. Have I a plan of my own? I am not on the subcommittee. If I have the opportunity, yes; I can give a plan.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is interested in the farmers' relief——

Mr. STEVENSON. Very specially interested in it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Give us your plan.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have not the time now. The gentleman would object if I undertook to give it, and he would not vote for it if I did.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman from Illinois has never yet voted against any legislation that was actually needed by the agricultural interests.

Mr. STEVENSON. I have yielded to the gentleman all that is necessary, and I now desire to read this beautiful parody on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which you will find in this week's Saturday Evening Post:

IF EVERYBODY DID THINGS AS CONGRESS DOES.

An old woman has just been knocked senseless by a speeding automobile. A policeman leans over her. A crowd has gathered around them.

FIRST BYSTANDER. Mr. Policeman, I offer a resolution summoning a doctor for this poor woman.

SECOND BYSTANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

FIRST BYSTANDER. I yield.

SECOND BYSTANDER. I suggest there may be a doctor in the crowd.

FIRST BYSTANDER. I accept the gentleman's suggestion. Mr. Policeman, I will amend the pending resolution to ask if there is a doctor in the crowd.

POLICEMAN. Is there objection?

THIRD BYSTANDER. I object. It would be impossible to find a competent doctor in a street crowd. I suggest the gentleman withdraw his amendment.

FIRST BYSTANDER. I withdraw my amendment, Mr. Policeman.

POLICEMAN. The question is on the resolution. The clerk will call the roll.

FOURTH BYSTANDER. Mr. Policeman, I object. I am a doctor, and I suggest that this woman is in need of immediate medical aid, which I shall be glad to furnish.

THIRD BYSTANDER. I should like to ask the gentleman how much compensation he expects for rendering the medical aid of which he speaks in such a care-free manner. The gentleman looks like one who seldom does anything for nothing.

FOURTH BYSTANDER. That is where the gentleman and I are different. The gentleman is obviously one who seldom does anything, even for something.

THIRD BYSTANDER. I would like to ask what the gentleman means?

FOURTH BYSTANDER. The gentleman may draw his own conclusions.

FIFTH BYSTANDER. Mr. Policeman, I make the point of order.

POLICEMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on the resolution.

A VOICE. The old woman's dyin' while you boobs is talkin'.

POLICEMAN. The Chair will have the street cleared if the spectators do not observe silence. The Chair can not tolerate these interruptions from the gallery. The question is on the resolution.

SIXTH BYSTANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When in the course of human events it becomes necessary to invoke medical aid for an old woman who has been struck by an automobile, what will the press and public say if we are unfaithful to our trust? I hold here in my hand a letter from Amos Q. Gilkeyson, which I ask permission to read.

SEVENTH BYSTANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

SIXTH BYSTANDER. I yield.

SEVENTH BYSTANDER. I would like to ask the gentleman if Mr. Gilkeyson is a qualified medical practitioner?

SIXTH BYSTANDER. I am glad to ease the gentleman's mind. Mr. Gilkeyson is a graduate of the American Masseurs' University, and——

EIGHTH BYSTANDER. I object.

POLICEMAN. Objection is heard.

A VOICE. The old woman's dead.

NINTH BYSTANDER. I am just informed, Mr. Chairman, upon authority too reliable to controvert, that the old lady no longer needs medical attention. I suggest that the gentleman withdraw his resolution.

FOURTH BYSTANDER. Will the gentleman give the name of his authority?

I would like to commend the answer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] with reference to the colloquy that occurred here a day or two ago between them:

NINTH BYSTANDER. I am sorry I can not oblige the gentleman, as my authority wishes his name to be kept private, but I can assure the gentleman that he is the very highest authority.

FIRST BYSTANDER. In that case I shall be glad to accept the gentleman's suggestion in part, and move to amend my resolution by substituting the word "coroner" for the word "doctor" in my original resolution.

POLICEMAN. Is there objection? (There is no objection, so the amendment is agreed to.) The question is on the resolution. (There being no objection, the resolution is carried.)

[Applause.]

And that is about the way the agricultural temporary relief of the farmer matter is moving along in this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask not to be interrupted, as I fear that I shall not be able to finish what I desire to say in the time allotted me.

The World War ended four years ago. By resolution of Congress adopted some 18 months ago our war laws were repealed or their operation suspended. It was the general expectation of the public and of Members of Congress that those who had been convicted under the war laws would be released upon the repeal of those laws. However, such course has not been taken. We have yet sixty-odd men in our jails convicted under laws which no longer exist.

It is also a fact that of all the nations of the world the United States is the only nation which yet holds in prison offenders convicted under the war laws. I know of no better name for these persons than "political prisoners," because that is exactly what they are. Their offenses were not against persons but directly against the Government by opposing measures relating to carrying on the war.

I am impelled to discuss this subject because of the feeling that the situation is a disgrace to our country. I feel that it is a situation which demands the attention of Congress. I am disturbed by the thought that we have too long been silent and that perhaps I myself have failed in my duty in not before demanding here upon this floor that these prisoners be released. It is perhaps not upon me more as a Member of

Congress than as a citizen. There is, of course, the consideration that it may injure me politically to speak. Demagogues and reactionaries are quick to hound any advocate of liberal opinion. But that very fact is one of the best reasons why I should take my stand for real Americanism and the American Bill of Rights. I can not longer retain my self-respect if I allow this situation to continue without my protest when in my heart I do so bitterly condemn it. The fact that it may be expensive politically is merely an added reason why any man worthy of a seat in Congress should speak his sentiments.

THE CASE OF RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

The subject was again brought to my attention by the discussion with reference to the case of Ricardo Flores Magon, which occurred in the House on Monday last.

We live in the greatest country in the world. Our public men are the bravest and most enlightened. Our elements which guide public opinion are the most liberal. Our classes of large wealth are the most generous toward economic heretics. All this is demonstrated by the case of this man Magon. In Mexico the Chamber of Deputies is said to be draped in mourning for the death of Magon, its citizen who was associated with Madero in his efforts to overthrow the tyranny of Diaz, while here in the United States House of Representatives Magon's memory is reviled and blackened by insinuations that he was a murderer and an assassin or an advocate of murder and assassination.

I am impelled to discuss the case of Magon because I feel that it is a typical case in the respect that it illustrates the practices of the Department of Justice in dealing with amnesty for all of these political prisoners. Whenever pardon for them is mentioned the department emits a smoke screen and attempts to divert attention from the true issue by reckless statements that the prisoners are "anarchists," "communists," or even murderers. It has tried to excuse itself with contemptible evasion and by blackening the names of these men by making unproven charges, by the use of epithets, and I would almost say making lying statements in regard to them. Once you mention the case of one of these men, back comes the propaganda that he is an "anarchist," an "I. W. W.," a "communist," or some other kind of a political or economic heretic. Never will they deal with the facts of the particular offense for which he was convicted or with the proof as appears from the record of the trial of the case.

OUR LAWS ARE AIMED AT DEEDS, NOT AT BELIEFS.

Let me say at this point that it is no crime under the laws of the United States for a man to be an I. W. W., a communist, an atheist, or to hold to any other belief, no matter how wild and subversive it may be, nor is it a crime for men to belong to an organization, no matter what purpose it may have. Our laws are aimed at men's actions, not at a frame of mind or a belief. Men may be convicted as criminals only for deeds and not for thoughts. It is no more a crime to be a communist than to be a Mormon or an agnostic. It is only when a man is guilty of some overt act or of conspiracy coupled with an overt act that he violates the law.

Never at any time has it been unlawful in this country for a man to express his beliefs and to propagate his ideas, except during the World War. These political prisoners were convicted for words spoken and not for deeds done. They violated the espionage act by expressions against the war or in opposition to conscription or other war measures. They were not guilty of spying, nor of sabotage, nor of actively aiding the enemy, nor of anything other than the expression of opinions which men may sincerely hold. They did not incite to murder nor destruction of property nor injury to human beings, but obstructed the draft or criticized public officials or preached against wars in general or other matter of that kind. Yet we find that the Department of Justice delights to obscure the facts by reckless insinuations and by prejudicing the public against these prisoners with charges that they were communists, anarchists, and so forth.

The sinister effort to prejudice the public against these prisoners by making charges against them which have no connection with the offenses for which they were convicted is inspired by the consciousness of the slender basis for their conviction. In no case were they tried for disloyal or violent deeds. Always it was for use of "words," and in some cases the construction placed upon their words was so strained as to pass into the realm of the ridiculous. Men were convicted of conspiring with each other who were rank strangers, had never met, and had never communicated, and when the proven overt act consummating the conspiracy consisting merely of spoken or written words.

LEGALIZED MOBBING.

Necessarily, as in the case of all laws aimed at free speech, the espionage act convicted men for the intent or purpose with which they spoke, and in actuality they were tried before the bar of public opinion as represented by juries. In such cases jurors, of course, carry into the box the prejudices of the outside world and are left free to vent the feelings of the majority upon the dissenter. When public feeling is intense and practically unanimous, as in time of war, there is a demand that examples be made of any who may have been conspicuous in dissenting. Conviction is demanded whether there be actual guilt or not, and men are convicted upon their reputations and what others may believe about them. In such cases a trial is more or less a farce. It is a sort of legalized mob action. The rich, influential and ably defended, of course go free. The weak, the undefended, and the friendless are convicted, of course. To be an alien radical or labor agitator is to go to jail.

The fact should be frankly and boldly recognized that certain influential groups in this country do not sincerely believe in free speech or other constitutional guaranties. As the beneficiaries of abuses of our system, these groups hold to valuable privileges, monopolies, and the control of great aggregated wealth. They fear the exposure of their practices and the correction of the evils by which they have profited. Dominating to a large extent the channels of public information, twisting and coloring the news which the people receive, their security lies in the suppression of criticism. They identify themselves as the Government, because they are often permitted to control its activities. Then, there are the militarists and imperialists, with their thoughts of unpopular future wars for which conscription will be necessary.

Without any particular regard for the guilt of our political prisoners, these dominating groups would hold them in prison for its effect upon all who might desire to expose their practices, to thwart their aims, or to question their right to dominate. It is out of deference to these groups that the Department of Justice holds these men in prison. The department bows to the will of the masters of the present administration. Of all the vices which officials may have, hypocrisy is the most contemptible—the exercise of discretion for one set of reasons while pretending to do so for other reasons. This charge I lay at the door of the department.

THE REAL RADICALS.

The reactionary and selfish elements to which I have referred have not merely dictated that the political offenders shall remain in prison, but promptly vent their spleen upon all who may advocate their release. They answer all arguments with the sheer brutality of epithets and false propaganda. Anyone who presumes to invoke American traditions of free speech is promptly crucified by their parasite press and denounced as a "Red" or a "radical" or some other kind of heretic.

The truth is that these reactionaries are themselves the real radicals; they are the real revolutionists. In their hearts they would like to repeal the Bill of Rights except in so far as it may give protection to their property and their interests.

Sometimes they vary from epithets to ridicule and condemn the advocates of amnesty as "maudlin sentimentalists." Why "maudlin," I do not know, and since when has the sentiment of love for American institutions and ideals been unworthy?

On last Monday, December 11, the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] discussed in the House the Magon case and made certain statements which I questioned. He had obtained leave to extend his remarks and I challenged him to obtain and extend in the RECORD as a part of his remarks the indictment against Magon and the article which it was stated he had printed and which constituted the basis for his conviction. The gentleman has caused his remarks to be printed, but has failed to print any of the documents called for. He has failed to meet the challenge and, I presume, does not intend to do so.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do propose to do that, and will do so in the next few days. The gentleman's challenge will be fully met by the production and insertion in the RECORD of the documents which he asked for in his speech of December 11.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am going to save the gentleman a part of that trouble by reading now the article the publishing of which constituted Magon's offense.

I hold in my hand the translation which was used by the Department of Justice as the basis of its prosecution of Magon. This man was convicted of violating the espionage act and section 211 of the Criminal Code by publishing this article in a little Spanish newspaper in Los Angeles. I read:

MAGON'S MANIFESTO.

THE ASSEMBLY OF ORGANIZACION OF THE MEXICAN LIBERAL PARTY.

To the Members of the Party, the Anarchists of the Whole World, and the Workingmen in General.

COMPANIONS: The clock of history will soon point with its hands inexorable the instant producing death to this society, already agonizing.

The death of the old society is close at hand; it will not delay much longer, and only those will deny the fact whom its continuation interests; those that profit by the injustice in which it is based; those that see with horror the approach of the revolution, for they know that on

the following day they will have to work side by side with their former slaves.

Everything indicates, with force of evidence, that the death of the burgeoisie society will come unexpectedly. The citizen with grim gaze looks at the policeman whom only yesterday he considered his protector and support; the assiduous reader of the bourgeoisie press shrugs the shoulders and drops with contempt the prostituted sheet in which appear the declarations of the chiefs of state; the workingman goes on strike, not taking into account that by his action he injures the country's interest, conscious now that the country is not his property but is the property of the rich.

In the street are seen faces which clearly show the interior torment of discontent; and there are arms that appear agitated to construct barricades; murmurs in the saloons, in the theaters, in the street cars, in each home, especially in our homes, in the homes of those below, where is mourned the departure of a son called to the war, or hearts oppressed and eyes moistened when thinking that to-morrow, perhaps to-day even, the boy who is the joy of the hut, the youngster who with his frankness and gentility wraps in splendor the gloomy existence of the parents in some sense, will be but by force torn from the bosom of the family to face, gun in hand, another youngster who like himself was the enchantment of his home, and whom he does not hate and can not hate, for he even does not know him.

The flames of discontent revived by the blow of tyranny each time more enraged and cruel in every country; and here and there, everywhere, and in all parts the fists contract, the minds exalt, the hearts beat violently; and where they do not murmur, they shout, all sighing for the moment in which the calloused hands during hundred centuries of labor they must drop the fecund tools and grab the rifle which nervously awaits the caress of the hero.

Companions, the moment is solemn. It is the moment preceding the greatest political and social catastrophe the history registers, the insurrection of all people against existing conditions.

It will be surely a blind impulse of the masses which suffer; it will be, without a doubt, the disorderly explosion of the fury restrained hardly by the revolver of the bailiff and the gallows of the hangman; it will be the overflow of all the indignation and all the sorrows, and will produce the chaos, the chaos favorable to all who fish in turbid waters—chaos from which may sprout new oppressions and new tyrannies; for in such cases regularly the charlatan is the leader.

It falls to our lot, the intellectual, to prepare the popular mentality until the moment arrives, while not preparing the insurrection, since insurrection is born of tyranny.

Prepare the people not only to wait with serenity the grand events which we see glimmer but to enable them to see and not let themselves be dragged along by those who want to induce them now over a flowery road toward identic slavery and a similar tyranny as to-day we suffer.

To gain that, the unconscious rebelliousness may not forge with its own hands a new chain that anew will enslave the people, it is precise that all of us, all that do not believe in government, all that are convinced that government, whatsoever its form may be and whoever may be the head, it is tyranny, because it is not an institution created for the protection of the weak but to support the strong, we place ourselves at the height of circumstances and without fear propagate our holy anarchist ideal, the only just, the only human, the only true.

To not do it is to betray knowingly the vague aspirations of the populace to a liberty without limits, unless it be the natural limits—that is, a liberty which does not endanger the conservation of the specie.

To not do it is giving free hand to all those who desire to benefit merely their own personal ends through the sacrifice of the humble.

To not do it is to affirm what our antagonists assure—that the time is still far away when our ideals will be adopted.

Activity, activity, and more activity is the demand of the moment.

Let every man and every woman who loves the anarchist ideal propagate with tenacity, with inflexibility, without heeding sneer or measuring dangers, and without taking into account the consequences.

Ready for action, and the future will be for our ideal—land and liberty.

Given in Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America, the 6th day of March, 1918.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.
LIBRADO RIVERA.

The article was perhaps a foolish article. It may have been a wicked article. The man was tried. He was convicted of violating the espionage act. How anybody could imagine that that article could have had any effect whatsoever toward obstructing our war operations is beyond my comprehension. The gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER], however, said that—

During the dark days of the war, when all patriotic men, women, and children under American skies were giving their all in order that the country might win the war, people such as Ricardo Flores Magon were seeking to obstruct our endeavors in winning that war.

He also said:

Ricardo Flores Magon during that time was publishing this paper of his, Regeneracion, in Los Angeles, obstructing the draft, trying to get those Mexicans in this country who were of American citizenship to refuse to serve under the colors, and inciting them to return to Mexico and enlist themselves under the banner of Mexico with Germany in order to recover the so-called lost Provinces of Mexico, to wit, California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

I again challenge the gentleman to put into the RECORD something printed by this man Magon that bears out his statements. I call upon him to put into the RECORD something from the court records of the case in which Magon was tried—not from his imagination—which will justify his statements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama three additional minutes that I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to read what Magon said later of his own article:

DID NOT REFER TO AMERICA.

On the 21st of March, 1918, I was arrested with Rivera for having published in Regeneracion the manifesto for which I was given 20 years' imprisonment, and Rivera 15. The wording and meaning of the manifesto were construed as seditious by the prosecution; that is, as aiming at the insubordination and revolt of the military and naval forces of the United States. Any sensible person who happened to read the manifesto would not draw such a conclusion, for in reality the manifesto is only an exposition of facts and a fair warning to all mankind of the evils those facts might produce.

In one of its paragraphs it is clearly stated that no one can make a revolution on account of it being a social phenomenon. The manifesto was aimed at the prevention of the evils a revolution carries itself, the revolution being regarded from a scientific standpoint as a world-wide inevitable result of the unsettled conditions of the world.

The manifesto does not refer in the least to the policies of the American Government in the last war, nor gives aid and comfort to its enemies. It is neither pro-German nor pro-Allied, and does not single out the United States in its brief review of the world conditions. It was enough, however, to secure for me a life term behind prison bars. The persecution, this time, was exceedingly severe. My poor wife, Maria, was incarcerated during five months, and is now free on bond awaiting trial for having notified my friends of my arrest, that they should assist me in my legal defense.

I have examined Magon's article with some care. According to usual standards it is somewhat vague and bombastic, but there is little in it that can be considered as inciting to disloyalty or revolution. Perhaps its most objectionable passages are those which speak of the workingman being conscious "that the country is not his property, but is the property of the rich," and the criticism of government in general: "It is tyranny, because it is not an institution created for the protection of the weak, but to support the strong." Also, I note the condemnation of war by reference to the young man "torn from the bosom of his family to face, gun in hand, another youngster who, like himself, was the enchantment of his home, and who he does not hate and can not hate for he even does not know him." There is not a word of criticism of the United States, nor of our Government, nor of any official action in particular. Yet the publication of this article in a little-read Spanish newspaper was considered to merit 21 years in the penitentiary, of which Magon had served 5 at the time of his recent death.

In discussing Magon's case the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] read a statement which obviously emanated from the Department of Justice. Of course, I accord to him sincerity and belief in the statement. The thing I chiefly complain of is that the statement was grossly misleading to all who did not know the facts.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman please state to the House in what particulars my statement was misleading.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I am going to do that.

The statement was made that Magon was convicted under section 211 of the Criminal Code and sentenced to 21 years, and that he was also convicted under the espionage act and sentenced to 20 years. The fact is that Magon was sentenced for only 1 year under section 211 and to 20 years for violating the espionage act. It is also a fact that his sole offense was publishing the article which I read. He was not convicted for two separate offenses, as the statement implied. I am informed that the statement that he had previously been twice convicted under Federal laws for "anarchistic activities" is erroneous, and that his prior conviction was for a breach of our neutrality laws by aiding from the United States in the Mexican revolution against Diaz.

What I most resent is the misleading references to Magon's belief in anarchism and the implication that he was an advocate of murder, bombing, and forcible resistance of Government. From the information I get, he never believed in or advocated any such thing. He was a believer in the doctrines of Proudhon and of Tolstoy—in a world ruled by good will, cooperation, and brotherhood, instead of policemen's clubs and bayonets—what is called a "philosophical anarchist." The reference to Magon as an anarchist is a mere smoke screen. He was not convicted of being an anarchist, for there is no law against it, and the reference is merely to mislead and to prejudice his case.

The New York World of November 25, 1922, carries an editorial upon the Magon case which affords food for thought:

MAGON AND MORSE.

Ricardo Flores Magon died last Tuesday in Leavenworth Penitentiary, having served nearly 5 years of a 21-year sentence imposed under the espionage act. A Mexican disciple of Tolstoy, Magon had spent a number of years in prison as a result of revolutionary activities against the Diaz régime; then, entering the United States in quest of greater freedom to speak and write in the cause of Mexican enfranchisement, he was caught in 1918 dragnet and received a maximum penalty for alleged interference with the conduct of the war. In reality, the article for which he was convicted had no bearing on the war with Germany except what was read into it by prosecution. That, of course,

was not unusual. In the heydey of witch burners and unofficial spies, Magon was only one of the victims.

The point of the case lies in the fact that Attorney General Daugherty, had been informed by the prison physician that Magon was going blind, and had been repeatedly warned by others that he would die unless pardoned. Mr. Daugherty remained unshaken. He wrote that he had taken up the matter with the President and that "both of us were agreed that no action should be taken directed to the granting of Executive clemency." It is not often that a reason is vouchsafed for decisions of this nature, but Mr. Daugherty did give a reason as follows: "He regards his prosecution by the Government as a persecution and makes it appear that he is a martyr. He in no manner evinces any evidence of repentance but on the contrary rather prides himself on his defiance of the law."

By a great effort, one remembers, after this high moral sentiment, that it was Harry Daugherty who procured the pardon for Charles W. Morse on the ground that Mr. Morse was dying. That was many years ago, and Mr. Morse, though much older than Magon, is not yet dead. Indeed, Mr. Daugherty is trying at this moment to send him to jail on another charge. Undoubtedly, Mr. Morse was repentant. Or is the moral simply that it is better to break the banking laws whenever there is a profit in doing so than to fool with free speech in this land of the free?

I now quote from a recent editorial from the Baltimore Sun, which is full of interest:

ANOTHER POLITICAL PRISONER FREE.

The name of Ricardo Flores Magon has been removed from the long roll of political prisoners still in Leavenworth. No belated Executive clemency gives him this freedom. Death has intervened where Attorney General Daugherty was adamant.

Magon was not an American. He was not a subject of any nation participating in the late war. The articles in the little paper which he published in Los Angeles were in the Spanish tongue and as little likely to "discourage recruiting" as a Dutch edition of the New Testament. But the espionage act was broad enough to catch him, and now, after serving 5 years of a 21-year sentence, Magon is dead. After all he was only a Mexican radical, and what does it matter that the Mexican Chamber of Deputies is said to be draping its rostrum black in honor of him?

* * * * * * *

To the Attorney General the President of this country can give great powers. Powers of life and death, power to stamp out the soul by months and years of jail, power to procure a pardon for men like Charles W. Morse, power to deny a pardon to men like Magon. But one power only God can give to men in authority, and that is the power of understanding.

Magon was not released, it seems, because he would not say he was "repentant." And in a letter of which the following passage is the core Mr. Daugherty found evidence that Magon "prides himself on his defiance of law":

"I do not complain against my fate. I am receiving what I have always gotten in my 30 years of struggling for justice—persecution. I never expected to succeed in my endeavor, but I felt it to be my duty to persevere, conscious that sooner or later humanity will adopt a way of social intercourse with love as a basis."

Magon was a follower of Tolstoy. Imprisoned in Mexico under the autocracy of Diaz, he sought America as a haven where he might work for the liberation of the peons of his country. Caught in the dragnet of war hysteria, he was given what amounted to a life sentence in Leavenworth.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] included in his extension of remarks in the RECORD of December 11 a peculiarly vicious statement from American Defense Society. I have read the statement with amazement. It would be difficult, indeed, to include in a statement of the same length more downright misrepresentations. Yet by including it the gentleman from California appears to give it his approval. I will not deal with the statement further than by quoting the statement of Dr. John A. Ryan, of Washington, who, because of his standing as a scholar in the field of morals and economics and because of his special knowledge of the cases discussed, is an excellent authority. Doctor Ryan says:

The bulletin given to the press by the American Defense Society on December 11 is grossly misleading. It asserts that the political prisoners for whom amnesty is sought are detained in jail not merely for violating free speech but also for various acts of physical violence. It asserts, in fact, that they are "murderers and destructionists."

The American Defense Society makes a disingenuous effort to support these assertions by quoting the substance of the four charges upon which these men were tried. The first two charges involve crimes of violence. The third and fourth involve only written and spoken opposition to the war.

The dishonest tactics of the American Defense Society consist of failing to state that the convictions under the first two charges were set aside by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the seventh and eighth judicial districts. These reversals affect the great majority of the political prisoners. Had the cases of the rest of them been appealed in the same way the higher court would undoubtedly have reversed the finding of the lower court in those cases also.

Therefore counts 1 and 2, which charge violence, are entirely irrelevant in any discussion of the continued imprisonment of these men.

The sum of the matter is that all the political prisoners are now serving sentences under count 4, which involved merely oral or written or printed expressions. None of them is legally detained in prison for any offense of destruction or violence.

How horrible were their oral or written or printed expressions? Well, they could all be reduced to assertions that the war was a capitalistic war; that the working classes were fools to engage in it; and that the way to prevent war is through a general strike. For these utterances the majority of the political prisoners were sentenced to terms of from 10 to 20 years.

Did any of these men really commit the acts of poisoning and burning and other forms of destruction which are charged against them in the statement of the American Defense Society? I do not know. What I do know is that they were not legally convicted of these crimes or their conviction in the lower courts was reversed by the upper courts.

The mention of these crimes, therefore, in any statement against the political prisoners is irrelevant and unfair. It is, in effect, an attempt to deprive them of the "due process of law" which the Constitution guarantees to all persons in the United States.

The contention of the American Defense Society is that these prisoners should be kept in jail not because of offenses of which they have been convicted but because of other offenses of which they have not been convicted. This is an outright denial of "due process of law." It is a greater injury to our institutions than all the wild utterances of all the I. W. W.'s, whether in or out of jail.

It comes from men who think they are superpatriots, but it is fundamentally unpatriotic, because it is contrary to one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution. It is an appeal to legal violence, or even to a kind of legal lynching. The political prisoners may be guilty of a hundred detestable acts, but as long as they have not been convicted of them they should not be kept in prison on account of them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Gentlemen of the committee, you have just heard the very impassioned appeal, the very fervent defense made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], for whom personally I have nothing but regard and esteem, but with whom I so greatly differ in the matter which he has discussed. But in the strained oratorical effort which the gentleman has made before the House he in his effort to strengthen his weak argument has again resorted to certain challenges, and, as I just said, he seems to be particularly strong on challenges to offset, I suppose, the weakness of his arguments, so in the brief time now allotted me I want to reiterate to the gentleman that I propose, as I have proposed over and over again, to answer not only the challenges made by him here today but to accept the challenges—oratorical, of course—which he made in his speech of like character on December 11. The House, I hope, if not the gentleman from Alabama, will be satisfied when I am done. I am having prepared from the official records of the Department of Justice abstracts of the necessary documents which in due season I shall place in the RECORD. I shall have to assume, of course, and do assume, that those records are correct, because they were the records upon which this prosecution was based and upon which the convictions alluded to were secured. I am going to have those documents inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the gentleman from Alabama as well as for the benefit of the people of the country and the entire membership of Congress. Of course, I am not surprised at what has taken place on the floor of the House in the last few days in this connection and in which the gentleman from Alabama has taken such an important part. It is all a part of a gigantic program, a drive for the liberation of these men who were convicted of espionage, of treachery to our laws and institutions when that Great World War was in progress. I hope and believe that the Members of this body involved in the net, and I, of course, include the gentleman from Alabama, are the innocent victims of maudlin sentimentalism, which has oftimes before in the history of man enveighed heavily upon those more or less amenable to this most insidious type of appeal, because it aims, as it has done in this case, to the heart and not the head. I believe in coordinating mind and heart and in leavening human sympathy with patriotic good judgment. This seems to me to be lacking in the psychology of those who have been so grossly misled in this matter.

The White House grounds were being picketed only a few days ago and perhaps are to-day. Matter of the kind I hold in my hand and which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD is being broadcasted to the membership of this House, requesting the release of so-called political prisoners en bloc for Christmas. Attached thereto is a card in which they plead, in the spirit of Christmas, which the soul of they among the prisoners who would destroy American institutions do not know, for the unconditional release of the 62 political prisoners now serving 5 to 20 years in the Federal penitentiary. Certain Members of the so-called "progressive" group, which has recently been organized—and God save the name "progressive" if it alludes to anything concerning that Progressivism which so many patriotic Americans were proud to own in 1912 and which was championed by that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, who in silent vigil still watches over the America he loved so well from a sacred mound on the shores of Oyster Bay—have made an attempt through a certain kind of the press in this country and through meetings, in which various of the so-called purported membership of that organization have taken part, to secure the release of these war criminals. We Members of the House, and in this I believe I include 98 per cent, who feel that the law of the land, irrespective of who it affects, should be carried out, and that justice, inexorable though it be, should be satisfied in

this matter, propose to fight this wholesale amnesty movement to the finish, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama, and we throw down the gauntlet to those who so deeply sympathize with those who would upset the Government and institutions for which our comrades fought and bled and died on Flanders Field in 1917 and in 1918. We will keep the faith, buddies, never fear. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD the copy of a document called "Prisoners of Hope," and another document headed "Release the Political Prisoners for Christmas."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to are as follows:

PRISONERS OF HOPE—MEN WHO BELIEVE IN THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AS IT IS WRITTEN.

[By Ellen Winsor.]

A nation denied free speech is a nation without a soul. Its charter of freedom is but a scrap of paper; its institutions but the high bulwarks of tyranny; its elected officials no better than medieval monarchs. Such is America to-day. We have permitted one tyrant to throw into prison a group of idealists whose courage and faith should be the watchwords of a people. We permit another tyrant to hold them behind iron bars whilst a subtle poison of unrest and discontent eats its way into the heart of the Nation. Who are these prisoners? For what were they sentenced? Why are they not released?

WHO ARE THESE PRISONERS?

College graduates, engineers, poets, a cartoonist, journalists, skilled workers, agricultural and unskilled migratory workers—feared, hated, persecuted, despised—America's political prisoners.

And what do we mean by a political prisoner? One convicted for an offense of which the sole evidence is an expression of opinion as distinct from the commission of any overt act.

Fifty-eight of the political prisoners are members of the Industrial Workers of the World; five have no connection whatever with the organization.

Was there 1 among these 63 men who was an agent of the enemy? No. Did anyone of them bear arms against the United States? No. Did even one of them commit any overt act whatsoever against the Government? No.

In fact, against a large number of the prisoners there was not brought one scintilla of evidence of any kind to prove their guilt. Think of it! The shame of it! Judge and jury trifling with men's lives with no more respect for justice than a cat has for a tortured bird.

Realize, ye stiff upholders of the Constitution, that the only offense for which these prisoners are now serving time is alleged opposition to the war, written or spoken. You do not believe it? Refer, then, to the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the Chicago and Wichita cases, and what do you find? The fact that these prisoners have been completely exonerated of any charge of violent acts against persons or property, and are therefore only guilty of that most heinous of crimes in America—free speech.

Ah, you say, I admit that it is true that the men in the Chicago and Wichita groups are guilty of only indulging in their constitutional rights of free speech, but what is the status of the prisoners convicted in the Sacramento trial? In reply, be it known, O reader, that the Sacramento men, realizing from long and bitter experience that there is little or no justice in American courts for the working class, wisely decided to put no money in lawyers' fees or in the legal claptrap connected with court procedure. They sat during their trial in noble silence, while their prosecutors fretted and fumed over all the barren verbiage in their legal vocabulary. On a technicality, therefore, owing to this silent defense, the superior courts can not review their case. Lawyers who have examined the one-side record of this Sacramento trial bear witness to the fact that it differs in no respect from the Chicago and Wichita cases. For a whim of the law these men may rot and wither for 20 years in jail for all the Department of Justice cares.

Such is America to-day.

Feared, hated, persecuted, despised—why? Because it is a crime for a workingman to attempt to better his condition—a blacker crime than putting into practice his belief in the Constitution. Read, mark, and learn, O ignorant Americans, what ye may do in these United States to keep out of jail and what deeds will land you in a steel cell, 4 by 9, for 5, 10, or 20 years:

RECIPES FOR KEEPING OUT OR GETTING INTO JAIL.

Be a shipbuilder, and during a war rob the Government.

Profiteer in food while your country is at war. For this you may be fined. Remain calm. The Government will pay your fine later.

Conspire to defraud the Government on war-time contracts.

Attempt to better your living conditions or to raise your standards of life in any way.

Tell your employer the food is rotten or that the bunk house in the lumber camp is lousy and sour.

Demand a living wage from your boss.

Furthermore, if you have a choice in the matter, remember it is safer in this sweet land of liberty to be a bomb plotter than a home builder or a believer in free speech. The President pardons men for the following deeds:

REASONS FOR PRESIDENTIAL PARDONS.

1. Conspiring to set on foot a military enterprise directed against a foreign country. (Jacobsen, pardoned for this, December 25, 1921.)

2. Providing doctored eyeglasses to registrants so as to get them off under the draft. (Kennedy, pardoned for this, December 25, 1921.)

3. Leaving the country unlawfully during a war in order to sell plans for a new gun to the German consul in Mexico. (Freese, pardoned for this, December 25, 1921.)

4. Attempting to blow up munitions ships. (Capt. Robert Fay, pardoned for this, August 31, 1922.)

And other similar cases too numerous to mention.

But try to shorten your work hours, to raise your wages, to secure decent living conditions, or to express an honest opinion, and, verily, your reward will be an American dungeon, with several preliminary coats of tar and feathers and a beating up given in the best American mob style.

Such is America to-day.

Let us examine further into the methods of how America is leading the world into the paths of freedom and democracy. Cast your eye over this table. It is called:

AN AMERICAN PILGRIM'S PROGRESS—1799–1917.

January 30, 1799: The act against criminal correspondence with a foreign government. Maximum penalty, 3 years.

1861: Section 6 of the Penal Code: Conspiracy to overthrow by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against it, or to oppose by force its authority, or by force prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States. Maximum penalty, 6 years.

August 6, 1861: The act against recruiting soldiers or sailors to serve against the United States. Maximum penalty, 5 years.

August 6, 1861: The act against enlistment to serve against the United States. Maximum penalty, 3 years.

ESPIONAGE ACT, 1917.—MAXIMUM PENALTY, 20 YEARS.

He who placed the Statue of Liberty with her back turned to her country and her eyes directed across the seas to England was a prophet in his generation. In England, the maximum sentence for political prisoners during the war was 6 months. Here, 20 years! Alas, America!

Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty, the watch dog of Wall Street, and all his understudies and underlings, the whole pack of legal hounds, will tell you solemnly on their Bible oath, if need be, that there are no political prisoners in America. That there never have been political prisoners in America. However, there they are—63 of 'em—but the Government does not recognize them! Ignorance is bliss for the watch dog of Wall Street.

But, Mr. Daugherty, what about President Lincoln? Or do you not recognize him either? This is what that wise, magnanimous, noble man, not a petty, peanut politician, had to say:

"The President—anxious to favor a return to the normal course of the administration—directs that all political prisoners or State prisoners now held in military custody be released"—(from Executive Order No. 1, relating to political prisoners, February 14, 1862).

Rather a sound example for the recognition of political prisoners from the pen of the only great Republican President! Lincoln's proclamation is of greater importance in that it is a precedent for general amnesty. Does Mr. Harding need further historical evidence that one can declare a general amnesty and still remain a 100 per cent American President? If so, let him study this:

"Therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do proclaim, declare, and make known to all persons who have directly or by implication, participated in the existing rebellion * * * that a full pardon is hereby granted to them * * *."

His successor in office said: "To the end, therefore, that the authority of the Government of the United States may be restored and that peace, order, and freedom may be established, I, Andrew Johnson, President of the United States, do proclaim and declare that I hereby grant to all persons who have directly or indirectly, participated in the existing rebellion * * * amnesty and pardon. * * *"

A modern statesman of international reputation, Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, said at Chicago, October 1, 1922: "Of recent years a vicious doctrine, treasonable to the American Constitution, has obtained a foothold in this country. This doctrine says that during a war the Constitution is suspended. The rights guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution were provided for just such emergencies, when public opinion is inflamed and it is difficult to get justice through ordinary channels. * * * It should be remembered that this Government and the Constitution by which it lives were founded on revolution and free speech. * * * Every day that our political prisoners remain in prison we are denying the principle on which this Republic is founded—the right of free speech, free press, and free assemblage."

Oh, for a President who would dare to do the right thing in spite of the watch dog of Wall Street! That he would say: "I so cherish freedom, that even though it be against the wishes of my financial masters, I do hereby declare a general amnesty for political prisoners." Why can he not do this thing? Why does he not do it? Would it not be better to defy the whole world than to sit with a blackened soul in a whited sepulchre? It will be a glorious day for America, Mr. President, when you throw down your false gods, and grant an unconditional release for all political prisoners. (Reprinted from the Voice of the People.)

Joint Amnesty Committee, 233 Maryland Building, Washington, D. C.; Gilson Gardner, chairman; Basil M. Manly, treasurer; Mary Gertrude Fendall, executive secretary; Helen Todd, field secretary; Roger N. Baldwin, Lucy G. Branham, Edmund C. Evans, Elisabeth Gilman, Mrs. Paul Hanna, Mrs. Ida Jaffe, William H. Johnston, Mrs. Lillian Kisliuk, Mrs. Robert M. La Follette, Jackson H. Ralston, E. J. Reefer, Rev. John A. Ryan, Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, Harry Slattery, Frank P. Walsh, Ellen Winsor.

RELEASE THE POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR CHRISTMAS—ARE 110,000,000 AMERICANS AFRAID OF THE IDEAS OF 62 MEN?—DO YOU KNOW?

1. Sixty-two war-time prisoners are still held in prison in the United States.

2. These men are serving sentences of 5 to 20 years.

3. These men are in prison solely for expression of opinion in writing or speech.

4. The espionage act under which they were convicted was repealed over a year and a half ago.

5. Every other country that took part in the war has released its war-time prisoners years ago.

6. All the German spies and agents who tried to wreck our industries and shipping have long since been freed.

DO YOU KNOW?

Distinguished lawyers said that most of these 62 men should never have been convicted and that all of them should be released.

These lawyers include:

Hon. Charles Nagel, Secretary of Commerce and Labor under President Taft.

Hon. Francis Fisher Kane, ex-Federal district attorney, of Philadelphia.
Zarachiah Chaffee, Harvard University Law School.
Felix Frankfurter, Harvard University Law School.
Maj. Alexander Sidney Lanier, United States Army, retired.

DO YOU KNOW?

The following organizations are among those which have urged the immediate release of all these political prisoners:
Federal Council of Churches.
American Federation of Labor.
World War Veterans.
Fellowship of Reconciliation.
League for Democratic Control.
Socialist Party of America.
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.
Workmen's Circle.
Women's Trade Union League.
American Women's Independence League.
Methodist Federation for Social Service.
Farmers' National Council.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
Western Unitarian Conference.
Society of Friends (Quakers).
National Popular Government League.
Central Conference of American Rabbis.

"Every day that our political prisoners remain in prison we are denying the principle on which this Republic is founded—the right of free speech, free press, and free assemblage."—(Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, at Chicago, October 1, 1922.)

WAKE UP, AMERICANS.

Help us free these 62 men.
Help us set them free.
Help before it is too late.

THE WAR IS OVER.

They suffer to-day in vile jails for their belief in free speech.
They are American workingmen suffering for their activities in the labor movement.
One man died recently. One man has gone insane. Two are dying of tuberculosis. Others have heart disease or are losing their eyesight, etc.

PRESIDENT HARDING WILL RELEASE THEM IF YOU URGE IT.

For confirmation of these facts and further information, apply to Joint Amnesty Committee, 233 Maryland Building, Washington, D. C.
Tear off this card, sign your name and address, put on a 1-cent stamp, mail it to-day; or, better still, write a letter to President Harding.

PEACE ON EARTH, GOOD WILL TO MEN.

President WARREN G. HARDING,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I plead in the spirit of Christmas for the immediate unconditional release of the 62 political prisoners now serving 5 and 20 years in Federal penitentiaries.

Name ——— ———,
Address ——— ———.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina still has two minutes if he desires to use it.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LOGAN].

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the pending bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

SALARIES, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

Secretary of the Navy, $12,000; Assistant Secretary, $5,000; and for chief clerk and such other employees as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary, $108,000; in all, $125,000: *Provided*, That, other than the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum, except the following: One $4,000, 2 at $3,000 each, 1 $2,500, 6 at $2,400 each, 2 at $2,250 each, and 3 at $2,000 each.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 2, line 4, strike out the words "as the Secretary of the Navy may deem necessary."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, this is pro forma in order that I may comply with a promise I made to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] to cite him to a specific instance where the mother of a minor boy was scared into withdrawing her application for his discharge from the Navy.

Messrs. Walters & Baker, a reputable firm of lawyers in the city of San Saba, Tex., called my attention to the fact that a young boy named Eddy had been induced to enlist in the Navy against the knowledge and consent of his widowed mother, and said that she was in destitute circumstances and needed him, and I later had the affidavits filed asking for his release. The Navy Department, in promising to have the boy discharged, says this:

When young Eddy enlisted, December 1, 1920, he made oath that he was born August 12, 1901, from which it would appear that his enlistment was taken in good faith, and considered legal and binding in all respects under the Revised Statutes, which make the enlistment of a boy 18 years of age, or over, without the consent of his parents or legal guardian, a valid contract.

When his mother read that statement coming from the Navy Department, here is her reply:

WILLOW CITY, TEX., *September 5, 1922.*

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I received your letter last night concerning the discharge of my boy, Terrel Robert Eddy. I have decided to let the matter drop, as I don't know what the boy swore, and I am afraid I might get him into trouble. He has one more year to serve in the Navy, and I think it best to leave him alone. However, I thank you very much for your trouble.

Yours very truly, MRS. SELMA EDDY.

You see how it affected this widow. When they tell her that her boy swore he was of a certain age, the anxious widowed mother suspects that the Government of the United States is going to put him into the penitentiary if she insists on his discharge, and she lets the matter drop. That is what happened in the case of this widowed, destitute mother, who needs the services of a minor son. I could call the attention of the gentleman to several instances like this.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute, please, and then I will. I want to give the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] another case of a young man named Robert Lee Bradshaw, from my home city, who was induced by a slick-tongued recruiting officer to enlist when he was not yet 16 years of age. The recruiting officer told him about traveling all over the world, and he enlisted without the knowledge or consent of his parents. When they asked that he be discharged I filed the proper affidavits with the Bureau of Navigation showing that he was not yet 16 years of age and asking that he be discharged because he was induced to enlist without the knowledge or consent of his parents. Promising to consider the case, on November 28, 1922, the Bureau of Navigation wrote the same kind of a letter, saying:

When young Bradshaw enlisted September 1, 1922, he made oath that he was born September 8, 1903, from which it would appear that his enlistment was taken in good faith and considered legal and binding in all respects under the Revised Statutes, which make the enlistment of a boy 18 years of age or over without the consent of his parents or legal guardian a valid contract.

That intimates to the parents that a prosecution might occur and that dishonorable discharge may follow if they insist upon his discharge. Why not discharge this 15-year old boy without all this implied threat? But let me call your attention to this other case to show that the Navy Department, when the Eddy boy enlisted, knew that he was under the lawful age for enlistment, because Messrs. Walters & Baker, this reputable firm of lawyers, of San Saba, Tex., say:

It seems that the department knew that he was under age from the fact that his mother, who is and was then a poor widow, received a message asking that she give her permission to him to join the Navy, and she immediately answered this message with a telegram stating in effect that she would not consent to same, and that her boy was but 17 years of age. She is in straitened circumstances and has five children, this son being her eldest and her main support.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I should like to ask you if you followed up these cases after you got these communications?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course I did not follow it up when the intimidated woman said she wanted to let the matter drop. I did not know but what there would be a dishonorable discharge. I did not want to force the boy, the son of a widowed mother, to take a dishonorable discharge from the Navy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman to one fact, and that is that I have had several cases of this kind, and when I went after them I always got them released.

Mr. BLANTON. And I have gotten several released. The point I am trying to make is this, that this Congress ought to give the Secretary of the Navy and the Bureau of Navigation to understand that when we produce evidence showing that a boy is only 15, 16, or 17 years of age and has been induced to join the Navy without the knowledge and consent of his parents they should discharge him and send him home without all this "monkey business."

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has discussed this matter with Admiral Washington, of the Bureau of Navigation?

Mr. BLANTON. I have; and he is a splendid man, and he has sent lots of these boys home. When I can get a case personally to Admiral Washington he discharges the boys. But he is sometimes away on an extended trip. You can not

always find him. You understand that while this letter was signed by him he likely never saw it personally.

Mr. OLIVER. I was going to bring that out. The gentleman says this letter was written by some clerk. I will say that Admiral Washington has never failed to discharge them promptly and send them home when the proper affidavits have been made.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is correct. When I have been able to find Admiral Washington personally he sees that they are sent home; but I am insisting that the Navy Department should not write these letters containing the implied threat of a dishonorable discharge and prosecution, which scare the fathers and mothers of these boys and cause them to withdraw the application for a discharge, as the Eddy widow did. Why should we not demand proper action on the part of the Navy Department?

Mr. FIELDS. What is the character of the discharge?

Mr. OLIVER. It is an honorable discharge.

Mr. BLANTON. Why should they impliedly be threatened with a discharge that is not honorable?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have heard a good deal about discharges from the Navy of under-age boys, and intimations have been made that the Bureau of Navigation has acted harshly in cases of this kind. Now, in justice to the Bureau of Navigation and Admiral Washington, a man of the highest integrity, kind and sympathetic, I want to refute any aspersion that may be cast on him or the bureau over which he presides. In every case that has come to my notice, and a great number have come under my observation, not only those from my own district but those of other Members of Congress, because of my membership on the Naval Committee, never in one instance in my knowledge has the Navy Department declined to discharge a man who entered the service under age when proof was shown.

They have gone further than that; in cases where they found a man who is over age but enlisted in the Navy who showed the need of his being at home on account of dependency, they have in many cases been lenient and given those men honorable discharges. If my friend from Texas desires to bring before this Congress and spread on the RECORD statements that that is not the fact and criticizing the Navy Department for doing as it has done, I think he will stand alone, as he stands alone in many other matters that he brings to this body.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York will be alone on March 4.

Mr. VESTAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. VESTAL. I want to say that never in the six years that I have been a Member of Congress has the Navy Department refused to discharge any boy—I do not care what his age has been—when I was able to show that they needed that boy at home.

Mr. HICKS. I am glad to get the testimony of the gentleman from Indiana. There are times, of course, when men go into the Navy, overenthusiastic, perhaps, because of the coloring that the recruiting officers give to naval life, the visiting of foreign countries, the adventure which appeals to young men, and in some cases men will probably forswear themselves as to age. But when these cases come before the bureau in a proper way, supported by proper evidence, I do not believe there is a case in recent years on record when in peace times the Navy Department has not said that has been a mistake and given the boy an honorable discharge from the Navy.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, there is another side of this matter that it might be well to consider. I have all the sympathy in the world for the young boys who enlist in the Navy in a moment of enthusiasm and in the spirit of adventure and who later conclude that they do not like the service, and write appealing letters home to mother. We feel for the mother of such boys. From the discussion this afternoon one would judge that only the sons of widowed mothers did this sort of thing. That is, of course, not true. The Navy of the United States, Mr. Chairman, is not a bad place for a young boy with an adventurous spirit who desires to see the world—a little inclined to run away and have his fling.

I have some question whether or no we should in every case respond favorably, immediately and forthwith, to the request that a boy enlisted under those circumstances should be discharged. In the 25 years I have been here I have had quite a bit of experience in cases of this sort. I have in mind, I think, not less than half a dozen cases—and I have been trying to recall them as the discussion has been going on—where during the pendency of correspondence with a view of securing a discharge the parents or the boy or both have changed their minds in the matter. I recall a number of instances where I have myself advised, after learning all the circumstances—advised the parents to let the boy serve out his time. I have in mind one very recent case where the parents took a considerable journey to personally thank me for such advice.

One would imagine from some things that have been said that a boy who in his enthusiasm makes a misstatement in regard to his age and gets into the Navy has entered upon a service most unfortunate for him and unhappy for his family.

I do not think that is true generally. Quite the contrary. I do think that where boys have entered the Navy contrary to the wishes and desire of their parents, and it is very clear that the boy is needed at home, and if sent home would be of real service, we ought to endeavor to secure the discharge of such boys. But I think there are many of the cases where the boy is quite as well off in the Navy as he would be discharged. I do not think we ought to treat too lightly the offense on the part of a young boy for misstating his age. I think it is a good thing for a young man to learn early in life that he must not take a false oath; that he must not enter upon any enterprise under false pretenses; that he must not enter upon a service with the expectation of enjoying it, under misstatement of facts, and then expect to be allowed to leave it any moment that he concludes he would like some other adventure better. In all cases of this sort that have been called to my attention—and there have been many—I have felt it my duty to thoroughly inform myself as to all of the facts and circumstances, and I have not in all cases requested that the boy be discharged. I have come to the conclusion in quite a number of cases that the boy would after all, everything considered, be better off if he served out his term. Of course, if there be a widowed mother or an indigent father who may need the services of the boy, and it is very clear that he ought to be with them and have the benefit of their counsel and advice and assist them, we ought to get such a boy out. But not all the cases fall within that category.

There are many cases where a young fellow, having gone into the Navy without sufficient reflection, finding it not an altogether pleasant service, has been greatly benefited by being compelled to finish the term of his enlistment. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with much that the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said with regard to many boys being better off in the Navy than out of it. We all have cases of this kind in our districts, and it is always my rule to write and fully inform the parents before making application for the boy's discharge. I am glad to hear that the Navy is issuing honorable discharges in cases of this kind. I regret that the Army has not adopted the same policy. I do criticize the efforts of recruiting officers in many cases of this kind. Only a few days ago I received a letter from a constituent, a widow, stating that her son had enlisted in the Navy at the age of 15. That recruiting officer knew that the boy was under age. There is no question about that. My complaint of the department, which I have voiced heretofore, is that they are not more rigid with the recruiting officers. Recruiting officers should be reprimanded, should be disciplined, should be punished for taking into the service boys under age when their appearance is bound to convince the recruiting officer that they are under age.

I may not have an opportunity to refer to this when the Army bill is under consideration, and I take the opportunity to refer to it now. The Army has not been so liberal as the Navy. In cases of this kind a boy is given a discharge without honor. It is always painful for me to see a young man who is enthusiastic enough to go into the Army, and who, prompted by his patriotic impulse, enlists in the service, but because of his tender years becomes dissatisfied, thrown out of the service, and discharged without honor. I say it is unfair to have this campaign go on by the recruiting officers of the Army and the Navy, taking into the service the children of the country and then giving them discharge without honor, when the recruiting officers know full well that they are not of military age when they take them in. I protest against it, and I wish that the departments would take some action to correct that evil.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I remember during the period of the war that a widow came to my house and said she had four children. Three of them had enlisted, and she was very proud of it, but the fourth boy was under 16 and had run away from home. She said she wanted him home because she believed the home influence to be better than the influence of the Government. She said that when he arrived at the proper age, and then did not go to war, she would be ashamed of him. I made an application and the boy was discharged without dishonor. I have had many cases similar to that, and not one

do I recall where the bureau did not discharge the boy. Perhaps the only penalty was in one case where he had to pay his fare home from the place where he was stationed.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. While this matter was discussed a little while ago, some erroneous statement was made, or perhaps suggested, I think, that the recruiting officer received some compensation or recognition if he obtained a large number of recruits for the service. That is not correct. A recruiting officer is detailed to that work in the same way that he is detailed to other work, and whether he gets one man or ten or a hundred into the Navy the fact does not make a particle of difference so far as compensation or his service record is concerned.

Mr. FIELDS. I remember no such statement as that.

Mr. HICKS. It was made here, perhaps in casual conversation.

Mr. BLANTON. It was not made in debate.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For professional and technical books and periodicals, law books, and necessary reference books, including city directories, railway guides, freight, passenger, and express tariff books, for department library, $2,000.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I had not intended to take up any of the time of the House during the discussion of this bill. I intended to express my sentiments toward the bill by voting for it on final passage. But I can not remain silent after the delivery of the very eloquent address of my friend from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY]—and he is my friend. With most of what he said I agree, but I have to protest when he attempts to "Conan Doyle" the wraith of the dead and buried Alameda naval base project, buried under some 6 to 20 feet of water in an eternal grave on a mud flat on which borings have been made for over 250 feet and no bottom found other than quicksand and mud, on which certain people more or less interested are asking the Government of the United States to spend $160,000,000, a tax of about $1.40 per capita on every man, woman, and child in the United States, for the construction of an unnecessary naval base on San Francisco Bay, on property to which the city of Alameda has no title except a possessory title from the State of California to use it and lease it for a limited number of years for certain purposes to private persons, corporations, and firms, and to which the city of Alameda can give no title in fee to the United States Government, but only a perpetual possessory title to use certain mud banks for naval purposes only. If the Government should accept that site and spend forty or fifty million dollars in filling in that mud bank in an attempt to make it available for naval base purposes, and should find, as it would find, that the foundation was such that it could not carry the weight of a battleship, and should then wish to quit, the Government could not salvage and sell the site, but it would revert to the city of Alameda, and all of the moneys spent by the Government would be wasted, so far as the Government is concerned, although it might be a good thing for the city of Alameda and probably would be for the State of California.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any appropriation recommended by this committee for Alameda?

Mr. CURRY. An appropriation for Alameda on this bill would not be in order.

Mr. BUTLER. I had that in mind.

Mr. CURRY. But my friend from California was finding fault with the committee for not having included an item for it. Of course, before an appropriation could be included in this bill the matter would have to be considered by the Naval Affairs Committee and a bill reported, passed by the House and by the Senate, and then signed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, we have in San Francisco Bay a good navy yard, the nucleus of a good naval base, at Mare Island. It is on a rock foundation. The property, thousands of acres in extent, belongs to the United States Government in fee simple. It has cost about $40,000,000 to develop it. It is the best navy yard in the United States. It turns out better work at a cheaper cost and more expeditiously than any other yard, public or private, in this country. During the war there was no fault found with the work it turned out. There can not be any fault found with it now. When the time comes that the country needs more naval shore developemnt in San Francisco Bay that is the place to develop it. The whole bay is a naval base, but the proper place to develop for a navy yard and base is what you have now and what you have used for the past 50 years. The late Admiral Farragut, then a lieutenant, was its first commandant. He has been succeeded by many able naval officers. I dislike to appear in opposition to something that might result in the expenditure of $160,000,000 of American money unnecessarily in my State, but I fear the vision of my colleague of a developed and completed naval base at Alameda at the end of 40 years and the unnecessary expenditure of $160,000,000 of the people's money to accomplish that purpose on a site that in no way meets the requirement of such a plant is an ectoplasm of his imagination. There is no material substance to it.

I am a Representative from the State of California, from the third California district, but I hope that my attitude in this House has convinced the membership that I am not in favor of spending money unnecessarily in my district or any other district in this country; that I am first of all a representative of the American people; that I am interested in the national defense, and if I thought that the Mare Island Navy Yard——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CURRY. May I have three minutes more time?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CURRY. If I thought that Mare Island was not a proper place for a navy yard or a naval base and the adequate defense of the United States required another naval base or a navy yard built on San Francisco Bay, I would be one of the first—even if I lost my seat in Congress—to say to this House, if Alameda were a proper place or some other place were a proper place, and the defense of my country needed another naval base, do away with Mare Island and go to Alameda or elsewhere. If the Navy Department itself can give me one single solitary uncontroverted valid military reason for the expenditure of this unnecessary amount of money in the development of a place on San Francisco Bay other than Mare Island as a naval base I will quit. The facts of the matter are that the very best thought in the Navy is not in favor of Alameda. The real Navy and Army experts are in favor of the development of the Mare Island Navy Yard, and if a bill should ever properly come before the Committee on Naval Affairs of this House providing for the development of Alameda as a naval base I will not try to have any ex parte evidence given before that committee in favor of Mare Island, but I will subpœna the best experts in the Navy to appear before that committee and give their evidence of what they think is best and will submit the proposition on expert testimony from the Navy Department itself. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I hope we can make a little progress; this particular project is not in this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to answer a criticism. I called attention to a specific case where a poor widow with five children, destitute, had her minor son join the Navy under lawful age without her knowledge or consent. These facts came to me from the reputable firm of lawyers, Walters & Baker, of San Saba, Tex., showing that attention of his unlawful age was brought to the Navy Department, because they wired his mother for consent and she wired back saying she protested against the boy being accepted; but he was accepted. I maintained that under such circumstances the Navy Department should release him immediately when the proper proof was filed, and not send a statement to the widowed mother that would make her believe that her son would be prosecuted and dishonorably discharged. I read the letter from this widow wherein she said: "I have decided to let the matter drop. I don't know what my boy swore. I am afraid I might get him in trouble, and withdraw my application for his discharge." That was my offense, calling a case of that kind to the attention of Congress, and because I did it the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] gets up and criticizes and gets personal and calls attention to the fact that I have to stand alone sometimes on the floor of the House. Is it a disgrace to stand alone when a man believes he is right? I am not afraid to stand alone on a proposition when I believe I am right. I offer no apology to the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] for standing alone sometimes when I believe I am right. It is easy to drift with the tide. It requires strength to swim upstream. I am sorry that after the 4th of March I will not have a chance for either one of those gentlemen to back me up on propositions. They will not be here then. I did not get personal. I did not try to throw cabbage bouquets at either of them. I was standing up here fighting for the rights of a destitute widow whose son was wrongfully inducted into the Navy, and it ill becomes

the distinguished gentleman from New York to criticize me. That is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY, MISCELLANEOUS.

For commissions and interest; transportation of funds; exchange; mileage to officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve Force while traveling under orders of the United States, and for actual personal expenses of officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve Force while traveling abroad under orders, and for traveling expenses of civilian employees, and for mileage, at 5 cents per mile, to midshipmen entering the Naval Academy while proceeding from their homes to the Naval Academy for examination and appointment as midshipmen; for actual traveling expenses of female nurses; actual expenses of officers while on shore patrol duty; hire of launches or other small boats in Asiatic waters; for rent of buildings and offices not in navy yards; expenses of courts-martial, prisoners and prisons, and courts of inquiry, boards of inspection, examining boards, with clerks, and witnesses' fees, and traveling expenses and costs; expenses of naval defense districts; stationery and recording; religious books; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising for the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); copying; ferriage; tolls; costs of suits; commissions, warrants, diplomas, and discharges; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; quarantine expenses; reports; professional investigation; cost of special instruction at home and abroad, including maintenance of students and attachés; information from abroad and at home, and the collection and classification thereof; all charges pertaining to the Navy Department and its bureaus for ice for the cooling of drinking water on shore (except at naval hospitals), and not to exceed $225,000 for telephone rentals and tolls, telegrams and cablegrams; postage, foreign and domestic, and post-office box rentals; for necessary expenses for interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction, and for payment of claims for damages under naval act approved July 11, 1919; and other necessary and incidental expenses; in all, $2,730,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the expense of any naval district unless the commandant thereof shall be also the commandant of a navy yard, naval training station, or naval operating base: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards and naval stations, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, shall not exceed $625,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice in the hearings on page 637 that Admiral Potter stated that they have a balance in the fund of $3,400,000.

Mr. KELLEY. We gave you too much money?

Admiral POTTER. No, sir. The balance of the 1922-23 appropriation available on June 30, 1922, was $6,483,000.

But looking up the bill of last year I find the appropriation was $700,000, and I was wondering why it could not be cut more——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman from Florida is under a misapprehension as to the item under consideration. This item we are considering now is "Pay, miscellaneous." I think the gentleman refers to "Provisions, Navy."

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT, NAVY.

For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, $40,000.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I could have obtained the information if I had had an opportunity to hear the entire speech of the gentleman from Michigan, but I was called from the Chamber. Do I understand we have pretty clear information as to whether we have sufficient men in the Navy to man the treaty Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that the information that was presented to the House eight or nine months ago is not materially different from the information now obtainable. I will say this, that at the present time—although we are not on that item now——

Mr. TINCHER. I know.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. At the present time there are 52,900 men in the treaty fleet; that the Navy Department anticipated putting on the treaty fleet as soon as the ships that are now being decommissioned are put out of commission, 3,889 more, and 1,700 more on that date on transports, making a total of 58,000 men on the fleet, leaving 28,000 men for the shore. That is the distribution of the 86,000 men.

Mr. TINCHER. Does the department still claim that they want 28,000 men on shore?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Is that the kind of disposition that was represented to the House they would make of the people at the time they were clamoring for what they called an increase sufficient to man the fleet?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, the gentleman's memory is good, and I am not clear in my mind as to what division they proposed.

Mr. TINCHER. I thought they claimed that they had to have these men in order to properly man these treaty ships. Now, if it is true that they have been without that increase, I suppose the gentleman will refrain from bringing a bill in as he did a year ago for the reason that he treated it as res adjudicata, so far as this Congress is concerned, and we will maintain 28,000 men on shore until we have a new court.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL.

SALARIES, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

For officers and employees in the office of the Judge Advocate General, $76,420: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum except the following: Solicitor, $4,000; attorneys—3 at $3,000 each, 3 at $2,500 each, 3 at $2,400 each; law clerks—2 at $2,250 each, 1 $2,200, 3 at $2,000 each.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANKIN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 10 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will not the gentleman content himself with five?

Mr. RANKIN. If there is objection, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention of the House to an apparently inspired newspaper article, or series of articles, that have been going out from Washington from time to time relative to the farm bloc in this body, and especially to one that recently appeared in the papers throughout the country to the effect that the farm bloc in the House had deserted Henry Ford on his bid for Muscle Shoals. I will not take the time of the House to read all the article, but will call attention to the headlines and then read enough of the body of the dispatch to show its general trend. The headline which I have before me reads as follows:

FARM BLOC QUITS FORD SHOAL BID.

Farm bloc in Congress deserts Ford plan in favor of Government operation.

Under that ominous headline we find the following laughable statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 6.—The House "farm bloc" Wednesday deserted Henry Ford by withdrawing support for his plan to lease the Government Muscle Shoals property.

Let me pause here long enough to say that there is not a member of the farm bloc in the House, so far as I have been able to find, who has deserted the Ford proposition. If there is one under the sound of my voice, I want him to stand up and say so. [After a pause.] Not a man rises. Every man before me who is a member of the farm bloc knows that the farm bloc has not deserted Ford, and that the statement above quoted is absolutely erroneous. But let me proceed to read you the most amusing part of this most amusing article, which is as follows:

In a bill introduced in the House by Representative DICKINSON, leader of the bloc, Government ownership of the property is to be continued, etc.

Mr. Chairman, before taking the floor to discuss this ridiculous statement, I called up the office of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and notified him that I was going to do so, because I did not want to discuss it in his absence, or at least without his having notice and being given an opportunity to be present.

It is hard for me to believe—in fact, I refuse to believe—that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is responsible for the preposterous statement that he is "leader of the farm bloc" in this House. He has never been elected to, appointed to, or recognized as head or leader of the farm bloc in the House, and it certainly is a huge joke for the newspapers to refer to him as such. I understand that references to him as head of the farm bloc went the round of the press in Iowa, and possibly other Western States, during the last campaign, and I have even heard it intimated that he made a lecture tour recently as head of the farm bloc, but I refuse to believe such reports. Surely no member of this House would arrogate to himself leadership in a body of two or three hundred intelligent men without their knowledge or consent.

As a matter of fact, the farm bloc in the House is not a concrete organization. Every member of this body who is from an agricultural district, and who conscientiously represents his

constituents, is a member of the farm bloc. He controls his own vote, and he is neither led nor delivered by any imaginary or self-appointed leader. There is no chosen leader or head of the bloc in the House, as I said, but every member is free to vote his own convictions on any and all propositions, and is answerable only to the people of the district which he is sent here to represent.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. I understand the paper says that the farm bloc will do so-and-so, and then it says that Mr. DICKINSON is the head of the farm bloc. That is sufficient, that settles it, so far as he is concerned, does it not?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] ironically suggests, that makes him the self-appointed head of the farm bloc, so far as he is concerned, provided he inspired or condoned the statement. But so far as the other members are concerned, we are not bound by any such ex parte proceedings.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is it a certainty who is the head of the farm bloc?

Mr. RANKIN. As I said a moment ago, there is no concrete organization of a farm bloc. No leader has been chosen, and no one is authorized to pose as the head of the bloc.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is what I understood the gentleman to say.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is not warranted or empowered to speak in behalf of the farm bloc?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, certainly not. He is no more the leader of the farm bloc than is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] or any other Member who conscientiously represents an agricultural district.

Mr. BUTLER. Who compose the farm bloc? I am a Representative of an agricultural district, and I am not a member of it or of any faction in the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Are you not a member of the farm bloc?

Mr. BUTLER. No. That is a distinction that I do not claim or appreciate.

Mr. RANKIN. I am willing to let the RECORD show that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is not a member of the farm bloc. I said that the members of the farm bloc were men who represented agricultural districts and who are conscientiously in sympathy with the agricultural interests.

But, Mr. Chairman, the statement that the farm bloc in the House has deserted the Ford proposition seems to be a part of that propaganda that has been going on ever since his offer was submitted, more than a year ago. When I first came here, in February, 1921, just before the old Congress expired, I heard some of the very men who are now denouncing and opposing the Ford proposition advocating scrapping the Muscle Shoals project. They regarded it as absolutely worthless. But when Henry Ford came forward with his bid, containing a proposition to manufacture fertilizer for the benefit of the farmers of the country, the Fertilizer Trust began to propaganda Congress against the Ford proposition. Mr. Ford's representative said at the hearings on the Ford proposition that he believed Mr. Ford could produce fertilizer at Muscle Shoals so as to reduce the price of that material 50 per cent. What would that mean to the farmers of America? Senator HEFLIN, of Alabama, said on the floor of the Senate a few days ago that the farmers of Alabama alone use $20,000,000 worth of fertilizer annually. Reduce that 50 per cent, and you save the farmers of that State alone $10,000,000 a year. The same may be said of other States. In my humble opinion, if we will accept the Ford offer and turn this great project over to him he will save the farmers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars every year that rolls around in the price of fertilizer alone, to say nothing of the great benefit it will be to the American people in reclaiming lands that are now considered as worn out. Thousands of men who are now out of work will be given employment at living wages, without placing a constant drain on the Treasury of the United States.

The Power Trust has been busy spreading anti-Ford propaganda, and trying to make the people believe that if Henry Ford should get this project he would use all the power himself, and that there would be none left for distribution. Every man who has investigated the proposition knows that such would not be the case. The fact is that the Power Trust is fighting this Ford offer because they realize that if he gets control of Muscle Shoals he will be able to give the people power at a much cheaper rate than they are getting it now, and the power companies do not want him as a competitor. They know that he will make that part of the country hum with industry, and they would rather see the country remain at a standstill than to see it enjoy this prosperity without their getting the lion's share of the proceeds.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, for a question.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman know that when Mr. Ford made his offer to take over Muscles Shoals he only agreed to make about a million tons of fertilizer, provided he could make it at all, and that there are over 18,000,000 tons used in the United States? How is 1,000,000 tons going to bring down the price?

Mr. RANKIN. One question is enough. That shows how the gentleman feels on the proposition. It is the same old stereotyped argument. If you will turn Muscle Shoals over to Henry Ford and let it be known that he will make fertilizer at all, it will throw such a bomb into the camp of the Fertilizer Trust that you will see the price come down within the reach of the average farmer.

No, Mr. Chairman, the farm bloc has not deserted the Ford offer. Those of us who have favored his proposition ever since it was made are still supporting it, and we are still asking that the committee to which the matter has been referred, and of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] is a member, will bring the matter before the House and give us a chance to vote on it, and you will see that the farm bloc in the House has not deserted the Ford proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I shall not object to my friend KEARNS going ahead; but this Muscle Shoals proposition might consume more time than we have to spare, and after the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEARNS] concludes I think I shall object to having anything more on the subject of Muscle Shoals.

Mr. OLIVER. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Ohio desires to speak out of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; he wants to speak on Muscle Shoals.

Mr. OLIVER. I think there should be a reply, inasmuch as the gentleman proposes to speak out of order.

Mr. BEGG. I do not see any reason for a reply. You have already had 10 minutes.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman from Ohio has filed a report on this subject. I think the House is pretty familiar with his position, and if there is something to be written in the RECORD at this time on a matter that in no way relates to the bill, I feel that there ought to be a reply.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman did not object when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] took the floor.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman from Mississippi was not discussing the details of the Ford proposition but was rather giving a correct statement as to the attitude of Mr. Dickerson, and he very properly said he did not understand that Mr. Dickerson had ever authorized anyone to say that he represented the farm bloc or that he was speaking for the farm bloc.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. OLIVER. I object, if the gentleman is going to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

TRANSPORTATION AND RECRUITING.

For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation to their homes, if residents of the United States, of enlisted men and apprentice seamen discharged on medical survey, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of sick or insane enlisted men and apprentice seamen to hospitals, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force to and from duty, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers, and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation; expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties; transportation of dependents of enlisted men; in all, $4,000,000.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. OLIVER. Reserving the right to object, I understand that it is the desire of the gentleman in charge of the bill that no further discussion be allowed out of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. What I thought was this, Mr. Chairman, that the Muscle Shoals matter is full of controversy.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And if we went into it extensively a large amount of time would be consumed. One speech having been made on one side, and the gentleman from Ohio desiring to speak on the other side, I thought perhaps it was only fair that two speeches should be made, and then the debate closed up on that subject.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall not object.

Mr. KNUTSON. When the agricultural appropriation bill comes up there will be ample opportunity to take up the several generous offers that have been made.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall not interpose any objection to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] that at the end of five minutes all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I rise to talk on the Muscle Shoals proposition of Mr. Ford at this time is because there has been sent out, through Congress and otherwise, information relative to this offer that is very misleading, indeed, to the American people. Those who favor the Ford offer have attempted to gain the sympathy of the farmer by pretending to him that Henry Ford, if his offer should be accepted, would use this gigantic plant at Muscle Shoals and the water power at Dams Nos. 2 and 3 for the manufacture of fertilizer. Mr. Ford in his proposition to the Secretary of War has not agreed to make one pound of fertilizer at Muscle Shoals unless he can make it at a profit to himself.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KEARNS. No; I can not in five minutes. Even if he can make fertilizer at a profit to himself, he only agrees to use one-tenth part of that power in the manufacture of this very much needed commodity. The Ford propagandist never, for reasons obvious, tells the country this fact. This is concealed from the public.

He tells the Military Affairs Committee both of the House and the Senate very frankly that he intends to use the other nine-tenths of the power which the Government gives him practically free for the purpose of carrying on a manufacturing plant down there for his own profit. He will manufacture with this other nine-tenths whatever is deemed most profitable to him unrestrained by any authority. He also proposes in the proposition he makes to the Secretary of War that the Federal water power act be laid aside in his case, so that the Government will have no control over his activities. Every other man or set of men in the United States who get water-power rights are under the control of the Federal Government. Any other man or set of men who get water-power rights at Muscle Shoals can get it for a period of 50 years and no longer. He demands a term of 100 years, and there are those here who would give him these special privileges. Every other man or set of men who get rights in the water power in this country are required to build their dams at their own expense.

In this instance Henry Ford demands that the United States Government out of the Federal Treasury shall build his dam for him and allow him to use it for 100 years with a rental at 4 per cent. He agrees that he will pay into the Treasury of the United States $55,000 per annum for the upkeep of these dams, and yet every engineer who appeared before our committee testified that the minimum estimate is 1 per cent of the cost of construction for the upkeep of the dam and the maximum cost of upkeep 3 per cent, and the cost of construction would be $67,000,000. So it would cost the American people to keep up the dams for 100 years $670,000 per annum less $55,000 of this sum to be paid by Ford. That is the minimum cost, and if it should reach the maximum cost of 3 per cent it would be three times that amount, or $1,845,000 for repairs alone.

Every other man who gets water-power rights in the United States not only builds the dam but he pays for the upkeep. Ford writes into the contract that if these waters should wash out the dam, carry away any property or human life, the Government of the United States would pay the damage. He guards himself against the payment of one dollar's worth of damage that may occur. The men who advocate the acceptance of the Ford offer say that Ford is to pay back $50,000,000 of the $67,000,000, the cost of dam, and they send this statement out broadcast through the country and say with an emphasis that impells belief that they are speaking the truth. When anyone who has read the Ford offer says that, they must be attempting deliberately to carry a false message to the American people, because Ford only agrees to pay back about $4,500,000 of this $67,000,000 that the United States puts up for his dams, and how does he propose to pay this amount? He proposes to pay it in sums of $23,363 every six months during a period of 100 years. He says if the Government will compound the $23,363 at 4 per cent interest, at the end of 100 years it will amount to about $49,000,000. This is the rather unique way he proposes to pay back the $50,000,000, and yet these men who advocate the acceptance of the Ford offer say to the American people that Ford intends to pay back the full amount. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OCEAN AND LAKE SURVEYS.

For hydrographic surveys, including the pay of the necessary hydrographic surveyors, cartographic draftsmen, and recorders, and for the purchase of nautical books, charts, and sailing directions, $75,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do that for the purpose of obtaining some information from the chairman of the committee as to what work the Hydrographic Bureau does in connection with the surveys of the Great Lakes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My understanding is that this is not conducted within the adjacent or continental limits of the United States; it is in foreign waters.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the need of the descriptive title "Ocean and lake surveys"? I am acquainted with the work of the Hydrographic Bureau in surveys of the ocean and in interchanging the charts with foreign nations. But I was not acquainted with anything they did as far as the Great Lakes are concerned. In the appropriation bill for the War Department we have been carrying an item for the survey of the Great Lakes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There is nothing in this that has any reference to the Great Lakes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Great Lakes, Ill., $250,000.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to make an inquiry of the chairman. The very much lamented statesman, Mr. Mann, who, to the great regret of the House and the loss of the country, has passed away, I think at one time made an observation to the effect that the Great Lakes station had been passed upon by naval authorities as not a suitable place for a naval station at all.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I do not recall the observation to which the gentleman refers. The only objection I ever heard to the Great Lakes Training Station related to the cost of heating the institution. It is located in a section of the country where there is a long season of cold weather, and the amount of coal required is greater than at the naval base at Hampton Roads.

The same general observation would be applicable to the training station at Newport, R. I. The reason for maintaining all these stations is not the fact that they can not all be trained at one place, but it seems advisable to train the young boys rather in the general vicinity of their homes, and so the three stations have been provided for in the bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have heard the objection on account of the location that it was necessarily not provided with the numerous facilities that go along with one of the great naval ports like Hampton Roads, or Newport, R. I., or the one at California.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman is correct so far as training on ships or work of that kind is concerned. Of course, it could not be done in Chicago on account of the treaties between the United States and England respecting the carrying of guns on the vessels on the Great Lakes, but all other sorts of seamanship, of course, are feasible at Chicago.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As far as seamanship consisting of being on land all of the time is concerned, I think that is likely.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, no; the harbor has been constructed there recently, and every part of seamanship, except that of gunnery, is practiced at that base in Chicago.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have seen the harbor, but it is rather complimentary to call it a harbor. It is all right for pleasure craft and small vessels, but I do not think it is of much use for naval vessels, and, in fact, there are none there that I know of and should not be.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman began his remarks by a reference to our mutual good friend, Mr. Mann, who, to the great regret of all of us, has passed away. A year ago, when this proposition was before the House and the committee, Mr. Mann expressed his regret that here, in his opinion, the proper activities were not maintained at the Great Lakes. I am sorry that Mr. Mann is not here to know to-day that the great Committee on Appropriations has made an ample appropriation for the performance of the activities at the Great Lakes for which that institution was established and on which the Government has spent $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the activities at this naval station, regardless of the question of its particular utility, might well be concentrated at these other stations, without the necessary expense of keeping this up.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I will say to my friend the gentleman from Iowa that if it had not been for the Great Lakes during the war, not only the personnel of the Navy but the personnel of the merchant marine would have fallen down. The Great Lakes provided 60 per cent of all of the men that went into the Navy and the merchant marine during the war.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Because they were sent there.

Mr. BRITTEN. No. Not merely because they were sent there, but because Great Lakes had the facilities for turning out great numbers of men in the shortest possible time. These very men subsequently became the cream of the Navy's enlisted personnel and were requested by commanding officers of many of our fighting ships.

The Navy is America's first line of defense. Its efficiency lies in the men who man it. These men are not, as generally supposed, drawn from the coasts alone, but in the main from the farms and country towns and inland cities.

During the Great War, with its heavy strain upon our military and naval resources, 65 per cent of the enlisted personnel of the Navy came from the Middle West. Great Lakes was by far the largest of our country's naval training stations, having as many as 45,000 recruits in training at one time, whipping into shape these men who, without the loss of a single vessel, convoyed across the submarine-infested Atlantic a large part of America's mighty Army.

Mr. Chairman, it will always be easier to enlist men in the Navy where the naval training station is close to the source of its man supply. To abandon or materially reduce Great Lakes would seriously hamper all future enlistments and lessen public interest in the Navy.

Thirty-eight thousand men are to be trained for the Navy in the coming fiscal year. Great Lakes is in perfect condition and without any additional investment in equipment can immediately care for 2,500 men at one time and 6,000 during the coming year. This should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just let me say this in further reply to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN]: The Great Lakes Training Station is one of the best equipped training stations in our country, and one of the great services performed by that station is the training for trades in connection with the Naval Service. Then there is another observation that was brought to the attention of the committee which we can not overlook. That is this: The section of country around the Great Lakes probably contributes a greater per cent of young men to the Navy than any like populous section of the country in the United States. At the Great Lakes Training Station these young men are trained in large part for their services upon ship board. They are in comparatively ready access to their people at home, and many people from the surrounding States come to that station to visit their sons before they go on to the longer stay on ship board. Those considerations appealed to the members of the committee, and when you think of it in connection with the great plant we have there it seemed desirable to continue the station further.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Is it not a fact that in addition to the argument the gentleman has presented there is this further fact, that the Great Lakes is the greatest training station we have for mechanicians in connection with the aviation service of this country? The ground men are trained there.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESERVE FORCE.

For expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia; for the maintenance and rental of armories, including the pay of necessary janitors, and for wharfage, $194,000; for pay and allowances of officers and enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force other than class 1 while on active duty for training; mileage for officers while traveling under orders to and from active duty for training; transportation of enrolled men to and from active duty for training, and subsistence and transfers en route or cash in lieu thereof; subsistence of enrolled men during the actual period of active duty for training; pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve Force and pay, allowances, and subsistence of enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force when ordered to active duty in connection with the instruction, training, and drilling of the Naval Reserve Force; and retainer pay of officers and enrolled men of the Naval Reserve Force other than class 1, $2,800,000; in all, $2,994,000, which amount shall be available, in addition to other appropriations, for fuel and the transportation thereof and for all other expenses in connection with the maintenance, operation, repair, and upkeep of vessels assigned for training the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided*, That members of the Volunteer Naval Reserve may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be issued such articles of uniform as may be required for their drills and training, the value thereof not to exceed that authorized to be issued to other classes of the Naval Reserve Force and to be charged against the clothing and small stores fund: *Provided further*, That no part of the money appropriated in this act shall be used for the training of any member of the Naval Reserve Force except with his own consent. That until June 30, 1924, of the Organized Militia as provided by law, such part as may be duly prescribed in any State, Territory, or for the District of Columbia shall constitute a Naval Militia; and until June 30, 1924, such of the Naval Militia as now is in existence, and as now organized and prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of the act of Congress approved February 16, 1914, shall be a part of the Naval Reserve Force, and the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to maintain and provide for said Naval Militia as provided in said act: *Provided*, That upon their enrollment in the Naval Reserve Force and not otherwise until June 30, 1924, the members of said Naval Militia shall have all the benefits, gratuities, privileges, and emoluments provided by law for other members of the Naval Reserve Force; and that with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy duty performed in the Naval Militia may be counted as active service for the maintenance of efficiency required by law for members of the Naval Reserve Force: *Provided further*, That retainer pay provided by existing law shall not be paid to any member of the Naval Reserve Force who fails to train as provided by law during the year for which he fails to train.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I wish to ascertain generally what the Navy is doing as to the training of its reserve force, also as to the number of men that availed themselves of the liberality of the Government last year under the appropriation provided, which was much larger than that carried in the War Department bill for the reserve force of the Army, and why the Navy, without the need of having such a large reserve force, should carry virtually three times the appropriation that is carried in the War Department bill for the Army reserve force.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The naval appropriation bill for the current year did not become a law until so late in the summer prior to July 1 that very little could be done during the summer months in the way of training. These reservists are at the present time in a class that draws no pay. My understanding is that the money carried here outside of what is necessary for the operation of the vessels employed in the Naval Reserve Force, which is a small amount, has not yet been expended, and will not be until the naval reservists that are called are transferred into the pay class under the naval reserve act. This sum is about sufficient to pay for 1,500 officers and 5,000 men for half the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many officers are there in the Naval Reserve Force?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There are two classes of naval reserve officers and men. The first class, as the gentleman knows, is composed of those who have served in the Navy and the second class those recruited from the young citizenship of the country generally.

Mr. STAFFORD. Through the Naval Militia.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Through the naval organizations. In that second class there are 4,000 officers, in round numbers, and about 7,000 men.

Now, of that number it is expected that 1,500 officers and 5,000 men will have done their training and are in every way qualified to draw retainer pay for the last half year, and it is the intent of the Navy Department to transfer them to that class which draws retainer pay, and this sum carried in the current law will be required to meet that payment.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the amount of the retainer pay? For how long?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Two months' pay at the corresponding rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. And what service do they perform for that two months' pay?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am not enough technician to explain to the gentleman in full, but I know they have to go through the regular drills, as far as they can be conducted in a drillery, to start with. Then they have cruises prescribed by the regulations of the Navy Department, and unless they carry out all the provisions laid down by the Navy Department they are not transferred into the pay class but are carried in the class that receive no compensation.

Mr. STAFFORD. From the description of the services the gentleman has given, it seems this appropriation is much more liberal for the Naval Reserves than that to the officers of the Reserve Corps. There they only receive the pay of their grade and allowances for the 15 days they are actually in attendance at the training camps.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This, of course, covers transportation of the men to and from the training camps.

Mr. STAFFORD. What rate do they receive?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. At the regular rate that the officers and men of the Navy receive.

Mr. STAFFORD. Again, the Navy is much favored by receiving 8 cents a mile, whereas in the Army the officers attending the reserve training camps receive only 4 cents a mile. The Navy seems to be much more favored.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman will bear in mind that the Navy reservists are quite likely to be called a greater distance in training. Those in the Army, as I understand it, are furnished training nearest to the localities in which they live.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct. The Army reservists are called generally to some place within the corps area.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This also provides for provisions as well as——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask that the gentleman have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And also for the maintenance of the ships and keepers of ships that are used by these reservists in their training. This covers the entire expense of repair of ships and everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee, perhaps, did not have its attention called to the fact that Army officers in the Officers' Reserve Corps receive only 4 cents a mile by reason of an amendment which was proposed by the Senate and was agreed to in conference in the War Department appropriation bill last year that resulted in a saving of considerable money to the Government, perhaps a half million dollars, and I would suggest to the committee that they bear that in mind in case the Senate, in their spasmodic spells of economy, attach such a limitation on this bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course, the gentleman will bear in mind, too, we cut this item a million dollars below the Bureau of the Budget, and it is because of a great many things such as the gentleman has been reciting to the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not this amount for pay to the Naval Reserve Force, $2,800,000, the same amount as carried in existing law?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; but $3,800,000 was recommended.

Mr. STAFFORD. But in the existing law it is $2,800,000, so the gentleman did not cut the existing appropriation for that purpose. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13374, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in 8-point type on the so-called Bursum bill, S. 3855, which was recently withdrawn from the House by resolution of the Senate, and I desire to print in it a letter from a gentleman who is thoroughly conversant on the measure, so the membership of the House may understand what there is in that measure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there are so many bills pending with the name of the Senator from New Mexico attached, described as Bursum bills, that it is difficult to know which one is referred to. There passed the Senate one relating to officers in the volunteer service, in which they were to receive the same pay and allowances as those in the Regular Army, and recently a so-called Bursum bill providing for a $72 pension to old soldiers——

Mr. SNYDER. I stated in my request the number of the bill, S. 3855, which deals with the Pueblo Indian question in New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much propaganda on the part of the so-called Bursum bill—No. 3855—which was recently withdrawn from the House by resolution of the Senate, that I have thought it wise, in the interest of all the Members, to ask unanimous consent to print a statement with regard to the matter, so that the Members of the House who are being circularized by the opponents of this measure will have all of the information at their hand, thereby making it unnecessary for them to look further for it.

Some two years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, with a select committee, we visited the city of Santa Fe, and in what was practically an all-night session we made a careful investigation of the question which the proposed bill surrounds. There is much misinformation being distributed by people who are not fully advised as to the facts of the matter, and I have thought it wise to give as much information as possible at this time, and with that in view I am printing a letter which was recently written to the editor of the New York Tribune by Mr. A. B. Rennehan, an attorney at Santa Fe, which, in my judgment, sets forth the question more clearly and illustrates the situation out there better than any document I have seen on the question up to this time:

DECEMBER 2, 1922.

To the EDITOR, TRIBUNE,
New York City:

In your issue of the 25th ultimo you have an editorial entitled "Robbing the Pueblo Indians," and referring to the Bursum bill as the instrument of the robbery.

I am not at all surprised at the industry and emotion shown by many well-meaning but, I believe, wrongly directed people in seeking the defeat of that bill, but they are not taking a broad view of the measure. They are warm-hearted people, who wept abundantly as they read of the exodus of French peasants before the German invader and, more lately, at the flight of Christians, pagans, and half pagans from Smyrna. They do not vision that about 6,000 men, women, and children would be driven from their homes and little farms, with their worldly goods upon the backs of donkeys, traveling as sadly down the roads of New Mexico as the others fled along the roads and pathways that led from their villages and vilayets.

Some of these American citizens of Mexican blood, who live upon these so-called Pueblo grants, are the descendants of those who first inhabited these lands 200 years ago or more, and later, in the Civil War, in numbers greater than their quota, fought for the Union's preservation. Virtually all of the settlers are the successors in interest by descent or purchase of these early inhabitants.

But I am concerned just now with the egregious blunders which you and the assailants have made. They seem to be without charity for these non-Indian persons who have, through their ancestors and their grantors, occupied parcels of these so-called reservations, which were waste when originally taken and by them made to blossom and bear fruit. I do not condemn the motives of these opponents, which are worthy but hysterical and uninformed. They are obsessed with the idea that the Indians are about to be either hurt or sacrificed or both. I am a better friend of these Indians than many of the spokesmen of the opposition. I have never betrayed any of them for personal self or profit or for any purpose, which is

more than can be said for some local representatives of these well-intentioned ladies and gentlemen, whose eyes have been clouded and whose ears I fear have been filled with malignities by compensated and uncompensated agitators. I speak the Spanish and thus approach the Pueblo Indian without the aid of interpreters. I count more personal friends among them than any unofficial person whom I know. I am the only lawyer who has advised an Indian who left his wife to maintain her and pay her the equivalent of alimony and procured him to do so.

At the time of the argument before the United States Supreme Court of the Felipe Sandoval case I heard the Solicitor General say: "I never can guess what a decision will be, but this is a case I will win. The East is full of the notion that the Indian and his friends are always right and need protection. Courts are not free from the notion."

You say that friendly New Mexico State courts will handle the suits to quiet titles. No; only the Federal court will have jurisdiction under the later Bursum bill, the one which passed the Senate. Evidently you did not read the bill or you would not have made such a mistake, which, with your influence, may be very harmful.

The Indians will not in any event "face exile or extermination," as it is not the purpose or effect of the bill to touch any lands which have not been for a long time used and occupied by others than Indians and out of the latter's control.

The Bursum bill does not confirm claims against the Indians, but fixes rules by which the United States district court can decide whether a claimant has a right to the land he occupies, and he is compelled to bring his suit against the Government in five years or lose his possession.

Much ado has been made by some of the opponents about the use of the expression "with or without color of title." They do not seem to realize that the words "color of title" are strictly of legal significance, and they take the phrase to mean "without color of right." "Color of title" is a writing granting or seeming to grant title. It is not the bald claim of a mere brazen intruder. But New Mexico had no recording system until 1852. The Spanish and Mexican archives, which were kept in Santa Fe in the Old Palace under the prior régimes, were in great part destroyed by the Indians in their uprising of 1680. It is claimed that the Indians had no power to part with their lands without consent of the Mexican or Spanish authorities, as the case might be. If such consent were given, we have no way to make the proofs, for they have been destroyed or otherwise have disappeared. The bill proposes to relieve against this situation. Again, the blood of the Spaniards and Mexicans mixed with the Indian blood, and the individuals of both races were known by Spanish names. After the lapse of so many years we can not trace the source from which a title may have come, as the name of a grantor, being Spanish, may have appertained to an Indian, a Mexican, or a Spaniard.

They say that the Bursum bill enables the district court (sec. 2-e) to take away from the Indians the power to regulate their own affairs. This is untrue. The purpose of this provision is to take away from the State courts the power to meddle judicially in disputes concerning the internal government of the Indians when the Indians themselves are quarreling among themselves. The State court formerly exercised this jurisdiction. It thinks that it still has it. The Federal court disagrees with that belief. The State court held in contempt an Indian agent named Lonergan for refusal to obey a subpœna duces tecum to bring into court certain Indian insignia. The Federal court at Santa Fe took from the State court the man thus adjudged contumacious. There was a conflict of jurisdiction; therefore section 2-e of the said bill.

One of the critics of the bill charges that the Indians will lose or have lost 41,000 acres of land known as the Pajuate purchase. An action was brought in a State court, in the name of the Pueblo community or corporation by the special attorney for the Pueblo Indians appointed by the Indian Bureau. The court decided against the Indians. The attorney either forgot to take an appeal or to perfect it. He then tried to get into the Federal court, which ruled against him because the question was res adjudicata through the State court judgment, and because the Federal court was without jurisdiction. He then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, which promptly showed him the door, because of the condition created by the unappealed judgment. The suit would better have been filed in the Federal court and in the name of the United States, by virtue of its guardianship. All sins can not be attributed to the settlers.

The Bursum bill, so called, S. 3855, introduced July 20, 1922, was sponsored by the Indian Bureau, and is understood to have been drawn or suggested by the Special Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in charge of Indian litigation in New Mexico and Arizona. I, as attorney for the settlers or a great number of them, suggested sections 15 and 16 and a part of section 10. It was understood to be a bureau measure, and I was told to keep hands off for fear of mutilation or disturbance of its symmetry. I appealed to the Secretary of the Interior, who stated that his object was to protect the Indians against encroachment, while at the same time assisting the settlers, whose unfortunate circumstances he knew, so far as it could be done without injustice to the Indians. He approved section 15 because it made certain plats and surveys merely prima facie evidence of the settlers' lines, and because, if there was no dispute as to these lines, a quick adjustment would be reached. But these surveys, made under the supervision of the Indian Bureau and known as the Joy survey, as a matter of law, were disputable by either party to the litigation. While the bill is called the Bursum bill, it is really a departmental measure.

He approved section 16 because it granted nothing, but provided that in the probably few cases which it would fit a good-faith occupant, where there were peculiar equities in his favor, could purchase his fenced holding, if his application were approved by the Secretary of the Interior. This, in the light of the section, presupposes that the occupant has lost in the courts.

He approved that part of section 10 which I submitted, that rights of water and the facilities established by it for its use "be decreed to the pueblo according to its appropriation thereof for the irrigation of the lands of the pueblo as irrigated and cultivated at the time of the passage of the act," but that "any further or additional use of such waters and the appropriation thereof shall be acquired, determined, and adjudicated according to the laws of the State." This feature, I understand, has been criticized as subjecting the Indians to New Mexico's water laws as to augmentation of their use of water. But the Mexicans, Americans, and Indians frequently use the same waters through the same ditches in which they are partners and have lived and worked in harmony until the Indian cupidity has been stimulated by the proposal to take from the Mexicans and Americans what they have created and give it to the Indians.

In a matter so tender and essential as water in the arid region a conflict of jurisdiction would be disastrous, for the waters frequently arise outside of the pueblo lands and are carried within or across by ditches, which may be the property of Indian and non-Indian alike in cotenancy. Sometimes the streams flow through Indian lands, serving Indian and non-Indian equally inside and outside of the Indian grant.

The Indians have not been deprived of water, but, on the contrary, in most instances have been favored. In a country like this, where rights in and to water depend upon "appropriation, diversion, and application to a beneficial use," if the Indians were given privileges for the acquirement of additional water, independent of State sovereignty, if it could be done constitutionally, they would eventually take it all and dry up the farms and orchards of the settlers.

The pueblo of Pojuaque has signed a protest. This pueblo is virtually extinct. There remains 1 full-blood and 11 mixed bloods—part Mexican. Most of those gone have been absorbed into other pueblos, particularly the pueblo of Nambe.

The pueblo of Pecos has signed a protest. This pueblo is utterly extinct. Not an Indian remains upon it. There are but three or four of that blood living, and they have been absorbed into the Jemez Pueblo.

The lands of these two pueblos were sold to D. C. Collier & Co. at a time when the Government maintained a "special attorney for the Pueblo Indians," and since good faith and consistency are exacted, it would repay the inquiry to ask why now this querulous talk of Indian rights and who now pretends to have concealed a cure-all bill as a magpie hides a rag. I filed for the Indians a suit to set aside the sale of the Pojuaque grant to Collier & Co., in the Federal court, without a hope of reward, and argued it before Judge Pollock, temporarily sitting in the Federal court here. Decision was not rendered, but taken under advisement. Later, when Col. R. E. Twitchell, an able lawyer and historian of note, was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General in reference to Pueblo Indian litigation, he pressed the bill to vacate the sale and a decree to that effect was signed.

It is apparent to my mind that the objurgations which have been emitted that the State courts are vested with jurisdiction over all questions affecting Indian lands results from a misconception of section 3 of the bill. It provides that the State courts shall have jurisdiction over lands lying within the

pueblo grants, which have ceased to be pueblo land. Naturally this would be so, for the Constitution of the United States does not allocate or permit to be allocated to the Federal courts the determination of questions of purely State cognizance. I have always doubted the necessity of this provision and its propriety. What has the United States to do with lands non-Indian?

Tyros have been dabbling, I fear, and muddying the waters.

The questions involved are extremely complex, both in law and in fact, and can not be understood at a glance by individual lay intuition or inspiration, and much of the ill-temper manifested is aroused by benevolent but perilous ignorance and superficiality which cries "Wolf! Wolf!" when there is no wolf.

Section 8 is most condemned because, it is claimed by friends of the Indian—whose friendliness I would be the last to impugn—it will take from the Indians their homes, their farms, and plantations, and so forth. This is not a fair but an unjust construction. It gives no right to land acquired within 10 years prior to June 20, 1910, when the act to enable New Mexico to form a State government was passed. But it authorizes the United States court to decree to a possessor and occupant the land within his lines, if he had actual, open, notorious, and so forth, possession for more than 10 years prior to the date above mentioned, whether he could prove a deed or not; that is, color of title; in other words, in technical, legal phraseology, adverse possession. It is not, as some of those think who have espoused the Indian cause, any mere claim hostile to the Indian. It is a claim evidenced by outward signs of dominion throughout a period continuously of more than 22 years if the bill became a law to-day.

Why was that date, June 20, 1910, adopted in the proposed act? Because it was then that Congress decreed as a condition precedent for the admission of New Mexico that "until the title of such (Pueblo) Indian or Indian tribes shall be extinguished the same shall be and remain subject to the disposition and under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the Congress of the United States," the people of New Mexico disclaiming all right and title thereto.

The courts of New Mexico had held uniformly that the Pueblo Indians were citizens of Mexico at the time of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and afterwards of the United States, and had the right to alienate their lands like any other citizen of these countries. This was the course of judicial decision from earliest Territorial days. The Supreme Court of the United States, at its October, 1876, term, in United States *v.* Joseph (94 U. S. 614) came to the same conclusion. Speaking of the grants made by Spain and Mexico to the Pueblo Indians and the subsequent confirmation by act of Congress, the court says: "It is unnecessary to waste words to prove that this (act of confirmation) was a recognition of the title previously held by these people, and a disclaimer by the Government of any right of present or future interference, except such as would be exercised in the case of a person holding competent and perfect title in his individual right."

These were rules of property made by law and announced by the Territorial courts, which were created by Congress, and by the Supreme Court of the United States, in 1876, and they continued in force and effect and were relied upon by people and by courts uninterruptedly thereafter until the case of Felipe Sandoval *v.* United States, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States (231 U. S. 28, 58 L. Ed. 107), when, in effect, the Joseph case was reversed and the doctrine of tutelage established, from which have sprung the troubles of the settlers and their descendants and grantees.

Therefore this Bursum bill seeks to do justice to the settler and his dependents by recognizing the status that the courts affirmed, without injustice to the Indian, so that it be not conceded that the United States, through its Congress, shall, like an Indian giver, seek to undo that which it had solemnly done. It sought to prevent the pauperizing of people who bought land in the pueblo grants through confidence in the decisions of the national courts.

But while this bill has been called the Bursum bill, it is plain that he was the intermediary through whom it was presented to the Senate. It is an ambitious project, having for its object the assuaging of all antagonisms and laying down rules for the settlement of all questions affecting Pueblo Indians which could conceivably arise, and not through the State courts but through the national courts.

Mr. BURSUM had previously introduced in the Senate—July 19, 1921—a bill of my draftsmanship—S. 2274—less ambitious and less comprehensive in scope, but having the same general purposes, except that I provided for a commission of three lawyers to be appointed by the President for the settlement of these questions, the progenitor of which was the act of Congress providing for the adjustment of like controversies concerning lands within the pueblo of San Francisco. I adopted that act as the pattern for mine. I also incorporated Arizona, for it has like problems, though not so many and important as those of this State.

The fundamental object of the two bills is to permit the plea of the statute of limitations or adverse possession as against the Government, against which it does not ordinarily run, and to permit proof by secondary evidence, if it can be found, which is doubtful, that the Government of Spain or Mexico authorized the sale of parts of Indian grants. Without these two modifications of the rules of evidence, particularly the first, according to the contentions of the Attorney General of the United States, the settlers' mouths are closed and they can make no defense whatsoever. Consequently there will be for them nothing to do but to take up their beds, their household goods, their movable property, and walk, driving before them their flocks and their herds.

The people of the United States, when properly informed, the Members and Senators in Congress, the great and mighty press, which can form powerful public opinion, even upon false premises, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations, will not want and will not ask a consummation so devoutly to be shunned.

For the enlightenment of those who would look further I refer to the following judicial decisions, additional to those cited: 1 N. M. 226; 1 N. M. 422; 1 N. M. 583; 12 N. M. 139; the opinion of Judge Pope in United States *v.* Felipe Sandoval, reversed by the United States Supreme Court, supra; the many decrees and decisions cited in 12 N. M., supra.

For sidelights I call attention to a few other facts.

The people of the pueblo of Abiquiu have been completely absorbed by the Mexican element. This is a fine indication of what has happened upon other pueblo grants, but in less degree.

The number of acres included in the Tesuque Pueblo grant is 17,471, as patented. The number acquired by settlers, as shown by the survey mentioned in section 10 of the Bursum bill, is 457. There is no recent augmentation.

The number of acres included in the Santa Clara grant is 17,368, as patented. The number acquired by settlers, as shown by the said survey, is 4,073. There is no recent augmentation.

I have taken as samples one of the grants in which less acreage is claimed adversely, and one of the grants in which greatest acreage is claimed adversely.

The total in each instance is very small, considering the time that has passed since the Spaniards first dominated the Indians of the pueblos.

It is only recently that the Indians have begun slightly to increase their acreage in cultivation, and the smaller quantity of land heretofore cultivated by them is not due to any antagonism between the races, for they have lived side by side as friends, and intermarried, along the centuries, except on occasions of revolution attempted by the Indians, first against Spaniards and Mexicans, and against Americans after the American occupation.

Their villages are usually quite distant from the Mexican and American towns, as in the case of Taos, 3 miles away; Santa Clara, 3 or 4 miles from Espanola; Tesuque, 3 miles away from the settlement of the same name.

Remember also that Taos is a town with an actual property valuation of probably $750,000 to $1,000,000; Espanola, with an actual property valuation of as much or more; in neither instance including farms, ranches, and orchards.

No conscientious person, lay or official, desires the inequitable detriment of these Indians; no conscientious person, artist, tenderfoot, or dilettante, should desire the inequitable detriment of the settlers.

It is rare that a legislative bill falls perfect from the hands of its makers. This bill may contain imperfections, though, looked at sympathetically and honestly, they are not fundamental or critical. If there are in it important imperfections, judicious consideration will discover and remove them much better than accusation and denunciation of honorable public servants as scoundrels, who would cruelly expunge an ancient and interesting civilization, largely based, however, upon the Spanish.

Abuse of the Indian has been more the pastime of the Anglo-Saxon than the nature of the Mexican, for the Mexican and the Indian have fraternized and cooperated. The Anglo-Saxon, where he has not driven off the Indian by the bullet, has cajoled and purchased him with whisky and beads and other trinkets.

The titles to the towns of Taos, Espanola, and Tesuque are as good, if not better, as the original titles upon which the city of New York rests.

This is very lengthy, but as short as the subject will permit, and I hope you will give it space, notwithstanding its length, because of the importance of the question both to those who oppose the bill and those who favor it.

Respectfully,

A. B. RENEHAN.

Mr. KRAUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by my colleague [Mr. SANDERS of Indiana] at New York before the Indiana Club on Tuesday evening.

My colleague has done much research work in the early history of the State of Indiana. The results of some of that work were detailed before the club, and they are of general interest. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting that address.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech is as follows:

Speech delivered by Representative EVERETT SANDERS, of Indiana, on the occasion of a banquet of the Indiana Club of New York City at the McAlpin Hotel on the night of December 12, 1922.

INDIANA A CENTURY AGO.

Every first-grade pupil knows the name of our first President—most Indiana high-school pupils know the name of our first Indiana governor. I doubt, however, if 1 Indianian in 500 knows the name of the first Delegate to Congress from Indiana Territory or the name of our first Congressman and our first two Senators.

Our first Delegate was Benjamin Parke, listed as a Democrat. I have searched through the Annals of Congress very diligently to find the initial speech of our first spokesman. Parke's first utterance was on February 14, 1806, and arose when there was a controversy in the House over the proposed sale of a township of lands to Frederick Rapp and his associates, who were going to and did afterwards settle New Harmony, Ind. Representative Jackson, of Virginia, was opposing the sale and Jackson asserted that "the land ought to be sold for at least $6 an acre." Whereupon we find in the record:

Mr. Parke, of the Indiana Territory: "Even in the settled parts of the Territory lands are not above $3." This was a short speech, but it settled the question. Land has since so increased in value that in Indianapolis it sells as high as several thousands of dollars per front foot. I might say in passing that length of congressional speeches has increased in direct ratio with the value of the land.

In person Parke was tall, nearly 6 feet, spare in habit, and of rather delicate frame. He was in the Battle of Tippecanoe at the head of a company of dragoons, and was made a major, commanding a troop of Cavalry after Major Daviess fell.

General Harrison said of him: "He was in every respect equal to any Cavalry officer of his rank that I have ever seen. As in everything else which he undertook, he made himself acquainted with the tactics of that arm and succeeded in bringing his troops, both as regards field maneuvering and the use of the saber, to as great perfection as I have known."

Benjamin Parke headed the committee to whom was referred the letter of Gov. William Henry Harrison, inclosing resolutions of the legislative council and the House of Representatives of Indiana Territory, asking a 10-year suspension of the article in the ordinance of 1787 forbidding slavery. Mr. Parke, for the committee, reported a resolution favoring the suspension for 10 years. This occurred on February 12, 1807.

Mr. Parke was a lawyer and resigned as Delegate to become Territorial judge, which position he held from 1808 to 1817, at which time he became the judge of the first United States District Court for the State of Indiana, serving in that position from 1817 to 1835, at which time he died at Salem, Ind. He had entered public life in 1804 as attorney general for Indiana Territory, and was in the Territorial legislature. He was in public life continuously for more than 31 years.

Parke was succeeded by Jesse B. Thomas, a Whig, former speaker of the House of Representatives of Indiana Territory, whose chief activities consisted in dealing with the problem of separating the Indiana Territory into Indiana and Illinois. He headed a committee to determine whether the Territory should be divided, and in his report urged the division, because the people in Illinois couldn't get across from Illinois to the court at Vincennes. Muddy swamps of the Wabash prevented them. The report also stated that at that time there were approximately 11,000 people west of the Wabash River and 17,000 east. When the bill was under consideration, violent opposition was met, and the record shows that the opposition was on the grounds, quoting verbatim, "that the expense to the United States for this new government (that is, the proposed new Illinois Territory) would be $6,950 yearly, * * *; that this proceeding might be very convenient to the men who should be appointed governors and judges, but for no other good purpose."

Six thousand nine hundred and fifty dollars! Boy, page Mayor Thompson of Chicago. That would not half-sole the shoes of his policemen.

After Illinois Territory was organized in 1809, Thomas became Judge of the United States District Court for the Northwestern District—was delegate to the Illinois constitutional convention, became president of that body, and was one of Illinois' first two Senators, serving in that capacity from December 3, 1818, to March 3, 1829. He was in public life for 24 years. When a Senator from Illinois, he was the real author of the Missouri Compromise, although Henry Clay is generally given credit for this measure.

Our third and last Delegate was Jonathan Jennings, a Federalist and a conspicuous character in the early Indiana history. He was about 5 feet 8 inches in height, had blue eyes, a fair complexion, sandy hair, weighed about 180 pounds, and is described as a man of polished manners.

The ordinance of 1787 had a proviso against slavery. Ever since Indiana became a Territory there had been political agitation to have the Congress repeal this proviso. The proposed repeal of the anti-slavery clause and acts by the Territorial legislature passed with a view of evading the slavery provisions constituted almost the sole political issue in Territorial days. It is interesting to note that those favoring slavery usually came from slave States, while those opposing came from free States.

When it came to selecting the third Delegate, the people had been granted the right of suffrage. Jennings, who was born in New Jersey and had spent his early life in that State and the State of Pennsylvania, came out as a candidate for Delegate on a platform opposing slavery, while Thomas Randolph, who was born in Virginia, announced in favor of slavery. The contest was bitter and Jennings won out by 39 votes, and Randolph went to Washington and contested the seat. The Elections Committee reported in favor of declaring the seat vacant. The Committee of the Whole House adopted the report, but the House seated Jennings.

He served from November 27, 1809, until Indiana became a State, at which time he became the first governor. His work in the House as a Delegate, in addition to his fight for statehood of Indiana, was principally in the interest of extension of roads and the establishment of land offices, and the extension of time of payments on lands. He also made a very brilliant speech urging the raising of mounted rangers to protect the frontier from the Indians. The greatest work he performed as a Delegate in the House was to secure the admission of the Territory of Indiana as a State. He was chairman of the House committee and his report accompanying the bill for statehood showed that the total population of Indiana was 63,879, or about 2 per cent of our present population.

His efforts were crowned with victory when on December 6, 1816, William Henry Harrison, then a Representative from Ohio, who had been governor of the Territory for 12 years, and was destined later to be President of the United States, moved a final resolution of statehood, which was adopted. This resolution was passed by the Senate and signed by President James Madison on December 11, 1816.

I can't resist following Jennings back into the State, for his advent as our first governor gives us considerable light on the political and governmental history of that time. In his first race for governor he ran against Thomas Posey, a former Virginian, and the slavery question was again an issue, and Jennings again won out on the antislavery platform.

When he became governor, Christopher Harrison became lieutenant governor. President James Monroe wanted to make land treaties with many tribes of Indians and appointed the governor to serve as one of the negotiators. The new State constitution contained a provision preventing the governor from holding a commission as a Federal officer. While the governor was absent negotiating the treaties the lieutenant governor claimed that he had forfeited the office. The Vincennes Western Sun and General Advertiser, under the head, "The National Register," thus reviewed the political situation in Indiana:

"Politics in Indiana are in a great measure personal contests. The latest agitation of her statesmen that we have heard of is the oppugnation of the lieutenant governor to Governor Jennings acting as negotiator of Indian treaties under an appointment by the President of the United States.

"The lieutenant governor, considering the governor as having forfeited the throne, seized upon the reins of authority as heir apparent and sequestered the seal of the Commonwealth. Governor Jennings, returning from diplomatic converse with the Indians, walked very deliberately into the secretary of state's office, put the great seal into his breeches pocket, hinted that kings and rulers were not accountable to frail mortality, and coolly walked away, and probably whistling Lillabullero.

"The people we presume will settle the dispute."

On its assembling both houses of the legislature recognized Mr. Harrison as governor, but appointed a committee to investigate, and the report in favor of recognizing Governor Jennings was adopted 15 to 13, whereupon Harrison resigned in a huff, and the next year ran against Jennings for governor, but was beaten 11,000 to 2,000.

It is of great interest to Hoosiers to know that in 1821 the legislature elected Harrison, James W. Jones, of Gibson County, and Samuel P. Booker, of Wayne County, commissioners to lay off Indianapolis, the new capital. At the time fixed by law for the commissioners to meet none of them, except Mr. Harrison, appeared. He acted by himself, appointed surveyors who commenced work in April, 1821, and the next October the lots were sold. One of the surveyors was Alexander Ralston, who had assisted in the survey of Washington City.

The political bias of the day afforded about as good a criterion for an opinion as at present, for on July 4, during the gubernatorial campaign between Jennings and Harrison, at banquets of the political cliques, I find on one program the following toast:

"The State of Indiana—may she arise in the purity of her strength and indignantly banish from power the man who dares to tramp upon her constitution and laws."

While on the same day on the other program appeared "Jonathan Jennings—well done, good and worthy servant." The vote of the people approved the last toast, for Jennings defeated Christopher Harrison. After serving almost two terms he resigned as governor and reentered Congress as a Representative and served from December 2, 1822, to March 3, 1831. He had entered public life as a clerk of the Territorial legislature; but, not counting that service, he had been in public life from 1809 to 1831, a period of 22 years.

This concludes our Territorial representation.

William Hendricks was our first Representative in Congress. I mean actual Representative after Indiana was admitted to the Union. He served from December 2, 1816, until his resignation in 1822 to become Indiana's third governor. At the close of his term as governor he was elected United States Senator for Indiana and served from March 4, 1825, to March 3, 1837. Counting his service as a member of the Territorial house of representatives, where he also served as speaker, and his service as secretary of the constitutional convention, Hendricks was in public life about 22 years. He was not the father but the uncle of Thomas A. Hendricks, who subsequently became Governor of Indiana, and still later Vice President of the United States.

Hendricks was 6 feet high, had a well-proportioned body, auburn hair, blue eyes, and a florid complexion. He was a newspaper man. When he came to Indiana he brought with him a printing press and commenced printing a publication called The Eagle. Newspaper men in those days were more frank than at present. For instance, on May 29, 1819, the National Intelligencer contained the following:

"We are obliged to devote our columns to-day to advertisements and a few more pressing and promised articles. Having got them out of the way we shall be able again to make progress in the publication

of the debate in the House of Representatives * * * and in the Senate" * * *.

No newspaper to-day apologizes for omitting congressional debates to make space for advertising.

The newspaper men also had their troubles, as shown by this advertisement in the Tocsin of June 12, 1819:

"To printers and patrons:

"Beware of a villain. Winslow Skeel, as he calls himself, a printer, called on me between two and three weeks since for employment, dressed in an old sailor's suit of blue, which he said he purchased at Louisville in consequence of losing all his clothing in coming down the Ohio on a raft which was stove to pieces in going over some rapids. He left this place secretly, on Wednesday last, about $11 in my debt for money and clothing, besides taking from the office several articles in clothing, such as vests, handkerchiefs, shirts, and stockings, to what amount is unknown. * * * He is very capable of acting the rascal and much of an adept in the act of roguery. He is about 26 years of age, rather under common size, about 5 feet 6 inches high, dark complexion, long dark hair, down look, and the end of his nose turns up; he has lost one or two of his upper foreteeth for which he has substituted a piece of a bone cut in the form of two teeth, which he does not always wear as they plague him in eating. * * *

"Patrons will be careful to whom they pay money for subscriptions. * * *

"E. PATRICK."

Mr. Hendricks spoke in favor of only $6 per day on the compensation bill for Congressmen during his first term on January 14, 1817. I quote from the Annals, which, however, were always written in the third person:

"There was scarcely a man, he believed, in the remote settlements of Indiana who had not heard and reprobated the law, and it was no wonder, said Mr. Hendricks, that his constituents disapproved the law. Their ideas of expenditures were very unlike those of all the eastern cities. Six dollars per day sounded large enough to them. Their sources of wealth, means of producing money, were few and narrow when compared with the commercial opulence of the maritime country or even the independent competency of an older State. They were rescuing their country from a wilderness. Agriculture was in its infancy, and the produce they had to spare, their corn and their beef, in the neighborhood of a plentiful market bore a very low price." (Jan. 14, 1817, 30 Annals, p. 597.)

During the time that William Hendricks served in Congress his wife accompanied him to Washington, riding on horseback the entire distance from Madison, Ind., to Washington, D. C., carrying an infant child in her arms.

Our first two Senators were James Noble and Waller Taylor. They appeared and qualified together on December 12, 1816. They had presented their credentials on the 2d of December, but were not seated until after the signing of the final resolution of admission.

Senator Waller Taylor was a Virginian and a steadfast friend of Governor Harrison, and a determined advocate of slavery. He was of soldierly bearing and had been a major in the Army. He had taken sides with Randolph on the slavery question in the contest for Congress with Jonathan Jennings, and even went so far as to try to get Jennings to challenge him to a duel, but failed to accomplish that purpose.

The Annals of Congress do not indicate that Taylor took a very active part in the debates, although he always cast his vote on the proslavery side of every piece of legislation involving slavery, apparently still clinging to his old Virginian ideas.

Senator Noble had been in the first Indiana Constitutional Convention. He was a lawyer and was said to be one of the strongest and most effective speakers of his time before a jury. He was a large, well-proportioned man of fine address and bearing. He had black hair, dark eyes, and easy and graceful manner. He was a brother of Noah Noble, one of Indiana's governors.

It was during Noble's early service in the Senate, on February 12, 1817, that Indiana was the cause of breaking up a joint meeting of the House and Senate called to count the electoral votes. In those days, as now, people did not vote directly for President, but voted for electors who sent the sealed electoral votes of the respective States to the President of the Senate to be opened by him in the presence of the House and Senate and there counted.

James Monroe, of Virginia, and Rufus King, of New York, were the candidates. After the joint meeting was assembled, Taylor, of New York, a Democrat, who no doubt was anxious to be courteous to his friend, Rufus King, objected to counting Indiana's three votes, because he said it would set a bad precedent to let a State vote whose electors had been chosen before the State was finally admitted. The election, of course, had occurred before December 11, 1816. The Speaker, Henry Clay, said the joint meeting was to count the votes, and the only way they could take up Taylor's discussion was for the Senate to withdraw. Whereupon the Senators withdrew, and after some considerable discussion in the House, in which Representative Hendricks, of Indiana, joined, it was decided that the electoral votes of Indiana should be counted. The Senators returned and Indiana cast three votes for James Monroe, who received 183 to 34 for Rufus King.

Senator Noble served in the Senate until his death in Washington on February 26, 1831. Impressive ceremonies were held in the Capitol, attended by the President and the Cabinet, and Indiana's first Senator was then laid to rest in the Eastern Branch burial ground in the city of Washington.

Thus of the three Delegates who represented us while we were a Territory, the first was of such distinction that he became our first United States district judge, the position now held by Judge Anderson, and served the remainder of his life with great honor. The second was appointed to a like position in Illinois Territory, and later became that State's distinguished Senator, while the third was of such marked ability that he was chosen as our first governor, and after being elected twice to that office was returned four successive terms to Congress.

Our first Congressman served with such distinction that he was continuously reelected until he resigned to accept the governorship and served so well that he was then elected Senator.

Our first two Senators were men of equally high character and ability. The record is filled with chronicles of the fights by all of these men for roads, for canals, for land offices, for settlers' rights and privileges, for frontier protection by rangers and militia. In one address these details can not be given, but these were the necessary foundation stones carefully laid for the great State structure the world knows as Indiana.

This meeting of Hoosiers to-night on the day following the anniversary of the admission of Indiana to the Union is a proper occasion to go back for a century for a picture of those early days. Those pioneers in statecraft shall not be forgotten. Like the pioneer woodsmen and farmers who were hewing civilization out of a wilderness, those early statesmen were bringing order out of chaos in building the necessary government to foster our progress.

Happy for Indiana and for the Nation that these first men who stood in our national halls and responded when Indiana was called were representative of the fine bulwark of civilization that was being builded up on the Ohio and the Wabash.

New York City, with all its needs for men of action, of enterprise and of industry, like our other large cities, reaches out for Hoosiers who have come from the environment I have here described. We meet here to-night as Hoosiers to let our memories dwell on the Wabash and the Ohio, whose waters have been made immortal in verse and song. Wherever we shall go, whate'er may betide, we shall carry with us the Indiana spirit.

The warm, generous impulse of heart shall govern our dealings with others. These Hoosier ties of friendship we shall nurture and cherish. We shall so carry on in all the walks of life that it shall continue to be a proud honor to hear it said, "He hails from Indiana."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that December 12 they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 540. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone;

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher;

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam;

H. R. 8062. An act amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act; and

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 15, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

828. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a statement of all expenditures for the encouragement of the breeding of riding animals suitable for the military service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13235. A bill to amend the Indian appropriation act of February 14, 1920 (41 Stat., p. 413), in so far as the same relates to the collection of fees for determining the heirs and approval of wills of deceased Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8184. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the Saginaw, Swan Creek, and Black River Band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VESTAL: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 13194. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6852. A bill to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Commercial Pacific Cable Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13211) granting an increase of pension to Nellie J. McKenna; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13261) granting a pension to Robert McAfee; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13403) to repeal Title III of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 13404) granting Hell's Half Acre to the county of Natrona, State of Wyoming, for park purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRENNAN: A bill (H. R. 13405) to make provision for and grant relief to vocational trainees who suffer an additional injury while pursuing vocational training; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13406) providing for a survey of the west fork of White River, Ind., with a view to making same navigable; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 13407) to further amend and modify the act to establish a United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 13408) providing for an appropriation for the purpose of making a survey and completing plan and estimate of cost for regulating the stream flow and controlling the flood waters of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 13409) to provide for the erection of a public building on ground already acquired at West Plains, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 13410) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Aurora, Kane County, Ill., a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 13411) to amend an act entitled "An act to define and punish crimes in the District of Alaska, and to provide a code of criminal procedure for the District," approved March 3, 1899, as amended; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13412) authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the State Fair Association of Arkansas all right and title now vested in the United States to the Little Rock air intermediate depot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 13413) to amend the revenue act of 1921 in respect to capital gains and losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13414) relative to post-office laborers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13415) amending the civil service retirement law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13416) increasing the salaries of laborers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAINEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 13417) to provide for the registration of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 13418) for the retirement of all enlisted men who have served honorably in the United States Army, as herein provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 13419) to enlarge the public building at Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 411) authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Saxman Harbor, Tongass Narrows, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEWTON of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 412) providing for the relief of the distress and famine conditions in Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Resolution (H. Res. 467) for the immediate consideration of H. J. Res. 314, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REBER: Resolution (H. Res. 468) providing for payment for clerk to the Committee on Mileage; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13420) granting a pension to James N. Meyers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13421) granting a pension to Herschel Spainour; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13422) granting a pension to Luther L. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13423) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13424) granting a pension to Emma Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 13425) granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Bell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13426) granting a pension to Addie Sour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 13427) for the relief of Mordecai Fizone; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

My Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13428) for the relief of Edna Mae Baird; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6593. By Mr. APPLEBY: Petition of Halsted H. Wainwright, president of the Monmouth County (N. J.) Historical Society, and John Holsart, president of the Federated Boards of Education of Monmouth County, N. J., for the enactment of legislation for the preservation of valuable Government documents through the erection of a national archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6594. By Mr. CRAGO: Resolutions adopted by the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, protesting against the passage of the so-called Johnson bill, H. R. 12605, because its passage would assure horrible cruelty to our troops and serious military disaster to the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6595. By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of F. A. Mann and others, petitioning to abolish the discriminatory tax on small arms and ammunition and firearms in section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6596. By Mr. FULMER: Petition of Pierre F. LaBorde, D. P. Faulkenberry, Lane L. Bonner, of Columbia, and O. H. Folley and 41 other citizens, of Sumter, S. C., requesting removal of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms as embodied in section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6597. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of Robert B. Meentemeyer and 20 other citizens, of Gideon, Mo., asking for the removal of the tax on firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6598. Also, petition of C. H. Yanson and 21 other citizens, of Sikeston, Mo., asking for the removal of the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6599. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis., urging the impeachment of the Attorney General and Judge Wilkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6600. By Mr. OGDEN: Resolution of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Louisville, Ky., relative to the different postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6601. By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: Petition of 21 citizens of Camden, N. J., against the tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms, section 900, paragraph 7, internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6602. Also, resolution of Builders and Traders' Exchange, Newark, N. J., favoring 1-cent letter postage in cities, towns, and on rural routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6603. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of the Kentucky State organization, American Association of Recognition of Irish Republic, James G. Regan, president, and Mary E. Madden, secretary, protesting against certain statements made by Ambassador Harvey and asking for his recall; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6604. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of 37 members of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, Homer City, Pa., favoring the enactment of the Towner-Sterling bills (H. R. 7, S. 1252); to the Committee on Education.

6605. Also, petition of the Indiana County Sheep and Woolgrowers' Association, Indiana County, Pa., favoring enactment of the French-Capper truth in fabric bills (H. R. 64, S. 799); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6606. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the North Dakota Wheat Growers' Association, urging immediate legislation for the establishing of a Federal structure for agricultural interests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6607. Also, petition of H. B. Garden & Co. and others, of New Rockford, N. Dak., urging the abolishing of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6608. Also, petition of C. M. Bjerke and others, of Burleigh County, N. Dak., urging legislation be passed to relieve the farmers of their present desperate condition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6609. Also, petition of A. B. Herrmann and others, of Rolette, N. Dak., urging legislation to relieve the farmers of their present deplorable condition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6610. Also, petition of P. B. Peterson and others, of Fordville, N. Dak., urging that a fair price be fixed on all farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Thursday, December 14, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

PETER G. GERRY, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gooding	McNary	Spencer
Bayard	Hale	Myers	Stanley
Cameron	Harreld	Nelson	Sterling
Capper	Harris	New	Sutherland
Couzens	Harrison	Nicholson	Swanson
Culberson	Heflin	Overman	Townsend
Cummins	Johnson	Page	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pepper	Underwood
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Fernald	Ladd	Robinson	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard	
George	McKellar	Smith	
Gerry	McKinley	Smoot	

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent, due to illness in his family.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is detained at a meeting of the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. LADD. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained on important business in connection with his committee work.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are in recess, I wish to appeal to the Senator in charge of the unfinished business and ask that it may be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of taking up House bill 13316, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am willing that that may be done, with the distinct understanding, however, that if the appropriation bill shall not be disposed of by 2 o'clock the unfinished business will be called up. But I hope we shall be able to pass the appropriation bill in 15 or 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Labor, chairman of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth annual report of the board, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

CONSTRUCTION OF POST-OFFICE BUILDINGS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a letter which I received on yesterday from the Postmaster General directed to the Joint Commission on Postal Service relative to a matter which the commission is investigating and which I am sure is of great interest to the Members of the Senate. It refers to the necessity of determining whether we are to build by the Government certain absolutely necessary post-office buildings or whether we are to have buildings leased. I ask that the letter be printed simply for the information of the Senate. The question is being considered by the Joint Commission on Postal Service.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C. December 11, 1922.

JOINT COMMISSION ON POSTAL SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: On August 21, 1922, I had the honor to send to your commission a communication concerning the ownership by the Government of such new postal buildings as must of necessity be erected from time to time to accommodate the rapidly expanding volume of mail.

Basing my recommendation wholly on principles of business economy, I cited the fact that the department is constantly compelled to secure additional postal buildings by contracting for leases of structures not in existence but to be erected by private capital. Although such leases are negotiated with the greatest care and through the best competition available, they are usually made on an investment basis of from 8 to 15 per cent.

This state of affairs arises from the fact that, generally speaking, Congress, in the past, has followed the policy of appropriating moneys for the leasing of postal buildings, but has not appropriated for the construction and ownership of such buildings as they become necessary.

The Postal Service must be maintained. Mail is received in such volume as the public business requires. It must be housed, transmitted, and delivered in safety. The department can not decline to negotiate leases on new buildings. They must be had, otherwise valuable mail is exposed to the elements and ruined in transmission.

Under the law as it exists to-day, the department is absolutely compelled to execute leases on the best terms it can get, whether they are reasonable or otherwise.

Entertaining the belief that Congress would change this policy as soon as it could come to a complete understanding of all facts, I have refrained from completing contracts for the erection of certain buildings, although their urgency is great.

It is the purpose of this letter to present those cases to your consideration which are just now particularly pressing and which will become exceedingly acute before buildings can be constructed.

It is also the purpose of this letter to explain to you more fully the entire leasing situation, showing how leases now in existence are constantly expiring, presenting almost daily problems as to whether they shall be renewed or not. But, if the policy of owning postal buildings shall be adopted by Congress, the logical method in my opinion would be to take care of the pressing cases as they occur by ownership, just as under the present policy we take care of them by leasing, although I do not wish to presume upon the manner in which Congress may see fit to act in these matters.

The extent to which this leasing policy has gone and the extent to which it will go in the next few years is almost startling. In my former communication I recited that we now have 5,846 post-office buildings under lease, while the Government owns only 1,132. Many of the Government-owned buildings have become outgrown. The aggregate annual rental for leased quarters is about $12,000,000. Unless a building policy is adopted, this will increase by large amounts from year to year.

These leases are expiring almost daily, and whenever one expires it presents a new problem of what shall be done in a given locality. Renewals are made at increases of from two to four times the old rate, although careful study is made in each case and every possible effort made to secure the best terms. The popular objection to changing the location of post offices, particularly in the smaller cities and towns militates strongly against making a good trade for a lease.

The greatest actual and imperative demand for new buildings comes from the larger cities and from rapidly growing cities, where parcel-post stations, substations, and garages must constantly be added. Another class of cities where the building problem is acute are those having a single Government-owned building which is no longer adequate for the needs of the office and where men are obliged to work in insanitary cellars or basements.

The department has for more than a year been investigating this problem of buildings and has been making a careful survey to determine the adequacy of space in postal buildings. Since it requires from one to two years to construct buildings, it is necessary to anticipate to that extent the needs of each case.

While we have reliable information from more than 100 post offices that the space for the postal business is wholly inadequate and the conditions unsuitable, and while these cases are being more carefully studied to determine which are the most pressing, I desire for the moment to present for your information certain cases which have been delayed awaiting your policy, where the demand for the same is extremely acute but where we still think it would be advisable to decline to lease and to begin a program of Government ownership.

NEW YORK CITY.

The proposition in the city of New York has been before your committee for more than a year and concerning which you have had the details. This as you will recall is practically a duplication of the present central post office on Thirty-fourth Street. The requirement is for 800,000 square feet. The site is owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad and is said to be available at $2,000,000. We do not have definite information as to the cost of the proposed structure, but it is generally estimated at around $6,000,000. The average rental for such a building by the lowest bidders is approximately $1,000,000 per year. While these bids contain various options for purchase, there is no legislation by which such purchase could be made effective. The department has approved of plans and specifications but has declined to enter into any contract for a lease of this proposed building until Congress shall have acted in the matter.

DETROIT, MICH.

Another proposition which demands immediate action is that of a parcel-post station at Detroit, Mich., to contain approximately 55,000 square feet of floor space on two or three floors. Negotiations for the construction of such a building through the lease method have been under way for several months and are now ready for decision. A lease can be obtained on the proposed building when erected for $52,000 per year. I am not satisfactorily informed as to the cost of such a building, but believe the entire expense, including the lot, would be from $300,000 to $500,000.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

In this city 150,000 square feet of floor space in a new building must be provided forthwith. This proposition is under investigation, and while the need is well known, I have not the details with sufficient accuracy to submit them to you herewith, but will do so in a later communication.

DALLAS, TEX.

Here a new building must be provided as soon as possible containing 85,000 square feet of floor space on two or three floors. This case has been under careful investigation and negotiation for several months and the best proposition for a lease now in sight is for a building to be constructed for the department and rented as $84,250 per year. My information is that such a building would cost in the vicinity of $700,000. It would, however, enable us to discontinue two smaller stations which we are leasing at $9,000 each.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The department is now considering what would be necessary to do here at the Flatbush Station when the lease expires on April 1 next. The old rental was $5,000 per year, but the premises are inadequate and the proposition to take its place will cost about $20,000 per year.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

At this place a garage must be provided to accommodate the motor-vehicle service. It must contain about 30,000 square feet of floor space. On a rental basis it will cost $30,000 per year for a building which we are informed can be erected for $175,000.

Let me remind you in closing that this list of cases is but the beginning. They are the ones which are at this moment on my desk pressing for decision. If the policy of constructing post-office buildings is to begin it is apparent that we must discontinue to take care of the acute cases by leasing. There may be many other situations in the country as much in need of additional facilities as some of those in this list, and when our investigations have been sufficiently completed we will present them to you, together with the situations as they occur from time to time when leases expire.

Let me also call to your attention the fact that the business of the Post Office Department, doubling every 10 years, can never be placed on an efficient and stabilized basis until the erection of suitable buildings at suitable places is planned not only on an economic basis but from a scientific and service viewpoint.

Very truly yours,

HUBERT WORK,
Postmaster General.

PETITION.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Federated Shop Crafts, of Parsons, Kans., favoring the election of President and Vice President of the United States by direct vote of the people, abolition of the Electoral College, and shortening of the time elapsing between election and inauguration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3364) for the relief of W. O. Whipps, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 948) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, reported a bill (S. 4187) to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIAL:

A bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River in South Carolina; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GERRY:

A bill (S. 4173) for the relief of Thomas F. Sutton;

A bill (S. 4174) for the relief of Thomas A. Tabele; and

A bill (S. 4175) for the relief of Mary F. Spaight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 4176) to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4177) for the relief of John A. Clayton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4178) to amend paragraph 11 of section 1001 of an act entitled "An act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 4179) for the relief of Charles W. Mugler;

A bill (S. 4180) for the relief of Frank L. Smith; and

A bill (S. 4181) for the relief of the Fred E. Jones Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 4182) to provide motor vehicles for prohibition officers and agents; and

A bill (S. 4183) to increase the subsistence and per diem allowances of certain officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachussets:

A bill (S. 4184) to provide free transportation in the mails of bulletins of information to voters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 4185) amending section 2 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4186) for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Canal from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4188) for the relief of Maj. Allen M. Burdett; to the Committee on Claims.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Mr. McNARY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 382), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas under existing conditions the prices of agricultural products do not afford a fair and reasonable return upon the capital, labor, and expenses of the farmer, and in many instances do not meet the cost of production;

Whereas the agricultural interests of the country will be confronted with disastrous losses if the present conditions continue and unless a readjustment is brought about between the prices of their products and the prices of other commodities; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that the essential facts be ascertained as soon as possible in order that the many problems may be adequately analyzed and a sound, economic, and proper solution provided: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, by subcommittee or otherwise, is authorized and directed to investigate the conditions determining or influencing the export and domestic prices of agricultural products, in order to ascertain the most practicable methods of adjusting such conditions so that such prices will compare favorably with the prices of other commodities and to report to Congress such recommendations and to suggest such legislation as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. That such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the sessions and recesses of the Sixty-seventh Congress, at Washington or at any other place in the United States, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ such experts as it deems necessary, a clerk, and a stenographer to report any hearings had in connection with any subject which may be before such committee or subcommittee, such stenographer's service to be rendered at a cost not exceeding $1.25 per printed page, the expenses involved in carrying out the provisions of this resolution to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

SEC. 3. That the committee shall submit a final report, with its recommendations and suggestions, on or before March 1, 1923.

PAY OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Appropriations the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) authorizing payment of salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including the Capitol police, the legislative drafting service, and employees paid on vouchers under authority of resolutions, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator from Wyoming to state for the record just what the joint resolution covers?

Mr. WARREN. It simply authorizes the pay of employees of Congress on the 20th day of this month instead of on the 31st, so that they may be prepared for Christmas.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to its passage.

The joint resolution was passed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Senate to proceed now to the consideration of House bill 13316.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be considered first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in the appropriations for the Department of Commerce, on page 10, line 9, to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the restrictions and regulations of trade imposed by foreign countries, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 17, to strike out:

Public works: For the completion of one light vessel, $90,000.
For the construction of one light vessel, $150,000.
For enlarging and improving the lighthouse depot at Portsmouth, Va., in the fifth lighthouse district, or establishing a new depot, $154,500.
For repairs and improvements to Stannard Rock Light Station, Mich., $30,000.
For repairs to Barnegat Lighthouse, Barnegat City, N. J., $100,000.
For aids to navigation, Erie, Pa., and vicinity, $38,500.

And in lieu to insert:

Public works: For constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels for the Lighthouse Service, and for establishing and improving aids to navigation and other works as approved by the Secretary of Commerce, $738,500.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I inquire if that amendment is a summary or merely a condensation of the other items which were stricken out?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will state that that is all one amendment. We have stricken out these various items beginning on line 18, page 29, and inserted a provision covering them all and carrying an appropriation of $738,500, which is the amount of the Budget estimate, although an increase of the appropriation provided for by the House of about $175,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. The effect is, I understand, to give a little larger leeway to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. Without specifying the items that should be attended to, it gives him a chance to expend the fund wherever it is most needed?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is a very good plan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for the Department of Labor, on page 48, line 2, to reduce the appropriation for enforcement of the laws regulating immigration of aliens from $3,300,000 to $3,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to say that since that amendment was reported I have carefully examined the debate which occurred in the other House with reference to the item. The appropriation is proposed to be reduced by $300,000 by our committee because it exceeds the Budget estimate, but a reading of the debate in the House has convinced me that that amendment should not be adopted; that the bill should carry the full amount granted by the House, which is the sum appropriated for the enforcement of the immigration law for the current year. So I ask that the committee amendment may be disagreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments have now been all considered. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and is open to amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a committee amendment for the consideration of which I am directed to ask unanimous consent. The amendment is really obnoxious to the rule, and therefore the committee did not insert it. So I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The READING CLERK. On page 2, line 9, after the word "superintendent," it is proposed to insert the following—

who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think the Senator in charge of the bill ought to explain the reason the committee asks the Senate at this time to waive its rule which renders this amendment obnoxious.

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is not an amendment of very great importance, although the Secretary of Commerce said that its adoption would save considerable time and considerable delay. As it is now, papers that ought to be signed can not be signed when the officers who are required to sign them are away. This amendment, if adopted, would simply permit one of the officers of the department, to be designated by the Secretary of Commerce, to sign such papers in the absence of the Secretary or of the other person who is authorized to sign them. It does not entail any additional expense or any additional obligation upon the Government, but would be simply a saving of time and a convenience. The committee thought that it was very proper to submit the amendment to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. ROBINSON. How is the matter handled under present conditions?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Such papers, in the absence of those who are authorized to sign them, are held until those persons return to the city.

Mr. ROBINSON. Who will be designated to sign the name of the Secretary should the amendment be adopted?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The amendment provides that the chief clerk and superintendent shall be the chief executive of the department and may be designated by the Secretary to do these things.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. This amendment is not proposed for the purpose of effecting an increase of salary of any official, is it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not at all, nor is it for the creation of a new position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and by unanimous consent the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On behalf of the committee, I submit another amendment to the bill. There was some doubt as to whether it would be in order on the bill, but the committee considered it rather desirable, and I ask unanimous consent to propose it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

Information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees (including the expenses of attendance upon conventions and meetings of commercial bodies in the interests of American commerce), and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures, $50,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The adoption of this amendment, Mr. President, I will say, will enable the Secretary of Commerce to make further investigations with reference to the distribution of products of the farm and of the factory. It is hoped to get information that will aid in solving the problem of distribution in the country which the committee feels is a most important problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and by unanimous consent the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On behalf of the committee I submit two other amendments which really are interrelated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment offered by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 9, after line 24, following the amendment heretofore agreed to, it is proposed to insert the following:

Transporting remains of officers and employees: For defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce who may die abroad or in transit, while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment at their post or at home, $1,500.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is a similar provision in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill affecting the diplomatic and consular representatives of the country, and we felt that it was but just that we should make similar provision with reference to the attachés or representatives of the Department of Commerce who may die abroad.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee will be stated.

The READING CLERK. Following the amendment just agreed to it is proposed to insert:

Transportation of families and effects of officers and employees: To pay the itemized and verified statements of the actual and necessary expenses of transportation and subsistence, under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe, of families and effects of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under the order of the Secretary of Commerce, but not including any expenses incurred in connection with leave of absence of the officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, $15,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, a similar provision to that is contained in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Washington if there is any provision in this bill requiring the representatives of the Department of Commerce to travel on American ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Ought there not be an amendment added to the bill along the same line as the one which was adopted yesterday in connection with the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would certainly have no objection to that; and, if the Senator will prepare such an amendment, I shall not oppose it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will prepare such an amendment and offer it in a moment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The officials of the department ought to do it without any positive requirement of law, but they have not done it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I am informed the officers of the department follow that practice now in every case where there is an American ship available.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read in the hearings the other day, I think, that the United States Government is paying to foreign shipping companies something like $7,500,000 a year for the transportation of its representatives to and from foreign countries. It seems to me, if we want to build up the business of our merchant marine, that some such a provision as that to which I have referred should be attached to all of these bills.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, there is no objection to such an amendment being added to the bill, but it should not be so broad, of course, that the department could not send a representative to some port to which no American vessel sails.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will recall the amendment I offered yesterday, he will remember that it provided for a certificate from the Secretary of State in case no American vessel were available, and in this instance, of course, the certificate would have to be issued by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest to the Senator that he prepare his amendment immediately, because the Senate is now considering the only amendment which is left which the committee has to propose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that the Secretary has a copy of the amendment which was offered by him yesterday to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and possibly the Secretary can read it and it will be satisfactory to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 448 of the RECORD of the proceedings of yesterday, in the right-hand column, the amendment then offered appears, as follows:

Provided, That no part of said sum shall be paid for transportation on foreign vessels without a certificate from the Secretary of State that there are no American vessels on which such officers and clerks may be transported.

Mr. McKELLAR. It should read "Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor," as this bill applies to both departments.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be done.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer that amendment, substituting the words "the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor" for the words "the Secretary of State," the amendment to be inserted at the proper point in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the vote whereby the committee amendment was adopted will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The amendment may be inserted following the last amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent the vote by which the committee amendment was adopted is reconsidered. The Senator from Tennessee now offers an amendment to the amendment, which, without objection, will be agreed to. The question is now upon agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether all of the amendments which the committee has to offer have now been acted upon?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have all been acted upon.

Mr. SPENCER. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an amendment which, it seems to me, ought to go to conference, and which I will send to the Secretary's desk and have read in a moment.

Mr. President, there has been built up in the Bureau of Standards during the last two or three years a unit which has to do with the determining factors concerning gasoline and fuel consumption in internal-combustion engines, and all devices in connection therewith. So far as I am able to ascertain, the work of that unit has been of the highest order. It has gathered together a small number of men who are leaders along that line, with the result that in the last year they have determined a method by which internal-combustion engines, by a perfectly feasible change, may be enabled to use a coarser grade of gasoline. If such a change may be brought out on any considerable scale, it will increase by 25 per cent the available supply of gasoline for use by such engines and will promote the general welfare by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. President, I merely wish before sending the amendment to the desk to say that the unit to which I have referred has been in existence for two or three years without any appropriation for its continuance. Its operation has been made possible because the Department of War and the Department of the Navy during the last three years have referred to the

Bureau of Standards to be worked out problems along the line referred to, and have transferred sufficient funds to enable them to study and investigate those specific problems. If it had not been for that, this unit would of necessity have been disintegrated before this time.

The amendment which I propose has been estimated for and was submitted to the House. It came before our committee, but we had little time to consider it. I think, however, every member of the committee thought it was desirable, although perhaps it might be postponed for another year. The difficulty of the situation is that if this unit is not given the basic $40,000 which is proposed to be appropriated by the amendment to insure its continuance, if it shall be dependent merely upon the problems that may perchance come to it in a haphazard manner, it will disintegrate.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCER. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the Senator's amendment been printed?

Mr. SPENCER. It came to us written on the side of the bill, but I am sending it now to the Secretary's desk for reading.

Mr. ROBINSON. Where did it appear in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not in the bill.

Mr. SPENCER. The Senator would not have it, because he does not have the copy of the bill which came to the Committee on Appropriations. May I say to the Senator that it was on the side of the bill as an item that was new, that had been estimated for, but was not adopted by the House, and was put there merely for information. That is the only place where it has been printed, but the question was taken up in the House hearings on the bill at page 206.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the proper place in the bill the following:

For the maintenance and equipping of automotive engine test plants, including vacuum and refrigerating machinery necessary to simulate atmospheric conditions at altitudes up to 40,000 feet; supplies, equipment, and operation of laboratories for testing engines and materials used in their construction and operation, lubricants, carburetors, ignition devices, radiators and cooling systems, chassis and power transmission systems, and other researches incident to the standardization and development of automotive power plants, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, $40,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SPENCER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. This appears to be a legislative provision, pure and simple.

Mr. SPENCER. No; let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that it is not a legislative provision, because it is the carrying out of the organic law with relation to the Bureau of Standards, which provides that the Bureau of Standards is authorized to determine the properties of materials and their physical constants. This is directly within the legislative authority which gives them their existence. Of course, as the Senator knows, if the Senate agreed that it had some wisdom in it it would go to conference for the conferees to determine what was best.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the amendment is clearly new legislation. The language of the amendment is distinctly different from the language of the organic act creating the Department of Commerce, as just read by the Senator from Missouri. It seems to me that this is a case where the rule ought to be observed. In the consideration of these appropriation bills we have found, during the last two or three days, a disposition on the part of the members of the committee responsible for the management of these bills in the Senate to override the rule that has been adopted by the Senate requiring that the Committee on Appropriations shall not report legislative provisions in its bills. There is not the slightest reason why the committee that has jurisdiction of this legislation should not consider a bill for this purpose, and, if legislation be deemed wise by that committee, report a bill authorizing this appropriation.

I therefore make the point of order that the amendment is obnoxious to the rule against new and general legislation in a general appropriation bill.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, of course, if this is new legislation the point of order is well taken. I should like, however, to call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas—whose knowledge of parliamentary law is par excellence—as well as that of the Chair to the remarks of the director in the House hearing upon this very point. There the question was raised as to whether this item was new legislation or whether it was already provided for in the organic act establishing the Bureau of Standards; and I may read this sentence or two upon that point.

Doctor Stratton said:

The authorization—

That is, for this amendment—

is in our organic act, which covers the determination of the properties of materials. A very large amount of this work has to do with materials. In fact, the greater part of it. The work results in the end in the standardization of the devices used.

Which is the very purpose of the Bureau of Standards, as defined in its organic act.

Doctor Stratton continues:

I do not think that there is any item in our estimates that comes any more clearly under our functions than that one.

A mere reading of the amendment may, I say, indicate clearly that it has to do in the end with the standardization of the use of gasoline and other oil fuel, and therefore is within the very organic act which created the Bureau of Standards, for whose benefit this amendment is proposed.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Missouri in the first instance to admit that this amendment is new legislation. Was I correct?

Mr. SPENCER. No; the Senator was mistaken, or, if I did admit it, it was a mistake on my part. Certainly I never would have proposed the amendment if I had thought it was new legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, clearly the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri authorizes the Bureau of Standards to do something that it is not now authorized to do; otherwise there would be no necessity for the adoption of the language embraced in the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. All that it would be necessary for his amendment to provide would be the appropriation. If the authorization already exists, why does the Senator from Missouri seek to repeat it in his amendment? But, I repeat, a reading of the authorization contained in the organic act and a reading of the amendment discloses the fact that the amendment is new legislation, that it provides for services to be performed by the Bureau of Standards that are not authorized by existing law, and clearly it is obnoxious to the rule against new and general legislation. I think if we are going to have a rule upon this subject the Committee on Appropriations ought to respect that rule, and I think that the Senate ought not to drift back into its old practice of incorporating in appropriation bills legislative provisions.

Some Senators pointed out when this rule was under consideration that it would not prove workable in this respect. The champions of the rule insisted that it would be observed. The committee, in order to avoid the effect of the rule, gives its tacit consent to an amendment that violates the rule, and then some Member of the Senate offers it, with the declaration that the amendment really is acceptable to the committee, but that the committee has not incorporated it in its report because of the rule.

Let us enforce this rule, except in emergency cases where plainly the public interest requires that it be relaxed, and let these bureaus that are constantly seeking increased appropriations and expanded sphere of activity for the services they render justify their increases before the committees of the Senate and the House that are authorized to pass upon these questions. Let the Committee on Appropriations in the main confine its activities to appropriations. The fact is that in this instance the committee rejected the amendment. I think I ought to say, in all justice to the Appropriations Committee, the committee declined to incorporate it in its report; and as to this particular amendment I do not think there is anything to indicate that the committee has given even its tacit consent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri may be agreed to. The criticism, however, might be held applicable to some other amendments that have been offered this morning. It does not apply to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. Now, plainly the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is calculated to authorize the Bureau of Standards to do something that it has no authority to do under existing law.

Mr. OVERMAN. And that has been performed by other departments.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; as suggested by the Senator from North Carolina, to perform some service that has been heretofore performed by other departments.

This is new legislation. It is obnoxious to the rule. This is a case where the rule ought to be enforced. If we are never going to apply this rule against the incorporation in appropriation bills of authorizations for expenditures, we might just

as well repeal the rule and go back to the old practice that prevailed in the Senate before the adoption of the rule.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, by your courtesy and patience, I should like to say that I agree with the Senator from Arkansas as to the necessity of fully carrying out the existing rule with regard to new legislation, and I want to say that the test as to whether or not this is new legislation might rest right here: Everything that is proposed to be secured by that amendment could be secured if the amendment read—

To carry out the organic purpose of the Bureau of Standards, $40,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I suggest to the Senator that if he takes that view of the matter he ought to offer his amendment in that form, so as to obviate any question of violating the rule.

Mr. SPENCER. The only reason why I do not—and I am through, Mr. President—is because of what the Senator from Arkansas knows well enough, and that is that in the House as well as in the Senate, but particularly in the House, there has been for some years the desire that where any item carrying out the organic functions of a bureau required an appropriation, there should be a specification of that phase of its organic purpose for which the appropriation was intended. That is the only reason for making this more specific. The effect would be precisely the same, and it would be equally satisfactory.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, if the general language quoted from the organic act by the Senator from Missouri can justify this specific use of public moneys, then the rule adopted by the Senate providing against new and general legislation in appropriation bills can have little value.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is subject to the point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I offer this amendment, in order to make the record clear, if the Secretary will take it down:

For the purpose of further carrying out the organic purpose of the Bureau of Standards, $40,000.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think the amendment should be voted down, because it is plainly an effort to do indirectly what can not be done directly. It is an attempt to evade the very wholesome rule of the Senate which is designed to protect the Treasury against legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I make the point of order against the amendment as now proposed, in that it is not estimated for. There is no estimate for it in the form submitted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that both points of order are good, but prefers to base his ruling upon the point of order made by the Senator from Washington, which is sustained. If there be no further amendment proposed to the bill as in Committee of the Whole, it will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HUSTED, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 11040) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on House bill 13232.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House, agree to the conference asked for by the House, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate may be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. WARREN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HITCHCOCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. NORRIS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 949) thereon.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business and that it be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] desires to take the floor to discuss the measure, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lenroot	Robinson
Bayard	George	Lodge	Sheppard
Brandegee	Glass	McCumber	Smoot
Brookhart	Gooding	McKellar	Spencer
Cameron	Hale	McKinley	Stanley
Capper	Harreld	McLean	Sterling
Caraway	Harris	McNary	Sutherland
Colt	Heflin	Nelson	Swanson
Couzens	Hitchcock	New	Townsend
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Trammell
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Keyes	Overman	Warren
Dillingham	King	Page	
Ernst	Ladd	Pepper	
Fernald	La Follette	Reed, Pa.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, at the very beginning of this discussion I lay it down as a cardinal principle of our system of representative government that we are bound, so nearly as we may, upon all issues to register the will, and to embody into law, the clearly expressed judgment of the people of this country.

Where the people have indicated beyond dispute that they favor a certain public policy, I believe it to be the duty of the Members of this body to embody that policy into law. Where the people have expressed their opposition to any well-defined public policy, I believe it to be our duty to oppose and to reject that policy.

I do not believe any Senator here will dispute that that principle lies at the foundation of our system of government, for from the beginning of our history it has been recognized that above Presidents and Members of Congress the people of this Nation are sovereign and that the will of the people shall be the law of the land.

I propose to demonstrate here to-day, preliminary to a discussion of its terms, that the pending ship subsidy bill is contrary to the expressed will of the American people and that the action of the President and the other sponsors in attempting to force its passage at this time is an open challenge to the people and a violation of the trust reposed by the people in their delegated representatives.

In my view, it is not only unwise and impolitic but it is indefensible to propose the enactment of this legislation at this time, and I propose to state as briefly as I may why I hold that opinion.

This bill is brought in at the instigation of the Executive immediately following an election in which the American people have expressed their disapproval of the policies of the administration now in power.

The administration majority of 169 in the House of Representatives has been reduced to less than 20, and the majority in the Senate has been reduced from 24 to 10. No one will question the assertion that in the new Congress elected by the people on November 7 Members of the Senate and House of both parties who are opposed to the more important policies of this administration will be in a majority in both Houses.

Under these circumstances the Executive has brought forward the pending bill and an effort is now being made to obtain its passage by a Congress the administration majority in which has been repudiated by the American people.

This bill has already passed the lower House by a majority of 24 votes. I count it a significant circumstance that at least 70 of the votes cast for this bill in the House were cast by Members who were defeated in the primaries and the elections. No one will deny that without the support of these defeated Representatives of the people this measure would have met the same fate that has been met by every previous subsidy bill. Moreover, no one will deny that were this bill offered to the new Congress elected in November it would be defeated by a substantial majority.

What warrant can be found for bringing up this bill at this time? It involves an expenditure of hundreds of millions of public money and the delegation of broad and unprecedented powers to a small body of men, at least a majority of whom have forfeited the confidence of right-thinking, conservative-minded people. Where is the authority upon which the Congress can rely in enacting this bill into law in the name of the American people?

I venture to say that never in the history of this country in time of peace has a measure of the far-reaching importance and revolutionary character of this ship subsidy bill been presented to any Congress by any Executive when not a line could be found in the platforms of any political party indorsing the policy embodied in it.

I am familiar with the oft-repeated and wholly untrue and false assertion of those who have conducted such a vigorous propaganda in behalf of this bill that a pledge to the shipping interests to pay them large sums of money from the Treasury in the form of cash subsidies was embodied in the Republican platform of 1920. That argument is sufficiently answered and its complete falsity is demonstrated merely by reading all that the Republican platform of 1920 had to say on the subject of a merchant marine and by stating that the legislation referred to therein and specifically indorsed was the merchant marine act of 1920, known as the Jones Act, which entirely rejected and excluded all plans for a subsidy payment which might then have been proposed.

This is the extract from the Republican platform of 1920 on the subject:

MERCHANT MARINE.

The national defense and our foreign commerce require a merchant marine of the best type of modern ships flying the American flag, manned by American seamen, owned by private capital, and operated by private energy.

We indorse the sound legislation recently enacted by the Republican Congress that will insure the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine.

We recommend that all ships engaged in coastwise trade and all vessels of the American merchant marine shall pass through the Panama Canal without payment of tolls.

I need hardly to add that every platform of the Democratic Party which has dealt with the subject of a merchant marine or shipping in the past 50 years has specifically expressed the unalterable opposition of that party to the payment of ship subsidies to private interests. Let me add that every Democratic candidate in the elections held since 1920, who did not specifically repudiate that declaration in his party platforms, must have been presumed to have indorsed it, and now stands pledged to carry that traditional policy of his party into effect.

Nor is that all. In the recent election the ship subsidy was a direct issue discussed frankly before the electorate in the campaign in a number of States. It was an important issue in the campaigns in Iowa, in Minnesota, in North Dakota, in Wisconsin, and in perhaps a score of other States in which individual candidates for the House and Senate bound themselves by specific pledges to oppose the pending bill.

I have examined these platforms and personal pledges with care, and on the basis of that investigation I am prepared to make the statement that wherever the ship subsidy was an issue in almost every instance the policy involved in the present bill was overwhelmingly repudiated by the American people. Wherever a candidate for public office declared against this ship subsidy bill, in a district normally of his own political party, he was elected, and in many districts normally Republican, Republican candidates who failed to pledge themselves to oppose this bill were defeated by Democratic candidates who pledged themselves to vote against it.

Mr. President, I confidently assert that three-fourths of the people of this country through resolutions adopted by nonpolitical and nonpartisan organizations which fairly represent them have gone definitely on record as unalterably opposed to a ship subsidy, and more particularly to the terms of the pending bill.

The census reports of the Government will show that approximately three-fourths of our population are either directly engaged in or are dependent upon bread winners engaged in agriculture or wage earners in industry.

I assert that these elements of our population, the farmers and the wage earners, are practically unanimous in their opposition to this bill, and I have in my possession the formal resolutions adopted by the great organizations which represent these citizens to prove that statement.

I propose to take up in order the various declarations which have been made upon the question of the subsidy by the farm organizations and the labor organizations which have given an expression on the subject.

An examination of these resolutions will convince any fair-minded person that the farmers of the country are unanimous in their opposition to this bill.

I have no hesitation in saying that in my experience in public life an issue has never been presented before the people of the country which has encountered among American farmers the unyielding opposition and hostility which the pending measure has brought down upon itself and upon those who sponsor it.

I shall take the time of the Senate to read only two of those resolutions, but I request that all of the declarations of representative organizations of farmers and labor which I have been able to assemble and have before me may be printed as an appendix to my remarks in the regular RECORD type.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether he has included in the data which he has asked to have printed a statement from the American Federation of Labor information and publicity service, Washington, D. C., of December 8, 1922? That gives the position of the Federation and goes into some detail.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have that document before me, and shall include it in the appendix to my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Appendix.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the National Grange is the oldest farm organization in the United States. It is, I believe, taking its entire membership, probably the most conservative of all the farming organizations in the country. It is my understanding that the National Grange is strongest in its membership in the Eastern States. It originated in the Middle West, in the upper Mississippi Valley, in the early seventies. It has a most interesting history. At its national session in November, 1922, it adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the National Grange, in the fifty-sixth annual session, assembled at Wichita, Kans., November 24, 1922, and representing nearly 1,000,000 organized farmers of America, hereby declare its unalterable opposition to all ship subsidy legislation and to every form of direct subsidies to private enterprises; and

It hereby pledges the full strength of the organization toward the defeat of whatever form of ship subsidy legislation has been or hereafter may be introduced in Congress.

If upon investigation it is found that the American merchant marine is handicapped in its operation by present conditions and laws, then the grange favors a revision of the navigation laws rather than Government aid through a ship subsidy.

C. M. FREEMAN, *Secretary*.

I hope at some subsequent time during the consideration of the bill to have something to say about those navigation laws.

I also read the resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor at their annual convention at Cincinnati in June, 1922, as follows:

Whereas the bill known as S. 3217—

That is not the number of the pending bill, but it was the number of the bill introduced last February by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], who, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, reported the pending bill. It contained many of the subsidy provisions of the pending bill. The declarations in the resolution which I am about to read apply quite as well to the pending bill as to the bill which is numbered in the resolution and which was the only bill on that subject then pending. A later resolution by the council of the American Federation of Labor is so sweeping in its denunciation of all subsidy legislation of this character as applied to the merchant marine that I shall incorporate that resolution, rather than the one which I am about to read now, in the appendix which I have permission of the Senate to publish to the remarks I am now making. I read the resolution adopted at Cincinnati:

Whereas the bill known as S. 3217, now pending in Congress, and which is purported to be "a bill to amend and supplement the merchant marine act of 1920, and for other purposes," is in reality a cunningly devised scheme to enrich certain classes of so-called American shipowners at the expense of the truly American taxpayer and

also to provide patronage which is certain to be used for purely political purposes; and

Whereas said bill, commonly known as the "ship subsidy bill," is being widely misrepresented as a measure intended for and necessary to the maintenance and upbuilding of an American merchant marine; and

Whereas the facts are that its enactment into law will bring about a condition under which all managers and operators of ships must regard politics as the prime factor in their business and efficient management as a secondary consideration of compartively little importance; and

Whereas the claim that ship subsidies are necessary to equalize the cost of operation between foreign and American vessels is deceptive and can not be substantiated except in cases where such inequality exists because the American Government has failed and is failing to properly enforce the existing American laws intended to promote equalization, this being especially true of the law known as the La Follette Seamen's Act: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Federation of Labor in regular convention assembled, That the said ship subsidy bill be condemned as inimical to the public interest, and particularly destructive to the Nation's hopes and aspirations for sea power; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, and to the Members of Congress.

I am going to run over at this point a brief list of a few of the great farm organizations which have condemned the pending bill in formal resolutions, and I ask that these resolutions be incorporated in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks. Let me add that this is only a partial list, for State and local organizations by the scores, representing constituent organizations and gatherings of large numbers of farmers, have voiced their opposition to this bill:

The Farmers' Union.
The Society of Equity.
The National Grange.
The National Board of Farm Organizations.
The Farmers' National Council.

To this list must be added the American Farm Bureau Federation, which, despite the action of J. R. Howard, the gentleman temporarily holding the position of president of this organization, in indorsing the House bill, has formally gone on record as opposed to the principle of a ship subsidy in any form.

The labor organizations which have gone on record, in one form or another, in opposition to the pending bill, either by formal resolution or by authorized statements of their officials, include the following:

The American Federation of Labor (representing nearly all crafts except those employed in transportation).
The railroad brotherhoods.
International Seamen's Union of America.
Washington State Federation of Labor.
Water Front Workers' Federation.
Cigar Makers' International Union.
Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs.
Arkansas State Federation of Labor.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
Minnesota State Federation of Labor.
International Association of Oil Field, Gas Well, and Refinery Workers of America.
Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees.
Order of Sleeping Car Conductors.
Maine State Federation of Labor.
International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers.
United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers.
Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
The New York State Federation of Labor.
Utah State Federation of Labor.
Rhode Island State Federation of Labor.
Missouri State Federation of Labor.
Montana State Federation of Labor.
Amalgamated Lithographers of America.
Nebraska State Federation of Labor.

Now, I anticipate it will be said that, after all, it is a matter of small importance that the men and women who work with their hands have gone on record in opposition to this bill.

The author of the ship subsidy bill did not take that view, and in speaking of the author of the ship subsidy bill I refer to the chairman of the Shipping Board. In a manner which I shall not now take occasion to characterize, Chairman Lasker sought to win the support of the working people of this country for the bill which is now pending in the Senate.

I content myself with the statement that Chairman Lasker of the Shipping Board sought a conference with Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, and made a highly improper proposal to a group of labor officials that they disregard the will and the interests of their membership and support the pending bill.

This conference took place on April 6 and 7 in the headquarters of the American Federation of Labor in the city of Washington. Chairman Lasker then and there, I am informed, offered to withdraw certain provisions in the pending bill dealing with labor if he could thereby induce the labor organizations to abate their opposition to the bill.

Let it be said to the everlasting credit of the representatives of the workingmen of this country that they spurned and rejected this barefaced proposal that they barter the public interest for what was held up to them as a special provision which would be inserted in the bill in the interest of labor. They sent Chairman Lasker back to the Shipping Board with a refusal of his suggestions. He found that he could not buy American labor, and to-day he faces the unbroken and unyielding opposition of the wage earners of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I believe I have demonstrated to the satisfaction of any fair-minded person that the pending bill is opposed by the great mass of the American people. Its passage at this time would be a gross violation of the very spirit and letter of the principles of representative government.

I am confronted with a choice that confronts every other Member of this body, as to what course I shall pursue as a representative of the people in the situation which the Executive has forced in this Chamber.

Let me say at this time that, carrying out the pledge I gave to the people who elected me and expressing so far as I may the plain mandate of the people of the Nation, I shall continue as a Member of the Senate to register my opposition to this bill so long as it is before the Senate. I do not know of any higher public service that I can perform during the present session than to do what it lies in my power to do to defeat this legislation, and to the limit of my ability I am prepared to work with other opponents of the bill toward that end.

I can not be unmindful, Mr. President, that an effort will be made to place upon the opponents of this bill responsibility for delay in the enactment of farm-credit legislation for the relief of farmers who have been brought to a condition of grave distress by the policies of this administration.

Let me say at the outset that no such subterfuge will succeed. The public knows that, representing the will of the administration, you have framed the program of legislation for this session of Congress. The public knows that the President and his advisers have decided to give the farmers of this country not one additional penny of credit until you have first voted hundreds of millions of public money into the coffers of the private shipping interests of the country, unless it may be that there are enough Members of the Senate to force the substitution of a measure looking to the relief, the immediate relief, of distressed agriculture. I shall at the proper time be ready to submit or to support a motion which will insure immediate relief to the American farmer.

Let me say in passing that I do not favor merely passing a bill which on its face purports to relieve the farmers, but which in reality will serve only to increase their indebtedness and will leave them in their present helpless and intolerable situation, unable to market their products and unable to meet the obligations they already owe.

I propose to support legislation, such as the Norris bill or some like measure, which will enable the farmer to market his products at a reasonable and fair profit in addition to making money available for direct loans to farmers without the intervention of the bankers, who have thus far handled all moneys loaned to the farmers at high rates of interest.

THE PRESIDENT'S ARGUMENT CHALLENGED.

Mr. President, I challenge the correctness of the proposition which underlies the whole argument in support of the immediate passage of this bill. That proposition is that the drain upon the Public Treasury incident to the maintenance of our Government-owned merchant marine is so great that its longer continuance is a serious menace to the country, and that this bill, if it becomes a law, will immediately relieve the public from this burden in whole or in part.

In his message on this subject, addressed to the joint session of the Congress on November 21 last, the President said:

Our immediate problem is not to build and support a merchant shipping * * *. Our problem is to relieve the Public Treasury of the drain it is already meeting.

In the same message he said:

I am very sure the need for decisive action—decisive favorable action—never was so urgent before.

Again, he said:

When the question is asked, Why the insistence for the merchant marine act now? the answer is apparent. * * * We have the unavoidable task of wiping out a $50,000,000 annual loss in operation and losses aggregating many hundreds of millions in worn-out, sacrificed, or scrapped shipping. * * * This problem can not longer be ignored; its attempted solution can not longer be postponed. The failure of Congress to act decisively will be no less disastrous than adverse action.

Any question concerning replacement of worn-out ships can only arise in the future.

The immediate problem, the President tells us, is to relieve the Treasury of the drain of $50,000,000 a year. To what extent does the President claim that this bill will relieve this drain upon the Treasury? I quote again from the same message:

When your executive government knows of public expenditures aggregating fifty millions annually which it believes could be reduced by half through a change of policy, your government would be unworthy of public trust if such a change were not commended, nay, if it were not insistently urged.

So that the most the President claims that this bill will reduce public expenditures for the maintenance of a merchant marine is $25,000,000 annually, with this difference, that when, as the President says, $50,000,000 annually is spent now of the people's money to maintain a merchant marine it is spent to maintain the people's own ships, but when the millions are spent under the plan the President proposes it is to maintain the ships as the property of private owners, to whom the Government will have practically given them, according to the scheme proposed in this bill.

So it would seem that even according to the President's contentions the great and overpowering necessity for the immediate passage of this bill is no more than to save the public $25,000,000 a year. But even this claim of the President is without any support in the facts. Neither $50,000,000 a year nor any other sum is being lost through Government operation of our ships.

The only ships operated by the Government are those of the United States Line and the Panama Line, and the ships of both these lines have been making money at the very time when the President claims our ships had been operated at a loss.

Of the manner in which our ships have been operated and their alleged losses I shall speak later.

This program of Mr. Lasker and the President so far from saving the public anything will, if adopted, tax the people much more to maintain the ships in the hands of the private parties to whom they will have been practically given than even the advocates of this bill claim they are costing now. But I am not now discussing that question.

ABSURDITY OF CLAIMS MADE FOR THIS BILL.

I am merely pointing out the absurdity of the contention that there is anything in the present situation which requires the immediate passage of this or any other measure which has for its object the transfer of these ships at the present time from the Government to private owners on any terms which the Government can make at this time. Why, sir, the few million dollars, which is the most the President promises to save the public revenue annually under this measure, is only a small fraction of what he will ask for and receive annually for the maintenance of the Navy. Hundreds of millions will be spent to maintain a naval program for war purposes, most of which is unnecessary for any purpose of defense, but $25,000,000 spent to maintain a great merchant fleet in peaceful commerce is something that this administration will not tolerate.

The President's message, however, furnishes the best answer to the contention that there must be a sudden transfer of the title to these ships from the people, whose money paid for them, to private individuals who are to receive them practically as a gift with a bonus for their operation. I quote once more from the President's message.

The net loss to the United States Treasury—sums actually taken therefrom in this Government operation—averaged approximately $16,000,000 per month during the year prior to the assumption of responsibility by the present administration. * * * It is very gratifying to report the diminution of the losses to $4,000,000 per month, or a total of $50,000,000 a year.

Mark you, he says—

in this Government operation.

Why, sir, if the President's figures are correct, within less than two years and under the most unfavorable circumstances imaginable a deficit of $16,000,000 a month has been reduced to only $4,000,000 a month, and that reduction has been made at a time when not only the shipping business of this country but of the world was depressed as never before in history. Mr. Lasker, chairman of the Shipping Board, in his testimony before the House committee described the world trade at the present time as at the lowest ebb. In the document prepared and distributed under the direction of the Shipping Board in behalf of this bill, and made a part of the record of the joint Senate and House committee hearings thereon, it is said:

One of the most difficult problems confronting the Shipping Board is the sale and transfer of Government-owned ships to private owners. The task has been made especially difficult by the present world-wide depression in industry and by the large overproduction of ships. These two important factors have delayed the sale of Government-owned tonnage to such a degree that only a few ships have been sold in the 18 months that have elapsed since the passage of the Jones law. * * *

The present depression in shipping will doubtless continue for several years. Ships can not, therefore, be sold except at very low prices, as is evidenced by the low prices at which privately owned British tonnage and a few Shipping Board ships have been sold in recent months. * * *

The condition of world shipping is well described in the minority report of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House accompanying the bill. From the report I quote this paragraph:

There is a large amount of idle tonnage all over the world. France pays the most liberal subsidies of any nation, and yet on March 1 one-third of her tonnage was laid up. Sixty-five per cent of Italian, 50 per cent of Belgian, 40 per cent of Danish, 40 per cent of Swedish, 38 per cent of Spanish, and 25 per cent of Greek merchant tonnage are laid up. A large amount of Japanese tonnage is idle, but the exact figures are not available. Great Britain, which pays no subsidies and whose seamen receive the largest wages of any country except the United States, has the smallest percentage of idle tonnage—I believe about 22 per cent—except that there is probably a smaller percentage of idle German tonnage, although their entire fleet is very small. Italy, which pays the lowest wages of any country except the oriental countries, has the largest percentage of idle tonnage, although she pays ship subsidies.

That accurately describes the present condition of world shipping—a condition which no subsidy could avert or mitigate—and subsidy has nothing to do with it. That condition is the logical outcome of the late war, which, on the one hand, greatly increased the number of ships, while, on the other, it well-nigh destroyed the producing power of the belligerent nations and the products which they transport. The United States alone raised its tonnage engaged in foreign commerce from something over a million dead-weight tons to 16,000,000 tons.

The United States Shipping Board in its report for the year 1922, made public within the last few days, on page 111 gives a table which graphically illustrates the increase in our merchant marine tonnage, and in that portion of it employed in foreign transportation. I ask leave to insert at this point the table which I hold in my hand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table is as follows:

Total United States merchant marine and tonnage employed in foreign trade.

Fiscal year.	Total merchant marine.	Tonnage in foreign trade.
	Dead-weight tons.	*Dead-weight tons.*
1800	1,458,738	1,000,661
1810	2,137,175	1,471,529
1820	1,920,251	874,486
1830	1,787,664	806,345
1840	3,271,146	1,144,257
1850	5,303,181	2,159,541
1860	8,030,809	3,509,094
1870	7,309,761	2,173,201
1880	6,022,051	1,971,003
1890	6,635,746	1,302,003
1900	7,747,208	1,225,193
1910	11,262,123	1,173,776
1917	13,308,586	3,661,164
1920	25,027,342	15,092,631
1921	27,538,464	16,819,943
1922	27,784,989	16,279,371

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is a very interesting table, let me say in this connection, and one which Senators will find fruitful of much reflection and many deductions not only upon the issues raised in this bill but upon other economic issues which are now foremost in the public mind.

The marked drop in the tonnage of the American merchant marine employed in foreign transportation covering certain cycles, certain extended periods of consecutive years, coincident with legislation affecting the industrial interests of the country, will prove suggestive to Senators in the debate upon this bill and other measures likely to follow it.

The 1917 foreign-trade tonnage of 3,661,164 tons shows the commencement of the great increase due to the war. Perhaps I ought to say that the reported tonnage for 1910 employed in foreign trade was 1,173,776 tons.

Mr. POMERENE. At what time was that?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is given by 10-year periods. I believe I will just read the figures of our tonnage employed in foreign trade, as published in this late report, just issued a few days ago by the Shipping Board:

	Dead-weight tons.
1800	1,000,661
1810	1,471,529
1820	874,486

A drop of nearly one-half.

	Dead-weight tons.
1830	806,345

A decrease.

1840	1,144,257
1850	2,159,541
1860	3,569,094

Between 1850 and 1860 the Crimean War occurred.

In 1870 it dropped again, to 2,173,269 tons.

By 1880 it had dropped still lower, to 1,971,603 tons.

	Dead-weight tons.
1890	1,392,093
1900	1,225,193
1910	1,173,776

That is the report for 1910. The next year reported is 1917. Then the effect of the European war had expressed itself in the tonnage of American vessels used in foreign trade, and the tonnage ran up to 3,661,164 tons. By 1920 we had 15,692,631 tons employed in foreign trade. By 1921 we had 16,819,943 tons employed in foreign trade. In 1922 there was a slight drop, but for this present year it stands at 16,279,371 tons.

To recapitulate, the 1917 foreign-trade tonnage of 3,661,164 tons shows the commencement of the great increase due to the war. It will be observed that from a little more than three and a half million tons in 1917 we rapidly increased to more than fifteen and a half million tons in 1920, and to more than sixteen and three-quarter million tons in 1921, and that our tonnage engaged in foreign trade stands at over sixteen and a quarter million tons in the present year, 1922, as reported in this document just issued by the Shipping Board.

After the war the surplus of ships remained, but there was an enormous shrinkage in products for overseas trade. It will take several years to recover from this condition under the most favorable circumstances. During this period ships will remain a drug upon the market. Their price is probably right now at the lowest point, unless we were seeking solely to consult the interests of the purchaser, and not Uncle Sam, the seller. There never could be a worse time selected for marketing our ships than the present. The man would be counted a fool who in private business, unless on the verge of bankruptcy, selected the time of greatest depression to dispose of his property, knowing that it would not bring more than 5 cents on the dollar of what it cost, and only a small fraction of its real value. But that is precisely what this bill proposes we shall do with the great merchant marine now belonging to the people of this country and in the disposition of which we are merely trustees.

The Shipping Board has authority to sell the ships under existing law. It has not done so because there was no market for them. There is no market for them because there is little or no employment for them. A subsidy will not increase the business. A subsidy will not create cargoes. There is no certainty, indeed there is no evidence tending to show, that the proposed subsidy would make a market for the ships or increase the price for which they can be sold. The most optimistic claim that I have seen put forward by Mr. Lasker and other advocates of this measure is that the ships might be sold for $200,000,000. This is something like 5 or 6 per cent of what the ships cost the American people. It is a small part even of the pre-war value of such ships or their cost of construction under normal conditions.

Everyone knows that if European conditions become more nearly normal and as the commerce of the world is reestablished the market value of these ships will greatly increase. If, on the other hand, Europe is plunged into another war, judged by the increased volume of traffic during the last war, that fact will greatly enhance the value of the ships; so that, viewed from any possible angle, the plan to dispose of the ships immediately means a tremendous loss to the people of this country, no matter whether the world is entering upon a period of peace-time development or of further wars.

All this agitation and propaganda to try to prove to the people that a great crisis exists which makes it necessary to sacrifice their property at a few cents on the dollar is fictitious, if not fraudulent.

The attempt to foist a ship-subsidy plan upon the people is no new scheme. It has been tried by far more powerful and able financiers and politicians than those supporting the present administration. The scheme has always failed, as it will fail now, because the people are opposed to it.

But whatever difference of opinion may honestly exist as to the wisdom or unwisdom of a ship subsidy, I can see no room for any difference of opinion on the proposition that this is not the time to commit the country to a permanent policy respecting our Government-owned merchant fleet, nor is it the time to try to make a market for that fleet. The price of ships can not go lower; that price must inevitably advance. A worse time could not be selected for the Government to sell these ships or a better time for the favored purchasers, in which to attempt to dispose of our merchant fleet or to decide the question whether it shall be subsidized or not. Just in proportion as we approach more normal shipping conditions we will be able to decide more intelligently what action to take and secure a better price for our ships if we decide to sell them at that time.

EXPERIENCE SHOWS OUR SHIPS CAN BE OPERATED SUCCESSFULLY.

The President tells us that in a few months the expense of maintaining the fleet has been reduced from $16,000,000 a month to $4,000,000 a month. This reduction has been made with less than a third of the Government fleet in operation and at a time when shipping the world over is at the lowest point. But this is not all. This result has been accomplished under the direction of a Shipping Board, not one member of which claims to be experienced in ship operation. The chairman of the Shipping Board was selected, as it now appears, not because he knew anything about shipping but because he was a clever advertising man. He was put in his present position at the head of the greatest merchant fleet in the world, not to operate ships but, as he is reported to have declared, as I think he himself has testified, to "sell" ship subsidy to the American people, and one can see some logical reason for his selection for that purpose. For months an intensive propaganda has been carried on to so blind the American people to the real facts as to lead them to acquiesce in being plundered and robbed, as they will be, according to the terms of this bill.

Very frankly Chairman Lasker admits that the Shipping Board, of which he is the head, has not tried to build up the shipping business of the country during his administration. Chairman Lasker, at the joint hearings of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on this bill, testified upon this point as follows:

> The Shipping Board is not trying to establish trade. * * * We are only taking such trade as is offered, and you can not build up an American trade that way. We get only the plusage of the trade, as is proved by the fact that now we have tied up much more than Great Britain has.

Why, Mr. President, it has been pointed out on this floor again and again in the last year or year and a half that the policy of the Shipping Board was one of hostility to making the operation of the Government-owned ships a success. It is akin, sir, to the policies which have been employed widely wherever there was an opportunity, because of exceptional conditions, to discourage the Government operation of anything, and to reserve that field entirely for private profits and exploitation of the American people. A new day will come, sir. I believe that it is not far distant. I trust it will not come before we are ready for it and ready to deal with it on sound economic principles.

Why, sir, I pause briefly to say that it is a fact, sustained by the record, that the men who have been put in the responsible positions under the present Shipping Board, operating, handling, and directing the operation of the Government-owned ships, were drawn from private shipping corporations more British than American, and every man of whom, influenced by his years of service in those corporations, had interests not only inimical but hostile to the successful operation of any fleet owned by our Government. I go further than that and say that their connections, as I demonstrated on the floor more than a year ago, were such as to make them more friendly to other interests, if they, as most men under like circumstances are certain to be, were influenced by their long and previous connection with interests which were not American and not in sympathy with the development of an American merchant marine. But more of that later in this debate.

I remind the Senate again of the quotation just made from Mr. Lasker's testimony, in which he said that the Shipping Board "was not trying to establish trade," and yet the point that is driven in here by the President's message, by arguments which have been presented by supporters of the bill, by all the propaganda that has flooded the country, is that the terrible expense, the outlay for handling these Government-owned ships, is so great that it is the duty of Congress immediately to rescue the Government from the expenditure. If the Government-owned ships all could be employed in the business of transporting, limited as the products for transportation have been and still are, and had been honestly and sanely employed to make money for the Government, no such balance as a $50,000,000 expense would have been rendered or could have been used as an argument to push this legislation through. The Government-owned ships that have been run, not as the Shipping Board has run them, but which have been run to establish trade and to make them profitable—the Pan-

ama Canal Co. and the United States Lines, operated by Mr. Rossbottom—made money. During the very lowest ebb of shipping there were some months in which they did not make money, but taking the whole period, which shows loss year by year on the part of the Government under the management of the Shipping Board, and contrasting it with the Panama Co. and later with the United States Lines under the management of Mr. Rossbottom, the manager of the United States Panama Line, it will be found they have been operating at a profit with the exception, I think, of one single year. Had they been permitted to lay by a surplus to draw upon for that year a still better showing would have been made.

I return now and again remind Senators of the quotation from Mr. Lasker's testimony and take up the argument at that point. I wish to reread the quotation from his testimony just to get the connection:

> The Shipping Board is not trying to establish trade. * * * We are only taking such trade as is offered, and you can not build up an American trade that way. We get only the plusage of the trade, as is proved by the fact that now we have tied up much more than Great Britain has.

That is the policy upon which it is admitted that our ships have been operated since the close of the war. They have made no effort to get business. Wherever they have come into competition with privately owned American ships the Government-owned ships have been taken off. In the language of Chairman Lasker, they have only been taking such trade as was offered. That has been the deliberate policy of the administration.

And yet, in the face of all that and in spite of the fact that every man, from Chairman Lasker through all his organization of $35,000 a year assistants who have been operating these ships, has tried to make Government operation a failure—yet the deficit from their operation has been reduced from $16,000,000 a month to $4,000,000 a month.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator who testified to the fact that when the United States Shipping Board vessels came in competition with privately owned ships the Government owned ships were taken off?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is the testimony of Mr. Lasker and, I think, of other witnesses. I have not noted the pages of the testimony, so I am unable to refer the Senator to them.

Mr. POMERENE. What reason was assigned for that action?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not at this moment recall that any reason was assigned for it, but just simply the fact stated.

Mr. CARAWAY. As I understand the Senator from Wisconsin, that was the statement of Chairman Lasker?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The statement which I read was the statement of Chairman Lasker, and I distinctly recollect, though I have not quoted the testimony upon that nor made reference to it, that in reading the mass of testimony taken by the committee it was admitted that wherever the Government-operated ships came in competition with private-owned lines, the Government-operated ships have been taken off. If I am in error about that I ask to be corrected.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield with great pleasure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the reason given for that action was that no ships privately operated long continued in competition with Government ships and as the only purchasers they could hope to get for ships would be private operators, if we drove them out of business then we would have no purchasers whatever for the Government ships. I think that was the reason.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no doubt that is the reason, and which they assigned. It is the fact that that has been the policy of the board.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to be confirmed in my statement of the testimony by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. The testimony of Lasker is that the operation of Government ships was at a great loss. Then he said if we put those ships which we were operating at a loss in competition it would destroy vessels which were operating at a profit. I am curious to know how that could be.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Lasker said that the operation of Government ships was at a great loss; that it cost more to operate them than they earned; and yet he testified that because of their competition, which would necessarily mean they were running at a less cost, they would destroy privately owned ships being operated at a profit. If a privately owned ship was operated at a profit, I do not see how it would be destroyed by being put in competition with any such incompetent concern that was operating at a loss.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I suggest that if we put all of the resources behind the Government ships we could keep them going even though we ran them at a loss, and if we did that we would soon drive the private shipping out of business.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I may be permitted to say to the Senator from Washington, that is rather a remarkable statement in view of his oft-repeated statement that we had hundreds of ships tied up which we did not operate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. To resume my argument:

The report just issued by the Shipping Board, however, shows that in spite of the maladministration of our Government-owned ships and the adverse conditions which have attended shipping operations the world over we have fared very well. I quote from page 44 of that report:

> During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922, United States ports witnessed 37,312 arrivals and departures of vessels engaged in waterborne foreign commerce, which aggregated 80,231,000 long tons of cargo. Of this total, 52 per cent moved in American vessels, including tankers and Great Lakes traffic, in which our ships predominate. Excluding these, American ships moved 30 per cent only of our commerce. The total vessel dead weight entering and clearing was 214,952,000 tons, 51 per cent of which was American tonnage.
>
> In relative efficiency, as indicated by the relation of load to dead-weight tonnage, the American percentage was 37.9 per cent and the foreign 36.4 per cent. In other words, while American vessels used 2.62 dead-weight tons to transport each ton of cargo, foreign vessels used 2.74 dead-weight tons per cargo ton.
>
> Exports constituted 54 per cent of the total commerce. Forty-nine per cent of the entrances and clearances and 51 per cent of the dead weight entering and clearing were American vessels, and carried 68 per cent of the total imports and 39 per cent of the total exports.

Fifty-two per cent of our foreign commerce carried in American vessels during the time of the great depression in our shipping business is certainly nothing to be discouraged about.

Again, I quote from page 106 of the Shipping Board Report of 1922, and I might remind any Senators who have come in since I referred to the fact that the report from which I am about to quote has just been issued, and it will be found to be very interesting.

> Efforts of the corporation during the year to secure shipment of Egyptian cotton for American vessels were successful. This trade was under the control of British lines who, as a consequence, carried all Egyptian cotton to the United States. After considerable negotiation between representatives of the corporation and Egyptian cotton shippers an agreement was concluded whereby a division of American and British tonnage would take care of this cotton movement to the extent of 50 per cent of its exports by American and British vessels. A considerable portion of this cotton goes to Boston for New England mills, with occasional part cargoes for New York.

This shows what can be done in the way of getting business even with a very moderate amount of initiative.

Again, I quote from page 110 of the same report:

> General conditions in the Mediterranean trade, both from the Gulf and North Atlantic ports, were somewhat depressed owing to unsettled conditions. Both to continental Europe and Mediterranean ports the corporation made particular progress in the establishment of trade routes from Gulf ports.

Concerning the South American trade the report says:

> By close adherence to definite schedules and by placing the most suitable vessels in these trades the Shipping Board lines took a strong lead over the foreign lines; this was particularly true of the fast passenger cargo service between New York and Brazil and River Plata ports.

These are but samples to be found throughout this report, indicating the success and prosperity of American-owned ships, at least as compared with the ships of other countries. If this report is true, and there is certainly no reason to suppose that it exaggerates in favor of American shipping, it is conclusive proof that we have not only been able to hold our own but that our merchant marine has gained upon its rivals in competition for business during the last year and that it has done this without any subsidy.

We have heard much about loss on the operation of Government ships, and the effort has been made to mislead the public into the belief, by the most extensive and skillful propaganda ever attempted in behalf of any measure, that Government ownership and operation of a ship inevitably means a loss. The fact is that losses on Government-owned ships, if losses

have been sustained, have occurred on those ships not operated by the Government but operated largely under contracts adroitly devised to make the Government lose money. When Mr. Lasker came into the Shipping Board he thus described the now famous or infamous MO–4 contract:

> The contract is the most shameful piece of chicane, inefficiency, and of looting the Public Treasury that the human mind can devise. (See testimony of Mr. Lasker on previous hearing and inserted in the record of the joint hearings before the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.)

Under this form of agreement all expenses of the operation of the vessel covering wages, feeding, stevedoring, wharfage, repairs, fuel, port charges—in fact, expenses of every nature whatsoever incurred directly or indirectly by the ships—are paid by the Government. Under this form of agreement the managing operator receives as his compensation a 5 per cent commission on the gross freight revenue for securing the cargo and handling the vessel at the port at which the cargo is loaded, and 2½ per cent of the gross freight revenue additional at the port at which the cargo is discharged. In other words, a total of 7½ per cent on the total freight revenue of the vessel as shown by the manifest. Also 10 per cent of the gross passenger earnings.

The foregoing description of the MO–4 contract is substantially taken from the statement of Mr. Frey, vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, Volume I, page 538, of the above hearings. Further speaking of the MO–4 contract Mr. Frey said:

> The most disturbing element in connection with the MO–4 system of operation is that there is no incentive for the managing agent to bring about economies in operation. His compensation is fixed entirely on the gross revenue of the vessel, and it makes no financial difference to him whether the expenses of the voyage are $50,000 or $80,000, with the gross revenue at, say, $60,000. So far as he is concerned his compensation is based on 7½ per cent of the $60,000, and it makes no change in his revenue whether he operates the vessel with economy and with quick turnabouts in ports and is able to keep his voyage expense down to $50,000, or whether he allows things to shift for themselves and the voyage expenses run up to $80,000—the deficit comes out of the Government Treasury. (Vol. I, joint hearings, p. 539.)

Yet, sir, it appears from this statement that Mr. Frey presented at the joint hearing of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, held on September 8, 1922, that the MO–4 agreement is the basis on which—to quote his words—"practically all of the vessels of the Shipping Board now in operation are being handled." (Vol. I, joint hearings, p. 538.) In view of this situation the wonder is not that some loss has attended the operation of our ships under the depressed condition of the last two years, but the wonder is that the loss has not been a thousand times greater.

The Shipping Board made elaborate preparations to present its case for subsidy at the hearings before the joint committees of the two Houses. It marshaled all its experts, its $35,000 a year employees, and with the whole force and power of the administration back of it tried to make a case for subsidy and it failed. The testimony of one witness which found its way in the record on this subject, contrary to the wish and purposes of the Shipping Board, largely nullified the efforts of Mr. Lasker and his associates to show the impossibility of operating our ships without a subsidy. I refer to the testimony of Mr. Rossbottom, who had for years operated the Panama Line of Government ships and is at present operating the United States Lines.

Mr. Rossbottom was called by the Shipping Board to testify merely with respect to section 301 of the bill relating to the carriage of immigrants in American ships. After he had completed his testimony upon that subject he was questioned by some members of the committee, who developed the fact that Mr. Rossbottom had for years managed the Government's Panama steamship operations at a profit, and was at the present time in charge of the United States Lines. On this subject Mr. Rossbottom said:

> You can not operate any ships, no matter how much of a subsidy you give them, unless they have a trade to carry (p. 350).

Mr. Rossbottom's testimony will be found in Volume I, page 335, of the joint hearings previously referred to. Pages 360 to 381 of his testimony are particularly illuminating. I had intended to read from it at some length, but I pass it by for the present. However, there may be occasion to refer to it later in the debate. This portion of Mr. Rossbottom's testimony shows conclusively that ships can be run successfully in competition with any other ships in the world and without subsidies both in South American and European trade if only honesty and ordinary intelligence are applied in their operation.

The substance of his testimony is that both these lines had been run successfully and profitably, and that they could compete with the shipping of any other country in the world, and this in spite of the fact that some of the ships in the United States Lines were obsolete and not up to modern standards.

Mr. Rossbottom was compelled by the Shipping Board to take such ships as they were willing to let him have. He was not permitted to pick and choose from the idle ships tied up at the wharves—ships that would have returned a much greater profit in their operation—but he was obliged to take, with some ships that were fit to be put into service, ships that were unfit for operation in that trade; but taking them all together, he found himself able to operate that line of Government-owned ships successfully. The fact is that just as soon as we get away from the infamous MO–4 contracts and operate our ships with the desire to make them succeed, instead of a fixed purpose to make them fail, we find that our ship operations have been as successful as those of any other country in the world.

CONGRESS DENIED NECESSARY INFORMATION BY SHIPPING BOARD.

There is just one other point I wish to make upon this branch of the subject in passing. It is this: We hear a great deal about losses in the operation of Government-owned ships, but as I read the record of the joint hearings of the Senate Committee on Commerce and the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on this bill, Congress up to the present time has been denied full and definite information concerning the cause of those losses or the ships or lines upon which they have occurred. The Shipping Board—and I undertake to say that this information will startle Senators who are within the sound of my voice—flatly refused that information to Congress, as I read the record. On this point I quote from the minority report dated November 25, 1922, of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House, submitted to the House in opposition to this bill:

> Not only did members and representatives of the Shipping Board, who it had been announced would appear, fail to appear, but also other witnesses who had been requested by the Shipping Board and shipping interests to appear in behalf of the bill, were advised to send in written statements instead of appearing in person. It is known that a representative of the shipping interests, who took an active interest in behalf of the bill, wrote letters to some of those who had previously been requested to appear in person, not only advising them to send in written statements instead of appearing in person, but also advising that "this method will also prevent the cross-examination of witnesses."
>
> The hearings were not conducted in the interest of an unbiased investigation of the subject, but solely for the purpose of promoting the pending bill. The members of the Shipping Board who took an interest in the hearings manifested extreme partisanship. Meyer Lissner, a member of the Shipping Board, who was nearly always present, frequently interfered to prevent the development of important facts. The Shipping Board repeatedly refused to furnish important information called for by members of the committee. For instance, they refused to produce for insertion in the hearings the appraisal alleged to have been made in accordance with the law at the time all of the ships were advertised for sale; they refused to disclose the operating profits or losses of the different companies operating Shipping Board vessels; although they promised to do so, yet they failed to furnish an itemized statement of the expenditures from the $1,715,000 advertising fund, though repeatedly requested to do so.

Naturally, one might think that some of that advertising fund strayed off into backing propaganda for this ship subsidy bill.

> Of those who appeared in behalf of the bill at least nine were representatives from the Shipping Board, who, of course, appeared at the behest of Chairman Lasker; at least nine were connected with shipping interests who would share in the subsidies and other aids provided in the bill; it appeared that, with possibly two or three exceptions, the remainder who appeared in behalf of the bill did so at the instance of the Shipping Board or shipping interests, or both; some of these were representatives of licensed offices, one of whom, Luther B. Dow, business manager of the American Steamship Licensed Officers' Association, admitted that he was paid a salary of $5,000 per annum by certain steamship lines which he named, and that said steamship owners likewise paid their office rent of $237 a month and also the salaries of two subordinate officials; and that the licensed officers themselves did not contribute one penny to these expenses. He further stated that the said steamship owners had equal representation on their board of directors, etc.
>
> Five parties appeared and testified against the bill as a whole; four others testified against certain provisions of the bill without indorsing any of its provisions. As we recall, not a single witness—not even among those who appeared in behalf of the bill—approved all of the provisions of the bill. On the other hand, practically every witness criticized at least some of the features of the bill; but few of the objections thus pointed out have been remedied.
>
> Of course, those citizens opposing the bill did so from a patriotic standpoint, having no personal interest other than that of the great body of citizens generally. Consequently it was quite natural that but few would feel that it was incumbent upon them to voluntarily come to Washington on their own expense to help to protect the public interest. The members of the committees who were convinced that the bill was bad either as a whole or in part neither had the time, opportunity, nor facilities for ascertaining and procuring the attendance of witnesses to testify to the inequities of the bill. The hearings were rushed so rapidly that those who were faithfully attending and attempting to develop all the facts did not even have sufficient time to attend to their other official duties when not engaged in the hearings. We did not have a large force of Government-paid employees at our beck and call, as did the proponents of the bill. The committees refused to have summoned witnesses asked for by those opposed to the bill.

The correctness of these statements is vouched for by five perfectly reputable Members of the House of Representatives, who signed the report in which they are contained, and no one has denied or challenged the correctness of these statements.

In further support of what I say I will read a few questions and answers from the above record of the hearing in Volume II, page 1517:

Mr. DAVIS. Which information do you mean is not given out?
Mr. LOVE. The information that I have here.

For the information of Senators who may not happen to know, I will state that Mr. Love is one of the highly salaried employees of the Shipping Board who was taken over from one of the offices of the private shipping corporations and installed in that position.

I repeat the question in order that Senators may preserve the connection:

Mr. DAVIS. Which information do you mean is not given out?
Mr. LOVE. The information that I have here.
Senator FLETCHER. It does not cover the cargo ships at all; only passenger?
Mr. LOVE. No, sir. I had it made up in accordance with the request, Senator.
Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Love, I want to know whether there is any objection to furnishing the net voyage loss or the net profits of each of the Shipping Board lines for the past six months up to as near as you have it?
Mr. LOVE. That is, for the passenger services?
Mr. DAVIS. Both passenger and cargo.
Mr. LOVE. Judge, those figures all show in the monthly financial statements that we get out.
Mr. DAVIS. Chairman Lasker has already given the sum total?
Mr. LOVE. Yes, sir.
Mr. DAVIS. Of all of them combined?
Mr. LOVE. Yes.
Mr. DAVIS. I want to know if you are willing to break that up and give the same profits or losses as to individual lines?
Mr. LOVE. I would be very glad to confer with the chairman on that, but I do not believe this committee will be in session by the time we get it ready for you.
Mr. DAVIS. Have you an account with each company?
Mr. LOVE. Yes; but there are uncompleted voyages.
Mr. DAVIS. We will say, then, up to the period when the accounts are complete; in other words, Chairman Lasker furnished the voyage loss for February.
Mr. LOVE. Month by month?
Mr. DAVIS. For February and March. He had everything in before he could furnish that, did he not?
Mr. LOVE. Yes.
Mr. DAVIS. He had it in as to each individual line, then, did he not?
Mr. LOVE. That refers to the voyages closed within that month.
Mr. HARDY. I would like to know this, Mr. Love, in a general way: What kind of facts it is that you think can not be given out?
Mr. LOVE. I will read the headings.
Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this examination is proceeding just the way it should.
Mr. GREENE—

Mr. GREENE is the chairman of the House committee.

Mr. GREENE. I think it is going pretty wide of the mark myself.
Mr. CHINDBLOM. Are we in the attitude here of trying to force the hand of the Government, which we represent? Why not tell the gentleman what you want him to furnish and let him confer with the chairman of the board and the members of the board and then let them come to a conclusion and give us a complete answer as to what their attitude is on it?
Mr. HARDY. That is what we are trying to get now.
Mr. GREENE. But he has told you he could not furnish it.
Mr. HARDY. And now I have asked what it is he can not furnish the committee.
Mr. GREENE. He stated he could not furnish it to you, and still you are insisting on trying to get it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. It occurs to me that if the Shipping Board had kept books they could have furnished the information sought.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. An examination of the testimony I think will convince anybody that the information could have been furnished, but it was not the purpose of the Shipping Board to uncover the facts. That has been the attitude of that Shipping Board ever since it has been in office; but more of that will, I think, appear later in the debate on this bill.

After an attempt to deceive the committee into the belief that the Shipping Board did not have the figures in question, a summary was finally produced before the committee giving the aggregate but not the detailed figures, and the detailed figures were flatly refused. (See pp. 1519 and 1520.)

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I confess I am somewhat amazed and astounded at the statement the Senator has made. Did the Shipping Board refuse to give the committee the information?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator will find on pages 1519 and 1520 testimony which supports the statement I have made, that it was flatly refused. That testimony was taken in joint hearings of the House and Senate committees.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to see if I get it correct. As I understand it, they did give the information in the aggregate as to all the lines for February and March?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They did.

Mr. NORRIS. They refused to give the committee the loss or the gain of the different lines?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For the voyages.

Mr. NORRIS. They must have had that information or they could not have given the other.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Or they could not have given the complete statement for February and March.

Mr. NORRIS. What reason was given as to why they would not say whether there were some lines which were making money, while others were losing, and which they were?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There was no definite reason given, according to my recollection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, while these were joint hearings, I was not able to be present at the hearings very much of the time on account of other business in connection with the committee, which kept me elsewhere. My understanding of the reason why they did not give out the detailed information with reference to these different routes in particular was that it would give information to the competitors of those lines which would be very detrimental to our own lines. That was the sole reason why it was refused, as I understand. My recollection also is that the chairman of the Shipping Board stated that he was perfectly willing to give that information to the committee in a confidential way, so that the information would not get out to the competitors of those lines.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, there is a great mass of this testimony, two very large volumes of several hundred pages each, and I did not quote that portion of the testimony. My recollection is that the members of that joint committee who were pressing for that information, when they found they could not secure the information for the record, to the end that it could be made available for Congress, asked to have it privately furnished to the committee, and that it was not furnished. That is my recollection of the testimony.

The fact is that the Congress is being asked to legislate upon a subject it knows nothing about and upon which it has been denied the very information necessary to enable it to act intelligently. Until you know the ships and the lines and the voyages upon which it is claimed money has been lost and the contracts under which those ships were operated when it is claimed the loss was sustained, I submit to any man of business experience in this body, you can not say that ships require a subsidy unless you know the profit and loss resulting from the operation of every ship and all of the facts, conditions, and circumstances connected therewith; and this whole argument for disposing of the ships and granting a subsidy is based upon the fact that we were sustaining a $50,000,000 a year loss. That is the burden of the President's argument in his special message for this ship subsidy bill.

You can not say that the loss was not sustained through incompetence or worse; you can not say that a subsidy would remove the cause of the loss and put the ship on an operating basis. Certainly when the Shipping Board, representing the President, comes to the Congress and asks for a subsidy for the ships, every fact and every figure with regard to the operation of the ships ought to be laid before Congress. Nothing better illustrates the depth to which the Executive must believe the Congress has sunk than that he should send his representatives to Congress demanding this legislation while withholding information necessary for Congress to have in order to form any intelligent judgment on the subject.

It is a remarkable campaign that has been conducted to put over ship subsidy. On the one hand, Mr. Lasker, probably the cleverest advertising man in the country, has for months, as he has testified himself, been "selling" ship subsidy to the people through the press, in pamphlets, and the influence of prominent persons and corporations; while on the other hand he has veiled in darkest secrecy and hid from the Congress itself the most vital facts and information upon this subject.

THIS BILL IS ADMITTEDLY CONTRARY TO THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE.

Mr. President, this bill comes before you with the admission written all over it that it is contrary to the will of the people we represent and that every man who favors it, from the President down, knows that it is contrary to the will and wishes of the people of this country. The central provision

of the bill, section 403, which provides for the subsidy, is pregnant with this admission. That section declares:

The board is authorized and directed on behalf of the United States to enter into a contract with any person, a citizen of the United States, who is the owner of a vessel, for the payment of compensation in respect to such vessel, subject to the limitations of this title.

Why is it necessary to provide for this subsidy in the form of a contract? There is only one reason, and that is because it is known that the people are so far opposed to the subsidy that at the first opportunity they will send representatives here to Washington who will repeal any subsidy law, and so it is proposed to put this subject, if possible, beyond the control of the people for a period of 10 years. I suppose it is assumed that everyone supporting this legislation will be dead or out of office within the next 10 years. Certainly they will be out of office within a very much shorter period.

I observe that the majority of the Senate committee amended this section of the bill to provide—

That no contract made hereunder shall extend beyond a period of 15 years from the date of the enactment of this act.

Of course, the next or any succeeding Congress could repeal this section, as it could any other legislation, and that is the reason for the contract provision. It is fondly hoped that by making the subsidy a matter of contract between a Government official and the shipowner that the whole matter is placed beyond the control of Congress and the people.

The President when he came before the Congress a few days ago in a special message urging the passage of this bill had the temerity very frankly to urge that Congress should disregard the known wishes of their constituents upon this subject. He said:

In individual exchanges of opinion not a few in House or Senate have expressed personal sympathy with the purposes of the bill and then uttered a discouraging doubt about the sentiment of their constituencies. * * * Frankly, I think it loftier statesmanship to support and commend a policy designed to effect the larger good to the Nation than merely to record the too hasty impressions of a constituency.

Mr. President, there is no other government in the world laying any claims to being a representative government democracy in which such an utterance from the executive would be tolerated. Suppose that the premier of Great Britain, after an election at which the people had pronounced overwhelmingly in favor of a great governmental policy, should go before the House of Commons and urge the members to disregard the will of the people as expressed in the late election. That would be regarded in Great Britain as so dishonorable as to be practically unthinkable. A prime minister who would be guilty of it would not last for a single day. For the British King to do such a thing would mean a revolution and his overthrow in 24 hours. Yet, sir, such is the madness of the present administration that the President comes before the Congress, which has been but a few days previously advised of the people's will, and urges the Members to disregard it. "The too hasty impressions of a constituency" is not to weigh against "the larger good" to the ship magnates, including the Standard Oil, the United States Steel Corporation, the United Fruit Co., and other favored interests.

I shall not at this time attempt to discuss in detail the provisions of this bill. It is so fundamentally bad and conceived in such hostility to American institutions and so foreign to the will and purpose of the people of this country that no amendment could preserve the subsidy features and leave it a bill that any Senator, in my judgment, ought to support.

But there are some provisions in it that are so obviously vicious and so clearly indicate the real purpose of this bill that I will at this time call attention to a few of them.

SOME VICIOUS PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

It will be observed that section 1 of the bill authorizes the disposition of the ships by public or private competitive sale after appraisement and advertisement substantially in the language of the existing law. So far so good. But turn to section 2 of the bill, which is new, and you read this:

That the board shall not for the period of two years after the enactment of the merchant marine act, 1922, sell vessels operating on routes established by the board prior to the enactment of this act to persons other than those who, in the judgment of the board, have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested in such lines.

By this provision the whole matter of the persons to whom the ships are to be sold is left to the judgment of the board. They may go through the form of competitive bidding provided for in the first section of the act, but if, "in the judgment of the board" the successful bidder is not one to whom the board wishes to sell, the sale will be declared off and a new sale made, in which the successful bidder will undoubtedly be one approved by the "judgment of the board."

We deal with public lands. We have dealt with the lands of the wards of this Government as well as public lands. We have never lodged such power in a Cabinet minister as it is proposed to put in this board, which has lived under a cloud of suspicion for the last 15 months.

That the purpose of the framers of the bill was as I have stated is shown conclusively from the fact that the bill as it passed the House had in it a provision specifically authorizing the board to sell ships without competitive bidding or advertising. Just how it was possible for this board, even with its adroit advertising agent, Mr. Lasker, to put through the House of Representatives a proposition of that sort I am wholly unable to understand. The bill as it is now before the Senate gives the Shipping Board exactly this power, but the language in which it is done is made a little more obscure. They are invested with the discretion to set aside everything that is done under the provisions which require advertising and competitive bidding.

Everyone knows what will happen as soon as a contract is made with the Shipping Board for the sale of a ship. A corporation will be formed. The contract will be capitalized. Stocks and bonds will be issued and sold to the public. The insiders will get the bonds, the public will get the stocks at a cost greater than the value of the entire vessel.

The purchasers of the stocks will be lured on with the declaration that the Government has given a subsidy to the ship in which they are buying an interest. The money to purchase the ship will really be wheedled out of the public by clever salesmen like Mr. Lasker. The control, of course, will remain with the insiders, as is always provided in these cases. Then in a little while, when the public is getting no dividends upon its stock because the ship was capitalized for many times its actual value, the passenger and freight rates will have to be put upon the American people, and this fine scheme which is proposed to "save the farmers" and "furnish them transportation at reduced rates" will load onto their already bended backs unlimited advances in ocean transportation charges over which neither the Congress nor the Government proposes to exercise any control whatever. We are asked to give the big steamship corporations the Government ships, subsidize them on top of that to operate the vessels, and leave them unlimited authority to tax the public through transportation charges up to the limit of the paying power of the American people.

It will be the old, old story of the railroads over again. Think of the possibility of capitalizing and selling in this way ships which cost the Government three or four billion dollars, to be sold to such persons as the judgment of the Shipping Board approves. The merits of ship subsidy are lost sight of entirely in the presence of the great and immediate opportunity for graft and public exploitation under the provisions of this bill.

Section 5 of the bill provides for a revolving fund of $125,000,000, to be known as the "United States Shipping Board construction loan fund." This fund the board may use, according to subsection (b) of the bill, in making loans to aid such persons, citizens of the United States, as it pleases in the construction of ships or in the equipping of ships already built. This simply adds $125,000,000 more to the power of the board to dispense benefits to favored persons and interests. This section had an amendment added to it in the Senate committee, as follows:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to the construction or equipment of vessels by corporations or individuals primarily for the purpose of transporting their own products.

I suppose it will be contended that this takes care of the Standard Oil and Steel Trusts and other similar concerns and prevents their profiteering under the bill. Of course, the provision is useless for any such purpose. Even without this provision in the bill those concerns will doubtless organize separate corporations for owning and operating their ships so that the corporation owning the ships will not, of course, own the products which the ships transport. By this simplest of all devices known to corporation experts, the amendment added by the Senate committee will be completely nullified.

When you come to the sections dealing directly with the subsidy provisions of the bill the situation is even worse. Section 403, subsection (a) of the bill, provides that the board is authorized and directed to enter into a contract for the subsidy with any person, a citizen of the United States, who is the owner of a vessel. Then follows the provision: "The board shall not be required to enter into such contract unless in the judgment of the board such person possesses such ability, experience, resources," and so forth, as the board may approve. The whole matter is left to the absolute uncontrolled discretion of the board. You might just as well hand over the

millions involved in this subsidy scheme to the Shipping Board and say, "Put it where you think it will do the most good," as to enact into law the provisions of this bill. The board would have just as much control over the money in one case as it would in the other.

Subsection (b) of section 409 contains what looks like a very reasonable provision. It provides in effect that the compensation or subsidy after three years shall not be paid to any vessel owner unless at all times during the period covered by such payment a certain percentage of the total gross tonnage of the vessel is registered under the laws of the United States. Turn, however, to subsection (d) of the same section, and it reads:

The board may suspend from time to time the provisions of subdivision (b) in respect to a power-driven vessel—

And so forth.

In other words, the provisions which are so elaborately set out in subdivision (b) are by subdivision (d) made subject to suspension by the board according to its pleasure.

Subsection (a) of section 410 provides that whenever the board thinks that the regular rate of compensation or subsidy provided in the bill is not sufficient, the board in making the contract with a particular shipper may increase the rate of compensation to "double" that provided for in the bill. In other words, the board is authorized to contract with favored shipowners or lines for double the ordinary rate of subsidy provided for in the bill.

Subsection (c) of the same section provides:

After the making of the contract of compensation the board may, with the consent of the other party thereto, decrease or, within the limit provided by subdivision (a), increase the rate of compensation to be paid.

In other words, the owner of the ship may with his consent have his compensation reduced, but if he prefers to have it increased, then the board may increase it above the amount provided in the contract. To this section of the bill as it passed the House the Senate committee added the following amendment:

Provided, That no expenditures shall be made from the merchant-marine fund because of any increased compensation granted under the terms of paragraph (c) of section 410 except out of the appropriations made annually therefrom by Congress.

As the bill passed the House, section 402 had added to it subsection (d), as follows:

No expenditures shall be made from the merchant-marine fund except out of the appropriations made annually therefrom by Congress for carrying out the purposes of this act.

The result is that the provision in the bill as it came from the House, which was really notice that Congress would exercise some sort of control over the matter, is stricken out and a perfectly useless provision is added.

I deliberately assert that this amendment, added in the Senate committee in lieu of the so-called Madden amendment, amounts to nothing so far as affording any protection to the Treasury of the United States. Suppose that a contract is made with a favored shipper and afterwards the Shipping Board and the shipper agree that the rate of subsidy provided in the contract is not high enough and they fear that the proposed increase of subsidy is so obviously undeserved that Congress will not make an appropriation for it. That is the only conceivable situation in which this amendment would apply at all. In the situation supposed, what would be done? Both parties being in favor of the high rate of subsidy, they would simply agree to cancel the existing contract and make a new contract, naming in the new contract the rate of subsidy desired. That procedure is perfectly permissible under the amendment which was added to this bill in the Senate committee. Moreover, by making the rate of subsidy sufficiently high in the contract in the first instance, there would never be any reason or excuse for increasing it.

Section 411 of the bill provides that the contract for subsidy may require the vessel to be operated in a particular service, but subsection (b) thereof gives the shipowner the right to terminate the contract upon six months' notice, so that the first part of the provision is of no avail.

Section 413 provides that the repairs or renewals shall be made in ports of the United States. But the only penalty for disobedience of this provision is that the board may deduct what it pleases from the subsidy otherwise payable to the offending ship or line. This is simply an additional club which the board may hold over the head of the vessel owner. The board may withhold the subsidy for any reason or for no reason, but the unfortunate shipowner is powerless.

Of course, these provisions about the United States taking over the ships and paying compensation for them in case of war or other emergency adds nothing to the rights which the Government already possesses.

Another remarkable provision in this bill is that which provides that an owner of vessels registered under the laws of the United States and of other States may, nevertheless, receive compensation under the terms of this bill. It has been iterated and reiterated that the great purpose of this bill is to build up a 100 per cent American merchant marine; that in times of peace it shall enter into the sharpest kind of competition with the vessels of every other country in order to obtain business, and that in times of war it shall be an asset to the Government for national defense. This means and must mean that there can be no divided allegiance on the part of the person or the corporation receiving a subsidy in order to build up a great American merchant marine.

But what this bill does is to permit a person or corporation to be nine-tenths or ninety-nine one-hundredths foreign, so far as the ownership of vessels is concerned, and still draw the subsidy upon its American registered vessels under the terms of this bill. It is not until after three years have elapsed that any limitation is put upon it, and then that limitation is such as to still permit the subsidy to be drawn by the vessel owner, provided 50 per cent of the gross tonnage of his vessel, plus the total gross tonnage of vessels owned by persons with whom he is affiliated, are registered under the laws of the United States.

To-day we have one company, at least, which well illustrates the situation provided for in the bill, and it is doubtless for that company, and perhaps others similarly situated, that the provisions of the bill were framed to which I now call attention.

It would have been easy enough to have required in this bill that no person or corporation should receive the subsidy it provides for if such person or corporation was the owner of and engaged in operating ships of any foreign country. That is what the bill ought to have provided; and what it would have provided if its framers had considered the interests of an American merchant marine instead of the interests of certain favorite shippers who have always been more British than American.

Section 406 provides that compensation shall be paid in respect to any vessel only for mileage covered while the vessel (1) is privately owned and (2) is registered or enrolled and licensed under the laws of the United States.

Section 409(a) provides that compensation shall be paid in respect to any vessel only while the vessel is owned by any person who is a citizen of the United States. These sections seem to mean, upon their face, that no owner shall receive compensation unless he is an American citizen and his ships are registered under the flag of the United States. A little more critical examination shows, however, that the sections mean nothing of the kind. If a particular vessel is American owned and if it is registered under the laws of the United States it is entitled to compensation even though the owner may own four times as much tonnage registered under the British flag, and, consequently, his interests in a merchant marine would be four or five times as much British as American.

Then comes subsection (b) of section 409, which provides that if after three years—you see no question is raised about it until after three years—the compensation will be continued to the owner if during that three-year period 50 per cent of his tonnage, plus the tonnage of affiliated concerns, is registered under the laws of the United States. The Senate very generously reduced this percentage of tonnage from 75 to 50 per cent, going even farther than the House bill, and even further apparently than Mr. Lasker cared to go in allowing foreign influence to get a controlling grip upon our merchant marine.

Whether these sections were put into this law simply to fit the International Mercantile Marine Co. or not, or whether there are other companies to which they are equally applicable, I do not know. But I do know it fits the International Mercantile Marine Co. exactly, and it allows that company, although nine-tenths British, to profit on its American-owned ships under this bill precisley as though it were wholly an American company.

The International Mercantile Marine Co. owns a few American ships, but it owns, according to its last report, or the last one available to me, about 100 British ships, nearly ten times its holdings in American ships. And these British ships, which traverse every route of maritime commerce open to American ships and enjoy the most profitable of the carrying trade of the United States, are just as completely British ships and subordinated to British interest as any ships which fly the British flag.

In my remarks in the Senate printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 1, 1921, I dealt with this subject very fully, and demonstrated how completely British interests dominated

the International Mercantile Marine; and yet, sir, so cleverly is this bill framed that this thinly disguised British concern is to receive compensation under the terms of this bill. I read at that time the provisions of the contracts, which showed how completely the ships of this concern are tied up to the British Government, and the substance of those contracts will be found in the RECORD containing my speech on that subject on August 1 and 2, 1921.

In order to refresh the recollection of Senators, I quote the principal provisions of those contracts.

The contract of 1903 between the British Government, the International Mercantile Marine Co., and the subsidiary British companies provides in its first paragraph that these ships shall be on an equality with all other British ships "in respect of any services—naval, military, or postal—which His Majesty's Government may desire to have rendered by the British merchant marine."

The second paragraph provides, respecting these companies, that "a majority at least of their directors shall be British subjects."

The third paragraph forbids the selling of any of these ships to other than British subjects without the consent of the British Board of Trade.

The fourth paragraph provides that the officers shall be British subjects, and such proportion of the crew as the British Government shall prescribe.

The fifth paragraph provides that these ships must be sold or let to the British Admiralty upon the Admiralty's demand.

The sixth paragraph provides for the building of ships for British companies.

The seventh paragraph deals with the manner in which other British subjects or corporations may become associated in the business.

The eighth and ninth paragraphs provide for the contingency of some one other than a British subject or corporation becoming connected with the enterprise and subjects them to the terms of the agreement.

The tenth paragraph provides that the contract shall run for 20 years from September 27, 1902, and shall continue in force thereafter subject to a notice of five years on either side—

Provided, That His Majesty's Government shall have the right to terminate this agreement at any time if the association pursue a policy injurious to the interest of the British mercantile marine or of British trade.

The eleventh paragraph provides that the agreement shall take effect as a contract made in England and in accordance with the laws of England.

The twelfth paragraph provides that in case of any difference as to the interpretation of the contract or any dispute arising out of it "the same shall be referred to the lord high chancellor of Great Britain for the time being, whose decision, whether on law or fact, shall be final."

I come now to the second agreement which controls the International Mercantile Marine Co. I have just given the Senate the first agreement, which was made in 1903; the second was made on October 1, 1910. The agreement of October 1, 1910, between the same parties increased the facility with which the Admiralty might obtain control of any of the ships of the subsidiary British companies, and provided that any such ships "which may be considered by the Admiralty suitable for the employment as armed cruisers or commissioned auxiliaries shall be sold or let on hire to the Admiralty" as therein provided. Great Britain evidently saw something in 1910 from afar off.

A further agreement of September 2, 1919, is even more significant than the other two.

Paragraph 1 thereof provided, respecting these subsidiary companies, that—

No person shall henceforth be a director, managing director, managing agent, manager, or person to carry on or manage the business of any such companies unless his appointment shall be acceptable to the board of trade.

That means, of course, to the British Government.

Paragraph 2 places the entire management of the subsidiary companies under its British board of directors, and even assumes to extend the power and authority of such directors beyond that provided in their articles or by-laws.

Paragraph 4 provides that these subsidiary companies shall not be regarded "as a foreign-controlled company" as to the building, purchasing, and operating of vessels and the acquisition of shares in other British steamship companies.

The succeeding paragraph provides that these subsidiary companies shall be on the same footing as all other British steamship companies, which are free from foreign control as to any facilities or advantages for the development of the business, but if the British companies shall give notice for the termination of the principal agreement these advantages shall cease.

These are the ships—nearly a hundred of them—which must be run entirely in the interest of British commerce and as the British Government directs, from which the International Mercantile Marine Co. derives the bulk of its revenue and upon the continued operation of which it must depend if it is to succeed. The International Mercantile Marine Co. is bound to serve British interest; first, by the natural desire to make a profit out of its business; and, secondly, by its contracts which place it absolutely under the control of the British Government. Yet this bill was purposely so framed as to allow that company to share in the subsidy for which it provides.

In concluding what I have to say at this time, I desire to call special attention to section 272 of the bill, which assumes to confer upon the Shipping Board powers entirely foreign to any legitimate function of the board. Subsection (a) of that section provides, in effect, that the Shipping Board shall determine and allocate to the proper years the allowance to the shipowner for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence, which is provided for in the revenue act and which has been determined as provided for in that act. Whether this provision of subsection (a) of section 272 of the bill is intended to be retroactive and give the Shipping Board power to reopen what has been settled and determined by the Treasury Department is problematical. But there is no doubt that subsection (b) of section 272 confers upon the Shipping Board the power to make a deduction from the value of the vessel for income-tax purposes, going back to the year 1914. Subsection (b) provides:

In the case of a vessel of 1,000 gross tons or more (as shown by her certificate of admeasurement) registered, enrolled, or licensed, under the laws of the United States, acquired after August 1, 1914, and prior to January 1, 1921, there shall be allowed for the taxable year 1922 and each of the four succeeding taxable years a reasonable deduction for the exceptional decrease in value thereof since the date of acquisition, but not again including any amount otherwise allowed under this act or any previous act of Congress as a deduction in computing net income.

It is further provided that this deduction to be determined by the Shipping Board shall be allocated to the taxable year 1922 and the four succeeding years. This section means nothing more than this: A vessel may have been purchased or built during the war at war prices, operated sufficiently to pay many times her cost, but at the present time there is an "exceptional decrease in value." The Shipping Board is now going to open up this whole question, going back to 1914, and although the vessel may have received the allowance provided by law for exhaustion, wear and tear, and obsolescence, this new element of "exceptional decrease" is to be allowed by the Shipping Board, written into the revenue law, and the deduction made from the taxes of the vessel owner going back to August 1, 1914. When the exceptional circumstances are considered under which vessels were acquired and operated during the war period and their great decrease in value since that time, the tax which the shipowners will recover will run into tremendous amounts. This one section of the bill in the benefits conferred upon shipowners may well exceed in value all other provisions in the bill.

I do not believe that a worse bill than this ever came before the Senate of the United States for consideration. It represents a policy that has been repeatedly rejected by the people of this country. The public opinion of the country is overwhelmingly opposed to it to-day. It simply means turning over the people's property to favored interests for a few cents on the dollar and a tax of millions of dollars levied annually in order to pay as a subsidy to those who take the ships practically as a gift. It means millions of dollars of tax refunds to the shipping interests. It does not even promise, much less guarantee, cheaper rates for ocean commerce. It proposes to destroy our Army and Navy transports and turn this great agency of potential defense over to private shipowners. It does not guarantee the building of a single new ship or the maintenance of those we have. It is wholly bad, and the attempt to force it upon an unwilling country can not be too strongly condemned.

APPENDIX.

Resolution adopted November 24, 1922, by the National Grange in national session at Wichita, Kans.

Resolved, That the National Grange, in the fifty-sixth annual session, assembled at Wichita, Kans., November 24, 1922, and representing nearly 1,000,000 organized farmers of America, hereby declare its unalterable opposition to all ship subsidy legislation and to every form of direct subsidies to private enterprises; and

It hereby pledges the full strength of the organization toward the defeat of whatever form of ship subsidy legislation has been or hereafter may be introduced in Congress.

If upon investigation it is found that the American merchant marine is handicapped in its operation by present conditions and laws, then the grange favors a revision of the navigation laws rather than Government aid through a ship subsidy.

C. M. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

Resolution of the National Farmers' Union passed at annual convention.

LYNCHBURG, VA., *November 21, 1922.*

We hold that public subsidies for private business enterprises are inconsistent with legitimate governmental functions, and therefore we are opposed to ship subsidies or to any other Federal appropriations designed to support failing private enterprise at the expense of the taxpayers.

Resolution of American Federation of Labor.

Whereas Congress through its committees is now conducting hearings on S. 3217, a bill to amend and supplement the merchant marine act of 1920, and for other purposes; which is, in fact, a bill to subsidize the shipowners of America; and

Whereas this bill in every feature thereof is predicated upon the unfounded claim that such subsidy is needed to equalize the wage cost, which it is claimed runs strongly against the American vessels; and

Whereas there is no material difference in either wage cost or subsistence cost running against American vessels, and any real enforcement of the seamen's act will prevent any differential against vessels under the American flag in the future: Therefore be it

Resolved, That, acting for and on behalf of the trade-unions of America, we reiterate that we are generally opposed to subsidies of any kind, and specifically opposed to subsidies being granted to shipowners, because, first, there is no proof that subsidies ever built up or materially aided in building any merchant marine; second, because it is provocative of inefficiency and graft and general parasitism.

Resolved further, That we are opposed to this particular bill for reasons some of which we enumerate as follows:

First. Because it presumes to sell the vessels now owned by the Government, when in fact the so-called sale is nothing but a smoke screen to hide the fact that the shipowners are to receive the vessels for nothing and then some $300,000,000 over and above the purchase price for operating the vessels for 10 years, after which time the ship operators may turn the vessels back to the Government.

Second. Because this bill confers upon the Shipping Board powers such as have never, so far as we can ascertain, been given to any commission or board in any country. Under this bill it can give the subsidy or withhold it; it can reduce the subsidy or double it; it can sell the vessels at any price to one person or refuse to sell to another person at a higher bid because it is of the opinion that the bidder's character is such that he may not use the vessel to promote the interests of the United States. It can lend money to one person at 2 per cent interest and refuse it to another when both are to use it for the same purpose.

Third. Because the shipowners who are advocating the bill and will be the recipients of the bounty refuse to give any real information about their business during the last 10 years; in fact, any information which might show whether any subsidy is really needed, even from the point of view of those favoring subsidies as a principle, unless ordered to do so by the joint committee conducting the hearings.

Fourth. Because the shipowners are so organized that there is not, nor will there be, any competition between them in the buying of the ships.

Fifth. Because the shipowners have dominated the policy of the Shipping Board during nearly all of its history. They are dominating it now, and there is no reason to believe that they will not continue to control it in the future.

Sixth. Congress has, during our history, except in two or three instances, given the shipowners anything they asked; and it is, therefore, the shipowners and shipbuilders who are at least indirectly responsible for the decay of our sea power, and there is no good reason to believe that the shipowners and their policy will improve after getting the subsidies.

Finally, we believe that this is no time to sell the vessels, but that, having tried to operate the vessels under agreement with the shipowners and having failed, we may now try to operate them directly in the manner that Mr. Rossbottom is now operating his "spiked team," without any serious loss to the Government. We believe that the losses would be much less, if any, and that the shipowners would then buy the vessels which they have so far refused to buy.

Resolutions of International Seamen's Union of America.

CHICAGO, ILL., *January, 1922.*

Whereas the agitation for some kind of a ship subsidy is continued; and

Whereas the bases claimed for such subsidy seem to be (a) the greater cost of shipbuilding and (b) the greater cost of operation on account of greater wage cost; and

Whereas the cost of shipbuilding, because of the monopoly of shipbuilders, is true as to ships to be built, but has no application now, because the Shipping Board may sell vessels at any price; and

Whereas the difference in wage cost in so far as it may now exist arises from failure to enforce the seamen's act: Therefore be it

Resolved by the International Seamen's Union of America, That we are opposed to any ship subsidy and protest against it on the ground of its proven ineffectiveness in promoting a merchant marine and in building sea power: And be it further

Resolved, That we favor any just mail subsidy on the ground that such is not a subsidy but payment for work performed.

Resolutions of Washington State Federation of Labor.

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 22, 1922.*

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill known as H. R. 10644 and S. 3217 which provides for a subsidy, a naval reserve, and an amendment to the immigration law as now applied to seamen; and

Whereas it is a well-known fact that where subsidies have been in operation they have proven failures, and in many cases abandoned, as in France, where the vessels sailed all around the globe in ballast, and the people were mulcted so the shipowners could draw dividends; and

Whereas the American shipowners in 1921 made from 10 to 20 per cent dividends, and their cry that they must have financial assistance from the Government has no bearing on facts; and

Whereas the bill provides that no seaman coming into the United States on a foreign vessel can enter unless he has a consular certificate, which seamen can not procure, and if he should leave the vessel the owner will have to pay for him the sum of $200, which means that he will be unable to leave, because the owner will see to it that he remains on board; this will not work the same way with the Chinese, because it is a well-known fact that a Chinese landed in the United States is worth from $750 to $1,000, and it does not take much imagination to see that this proposed law would legalize importation of Chinese into the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Washington State Federation of Labor, That we are opposed to said bill and urge upon all our Senators and Congressmen to vote against it.

Respectfully submitted.

W. M. SHORT,
President Washington State Federation of Labor.

Resolutions of Waterfront Workers' Federation.

Whereas the President of the United States, in a recent message to Congress, recommends the enactment of legislation providing for the payment of a subsidy to certain shipping companies: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Waterfront Workers' Federation, in meeting assembled this 13th day of March, 1922, That we are opposed to the proposed subsidy legislation on the grounds—

1. Instead of promoting the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine such legislation is more likely to have the opposite effect, inasmuch as the subsidized vessels would be put into competition with nonsubsidized craft and thus destroy the business of the latter; and

2. We are opposed to the expenditure of public funds to promote private enterprise; and

3. We feel that the Nation owes a prior duty to its ex-service men, and until that obligation is discharged the question of aiding private enterprises should be held in abeyance; further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States and to the Members of Congress from California.

M. T. DOYLE, *President.*
E. F. KRAUT, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

[From American Federation of Labor information and publicity service, Washington, D. C., December 8, 1922.]

Protests against the enactment of the ship subsidy bill now pending before the United States Senate have been reaching the American Federation of Labor from labor organizations throughout the country. These protests have been received from officials of international unions whose membership reaches from coast to coast, and also from State federations of labor and from local bodies of labor throughout the country. The protests indicate a thorough understanding of the measure and a genuine apprehension on every hand of evil results in the event of its enactment into law.

Because of the widespread interest in the ship subsidy issue a number of these protests were made public to-day at the office of President Samuel Gompers. They are attached hereto.

—

A COST-PLUS PLAN.

(By G. W. Perkins, president Cigarmakers' International Union.)

If we subsidize the so-called ship marine for the purpose as stated of enabling our ships to compete with the ships of foreign nations, the foreign nations would immediately subsidize their shipowners, reduce wages, or otherwise cheapen the cost of shipping by water. We, in that event, being bound by a 20-year contract on the cost-plus plan, would have to increase our subsidy to the American ships. Such a system leads nowhere except to piling up taxes on the innocent, burden-bearing masses. Some are bold enough to say that the question of subsidizing our ships originated in foreign countries. The idea is that if America subsidizes its ships it would give these foreign shipowners an excuse to go to their own Government and demand an equal subsidy for their ships. The whole system of subsidizing or anything else is economically and financially unsound and perniciously vicious and should under no circumstances be tolerated.

—

SUBSIDY AND SOCIALISM.

(By John A. Voll, president Glass Bottle Blowers' Association of the United States and Canada.)

The cry has been that Government ownership of railroads and merchant marine is socialistic. What, may we ask, is a subsidy to private industry? If private industry in the shape of public utilities can not stand upon its own bottom and will function only through a subsidy, then those public utilities should be owned and operated by the Government, for if there is a deficit in the operation that must be met by taxation, the expenditure of the money thus derived should always be in the hands of the people's representatives upon whom they at all times have a check through the ballot and which eliminates 20-year contracts that deprive the people from taking any advantage of changes that may occur favorable to their interests in the method of transportation or prevent abolishing entirely, if in their minds, this burden of taxation for making up a deficit in transportation on water or land does not meet with their views or expectations.

—

PREMIUM UPON INEFFICIENCY.

(By E. William Weeks, secretary-treasurer Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.)

The Shipping Board experts in a report state that subsidy in building up a merchant marine for foreign countries has been unimportant. It has only been through the superior skill and technical ability that other nations have maintained the lead, and no gift or reward from our Government to our shipowners will take the place of the necessary mental qualifications held by others who have prospered without a subsidy. In this particular case it is not a matter of fostering or protecting an infant industry. It is a matter of meeting efficiency with efficiency.

The second opposition is based on the fact that the people of this country do not want a ship subsidy. Both in the primaries and in the fall election adherents of the scheme have been replaced by those in opposition to the measure. The very anxiety shown in forcing through the bill, before the political death of those who favored it, is evidence that something is contemplated at variance with the wishes of the people.

—

CLASS LEGISLATION.

(By Daniel J. Tobin, general president International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs.)

In every instance I have found that all classes as a unit are opposed to the passage of this measure. In many instances business men, as well as the workers, call it a "steal" from the American people in behalf of certain shipping interests. They say, "If the Government has the right to subsidize the shipping interests, why not subsidize the farming interests which are suffering as a result of the many perplexing conditions that surround agriculture?" They say, "Why not subsidize the packing houses or the packing industry so that the price of meat may be reduced?" In short, the masses of people say that no special interest in this, or any other country, during times of peace, should be subsidized by the Government, taking it from one class and turning it over to another class.

—

UNFAIR TO FARMERS.

(By H. M. Thackrey, secretary-treasurer Arkansas State Federation of Labor.)

I realize the fact that the legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor and the joint legislative conference are using their best efforts to defeat the ship subsidy bill that has been brought forward by the President as the reason for calling a special session of Congress.

I heartily commend you for your untiring efforts and urge your continued efforts in the defeat of this measure.

It will place an excessive burden upon an already overtaxed people for the benefit of existing shipping companies or companies to be organized.

This bill provides for a loan to shipowners of a revolving fund of $125,000,000 at 2 per cent interest and for a period of 15 years at a time and up to two-thirds the cost of the ships upon which the loan is to be made. Whereas under the Federal farm loan system farmers are compelled to pay 6 per cent interest and are not allowed to borrow more than 50 per cent of the market value of their farms.

This bill does not require the Shipping Board to make any report or accounting to the President or anyone else. It confers upon the Shipping Board the most autocratic and unprecedented powers ever conferred upon any board.

The labor provisions of the seamen's act would be partially destroyed, and there is no doubt that eventually the shipping business would gradually come into the hands of powerful shipping combinations.

—

AN ENDLESS DRAIN.

(By J. P. Noonan, president International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.)

We are entirely in accord with the American Federation of Labor on the ship subsidy bill because we are fully convinced that the public has been systematically robbed and burdened with taxes; first, by paying the railroads unearned money; second, on a more gigantic scale by the passage of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and because our experience with such legislation leads us to the belief that a ship subsidy, however innocent appearing at the time of its birth, will develop into a feeding trough for certain financial interests whose appetite will prove insatiable and while the first year of its operation may cost what our financially erudite administration may term a nominal sum of $50,000,000 a year difficulties and exigencies will continuously develop that will cause expenditures far more than $50,000,000 a year. An indebtedness of this nature under a contract such as proposed would, in my opinion, be progressive, and if the tenth year would see the country escaping an indebtedness for that year of $200,000,000 it would, in my opinion, not only surprise those who desired it but would also surprise the oldest and most capable of our politicians.

—

MINNESOTA PROTESTS.

(By E. G. Hall, president of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor.)

I am writing you briefly that the labor forces of Minnesota object to the ship subsidy bill that is coming up before the United States Senate in the very near future. The men and women of labor of Minnesota desire to register their protest against the passage of this bill.

We believe that the Shipping Trust, the Railroad Trust, Steel Trust, the Standard Oil Trust, United Fruit Trust, the Sugar Trust, etc., have got more now from our Government and its people than they are justly entitled to. We do not believe in a government paying a premium to any business or the administration at Washington now to give over its millions of investments and then to guarantee a payment in addition for their operations.

—

UNITED STATES AGAINST SUBSIDY.

(By J. L. Coulter, secretary International Association of Oil Field, Gas Well, and Refinery Workers of America.)

President Harding and his colleagues plainly see from the reflection in the mirror of our last general election that the people of the United States do not want such a law enacted. Therefore the reason for calling a special session of Congress to arbitrarily force this bill through, if possible, before the Wall

Street puppets must relinquish their seats to their progressive successors. The people of the United States do not want individual, group, or class legislation, and every effort should be put forth to prevent such being arbitrarily forced upon them.

The American people to an extent are losing confidence in constitutional government as maneuvered as it has been by big business, and such legislation as proposed by our President in the ship subsidy bill only adds fuel to the revolutionary propaganda that is already falling on attentive ears.

—

FLAG-WAVING BUNK.

(By Roscoe H. Johnson, international president Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America.)

Flag waving in connection with establishment of a vast subsidized American merchant marine is the bunk, and our hypocritical incumbent of the White House knows it.

Slip a good fat subsidy into the coffers of the shipping interests—American so called—and the people are promised that nice pretty American flags will make their appearance at the mastheads of every emergency-built piece of junk now resting peacefully at anchor in our seaports.

And how long will these subsidized flags remain there? Just so long as the Shipping Trust is successful in milking Americans of further "Government aid."

—

INVITATION TO GRAFT.

(By E. H. Fitzgerald, president Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.)

I am unqualifiedly, whole-heartedly, and bitterly opposed to this legislation.

First, it will adversely affect American seamen. I note that twice within a year the pay of American seamen has been decreased until now the official Shipping Board rate is $55 for seamen and $57.50 for firemen, per month. Why should the American people subsidize an industry which treats its employees in this fashion? Why should such industries be given further authority by the United States Government to mistreat American seamen?

Secondly, the great American public, most of which consists of us common people, must foot the bill, which will be more than $50,000,000 annually to be handed to shipowners if this nefarious legislation is adopted. In return, the public gets no guaranty of improved shipping conditions, no assurance of lower freight rates, and no assurance of better service.

The bill further provides that merchant ships which have cost the taxpayers of this country $3,500,000,000 are not only to be given away at panic prices but the big shipowners are actually to be paid for taking them. The bill does not provide that they shall be sold under competitive bids. Therefore, in that respect it is un-American and is in fact an invitation to graft and thievery.

—

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AT PUBLIC EXPENSE.

(By M. S. Warfield, president Order of Sleeping Car Conductors.)

The transfer of ships and shipping from Government to private interests will not remove the burden from the taxpayers. The drain on the Treasury will continue. The public will be compelled to establish and maintain a profitable business for a few individuals by financial guaranties. Shipping will thus become private enterprse at public expense, and for this reason the bill should not pass. The problem of handling the United States merchant marine should be solved in the interests of all the people.

—

(By A. F. Eagles, president, and H. B. Brawn, secretary, Maine State Federation of Labor.)

The Maine State branch of the American Federation of Labor is absolutely opposed to the ship subsidy bill, for the following reasons:

First. Nobody knows what this class of legislation will cost the people of this country; no limitations are specified as to what the actual cost will amount to.

Second. We are opposed to the enactment of any law that would not allow of the repealing of that law if it shows defects, and as the law would allow of 20 years to elapse before it could be repealed or amended we object to this class of legislation.

Third. The ship subsidy bill deals with special interests and opens up the way for unlimited grabs upon the Public Treasury.

Fourth. It denies to those who follow the sea for a livelihood that protection which should be given toward the upholding of good American standards of living, and would in the end place the American seaman on a level with the Chinese coolie labor.

Fifth. We believe that general principles should defeat and not enact legislation as contemplated in the ship subsidy bill.

REPEAL IMPOSSIBLE.

[By J. J. Handley, secretary Wisconsin State Federation of Labor.]

The ship subsidy "steal," known as a bill now before Congress, is a most brazen attempt to fleece the American people. It means selling the Government-owned ships to a monopoly at 10 cents on the dollar, and then pay a subsidy of $75,000,000 a year to operate them. Their attempt to hoodwink the people of the Northwest by attaching an amendment purporting to favor the deep water-power interest, purporting to favor the deep-waterway plan from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, should not be tolerated. Labor would not feel so keen about this legislation were it possible to repeal the law after this session, when the people would have realized what had happened, but because of the contracts it carries its repeal will be impossible for many years.

Organized labor of Wisconsin is opposed to the ship subsidy and warns against any scheme in putting it across, be it the deep waterway or anything else, because it practically gives to a private shipping monopoly our Government ships and then requires our Government (the people) to pay an enormous sum to this private ship monopoly for operating them.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 11, 1922:

S. 4025. An act to permit Mahlon Pitney, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to retire.

On December 14, 1922:

S. 3990. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Brooklyn Museum the silver service which was presented to the cruiser *Brooklyn* by citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.

REPORT OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the seventy-third annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1922.*

PERMANENT ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL ROAD CONGRESSES (S. DOC. 275).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress and for its determination whether it will authorize that the United States be officially represented in the Permanent Association of International Road Congresses and grant permission for the Secretary of Agriculture to advance the necessary annual sum for membership fee therein out of the administrative fund provided by section 21 of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921, a report from the Secretary of State with an accompanying letter from the Secretary of Agriculture on the subject.

I believe it is altogether desirable for the United States to have representation in this association and I strongly recommend the granting by Congress of the authority requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1922.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. I ask permission at this time to present a conference report, which I send to the desk. It is the conference report on the Treasury Department appropriation bill. I ask for its adoption. The conferees have come to an agreement on all but three or four items, which have to go back to the House. I ask for the adoption of the report so that it can go to the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The reading clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) "making appropriations for the Treasury Department

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 11, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ", and $35,000 of the $12,100,000 to be available for expenditure in the District of Columbia in addition to the sums herein and heretofore authorized: *Provided*, That no person shall be paid at a rate in excess of $3,000 per annum and not more than four persons may be paid at a rate of $3,000 per annum each from the said sum of $35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brookhart	Glass	McKinley	Smoot
Broussard	Hale	McNary	Stanley
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Cameron	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Capper	Heflin	Norbeck	Swanson
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Couzens	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Ernst	King	Ransdell	Warren
Fernald	Ladd	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Sheppard	
George	Lodge	Shortridge	
Gerry	McKellar	Smith	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to take just a few moments on the subject referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in connection with the efforts on the part of some members of the committee when this bill was under consideration by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, sitting together to get certain information. The hearings beginning at page 1517 and on through to page 1521, inclusive, cover that subject, and they show that the effort was made on the part of Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HARDY, and myself while Mr. Love was on the stand to secure those statements showing the operation of each line and the result as to each ship, the idea being that we could thereby establish the weakness, wherever it existed, and determine what ships were losing and what ships were not losing, which would be very helpful to the committee, much more so than a general statement merely showing the aggregate of revenues received, voyage expenses, repairs, insurance, lay-up, administrative expenses, and all that sort of thing included in the general summary which the Shipping Board furnished. We wanted a statement as to each ship, and especially as to each operating agent, so that there would be details before the committee which would enable us to determine what routes were paying and what routes were not; what ships were profitable and what were not; where the losses were occurring, if any, and also separating the other items in the general summary so as to be able to have clear before us a view of the situation in connection with the operation of the ships.

That inquiry began while Mr. Love was on the stand, as I have said, and this occurred:

Mr. DAVIS. I want to know if you are willing to break that up and give the same profits or losses as to individual lines.

Referring to the combined summary:

Mr. LOVE. I would be very glad to confer with the chairman on that, but I do not believe this committee will be in session by the time we get it ready for you.

Mr. DAVIS. Have you an account with each company?

Mr. LOVE. Yes; but there are uncompleted voyages.

Mr. DAVIS. We will say, then, up to the period when the accounts are complete; in other words, Chairman Lasker furnished the voyage loss for February.

Mr. LOVE. Month by month?

Mr. DAVIS. For February and March. He had everything in before he could furnish that, did he not?

Mr. LOVE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. He had it in as to each individual line, then, did he not?

Mr. LOVE. That refers to the voyages closed within that month.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to know this, Mr. Love, in a general way—what kind of facts it is that you think can not be given out?

Mr. LOVE. I will read the headings.

Then followed further discussion, when Mr. HARDY inquired:

And now I have asked what it is he can not furnish the committee?

Mr. GREEN. He stated he could not furnish it to you, and still you are insisting on trying to get it.

On page 1519 this occurred:

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Love, I am sure, undertook to speak accurately for Mr. Lasker in the matter.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think that the aggregate or data inserted in the record as to the aggregate should go in as a statement of fact unless we are allowed to put in the same thing as to the particular companies. I think we should have the figures as to those particular companies that make up that aggregate.

Then this followed:

Mr. HARDY. Do you think it would be more important to the foreign competitor to have the details of that statement than to have the aggregate?

Then followed further discussion of the subject, the point being made that it would be information to competitors. Finally Mr. HARDY said:

Mr. HARDY. Unless the Shipping Board furnishes the details we do not know what we get.

Mr. GREENE. He states he will furnish it for the consideration of the committee.

Mr. HARDY. Under the ban, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will not make it public, and we will still be in the same shape.

* * * * * * *

Senator FLETCHER. Right on that point, I think we are entitled to know, the committee and the country, precisely what routes are established and are in operation and what service is being rendered.

Mr. LOVE. Senator, that is all here.

* * * * * * *

Mr. HARDY. And don't you think a separate analysis of this ought to be given to us, too?

Mr. DAVIS. This data just submitted here does not give anything at all about the losses or profits. It simply gives the names of allocated ships and the lines operating them, etc.

Mr. LISSNER. Well, we give you the aggregate figures on the losses and profits.

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, yes; I know.

Mr. LOVE. If you will allow me to read the headings of this statement it will answer Senator FLETCHER'S question.

* * * * * * *

Senator FLETCHER. Now, I understand the financial statement, in each instance, is to be taken up with the chairman of the Shipping Board, and we will hear from you further?

Mr. DAVIS. Do we understand, Mr. Love, that the question of submitting this financial information, profits and losses per line, is to be taken up with the Shipping Board and an answer given to the committee about that?

Mr. LISSNER. I just stated that would be done, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DAVIS. Senator FLETCHER asked that question and not one of you answered it.

Mr. LISSNER. What was that?

Mr. DAVIS. The question as to whether it was understood that that would be done, and I just repeated it so that some of you would catch it and respond.

Mr. LISSNER. Yes, sir; that will be taken up and an answer given.

Up to this time we have never had any answer. I have never had information to the effect that it could or could not be furnished in detail. The only definite thing about it is an intimation by Mr. Love that it would probably take until Congress adjourns before the statements could be prepared; at any rate, the information was that those statements might be furnished to the committee if Chairman Lasker permitted it, and the committee was to be advised whether they would or would not be furnished, and that was the end of that matter.

I wish to refer further to the document attached as Appendix A of the hearings, "Report on the history of shipping discriminations and on various forms of Government aid to shipping," prepared at the instance of the Shipping Board, and to a statement there which I think I omitted to mention yesterday. In the conclusions of that report to the Shipping Board by an expert on the subject, after a thorough investigation, he said:

A study of the authorities on subsidies, taking into account the policies adopted by the various countries, would seem to indicate that, with the exception of Japan, the policy has not been important in the building up of a merchant marine.

Mr. POMERENE. Who is that speaking?

Mr. FLETCHER. This is a report sent out by the Shipping Board in the first instance, prepared at their request by an expert on the subject, and subsequently it was put into the RECORD at the instance of the minority of these committees, and I understand the Shipping Board did not care to circulate it further—either suppressed it or failed to circulate it.

Mr. POMERENE. Who was the expert?

Mr. FLETCHER. The name escapes me just at the moment, but he was a professor in one of the universities in New York, whether in Columbia or New York University I am not sure. I can give the name a little later.

I have heretofore referred quite extensively to that report, but that conclusion I wanted to get into the RECORD, as I think it bears very materially on the subject.

Just one other thing with reference to the statement by Mr. Chamberlain, Commissioner of Navigation, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 28, 1922, referred to yesterday and the day before, and particularly mentioned by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] as tending to show that the minority were in error in their views as to the subsidies furnished by various countries. I call attention to another statement in that table furnished by Mr. Chamberlain, of the Department of Commerce.

I showed yesterday, I think, that the total cost of the construction of the fleet by Australia should not be included under the head of subsidies, as it is included in this statement. But there appears in the statement also a list of countries providing subsidies, subventions, and the like, and the payment made by Canada is given as $10,149,944. I have before me now the budget statement just issued, giving mail subsidies and steamship subventions for Canada, and it shows that the amount to be voted for those purposes is $1,100,755.66. There is a difference of nearly $9,000,000 between the public statement by the Government of Canada, made since these figures were furnished, and the figures as given by Mr. Chamberlain. I ask to have that inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADA.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions.

Amount to be voted, $1,100,775.66.

Page No.	Vote No.		1921-22	1922-23
		ATLANTIC OCEAN.		
5	169	Canada and Newfoundland	$35,000.00	$35,000.00
6	170	Canada, the West Indies, and South America	340,666.66	340,666.66
10	171	Canada and South Africa	146,000.00	146,000.00
		PACIFIC OCEAN.		
13	172	Canada, Australia, or New Zealand, or both (Pacific)	130,509.00	130,509.00
16	173	Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands	21,000.00	21,000.00
17	174	Victoria and San Francisco	3,000.00	3,000.00
19	175	Victoria, Vancouver, and Skagway	25,000.00	25,000.00
20	176	Victoria and west coast Vancouver Island	15,000.00	15,000.00
22	177	Vancouver and northern ports of British Columbia	24,800.00	24,800.00
24	178	Vancouver and ports on Howe Sound	5,000.00	5,000.00
		LOCAL SERVICES.		
27	179	Baddeck and Iona	8,825.00	9,000.00
28	180	Charlottetown, Pictou, and/or New Glasgow.	2,000.00	2,000.00
29	181	Charlottetown, Victoria, and Holliday's Wharf.	3,500.00	3,500.00
30	182	Grand Manan and the mainland	15,000.00	15,000.00
31	183	Halifax, Canso, and Guysboro	7,000.00	7,000.00
33	184	Halifax and La Have River	6,000.00	6,000.00
34	185	Halifax and Newfoundland via Cape Breton ports	5,000.00	5,000.00
36	186	Halifax and Spry Bay	6,000.00	6,000.00
38	200	Halifax, South Cape Breton, and Bras d'Or Lakes	6,000.00	6,000.00
39	201	Halifax and West Coast Cape Breton	6,000.00	6,000.00
	187	Mainland and Island of Miscou and Shippegan		3,300.00

CANADA—Continued.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Continued.

Page No.	Vote No.		1921-22	1922-23
		LOCAL SERVICES—continued.		
41	188	Mulgrave and Canso	$13,500.00	$13,500.00
42	189	Mulgrave and Guysboro	7,500.00	7,500.00
44	190	Newcastle, Neguac, and Escuminac, Miramichi River and Bay	4,000.00	5,000.00
45	191	Pelee Island and the mainland	8,000.00	11,000.00
48	192	Mulgrave, Arichat, and Petit de Grat	10,000.00	10,000.00
49	193	Pictou, Montague, Murray Harbor, and Georgetown	6,000.00	6,000.00
50	194	Pictou, Mulgrave, and Cheticamp	7,500.00	7,500.00
52	195	Pictou, New Glasgow, and Antigonish County	1,500.00	1,500.00
53	196	Port Mulgrave, St. Peters, Irish Cove, and Marble Mountain	6,500.00	6,500.00
54	197	Pictou, Souris, and the Magdalen Islands	24,000.00	24,000.00
56	198	Quebec, Natashquan, and Harrington	50,000.00	85,000.00
57	199	Quebec, Montreal, and Paspebiac	30,000.00	30,000.00
	202	St. Catherines Bay and Tadoussac		2,000.00
59	203	St. John and St. Andrews, N. B	4,000.00	4,000.00
60	204	St. John and Bridgetown	2,000.00	1,500.00
61	205	St. John and Digby	10,000.00	15,000.00
63	206	St. John, Digby, Annapolis, and Granville	2,000.00	2,000.00
64	207	St. John, Bay of Fundy, and Minas Basin	8,000.00	8,000.00
66	208	St. John, Westport, and Yarmouth	10,000.00	10,000.00
	209	St. Stephen, Deer Island, and Campobello	2,000.00	2,000.00
67	210	Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence	9,000.00	9,000.00
69	211	Sydney and Whycocomagh	4,000.00	7,000.00
70	212	Sydney, Bras d'Or Lake ports, and East and West Coast of Cape Breton	14,000.00	14,000.00
72	213	Expenses of supervision	4,000.00	4,000.00
		Other appropriations for 1921-22 not required for 1922-23	2,000.00	
		Total	1,050,800.66	1,100,775.66

Mr. FLETCHER. I have before me extracts from the Shipping World of November 29, 1922, referring to subsidies and subventions by Italy. It will be recalled that on yesterday I challenged with great confidence the correctness of the statement appearing here as to the subsidies paid by Italy. The concluding portion of the article is as follows:

Will Mussolini be strong enough to say to the shipbuilding interests of Italy: "You are employing your capital in modes that can not bring profit to you, and you are expecting the State to find the return that your industry can not possibly find. Close your yards, turn your machinery and plant to other purposes, as your own commercial judgment may direct, and cease to rely on the State"? Or will he relieve them of the tariff burdens and obligations to which they are subject and let them establish themselves on a basis of freedom? It needs a courageous man to take either of these steps. And Mussolini is reputed to be courageous.

This shows that whatever Italy may have done in the past in the matter of aid to her shipyards and shipping, the new administration contemplates a complete revision of the whole subject and undoubtedly intends to impose restrictions on subsidized shipping lines and shipyards and to limit appropriations very greatly in those regards.

I ask to have the article inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

ITALIAN SHIPPING.

MUSSOLINI'S TASK.

The world is watching carefully to see the results of the new experiment in the Government of Italy. Signor Mussolini, the leader of the Fascisti, has been called to office and, what is more, is actually in power, relying as he does on the sympathy and support of his fellow countrymen. It is clearly a case of a strong man being called in, or calling himself in, to cut the Gordian knots that weak and inefficient governments have been unable to untie. And outside Italy people are anxiously asking, Will he succeed?

Many difficult problems face him—problems of foreign and domestic policy which have become intensely complicated. The industrial situation is worse perhaps than in the majority of European countries. Previous Governments have attempted palliatives which have only caused more confusion, and at best have only deferred the inevitable crisis. The position in the shipyards is a case in point. These yards hold big stocks of materials bought at high prices, and without serious loss they are unable to compete with foreign shipbuilders, especially British firms. They can obtain no orders except from the State and these are insufficient to keep them going. Besides, according to a law of 1911, they are obliged to purchase 75 per cent of their materials, tools, and plant from Italian firms. For these the prices are excessive because of the prohibitive customs duties, amounting to from 600 to 1,100 lire per ton on manufactured metals and 160 lire per quintal on motors. As a result they can not fit out their works in such an economical manner as to be able to compete with foreign yards and turn out ships at a price that permits of remunerative operation. Instead of relieving them of these burdens former governments have sought to aid them by subsidies. Ships on the stocks were to be continued, and the State would pay a certain part of the cost.

But this was not facing the situation. The ships were not required, either for Italian or for foreign trade. And there were too many yards engaged in their production. Their capacity of production exceeded by 100 per cent the possibility of absorption of their output. It was next proposed that the shipbuilding firms form a consortium, which should decide which yards should continue open and which should be closed down. The yards that were to continue in work would receive the State subsidy, and out of their total proceeds would

pay compensation to the yards which had ceased to operate. This, however, was only removing the unpleasant task one degree further aloof, so that the Government might be relieved of the responsibility for performing it.

Will Mussolini be strong enough to say to the shipbuilding interests of Italy: "You are employing your capital in modes that can not bring profit to you, and you are expecting the State to find the returns that your industry can not possibly find. Close your yards, turn your machinery and plant to other purposes as your own commercial judgment may direct, and cease to rely on the State?" Or will he relieve them of the tariff burdens and obligations to which they are subject and let them establish themselves on a basis of freedom? It needs a courageous man to take either of these steps. And Mussolini is reputed to be courageous.—(From the Shipping World, November 29, 1922.)

Mr. FLETCHER. I also hold in my hand an extract from Review of the Foreign Press, in the Economic Review of December 1, 1922—note the date, December 1, 1922—containing a statement by the minister of the treasury on the Government's scheme of retrenchment and reform, which is supplemented by a communication issued from the premier's office announcing certain reform measures, among others—

Restriction of subsidized shipping lines to those which perform the services to the colonies and the islands, and reduction of the number and speed even of these during the present crisis; reduction or suppression of subsidies to lines competing with the railways and one another and plying to those ports and countries, communication with which is not absolutely essential.

This shows that the subventions and aids heretofore provided by Italy are being already revised and an entirely different policy is about to be adopted and different provisions to be made, all in conformity with the statement which Mr. Chamberlain himself made in the Commerce Reports as of December 4 when he said that there was now contemplated a possible abandonment of previous provisions as to subsidies in Italy. I ask to have the extract inserted in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALY MERCANTILE MARINE.

THE PREMIER'S COMMUNICATION.

The statement by the Minister of the Treasury on the Government's scheme of retrenchment and reform is supplemented by a communication issued from the Premier's office announcing the following measures of reform to be adopted in various departments.

* * * * * * *

Restriction of subsidized shipping lines to those which perform the services to the colonies and islands and reduction of the number and speed even of these during the present crisis; reduction or suppression of subsidies to lines competing with the railways and with one another and plying to those ports and countries communication with which is not absolutely essential. Transfer without exception of State-owned lines to private enterprise, for which purpose the necessary measures will be introduced into Parliament forthwith, probably before the end of the year. Suppression of a number of harbor boards and other independent organizations connected with ports, the chief functions of which appear to be continuous demands on the Government for grants and provision for their officials.—(From Review of the Foreign Press, The Economic Review, December 1, 1922.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill and he wants an executive session, I think the time has come to take such action.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not think we desire an executive session to-day. If the Senator has concluded, I am willing to adjourn for the day. Before doing that, however, I would like to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-morrow it shall recess until 11 o'clock Monday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not know of any objection on this side of the Chamber to the proposal. It is entirely agreeable to me personally. I think perhaps it may be a little inconvenient for some Senators to be on hand promptly at 11 o'clock. That is a pretty early hour. I wonder if the Senator would not be willing to recess from to-morrow until 12 o'clock on Monday. I am willing to agree to a recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I would like to have the Senate meet at 11 o'clock Monday morning. I will say that I expect to close the session to-morrow probably rather early, say about 4 o'clock.

Mr. FLETCHER. With that understanding, I shall not raise any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Washington, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I should give Senators notice that I expect to press the bill a little more persistently next week than I have done this week. I think the Senate should begin to give more time to its consideration. There has been no unnecessary delay in connection with its consideration this week, but I feel that we have held it back more than we should do after this week.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Monday, I shall address the body on the pending bill as soon after it convenes as I can secure recognition from the Chair.

EXCESS EARNINGS OF RAILROADS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, a few days ago I submitted the resolution (S. Res. 379) calling on the Interstate Commerce Commission for certain information as to excess earnings of railroads, and I asked that the resolution lie on the table. I now ask unanimous consent that the resolution be taken up and passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the resolution be read so that we may know what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution, S. Res. 379, submitted by Mr. CAPPER December 8, 1922, was read by the Assistant Secretary as follows:

Whereas by the section numbered 15a of the interstate commerce act, which was added by the Cummins-Esch Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission, after the termination of Federal control, was required to group the railroads of the country, and to adjust rates so that an aggregate fixed percentage return, specified in said section, should be earned upon the aggregate value of all such railroads; and

Whereas it was stated in said section 15a that the rate-making provisions therein contained would enable some carriers "to receive a net railway operating income substantially and unreasonably in excess of a fair return upon the value of their railway property"; and

Whereas with the purpose of recovering a part of such unreasonable excess, and of securing the use of the same for the benefit of the public in the promotion of interstate commerce, it was provided in said section that any road that should receive such excess income should hold one-half of the excess above 6 per cent upon the value of its railway property "as trustee for the United States," and that the amount so held in trust should "within the first four months following the close of the period for which such computation is made be recoverable by and paid to the commission for the purpose of establishing and maintaining a general railroad contingent fund"; and

Whereas it is now almost three years since the termination of Federal control, and it is reported that many railroads, under the rates which have been fixed through the application of the provisions of said section 15a, have earned in excess of 6 per cent upon the value of their railway property, but have failed to make report of the same to the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to pay over one-half of such excess to said commission, and in disregard of the trust created by said section, have devoted all of said excess to their own uses; and that 13 great railroad systems will increase their dividends this year; and

Whereas it is reported that none of the railroads have paid over to the commission any excess earnings under said section 15a, and that in fact all the railroads of the country which have received earnings in excess of 6 per cent have, with few exceptions, failed to pay over one-half thereof, or any part thereof, to the commission for the uses and purposes provided by said section: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to report to the Senate the following information:

1. The "rules and regulations for the determination and recovery of the excess income," payable under section 15a, which have been prescribed by the commission.

2. The Class I railroads which have made reports to the commission as to their earnings in excess of 6 per cent; the value of its railway property claimed by each; the excess earnings admitted by each; the value of the railway property of each as found by the commission under section 15a, in each case where a tentative or a final valuation of the same has been made, and in each case where no such valuation has been made, the nearest approximation to the value which can be readily reported, according to the rules and regulations applicable for the determination thereof, prescribed by the commission; the excess earnings of each such railroad computed according to the value so found or determined; and the amount of excess earnings paid to the commission by each such carrier.

3. All other Class I railroads which, from any reports made by the same to the commission, annually, monthly, or otherwise, appear to have received in excess of 6 per cent upon the value of their railway property; the value of such property of each, found or approximately determined as aforesaid; and the excess earnings of each computed according to such value, or the nearest approximate estimate of the same which can be readily reported.

4. Each railroad other than a Class I railroad that has reported any excess earnings to the commission under section 15a; the value of the railway property of each, as claimed by it; the excess earnings admitted by it; the value of the railway property of each such railroad as found or determined by the commission as aforesaid; the excess earnings of each such railroad as computed on such value so found or determined by the commission; and the amount of excess earnings paid by each such railroad to the commission.

5. The aggregate of excess earnings which remain payable to the commission from all railroads, according to the provisions of said section 15a, as computed by the commission, or the nearest approximation or estimate thereof, which the commission can readily report; and the items which make up the aggregate, to the extent that the same have been separately computed or estimated.

6. Whether any railroad which has failed or refused to make any report as to excess earnings required by such rules or regulations as the commission may have prescribed, or to pay over one-half of such excess earnings in accordance with the provisions of said section 15a, has made any statement of its grounds or reasons for such failure or refusal; and, if so, the name of each such railroad, with a copy of such portion of such statement as sets out such grounds or reasons.

7. As to any railroad or railroads appearing to have received in trust for the United States excess earnings which remain payable to the commission, according to the provisions of said section 15a, the steps or proceedings taken or begun by the commission to enforce payment of the public moneys so unlawfully retained; and be it further

Resolved, That the commission be requested to make report of the information called for by the foregoing resolution not later than January 1, 1923, if the same can with reasonable diligence be prepared for transmittal before that date; and if the same can not all be so prepared by that date, that it then make report of all information which can be at that time transmitted, and that it make a supplemental report as soon thereafter as may be practicable, completing the information called for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the resolution be taken from the table and that the Senate proceed to its consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. For the purpose of considering the resolution, I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is calling for some information. It would be very useful information. It is information that I personally would like to have, because I was interested in the workings of the proposition limiting the earnings of the great railroads of the country and establishing this fund. But I notice that the Senator in his resolution calls on the Interstate Commerce Commission to report on the final valuation or the tentative valuation, one or the other, of the railroads of the country.

To make a report of that kind I imagine would take a great many clerks and involve a great deal of work. I would be glad to hear what the Senator has to say on the subject. He may have better information as to what it would require. I am referring to the mere clerical work of reporting the value of the railroads. Of course, that work is not finished, and when it is finished it will be a very elaborate report. I am not saying this with any desire to oppose the Senator in getting the information, but I am not sure that he can get the information without securing an additional appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama has a rather exaggerated idea of the work which would be entailed upon the Interstate Commerce Commission in preparing the report. I think the resolution clearly states that only such information is asked for as the commission have or which is readily obtainable and which they can forward to the Senate without any great amount of work.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course I do not belong to the majority party; I am not responsible for the expenditures of the Government; and if the majority party thinks it is necessary to entail this expenditure it is not for me to object; but I wish to call the Senator's attention to the information which is asked for by the resolution and see if he can give me some opinion as to the cost which it is going to entail. In the second clause of the resolution it asks for information concerning—

The Class I railroads which have made reports to the commission as to their earnings in excess of 6 per cent.

That ought not to occupy many pages. Then the resolution asks for information as to—

the value of its railway property claimed by each; the excess earnings admitted by each.

When the Senator uses the word "each" in that connection I assume he refers to the railroads, and there are many railroads in the United States.

The resolution also requests information as to—

the value of the railway property of each as found by the commission under section 15a, in each case where a tentative or a final valuation of the same has been made and in each case where no such valuation has been made—

And so on.

If the Senator from Kansas does not think that the resolution, if passed, will require a vast deal of labor on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to make the report which it calls for, I shall not have the slightest objection to his getting the information.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I made some inquiry as to the work which would be involved in preparing the information called for by the resolution, and I have reason now to believe that it will not be a great undertaking and that the information asked for is readily obtainable.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If that be so, I shall not object to the resolution.

Mr. CAPPER. I agree with the Senator from Alabama that it is not desirable to go to a great expense in securing the information asked for by the resolution, but I think it is all now available to the Interstate Commerce Commission and may be obtained without any difficulty.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator's opinion is that the information is available and obtaining it will not involve a great charge to the Government, I shall not object to the resolution.

Mr. CAPPER. I feel sure of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But from the language of the resolution I was apprehensive it would require a considerable expenditure of money on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to assemble the data with which to answer the Senator's inquiries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I send to the desk an amendment to come in following the last clause of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, after line 2, it is proposed to add:

3. That the commission report the amount of the value of each of the railroads in each State, respectively.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I agree with the author of the resolution that it is a very wise resolution. In my opinion, the information called for is very necessary. If there is one calamity more than another with which the country has been afflicted during the last two or three years it has been that of excessive freight rates. That is particularly true in my section of the country and in my State. I understand that under the law pertaining to the valuation of the property of railroads such valuation is required to be given not only in the aggregate for each system but to be segregated as to States. Such information could be utilized by the State commissions for the purpose of regulating freight rates within the State.

I hurriedly prepared the amendment which I have sent to the desk as an additional section of the resolution, but I am seeking to ascertain whether or not the Interstate Commerce Commission has complied with the provision of the law that the valuation of the railroads shall be determined and stated within the States respectively. I should very much like to have that information. I have heard that the data as to valuation have not been compiled upon that basis. If they have not, I should like to know why not, and if they have, I should like to have the information.

In my State freight rates are very excessive; they are unreasonable; and, except when those who consume our products pay for them what may almost be termed exorbitant prices, the producers of my State can not earn sufficient upon which to defray the expenses involved in maintaining their groves and their farms. I want to secure any information that may assist in bringing about a freight rate reduction.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask whether or not the Senator's amendment would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain the value of any railroad regarding which they have no available data?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not think it would do that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It seems to me the amendment is very broad in its terms.

Mr. TRAMMELL. It merely asks for the information set forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the information is not available, then would they be required under the amendment to go ahead and secure it?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not think the amendment would require them to do that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is not the Senator's intention?

Mr. TRAMMELL. No; I do not intend that shall be done; but it is my understanding that the law at present requires the commission to collect the information suggested by my amendment. I have understood, however, that the data have not been compiled strictly within the provisions of the law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We have a law, of course, providing for the valuation of the railroads, but I do not know whether the work has been completed or not. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] advises me that it has not been completed. Therefore, if it has not been completed, possibly the information which the Senator desires would not be avail-

able. I think the amendment should be modified in some way so as to call for the information only in case it is available.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The commission may report to the effect that the information is not available. The resolution itself provides that they shall report by January 1, 1923, such of the information called for as they possess. The amendment would not require the commission to submit a report as to information not now available to them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I thought the language of the Senator's amendment was very broad.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the language of the Senator's amendment is, I think, out of line with the provisions of the original resolution. It is made clear in the resolution that we desire only such information as is readily obtainable.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I will amend my amendment, then, so as to provide that the commission shall furnish the information requested if it be available.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, of course, while the information might be available, it might require several months' work to compile it and submit it in the shape of a report. I suggest that there be added to the amendment the words "so far as the same has been compiled."

Mr. TRAMMELL. Very well, that is satisfactory to me. I wish to have the subject developed. If the commission are not complying with the law in regard to the matter of having the valuations segregated according to States, so that one State will not be required to pay excessive rates for the purpose of building up railroad systems in other localities, I wish to know it. Then we can go into the subject as to why they do not comply with the law on that question.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, with the suggestion made by the Senator from Wisconsin, is satisfactory to me.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Very well; let the words "so far as the same has been compiled" be added to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida as modified will be agreed to. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). Without objection, the preamble will be agreed to.

SALARIES OF APPOINTED AND ELECTED SENATORS.

Mr. SPENCER. From the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 248) to provide for the payment of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies, and for other purposes. I ask that the joint resolution may be read, and, if there be no objection, I shall then ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I do not think there will be any objection to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The Assistant Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies in the Senate shall commence on the day of their appointment and continue until their successors are elected and qualified; and salaries of Senators elected to fill vacancies in the Senate shall commence on the day they qualify.

Mr. SPENCER. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I think the joint resolution ought to pass. It is a very important measure, and its importance might warrant a full Senate; but some days ago it was fully discussed in the Senate, and at that time there was no indication that there was any opposition to it from any source. Therefore I make no objection to the resolution being considered at this time of the evening.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STERLING.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I have before me a copy of an address on the subject of the constitutional and political significance of Federal legislation on education delivered by my colleague [Mr. STERLING] before a conference on the relation of the Federal Government to education held at the University of Illinois on December 1 and 2 of last year. In view of the interest in this subject and the important bearing it has on pending legislation, I ask that the address may be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL AND POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON EDUCATION.

Delivered at a conference on the relation of the Federal Government to education, held at the University of Illinois, December 1 and 2, 1921, by THOMAS STERLING, United States Senator from South Dakota.

In speaking to you on the subject assigned, namely, "Constitutional and Political Significance of Federal Legislation on Education," I should, perhaps, say a word for the purpose of clarifying the theme itself. By the "constitutional significance," I understand is meant the bearing, if any, the Constitution of the United States may have in the way of either permitting or preventing any legislation by Congress for the purpose of controlling or promoting education.

By "political significance," I understand is meant the bearing such legislation may have on the relations of the individual citizen to the State or the Federal Government, including its bearing on the social and political life and ideals of the people.

While in our day education is an all-absorbing and practical source of effort and desire, we search the Constitution of the United States in vain for the word "education." It is, in this respect, a barren field. So far as we know, no proposal in the interests of education was brought before the convention of 1787 save one, by James Madison, which would have given Congress the power—

"To establish seminaries for the promotion of the arts and sciences.

"To establish public institutions, rewards, and immunities for the promotion of agriculture, commerce, trade, and manufacture."

It appears that the proposal was not discussed by the convention except that one member expressed the view that it was not necessary to grant such power to Congress, as "the exclusive power at the seat of Government will reach the object."

We read the specifically enumerated powers of Congress contained in section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, beginning with the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, etc.," and ending with the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, etc.," and find no authority, expressed or to be implied, in this grant of powers for congressional action in directing, controlling, or promoting the education of the people. The nearest approach to the subject is found in that clause which confers upon Congress the power—

"To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries"—

the constitutional warrant, of course, for our copyright and patent laws, but never thought of by the most liberal constructionists as affording ground for Federal interest in or control of education.

To come to the point, the powers of Congress under the Constitution are delegated powers. By the terms of Article X—

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

The power to direct or control education is not delegated to the United States—that is, not delegated to the Federal Government acting through either the legislative or executive branches thereof. It is not a power prohibited to the States, and is, therefore, a power reserved to the States or to the people.

The various grants of power are in the most concise terms possible. In many cases they have been apparently extended by judicial interpretation, or by what the criticis would more harshly term "judicial legislation." The framers of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, giving Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, could hardly have dreamed of those new conditions and that more complex society which have invited or demanded the frequent application of the right of Congress to regulate commerce among the several States of the Union. It is in this sense, rather by judicial legislation, that the powers of Congress seem to have been extended.

Likewise, the power to establish post offices and post roads is couched in so many words, but as a result we have the Postal System, which is the marvel of the world. Moreover, rural and city free delivery; the parcel post; the exclusion from the mails of certain matter regarded as dangerous to the morals, health, and peace of society; the appropriation of more than $300,000,000 of Federal money since 1916 to aid the States in the construction of roads, have followed as a consequence of this apparently limited grant of power.

Of course, with each new exercise or application of the power has come the cry of unconstitutionality, or centralization, of paternalism; but, recognizing new conditions and new needs, the highest judicial tribunal has for the most part sustained the legislation enacted in pursuance thereof, and the

people have come to realize that there has been no usurpation and no infringement upon the principles or spirit of true democracy.

But in the cases I have cited there is the ultimate power found in the language of the Constitution. In the matter of education there is no such obvious starting point. Is there anything at all on which to build?

There is little question but that the desire for the general welfare has been the animating cause for much of the legislation assumed to be in pursuance of a power under the Constitution, and that it has been a factor also in judicial interpretation.

To what extent may the general welfare be the ground of congressional action where no express power whatever concerning the particular subject is conferred upon Congress?

The general welfare is twice mentioned in the Constitution. First, in the preamble, where to "promote the general welfare" is named as one of the objects for which the Constitution is ordained and established; and secondly, in section 8 of Article I, where, among objects for which Congress may collect taxes, is the one to "provide for the general welfare of the United States."

To what extent may Federal legislation relating to education be built on these two?

As a background to some conclusions reached, let it be observed that the omissions of the Constitution do not reflect the attitude of the fathers of the Republic in regard to education, although considering the fact that so many of these were educated men with their traditional belief in the diffusion of education among the people, and that it must be counted on as the very corner stone of free government, the wonder to the superficial observer at least is that their beliefs did not find some expression in the fundamental law.

But now, in the light of our wonderful history, with our better understanding of all the forces and factors that have entered into the problem, I am convinced that if the founders of the Constitution did not "build more wisely than they knew," they builded more wisely than many who came after them have known. For it was a new and as they hoped permanent Federal Government they were constructing, and that, too, out of States most sensitive as to their prerogatives. Few, indeed, were the interests which they were willing to yield to the control of a central power, and thus education, like a hundred other interests, was left to the initiative and control of the local community or of the State.

I think for those what we might term "formative days" it was better so. Out of the knowledge of the people of the several States of their own particular conditions and needs, out of State pride and a spirit of emulation, and out of the dependence of the State upon its own educational resources came that State initiative, development and strength which contributed more to the strength of the whole than if from the beginning there had been reliance on the central Government for controlling and directing aid in the maintenance of their several school systems.

Back of it all, however, was the American spirit in education. It had been manifested in many ways—by the admonition of individual leaders; by the action of legislative and governing bodies; by the quick response of the people to every proposition to widen the field or raise higher the standard of education. Let me recall a few of these:

The ordinance of the Continental Congress of 1785 gave the sixteenth section in every township for educational purposes, this out of lands ceded by the original States to the United States.

The celebrated ordinance of 1787, for the government of the Northwest Territory, contained the declaration:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

From the year 1803 to the year 1846, inclusive, 12 States had received the sixteenth section as an endowment for public schools, either out of the lands ceded by the States to the United States or out of the Louisiana Purchase, the total being 10,919,586 acres.

From the year 1850 to the year 1875, inclusive, 15 States received sections 16 and 36 out of every township belonging to the public domain for common-school purposes, or a total of 52,869,872 acres.

Certain of the original 13 States gave of their own State-owned lands for school purposes.

The munificent endowments of land for the purpose of general education rest for their authority on that part of section 8 of Article IV of the Constitution which gives Congress the power "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States," and Congress thus empowered could not have more nearly reflected the American genius or have better served the general welfare than it did in rendering this aid to education.

Aside from the strong religious motive which prompted much of the early colonial effort in the establishment of schools, these acts of Congress harmonized with what from the earliest times in our history has been the general American ideal.

Washington, as we know, cherished the idea of a national university. He made some provision for it in his last will and testament. From that remarkable document I quote these significant words. They have a bearing upon the scope and purpose of present congressional effort:

"For these reasons it has been my ardent wish to see a plan devised on a liberal scale which would have a tendency to spread systematic ideas through all parts of this rising Empire, thereby to do away with local attachments and State prejudices as far as things would or, indeed, ought to admit from our national councils."

The words, too, of his farewell address will be as appropriate down to our remotest posterity as when first uttered:

"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of Government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Thus both the will and testament and the farewell address state in a broad way the political significance of Federal legislation on education. Local attachments and State prejudices should yield to those systematic ideas through which men comprehend not merely local or special interests and institutions but the national welfare, and it goes without saying that in the last analysis it is public opinion in this country that governs, and in order to govern aright, it must be an enlightened public opinion.

Now we come to a new era and a new form of Government grant. It is not one in aid of the common schools or of education generally, but for institutions of a new type where, in the language of the grant—

"The leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislatures of the several States shall prescribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions of life."

The Morrill Act of 1862 was approved by President Lincoln after it had been vetoed by President Buchanan on the grounds that it was both inexpedient and unconstitutional. I do not think the constitutionality of that act has ever been questioned in any judicial proceeding. It has been characterized as "probably the most important single specific enactment ever made in the interest of education. * * * It expresses the final emancipation from formed traditional and aristocratic ideas." It recognizes the democracy of education.

This great State of Illinois was one of the first beneficiaries of the Morrill Act, and this, one of the most prosperous of our State universities, was established as the "Illinois Industrial University," by aid of the land scrip which the act authorized. It has been said that you have dropped the "industrial," but from all accounts you retain the industry.

But this was only a beginning. It is followed by the Hatch Act of 1887, which gives money, $15,000 a year, the proceeds of the sale of public lands, but not lands, to each State for an agricultural and experiment station. This amount is doubled by the Adams Act of 1906.

The second Morrill Act, that of 1890, gives as a further endowment to the agricultural colleges $15,000 a year to be increased by $1,000 a year until a total of $25,000 is reached.

And now comes the recognition of a new principle. It is found in the third Morrill Act. Senator Morrill foresaw the day when, with the decrease in the available public lands, there must necessarily be a decrease in the funds to be derived from the sale for apportionment among the several States, and so he provided that any deficiency arising from such sales should be made good from any funds in the National Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

We have crossed the line; we have set the precedent. If it were ever doubted whether the words "or other property" in that paragraph of Article IV of the Constitution, which gives to Congress "the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory 'or other property' of the United States," could be construed to include money, the doubt was in effect removed by the third Morrill Act. We did it. Not to my knowledge has the constitutionality of this act ever been questioned in any judicial proceeding.

The enactment successively of the agricultural extension act of 1914, the vocational education act of 1917, the maternity

act of 1921—all educational, all now acquiesced in, and as I believe, all rejoiced in—have given such strong legislative construction as to what Congress may do in the laying of taxes and the granting of money for the public welfare, that there is now no danger that the power will ever again be called in question.

But there is one more step. It must be taken if we keep pace with the growing American spirit in education. From the political standpoint it is of the utmost significance. Professor Bryce, in his American Commonwealth, third edition, 1895, after speaking of the Americans as an educated people compared with the whole mass of the population in any European country, except Switzerland, parts of Germany, Norway, Iceland, and Scotland, says parenthetically:

"I speak, of course, of the native Americans, excluding Negroes and recent immigrants."

And then he goes on further to say:

"The instruction received in the common schools and from the newspapers and supposed to be developed by the practice of primaries and conventions, while it makes the voter deem himself capable of governing does not fit him to weigh the real merits of his statesmen, to discern the true grounds on which questions ought to be decided, to note the drift of events and discover the direction in which parties are being carried."

Taking the two passages together with what he says by way of parenthesis in regard to the inclusion of native Americans and the exclusion of "recent immigrants," from his estimate we can readily discover our new need for legislation that will insure further aid and encouragement out of the national resources.

If when Viscount Bryce wrote these passages the recent "immigrant element" would have lowered the general high standard of American literacy, by how much more would it have done so a quarter of a century later, considering the swarms that have come to our shores within that period and the parts of Europe from which they have come.

A brief survey suggests these inquiries:

Is there need that these numerous alien elements, representing every variety of political, economic, or social creed, or without any creed at all, should be quickly assimilated and brought into harmony with our ideals of free Government?

Visit Ellis Island, the great immigrant port of entry for the United States, or the great industries—steel or cotton or coal—or the little Greece, or Italy, or Poland, or Russia, or Rumania, or the big ghetto, as you will find them in the big cities of our country, and tell me how long you think it will take and by what available processes or facilities the task will be accomplished?

Does this present a national problem? Is there need that the General Government aid in encouraging the States in extending the field and increasing their educational facilities?

Let the United States Army and the selective-service records made during the late war, with their astonishing if not alarming story of illiteracy and physical unfitness, answer the question.

Would you know to what classes and to what degree of ignorance and illiteracy the men who advocate the overthrow of government or the accomplishment of industrial revolution by force and violence make their most successful appeal? The records of the courts, State and Federal, will tell part of the story. The Immigration Bureau at Washington and the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice can add to the information, but those to whom such appeal is made are numbered by the million.

Can the Nation ignore this menace to its peace and good order by failure to do its part in providing means of education and Americanization?

Again, is it not a matter of national concern that the opportunities, especially for primary and rural school education, should be increased and equalized so that the children of America, whether they live in Massachusetts or in Texas, in densely or sparsely settled communities, shall have equal chances to obtain a common-school education and learn the fundamentals of good citizenship?

These are all national problems thrust upon us as the natural and logical result of our national policies and of our growth from the simpler needs which the community or the State could perhaps at one time supply to a nation-wide and complex social and political condition. These problems must have national sympathy and cooperation for their proper solution.

Let it be remembered that all these classes which I have just mentioned, un-American in spirit and sympathy as many of them are, are yet citizens or potential citizens, not of the State alone in which they reside but of the United States. They can not be Americanized out of hand overnight; Americanization involves education, and that takes time, skill, and fit instrumentalities. Let us not forget that the citizenship of every man, woman, and child, if they have citizenship at all, is a dual citizenship, one a citizenship of the State, one of the Nation, and each is the source of its peculiar rights and obligations.

It is no less imperative that the citizen respond to the call to perform his national duty than it is that he perform his duty to the State. More and more and sometimes in spite of ourselves do we recognize the all-pervasiveness of national interest and policies, and more and more do we share in the national consciousness. The Nation then is interested in the moral, educational, and political equipment of its citizenship. To refer again to the language of Mr. Bryce: The Nation even more than the State is interested in knowing that the voter is "fit to weigh the real merits of statesmen, to discern the true grounds on which questions ought to be decided, to note the drift of events, and discover the direction in which parties are being carried."

So, as it seems to me, viewed from the national standpoint, the political significance of Federal aid in education can no longer be open to conjecture. Further, that the aid thus far given in lands or in money has resulted in promotion of the general welfare there can be little doubt. But there are present-day exigencies not within the scope of existing legislation to aid in meeting which is, in my judgment, the imperative duty of the General Government. They can not be met by a submerged and unrelated bureau in the Department of the Interior, empowered to gather and distribute statistical information; nor can they be adequately met by Federal contributions only for specific objects to be matched by equal contributions on the part of the States accepting them. The vital importance of the subject, its intimate relation to the well-being and safety of the people—and this is the highest law—as well as the dignity of the subject, all combine to urge as the next great step the creation of a department of education, with its secretary a member of the President's Cabinet, whose proper function it shall be not alone to administer funds apportioned to the States, important though this may be, but through investigation and research to cover the whole field of our educational resources and needs; and which, without dictation, without ignoring State plans or encroaching upon the freedom of State initiative, shall from its higher vantage ground encourage, stimulate, and lead in every constitutional cooperative educational enterprise that will enhance the general welfare.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 16, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 15, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou dost reveal Thyself unto us as a heavenly Father on earth, full of compassion and plenteous in mercy. We humble ourselves in Thy presence, for we are conscious of our unworthiness. Let Thy will and work appear unto us, and may this day be what it ought to be. Enable us to see with full understanding that our high office is to render a most helpful part in the service of our country. Whether the lessons of our own lives be easy or difficult, may we accept them cheerfully, for perfection lies this way. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4032. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and

approaches thereto across the Kankakee River in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian;

S. 4033. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian;

S. 4069. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Colorado River near Yuma, Ariz.; and

S. 4031. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

December 14, 1922:

H. R. 449. An act for the relief of the Cornwell Co., Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 6251. An act for the relief of Leo Balsam; and

H. R. 8264. An act for the relief of Thomas B. Smith.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the appropriation bill just returned from the Senate, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill which the Clerk will report, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us how much increase the Senate has added to this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman has not examined it?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman is not going to agree indiscriminately?

Mr. MADDEN. We will not agree to anything that we can cut out. I will tell the gentleman that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. HUSTED, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—PAUL *v.* HARRISON.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the report on the contested-election case of Paul *v.* Harrison, from the seventh congressional district of the State of Virginia.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Echols	McArthur	Ryan
Anderson	Edmonds	McFadden	Sabath
Arentz	Fairchild	McKenzie	Schall
Bacharach	Focht	Mansfield	Shaw
Beedy	Freeman	Martin	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Frothingham	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Bowers	Gallivan	Michaelson	Snell
Brand	Gorman	Mills	Steenerson
Briggs	Gould	Montague	Stiness
Britten	Griffin	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Burke	Hammer	Mott	Swing
Cantrill	Haugen	Mudd	Tague
Carew	Henry	O'Brien	Taylor, Ark.
Carter	Herrick	Ogden	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, Okla.	Himes	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn
Clark, Fla.	Husted	Osborne	Ten Eyck
Classon	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Thomas
Codd	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Thorpe
Cole, Ohio	Kahn	Perlman	Tillman
Connolly, Pa	Kennedy	Petersen	Tincher
Cullen	Kindred	Purnell	Tinkham
Davis, Minn.	Kitchin	Radcliffe	Treadway
Deal	Kleczka	Rainey, Ala.	Tucker
Dempsey	Knight	Rainey, Ill.	Vare
Dominick	Kunz	Reber	Volk
Doughton	Langley	Roach	Wheeler
Drane	Layton	Robertson	Williams, Tex.
Drewry	Lee, Ga.	Rose	Winslow
Dunbar	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	Wise
Dunn	Luce	Rossdale	Woodruff
Dyer	Luhring	Rucker	Woodyard

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and six Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DALLINGER. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. Without objection it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. DALLINGER. I move the adoption of the resolution contained in the report.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the adoption of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Thomas W. Harrison was not elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the seventh congressional district of the State of Virginia in this Congress and is not entitled to retain a seat herein.

Resolved, That John Paul was duly elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the seventh congressional district of the State of Virginia in this Congress and is entitled to a seat herein.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] has the floor.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I wish to submit a point of order against the consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the proposition which I wish to discuss very briefly is this: That what purports to be a report bringing this resolution before the House is not in fact a report and can not be considered as such; that therefore the resolution itself is not before the House for consideration.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state the grounds for his point of order?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will indicate exactly what is in my mind. I will endeavor to present the matter very briefly, but I hope clearly.

This case was referred to the committee, of which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] is chairman, early during the present Congress, with instructions to investigate and report. The committee did investigate. The committee formulated and agreed upon a report, and a report was directed to be presented to the House. It was presented to the House on the 14th of June of this year. It was received by the House, and ordered to be placed upon the calendar and to be printed. That report was never printed as required by the rules, and has not been printed as required by the rules up to this time, and has not been distributed among the Members of the House as contemplated by the rules.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman will pardon me just a minute, I want to make a consecutive statement. The report was sent to the Government Printing Office. It was placed in type and the proof was turned over to the chairman of the committee. That document, thus dealt with, is the

only report that has ever been brought into this House within the meaning of the rule. When the chairman received the proof he undertook to change the report. He changed it elaborately; he changed it substantially and materially. For example, the report having declared that certain precincts should not be counted but disregarded altogether, the chairman changed that feature of the report and varied the number of precincts to be treated in that way. The chairman went further and added two independent important sections, something like three to five hundred words, in which he embodied calculations as to what would occur in the result on this or that hypothesis. That paper was substituted for the original paper and without any permission from the House. That paper went to the Government Printing Office and was printed and distributed, and that is what purports to be the report of the committee that is before us now.

The minority members of the committee in presenting their views spoke of that report, and it is called "the alleged report." That was an intimation to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it would be attacked as not being a report.

The SPEAKER. Is that the only intimation that was given?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The only one of which I have any knowledge. Upon that intimation the gentleman from Massachusetts called his committee together again, and that committee proceeded to give its approval to this second paper, which is now designated as a report. That action was taken without the authority of this House.

There was an original reference to the committee of the case and there was never any subsequent reference, and the central suggestion I wish to submit is that when the committee presented here the first paper that was agreed upon it exhausted its authority. Thereafter the Committee on Elections was powerless to go a step further. That would seem to be the view based upon common sense. If that is not a correct view, then this House is under the control of a committee, however arbitrarily it may choose to act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman need not argue that any further, for the Chair is inclined to agree with the gentleman, unless there is something to the contrary.

Mr. MOORE of Virgnia. I was about to say that that is the general law and is the view supported by the only precedents I have been able to find.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I have not ascertained exactly what the gentleman's point of order is.

The SPEAKER. Assuming that that is true, how is this resolution out of order?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Because I understand the case that has been referred for investigation and report is not before the House until there is a report on it for distribution. The case has been reported, but the report has been handled in such a manner by the committee that it can not be considered here.

The SPEAKER. How does that make the proposition before the House out of order?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The proposition before the House is the resolution that comes here only in a report.

The SPEAKER. The committee has reported, according to the gentleman's statement, and why is not the resolution before the House?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But that is not the report.

The SPEAKER. Does the fact that a proper report was not printed make the resolution out of order?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I should say so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear arguments upon that point.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Otherwise the report goes for nothing. Suppose we were talking of an alleged, but not in fact, report of the Ways and Means Committee bringing in a tariff bill. Could the mere schedules be taken up for consideration?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I will.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman's point of order is that the resolution is not up for consideration because it has not been printed?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The case is not up for consideration because the case was originally referred to the committee for investigation and report, and the committee has not made a report. The thing that is tagged by the name of a report is not a report of the committee and does not respond to the reference.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman knows that the chairman of the Elections Committee presented a report which was filed——

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman fails to understand the point I make. There was a report to the House made on June 14, and it was put upon the calendar and ordered printed. It has not been printed, and the case is therefore not here for consideration.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Because it has not been printed?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Because it has not been printed and another and materially different thing has been adopted by the committee.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is something that occurred subsequently to the filing of the original report?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is true, but the original report has not been printed. We are entitled to the report, and it is not here; it has not been printed, but another and entirely different paper has been presented.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That is what I am trying to arrive at, whether the point of order is that the committee has made no report or whether the point of order is that it did make a report and that precise report has not been printed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I make the point of order for the reasons I have given. Now the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has just called my attention to a ruling that is reported in Hinds' Precedents.

I refer to section 3117, Hinds' Precedents, volume 4:

A bill improperly reported from a committee is not entitled to its place on the calendar. On January 17, 1890, Mr. James T. McCleary, of Minnesota, made the following statement:

"It has been found that the vote by which the bill No. 10289 (a bill to provide for strengthening the public credit, for the relief of the United States Treasury, and for the amendment of the laws relating to national banking associations) was reported to the House from the Committee on Banking and Currency was not taken in due form. I am therefore authorized and directed by the committee to ask that the bill be recommitted."

The Speaker said:

"The Chair desires to say that if the vote in committee was improperly taken the bill would not be properly on the files of the House. The easiest way, therefore, to reach the matter would be to ask unanimous consent, which proposition the Chair will regard as agreed to if there be no objection, that the bill be recommitted. The Chair hears no objection."

On January 20, 1899, Mr. Marriott Brosius, of Pennsylvania, made this statement:

"I have been authorized by the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service to ask to recommit to that committee the bill (S. 3256) in reference to the civil service and appointments thereunder, which was reported to the House and went upon the calendar some time ago in an irregular manner. I ask to have it recommitted."

The bill was recommitted by unanimous consent.

The report came here in a regular manner. Then the chairman threw it overboard and brought something else here in an irregular manner. My proposition is that the only course the House can take now is to recommit the case to the committee, and that otherwise the committee is without any jurisdiction, just as it was without jurisdiction at the time when it met and agreed subsequent to June 4, 1922, that a certain paper should be presented to the House as the report of the committee.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The gentleman said something about the minority views. I find no minority views printed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Oh, yes; the minority views are in this paper which contains what is called the report.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The point that the gentleman is making, as I understand it, is that this irregular report as appears here is not the authorized report of the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Exactly, and that we are precluded from proceeding with the matter without a proper report, because the reference was for an investigation and report. Is it to be said, Mr. Speaker, that in considering an important matter of this sort, as to which there surely should be a report, that we are to proceed without any report?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS] desire to be heard? The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is a definite statement in the minority report to the effect that the majority report has not been properly printed?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. No; I did not use that term. I said that there was an intimation in the statement of the minority views to that effect because the minority views referred to this thing as the "so-called" report.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am unable to find the statement. On what page did that appear? The minority report starts out

with a clear recognition of the fact that the majority has made a report, and bases the entire minority report upon the majority report. There is no intimation whatever that it has been improperly filed.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think the gentleman from Ohio is partly right. I am now informed by members of the committee on this side that that statement does not appear in the minority views, but that the statement was made in substance to the chairman of the committee by some of the members.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That seems to me quite a different proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But that is immaterial. That has no relation to the real issue here. The real issue is whether we are going to proceed with this contested-election case in the situation in which we find ourselves.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I merely desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the precedent cited by the gentleman is one where the matter was recommitted on a motion made in the House and not one presented to the Chair. On the gentleman's statement of the facts, this resolution is not subject to a point of order. The gentleman states that the chairman of the committee obtained recognition and filed the report of the committee, and that subsequently the committee had a meeting and took some action with reference to some printed report. Of course, all that is necessary is the filing of the report by the committee. That has been done, and whether it is a proper report it is not for the Chair, under the precedents, and it was not held to be for the Chair in the instance cited by the gentleman from Virginia, because the matter was submitted to the House, and all of the precedents are to the effect that the question of the sufficiency of the report is a matter for the House. I asked the gentleman from Virginia just what his point of order is. When it is all sifted down, the point of order of the gentleman from Virginia is that this is not properly up for consideration because some changes were made in the printed report before the House, which is in substance a point of order that it is not properly up for consideration because it is not printed. There is not anything in the rules that requires the printing of a report before it is considered by the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. When the committee made the original report, assuming the facts to be as stated by the gentleman from Virginia, its jurisdiction over the subject matter passed.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That being the case, that report having been ordered to the calendar, if it was changed, that which is now before us can not be the report, can it, because the committee at the time it acted the second time had no jurisdiction to act, the case not having been rereferred?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The report that was filed by the committee is the report that is before the House, and the resolution that was offered this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts is the resolution that is now before the House. The gentleman from Virginia says that that particular resolution was made in the original report.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call your attention to one or two matters very briefly. I know nothing about the facts of the controversy but they seem to be conceded to be as stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore]. In Jefferson's Manual, section 400, it is provided:

> A committee meets when and where they please, if the House has not ordered the time and place for them; but they can only act when together, and not by separate consultation and consent—nothing being the report of the committee but what has been agreed to in committee actually assembled.

Section 412 of Jefferson's Manual:

> The report being made, the committee is dissolved and can act no more without a new power.

The SPEAKER. That does not apply to a standing committee.

Mr. CRISP. I think it would, and I think the Speaker, in his intimation to the gentleman from Virginia, said when a standing committee reported on a subject matter intrusted to it then their jurisdiction over that matter ceased unless recommitted——

The SPEAKER. The Chair agrees to that.

Mr. CRISP. Then I will not further argue that proposition. Now, as to the suggestion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Sanders] that the report of a committee is not required to be printed, I call the attention of the Speaker to section 803 of the manual, which is clause 2 of rule 18:

> And all bills, petitions, memorials, or resolutions reported from a committee shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. There is nothing that requires the report to be printed before.

Mr. CRISP. It means when it is reported; when a bill is reported it is turned over to the bill clerk and takes the regular course and is printed and goes on the calendar. I do not want to be tedious but simply desired to give the Speaker the benefit of these two rules before the Speaker rules. It is conceded that this report was changed after it was agreed to by the committee. Under the section cited the chairman and no one else could add to or change the report as agreed to in committee actually assembled. That was done in this case. That being true it seems to me under section 8117, volume 4, Hinds' Precedents, that the report being improperly made and the matter improperly before the House, that this matter is not regularly and legally before the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, in substance the point of order is that the report as made was not printed, has not been printed. I am of the opinion there is nothing in the rule that requires a report shall be printed before the consideration of the measure. The report was made, there is no question about that, and therefore the matter is before the House. But, Mr. Speaker, this whole matter is proceeding, as I understand it, on a misunderstanding of the facts. I understand that the report now before us which the House has had printed is exactly the report read to the committee, passed on by the committee, and presented by the chairman to the House.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I can not yield now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I want to give the facts. The gentleman is not stating the facts as they occurred in the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can bring that out.

Mr. HUDSPETH. All right.

Mr. MONDELL. The only change made after the first printing was made to correct mistakes made by the printer.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman is absolutely mistaken.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, can I make my statement?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MONDELL. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Dallinger] can verify my statement. I am simply stating my understanding of the case. I have a right to do that. The only changes made in the original print were, I am told, changes made in order to include in the print certain matter that was in the report as presented by the chairman of the committee and omitted, probably by mistake, by the printer, and there is nothing in the report now before the House that was not in the original report. While a statement of this fact is not necessary to the decision of the point of order, I think it best that the fact be stated. I understand the facts of the case are as I have stated, and the chairman of the committee can state whether this is so or not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The statement just made by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell], of course, puts a new aspect upon the case, but it is not necessary for the Chair to rule upon the discrepancy of fact. The Chair, to save time, is ready to assume that the facts are as stated by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will state, if the Chair will permit, those are not the facts—oh, yes; they are as stated by the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not wish, when there is a difference of opinion as to the facts, to pass upon the credibility of the witnesses or upon who is mistaken, so the Chair will assume the facts are as stated by the gentleman from Virginia. If that is true, it is clear that the committee which had jurisdiction to report this resolution, which the gentleman from Massachusetts calls up, reported it.

The report was submitted to the House and this resolution went upon the calendar, having been reported by the committee. That put it in the care of the House. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from Virginia is correct in arguing that the committee's authority was then exhausted and the committee could not then make a new report without having the matter again referred to it by the House. But it does not follow, it seems to the Chair, that a point of order can be made against consideration of the resolution because the provision of the

rule which requires the report shall be printed was not carried out. It is undoubtedly desirable for the convenience of Members that they shall have sufficient copies of the report at the time the matter comes before the House.

In this case the Chair will assume that this report, which is before the House, was not the same report that the committee made. But, of course, no harm has ensued to anybody. A full report is simply the argument of the committee. This is the report which the minority had before them and which their statement of views answered. It is the report that expressed the latest views of the committee. Apparently the committee supposed they had the right to correct and amplify their first report. As a matter of equity there could be no claim that this report should not be considered as the valid report of the committee. The only claim can be that, as a matter of strict technical law, the fact that the report which the committee first made was not printed prevents this resolution being in order.

There was here no improper vote, such as was referred to in the case in Hinds', volume 4, section 3117, cited by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE]. The report was properly made, and this being an election case it is not even necessary that there should be any report at all to make it in order. It has been held—Hinds', third volume, section 2584—that when an election case was before the committee, and a Member in the House, without waiting for the committee to report at all, moved a resolution on that case, a resolution similar to the one that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] moves now, that even then, without any report from the committee, that motion was in order. Much less, then, in this case, where the committee did make a report to the House, as is admitted, does such a point of order lie against the consideration of the resolution. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] if he and I can agree as to the allotment of time. The other day I had a talk with the gentleman from Texas in regard to this matter and he said finally that he wanted three hours for his side, and I agreed tentatively with him, subject to the approval of the House, that we should have three hours on a side, provided we could meet at 11 o'clock so that we could have a vote before dinner. At my suggestion the leader on this side yesterday made a request that when the House adjourned yesterday it should adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-day. When this request was made, however, objection was made on that side of the House. I told the gentleman from Texas that if such objection were made we could not have as long a time as three hours on a side, and inasmuch as this discussion on the point of order has consumed half an hour, besides the time occupied by the roll call on the question of no quorum raised by a gentleman on that side of the House, making an hour in all, I now ask unanimous consent that the vote on this question be taken at 5 o'clock, at which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered. That will give two hours of debate on each side; half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] and the other half by myself.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I did agree with the gentleman that if we could meet at 11 o'clock this side would be satisfied with three hours and allow three hours to the other side. But I want to ask the gentleman, in view of the record here of 2,000 pages; in view of the fact that Mr. Anderson, the attorney for the contestant, took two hours before the committee and then stated that he did not have ample time to state his case, and likewise the gentleman representing the other side, Mr. Fletcher, had two hours, I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks we could possibly present this case in two hours on a side?

Mr. DALLINGER. I have asked for four hours.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I would like to insist to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the time be fixed at five hours, and that he give us two hours and a half. This case took up some months in the committee to hear the case, and I do not think, if gentlemen desire to present the minority side, that we can get through in two hours and a half. The naval appropriation bill has been displaced in order to permit the taking up of this measure—an important measure—and I think we can save time between now and the 1st of January.

Mr. DALLINGER. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Texas wants two hours and a half on a side?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Two hours and a half on this side.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we want more than two hours on this side. I want to expedite the disposal of this case. We took only five hours, as I recall, on the Berger case. The custom of the House has always been to dispose of these cases in one day. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this resolution take place at 25 minutes of 6. That will give the gentleman from Texas the time he desires.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I will say right now that I am not going to agree to fixing an hour to vote on this or any other matter before the 4th day of March. We are arranging in regard to the allotment of time all the time, but I am not going to agree to fixing a specific hour on anything. In order to save time I will put you on notice now.

Mr. DOWELL. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the vote be taken at 25 minutes to 6, the gentleman from Massachusetts to control two hours and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] two hours and a half. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we can not agree upon the time for a definite vote, I will proceed with the case.

Mr. Speaker, at the commencement I desire to say that the record in this case is a very voluminous one and the committee did everything it could to expedite it. I know that there is a great deal of criticism in regard to the delay in bringing in these contested-election cases, but I desire to state that I have done everything I could to expedite these cases. Under the present law governing contested-election cases, however, if both parties take all the time allowed them by the statute and if the committee gives a reasonable time for the consideration of the case, as it should, it is usually a year and a half after the election before the case can be decided.

Now, in this case we delayed the hearing at the request of the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Harrison, who wanted more time to file his brief, and later we delayed our consideration of it in order to enable him to submit certain figures. Finally, the report was made in June, and then the six weeks' recess came and we had a bare quorum for the rest of the session. The special session, as is well known, was taken up entirely with the consideration of the ship subsidy bill. Ever since this regular session came in, however, I have been trying to get a chance to bring up the case.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of the House I have been a member of the Committee on Elections No. 1, and it has been a source of pride with me to have each one of these contested-election cases decided absolutely upon its merits, upon the law and upon the facts. The record of the committee and my record, both as a member and as its chairman, shows that it has been my endeavor to have every case decided upon its merits regardless of any personal or partisan considerations.

Because of the limited time, I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I decline to yield, and I ask that I may not be interrupted.

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Harrison, during the campaign of 1920 made certain bitter and unwarranted statements about me and about the unfairness of the Republican members of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD in order that I may insert the newspaper accounts of these remarks in my speech, as I shall not have time to read them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extent his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is it to be understood that anyone in the House is to be permitted to extend his remarks in this case? I will ask the gentleman if he has that in view?

Mr. DALLINGER. I shall not object to anybody doing it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I shall not object to the gentleman's request unless there be some objection indicated to a general application for leave to extend remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Pending the disposition of that request, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the House may have leave to extend his remarks on this case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that any Member of the House may extend his remarks on this case. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not mean to include anyone except those who speak on the case, does he?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; I do, because it is very evident that the matter is now in such a condition that perhaps only one person on a side is going to speak. That is the very purpose of asking general leave to extend.

Mr. MONDELL. That is not the fault of anyone on this side.

Mr. DOWELL. I object to the request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RAKER. I object to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have always been very proud of the fact that when in another election contest one of the contestants went to that friend of every Member of this House, Hon. Champ Clark, when he was the Democratic leader, and talked with him about his case, Mr. Clark said to him, "What committee is your case referred to?"

He said, "To the Committee on Elections No. 1."

Mr. Clark said, "Is that the committee of which DALLINGER is chairman?"

He said, "Yes."

"Then," said Mr. Clark, "you will get a square deal."

Mr. Speaker, we have had in this Congress nine contested-election cases, and in every one of them, except the present, a Republican committee has decided in favor of the Democratic sitting Member. This is the only case in which we have decided in favor of a Republican contestant and against a Democratic Member. In this case we tried and I hoped at one time to get a unanimous report in this case, but I was unable to accomplish it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts in regard to this case?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker.

The Virginia constitution of 1902, which is the present constitution of Virginia and which was never ratified by the people of Virginia, can not be read by any fair-minded man anywhere in the country without his coming to the conclusion that its object was to put the election machinery of the State absolutely and for all time in the control of the dominant party in that State.

Under this grossly unfair system the legislature elects the judges of the circuit court, all of whom are members of the dominant party, even in those circuits where a majority of the voters belong to the minority party. The decisions of these circuit judges in all election cases are final, there being no appeal to the appellate court, as in other States. These judges appoint, in each county and city, electoral boards of three members each, with no provision for minority representation, and these boards are almost invariably composed entirely of partisans of the dominant party. The electoral boards in turn choose the registrars, who are always members of the party in power, and also the judges and clerks of election. In the case of the latter the only provision for minority representation is the loosely drawn requirement that in the appointment of the judges of election representation "as far as possible" shall be given to each of the two major political parties, but in all cases the selection of the so-called minority member is exclusively in the hands of the electoral board, which, as mentioned above, is always in the control of the majority party.

At the congressional election held in the seventh congressional district in 1920 the election machinery was absolutely in the control of the political party to which the contestee belongs. The judges who appointed the electoral boards were all Democrats, and all the electoral boards, except in the counties of Rockingham and Page, were made up exclusively of members of the same party.

Throughout the district all the registrars were Democrats, except where there were no Democratic voters. The testimony shows that in the Republican counties these registrars almost invariably required written applications from persons desiring to register, while, on the other hand, in the Democratic counties the registrars either absolutely ignored the mandatory provisions of the State constitution in this regard and registered persons without any applications at all, or else assisted them in making out their applications in spite of the constitutional prohibition. While it is true that usually no discrimination in these regards was made as between Republicans and Democrats, it is plainly evident that compliance with the constitutional provisions in Republican strongholds and a disregard of the same provisions in Democratic strongholds would in both cases be to the distinct advantage of the contestee.

Two out of the three judges of election were always Democrats, and in many precincts all were of the same party. Even in those precincts where a Republican judge was appointed by the Democratic electoral board the testimony shows that in many cases the so-called Republican judge was either a Democrat or a friend and a supporter of the contestee. For instance, in Albemarle County, the secretary of the electoral board testified under oath that J. W. Austin was the Republican judge at Proffitts precinct, whereas Mr. Austin himself testified that he was a Democrat and that there had been no Republican judge at that precinct for eight years. (Testimony, vol. 1, p. 140.) In another case a Democratic registrar testified that W. E. Wood was the Republican judge at Free Union, in the same county, whereas the evidence discloses that Mr. Wood voted in the Democratic primary in August, 1920. (Testimony, vol. 2, p. 1880.)

Now, the result of this situation is that the contestant in this case had to prove his case by calling hostile witnesses. This is to be borne in mind all through this case in weighing the reliability of the testimony that these men were reluctant witnesses and that the actual state of affairs was undoubtedly very much worse than is shown by the testimony. But the testimony of these hostile witnesses shows clearly that thousands of men and women were permitted to vote who had no qualifications for voting under the decisions of the Virginia courts themselves.

Three out of four of the decisions of the Virginia Circuit Court hold that under the constitution of Virginia in order to register a person, unless physically disabled, must present to the registrar an application in writing, prepared without aid, suggestion, or memorandum in the presence of the registrar, and that unless this requirement of the constitution is complied with the registrar acquires no jurisdiction, and that the vote of any person placed by him upon the voting list in the absence of such application is illegal and void. If, however, the application is made and accepted by the registrar, the constitution goes on to provide that further questions can be asked of the applicant under oath as to his qualifications. As Judge McLemore well says in his decision in the Virginia case, in re validity of local-option election held in the city of Suffolk (17 Virginia Law Register, 353):

> In the light of the authorities cited, and many others that could be vouched for if necessary, I find no difficulty in concluding that the clause of the constitution first herein referred to (sec. 20, clause 2) is mandatory and the observance thereof on the part of the voter necessary in order to give jurisdiction to the registrar to act. Now, if the clause referred to is mandatory and if the provision has been ignored by the voter and the registrar alike in the manner charged in the petition, then the conclusion is irresistible that the persons whose names were placed upon the registration books without having complied with the provisions were placed there without legal authority, the act of the registrar in placing their names on the books was ultra vires and void, and the vote of such persons should not be considered in ascertaining the result of the election in which they have participated. * * * To permit registrars, judges of election, or other servants of the people to reject provisions which are mandatory and thereby become arbiters of the qualification of voters is to give them the power, if minded to use it, of determining the electorate which shall pass upon any and every question that may arise.

I wish I had time to go into this phase of the case more fully, but the decision which I have just read was a scholarly decision, in which the court went into all the authorities at great length, and it is perfectly evident that the decision itself is not only good law in Virginia but that also it is common sense and in accordance with the fundamental principles of our whole system of jurisprudence.

Now, there were thousands of these illegal votes, and our committee has subtracted these illegal votes, where it could not be definitely ascertained for whom they were cast, pro rata from the total vote of the contending parties in accordance with the rule established in the case of Finley against Walls in the Forty-fourth Congress and a long line of congressional precedents.

Now, when this evidence was going in before the notary to the effect that Democratic registrars had put these names on the voting list in defiance of the mandatory provisions of the constitution, the testimony being drawn out of reluctant witnesses, seeing that under these circumstances that the contestee being returned by only 448 majority would be defeated by over 1,300 majority and the contestant elected, counsel for the contestee proceeded to put into the record a whole lot of alleged defective written applications made without aid or memorandum by voters in Republican counties and precincts but accepted by Democratic registrars.

The committee has examined with care the applications in the cases of all persons whose names were set forth in the contestee's answer and finds that a very large number of the applications contain all the information required by the second clause of section 20 of the constitution. In the case of a considerable percentage of the applications which are technically defective the voters, mostly women, voting for the first time under the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, have simply neglected to state that they had never before voted, a fact of which any court might well take judicial notice. It would be absurd to place such defective applications in the same category as cases where no applications were filed or where assistance was given, and I wish to cite the analogy of the validity of a judgment, even though the notice, in a court of record, is grossly defective in form, once the court has acted on it and entered judgment. Moreover, although a notice in a suit is

defective, amendments are invariably allowed by the courts whenever the interests of justice demand.

Furthermore, the fact that the third paragraph of section 20 of the Virginia constitution provides for an examination under oath of the applicant by the registrar as to his qualifications, implies that the written application might not contain all of the required information, otherwise the registrar would not need to ask the applicant any questions but could from the application itself, after having sworn the applicant, make the proper entries on the registration book. If, however, the written application is imperfect, then the registrar can put the name of the applicant on the registration book after asking him questions as to his qualifications. In other words, while the registrar has no authority under the constitution to ask any questions or to do anything else until a written application has been made to him by a person in his own handwriting, without aid, suggestion, or memorandum, when such application has been made and accepted by the registrar, however defective it may be, then the registrar has jurisdiction to act, and he can ask the applicant any questions about his qualifications to vote, the registrar in such cases being required to reduce such questions and answers to writing and to preserve them. Consequently the committee is of the opinion that defective applications when once received by a registrar, under the Virginia law, are not void but merely voidable, and the vote of a person registered on such an application supplemented by the examination under oath by the registrar should not be thrown out in an election contest as contended by the contestee.

On this point the Virginia law and practice is perfectly plain. No judge of the circuit court has ever passed upon the question of defective applications because the question has never been raised by either party to a contest. They have had case after case of hotly contested local option contests, and both parties have always assumed that where the would-be voter went up and made the written application without aid, suggestion, or memorandum in the presence of the registrar and the registrar accepted it and took jurisdiction and by examination of the applicant under oath was finally satisfied as to his qualifications, the constitution had been complied with, and that the vote of such person could not be thrown out. If the courts of Virginia should throw out all the original written applications that are not perfect in form, as demanded in this case, there would be mighty few names left on the voting lists of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is not only the law and the practice in Virginia but it is in line with the underlying principles of the election law of the country, where the voter has tried to do his part, his vote will not be thrown out because of some technical defect which has been corrected by the registration officer.

It is like a case in court; until the man files his writ and his declaration the court has no jurisdiction. In this case there were thousands of illegal votes cast by persons who never tried to do their part by making out a written application without aid, suggestion, or memorandum in the presence of the registrar, and these votes were void ab initio and should not be counted. On the other hand, where a man does file his declaration in court the court gets jurisdiction and can amend the declaration if it is imperfect. This, Mr. Speaker, is the law and practice in Virginia, and it accords with common sense and the principles of American law.

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that while the committee on the law and facts finds that, with the illegal votes deducted pro rata from the total votes of the parties, Mr. Paul, the contestant, was elected by a large majority; it also finds that even if the contestee's contention is correct and defective applications render the votes of the applicants void, and these latter votes are deducted in the same manner, the result would still be that Mr. Paul was elected. But, in addition to the utter disregard of the mandatory provisions of the State constitution respecting registration and the failure to conform to the requirement in respect to the appointment of Republican judges of election, there were also in a large number of precincts violations of the constitutional and statutory provisions concerning the secrecy of the ballot, the keeping of the ballot box in view, the counting and disposition of the ballots, and especially the provision prohibiting the election officials from giving assistance to voters unless registered previous to 1904 or unless physically disabled.

Now, the law is plain that where there has been such an utter and reckless disregard of the provisions of the constitution and of the laws made to protect the purity of elections that it is impossible to say that there was a legal election, then those precincts where such irregularities occurred should be thrown out. Here again I deny that the committee has shown any discrimination. We have thrown out precincts wherever such practices occurred, no matter who it hit and no matter what the result was.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended, if time had permitted, to read a few quotations from the testimony outside of those mentioned in the report. I will simply refer to the testimony to be found on pages 155, 184, 195, 196, 252, 1785, and 1869 of the record in this case as fair samples of the irregularities referred to. This is what the majority found as a matter of fact, as set forth in our report:

In most of the precincts of Albemarle County particularly there was an utter and reckless disregard of these constitutional and statutory provisions from the beginning of registration down to and including the final return of the ballots. In many of the precincts of that county the registrars had made a practice for years of registering persons without requiring applications, so that a very large proportion of the persons voting at the congressional election in November, 1920, had no legal right to vote, while in other precincts the registrars made a practice of assisting persons to make out their applications, which rendered the votes of such persons equally void with the others already mentioned.

In this county the electoral board in violation of law delivered the official ballots previous to election to a deputy clerk of court, who gave no receipt for them and who distributed them throughout the county, in many instances to Democratic workers who were not election officials. The secretary of the electoral board, whose duty under the law it was to distribute the official ballots, admitted that in this instance the board had had nothing to do with it. (Testimony, vol. 2, pp. 1831, 1832.) The opportunity thus afforded to tamper with the ballots is too obvious to require any comment.

In most of the precincts in this county the provisions of the constitution in regard to the secrecy of the ballot, including the prohibition against giving assistance to voters in marking their ballots unless physically disabled, were openly violated. Judges of election openly and flagrantly assisted all voters who desired it in the preparation of their ballots without regard to the date of their registration or whether or not they were physically disabled. In many of the precincts the constitutional provisions in respect to the counting, disposition, and delivery of the ballots were entirely disregarded.

Similar conditions prevailed in the city of Charlottesville, in most of the precincts of Clarke County, in many of the precincts of Frederick County, and in the city of Winchester. In the latter city, the home of the contestee, the violation of the constitutional provisions in regard to registration, the secrecy of the ballot, and the indiscriminate giving of assistance in the preparation of their ballots to persons not entitled thereto was especially flagrant. The evidence clearly discloses the fact that for years the registrars in that city had entirely disregarded the mandatory provisions of the constitution requiring applications in writing and had filled their books with the names of persons who had never made any written applications at all. Consequently, at the congressional election in November, 1920, almost the entire registration was absolutely illegal and void. In the first ward, for instance, where 712 votes were cast at the election, there were 917 void registrations; while in the second ward there were 916 void registrations, although only 754 votes were cast at the election. The explanation of B. F. Davis, the Democratic registrar of this overwhelmingly Democratic ward, for this deliberate disregard of the constitution of the State is certainly illuminating:

"Q. Was there a great deal in the newspaper about it about that time?—A. Yes, sir; I said they were trying to make it as simple for the registrar as could be, and after as many registrants as possible; that is, what they wanted to do was to get as many as possible to register." (Testimony, vol. 1, p. 507.)

Although this was a large city precinct and the electoral board, composed entirely of members of the contestee's party, had months to make preparations for the election, there was no booth provided until 10 o'clock of election day; and even after two booths were put up the accommodations were entirely inadequate, and throughout the day voters prepared their ballots anywhere. Moreover, not only did the judges of election assist any voters who desired help, but bystanders indiscriminately helped voters mark their ballots. On this point the testimony of J. B. Beverly, Democratic city clerk of Winchester, is interesting.

"Q. In the second ward, were the judges helping anybody to mark their ballots who requested them—that is, were they doing that when you voted?—A. Well, yes, sir; I think they were.

"Q. Mr. Beverly, you, yourself, helped somebody to mark a ballot, didn't you?—A. Yes, sir; I helped quite a lot." (Testimony, vol. 1, p. 515.)

At this same precinct the used ballots were not sealed, but were put in the ballot box and the box returned to the clerk's office. (Testimony, vol. 1, p. 524.) Moreover, the clerk of the court to whom the ballots should by law have been returned after the count by the election officials, testified that he did not know whether the ballots were ever returned or not, but that the ballot boxes were simply delivered to the canvassing board. (Testimony, vol. 1, p. 515.)

All the way through there was such an utter and reckless disregard of the election laws that there can be said to have been no legal election in these precincts. Democratic election officers and Democratic workers marked the ballots openly at the polling places. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatever but what the committee was justified in throwing out these precincts, but I wish to again call the attention of the House to the fact that even if no precincts were rejected, just deducting the illegal votes pro rata, the contestant, Mr. Paul, was nevertheless elected by a substantial margin.

I have already called attention to the fact that the Virginia law provides that all unused ballots shall be destroyed but that the unused ballots in many cases were put in with the ballots that had been voted and were put in places where they could be tampered with before the electoral board made the count, making it possible for them to manipulate the returns in Albemarle County and offset the votes coming down from the rest of the district.

Mr. Speaker, at this election the Democratic officials returned Mr. Harrison as elected by a majority of only 448 votes. They knew that the election was going to be close in 1920. What happened in 1918, and what happened this year has nothing to do with the case. In this election of 1920 they realized that unless they used their control of the election machinery to violate the law they would lose the district. You can not give any other explanation to the fact that they deliberately disregarded the safeguards thrown about the election than that they intended to win this election by fair means or by foul.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time will not permit my going into the details of the minority report. But I wish to say that I have prepared an answer to every line of it. The minority raises the point that we were not fair in our conclusions in regard to certain precincts, whereas we have been absolutely fair.

Gentlemen should remember that in every case the absolute control of the election machinery was in the hands of the majority party and that whatever irregularities may have occurred in the Republican precincts they did not redound to the benefit of the contestant but to the benefit of the contestee. In any other State in the Union where the control of the election machinery is in the hands of the dominant party in the county you might say that because there were similar irregularities in the Republican counties that therefore those precincts should be thrown out, but in this case the Republican counties were absolutely in the control, so far as the election machinery is concerned, of the friends and partisans of the contestee. We have gone over very carefully every one of the Republican precincts, and although in some of the first testimony, some of those Democratic elections officials, knowing what it meant to show irregularities there, did exaggerate these irregularities, but on cross-examination it was shown that except in those cases where we threw out the precincts all through the Republican parts of the district, the provisions of this rigorous constitution of Virginia and the election laws made in pursuance thereof were rigorously enforced. The constitution of Virginia, which, according to the Hon. CARTER GLASS—and I wish I had time to read his remarks in the constitutional convention—was designed to disfranchise four-fifths of the colored voters of the State, and which, as a matter of fact, has also disfranchised a large part of the white population. It is interesting to note that in 1920 there was a total vote cast for 10 Congressmen in this State of Virginia of 223,267, while in the State of Minnesota, also having 10 Congressmen, there was a total congressional vote of 747,070 votes. The enforcement of these rigorous provisions of the constitution and election laws in the Republican parts of the district and the refusal to so enforce it in the Democratic parts of the State——

Mr. PARKS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-one Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Doughton	Jones, Pa.	Olpp
Anderson	Drane	Kahn	Osborne
Ansorge	Drewry	Kelley, Mich.	Overstreet
Appleby	Dunbar	Kelly, Pa.	Park, Ga.
Bacharach	Dunn	Kennedy	Perlman
Beedy	Dyer	Kiess	Petersen
Benham	Echols	Kindred	Porter
Bland, Ind.	Ellis	Kitchin	Purnell
Bond	Fairchild	Kleczka	Radcliffe
Bowers	Fish	Knight	Rainey, Ala.
Brand	Frear	Kunz	Rainey, Ill.
Browne, Wis.	Freeman	Langley	Reber
Byrnes, S. C.	Frothingham	Layton	Riordan
Cannon	Funk	Lee, Ga.	Roberston
Cantrill	Gallivan	Lee, N. Y.	Rogers
Carew	Gifford	Luce	Rose
Carter	Goldsborough	McArthur	Rossdale
Chandler, Okla.	Gorman	McCormick	Rucker
Clark, Fla.	Gould	McFadden	Ryan
Classon	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sabath
Codd	Griest	Maloney	Schall
Cole, Ohio	Griffin	Mead	Shaw
Collins	Hammer	Michaelson	Shreve
Connolly, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Miller	Siegel
Cooper, Wis.	Henry	Montague	Sisson
Crowther	Herrick	Moore, Ill.	Smith, Mich.
Cullen	Hogan	Mott	Smithwick
Davis, Minn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Mudd	Snell
Deal	Husted	Nelson, J. M.	Stiness
Dempsey	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Stoll
Denison	Jacoway	Ogden	Sullivan
Dominick	Johnson, Miss.	Oliver	Swing
Tague	Tillman	Vestal	Wise
Taylor, Ark.	Tincher	Volk	Woodyard
Taylor, Tenn.	Tinkham	Watson	Yates
Temple	Tucker	Wheeler	Young
Ten Eyck	Tyson	White, Kans.	Zihlman
Thomas	Underhill	Williams, Ill.	
Thorpe	Vare	Williams, Tex.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). On this call 276 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to occupy the time of the House for only a moment or two, and then to reserve the remainder of my time. I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to speak upon this matter be given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I already put the gentleman on notice that there would not be any more unanimous consents granted between now and the 4th of March, so what is the use of putting the request? I object.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before the point of no quorum was raised, I intended, if conditions had warranted it, to make a reply to the minority report line by line, but I shall simply state, as an example of the inaccuracy of that report to show that Members can not rely upon it, that in the very first part of that report there is the statement that in 1918 the contestant, Mr. Paul, was a candidate and was overwhelmingly defeated. As a matter of fact, I have here the certificate of the secretary of state of Virginia to the effect that he was not a candidate, and, as a matter of fact, he could not have been a candidate at that time because he was then fighting for his country over in the Argonne. The fact is that a few men in his district—friends of his—wrote his name in and he got a scattering vote from the district, and they bring that in to show his overwhelming defeat. The minority report also states that because in the Republican counties a larger proportional vote relative to the total population was cast, that that shows that in the Republican counties the Democratic officials were easy with the voters. As a matter of fact, it is in the Democratic counties, particularly in the county of Albemarle, that there is a large colored population, which, under the constitution of 1902, is disfranchised, as was the intention of the framers of that constitution, as stated by the Hon. CARTER GLASS in moving its adoption in the constitutional convention. Of course, in the counties having a large nonvoting colored population, the proportion of voters to the total population is not nearly so large as in the Republican counties, where there is little or no colored population.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I can not yield. Not only that, but the figures which the gentleman from Virginia presented to the committee and which I laboriously went over, because I have known him for years and I wanted to give him every consideration—the figures which he presented differ from ours, because where a voter whose vote has been found to be illegal has not himself testified as to how he voted, we have subtracted that vote pro rata. The gentleman from Virginia, however, in such a case would put on the witness stand one of his Democratic henchmen, and giving him the name of the voter would ask him what his politics were, and of course he would say that the particular voter was a Republican. Then, upon such testimony he would deduct that illegal vote from Mr. Paul's total vote.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I can not yield. One of these henchmen of the contestee testified as to the party affiliations of almost a thousand voters and testified that these people were practically all Republicans. Judge Harrison then subtracts all of these votes from the vote of Mr. Paul, when, as a matter of fact, there was no evidence worthy of the name of how they voted.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I can not yield. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman at any time has the right——

Mr. LONGWORTH. There has been practically no transaction of business since the last roll call.

The SPEAKER. It may be dilatory, but the Chair passes no judgment on that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have no desire to make it dilatory, but when a gentleman makes an assertion and will not answer

a question in reference to it I think we ought to have a quorum here. I make the point of order there is no quorum here.

The SPEAKER. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Fairchild	Little	Ryan
Anderson	Fish	Luce	Sabath
Bacharach	Frear	McArthur	Schall, Minn.
Beedy	Freeman	McClintic	Scott, Tenn.
Bland, Ind.	Frothingham	McCormick	Shaw, Ill.
Bond	Funk	McFadden	Shreve
Bowers	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Box	Goldsborough	Magee	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Goodykoontz	Mead	Smithwick
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	Michaelson	Snell
Burke	Gould	Miller	Steenerson
Butler	Griest	Moore, Ill.	Stiness
Byrnes, S. C.	Griffin	Morgan	Stoll
Byrns, Tenn.	Hammer	Mudd	Sullivan
Campbell, Pa.	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, J. M.	Swing
Carew	Henry	O'Brien	Tague
Carter	Herrick	Ogden	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hogan	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler, Okla.	Hull	Osborne	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Husted	Overstreet	Thomas
Classon	Hutchinson	Park, Ga.	Thorpe
Codd	Jacoway	Perlman	Tillman
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, S. Dak.	Petersen	Tinkham
Collins	Jones, Pa.	Purnell	Tucker
Colton	Kahn	Radcliffe	Upshaw
Connolly, Pa.	Keller	Rainey, Ala.	Vare
Cullen	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Ill.	Voigt
Davis, Minn.	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Volk
Deal	Kennedy	Rankin	Volstead
Dempsey	Kindred	Rayburn	Ward, N. C.
Denison	Kitchin	Reber	Wheeler
Dominick	Kleczka	Reece	Williams, Tex.
Doughton	Knight	Riordan	Winslow
Drane	Kunz	Robertson	Wise
Drewry	Langley	Rogers	Woodyard
Dunbar	Larsen, Ga.	Rose	Wyant
Dunn	Layton	Rossdale	Yates
Dyer	Lee, Ga.	Rouse	Zihlman
Echols	Lee, N. Y.	Rucker	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and seventy-five Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] asked unanimous consent to incorporate in his remarks certain newspaper clippings, which contained criticisms by me of the Committee on Elections. Objection was made; but if the gentleman desires it, I will ask unanimous consent to have these newspaper clippings incorporated as a part of my remarks. I think my friend, Mr. GREEN of Iowa, who is something of a Shakespearean scholar——

Mr. DALLINGER. Do I understand the gentleman wants to incorporate——

Mr. HARRISON. I will have these clippings incorporated as a part of my speech.

Mr. DALLINGER. Not unless I shall be given unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

Mr. HARRISON. I am not asking; I am just trying to get the gentleman's clippings in the RECORD if he desires it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was informed that during his momentary absence unanimous consent had been given to everybody to extend their remarks.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is mistaken. Does the gentleman from Virginia——

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent to incorporate the clippings the gentleman desires to have in his speech in my speech.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks for the purpose indicated.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent has been refused the gentleman from Massachusetts to extend his remarks, and I think it is hardly fair the gentleman from Virginia should have that privilege, as the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts was denied.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt with my colleague from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that there ought to be some fair tribunal for the consideration of these election-contest cases. I know that is simply carrying out what has been proposed a number of times before by many great thinkers. Mr. Mann, that distinguished statesman to whom we all paid honor here a few days ago in this Hall, undertook to remove the objections and the criticisms and the partisan character of these contests when he was chairman of the Elections Committee by giving a sort of congressional jurisprudence to the consideration of those cases, and for over 20 years, nearly, the impression that he gave to the consideration of election cases lasted. But, of course, that good influence has gradually been growing less. What I have said on the stump I say here, that of all the cases I have ever had an opportunity to review in these election contests there never has been a more partisan or more unjust finding than there is in this case. The gentleman from Massachusetts starts out by saying he is standing by the constitution of Virginia, but runs away from it when it did not suit his purpose. He says that he stands by certain decisions of the courts of Virginia and does not when it does not suit his purpose. He misconstrues the decisions and then abandons them when it does not suit his end, even his own misconstruction of them. It is a matter of no moment to me what construction he adopts if he will apply the same interpretation honestly and justly to every contested precinct in the district. If he adopts any interpretation and will uniformly carry it throughout the district, he will be forced to find that I had been elected by an increased majority over the returns; but in order to avoid that calamity, in order to carry out the purposes that this contest was instituted to do, he simply ignores his own interpretations and throws out 32 Democratic precincts without condescending an explanation. Nobody can tell on what grounds he proceeded. I defy him to tell it himself. After throwing out these 38 precincts here is what he says:

> There was such an utter, complete, and reckless disregard of the mandatory provisions of the fundamental law of the State of Virginia involving the essentials of a valid election that it can be fairly said that there was no legal election in those precincts.

That is all he gives, all the information he vouchsafes, and proceeds to elect his man by throwing out precinct after precinct where Democrats prevail, disfranchising men who have voted for 40 years. I myself, who have held responsible offices, who have been a voter for 40 years, he disfranchises under his rule. Five hundred men in my home town, men against whom there could not be the slightest objection as to their registration, as to their right as citizens, or their right to assistance, men registered prior to 1904, were disfranchised ruthlessly. He simply on a general statement eliminates sufficient Democratic precincts to accomplish his purpose, and then blandly explains that the elections at these precincts were not conducted according to law. I noticed in this Hall a few moments ago what was called to your attention by the gentleman from Massachusetts, a bulletin which proposed to give visual expression to the laws of Virginia, but the trouble with that bulletin is that it was not truthful. The judges of the court are Democratic, but in numerous instances the registrars were not, and the electoral boards were not Democratic, and at every possible precinct there was a Republican judge.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I have only 30 minutes; what is it?

Mr. VAILE. I want to ask if these 500 men——

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I suggest the gentleman's time is very limited.

Mr. HARRISON. I would be very glad to answer questions if I had the time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] undertakes to say here that contestant had to resort to hostile witnesses. Why, he had his leaders, he had his supporters, he had his lieutenants, sitting beside him all the time, and he did not dare to put them on the witness stand. I did, and I proved beyond question and beyond the possibility of a cavil that in this whole election there was not one single act of fraud; not a single instance of the improper use of money; not a single instance of intimidation; and that the only thing they could possibly rest upon was to trump up some matters to throw out a Democratic precinct.

The contestant has been constantly before the people. He has been elected from time to time to office, and he has been a candidate time and time again for office, and yet in this election as in all others he was the principal offender, if any offense was committed. Why did he not call the attention of the authorities to these matters and have them corrected? He was only too glad to get his people registered, and his people voted under the very conditions of which he now complains. He comes in now on the proposition of "heads I win and tails you lose." I will abide by any interpretation of the Constitution and the laws. I do not care if you take the decisions that the gentleman from Massachusetts has quoted and then failed to follow. I do not care upon what theory you go or what con-

struction he put upon those laws. Let him do it honestly and hew to the line, no matter where the chips fall, so long as he applies the law honestly and fairly to the various precincts of this district. That is all I ask.

I had hoped that this matter was settled by the last election. We had the case of Mr. Newberry, who bought his seat in the Senate, and when the people were heard from Mr. Newberry resigned. I took this case back to the people. I made it the sole and only issue before them. I said, "If I was not fairly elected, do not vote for me now." What was the result? I carried every county in the district, including the home county of the contestant and his own home precinct. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Give your majority.

Mr. HARRISON. My majority, instead of being 448, as it was at the last election, was 5,193.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. You carried the very counties which Mr. DALLINGER says were under Republican control and where there were no irregularities?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Shenandoah County, that gave 1,100 against me in 1920, gave 250 for me in 1922. Rockingham County and Harrisonburg, that gave a majority against me of over 800, I carried by something less than 200. Page County, another Republican county that went against me by 450, I carried by over 100. One little county my contestant carried, and that was Greene County, by a miserable majority of 26. And yet you are going to ram this man down the throats of the people of the seventh congressional district as their Representative in spite of the resentment that they expressed even at such a suggestion.

Of course, if the law has been improperly construed and has not been properly followed in these cases, the proper method would have been to have declared the election void. He participated in these matters, just as I did, and he got the benefit of them without objection. But there was no occasion for either. The people have spoken. The seventh district responds with an unprecedented majority, For the first time in 20 years Virginia sends a solid delegation.

Now, let me tell you what I think about the upshot of this whole business. The people of the country do not altogether understand Virginia Republican politics. It is a pure matter of patronage and a question of who feeds off patronage. I have been hearing all over my district about the sale of patronage. Constantly reports have come to me that offices were sold for what money there was in it. Let me repeat, I do not believe Republicans of the North realize southern Republicanism, and I do not believe they would indorse southern Republican methods.

I am going to read some letters. A man whom I do not know and for whom I do not vouch—I have not any idea who he is; he claims, as I understood him, and I do not even vouch for that—he complains that he bought an office and it was given to somebody else because that somebody else had given more money for it, and he put the correspondence in my hands. Now, the head of this whole patronage business in Virginia is the distinguished Member from the ninth district, Mr. SLEMP. He is the disburser of all patronage. He is the man who has to give his indorsement to the applicant, not only in my own State but also, as I understand, in other States. Here are canceled checks. They are indorsed, some of them, by Mr. SLEMP, some by his secretary, all for the indorsement of applicants to office.

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SLEMP. Will you state to the House what year you are referring to?

Mr. HARRISON. These seem to run for over a year, from December, 1920, to January, 1922. The whole period seems to be for a year during which this matter has been going on. These checks are better understood in connection with the letters I shall now read. I pick these letters up at random. Here is a good opener:

COMMITTEE ON APROPRIATIONS,
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. B. R. POWELL, *Gretna, Va.*

DEAR BEN: I have letters in regard to the collection of money for post offices. One must be very careful about this. It will bring the party into disrepute, which would be bad for everyone. We must preserve our standing with the people and with the administration.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
C. B. SLEMP.

The next one is from his secretary. I want to get the initial letter:

DEAR BEN——

Mr. LONGWORTH. What is the date?

Mr. HARRISON. December 27, 1921.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Read it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. This election was in 1920.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but we have not got proof of what was going on except the letters that we now have. We may suspect a lot, but we have not got the proof, except these letters:

DEAR BEN: I inclose you a copy of letter I received from Mr. Jones a short time ago. I have succeeded in pulling his son over the top and am ready to make the appointment, but before we do so it will be necessary for you to get in touch with him and arrange for some money. We will have to have at least $150 in order to come out whole. It took half of that amount to put the matter over—

[Laughter]—

which I will explain to you when I see you. I want you to handle the matter instead of writing to them direct. It is a very delicate matter and I had to do some strong wire pulling to get it through, and I know you can work it in the right way. I would not write any letter on the matter but phone the boy to come and see you. If you can I would like for it to all be arranged by the first of the year. This is a lifetime position for the boy, which he would not have gotten if it had not been for me, and I feel sure they will appreciate fully the circumstances and protect me in the matter. If you think it is worth more than the above amount you can arrange accordingly.

[Laughter.]

* * * * * * *

Your friend,
L. B. HOWARD.

P. S.—Be sure and destroy this letter if you are through with it.

Another:

Mr. B. R. POWELL, *Gretna, Va.*

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: Please accept my thanks for your letter of the 3d, inclosing checks in the amount of $100. You are doing good work. Keep it up.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely yours,
C. B. SLEMP.

Mr. CRISP. Who is L. B. Howard?

Mr. HARRISON. L. B. Howard is secretary to Mr. SLEMP. Here is another one:

DEAR MR. POWELL: The Civil Service Commission has announced examinations for postmasters on August 13 at Charlotte Court House, Halifax, and Concord Depot.

Please get in touch with our people at these places and have them thoroughly prepared for these examinations.

I have received your letter this morning in regard to the appointment of rural mail carrier at Wirtz; but it came too late, as on yesterday I succeeded in getting Mr. Clyde Boone appointed and wrote you accordingly.

I think you ought to see Mr. Boone before he gets his appointment and tell him what a fight we have made to have him appointed and make him promise to help out on expenses. Let me hear from you.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely yours,
L. B. HOWARD, *Secretary.*

Here is another:

DEAR BEN: I have had Mr. Moore appointed acting postmaster at Saxe. I suggest that you see him at once and have him help us. He should have his appointment within a few days.

Your friend,
L. B. H.

Here is another:

DEAR MR. POWELL: If you can arrange the balance of the $200 that I wrote you about, I am leaving for home on about the 23d and would like to have it before that time. Let me know when I can serve you.

With best wishes, your friend.
L. B. H., *Secretary.*

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Just what has all of this to do with the election of 1920?

Mr. HARRISON. As I will show you, the whole business here is simply a question of giving the contestant in this case $15,000. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Wyoming should show some nervousness.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. HARRISON. Here is another letter:

Mr. B. R. POWELL, *Gretna, Va.*

DEAR MR. POWELL:

* * * * * * * *

Of course, you know that it is necessary in making these appointments to get men in that will help us in a financial way, and also I want you to look after the situation in Campbell County. * * *

I am just reading the parts that bear on this point. Here is a clause in the other:

Doctor Smith was here yesterday raising hell about matter in Henry County. Will write you fully about it to-day or to-morrow. Keep all my letters confidential and don't say anything about the Smith matter until you hear further.

Your friend,
L. B. H.

—

DEAR BEN: The postmaster at Lennig, Halifax County, has resigned and wants to be relieved by January 1. Please get in touch with Lee Wolfe and give us name some one can appoint acting postmaster, fourth-class office paying about $500 per year. Get some help out of party you recommend.

Sincerely,
L. B. HOWARD.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U. S.,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1921.

DEAR BEN: The postmaster at Henry in Franklin County has died. The department is asking for the name of some one to appoint acting. The office pays about $600 per year. I wish you would get in touch with Beverly Davis or some one and let us have some name as soon as possible. I would have the party send in a little contribution. Say, $25 or $35.

Sincerely yours, L. B. H., *Secretary.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U. S.,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1921.

Mr. B. R. POWELL, *Gretna, Va.*

DEAR MR. POWELL: The Post Office Department has asked us to give them the name of some one who they can appoint acting postmaster at Scottsburg. Please get in touch with Lee Wolfe and give us the name at your earliest convenience. Be sure and get some one that will help us out in our finances.

With best wishes, sincerely yours,

L. B. HOWARD, *Secretary.*

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES U. S.,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1921.

Mr. B. R. POWELL, *Gretna, Va.*

DEAR MR. POWELL: I have succeeded in having Mr. Archie H. Kirkland appointed rural mail carrier at Concord Depot.

Can you see him and have him help out a little on expenses. You know how to handle matters of this kind so there will be no come back. I understand he is a very fine man. A good Republican coming from Massachusetts.

With best wishes, I am, sincerely yours,

L. B. H., *Secretary.*

I will not continue to read these. There are dozens and dozens of them, all showing the same thing that we have been claiming.

Mr. HUDSPETH. By whom are they written?

Mr. HARRISON. Some of them are signed by the gentleman from the ninth district, and some by his secretary.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Are these transactions with people in your district?

Mr. HARRISON. These particular transactions are not, but the point I am making is that we have got the proof here of certain matters that we know have existed in every district and all over the State.

Mr. LINTHICUM. On what stationery are these letters written?

Mr. HARRISON. On the stationery of the gentleman from the ninth district of Virginia.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Congressional letterheads?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Now, here is the point I am making, that the only possible purpose that can be served by the action proposed to-day is to give the contestant the $15,000 which he has not earned by any service rendered in this Hall. After the election of 1920, when Republicans won, there were a number of important places that he might have been appointed to, but the ninth district was getting a little shaky. The ninth district was showing wavering toward the Democratic column, and so it was proposed to put all of the important officers down in the ninth district, and they were. The contestant here is promised his $15,000 to compensate him. It is just as much the policy of the Republican Party to take care of its lame ducks down South as it is to call on everybody to make a contribution for the appointment that they get. That is the point that I make.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman spoke of some checks there. Will the gentleman state to whom they were made and who signed them?

Mr. HARRISON. There are bushels of them.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Who made them?

Mr. HARRISON. They are signed by Mr. Powell, some of them payable to SLEMP and some to Howard.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is SLEMP's indorsement on them?

Mr. HARRISON. On some of them; yes. Now I have not used this man Powell's name at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Who is this man Powell?

Mr. HARRISON. He is the disburser of patronage, or what they call the referee in the fourth district.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. These checks are for private money, but this $15,000 that is to be paid to this gentleman is the people's money out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. Why, what is the Treasury of the United States for? [Laughter.] To take care of Republican gentlemen who do not get elected.

He made the best run that any Republican has ever made in that district. He should have been proud of the accomplishments which he made. Had he rested satisfied with the honor he then won there is no telling but that he might have been here truly and honestly representing the people of the district in this election.

I regret the action of this House and this committee, because it prevents a real consideration in the South of the true political issues between the parties. You gentlemen want to know why you can not get a Republican Party down there. We would like to divide on party lines and party issues, but the moment a division arises it is abused here in the House or somewhere else to the prejudice of the rights of the people of that district.

I know of no more gallant people anywhere, of no more honorable and deserving people anywhere than in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia and Piedmont, which I have the honor to represent. They were men that followed Jackson in his successful fight and gave him the sobriquet of Stonewall.

Their forefathers were men that George Washington and all the Revolutionary heroes rested their strength upon, and to say that these people shall be deprived of their right of representation because a Massachusetts Congressman does not seem to approve of our constitution and laws seems absurd. I feel therefore that I have discharged my duty. I do not care whether the contestant gets the $15,000, which he seems to be scheduled for, but I do object to any Representative from another section of this country undertaking to say that we shall not have a Representative in Congress according to our own laws and our own statutes.

This constitution has been approved by the United States Supreme Court. The gentleman from Massachusetts can not say they are sorry for the poor colored brother because they claim to be lily white—nothing so white as are they. They kicked the negro out of the party after they had got their votes. They denied them representation in political conventions. They pride themselves on the fact of being extra-fine lily-white people. So the gentleman from Massachusetts may save his sympathy on the ground that the constitution of Virginia has in some way prejudiced the rights of the negro. As I say, the Supreme Court of this country has already passed upon the validity of that constitution, and we have a right to our constitution just as much as the gentleman from Massachusetts has to his. An investigation of election contest cases shows that there is about as rotten and corrupt exhibition of politics in Massachusetts contested cases as there are anywhere else. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the contestant, Mr. John Paul, be allowed to speak 20 minutes out of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the contestant be allowed to speak 20 minutes out of his time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I trust the House will pardon me for plunging immediately into the facts of the case, because I am frank to say they are the only things of moment to the House, and my time is very much limited.

Now, in the beginning I want to disabuse the minds of the Members of the House in thinking that there is any attempt by this committee or by me to override the laws of the State of Virginia or its constitution. I am simply here to sustain the constitution and laws of Virginia and to claim that they must be obeyed by the people who made them. [Applause.]

I can not go into detail, but the present election laws of Virginia are based on three primary qualifications. First, that a man must pay a poll tax; second, he must make before the registration officer a written application to register in his own handwriting, in which he shall state his name, age, date and place of birth, his residence and occupation at the present time and for the two years next preceding; whether or not he has ever voted; and if so, in what State, county, and precinct he last voted. The third qualification—if he is registered under the new constitution which went into effect in 1904—is that he must prove his ability, without suggestion, aid, or help from any source whatever, to prepare his vote on the printed form furnished by the election officer.

You might say on the face of it that these qualifications are good ones as a basis for an electoral system. In practice this electoral machinery charged with carrying out the administration of the election law is composed entirely of members of one party. I say entirely, practically so. The electoral board, which is the center of the system, is appointed by the judges of the circuit court, and these judges are always Democratic. There is no restriction on them as to the men they shall appoint on the board. They almost invariably appoint three Democrats. Now, the electoral board selects the registrar and judges and clerks of election. There is no restriction on the judges or clerks of election except a provision that where it is possible the minority shall have one out of the three judges of election. There is no restriction on the clerks at

all. We find in my district in 1920 that out of 13 electoral boards in the district 10 of them are composed entirely of Democrats. We find that at every precinct in the district in which investigation was made that the registrar was Democratic except in one precinct where there happens to be no Democrats at all, and of necessity he was a Republican. It is true that 5 registrars out of over 100 testified that they voted for me on personal grounds, but not "many of them," as the contestee said a few minutes ago. Five voted for me on personal grounds, although they were appointed as Democrats and they said they affiliated with the Democratic Party. In a great many precincts there were no Republican judges. In the county of Albemarle, around which centers this case, there was not even a nominal Republican judge in 11 precincts.

When I say a nominal Republican judge, I mean that they never claimed that there was a Republican judge even in those 11 precincts. At certain other precincts in that county and in other counties through the district there were men appointed as Republican judges who were, in fact, Democrats in disguise. That is the way the system is operated. I once heard the Hon. William Jennings Bryan stand before the Legislature of Virginia and say that the election laws of Virginia were a shame to an enlightened people, and I also heard him point out this very fact of a member of the Democratic organization selecting the judge for the Republican Party, and, as Mr. Bryan said, this judge is usually a traitor to his own party, or a Democrat in disguise. That is the electoral system as it was operated in the seventh district of Virginia in 1920.

The election machinery in Virginia is in no sense judicial. It is an ancillary organization to the Democratic Party organization. This record shows that all the way through. You will find repeatedly in this record where registrars testified that they were appointed by the Democratic committee to act as registrars, and you will find judges of election testifying that on the day of election they were representing the Democratic Party in the duties they were performing. That is the situation we went up against. Remember that the three great essentials of a valid voter in Virginia are the prepayment of the poll tax, the making of the written application without aid, memorandum, or suggestion, and the ability to mark your own ballot without suggestion or aid of any sort. If that law were rigidly enforced we would have no complaint, but our complaint is that having made this law deliberately unjust and outrageous—and I think I am justified in saying that—under which every advantage is taken by the dominant party, they are not content with the advantages given them under the law, but whenever they find themselves under the whip of necessity they go outside of the law to take still greater and dishonest advantages. You can readily see that when this provision of the State constitution was put into effect in 1904 requiring the voters to make written application to register, that it was a test as to their literacy. That was the purpose of making it. A wise test, we will say. The second test of literacy was the ability to mark the ballot; and under our Virginia law the ballot must be kept secret until election day. It was a test of literacy that the man should come there and be able to prepare a ballot that he had never seen, the form and style and contents of which were unknown to him until it was handed to him by the judges of election. This is the way the election law operates in my district and the way it was operated in 1920.

In those communities where the population is overwhelmingly Democratic in its sentiment, where we will say that three out of every four or four out of every five inhabitants are Democratic or would vote the Democratic ticket if they could vote, there is no restriction whatever as to the registration. They do not have the written application for registration. They can appear before the registrar and he simply writes their names on the books. Under that system in Albemarle County alone there were 425 persons put upon the books who never made any written application to the registrar at all. In the city of Charlottesville there were 640 in the year 1920, and in Clarke County 301, in Frederick County 266, and in the entire district there were 2,414 persons registered without the semblance of a written application in the year 1920. It appears that something like 3,000 more had been registered under similar methods previous to that time. That is in the Democratic communities. Do not understand me to charge that in any given precinct the registrar discriminates as between a Republican or a Democratic individual in that precinct. He does not, so far as this record discloses. He does, of course, in some instances, but I mean on a vast scale. The system is more ingenious that that. It is to discriminate between communities where there is a predominant Democratic vote and those communities where there is a predominant Republican vote. For example, take Rockingham County, my home county. There is one magisterial district, known as Stonewall district, in which there are four big voting precincts, and all of them strongly Republican. All of the people in that section of the county are strongly Republican. You can not go into that district and undertake to register without an absolutely meticulous compliance with the very strict letter of the statute and the constitution. The registrar will not register you until you have done what the constitution says, in spirit and in letter. When the constitution of 1904 went into effect in our State and these people were compelled to register in Stonewall district we find that at the precinct of Port Republic in the first election following the total vote was 122, while in 1900, before the constitution went into effect, it was 268. Of those the Republicans lost 125 votes and the Democrats lost 21. In other words, in an overwhelming Republican community they enforced the law up to the letter and debarred all of these people from registering, with the result that the votes that were lost were about four to one. The same thing took place at McGaheysville precinct. In 1900 there were 346 and in 1904 there were 178. At Elkton there were 344 in 1900 and in 1904 there were 189. The Republicans lost 146 and the Democrats lost 41. At Swift Run precinct, a precinct that usually goes 10 to 1 Republican, the vote dropped from 133 to 83, of which the Republicans lost 49 and the Democrats 1. You will see the system now. In those heavily Republican communities they enforced the law right to the letter and barred Republicans from registering on the books.

We can not complain of that, because that is a rigid observance of the election laws of the State. What we do complain of is the fact that they go into Albermarle County and Clarke County and Frederick County and different counties in the district and throw the doors open, putting on everybody that applies and apparently a good many who never applied, but simply had their names written on the books by the registrar.

In 1920 the great opportunity came for the perpetration of these practices. In that year the women were enfranchised for the first time in Virginia. It was apparent in the summer that the election was going to be close in that district, and so, as I pointed out here a minute ago, in Albermarle County and in Clarke County and in Frederick County, over 2,414 persons were put upon the registrar's books who had never made the semblance of an application to register.

They will tell you they were all intelligent people. They were not all intelligent people. They were ordinary people living in rural communities such as our district is mostly made up, probably the same sort of people who live in Rockingham. Hundreds of people can not register, because they can not pass the qualifications in a Republican community. So we found considerably over 2,000 votes on the registration books previous to the election of 1920. They say it happened before 1920. I never attacked a single vote in my notice of contest except those registered immediately previous to the 1920 election. I want to insist again, so far as I can see, the committee is not attempting to override the courts of Virginia, and I never contended that the members of the committee should. Every decision made in this case is based upon the decision of a case in a Virginia court, and they have so repeatedly decided—not our court of appeals, for their is no appeal to the court of appeals in a contested-election case in Virginia. The circuit court is the first and last of the courts of record to which you can go. The circuit courts of Virginia have repeatedly held that where persons' names have been put upon registration books without application to register that the registration is void, and that the person has no right to vote, and that the vote could not be counted, and it can be attacked at any time, even years after. That is the decision which this committee followed in this case. I am trying to sketch for you, gentlemen, the theory of our case.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. I will.

Mr. COCKRAN. Is it contended that these votes which the gentleman says were closely and unfairly scrutinized would have been cast for him if they had been accepted? Has the gentleman any figures to show exactly how many votes he lost by these alleged practices of which he complains?

Mr. PAUL. "Scrutinized"? I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. COCKRAN. I mean can the gentleman show this House to what extent he was actually entitled to any votes which had been excluded by any of this procedure?

Mr. PAUL. The brief submitted before the committee shows absolutely every vote we contended is illegal, by every precinct. We itemized them one by one.

Mr. COCKRAN. How many of those by any degree of certainty can the gentleman claim should be counted for him?

Mr. PAUL. The committee adopted—there was no proof of the political affiliation of these people. The committee took the only possible method, as I understand it, and I assume the committee in formulating——

Mr. COCKRAN. There are two resolutions here—one declaring the seat vacant and the other declaring this gentleman was elected. Now, what I think the House would like to know is, Upon what basis does the gentleman claim that he had a majority of the votes?

Mr. PAUL. By the exclusion of the votes which were illegal.

Mr. COCKRAN. How does the gentleman know——

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Go ahead. Your time is limited.

Mr. COCKRAN. I think it is safer for the gentleman to go ahead; he can not stand any questions.

Mr. PAUL. I can stand questions. Now, gentlemen, here is the next question: It is stated that the committee threw out certain precincts for illegal registration. I am not, of course, authorized to interpret the mind or purpose of the committee. I know the contention I made before the committee, that wherever the committee could point to a person whose registration was illegal I asked that that illegal individual vote be thrown out, and I never asked that a precinct be eliminated on that account. [Applause.] I assume that the committee followed that. The third and one of the important qualifications of the Virginia election laws was also grossly violated in many precincts. Our constitution provides as a third great primary test of the voter's qualification and literacy that a person that registered since 1904 shall, unless physically unable, prepare and deposit his ballot without aid, on such printed form as the law might prescribe, and any voter registering prior to that date may be aided in preparing his ballot by the officers of the election.

As I said to you a moment ago, our ballot is a secret one in that no publicity is given to it. It is forbidden to give publicity to it before election. The voter must take the ballot and mark it properly without aid or help or written word or gesture, the law says. These were the three tests, the test of the voter's literacy and ability to vote, together with the payment of the poll tax six months before election and registration in conformity to the constitution.

Now, after they had put these persons on the registration books without any application for registration, they took them to the polls on election day, and the judges of election marked all their ballots for them. That happened, too, only in the communities which were Democratic.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. PAUL. That happened, too, I say, only in the Democratic communities. In other words, we have Albemarle County, a county which we will admit is strongly Democratic, probably in the ratio of 3 to 1 or 3½ to 1, and there they put on the registration books hundreds and hundreds of persons without any application on their part for registry or any test as to their literacy. The same class of people is barred in the Republican communities. Then you come to the election day, and the judges of election take those persons who are illegally registered—and many of them could not possibly have registered—take them into the polling booths and mark their ballots for them.

I wish you would take these Democratic counties of Frederick, Clarke, and Albemarle and compare them with the conditions in Rockingham, Shenandoah, and Greene—those counties that are looked upon as strongly Republican or where at least the Republicans predominate. It is fraud on the wholesale. It is discrimination between communities, working and accomplishing, nevertheless, quite an effective result.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. Yes; certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How many Republicans were holding Federal offices in that district at the time of the election?

Mr. PAUL. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that I know of no one who was holding office in my district at the time of this election or indeed for a very few months after the beginning of the Democratic administration on March 4, 1913.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Therefore what has the question of Federal patronage to do with it? What bearing has it?

Mr. PAUL. I can say that it has none. I do not understand that the sitting Member from the seventh district suggested that it did have any. He did not undertake, as I understood it, to involve me in any way with these matters.

I simply want to say this, gentlemen, in regard to throwing out certain precincts here: I insisted and asked that certain precincts in Albemarle County, Frederick County, and Clarke County be eliminated because of certain wholesale violations of the law that had occurred therein. Let me read you, for example, a summary of what was shown as to some of them. We will take the precinct of Scottsville in Albemarle County. Now, mark you, this Albemarle County is the county where the electoral board turned the ballots over to a man who had no more business to have those ballots in his hands than any passer-by along the road. They turned them over to him. They were sealed, and when he delivered the ballots over to the judges of election for use they were unsealed. It is also true that the man to whom they handed them was the active Democratic manager in the campaign that year.

That went to the whole proposition of the votes in Albemarle County. But, in addition to that, in Scottsville the registration books contained the names of 106 persons who had never made the slightest application to register in any way at all. The poll books did not conform to the registration books at all, because many persons were recorded as voting whose names could not be found on the registration books at all. Assistance by judges of election in marking the ballots was given to every person who desired it, or to any person upon whom any of the judges could impress their assistance. It developed that early in the day the judges threw the registration books up on the shelf because they said they were mixed up; and from that time on they used poll-tax lists, and if they could not find them on the poll-tax lists they asked George Robinson whether they were entitled to vote, and if George Robinson said they were they voted. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Let George do it. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAUL. In regard to the illegality of the election in this precinct, the contestee produced nine witnesses to combat our contention, and it developed on their own testimony that every one of them was an illegal voter. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER], the chairman of this committee, stated that out of nine contests—I do not know whether they were all before his committee or not—eight Democrats had been seated. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is a great pity to blemish such a splendid record with the dastardly outrage perpetrated or attempted to be perpetrated to-day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen of the House, this is one of the most remarkable cases that I have ever confronted, and the most remarkable, I expect, that this House has ever confronted or will confront. Here is the gentleman who has just spoken, the contestant, asking this House, asking you gentlemen on that side, because you are in the majority, to give him a seat in this Congress, and incidentally $15,000. Of course he cares nothing about that money I am sure (?), but he wants the seat and the honor of being a Member of Congress.

Yet there is not, gentlemen, one scintilla of fraud alleged in this entire election. There is not one charge of the illegal use of money, and I defy the chairman of this committee to show a single line of testimony charging that there was any illegal use of money, charging that any voter was intimidated or attempted to be intimidated, or that any applicant who made application to register was not registered, or that any qualified voter that made application to vote was refused in any precinct in the seventh district of Virginia.

Now is not that a remarkable contest where they are asking you gentlemen to unseat Mr. HARRISON?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is there any allegation that any citizen was denied any legal right?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Not a single one, and I defy any man to show it. I yield part of my time for any gentleman to take the record and show it, and this applies to the chairman or any Member on his side. There is not a single allegation, I will state to my colleague from Texas, that any man or any woman, white or black, who ever presented himself or herself to register that was not registered, or ever presented himself or herself to a judge of election who was not admitted to vote.

Is not that a remarkable contest? I know some of you gentlemen over there. I think some of you want to be fair. I do not want to make that statement general. No man can take the record, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and base an honest conviction on it that Tom Harrison ought to go out of this body and that Captain Paul ought to take his seat upon the record here made by Captain Paul himself.

Now gentlemen, I have heard it stated that he who asks equity ought to come into court with clean hands. Here is the contestant Captain Paul, who wants a seat in Congress and incidentally $15,000, who upon his own testimony violated

the law of his State in two particulars. First, it is against the law to vote an open ballot, so you claim, and I agree with that contention. If your contention is correct that is against the law, and yet Captain Paul voted an open ballot, spread it out on the table before the judges and bystanders.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Just the same sort of technical violations on which they seek to unseat Mr. Harrison.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Just the same on which the gentleman from Massachusetts is asking to unseat Tom Harrison, on technicalities, the merest irregularities. Paul violated it and he knows it and he dare not deny that he voted an open ballot.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will not yield. I have not much time. I want to tell you some of the facts. If you will yield your mind and it is an open one I will give you some facts that will cause you to cast an honest vote and I believe you want to do right if you can get out from under the crack of the Republican whip.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes. I do not want to mislead you gentlemen over on that side. I have nothing to yield to you on the Republican side. I know that. I know, gentlemen, that the steam roller is all greased and ready.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The very disqualifications that it is claimed would exclude Mr. Harrison are permitted to Mr. Paul.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Absolutely; and that is not all. It is against the law to give aid, suggestion, or memorandum, is it not? You said it was, Mr. DALLINGER. I believe the statute of Virginia says so and the constitution of Virginia says so. Yet here are some blanks, one of which I will place in the RECORD:

FORM OF APPLICATION TO REGISTER.

To ———, *Registrar:*

I apply to register in ——— precinct, ——— County, Va.
(1) My name is ——— ———.
(2) My age is — years.
(3) I was born at ——— on the — day of ———, 18—.
(4) My residence is ——— and has been for the last two years.
(5) My occupation is that of ——— and has been for the last two years.
(6) I have never voted.

(Signed) ——— ———.

This form can not be used when you go to register.
It is simply to show the manner in which the application must be made out and the facts necessary to state in your application.
Study this form and get familiar with it; you will then be able to write out your application for registration without any difficulty on the blank piece of paper furnished you by the registrar.

And Mr. Paul swore upon the stand that he distributed these blanks.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HUDSPETH. No; I will not yield. I could not enlighten you in a thousand years.

Mr. VAILE. And I can not enlighten you.

Mr. HUDSPETH. And you can not enlighten me, a man that looks like you, the man that has the facial expression you exhibit at all times. I never know whether you are laughing at me or whether you are crying for me. No, my friend from Colorado, you can not enlighten me or anyone else. The gentleman from Massachusetts said it is against the law to give aid, suggestion, or memorandum to the applicant to register. Yet Captain Paul distributed these blanks to his friends, and he swears to it in his testimony, a plain violation of the law. I got these very blanks from him when he testified, and he swore that he distributed them. Yet he comes in here and asks you to unseat Tom Harrison. Is that all?

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] talks about the constitution of Virginia and says it is framed for the purpose of perpetuating the Democrats in power, and he talks about Senator CARTER GLASS, that arch political conspirator down there, as the Republicans would want to call him. You remember what he said about it. Well, Col. Henry W. Anderson, a distinguished Republican politician, strutted into this committee; and, by the way, my friends, he is the only man I ever saw in my life who could strut sitting down. [Laughter.] Colonel Anderson denounced this constitution in the vilest terms, saying it was framed by only 47 men, that it was never ratified by the people. Yet the people ratified it time and again, and they ratified it last year, when Colonel Anderson was a candidate, by 60,000 majority against him.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. He denounces that constitution now, and yet several years after its adoption he applauded it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Let me read you what he said. We have got it right here in black and white. Mr. DALLINGER, let us see what Mr. Paul's spokesman, Col. Henry W. Anderson, said. He was introducing President Taft on October 17, 1908. I am going to read to you, Mr. DALLINGER, what Colonel Anderson said about the constitution of Virginia—the man that you say gave the exposé of the law of Virginia. I want to read to you what he said about this constitution that you denounce and that Mr. Paul denounced, although he violated the law under it.

Mr. DALLINGER. I said it was framed for the purpose of perpetuating the dominant party in power.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You said it was for the purpose of perpetuating the Democrats in power and for the purpose of disfranchising the negro vote. Paul says in his testimony that there are no negro votes in the seventh district—are an infinitesimal number. So you could not disfranchise the negroes if there are none there. That is what Paul said. Let us see what Col. Henry W. Anderson said when he was introducing President Taft. He says:

The reason urged for the constitution of 1902 was that the adjustment of the problems which that instrument sought to settle would leave the people of this State free to divide upon economic questions, and thus increase the influence of Virginia in national affairs and promote the political and industrial progress of her people. The adoption of this constitution was the last step in the work of 40 years, which has placed the institutions of this State upon a sound basis, has assured the supremacy of intelligence in our government, and has opened to the people of all races and all classes the opportunity to reap and enjoy the rewards of good citizenship.

You see he says it would leave the people of this State free, not enslave them to Democracy, but leave them free to divide on economic questions, and assure the supremacy of intelligence in our government, and open to the people of all races—not a discrimination against the negro, as he stated when he addressed the committee, but to open to the people of all races and all classes an opportunity to reap and enjoy the rewards of good citizenship. Does that jibe with his statement before the committee and the statement of Mr. DALLINGER?

Now, my friend DALLINGER says that where a man made no application to register the vote ought to be thrown out, and the precinct.

Mr. DALLINGER. No; I did not say that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Then I misunderstood you.

Mr. DALLINGER. We have not thrown out any precincts because of illegal registration, not a single one.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But in the report you do assign as a reason for the precincts you threw out that there was no application for registration and defective applications for registration. I will show it to you right here. Mr. DALLINGER in making up his report in order to unseat Harrison throws out certain precincts. Here is the statement made up by Captain Paul, in which he claims these precincts should be thrown out. It is too long to read the list, but he claims they should be thrown out because there was no application taken for registration. In the first report that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] filed, against which Judge MOORE made the point of order, in summing up Mr. Paul's majority they included the precinct of Berryville, which was carried by Mr. Paul. In the report that was actually printed they left that out. They did not need it. They had enough without it. They had just gone ahead in a hodgepodge and taken a certain number of precincts that Tom Harrison carried and thrown them out and elected Paul; and I insert it right here:

Tabulation No. 1.

REGISTRATIONS VOID FOR FAILURE TO MAKE ANY APPLICATION TO REGISTER.

(This tabulation shows the number of names upon the registration books at various precincts whose registration is void for failure to make application to register as provided by section 20 of the constitution of Virginia. In one column are shown the number of such persons who were specifically named in the notice of contest or the answer; in another column are shown the additional number of such registrations as were disclosed by the evidence but were not set up in the notice or answer.)

Returned vote.			County or city and precinct.	Number of names set out in notice and answer whose registration is void.	Additional number of void registrations on books not set out in notice and answer, but shown by evidence.	Total void registration.	
Harrison.	Paul.	Total.					
			CHARLOTTESVILLE.				
189	94	283	Third Ward.....	40	27	70	Registered by person not registrar and having no official capacity, pp. 90-91, 95-96.
208	71	279	Fourth Ward.....	165	59	224	Pp. 77, 81-82.

Tabulation No. 1—Continued.

Returned vote.			County or city and precinct.	Number of names set out in notice and answer whose registration is void.	Additional number of void registrations on books not set out in notice and answer, but shown by evidence.	Total void registration.	
Harrison.	Paul.	Total.					
			ALBEMARLE COUNTY.				
39	3	42	Howardsville	2	0	2	P. 113.
20	6	26	Wingfields	3	9	12	Pp. 119, 121.
84	34	118	Monticello	32	40	72	Pp. 126, 130.
48	15	63	Proffit	18	35	53	Pp. 139, 141.
69	48	117	Earlysville	16	6	22	Pp. 150, 151.
49	22	71	Covesville	14	46	60	Pp. 217–222.
160	20	180	Scottsville	76	30	106	Pp. 24–7248.
			CLARKE COUNTY.				
309	60	369	Berryville	190	38	228	Pp. 265–274.
20	7	27	Mount Airy	2	33	35	P. 278.
107	36	143	White Post	36	87	123	Pp. 282–283.
10	10	20	Turners Shop	2	0	2	P. 312.
129	66	195	Millwood	38	0	38	Pp. 319–323.
176	79	255	Newtown (or Stephens City).	42	143	185	Pp. 393–395.
157	80	237	Middletown	58	120	178	Pp. 400–401.
28	22	47	Dry Run	0	10	10	P. 411.
7	29	36	Lamps	0	4	4	Pp. 415–416.
79	56	135	Kernstown	7	78	85	P. 419.
52	18	70	Old Forge	2	32	34	P. 425.
12	26	38	Armel	6	21	27	P. 427.
56	75	131	Carpers Valley	21	44	65	P. 430.
30	67	97	Gainsboro	15	14	29	P. 434.
77	123	200	White Hall	13	62	75	Pp. 436–437.
111	65	176	Brucetown	24	54	78	P. 439.
120	118	238	Neffstown	70	20	90	Pp. 405–407.
12	19	31	Yeakleys	1	2	3	P. 443.
49	38	87	Gore	4	2	6	Pp. 445–446.
73	43	116	Greenwood	3	15	18	Pp. 447–448.
			WINCHESTER.				
353	359	712	First ward	149	768	917	Pp. 475, 479, 483.
417	337	754	Second ward	92	824	916	Pp. 500–508.
			PAGE COUNTY.				
166	207	373	Shenandoah	120	121	241	Pp. 545–546.
3	24	27	Jolletts	0	7	7	P. 917.
40	72	112	Springfield	0	10	10	P. 948, 952–953.
48	68	116	Rileyville	0	41	41	Pp. 1007, 1011–1013.
37	79	116	Honeyville	0	22	22	Pp. 1069–1072.
			RAPPAHANNOCK COUNTY.				
75	26	101	Flint Hill	24	1	25	Pp. 582–583.
			SHENANDOAH COUNTY.				
278	327	605	Courthouse	226	28	254	Pp. 557–559.
142	185	327	Town Hall	103	49	152	Pp. 561–563.
159	158	317	New Market	99	145	244	Pp. 570–571.
28	100	128	Cabin Hill	29	17	46	Pp. 716, 724.
39	98	137	St. Lukes	31	34	65	Pp. 728, 735–736.
35	82	117	Fishers Hill	25	26	51	P. 795.
			ROCKINGHAM COUNTY.				
130	93	223	Mount Crawford	82	71	153	Pp. 534–535.
4,427	3,565	7,992		1,889	3,194	5,083	

The above tabulation contains only those precincts at which there were no applications of any sort, and shows that at these precincts casting 7,992 votes there were 5,083 void registrations. These registrations are so plainly void and constitute such a large percentage of the persons voting that it seems apparent that the entire vote should be thrown out. To these are yet to be added other precincts at which assistance was given registrants to an extent making their applications a complete nonconformity with section 20 of the Constitution, as will appear from other tabulations filed.

But if you are throwing them out because there were no applications taken I want to ask you why you did not throw them out in Lindsay, Shirley, Port Republic, Newport, Berryville, Jolletts, and these other precincts? There were no applications taken there. Why did not he include them in the list when you went to make it up?

I want to tell you gentlemen how they figured it. They first started in for the purpose of throwing out Mr. Harrison and they agreed with the minority of the committee that the defective applications stood alongside of where they made no application. They found that would increase the Harrison majority by 622 and you could not get the $15,000 and Harrison seat that way. That would not do. Then they grouped a lot of precincts together where Mr. Harrison had carried them and threw them out and in that vote of the precincts that you threw out, Mr. Harrison got 3,900 votes and Paul got 2,200. This may not be the exact figures, but close to it. If they were thrown out on the ground that no applications were required, why did they not throw out the other precincts? Because he did not need them; he had enough without them.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Does the law of Virginia permit a correction of the registration?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes, it provides that it can be corrected in only one way, that is that the registrar can go before the district judge and ask that it be purged, 30 days before the election, or any three citizens, or the contestant could have done so. The contestant did not do it and never has done it until this good hour. He ran in 1916 under the same system that was in vogue then and has been in vogue since 1902. He never has asked to have the registration purged. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] states that he was not a candidate in 1918, but his friends placed his name on the ballot. True he was fighting in the Argonne, but he was not fighting in the Argonne on the 7th of last November, he was fighting in Piedmont Valley and in the valley of the Shenandoah for an office which he lacked over 5,000 ballots of getting. Under the same system, with the same registration books that he has complained of, he has never asked that they be purged in the way that the law directs. He never has asked it up to this good hour. Mr. Harrison snowed him under by over 5,000. Now Captain Paul says there was a strict observance of the law in Albemarle and Shenandoah. He says that they observed the law strictly. Let me call to your mind, Captain Paul and the gentleman from Massachusetts, chairman of this committee, that in the recent election these counties went as strongly Democratic as any other county in the district. This seventh district of Virginia was never Republican and it never will be. But, you gentlemen are making it stronger Democratic by your high-handed procedure in this case.

What do you base it on? You say you will carry it in the next election, and as far as that goes you Republicans will say anything, but you have nothing to back it up.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us how many votes they disfranchised?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Five thousand.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Is it not 7,608? There were 25,994 cast and they gave 18,308 under the reform procedure.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes, the gentleman is right; it was over 7,000. Under this constitution, under the same system, the ninth district, until this report was made taking away the rights of the people of the seventh district—the ninth district had been Republican during Mr. SLEMP's time, and his father before him—and I do not know but that his grandfather may have held the office. Anyway it has been in the Slemp family a lifetime; but a Republican will never tarnish the office again. It has been, ever since I have watched the history of Virginia, until you gentleman wanted this $15,000. That is all there is to it; you are attempting to take away the rights of the people down there and prostitute their will. Why do you say Mr. Harrison's majority was so small? I will tell you: They had a hot contest in 1920 in the Democratic primaries over the liquor question. You know what bitterness is always engendered by the liquor question. One candidate, Mr. Leedy, was in favor of light wines and beer and Mr. Harrison was in favor of the Volstead Act. There was a great fight and much bitterness was engendered, and it was carried into the general election and there was almost as great a landslide against the Democrats as we discovered against the Republicans on the 7th of last November. These things detracted from the Democratic vote. But, gentlemen, when they read the report of this committee they came back into the faith of their fathers and the good old Democratic fold. In the very counties Mr. Paul says there was a strict observance of the law there was the largest Democratic gain.

Now, in one instance where the registrar sent a woman back to get educated, as Mr. Paul says, I asked him about this and he said he educated them on the blank I exhibited, so that they could vote, although it was in violation of the law. They told this woman to go back and be educated, and she did not come back. That is the only person that made application to register that was not registered in this entire record. You know it, every man on that side knows it, and every member of the committee knows it.

Talk about irregularities; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] threw out certain precincts because the ballot box was not kept in sight of the people. That occurred at Edinburg. It is testified that the ballot box was not at all times in public view; furthermore, why did you not tell the House that some gentlemen took tickets and went out and distributed them in the street to his henchmen. This was a Republican up at Edinburg. That is the only place I recall, just a mere technicality, no fraud alleged, no illegal use of money; but they did not have the box in sight all the time. Now, at Charlottesville the women had been enfranchised just before the election. The testimony is that the Republicans had been instructed to vote early, for if they did not vote early the Democrats would be in line and keep them out. The Republican women went to the polls and the Democratic and Republican judges had to request them to leave and get out.

They were nearly all Republican ladies. That is the testimony. Why do you not give them the record? I call the attention of the chairman to the testimony. They have been talking about aid. If you registered prior to 1904 and were on the permanent roll in Virginia you could get aid, if you desired. There were many registered at that time. The testimony is that in a number of precincts—I could not take the time to enumerate—the Republican and Democratic judges insisted upon the request of the Republican Party leaders in giving aid and assistance to voters. At one precinct, Fishers Hill, I believe it was, there was a Republican judge and two Democratic judges. One of the Democratic judges said that they were going to conduct this election according to law; that they were not going to give any aid. Then the other Democratic judge and the Republican judge said if that were the case, if they were going to conduct it in that way, they might just as well close the polls at that time, because they had always given aid and assistance, and they overruled the Democratic judge and did give that assistance. That is a part of this record. It shows that out of 2,400 votes that Paul claimed were illegal on account of no registration or that were there with the defective applications, he got a large majority of the benefit from them. That is this record, and I defy any man on that committee to go into it and get up here and state differently.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Did not Mr. Paul state before the gentleman's committee that he did not lose anything by these irregular votes?

Mr. HUDSPETH. He did. The statute provides that you must make application. I think that is mandatory, regardless of the able decision rendered by Judge Christian in the Suffolk local option case. I think it is mandatory that you must make out the application in your own handwriting without aid or suggestion or memorandum. The statute requires that sort of application, and that should be made. There were a number of defective applications where the man would say that he was of age and had never voted before and did not state on the application where he lived. There were numbers of those. If you took those defective applications, and where there were no applications at all, and you were to throw them out—and if you threw out one you would have to throw out the other—in other words, if you adhered to the strict letter of the law in the great State of Virginia it would increase Tom Harrison's vote by 622, and you know it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman has stated correctly, because I know the record, that there is no taint of fraud shown, no willful impropriety, in the conduct of this election.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But that the result is based on a charge that there were technical irregularities. When the case started the charge stressed was that there was a failure to pay the capitation tax, but they did not stand to that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No, because it did not give them enough votes to throw Tom Harrison out and permit Paul to embezzle the seat.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. They changed their footings.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes. That is the reason they run away from that charge. Of course we are all agreed that the law requires a poll-tax payment, and as they had not paid the poll tax the law says that they are not entitled to vote. To adhere strictly to the law in that respect as I recall would have increased Paul's vote by 62 votes. If all the votes claimed to have been cast for Harrison and for Paul where they did not pay the capitation tax were thrown out it would have increased the vote of Mr. Paul by 62. But he needed 448. Then they had to go out and throw out a lot of precincts helter skelter, without rhyme or reason. Paul must have the seat and the Republican Party a part of the $15,000 as I believe. For instance, they threw out a lot of precincts in Tom Harrison's home county, but every one that they threw out was one that Harrison carried. They did not throw out any that Paul carried where there were some irregularities—not one precinct. Yet the chairman says that they want to be fair in this contest.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, of course I have my own ideas, and my idea is that I think I see the steam roller coming. As I understand it, they figured that they would pull this thing off two or three days before the 4th of March, but they thought that it would not do to go back down there to the people of Virginia in that way, that that would be such a high-handed procedure so flagrant and raw that they better give two or three months and let Paul sit here a little while, and give a show of decency and having earned his salary. I have great respect and admiration for a man who wore the uniform of his country and fought across the seas for its preservation. That commands the admiration of every red-blooded American, but, Mr. Speaker, that does not entitle him to come back here and filch from the people of Virginia a seat in Congress that they have chosen Harrison to represent, and he knows it. However, you have the majority now, and I want to congratulate the majority on one thing, and say to them, that this is the only way in this country, now and this year, that you can win an election for Congress. The only way to do it is the way you are proceeding now. I think that you are going to follow the steering committee, I think that you are going to follow the crack of the whip, and I want to say to you, Captain Paul, that Tom Harrison came into this body with his head up and he will go out with his head up, and he will come back after the 4th of next March with his head up.

He will be able to look the people of Virginia in the face and to look his constituents in the face, and his children in future years will be able to point with pride to the fact that their father was a duly elected Representative from the State of Virginia; but I want to say, Captain, if you have any children, that I doubt very much if they will ever have the temerity to refer to the fact that you were a Member of this Congress. I doubt it very seriously. I doubt if they will ever refer to that fact, or that your grandchildren will, if you have any.

Let me say in conclusion that I have practiced a little in the courts of my country. I have practiced on the frontiers before good courts and bad courts, and in a few instances before kangaroo judges. I have practiced in Mexico over on the other side of the Rio Grande, where in times past the man who had the most political influence won his case in court. While I never appeared before him, I had acquaintance with the celebrated justice of the peace, Roy Bean—the law west of the Pecos. You have seen his name mentioned in western stories many times and in books and newspapers. He was the man who tried people for horse stealing and sent them to the penitentiary or started them on their way. I have known of his decisions where he has divorced people from one another and married them over again at $50 a shot. I remember one decision where a Chinaman fell off the Pecos bridge. He had $50 in his jeans and besides carried a six shooter. Judge Bean had his body brought before him and fined him $50 for carrying a gun.

But I have never seen as great an outrage, such a pernicious verdict, such a gross perversion of justice perpetrated by this or any other body—judicial, semijudicial, legislative, or otherwise—and I trust I will never see it again so long as God permits me to live. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be notified one minute before my time expires. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, in bringing this debate to a close I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning, that if there is any one thing which I have tried to do as a Member of Congress it is to have these contested-election cases determined absolutely upon their merit—upon the law and the facts—regardless of any partisan or personal considerations. There is no reason, with the overwhelming majority which we have in this Congress, why we should unseat or seat any man for partisan reasons. The only question here is, who was elected in the seventh Virginia district not in 1922 but in 1920? It is to that question and to that question alone which your Committee on Elections No. 1 devoted its attention, and no matter how you figure it out Captain Paul was elected a Member of Congress from that district. [Applause.] Now, I wish to correct one or two misapprehensions raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH], first, in regard to the printed form of application which he says was used by the Republicans. In the Republican parts of this district this con-

stitution which gives the control of all the registration and election machinery entirely into the hands of one party—so justly criticized by that great Democrat, Mr. Bryan—was enforced in all its rigor and with all its little details and at the same time was not enforced in the Democratic parts of the district. The result was that in those Republican parts of the district the Republicans had to go to school. They knew they would be held up to the strict provisions of the constitution, and so the Republican committee prepared these applications which the gentleman would have you believe were taken into the registration booths by the Republican voters. Not at all. They had them outside so that they could learn by heart what they would be required to do and how they must make out the application to the registrar.

In other words, they committed this form to memory so that they could go into the registration booths before a Democratic registrar and make application before him without assistance, suggestion, or memorandum from any person whatsoever. And the Republican committee in distributing these forms of application have in great big letters at the bottom of it this injunction, "Can not be used when you go to register." Yet the gentleman from Texas would have you believe that they took these forms in the registration booths.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will permit, that form is simply a copy of the constitution of the State.

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly; a copy of the registration provisions of the constitution that they studied before they went in. Now, in the Democratic parts of the district, particularly in Albermarle County, the Democratic registrars put men and women on the voting list who never filed any application whatever, and that fact was drawn out reluctantly from these hostile witnesses. They were asked under oath if they had required written applications, and they knew that if they said "yes" they would be asked to produce them. As Judge McLemore well said in the Virginia case, if the Virginia constitution is not mandatory——

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. I can not yield. The registrar might sit in his own home and put men and women on the voting list. There was no way of finding out who these illegal voters were at the election of 1920. Although the law provided that they must post a list of registered voters, these Democratic officials neglected to do it and there was no way you could find out who these illegal voters were until after the election took place.

Do not let any man on either side of the House misunderstand this situation. We eliminated no precinct because of illegal registration, absolutely none, and without eliminating a single precinct, but simply deducting the illegal votes pro rata, on the law and the facts Captain Paul is elected by 1,352 majority. [Applause.] We did, however, as a matter of justice and of right, following the precedents of Congress, reject the vote of those precincts where we found in the conduct of the election such a gross disregard of all the safeguards put in the constitution and laws of Virginia around the right to vote, the preparation of ballots before election, the secrecy of the ballots during the election, or the counting of the ballots after election, or all of them, that it could not be said that there was a legal election in those precincts. Oh, my friends, I am not here to divulge any of the secrets of my committee, but I know that the three Democratic members of this committee know at the bottom of their hearts that there was not a legal election in many of those precincts, and that Judge Harrison was not elected a Member of this House. What we did was this: We found on the law and the facts that certain precincts ought to be thrown out; that certain illegal votes in the other precincts should be deducted pro rata, in accordance with congressional precedents, and we found that Captain Paul was elected by a majority of 1,556. We then for the moment disregarded the misconduct of the election and did not throw any precinct out, but left all of them in, and, as counsel of the contestee insisted all through the record, we confined both parties to the names mentioned in their pleadings, and Captain Paul was still elected.

Then we deducted the defective applications that were actually proved to be defective, and Captain Paul was still elected. Then we admitted a lot of defective applications that were not mentioned in the pleadings that both parties put in, where they were actually defective—and there was testimony that the applicants had actually voted at the election—and still Captain Paul was elected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. In other words, you gave the sitting Member the benefit of every doubt?

Mr. DALLINGER. Absolutely; just as I gave him the benefit of the doubt when he appeared before the committee. I have served with him in four Congresses. I know him. I did not know the other man. But, Mr. Speaker, no personal considerations should enter into this matter. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Harrison] has gotten up here before you and spent half his time in attacking a Member of this House from another district for something that he says occurred in 1921 in another part of the State. It has nothing to do with this case. The question of whether Judge Harrison is an honest man or a pleasant companion has nothing to do with the case. It is a case solely of who was elected a Representative in Congress from the seventh Virginia district at the November election in 1920.

Something has been said about technicalities. Let me call your attention to the fact, shown on page 402 of Rowell's Digest of Contested Election Cases, that in the Forty-eighth Congress, in the case of O'Farrell versus Paul, a Democratic House unseated Captain Paul's father, not because certain men had not paid their poll tax, as required by the Virginia election law, and the money had not gone into the State treasury, but because some particular official had not given them a tax receipt.

I ask you today to give this man, whom you may not have met before this day, who fought for his country in the Argonne during the World War, a fair and square deal, which the Democratic election officials of the State of Virginia have refused to give him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman going to cut off debate now?

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion ordering the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the motion was agreed to.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 170, noes 84.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 96, answered "present" 1, not voting 130, as follows:

YEAS—203.

Ackerman	Ellis	Ketcham	Patterson, N. J.
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans	Kiess	Perkins
Ansorge	Fairfield	Kirkpatrick	Porter
Anthony	Faust	Kissel	Pringey
Appleby	Fenn	Kleczka	Purnell
Arents	Fess	Kline, N. Y.	Ramseyer
Atkeson	Fish	Kline, Pa.	Ransley
Barbour	Fitzgerald	Knutson	Reece
Beck	Focht	Kopp	Reed, N. Y.
Begg	Fordney	Kraus	Reed, W. Va.
Benham	Foster	Kreider	Rhodes
Bird	Frear	Larson, Minn.	Ricketts
Bixler	Free	Lawrence	Riddick
Bland, Ind.	French	Leatherwood	Roach
Boies	Fuller	Lehlbach	Robsion
Bond	Funk	Lineberger	Rodenberg
Brennan	Gahn	Little	Rogers
Brooks, Ill.	Gensman	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Brooks, Pa.	Gernerd	Luhring	Scott, Mich.
Brown, Tenn.	Gifford	McKenzie	Scott, Tenn.
Burroughs	Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shelton
Burtness	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Burton	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sinnott
Cable	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Slemp
Chalmers	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Smith, Idaho
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	MacLafferty	Snyder
Chindblom	Hadley	Madden	Speaks
Christopherson	Hardy, Colo.	Maloney	Sproul
Clague	Haugen	Mapes	Stafford
Clarke, N. Y.	Hawley	Merritt	Stephens
Classon	Hays	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Clouse	Hersey	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Cole, Iowa	Hickey	Mills	Summers, Wash.
Colton	Hicks	Mondell	Sweet
Cooper, Ohio	Hill	Montoya	Taylor, N. J.
Cooper, Wis.	Himes	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Coughlin	Hoch	Moores, Ind.	Temple
Cramton	Huck	Morgan	Thompson
Crowther	Hukriede	Mott	Thorpe
Curry	Humphrey, Nebr.	Murphy	Tilson
Dale	Ireland	Nelson, Me.	Timberlake
Dallinger	James	Newton, Minn.	Tincher
Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Denison	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Treadway
Dickinson	Kearns	Parker, N. J.	Underhill
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. Y.	Vaile
Elliott	Kendall	Patterson, Mo.	Vestal

Voigt	Watson	Williamson	Wurzbach
Walters	Webster	Winslow	Wyant
Ward, N. Y.	White, Kans.	Wood, Ind.	Young
Wason	Williams, Ill.	Woodruff	

NAYS—96.

Abernethy	Driver	Lazaro	Rouse
Aswell	Dupré	Lea, Calif.	Rucker
Bankhead	Favrot	Linthicum	Sanders, Tex.
Barkley	Fields	Logan	Sandlin
Bell	Fisher	Lowrey	Sears
Black	Fulmer	Lyon	Sisson
Bland, Va.	Garner	McClintic	Smithwick
Blanton	Garrett, Tenn.	McDuffie	Steagall
Bowling	Garrett, Tex.	McSwain	Stedman
Box	Gilbert	Mansfield	Stevenson
Briggs	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Sumners, Tex.
Buchanan	Hayden	Montague	Swank
Bulwinkle	Hooker	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Huddleston	O'Connor	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Hudspeth	Oldfield	Turner
Campbell, Pa.	Humphreys, Miss.	Oliver	Tyson
Cantrill	Jeffers, Ala.	Parks, Ark.	Upshaw
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Pou	Vinson
Collins	Johnson, Miss.	Quin	Ward, N. C.
Connally, Tex.	Jones, Tex.	Rainey, Ala.	Weaver
Crisp	Kincheloe	Raker	Wilson
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Rankin	Wingo
Dominick	Lankford	Rayburn	Woods, Va.
Drewry	Larsen, Ga.	Riordan	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

London

NOT VOTING—130.

Almon	Dyer	Kunz	Rosedale
Anderson	Echols	Lampert	Ryan
Andrew, Mass.	Edmonds	Langley	Sabath
Bacharach	Fairchild	Layton	Sanders, N. Y.
Beedy	Freeman	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Blakeney	Frothingham	Lee, N. Y.	Shaw
Bowers	Gallivan	Luce	Shreve
Brand	Goldsborough	McArthur	Siegel
Britten	Goodykoontz	McCormick	Smith, Mich.
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	McFadden	Snell
Burdick	Gould	Magee	Steenerson
Burke	Griest	Mead	Stiness
Butler	Griffin	Michaelson	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Hammer	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Cannon	Harrison	Morin	Swing
Carew	Hawes	Mudd	Tague
Carter	Henry	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, Ark.
Chandler, Okla.	Herrick	Nelson, J. M.	Ten Eyck
Clark, Fla.	Hogan	Norton	Tillman
Cockran	Hull	O'Brien	Tinkham
Codd	Husted	Ogden	Tucker
Cole, Ohio	Hutchinson	Olpp	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Jacoway	Osborne	Volk
Copley	Jefferis, Nebr.	Overstreet	Volstead
Crago	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Wheeler
Cullen	Kahn	Perlman	White, Me.
Davis, Minn.	Keller	Petersen	Williams, Tex.
Deal	Kelly, Pa.	Radcliffe	Wise
Dempsey	Kennedy	Rainey, Ill.	Woodyard
Doughton	Kindred	Reber	Yates
Drane	King	Robertson	Zihlman
Dunbar	Kitchin	Rose	
Dunn	Knight	Rosenbloom	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts (for) with Mr. Cockran (against).

Mr. Radcliffe (for) with Mr. Tucker (against).

Mr. Dunbar (for) with Mr. Brand (against).

Mr. Langley (for) with Mr. Clark of Florida (against).

Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Park of Georgia (against).

Mr. Edmonds (for) with Mr. Lee of Georgia (against).

Mr. Olpp (for) with Mr. Kitchin (against).

Mr. Cole of Ohio (for) with Mr. Tague (against).

Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Crago (against).

Mr. Hogan (for) with Mr. Deal (against).

Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).

Miss Robertson (for) with Mr. Mead (against).

Mr. McArthur (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).

Mr. Lee of New York (for) with Mr. Carew (against).

Mr. Moore of Illinois (for) with Mr. Kindred (against).

Mr. Henry (for) with Mr. Griffin (against).

Mr. Echols (for) with Mr. Ten Eyck (against).

Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Almon (against).

Mr. Hutchinson (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).

Mr. Connally of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Rainey of Illinois (against).

Mr. Kahn (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).

Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Wise (against).

Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. O'Brien (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. King with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Morin with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Keller with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Mudd with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Jones of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Beedy with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Magee with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Lampert with Mr. Jacoway.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has that right. The Clerk will report the first half of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Thomas W. Harrison was not elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the seventh congressional district of the State of Virginia in this Congress and is not entitled to retain a seat herein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to that part of the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 100, answered "present" 2, not voting 125, as follows:

YEAS—203.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Kline, Pa.	Ricketts
Andrew, Mass.	Faust	Knutson	Riddick
Andrews, Nebr.	Fenn	Kopp	Roach
Ansorge	Fess	Kraus	Robsion
Appleby	Fish	Kreider	Rodenberg
Arentz	Fitzgerald	Larson, Minn.	Rogers
Atkeson	Focht	Lawrence	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	Fordney	Leatherwood	Scott, Mich.
Beck	Frear	Lehlbach	Scott, Tenn.
Begg	Free	Lineberger	Shelton
Benham	French	Little	Sinclair
Bird	Fuller	Longworth	Sinnott
Bixler	Funk	Lubring	Slemp
Blakeney	Gahn	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Ind.	Gensman	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snyder
Boies	Gernerd	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Speaks
Bond	Gifford	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sproul
Brennan	Glynn	McPherson	Stephens
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	MacLafferty	Strong, Kans.
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Strong, Pa.
Brown, Tenn.	Graham, Pa.	Maloney	Summers, Wash.
Burdick	Green, Iowa	Mapes	Sweet
Burroughs	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Taylor, N. J.
Burtness	Greene, Vt.	Michener	Taylor, Tenn.
Burton	Hadley	Miller	Temple
Cable	Hardy, Colo.	Mills	Thompson
Cannon	Haugen	Mondell	Thorpe
Chalmers	Hawley	Montoya	Tilson
Chandler, N. Y.	Hays	Moore, Ohio	Timberlake
Chindblom	Hersey	Moores, Ind.	Tincher
Christopherson	Hickey	Morgan	Towner
Clague	Hicks	Mott	Treadway
Clarke, N. Y.	Hill	Murphy	Vaile
Classon	Himes	Nelson, Me.	Vestal
Clouse	Hoch	Newton, Minn.	Voigt
Cole, Iowa	Huck	Newton, Mo.	Walters
Colton	Hukriede	Paige	Ward, N. Y.
Cooper, Ohio	Humphrey, Nebr.	Parker, N. J.	Wason
Coughlin	Ireland	Parker, N. Y.	Watson
Cramton	James	Patterson, Mo.	Webster
Crowther	Johnson, S. Dak.	Patterson, N. J.	White, Kans.
Curry	Johnson, Wash.	Perkins	Williams, Ill.
Dale	Kearns	Porter	Williamson
Dallinger	Kelley, Mich.	Pringey	Winslow
Darrow	Kendall	Purnell	Wood, Ind.
Denison	Ketcham	Ramseyer	Woodruff
Dickinson	Kiess	Rankley	Wurzbach
Dowell	Kirkpatrick	Reece	Wyant
Elliott	Kissel	Reed, N. Y.	Young
Ellis	Kleczka	Reed, W. Va.	Zihlman
Evans	Kline, N. Y.	Rhodes	

NAYS—100.

Abernethy	Connally, Tex.	Huddleston	Mansfield
Aswell	Crisp	Hudspeth	Martin
Bankhead	Davis, Tenn.	Humphreys, Miss.	Montague
Barkley	Dominick	Jeffers, Ala.	Moore, Va.
Bell	Drewry	Johnson, Ky.	O'Connor
Black	Driver	Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield
Bland, Va.	Dupré	Jones, Tex.	Oliver
Blanton	Favrot	Kincheloe	Parks, Ark.
Bowling	Fields	Lanham	Pou
Box	Fisher	Lankford	Quin
Briggs	Foster	Larsen, Ga.	Rainey, Ala.
Buchanan	Fulmer	Lazaro	Raker
Bulwinkle	Garner	Lea, Calif.	Rankin
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tenn.	Linthicum	Rayburn
Byrns, Tenn.	Garrett, Tex.	Logan	Riordan
Campbell, Pa.	Gilbert	Lowrey	Rouse
Cantrill	Hardy, Tex.	Lyon	Rucker
Cockran	Hawes	McClintic	Sanders, Tex.
Collier	Hayden	McDuffie	Sandlin
Collins	Hooker	McSwain	Sears

Sisson	Stevenson	Turner	Weaver
Smithwick	Sumners, Tex.	Tyson	Wilson
Stafford	Swank	Upshaw	Wingo
Steagall	Taylor, Colo.	Vinson	Woods, Va.
Stedman	Thomas	Ward, N. C.	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

London	Underhill

NOT VOTING—125.

Almon	Edmonds	Layton	Ryan
Anderson	Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Anthony	Freeman	Lee, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Frothingham	Luce	Schall
Beedy	Gallivan	McArthur	Shaw
Bowers	Goldsborough	McCormick	Shreve
Brand	Gorman	McFadden	Siegel
Britten	Gould	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Browne, Wis.	Griest	Magee	Snell
Burke	Griffin	Mead	Steenerson
Butler	Hammer	Michaelson	Stiness
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison	Moore, Ill.	Stoll
Carew	Henry	Morin	Sullivan
Carter	Herrick	Mudd	Swing
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Nelson, A. P.	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Hull	Nelson, J. M.	Taylor, Ark.
Codd	Husted	Norton	Ten Eyck
Cole, Ohio	Hutchinson	O'Brien	Tillman
Connolly, Pa.	Jacoway	Ogden	Tinkham
Cooper, Wis.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Olpp	Tucker
Copley	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Vare
Crago	Kahn	Overstreet	Volk
Cullen	Keller	Park, Ga.	Volstead
Davis, Minn.	Kelly, Pa.	Perlman	Wheeler
Deal	Kennedy	Petersen	White, Me.
Dempsey	Kindred	Radcliffe	Williams, Tex.
Doughton	King	Rainey, Ill.	Wise
Drane	Kitchin	Reber	Woodyard
Dunbar	Knight	Robertson	Yates
Dunn	Kunz	Rose	
Dyer	Lampert	Rosenbloom	
Echols	Langley	Rossdale	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. Underhill (for) with Mr. Tillman (against).

Mr. Radcliffe (for) with Mr. Tucker (against).

Mr. Dunbar (for) with Mr. Brand (against).

Mr. Langley (for) with Mr. Clark of Florida (against).

Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Park of Georgia (against).

Mr. Edmonds (for) with Mr. Lee of Georgia (against).

Mr. Olpp (for) with Mr. Kitchin (against).

Mr. Cole of Ohio (for) with Mr. Tague (against).

Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Crago (against).

Mr. Hogan (for) with Mr. Deal (against).

Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).

Miss Robertson (for) with Mr. Mead (against).

Mr. McArthur (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).

Mr. Lee of New York (for) with Mr. Carew (against).

Mr. Moore of Illinois (for) with Mr. Kindred (against).

Mr. Henry (for) with Mr. Griffin (against).

Mr. Echols (for) with Mr. Ten Eyck (against).

Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Almon (against).

Mr. Hutchinson (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Rainey of Illinois (against).

Mr. Kahn (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).

Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Wise (against).

Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. O'Brien (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Magee with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Williams of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the second clause of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That John Paul was duly elected a Member of the House of Representatives from the seventh congressional district of the State of Virginia in this Congress and is entitled to a seat herein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 201, nays 99, answered "present" 2, not voting 128, as follows:

YEAS—201.

Ackerman	Bird	Burtness	Classon
Andrew, Mass.	Bixler	Burton	Clouse
Andrews, Nebr.	Boies	Cable	Cole, Iowa
Ansorge	Bond	Cannon	Colton
Appleby	Brennan	Chalmers	Cooper, Ohio
Arents	Brooks, Ill.	Chandler, N. Y.	Copley
Atkeson	Brooks, Pa.	Chindblom	Coughlin
Barbour	Brown, Tenn.	Christopherson	Cramton
Begg	Burdick	Clague	Crowther
Benham	Burroughs	Clarke, N. Y.	Curry
Dale	Himes	Mapes	Sinnott
Dallinger	Hoch	Merritt	Slemp
Darrow	Huck	Michener	Smith, Idaho
Denison	Hukriede	Miller	Snyder
Dickinson	Humphrey, Nebr.	Mondell	Speaks
Dowell	Ireland	Montoya	Sproul
Elliott	James	Moore, Ohio	Stephens
Ellis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moores, Ind.	Strong, Kans.
Evans	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan	Strong, Pa.
Fairfield	Kearns	Mott	Summers, Wash.
Faust	Kelley, Mich.	Mudd	Sweet
Fenn	Kelly, Pa.	Murphy	Taylor, N. J.
Fess	Kendall	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Tenn.
Fish	Ketcham	Newton, Minn.	Temple
Fitzgerald	Kiess	Newton, Mo.	Thompson
Focht	Kirkpatrick	Paige	Thorpe
Fordney	Kissel	Parker, N. J.	Tilson
Free	Kleczka	Parker, N. Y.	Timberlake
French	Kline, N. Y.	Patterson, Mo.	Tincher
Fuller	Kline, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Towner
Funk	Knutson	Perkins	Treadway
Gahn	Kopp	Porter	Vaile
Gensman	Kraus	Pringey	Vestal
Gernerd	Kreider	Purnell	Voigt
Gifford	Larson, Minn.	Ramseyer	Walters
Glynn	Lawrence	Ransley	Ward, N. Y.
Goodykoontz	Leatherwood	Reece	Wason
Graham, Ill.	Lehlbach	Reed, N. Y.	Watson
Graham, Pa.	Lineberger	Reed, W. Va.	Webster
Green, Iowa	Little	Rhodes	White, Kans.
Greene, Mass.	Longworth	Ricketts	Williams, Ill.
Greene, Vt.	Luhring	Riddick	Williamson
Hadley	McKenzie	Roach	Winslow
Hardy, Colo.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Robsion	Woodruff
Haugen	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Rodenberg	Wurzbach
Hawley	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rogers	Wyant
Hays	McPherson	Sanders, Ind.	Young
Hersey	MacGregor	Scott, Mich.	Zihlman
Hickey	MacLafferty	Scott, Tenn.	
Hicks	Madden	Shelton	
Hill	Maloney	Sinclair	

NAYS—99.

Abernethy	Driver	Larsen, Ga.	Rucker
Aswell	Dupré	Lazaro	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Favrot	Lea, Calif.	Sandlin
Barkley	Fields	Linthicum	Sears
Bell	Fisher	Logan	Sisson
Black	Foster	Lowrey	Smithwick
Bland, Va.	Fulmer	Lyon	Stafford
Blanton	Garner	McClintic	Steagall
Bowling	Garrett, Tenn.	McDuffie	Stedman
Box	Garrett, Tex.	McSwain	Stevenson
Briggs	Gilbert	Mansfield	Sumners, Tex.
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Montague	Swank
Bulwinkle	Hawes	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Colo.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	O'Connor	Thomas
Byrns, Tenn.	Hooker	Oldfield	Turner
Campbell, Pa.	Huddleston	Oliver	Tyson
Cantrill	Hudspeth	Parks, Ark.	Upshaw
Cockran	Humphreys, Miss.	Pou	Vinson
Collier	Jeffers, Ala.	Quin	Ward, N. C.
Collins	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, Ala.	Weaver
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	Raker	Wilson
Crisp	Jones, Tex.	Rankin	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Rayburn	Woods, Va.
Dominick	Lanham	Riordan	Wright
Drewry	Lankford	Rouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Bland, Ind.	London

NOT VOTING—128.

Almon	Echols	Langley	Rossdale
Anderson	Edmonds	Layton	Ryan
Anthony	Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Bacharach	Frear	Lee, N. Y.	Sanders, N. Y.
Beck	Freeman	Luce	Schall
Beedy	Frothingham	McArthur	Shaw
Blakeney	Gallivan	McCormick	Shreve
Bowers	Goldsborough	McFadden	Siegel
Brand	Gorman	Magee	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Gould	Martin	Snell
Browne, Wis.	Griest	Mead	Steenerson
Burke	Griffin	Michaelson	Stiness
Butler	Hammer	Mills	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Harrison	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Carew	Henry	Morin	Swing
Carter	Herrick	Nelson, A. P.	Tague
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Nelson, J. M.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Hull	Norton	Ten Eyck
Codd	Husted	O'Brien	Tillman
Cole, Ohio	Hutchinson	Ogden	Tinkham
Connolly, Pa.	Jacoway	Olpp	Tucker
Cooper, Wis.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Osborne	Underhill
Crago	Jones, Pa.	Overstreet	Vare
Cullen	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Volk
Davis, Minn.	Keller	Perlman	Volstead
Deal	Kennedy	Petersen	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kindred	Radcliffe	White, Me.
Doughton	King	Rainey, Ill.	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Kitchin	Reber	Wise
Dunbar	Knight	Robertson	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kunz	Rose	Woodyard
Dyer	Lampert	Rosenbloom	Yates

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. Bland of Indiana (for) with Mr. Martin (against).

Mr. Underhill (for) with Mr. Tillman (against).

Mr. Radcliffe (for) with Mr. Tucker (against).

Mr. Dunbar (for) with Mr. Brand (against).

Mr. Langley (for) with Mr. Clark of Florida (against).

Mr. Bacharach (for) with Mr. Park of Georgia (against).
Mr. Edmonds (for) with Mr. Lee of Georgia (against).
Mr. Olpp (for) with Mr. Kitchin (against).
Mr. Cole of Ohio (for) with Mr. Tague (against).
Mr. Griest (for) with Mr. Crago (against).
Mr. Hogan (for) with Mr. Deal (against).
Mr. Vare (for) with Mr. Sullivan (against).
Miss Robertson (for) with Mr. Mead (against).
Mr. McArthur (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).
Mr. Lee of New York (for) with Mr. Carew (against).
Mr. Moore of Illinois (for) with Mr. Kindred (against).
Mr. Henry (for) with Mr. Griffin (against).
Mr. Echols (for) with Mr. Ten Eyck (against).
Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma (for) with Mr. Almon (against).
Mr. Hutchinson (for) with Mr. Gallivan (against).
Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Rainey of Illinois (against).
Mr. Kahn (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).
Mr. Michaelson (for) with Mr. Wise (against).
Mr. Dyer (for) with Mr. O'Brien (against).
Until further notice.
Mr. McFadden with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I voted aye. I find I am paired with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MARTIN]; I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. DALLINGER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. Mr. PAUL will step forward and take the oath of office.

Mr. PAUL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the seventy-third annual report of the board of directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1922.*

PERMANENT ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL ROAD CONGRESSES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress and for its determination whether it will authorize that the United States be officially represented in the Permanent Association of the International Road Congresses and grant permission for the Secretary of Agriculture to advance the necessary annual sum for membership fee therein out of the administrative fund provided by section 21 of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921, a report from the Secretary of State, with an accompanying letter from the Secretary of Agriculture on the subject.

I believe it is altogether desirable for the United States to have representation in this association, and I strongly recommend the granting by Congress of the authority requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 15, 1922.*

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4032. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east of the third principal meridian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4031. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4033. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east of the third principal meridian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4069. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Colorado River near Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHAW, for five days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 16, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

829. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting schedules of claims amounting to $1,267,449.35 allowed by the various divisions of the General Accounting Office as covered by certificates of settlement (H. Doc. No. 501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

830. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to $612,033.95, which have been submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury and require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 502); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

831. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for the eradication of the pink bollworm, $75,000 (H. Doc. No. 503); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

832. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a list of judgments rendered against the Government by the district courts of the United States, as submitted by the Attorney General through the Secretary of the Treasury, which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 504); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

833. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting request for the amendment to Public Resolution No. 44, approved April 1, 1922, for the purchase of real estate to establish suitable burial places in Europe for American military dead, so that the expenditures may, when title to such real estate can not be secured, be made instead for the acquisition of the exclusive rights of burial in perpetuity in such lands (H. Doc. No. 505); to the Committees on Appropriations and Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TOWNER: Committee on Insular Affairs. S. 3617. An act to fix the salaries of the auditor and deputy auditor of the Philippine Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WINSLOW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended; without amendment (Rept. No.

1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McKENZIE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 4037. An act to amend the grade percentages of enlisted men as prescribed in section 4b of the national defense act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13429) to amend section 2238 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 13430) to amend section 370 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 13431) to provide for the erection of a public building at Carbondale, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13432) to provide for the erection of a public building at West Frankfort, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13433) to provide for insurance against unreasonably low prices for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 13434) to amend section 2 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved July 31, 1894; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A resolution (H. Res. 470) directing that the Committee on Rules be authorized and directed to make full inquiry into the matter of the permanent installation in the House wing of the Capitol Building and in the Hall of the House of Representatives of the apparatus or device therein designated as a public address or voice amplifying system; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENHAM: A bill (H. R. 13435) granting a pension to Mary A. Shook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRD: A bill (H. R. 13436) granting a pension to Luella M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13437) granting a pension to Margaret E. Dotson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13438) granting a pension to Martin L. Garver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 13439) granting a pension to Salina A. Julius; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAUST: A bill (H. R. 13440) granting a pension to Mary E. Touhy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13441) granting a pension to Mary M. Walden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 13442) granting an increase of pension to Eli J. Hayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13443) granting a pension to Nellie Louise Atkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REBER (by request): A bill (H. R. 13444) granting a pension to Cora I. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 13445) granting a pension to Anna D. Arrowsmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 13446) granting an increase of pension to Lucius P. Burress; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 13447) granting a pension to Rosetta Cottrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6611. By Mr. COLE of Iowa: Petition signed by rural carriers out of Marshalltown, State Center, Melbourne, Gilman, Albion, Haverhill, Green Mountain, Liscomb, Clemons, St. Anthony, Laurel, Rhodes, and Le Grande, all in Marshall County, Iowa, asking for carrier's equipment allowance at rate of $24 per mile per year, and an amendment to present salary scale, making it $1,800 a year for a 24-mile route and $75 per mile per year for overmileage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6612. Also, petition of Tama (Iowa) County Farm Bureau, indorsing the passage of the French-Capper "truth in fabrics" bill, known as H. R. 64 and S. 799; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6613. Also, petition of Frank Siaboch, jr., and 21 others, residents of Tama, Iowa, to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms, internal revenue bill, section 900, paragraph 7; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6614. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of sundry citizens of La Salle County, Ill., protesting against the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6615. Also, petition of Litchfield (Ill.) Merchants' Protective Association, favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6616. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the American Society, a Federation for National Unity (Inc.), New York City, N. Y., favoring an investigation of all secret societies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6617. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Mr. A. J. Harvey and sundry other citizens of Cadillac, Mich., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small arms, ammunition, and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we rejoice to call Thee by that name. We recognize a nearness of approach and a consciousness that Thou art with us and ready to help us in every emergency. We thank Thee that Thou hast for us help in our struggles, solution for our problems, forgiveness for our folly and our sin, and art always ready to open before us paths of duty along which Thou wouldst have us walk. Hear and help us this day. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, December 14, 1922, when, on request of Mr. Curtis and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Ashurst	Gooding	McLean	Shortridge
Borah	Hale	McNary	Simmons
Brandegee	Harreld	Moses	Smith
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	New	Spencer
Caraway	Heflin	Nicholson	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Sutherland
Couzens	Johnson	Overman	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Trammell
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Keyes	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Ladd	Pomerene	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Watson
George	McKellar	Robinson	Williams
Glass	McKinley	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is absent on account of illness in his family.

I was requested to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. CAMERON] is necessarily detained on official business.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

POSITIONS IN UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement as of December 1, 1922, indicating the total number of positions at the rate of $2,000 or more per annum, the rate of salary attached to each position, and the number of positions at each rate in the central office, also the corresponding information as of November 1, 1922, for the district and subdistrict offices, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR-ELECT STEPHENS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Mississippi, certifying to the election of HUBERT D. STEPHENS as a Senator from the State of Mississippi

for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which was ordered to be filed and to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting;
to the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, HUBERT D. STEPHENS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from the said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness his excellency, our governor, Lee M. Russell, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson, Miss., this the 2d day of January, A. D. 1923.

[SEAL.] LEE M. RUSSELL.

By the governor:

JOSEPH W. POWER, *Secretary of State.*

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two letters, one from Conrad W. Crooker, as attorney for John A. Nicholls, and the other from Conrad W. Crooker, as chairman of the Liberal Republican League of Massachusetts, relative to the title of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to his seat for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which will without objection be placed on the files of the Senate to accompany the credentials of the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHREVE, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. OLIVER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 408) authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SPENCER, and Mr. OVERMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS.

Mr. CURTIS presented a resolution adopted by the Federated Shop Crafts, of Parsons, Kans., favoring the election of President and Vice President of the United States by direct vote of the people, abolition of the Electoral College, and shortening of the time elapsing between election and inauguration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the directors of the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Upton, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LADD presented a resolution of the Federated Shop Crafts of Dickinson, N. Dak., favoring prompt action by the Federal Government to remedy faulty condition of railroad operating equipment, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of L. C. Merrick and 14 others, of Sawyer; Joe F. Blasy and 4 others, of Lefor; Otto Petterson and 7 others, of St. John; William Polis and 4 others, of Pekin; Mrs. A. Hermanson and 9 others, of Hamar; Will Darling and 8 others, of Thorne; Henry Paterandi and 4 others, of Dunseith; C. T. Nelson and 8 others, of Rutland; Charles Quittschrieber and 5 others, of Arthur; Mrs. S. A. Sundene and 2 others, of Adams; all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

POSSESSION, SALE, AND USE OF PISTOLS AND REVOLVERS.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 4012) to control the possession, sale, and use of pistols and revolvers in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 950) thereon.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) for the relief of sufferers from fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg., and, as it is an emergency matter, I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Let the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution was read, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "relieve," to insert the word "temporarily"; in line 7, after the word "otherwise," to strike out the words "to relieve the sufferers"; in line 9, after the word "establishment," to strike out the words "or procured by him in open market or otherwise"; in line 10, before the word "needy," to insert the word "such"; and on page 2, line 2, after the word "necessary," to strike out the words "and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction and in the discretion of the Secretary of War in carrying out the provisions of this resolution"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That in order to relieve temporarily the suffering and the conditions resulting from the recent fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg., the Secretary of War is authorized and directed, in cooperation with the authorities of the State of Oregon and of the city of Astoria, or otherwise, to issue subsistence and supplies belonging to the Military Establishment to persons in Astoria who are in such needy circumstances and to take such temporary sanitary measures as he may deem necessary.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, in conjunction with the joint resolution which has just been passed I desire to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram from the mayor and the citizens' executive committee of the city of Astoria, Oreg., and also a telegram from the president of the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASTORIA, OREG., *December 13, 1922.*

Senator C. L. MCNARY,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

On Friday morning last the entire business part of the city was totally destroyed by the most devastating fire in the history of the Pacific coast. Streets, water system, sewer system, and fire system in the entire devastated district are totally destroyed. Over 5,000 citizens have suffered loss of their entire property and are without employment or means of subsistence. Business is paralyzed and the city wholly without adequate means either to furnish employment or sustain its citizens who have so suffered. Contributions have been secured from coast cities and from individuals, but this can not be employed to rehabilitate the devastated district. In order to rebuild it will be necessary to fill by dredging the entire part of the city destroyed. Practically all of the streets and sewers destroyed were constructed on and under viaducts and cost assessed against the property. Such assessments have not been paid, which, together with the enormous loss sustained, makes it impossible to reconstruct. The situation is serious and appalling. Unless the city receives immediate Government aid it seems that it will cease to function and bankruptcy of its people, heretofore solvent, will result. The disaster, not counting loss of life, equals that caused by the tidal wave which devastated Galveston and the San Francisco holocaust of 1906. We deem the situation so critical that we feel it is necessary to appeal to the Congress of the United States for immediate aid, such as was granted Galveston and San Francisco. It is believed that it will require at least $3,000,000 to afford anyway near the adequate relief.

JAMES BREMNER,
Mayor of Astoria Citizens' Executive Committee,
By COL. W. S. GILBERT,
Astoria Chamber of Commerce,
By L. D. DRAKE.

PORTLAND, OREG., *December 14, 1922.*

Hon. C. L. MCNARY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our board of directors and leading business men most earnestly appeal to our Oregon delegation for the maximum support possible from Congress for Astoria in recovering from devastation that has effaced practically entire business district of city. Per capita loss on population or wealth basis is apparently greater than in other disasters that have received Federal aid of substantial amounts. Business interests

of city with high percentage of population seem to face bankruptcy and perhaps municipal ruin. Bonding power for municipal improvements had reached very maximum and much of these are effaced with debts remaining and a staggering reconstruction immediately compelled. Destitution of people losing all is being covered in way of food, clothing, and shelter through Portland contributions and from near-by sources, but such aid does not extend to vital requirements of city's future. We urge that all members of our delegation give most serious study to ways and means of securing congressional action in aid of Astoria. Generous contributions being made from all parts of Northwest and more distant points, but all this not sufficient for great future effort to save city.

O. W. MIELKE,
President Portland Chamber of Commerce.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4189) to pension soldiers who were in the military service during Indian wars and disturbances, and the widows, minors, and helpless children of such soldiers; to increase the pensions of Indian war survivors and widows; and to amend section 2 of the act of March 4, 1917; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4190) for the relief of Sam N. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4191) for the relief of Harry E. Fiske; and

A bill (S. 4192) to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4193) to repeal sections 300 to 316, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce,' approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 257) authorizing a disarmament conference with governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business has closed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12817.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Colorado Farmers' Congress protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill. I send the telegram to the Secretary's desk and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Western Union telegram.]

FORT COLLINS, COLO., *December 15, 1922.*

Senator SAMUEL D. NICHOLSON,
Washington, D. C.:

Colorado Farmers' Congress in thirteenth annual session adopted following resolution, which is submitted to you for earnest consideration:

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill known as the ship subsidy bill: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we do not believe this bill will in any way benefit agriculture but that it will only be a further drain upon our national finances.

"*Resolved*, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to oppose this legislation and that telegrams be sent to our Senators advising of our action."

I. L. GOTTHELF,
President Colorado Farmers' Congress.

RELIEF OF AGRICULTURAL CONDITIONS.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, only a few days ago the President of the United States came before Congress and delivered what might be called his annual message as to the condition of national affairs. In that message he took occasion to stress the deplorable condition of agriculture throughout the country and recommended remedial legislation that would aid the farmer in solving his present problems and provide for him an adequate credit system to enable him to take care of his affairs in the future.

Subsequently to the President's address the Committee on Agriculture, being keenly alive to the terrible conditions which exist, have been holding hearings on different bills looking toward carrying out the purposes of Congress in that respect.

There have come before our committee in the last week representatives of the grain growers and cattle raisers of the West and of the woolen and wheat and cotton producers of the South and West. Those representatives were men of affairs; they were men who had been in the midst of the terrible calamity which overtook the agricultural and stock-raising interests of the country when, without warning, the price of farm products and of the products of the cattle raisers had gone to a point which meant bankruptcy. There was no question of the cost of production; there was simply an absolute slaughter of the values involved in farm production and in cattle raising.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from South Carolina ought also to include in the class of men who appeared before our committee representatives of several hundred so-called country banks, in addition to the other classes mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for that suggestion. I wish to state that there did appear before us also representatives of innumerable country banks who indicated that, as a necessary result, the collapse of the security which they themselves had been handling in the past had practically bankrupted them, leaving those banks absolutely without means of further financing the farmers of the country.

I am not going to take this occasion to give my opinion as to what has brought about this condition of affairs. The curse causeless does not count. Some of us know the cause. We were informed that the collapse of prices was a natural and necessary result of the war; that deflation and the restriction of credits and the denial of any financial accommodation to those who stood in the midst of ruin and bankruptcy was essential in order that we might get back to "normalcy" and to prewar conditions as they obtained in a normal way; and that prices were too high and that, therefore, they had to be brought down.

Mr. President, for a while there were some people, including even farmers, who believed that to be true. We would have believed it more readily had we had evidences that other business in this country, not so fundamental and not so necessary as agriculture and stock raising, had suffered in proportion. There is not a Senator on this floor who does not know that unless agriculture is relieved there is going to be produced in this country a condition that will be infinitely worse than that which now obtains. Hands are leaving the southern farms by the thousands and seeking industrial employment; they are leaving the wheat fields of the West. One of the witnesses who came before our committee exhibited a newspaper published in his county, which heretofore has been one of the most prosperous and productive counties in his State, in which there were six pages of nonpariel type advertising farms for sale for taxes. That showing can be duplicated in practically every county in the United States. Producers of grain of all sorts, of corn, cattle, cotton, and wool, are distressed to the point of bankruptcy, even to the extent of having taken away from them the very basis of their industry, the land itself.

In view of that condition being established, I wish to read to the Senate an item published in the Washington Post of this morning, showing conclusively that this condition was not universal and that the necessity for these measures and the consequent lowering of prices which the farmer received was not general; indeed, there was no corresponding reduction in the prices of commodities which others had to sell. I am going to read the item as it appears in the Post:

BOSTON, December 15 (by the Associated Press).—Another batch of increased capitalizations, with consequent stock dividends, brought further Christmas distributions representing many millions of dollars to stockholders in New England corporations to-day. To the large sums already diverted from surplus and other companies there were added several actions of recapitalization and disbursement that ran into many hundreds per cent.

The Browne & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., of Providence, making machine tools, filed with the secretary of State notice that its capital stock had been increased from $100,000 to $16,000,000. A stock dividend of 16,000 per cent was voted to dispose of the new stock.

WILL DISTRIBUTE 1,500 PER CENT.

Stockholders of the Wanskuck Co., manufacturers of worsted—

In other words, manufacturing the clothing that people wear—

voted at Providence to-day to increase the capital stock from $500,000 to $8,000,000. They voted also to distribute among themselves the new stock as a 1,500 per cent stock dividend.

The York Manufacturing Co., of Saco, Me., making cotton cloths, by action of the directors, proposed to the stockholders a doubling of the $1,800,000 capitalization with a 100 per cent stock dividend.

The Oakdale (R. I.) Worsted Co., after increasing its stock from $60,000 to $540,000, distributed the difference in the form of an 800 per cent stock dividend.

The Merrimac Woolen Co. increased its capital stock from $750,000 to $1,000,000 and provided for a stock dividend from capital and surplus, the exact amount of which was not announced.

The New Bedford Cotton Mills Corporation declared a stock dividend of 200 per cent, increasing its capital from $350,000 to $1,050,000 to make it possible.

The article continues further along the same line, but I have read sufficient.

In the face of the universal suffering of the agricultural interests of this country and of the country banks comes this startling statement that one company made 16,000 per cent. I do not know during what number of years that profit was accumulated, but that announcement means that they lived and moved and had their being and created a surplus which, under the decision of the court, in order to avoid taxation, enabled them to declare a stock dividend of 16,000 per cent. Then I presume that the poor, distressed, and helpless woolen manufacturers by whom we were invoked here to pass an emergency tariff in order to protect the woolgrower from the inroads of foreign competition could only make 1,500 per cent. He could not get 16,000 per cent; he could only declare a stock dividend of 1,500 per cent.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a minute?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Here is one woolen firm up in Massachusetts that declared a 3,333 per cent dividend the other day—another one of those poor industries.

Mr. SMITH. I will just read this item as it is handed to me. I do not know from what paper it is taken.

Mr. CARAWAY. The New York Times.

Mr. SMITH. It reads:

BOSTON, December 14.—Stock-dividend declarations by textile mills continued to-day. A new high-water mark in these increases of capitalization from which the distribution is made was set by the Davis & Brown Woolen Co., of Uxbridge, a relatively small concern, which expanded its capital stock from $15,000 to $500,000, to make possible a dividend of 3,333 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Are these some of the companies that are engaged in the production of woolens, on which last summer a very high and excessive tariff was placed in order to protect them from failure?

Mr. SMITH. Why, certainly. These are the suffering individuals whom we have to pension. Do you suppose a man is going to sit down and be satisfied with a miserable 3,333 per cent dividend when another one is making 16,000 per cent? You have no right to have any such unequal situation in this country.

Mr. President, how long do you suppose the American people are going to tolerate a condition sanctioned by our Government such as is revealed by this manifestation here to-day? They come here and ask for protection, when even under the Underwood bill this stupendous amount must have been accumulated; because, while God knows they got enough, it is not reasonable to suppose they have made 3,333 per cent in anticipation of the operation of the present tariff law. This was made under the operation of the Underwood bill; but if, under the so-called slight protection of the Underwood bill, they made this much, what in the name of heaven can they make under the present wall around this country?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The highest woolen schedule that has ever been enacted into law.

Mr. SMITH. The highest that has ever been known since Schedule K became a stench in the nostrils of the American people.

The light will filter in after a bit. I said a moment ago that curse causeless did not come; and the American people will know that the curse that is on them is the control of our commercial and banking interests for the specially favored few. How in the name of heaven was it possible for a tool-manufacturing concern to make 16,000 per cent if the conditions under which they worked were fair and normal and open to competition? How could a woolen manufacturer make 3,333 per cent, how could he accumulate it if the conditions under which he worked and distributed his wares were open to competition, and it was the natural result of the law of supply and demand? This monstrous condition has arisen from the machinations of men who knew exactly what they were doing.

The existence of twenty-five billions of American bonds, bearing the stupendous interest of 4½ per cent, constituted a temptation too great for them to withstand of bringing about a condition where these bonds would have to be sacrificed and go into the hands of those who for generations to come could on every million dollars invested clip interest to the amount of $40,000 from the taxpayers of this country; and who pays these taxes? The very distressed crowd that is appearing before our committees, because under the decisions of the courts the organizations and the corporations can escape taxation by taking refuge behind stock dividends, and robbing the Government, as the collector of internal revenue has intimated, of $1,400,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina what class of people is opposing this relief that the farmers are asking?

Mr. SMITH. So far as we have had any intimation of opposition—and it has come to me not officially, because they have not appeared before our committee in rebuttal of the plea of the agriculturists—it is made up of the very class of men who are declaring these dividends.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I heard it conceded in the Banking and Currency Committee this morning by a witness of great intelligence, the owner, as I was told, of some forty-odd agricultural publications, that the farmers, even at this time, while other classes of people in this country are making such enormous profits, are not netting enough to pay the actual cost of production. Is not that conceded?

Mr. SMITH. Why, Mr. President, that is known to every man, not only to the man who is engaged in agriculture but to the local country banker who is financing him and to the merchants who are selling him his supplies. They all know that he is not even now making the cost of production, while he has a load of debt, incurred by the crime of deflation during 1920 and 1921, that he will not wipe out in a natural lifetime. I say to the Senator from North Carolina, a practical farmer as he is, that the debts that he and I were forced to incur by virtue of that will wipe out any reasonable profit that we may make for the next five or six years if we make a normal crop and get a normal price for it.

Mr. SIMMONS. A longer time than that.

Mr. SMITH. That is the condition that confronts us. If we were to make average crops now, and were to get a reasonable profit, it would take five or six years, or maybe longer, to accumulate profits enough to wipe out the indebtedness of 1920 and 1921; and yet here in 1922 the favored children of finance and government come out and declare a dividend of from 3,000 per cent to 16,000 per cent, and when we make an effort to get a financial system that will in some degree adapt itself to the peculiar conditions of agriculture we are met with the cry, "Class legislation!"

Mr. President, it amazes me to hear men of intelligence, to hear those, some of whom are the dispensers and purveyors of our news, declaring that any legislation in favor of the farmer is class legislation. Agriculture is not a class. It is fundamental. It is basic. With whom does the farmer enter into competition? When we speak of class, the ordinary acceptation of that is one class in a business pitted against another class in like business. Agriculture is fundamental. It is basic. It is as essential as fuel and water to an engine. The necessity for getting the fuel and the necessity for getting the water are prerequisites to the running of the engine. The necessity for agriculture is a prerequisite to every business, the Government included; and yet when we come and make the showing that agriculture has been so discriminated against that it is impossible for those engaged in it to live except under the conditions of peons and slaves, we are met with the sneer that "You are attempting class legislation," when 55 per cent of all the current wealth of this Nation, over twelve billions, is produced annually by agriculture, and according to statistics something like 35 to 40 per cent of the deposits in our banks are deposited there from the proceeds of agriculture; and yet the amount that the farmer gets to carry on his business as compared with other businesses is less than 2 per cent.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator, then, that in order to revive business in the general sense in which that term is used, the way to do it is first to revive agriculture?

Mr. SMITH. It is absolutely essential.

Mr. President, I am happy on account of one condition. Thank God, we are not dealing to-day with the same class of agriculturists that the world dealt with in the generations that have gone. The facilities for education, the distribution of knowledge in the form of current events in the newspapers, the telephone, the telegraph, and easy transportation, have made the man in "the sticks" as cosmopolitan as the man that walks your streets. He knows the laws and rules that govern economics, and he is going to have his proportionate share of the wealth that he produces. If we are wise we will begin now, in this Congress, to deal with him in precisely the same manner that we deal with what we are pleased to call commerce. We have established a banking system that is at the beck and call of what we call commerce—liquid assets; 30, 60, and 90 day paper—to meet all the requirements, and we have provided in the law that is on the statute books now that in case there should be a dearth of circulating medium based upon a certain gold reserve and commodity value there might be issued clearing-house certificates, known as Federal reserve notes, against the deposited wealth of this country.

We hailed it with delight, because for the first time in the history of this country commodities were recognized by the Government as the basis of the issuance of a temporary form of quickly diffusible currency. From May, 1920, up until a few months ago, that source of relief to the people was practically arbitrarily shut. Where it was not arbitrarily shut, the fear of a repetition of what had occurred kept men from embarking in the business once again under conditions which ruined them. They are afraid to attempt any extensive line for the fear that the like calamity might befall them.

Now we have come to the point where the country says, "You must show us. You promised us we could not have a panic." You can name it what you please, but in what condition is agriculture to-day? If it were not for such revelations as this I might suppose we were all practically in the same condition, but when you know the condition in which the producers of this country are, and then boldly have the declaration of a 16,000 per cent dividend the contrast is amazing.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. OWEN. What the Senator from South Carolina is describing as a panic has all the effect of a panic, because it is an industrial depression of the most serious character. When the reserve act was presented to the Senate as a bill I pointed out that while it would prevent financial panic in the ordinary sense, it would not prevent an industrial depression. What has taken place is an industrial depression, infinitely emphasized by the action of the Federal Reserve Board in directing, first, the contraction of credits by the large New York banks on their call loans on stocks and bonds, following that up by having the Federal reserve banks withdraw the lines of credit which they had extended to the banks of the country and using their influence with the banks of the country to restrict credits. When they did, it had the effect of bringing the market prices down below the cost of production, and brought on a ruinous condition which has all the effect of a panic, although it might not be described as an actual financial panic.

Mr. SMITH. When one contemplates the result of this condition, he may not fully know the minutiæ or the means instituted to bring it about, but he does know that there seemed to be, and, according to the Comptroller of the Currency, there was, a greater volume of redemption funds than ever before, a greater volume of gold in this country than we had ever had. Some estimate that our 12 regional banks hold up to almost one-half of the gold available in the world for monetary purposes. I do not know just what percentage of the world's available gold supply we do hold, but I know that it is far and away in excess of any legal requirements for reserve purposes. I do know that there was the possibility of issuing enough currency to relieve any situation, because we went through the acid test during the war, when there was a call upon us for billions of dollars to carry on that war. But let the condition be what it may, agriculture is dying, while manufacturers are declaring from 3,000 to 16,000 per cent dividends.

I have no quarrel with the manufacturing interests of the country. I come to the place where it is made possible to enter my protest against any system which would allow the universal death, ruin, and stagnation of agriculture and stock raising, while such incalculable profits as these are made. Congress should see to it that a financial system is inaugurated or the present one so amended, that agriculture will have the same opportunity to finance itself as other business has to finance itself.

I understand that one of our cooperative concerns, just started with bright hopes, has been confronted with the fact that the condition upon which it got money from the War Finance Corporation was that under the contract they must sell one-eighth of their yearly production each month. What man sitting before me could imagine a more suicidal condition than that, a cooperative company, dependent upon the product it holds as the basis of its loan, making a contract that it will dispose of one-eighth of its holdings each month? All a man who desires to get it has to do, if he has control of the market, is to fix the price at the time, because one-eighth has to come on the market.

In passing the War Finance Corporation act we provided that agricultural products might have a rediscount for 12 months through their cooperative market, and if by some mistake or other they did sign a contract which would call upon them to dispose of one-eighth of their holdings each month, we of the Senate ought to rise up and give them relief now by saying that in spite of the contract, what they hold should not be disposed of until the price shows a reasonable profit upon the cost of production.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in connection with the statement the Senator makes about the requirement of the sale of one-eighth of the cotton each month, I assert that they have nullified the law by their order, and are providing that the loan shall be for only 30 days for a part of the crop. Is not that true?

Mr. SMITH. That is the effect of it. I have called attention to this condition for the reason that, even with the hope we had in rehabilitating the War Finance Corporation, and writing the act as carefully as some of us thought it could be written under the circumstances, amending it as we thought necessary to relieve the situation, we are met with an arbitrary demand that the articles shall be put upon the market, contract or no contract, which is just as bad on the producers as the old system.

What we anticipated, and what the farmers of this country have a right to demand, is that when a farmer borrows on his product and pays the interest, and the commodity he puts up is worth the loan at the expiration of the loan, he should have an opportunity to rediscount it until such time as he gets a profit.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, can the Senator recall any provision in the War Finance Corporation act, as revised and enlarged, which confers power upon the board controlling that system to fix the time when the farmer shall sell his product?

Mr. SMITH. I do not recall any such provision. Of course, the whole idea was that as we had limited it, against the protest of some Senators, to banks, trust companies, and farm organizations, eliminating the individual, we had made it possible, if conditions did not warrant the settling of the account at that time, for a renewal of the loan and an extension of the time, if the collateral was all right and the interest paid, despite any contract which you might make or I might make that we would dispose of one-eighth of our holdings each month.

Under the terms of the bill itself, relief could be given if there were a waiver of even that contract by mutual agreement, because the object was to give relief, and if these cooperating societies say, "We need an extension of the time to give relief, and an extension of the contract," they are entitled to have it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I was called out of the Chamber and did not hear all of my colleague's speech. I understand that he spoke in reference to the cooperative market associations disposing of some of their cotton.

Mr. SMITH. I mentioned that incidentally.

Mr. DIAL. While it may be true that the cooperative associations have not sold very much, is it not also true that a great many of the producers have sold their entire crops?

Mr. SMITH. It is.

Mr. DIAL. A great deal more than one-twelfth of the production has been sold each month. All we desire is that the crop should be marketed in an orderly way, and that means that if it takes 12 months to produce it and 12 months to manufacture it, the grower should be allowed 12 months in which to market it.

Mr. SMITH. That is neither here nor there, for the reason that the man outside of the corporation took his chances. These cooperative societies were organized to try to protect the indus-

try, and we put the cooperative societies in the act, and therefore it seems to me that they are entitled, despite any specific contract, to have whatever relief the act can give them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, does not the Senator from South Carolina think that the intent of Congress, in establishing this corporation and conferring upon it the power to loan to farmers and to farm cooperative associations, was to enable the farmer and these associations to market their crops in an orderly way, and, if necessary, to hold their products until they could at least get something approximating the cost of production; and that, having that general line of policy in view, when we, in order to carry it out, provided that they might advance money to farmers and cooperative institutions upon 12 months' maturity, with the privilege of extension, it was the clear intent and purpose of Congress that that board should not attempt to exercise an authority which would defeat that purpose by forcing the farmer to sell before conditions justified him in selling?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if this is to be the policy, the last case is as bad as the first, or worse. I have said what I have presented this morning in order to call the attention of the public to the refutation of the plea that this drastic contraction of credit was unavoidable, and that it affected all alike.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has defined the situation. We had a commodity panic, and a money inflation. The money was here, necessarily here, and if credits were denied, it was hoarded somewhere; it was here in volume.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, when commerce is paralyzed by the contraction of credits the currency is no longer required in such volume and it automatically flows back into the Federal reserve agents' hands, because it is costing money to hold idle currency. It therefore goes back for the purpose of saving the interest on that idle currency. A great harm was done in contracting credit, which was deliberately done as a fixed policy and persisted in over the protest of many men, including myself. I made 10 different efforts, I remind the Senator, between January 1, 1920, and July 1, 1920, to prevent that policy from being carried out, but unavailingly.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, in concluding what I have to say showing the startling condition of affairs, between the extremes of poverty and distress on the one side and a 16,000 per cent stock dividend on the other, we in the Senate should not be satisfied and some of us are not going to be satisfied with any temporary makeshift legislation for the relief of agriculture in the country, with the limitation of the amount of capital that can be diverted to agriculture. Some of us will insist that the financial system available for agriculture shall be as extensive and limitless as the system for commerce and that the availablity of credits in behalf of the farmer shall be coextensive with the credits for commerce and adapted to the peculiar conditions of the production of agricultural products. We will have none of this temporary handing out of a crumb from a master's table, and I do not use even a figure of speech when I say that the farmer sets the table, furnishes the table, clothes and shoes the master, and yet he, perforce, must go hungry and naked while others in the country are cutting melons running up to hundreds and thousands of per cent.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to discuss a subject not before the Senate, but I ask indulgence for a moment or two in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

I represent in part a State which is one of the greatest in agriculture of any of the States in the Union. In that State the farmers have suffered. They are to-day in great difficulty. They are coming to us asking for aid. But, Mr. President, it seems to me that even more important than the question of credits for the farmer is that of trying to do something for him to afford him better market facilities. The other day my attention was called to the fact that in New York, which is a great dairy State and furnishes most of the milk for the great city of New York, the farmer is getting something like 3¾ cents a quart for his milk, while in the city, 100 or 150 miles away, the people who consume the milk are compelled to pay 16 and 18 and at times even 20 cents a quart for the milk. I am wondering, while we are discussing the question of credits for the farmer, if perhaps we are not encouraging him to reach out and borrow beyond his means, when, after all, his real problem is to obtain enough for the things he produces so as to secure even a small return for his labor and his investment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The matter of transportation comes in right there. Does not the Senator think that he made a mistake some few years ago when he voted for increasing the transportation charges of the country to such an enormous extent when what is known as the Esch-Cummins law was enacted? The Senator voted for it, as I recall, and the rates on milk from New York State points to New York City and to all the large cities were increased, as I recall, something like 200 per cent.

Mr. CALDER. Of course, the Senator has examined the freight rates on milk coming into New York City, and if he has he might tell the Senate the fact that the increased charge for carrying milk does not exceed one-eighth of 1 cent per quart, and that, of course, has not contributed very much to the increased price. I voted for the Esch-Cummins Act, but I do not recall any provision in that law which increased the freight rates.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator did not read the bill evidently, if he does not recall where the rates mere raised from 100 to 200 per cent.

Mr. CALDER. We gave the Interstate Commerce Commission added authority in the matter and, of course, they increased the rates. But the Senator has not explained, in his interruption, that under the domination of his party during the war billions of dollars were added to the expense of operation of the railroads, and that in those days the rates were increased through the instrumentality of his own commission acting under the authority of his own party. Nor does he tell us that his own President urged that the rates be increased because of the added cost of operation.

Now, Mr. President, just a word on the subject of the so-called stock dividends. I have no defense to make for any corporation in the country that makes abnormal profits. I am not going into that phase of the subject to-day. I do not know the facts about any of the companies which have issued these large stock dividends and to which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has referred; but it is a simple thing and we ought to have just a word or two of explanation as to how some of these things might happen.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CALDER. Not just now. I have in my hand a copy of this morning's New York Herald. I notice that its leading editorial is entitled "A 3,333 per cent dividend." The editorial goes into an explanation of just how this corporation, with $15,000 capital stock, increased its capital to $500,000. I shall later ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Herald on the subject to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD. The story of the development of this corporation is common with thousands of others. It tells in detail how a few men may organize a small business and through hard work, with little profit to themselves over a period of years, develop it into a great organization. During all of the time of its growth it paid taxes on its profits. It simply preferred to extend its business, rather than eat up its gains, and now it turns its undivided profits into stock without increasing its holdings to the extent of one dollar.

I have in mind a corporation, which I know of myself, in the city of New York, which began business 12 years ago, for the convenience of the men who owned the business, with a capital stock of $25,000 all paid in. The corporation was engaged in building houses. It did an annual business of something like $300,000. It borrowed on its mortgages from the banks sufficient money to carry on a business of that magnitude. This particular corporation, like many others, has never declared a dividend. From its business of $300,000 in the first year, as I recall, because I know a great deal about it, it made a profit of something like $18,000. That was put into surplus. With a capital stock of $25,000 and a surplus of $18,000 this company really had a capital of $43,000 the second year. The profits of the corporation were being taxed in proportion to its earnings, of course. Now that corporation, after a period of 12 years, without having declared any dividends, but earning profits upon its surplus in the meantime, has a value to-day with a capital of $25,000 and a surplus of something like $300,000. Of course, that company could issue a stock dividend of $300,000, which would not affect the value of the property to the stockholders to the extent of one cent. It would not create any more property. It would not change the condition at all. It would simply turn an earned surplus into capital stock.

It seems to me this may be the condition with many other corporations in the country of like character. I know of some that have issued very large stock dividends which have in the main very small capital stock.

I now request that the editorial in the New York Herald to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

[From the New York Herald, Saturday, December 16, 1922.]

A 3,333 PER CENT DIVIDEND.

A woolen mill company in Uxbridge, Mass., has declared a stock dividend of 3,333 per cent. But if that fact baldly stated takes anybody's breath away, let him catch it again while listening to a few of the details.

The capital stock of the company before the increase was only $15,000. It is now $500,000. The stockholders had long been plowing in earnings on top of that diminutive capitalization of $15,000 instead of paying them all out as dividends and spending them. A little at a time the earnings went into more machinery, more tools, and more wage-paying equipment until the company was able to do a bigger business than ever had been possible with its original microscopic capital.

Then came bigger earnings from the increased machinery and from the enlarged business, so there was more of those earnings to plow in. There were enough now to add, perhaps, a small wing to the old building, with more equipment, and still more business became possible. Finally there were earnings enough to put up a whole new mill, with a still greater producing capacity.

And so it went until there was a fair-sized business—a business that represented some $500,000 of capital value in place of the $15,000 of years before. And it had been put in by the stockholders with their plowed-in earnings just as much as if the earnings had been paid out to the stockholders and then they had subscribed the same amount as new capital to expand the business.

But, at that, the owners of the woolen mill—the stockholders—had not a dollar more of value in it the hour after the 3,333 per cent stock dividend was declared to themselves than they had the hour before it was declared. Under the $15,000 capitalization of the hour before they had the mill, the machinery, the other equipment, the good will, and the business they were doing. Under the $500,000 capitalization they now have the same mill, the same machinery, the same equipment, the same good will, and the same business as they had before.

They have more certificates of stock but no more woolen mill. It is the same as when a woman slices an apple pie for the family's dinner. There are more pieces of the one pie. But no more pie.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, while the Payne-Aldrich bill was under consideration we had similar charges made on the floor of the Senate by pointing out at that time three cases, I think, of excessive profits alleged to have been made by cotton manufacturers of the East. At the time we knew nothing about the details of the matter, but a very few days later the so-called profits were explained in detail, and the charges fell flat as no doubt these will.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] knows enough about machinery to know what $15,000 would purchase. Fifteen thousand dollars would purchase two and one-half modern looms, that is all, nothing more. Fifteen thousand dollars would about purchase one set of cards. The statement of the Senator is ridiculous on its face. I do not know the history of the case which the Senator calls attention to. There may be some truth in it, but I have no doubt that there is an explanation for the whole thing. I have no doubt, either, that some of the woolen mills and cotton mills as well as almost every other kind of business as well as the industries generally in the United States made large and in some cases extortionate profits during the war. There is no doubt about that. I do not think it bolstered up the Senator's argument for assistance for the farmer, because everybody recognizes the fact that whatever Congress can do to assist him ought to be done and no doubt will be done.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator what he referred to when he used the figures "$15,000"?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator stated the capital was $15,000. I do not know anything about the matter to which he refers, other than what you stated.

Mr. SMITH. I was just looking to see if there was any company with $15,000 capital stock mentioned in the article.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the woolen mill declaring a dividend of 3,333 per cent about which the Senator spoke.

Mr. SMITH. That was referred to in the clipping which was handed me. I did not see in the item relating the incident about the 16,000 per cent stock dividend any company with any such capitalization as $15,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know anything about it except what the Senator said. The Senator said there was a woolen mill with a capitalization of $15,000 which made a profit of 3,333 per cent.

Mr. SMITH. I do not want the Senator to get away from this fact. The argument of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and the argument of the Senator from Utah is on the assumption that with a small capital stock, with a comparatively large earning, over a period of years of accumulating surplus, they can at the end of that time declare that surplus in the form of stock dividends. That in no way lessens the terrific comparison between the individual industry for which I am speaking and the one I am seeking to illustrate with, for this reason: After a lifetime of working on the farms of this country, the mother and children working as well as the father, we have arrived at a point when not only they can not declare a stock dividend and buy another place, but they have to mortgage their cattle and their lands and the crops which they are growing in order to meet their necessary living expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Some time or other the Senate and the House of Representatives will begin to study the situation to ascertain where one of the faults of the high cost of goods lies. I know that the cost of distribution of goods in the United States, which the ultimate consumer has to pay, in many cases is outrageous, and the present system has got to be abolished at some time or other. I admit the demands for delivery of each little item and other unnecessary demands made by the consumer add greatly to the cost. I think I stated in the Senate on a previous occasion that I went to a retail store in Washington and bought a bill of goods and secured an invoice for that bill of goods at retail prices. I took that invoice and purchased from a little wholesale house in Washington the smallest quantity of the same identical goods that I could, and I found there was a difference of 87 per cent between the wholesale price and the retail price which I had paid. I do not know what the wholesaler's profit was; I do not know what was paid to the manufacturer of the goods; but all that profit had to be added to the 87 per cent. When we get backbone enough to investigate and consider the question of the distribution of goods, I think we shall help the ultimate consumer in the purchase of his goods.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator from Utah think that pari passu, right along with that, in determining where the fault lies in distribution to the ultimate consumer we have got to provide an adequate and impartial system of credits in order to meet the peculiar conditions under which the industry of agriculture labors?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had confined his statement to that one aspect of the matter, I should not have said a word, because in the main I agree with him; but some day or other, Mr. President, the question of excessive prices which are charged for the goods which are sold in this country will have to be considered. Now, let me call the Senators' attention——

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. Just one moment. Let me call the Senator's attention to an instance that came under my observation. Two years ago, just before Mrs. Smoot and I returned to Utah, Mrs. Smoot bought a pair of shoes for which she was charged $17. One day as I came out of the elevator at the Hotel Utah to go to my room, I met an old friend of whom I used to purchase shoes when I was in the merchandising business. I said to him, "Hello, Jack, what are you doing here?" "Oh," he said, "I am still selling shoes." I said, "For the same firm?" He said, "For the same firm." He further stated, "I have a line here now, in my room." His room was immediately to the left of the elevator; and he said, "Come in and look at my line of shoes." I went in and, Mr. President, I saw there a pair of shoes which I was positive were exactly the same make of shoes which Mrs. Smoot had purchased for $17. To be absolutely sure, however, that the shoes were exactly similar, I took the stock number of the shoe and later found it was the identical kind of shoe. I said to my friend, "Jack, at what price are you selling these shoes?" He replied, "I am selling them for $5.75." I asked, "Is that the price at which those shoes are sold in all parts of the United States?" He replied, "Yes, that is the wholesale price for which they are sold everywhere." Some time or other such exorbitant profits are not going to continue to be charged in the United States.

Mr. SMITH. Does not the Senator from Utah think that he could have helped the situation materially if he had desisted from his advocacy of the tariff iniquity which we have just passed, which makes that kind of thing possible?

Mr. SMOOT. That was before we began the consideration of the tariff bill; it was before the election of 1920. As the Senator from South Carolina refers to that matter, let me call attention to the "tariff iniquity," as he characterizes it. I thought the Senator from South Carolina or some other Senator would make such a statement as he has made, and I brought here to the Senate on yesterday a number of reports not only from France and other foreign countries but from England particularly, including clippings of items from foreign and New York papers. I will only mention one, although I have in my office the letter which contains the complete information. In one cablegram, however, it was stated that the pottery industry of England is again active because of the fact that the Americans have begun the purchasing of pottery of all kinds from England. Then the cablegram went on to say that the increased duty upon pottery in the tariff law had been met by the English manufacturers of pottery by taking the amount of the increased duty off their profits and selling their goods in America for the same price as they had done under the Underwood tariff law.

Not only that, but as to the firm of Gimbel & Co., of Philadelphia and New York, there is a statement—and I shall later put it into the RECORD—relative to the importation of dresses from Paris and from cities in other foreign countries that at first prices were increased, but it was found that the American people would not buy the goods at an increased price, and therefore the foreigner reduced the price by the amount of the increase in the duty, and was selling the goods at the same old price. That statement came from Gimbel & Co.'s purchaser of the goods.

Every dollar, Mr. President, of the tariff increase, so far as pottery in England and dresses which are imported from France and from other foreign countries are concerned, if those statements are correct, is being paid by the foreigner and goes into the Treasury of the United States. However, I had not intended going into the question of the operation of the tariff law and did not do so until the Senator from South Carolina brought the matter up.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. This is quite an interesting discussion, but we have got away from what we were talking about. I think we were discussing the price of shoes, and the Senator from Utah gave a very clear illustration by citing a case where shoes cost $17, I think it was, and shortly after some salesman stated that his firm was selling exactly similar shoes at wholesale for $5 per pair.

Mr. SMOOT. For $5.75 per pair.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah bought the shoes after or before he saw the traveling man, but it may be that they were bought after the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives had reported in favor of placing a tariff on hides, but the House, I believe through Democratic votes, took it off, or it may have been after the Finance Committee of the Senate had reported a high tariff on hides and when by Democratic vote in the Senate it was taken off. I am wondering whether that action had any influence on the prices which were being paid for shoes.

Mr. SMOOT. It was before the 1920 election under a Democratic administration. Of course, as to the pair of shoes of which I spoke, if the tariff had been in force it would not have amounted to 2 cents a pair.

Mr. HARRISON. But a tariff sometimes affords an excuse for increasing prices.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be an excuse so far as the seller of the shoes is concerned, but it is afforded no justification by the tariff law.

Mr. HARRISON. I may be mistaken as to my facts, and I do not want the RECORD to show a mistake; but if I recall the matter aright the Ways and Means Committee of the other House in drafting what was afterwards known as the Fordney-McCumber bill did put a tariff on hides.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; they did put a tariff on hides.

Mr. HARRISON. But the House, by a very close vote, removed the duty. Then the Finance Committee of the Senate, of which the Senator from Utah is the most influential member, restored the duty on hides, as I recall, in the bill which that committee reported to the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. They did.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senate, through Democratic votes, took that duty off. I merely wanted to get the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Mississippi should have said that was done through Republican votes.

Mr. HARRISON. Through Republican votes?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will remember as to those who voted for that duty, with the exception of 2 or 3 or 4 or 5, it was Democratic votes which took the duty off.

Mr. SMOOT. So far as that is concerned, there were Democrats who voted for the duty, and only 16 Democrats voted against a duty on hides.

Mr. HARRISON. I said with the exception of 4 or 5 votes.

Mr. SMOOT. But it was Republican votes that took the duty off.

Mr. HARRISON. There were 1 or 2 Republican votes in favor of eliminating the duty.

Mr. SMOOT. There were more than 1 or 2, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. HARRISON. How did the Senator vote?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah voted for a tariff on hides.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Just the same as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] voted for a tariff on hides. I need not mention the other Senators on the Democratic side who voted for it?

Mr. MCKELLAR. How many were there?

Mr. SMOOT. There were quite a number, I will say to the Senator; but, Mr. President, if the duty had been imposed and collected it would not have amounted to 2 cents on each pair of shoes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to enter into this filibuster and keep this discussion up. I want to go on with the shipping bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no wish to filibuster.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to be charged with assisting in any filibuster at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should like to discuss——

Mr. SMOOT. I am discussing something else besides the tariff bill, which is not now before the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not desire to discuss the tariff at this time, but I wish to ask the Senator a question with reference to the illustration he gave as to the prices charged by wholesalers as compared with the prices charged by retailers. Of course if the Senator does not desire me to interrupt him for that purpose I will desist.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the Senator can ask me a question now, but I should like to finish what I have to say on another matter. The suggestion in regard to the tariff was brought into the discussion by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I repeat I am not going to discuss the tariff. I will say to the Senator that we have discussed that heretofore, very greatly to the information and edification of the public, and we have had some results from it since, in the last election. We need not discuss the tariff now.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I think we had better not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not wish to discuss it, but I do wish to make an observation with respect to the statement made by the Senator a little while ago with reference to the enormous spread between the prices charged by the wholesaler and the prices charged by the retailer, in connection with which he used shoes as an illustration. The Senator showed that there is a spread of, I think, something over 300 per cent between those prices. I was very much gratified that the Senator developed that fact because we had a long discussion here during the last session from which it appeared that the Senators on the other side of the Chamber wished to have the country believe that the big spread between the wholesale and retail prices was due to the extortionate profits charged by importers and department stores who were themselves large importers.

Mr. SMOOT. The department stores are retailers.

Mr. SIMMONS. I only wish in this connection to say I am glad to have this confirmation from the Senator from Utah of the contention we then made in the illustration he now gives of a spread of 300 or more per cent between the wholesale and retail price of a domestic product of universal use. The Senator's statement confirms the contention we on this side of the Chamber then made.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I rose simply to call attention to the fact that the Senator from South Carolina had in view making the people of the country believe that there were certain manufacturers making 16,000 per cent. He did not qualify it and say whether it was made during one year or not, but he said this was the amount of a dividend that was declared. Then he referred to one particular case where there was a woolen mill with $15,000 capital that made 3,333 per cent.

I rose simply to say that in 1909, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was under discussion, the same thing was brought before the Senate in relation to some cotton mills—some three of them, as I remember—and when the facts in the case were presented to the Senate it was found that there was nothing to the charge. Then I continued by saying that I had no doubt in the world but that during the war not only the woolen mills and the cotton mills but the retailers and the wholesalers in all kinds of business made large profits. There is no doubt about it at all.

All I can say about the $15,000 capital stock is this: If that is all the capital stock they had, that would purchase about 2½ looms. It would not purchase one set of cards. So there is something radically wrong with the statement, and I think if time were allowed, if it were worth while, we could write to this concern and find out just what the facts in the case were; but it is quite certain that there could not be a woolen mill with only $15,000 capital.

I agree in part with what the Senator from South Carolina said in relation to the necessity of assisting the farmer by advancing him the money necessary to carry on his business. Of course, I was always taught when I was young to keep out of debt; that debt was the greatest bondage a man could be

under. If times were normal, and it were possible for the farmer of the country to carry on his business without assistance, my advice to him now would be to keep out of debt; but I recognize the conditions that exist, and I have not any doubt but that the Congress is ready, and not only ready but willing, to pass the legislation necessary to assist him in every way possible.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures, $50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "Public works: For constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels for the Lighthouse Service as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce not to exceed $240,000, and for establishing and improving aids to navigation and other works as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce, $473,000; in all, $713,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 3, and 4.

W. L. JONES,
SELDEN P. SPENCER,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
MILTON W. SHREVE,
MARTIN B. MADDEN,
W. B. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the unfinished business be proceeded with.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for just an hour and a half I have been waiting to talk about the bill under consideration, the ship subsidy bill. I call attention to the fact that Senators on both sides of the Chamber have taken up this time in talking about other matters not connected with the bill. I hope that that time, at least, will not be charged up to those of us who oppose the measure and that no claim of filibustering will be made against those of us who oppose the pending bill because of this use of time.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has for some time been an advocate, and an ardent advocate, of building up our merchant marine. It will be recalled that two years ago he, as chairman of the committee, brought into the Senate a bill for the purpose of permitting or directing the sale of our ships to private individuals or corporations, and for otherwise building up and maintaining the shipping interests of America. That bill, apparently, has been an utter failure. I voted for the bill, largely upon the strength of the conclusions reached by the Senator from Washington, for whom I entertain the highest esteem and in whom I have very great confidence; but the bill that he then reported has been a failure, as I have stated. At all events, according to the testimony in the hearings, our merchant marine has steadily gone down and down during the past two years, until now the President of the United States, upon the advice of the Shipping Board, has asked Congress to pass additional legislation to effect the very purposes that were proposed and advocated two years ago in the bill that was passed at that time.

Mr. President, the newspapers of the country, those of them that are in favor of this subsidy—and it seems that a very large proportion of them are in favor of subsidizing the American merchant marine—are trying to make it appear that those of us who do not believe in paying a cash subsidy to American shipping are opposed to building up a great merchant marine or opposed to maintaining a great merchant marine. Nothing can be further from the fact. Most of the very strongest advocates of the merchant marine, those who have done more to build it up than perhaps any others, are opposed to the granting of this subsidy. To show you how it works, in 1916, when a merchant marine bill was first passed under which the great merchant marine that we now have was built, my distinguished friend from Washington was opposed to it and voted against it. He now says he is sorry for it, and that is just like the manly, splendid man that he is.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not say I was sorry for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said that he had changed his mind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. I misunderstood the Senator if he did not, and I would not misrepresent him in any way in the world——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator would not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Because I have the highest esteem for him and the greatest confidence in any statement that he may make; but I misunderstood him, unless he said a day or two ago, in answer to a question that was put, that he had opposed the merchant marine bill when it was passed—and the RECORD shows that he opposed it—and that he had since changed his mind.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the matter of a filibuster came up, and some one, I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], asked if I had not talked all night with reference to the bill. I said I had, of course, and he asked me if I thought now that I was mistaken then. I said that I did not think I was mistaken then, but that after the first bill had been disposed of and the second bill came up, and many of the objectionable features were eliminated, my impression is that I voted for that bill. That is the present law, the act of 1916.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think if the Senator will look at the RECORD, as I have done, he will find that he is mistaken about that; but I want to say this about it——

Mr. JONES of Washington. That may be true. I say, I have not looked it up; but I did say, I think to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], that there are many things in the act of 1916 that I think are good, and I joined with him in a protest against the abolishment of the Shipping Board. I have always contended, for the last few years anyhow, that that board is a very important administrative body, and I should like to see it made a board to correspond to the British Board of Trade. I should like to see it have much more power than it has now, so as to promote the development of our merchant marine and meet the practices and policies that are carried out by the British Board of Trade with reference to their merchant marine to the disadvantage of all other merchant marines of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I accept, of course, everything that the Senator says on that subject. I know that whatever may have been his views in 1916 or prior to that time about building up a merchant marine, since that time he has become an earnest, sincere, and able advocate of the building up in this country of a merchant marine commensurate with the interests of our country. I believe he feels that way now. I know his intentions are the best. I know that what he seeks to do is to build up and maintain a great merchant marine in this country. I differ with him about his conclusions. I have no criticism to make of him personally in any way in the world; but I do believe, however honestly mistaken he may be, that he is mistaken in the conclusion that it is necessary or advisable to give a cash subsidy to our shipping interests in order either to build up or to maintain those interests.

The conditions that exist now and those that existed prior to 1916 in reference to our merchant marine are very different. It might have been argued with some plausibility before we built a great merchant marine that a cash subsidy was necessary in order to build up a merchant marine and maintain it; but now we have over 10,000,000 tons of shipping in this coun-

try. We have one of the best merchant marines of any nation in the world, second only to that of Great Britain. We have some fourteen or fifteen hundred great steel ships that are as good as the ships of any nation on earth, just as good as those of Great Britain. They are already built. It is not a question of building up a merchant marine. As I said, it might have been argued with some plausibility before this great merchant marine was built by this Nation that it was necessary to subsidize it, but now that it has been built, now that we have it, manifestly it is not necessary to tax the American people, already enormously taxed, already taxed almost beyond their ability to pay, it is not necessary to tax them further in the enormous sum of at least some $75,000,000 a year in direct and indirect taxes for the purpose of paying a subsidy to these companies.

Mr. President, it is contended that we ought to give this subsidy in order to build up and maintain a merchant marine that we already have, and that unless we do it, unless we give the cash subsidy, we will not have the merchant marine. All such talk is idle. We are going to keep our merchant marine. We are going to maintain it. We are going to make it a success. We are going to make it one of the greatest ocean-carrying shippings in the world. We are going to make it a success all along the line. This nation is determined to do it; and I have no patience with these temporary officers of the Shipping Board who come here decrying our merchant marine, who come here saying that we are unable to compete with other nations, and that we ought not to compete with other nations for much of the trade. I have no sympathy with them. That is not a patriotic doctrine; that is not a patriotic statement to be made by these officers of the Shipping Board, and it ought not to have been made. We are going to get our part of the commerce of the world.

I want to say right here that in discussing the members of the Shipping Board, and in discussing its chairman, I have nothing personal to say about those gentlemen. I am going to discuss what they propose, and I am going to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this ship subsidy bill is the outcome of the recommendations of Mr. Lasker. I met Mr. Lasker once, and he is a very nice gentleman, a very kindly man. I do not criticize him personally in any way; but what is there in Mr. Lasker's history, what is there in his business life, what is there in his knowledge of shipping, which would justify a departure from the precedents of over a hundred years, and warrant us in embarking upon this course of taxing the American people in this enormous annual sum, fixing it upon them for a period of 10 years, to carry out his views about shipping?

As I understand, prior to two years ago Mr. Lasker never had anything to do with shipping in his life, and I expect that after about two years he will never have anything more to do with shipping in his future life. He has been engaged in other business. He has not been engaged in shipping. It has not been his life work, and why should we follow his views on a subject he certainly knows no more about than other people?

Mr. President, I am for a real merchant marine, a merchant marine that prospers because it has business to carry, not a weak, sickly, hothouse merchant marine, dependent upon the Government to keep its head above water.

There is little provision in this bill for getting business for our merchant marine. This bill is aimed at a cash subsidy from the Government, pure and simple. Its main purpose, apparently, is to get the Government to tax all the people for the benefit of a few shipowners.

My judgment is that we ought to pass a bill which would result in our getting business for our merchant marine, and after we get the business for it, then it will prosper, whether it is in the Government's hands or whether it is in private hands or whether it is in both.

I am perfectly willing to agree to a bill which will reduce the tariff on all goods brought in in American ships in every case where there is a discrimination against our ships and divide such reduction of duty with the owners of the American ships bringing in the goods. I would gladly support a bill to require all American mails to be transported in American vessels. I would gladly support a bill requiring all American officials—Army, Navy, or any other officials—traveling abroad to travel on American ships. I would gladly support a measure to require that all supplies shipped by our Government be shipped upon American ships. I would be glad to support a bill placing harbor regulations on the vessels of any foreign country which in any way discriminated against American shipping. But I am wholly opposed to the un-American, unfair, and unjust method of paying a cash subsidy to a favored shipping interest, taxing all the people for the benefit of one small fraction of our people.

I want to say this, Mr. President, that we have a number of treaties with foreign countries. As far back as 1913 or 1914 we passed a law looking to the annulment of those treaties. In a recent act we called upon the President of the United States to annul those trade treaties which interfere with and put restrictions on American ships. Both a Democratic President, Mr. Wilson, and a Republican President, Mr. Harding, declined to carry out the mandate of Congress, and those treaties are still in existence. I would willingly vote for a law annulling those treaties, which we have a right to do, and then we could take care of ourselves by passing such laws as we wanted to build up the American merchant marine, as against any nation which put restrictions upon our shipping. I shall later offer such an amendment to this bill.

Mr. President, this bill must succeed or fail under the testimony of Mr. Albert D. Lasker. He is the father of the proposition. He is the principal witness who has been brought before the Congress in advocacy of this bill. He has testified at length. If upon his testimony this bill ought to be passed, it might be contended by Senators here that we should pass it; but I say that no fair-minded man, unblinded by prejudice of any kind, can read Mr. Lasker's testimony and come to any other conclusion than that this bill ought not to be passed, and I am going very briefly to refer to Mr. Lasker's testimony in chief, as shown in the first volume of the hearings.

Mind you, he talks about subsidy. He has little if anything to say about acquiring business for our merchant marine. Acquiring business is not in his mind. He wants to get rid of the ships. He wants the Government to dispose of them to private parties, and then pay those private parties a cash subsidy for running them. That is the burden and gist of his testimony. He does say in one place that there are some new markets to the south of us and to the east of us from which we might get some trade, but otherwise he pays no attention to the question of getting business. Substantially he concedes that the Atlantic business, which is the cream of the business, we are not entitled to.

In no part of this long explanation of our country's shipping business does he dwell upon the necessity of our doing business and getting business from foreign countries. He talks about the necessity of our merchant marine being used in time of war as an auxiliary to our Navy. This is a matter that he has nothing to do with except indirectly. He was put at the head of the Shipping Board for the purpose of building up our merchant marine, not for the purpose of building up our Navy. Our Navy is in other hands. His entire evidence is a complaint against our merchant marine. First, it is not evenly balanced; second, it can not be economically run; third, we need faster ships. He talks about our needing 1,250,000 gross tons of faster passenger ships and about the same amount of faster cargo ships, and then he blandly tells us that we have in operation only 421 ships, the remainder, more than a thousand, being laid up in our harbors.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Borah	Gerry	Lodge	Simmons
Brandegee	Glass	McCumber	Smith
Brookhart	Gooding	McKellar	Smoot
Calder	Harris	McKinley	Sterling
Cameron	Harrison	McLean	Sutherland
Capper	Heflin	McNary	Swanson
Carsway	Johnson	Moses	Trammell
Couzens	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Underwood
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kendrick	Poindexter	Watson
Dillingham	Keyes	Pomerene	
Fernald	King	Robinson	
France	Ladd	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when I was interrupted I was discussing the testimony of Mr. Lasker, the chairman of the Shipping Board. He next makes the astounding statement that 3,000,000 tons of our 6,000,000 tons of cargo shipping is all that is necessary or needed by our country. He makes the further astounding statement that 3,000,000 tons of this steel cargo shipping ought to be dismantled. Here is the chairman of the Shipping Board coming before the Congress asking to dispose of the steel tonnage that he has on hand. He said he believed that 3,000,000 tons of it could be disposed of, that only 3,000,000 tons

is needed by America, and that the other 3,000,000 tons should be dismantled or scrapped. The 6,000,000 tons of shipping no doubt cost the taxpayers of this Republic something like $2,000,000,000. It must be worth somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,000,000,0000. Mr. Lasker comes before the Congress and testifies that 3,000,000 tons of ship steel cargo shipping should be dismantled and should be put out of competition with the first 3,000,000 tons which he desires to sell to private owners, and at the same time he blandly asked the Congress to create a revolving fund of $125,000,000 for the purpose of building new ships. In one section of the bill he wants authority to dismantle and junk one-half of all the steel cargo ships, and in another provision of the bill he asks to have a revolving fund of $125,000,000 arranged by the Government to enable him to built new ships for the shipping interests. How are we to follow these remarkable recommendations? What is the reason for these remarkable recommendations?

He declares that 3,000,000 tons of our cargo shipping is of no value. He declares that we ought not to have but 3,000,000 tons anyway; that the second 3,000,000 tons we now have must be disposed of so that American interests shall not be hurt. Under no circumstances, he declares, shall the second 3,000,000 tons that we now own be used in such a way as to come in competition or to hurt the 3,000,000 tons that is proposed by him to be turned over to the shipping interests. He says on this subject:

> Automatically the 3,000,000 poor tons must be done away with.

The remaining 3,000,000 tons must be junked or dismantled. He states that we do not need more than 3,000,000 tons; that we can only use 3,000,000 tons economically; that we own 1,242 steel ships and that only 421 are being used, 1,021 are tied up; that on these 421 the Shipping Board is losing $50,000,000 annually. He admits that in the year 1921 America carried under her own flag 51 per cent of her foreign trade; that by excluding the trade in the Great Lakes and the Caribbean he shows that American ships carried only 24 per cent and that 5 per cent of this was carried in privately owned ships and 19 per cent by the American merchant marine. He is opposed to the Government running the ships. He says that it is true we are carrying daily 87 per cent of our own trade to Mexico and 57 per cent of the Caribbean trade in our own ships, but he claims that neither the needs of trade with Mexico or the Caribbean call for that type of ship, which is the very backbone of the second line of our Navy, and besides, this kind of ship is not serviceable anyway.

The ridiculousness of this statement is manifest in view of the figures he gives, that in these ships we are carrying 87 per cent of the one trade and 57 of the other. He says it is appalling to think that only 19 per cent of the American trade is carried in Government-owned ships. He says that the Government admits its inability to operate its ships in competition with privately owned ships of the world; that the loss to the Government of $50,000,000 a year does not include interest on capital invested, insurance, or depreciation; that the Government ought not to have entered into governmental operation. He thinks the Shipping Board is fast approaching perfection, but that no governmental operation can compete with privately owned ships; that when the present board took over the management of the ships they were paying too much commission to those who ran them, but they were not to blame for it. Nobody was to blame for any of the failures of the Shipping Board, past or present. He believes that they have built up a splendid organization in the Emergency Fleet Corporation; that it would compare favorably with any private organization, but that such organization "is discouraged by the impossibility of creating any proper operation through Government ownership," and then, in a spirit of fine frenzy against the board which he was selected to preside over and make successful, he says:

> But let us not be deceived; conditions still are bad and will ever remain so under Government ownership because of the impossibility of competing with private operation. Both the sense of initiative and responsibility found in private operation are lacking. Initiative is lacking because neither those employed by the Fleet Corporation nor the managing agents nor their employees in turn have the slightest notion they are building up anything permanent for themselves. At any time Congress may see fit to so reduce salaries that men of ability can no longer afford to stay with the Fleet Corporation.

Mr. President, Mr. Lasker, the chairman of the Shipping Board, says the principal trouble or one of the troubles in the Shipping Board is that they do not pay salaries sufficiently high, and yet he knows that the salaries paid by the Shipping Board are a national scandal. There are three employees of the Shipping Board who are getting salaries of $35,000 a year. That is more than twice as much as the Chief Justice of the United States receives. It is more than four times as much as any Senator or Congressman receives. It is more than any other official of the Government at all receives, except the President of the United States. In so far as salaries are concerned, no organization within the Government is paying such salaries as members of the Shipping Board are receiving, and yet the chairman of the Shipping Board comes here and makes the statement that one of the reasons for the failure of the Shipping Board to do anything in the last few years is because the salaries of the employees of the Shipping Board are not large enough. A large portion of his speech before the committee was taken up with the complaint about small salaries, and yet when I mentioned salaries in the manuscript of the argument I am making, when I said $35,000 a year and said something about it being pitifully small, the printer put a question mark in the margin about it! No officials of the Government, other than those of the Shipping Board, receive anything like half the salaries paid to those officials of the board.

Evidently we see the trouble. Their salaries are not large enough in the Shipping Board. The pitifully small and indecent salaries of $35,000 a year to men some of whom never received any such salaries before is, of course, sufficient to make it impossible to succeed in the control of our merchant marine. Of course, initiative is lacking, because the head of the corporation is in doubt, does not believe in the system, is opposed to the system, wants to see it fail. I want to suggest to the chairman of the Shipping Board that the employees of the Government have no business looking out for themselves only. It is their duty to look out for the interests of the Government and the Shipping Board. If they are not satisfied with the salaries they are getting, they can go into other business and there are men who will take their places who do believe in making the Shipping Board a success and in making it permanent.

A large portion of the chairman's speech is taken up with the crying against the small salaries paid by the Shipping Board, and yet, as we all know, the salaries received by the high officers of the Shipping Board—not the members, of course—are greater than every officer in our Government except alone the President, and they are not far behind him; and yet the chairman of the board talks about the failure of the board because of the failure of the Government to pay higher salaries. He then says that the Government can not continue to run the ships because they will wear out, even with proper repair. He says that he believes within 20 years our fleet would be worn out and gone. This statement is ridiculous. I doubt if there is a man in this body who has ever crossed the ocean who has not crossed it in ships more than 20 years of age. No wonder the Shipping Board is not a success when its presiding officer talks in this way.

And then he goes on to say in substantiation of his claim:

> Our contact with this thing is closer than others, and I am sure the members of the Shipping Board will join with the trustees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation in attesting that I truly record our experience.

His experience is two years. He never was in the shipping business before, and after he retires from his office, with all due respect to him, he will never be in the shipping business again. He certainly ought not to be.

He then undertakes to give the only reason advanced by him why private ships under the American flag must be governmentally aided—namely, because of the higher standards of living of American labor in the shipyard and on the ship. We will discuss this matter presently. After going over the matter of aid, he says:

> There is no hope of the establishment of a merchant marine through insufficient aid.

And, by the way, all through his testimony Mr. Lasker testifies, not once but innumerable times, that there is no hope for the American merchant marine; that it can not compete with the merchant marine of other nations; that we can not get business; that we can not be successful. He is decrying against the American merchant marine from the beginning to the end of his testimony.

> Rather than insufficient aid, let us have no aid at all and leave the question open until such time as we will give sufficient aid to insure our purpose. The achievement of our purpose should be our aim, not to fool ourselves and others and achieve failure by doing too late when we seem to be doing enough. We should take advantage at this time to write upon our statute books every possible indirect aid that can be uncovered and which can be properly used. * * * We must do enough or nothing (p. 15).

He then tells how he proposes to sell the ships. It is asked that the Shipping Board fleet be sold at world prices, regardless of the cost of construction. He says:

> The cost of construction is a war cost and should be written down to zero.

If he sells the ships at "zero" prices, how does he propose to get $200,000,000 for them? He says he does not believe that he can sell more than 100,000 tons out of the 6,000,000 tons.

How can he get the $125,000,000 out of 100,000 tons? But there is a better demand for ships than he thinks; yet he proposes to sell the ships for $200,000,000. After taking care of the charges of the Shipping Board it will take every dollar of the remainder to provide a revolving fund of $125,000,000 which is authorized in this bill. So that the shipping interests, just as he started out by saying, will get the ships at zero prices or pay nothing for them. I suppose that he means that we should give away the ships, because if the cost of construction is down to zero we are not entitled to any profits on zero. Then he goes on to say:

Whatever we get out of salvage is a profit, and if this fleet, built for war, can be turned into peace-time purposes, we shall verily have performed the miracle of turning the sword into the plowshare. No other of our war-time expenditures shall have such noble salvage. The sale of the Shipping Board fleet at world prices means that those that buy will not have higher capital charges than others to the extent of the tonnage they thus acquire (p. 16).

And to show what is in the chairman's mind, we find on page 13:

At the present time there is by and large no markets—

Meaning world markets—

for our vast tonnage.

In other words, here we have about 10,000,000 tons of ships that we are forced to sell in world markets, when there are no purchasers and when we are told by the chairman that they are only worth zero. In other words, it is perfectly apparent that he means to give away these ships.

We next come to Mr. Lasker's discussion of indirect aid.

In connection with that subject as to some features of his suggestion I agree with him, while as to others I do not agree with him. As I have said, I think our mails ought to be carried in American ships. Until a short time ago more than half of them were carried on foreign ships; wherever our authorities could make contracts with British ships to carry American mails they did so; but Congress got busy several years ago and required a portion of American mails to be carried on American ships, and now the greater portion of them are carried on American ships. All of them ought to be carried on American ships. None of the vast mail of Great Britain to this country comes in American ships; with the two lone exceptions of Finland and Esthonia no other nation employs American ships to carry its mail. The Government not long ago made contracts with those two little countries for a few hundred dollars to carry what small amount of mail they have. It is perfectly manifest that trade and mail go along together, and, of course, it would be a very wise and proper thing for us, under proper regulations as to cost, to give to the American merchant marine our mail contracts.

I next come to another proposal of indirect aid, as set out by Mr. Lasker, which, I think, is proper, and that is the matter of bringing immigrants to this country. We admit now immigrants of various nationalities on a ratio of 3 per cent to those who are already resident in this country. In other words, our immigration has been cut down enormously in the last two or three years, but even under this decreased immigration the transportation charges for bringing immigrants to this country is about $17,000,000 a year. There is no reason in the world why the business of bringing immigrants to this country should be carried on in foreign bottoms. We restrict immigration; we have absolute control over immigration, and there is no reason in the world why we should not build up our merchant marine by requiring not 50 per cent of the immigrants to travel on American ships but by requiring all of them, if need be, to be transported on American ships.

I think such a policy would be very much better for our country, and I think we should get a very much better class of immigrants if we required all of them to be brought here in American vessels and under the control of American officials. With that provision of the bill I am in hearty sympathy.

I next come to the question of the ships on which our agents travel across the seas. Mr. President, when American officeholders go abroad they do not deign to go on American ships; they are not willing to travel on American ships, but they want to go on British ships for the most part. At all events they want to go on a foreign ship. Last year we paid out—and I think it will be a very astonishing statement to those who are not familiar with the situation—the enormous sum of $7,500,000 to the owners of foreign ships to carry Government passengers and freight across the Pacific Ocean. The amount paid for such travel across the Atlantic Ocean and in the other oceans of the world is doubtless more than that; so that the Government spends annually for carrying Government freight and Government officials across the ocean not less than $15,000,000. Of course, that is not good business.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean that we are spending that amount now, or that we were spending that amount during the war?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are spending that now. We spent that amount last year, if Mr. Lasker is giving us the facts. He states in his testimony that in the Pacific Ocean alone last year the Government paid to foreign ships for the transportation of Government passengers and freight the enormous sum of $7,500,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the Senator from Tennessee the separate figures as to the amount which was paid by the Government for the transportation of passengers, and can he state that amount?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; Mr. Lasker does not give that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Can the Senator tell us what character of passengers they were? Were they Government employees?

Mr. McKELLAR. They were agents of the State Department, of the War Department, of the Navy Department, of the Department of Commerce, and of the Department of Labor and other departments.

If the Senator from North Carolina will recall, just a day or two ago in the consideration of the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill there was inserted an item of $30,000 for the purpose of carrying our consular and diplomatic agents across the waters during the next year. I secured the adoption of an amendment to the bill providing in effect that such employees should be carried in American ships, unless some urgent or proper reason for not doing so was certified by the Secretary of State.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is any part of the money paid by the Government for the transportation of its officers and agents and employees for travel between this country and foreign countries to which we have regular lines of steamboats operated by the Shipping Board?

Mr. McKELLAR. I judge so, from Mr. Lasker's testimony. He states that $7,500,000 was paid to foreign shipowners on the Pacific Ocean alone. I imagine our principal trade in the Pacific Ocean is between the Pacific coast and the Philippine Islands and China and Japan. As to that ocean alone we have the figures. In the other oceans of the world it is more than double that sum, I should imagine. I imagine that what the Government pays out for the transportation of passengers and freight in all the oceans of the world yearly to foreign shipowners amounts to some $15,000,000; and I think that we very properly ought, under proper safeguards as to cost, to require those passengers and that freight to be carried in American bottoms.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, what does the Senator estimate to be the amount of subsidy to be paid under this bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit me, I will reach that in a few moments; but if he is going to leave the Chamber, I will turn to it now.

Mr. SIMMONS. The only reason I asked the question was to ascertain what proportion of the total amount is represented by the $15,000,000 referred to by the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the different items, and I will give them to the Senator right now, and perhaps refer to the same subject a little later on. I have stated the figures under the head of "The cost of the bill."

The cost of this bill in indirect and direct subsidies will be at the lowest calculation $77,000,000 a year. The items showing this cost, as found in the bill, are, first, 10 per cent of customs duties, which, as the Senator knows, are impressed with a prior lien for the purpose of paying the cash subsidy.

The customs revenues are estimated at $350,000,000 a year. That figure is based upon our present income derived from customs duties. The Senator will recall that from the Underwood-Simmons law we had been collecting at our ports something like $850,000,000 a year for several years past, and therefore 10 per cent of that amount, or $35,000,000, would be available for the purpose provided for in the bill.

Our Republican friends say that under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law there will be a larger amount of revenues collected than under the Underwood-Simmons law; they say the amount of customs revenue will reach $450,000,000, or possibly $500,000,000, a year. If that should be the case, then 10 per cent of $450,000,000 would be $45,000,000, which amount, or $50,000,000, as it may turn out, would be available for the purposes of the bill. In my remarks I have based the calculation in this instance on the revenues derived under the Underwood-Simmons law and have placed the amount therefor at $35,000,000.

Then, under this bill, income-tax exemptions are allowed amounting to $10,000,000. In addition to that there are provisions in regard to exemptions from tonnage duties which will amount to another $4,000,000 a year.

Furthermore, there are provisions for the transportation of Government employees and Government freight which will amount to $15,000,000; and, in addition, there should be considered the cost of the transportation of Government mail, which will amount to not less than $5,000,000. Lastly, there is the provision requiring the transportation in American ships of one-half of the immigrants coming to this country, the amount involved in that instance being $8,000,000 or a little more, making the total amount, as I have said, $77,000,000.

COST OF THE BILL.

The cost of this bill in direct and indirect subsidies will be at the lowest calculation $77,000,000, and the items showing this cost are found in the bill and are as follows:

10 per cent custom duties	$35,000,000
Income-tax exemptions	10,000,000
Tonnage duties	4,000,000
Transportation of Government passengers and freight	15,000,000
Transportation of Government mails	5,000,000
Transportation of immigrants	8,000,000
Total	77,000,000

This sum may be greatly increased. The Underwood tariff bill brought in the neighborhood of $350,000,000 a year, and if the Fordney-McCumber bill brings additional duties, as was claimed for it, the amount arising from this source will be more than $35,000,000. It has been estimated it may reach $45,000,000.

Various estimates of income-tax exemptions have been noted, some of them going up as high as $20,000,000.

Mr. Lasker himself estimates transportation of Government freight and passengers in the Pacific alone at $7,500,000, and, of course, in the Atlantic and all other seas of the world it will amount to more than $7,500,000 additional.

Again, of course, it is shown that the cost will be much more than $50,000,000 from the very fact that the Shipping Board has the right to double the direct compensation.

Senators, if you pass this bill, it will just be an entering wedge for future raids on the Treasury by the shipping interests. They will have a lobby here at all times, and there is no telling to what extent the American people may be taxed in the future if we permit this additional raid on the people's money to be successfully carried out. So that the President is entirely wrong in saying it will be cheaper for the taxpayers to pay these bounties rather than to pay the losses now taking place.

I will pause here long enough while I am on that subject—I intended to reach it later—to say that the President comes before Congress and says we are losing $50,000,000 a year under existing conditions. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on yesterday showed how mistaken the President was in giving those figures. Of course, the President is not to blame; he secured his figures from Mr. Lasker as furnished him by the Shipping Board; but, as was demonstrated here yesterday by the Senator from Florida, $33,000,000, the loss for the present year, was the greatest loss which the Shipping Board has sustained. So, instead of the loss being $50,000,000 a year, it is less than $33,000,000. The President, however, says that if we pass this bill the drain on the taxpayers of the country will not be so great as it is now; and yet it is perfectly evident that those who will derive the benefit of the subsidy will receive not less than $77,000,000. Of course $33,000,000 is less than $77,000,000, the President and Mr. Lasker to the contrary notwithstanding, and, as the Senator from North Carolina knows, the Shipping Board has the power under this bill to increase the cash subsidies given under the bill to double what is proposed. So we know as a matter of fact that, instead of the President being correct, instead of Mr. Lasker being correct, instead of losing $33,000,000 a year, as we have done this year from the operations of the Shipping Board, we will tax the American people not less than $77,000,000, and I believe the amount will be a great deal more than $100,000,000 if we pass this bill. That is the difference between what is proposed and what will actually happen.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to thank the Senator for myself and, I am going to say, for the country for his explanation as to the actual amount which the Treasurer will have to pay out in the shape of a bonus if this proposed legislation shall pass. I myself have not thoroughly investigated, as the Senator has, the question of ultimate cost, but, judging from the statements which have been made by the proponents of the bill, I had not the remotest idea that the amount to be paid out by the Government would be anything like the staggering sum the Senator now demonstrates will have to be paid out annually by the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in direct and indirect subsidies granted under this bill it will not be a dollar less than $77,000,000, and in my judgment it will mean the taxation of the American people, directly or indirectly, to the extent of not less than $100,000,000 a year. Furthermore, the Senator knows, and we all know, that once this subsidy is granted to the shipping interests, from now on we will have a lobby here working with Members of the House and working with Members of the Senate to increase the gratuities that are given in this bill. It is the history of all gratuities. As soon as you give a gratuity there is an immediate demand for an additional gratuity from the parties who get it.

I want to say right here—and I will depart from the order in which I expected to make the proposals that I have here long enough to say it—that we not only have here the granting of a subsidy itself but we are establishing two principles, two policies, that ought not to be established in this country. One of them is to tax all the people for the benefit of this favored class of people and pay the money to them. The other one is that while every other citizen of this Republic is taxed under the income tax law—there are no exceptions; the President is not excepted; the Chief Justice of this Republic is not excepted; no person is excepted except alone the shipping interests that are so tenderly cared for in this bill—the income taxes alone that are remitted to this favored class of people will amount, according to Mr. Lasker, to not less than $10,000,000 a year, and according to other experts the amount may run as high as $20,000,000 a year. It is an indefensible proposition.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I ought to suggest to the Senator there that the Commerce Committee has stricken out, by way of amendment, those provisions. Of course, the amendment has not been adopted, but that is the recommendation of the Commerce Committee—that those provisions be stricken out.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted to hear that. They appear in the bill as reported by the committee, and there has been no formal notice here that such an amendment was going to be offered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes; it is stricken out in the bill, beginning on page 10 of the printed bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Down to page 20?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I think about that far.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of Title II is stricken out?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Well, that is hardly correct—not all of Title II, but all of Title II relating to the exemption. There is a depreciation provision that stays in.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much will that amount to?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is just a provision with reference to fixing a rule for determining the depreciation of vessels. Of course that does not amount to any particular sum. I do not know how much it would amount to. It is more particulary designed to determine a basis to put our people upon an equality with other people in the way of depreciation. The tax exemptions appear from page 9 down to line 19, page 18, of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the first place I want to congratulate the Senator from Washington and his committee on taking this un-American, unnecessary, improper special favor, special privilege, out of the bill. It ought to have been taken out, of course. It ought never to have been in the bill. I congratulate the Senator and his committee upon their fairness and sense of justice and sense of Americanism in not forcing all other American taxpayers to pay income taxes and permitting only the favored shipping trust, which is proposed to be built up by this bill, to have its income taxes remitted.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Do I understand that the bill as originally recommended by Mr. Lasker contained the provision about which the Senator complains?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course; he laid great stress upon it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And that was indorsed by the President?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was indorsed by the President and indorsed by Mr. Lasker. Well, I will say this: The President's indorsement of it just referred to the whole project as submitted by Mr. Lasker. As I understand, President Harding has taken this position about the bill: Mr. Lasker caused a study, as he calls it, to be made by experts in his board as

to what kind of a bill ought to be prepared and passed; and thereupon, after he had received the bill as prepared by those who made the study, he approved it and recommended it to the President, and the President has already recommended it twice, I believe, or maybe three times, to the Congress.

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is the original form of the bill as it passed the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. It passed the House in that shape.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think it is but fair to say that these two provisions are in the act of 1920, signed by a Democratic President, passed without any party division in the Senate and in the House, or at least in the Senate, and that the language of these two provisions is simply the expert language expressing the exemptions provided in the act of 1920.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, as I understand, if these provisions are stricken out as the committee has stricken them out it will leave the present law, which is a modified and a lesser proposition than is contained in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I doubt if it is a lesser proposition than contained in this bill in these respects, but——

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why was the amendment offered?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Here is the situation: The provisions in the act of 1920 have never really been put into effect, because the rules and regulations provided for therein have not yet been framed and adopted by the Treasury Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad to hear that; and I want to say to the Senator that when we come to consider the bill I am going to offer an amendment repealing the provisions of the act of 1920 in so far as exemption from income taxes is concerned. It ought to be done. It is absolutely without merit of any kind, nature, or description. It is unfair and unjust to the other taxpayers of this country to have to pay income taxes and have the shipping interests of the country not required to pay them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to say that, in my judgment, there were most excellent reasons for the incorporation of the provisions in the act of 1920. I do not believe we ought to bring any partisanship into these matters if we can keep it out, but——

Mr. McKELLAR. That view of it is entirely satisfactory to me, but I am afraid a good deal of partisanship has been brought in.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Not by me.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; not by the Senator from Washington. I acquit him and exonerate him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do want to say, however, that this provision was proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL]—I know he would not object to my saying so—in the act of 1920; but, as I say, it appealed very strongly to all the members of the committee. My recollection is that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], who was a member of the committee, did not oppose it at that time because, of course, the conditions were different then from what they are now, and the purpose of those amendments was to encourage the building of some new, up-to-date ships that everybody concedes that we need, and it was thought that the excess-profits taxes and different taxes then could be used to very great advantage. While it would relieve the individuals, of course, yet it would not relieve them from actual taxation. They would have to put that money into the fund used for the building of these ships.

Conditions are entirely different now from what they were then, but those are simply the facts—that the provisions are in the act of 1920, and this is simply putting them in expert language, they claim. We used what we thought was just plain, common-sense language in telling what it was desired to do, but apparently the experts of the Treasury and other departments could not tell what we wanted to do, and so they have never yet adopted the rules and regulations to carry them out; and our committee thought it was well then to strike these provisions out of this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe this is one of the first occasions I have ever had in my life to compliment most cordially the expert. Long life to them, if they will keep the hands of private interests out of the Treasury!

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were not intending to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope they will not attempt to put new life into the old law, because we are not going to have a new law on the subject, according to the report of the committee, and I am going to recommend to the Senate very urgently that it adopt some amendment repealing the remission from taxation provisions of the old law.

While I am on that subject, I want to stop long enough to ask the Senator from Washington if, under the old law, what is known as the Standard Oil fleet and the United States Steel Corporation fleet and the United Fruit Co. fleet are exempted from their income taxes?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They would be covered by that provision in the act of 1920; that is, they would be permitted to take advantage of that provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, there would be a remission of taxes to the Standard Oil Co., the United States Steel Corporation, and the United Fruit Co., each of which has a most successful and flourishing fleet of ships of its own?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were not excepted at that time. The real object of those two exemptions, as I said, was to secure the building of fast combined passenger and freight ships that we do not have. That was the object of it, and that was the only justification that the committee had for recommending it to the Senate, and there was not any controversy on the floor of the Senate with reference to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. All I say is, in perfect good nature, that the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Louisiana were certainly wrong when they sat there and permitted that provision to go in two years ago—that is, if they could have kept it out—just as I believe the Senator from Washington was wrong in 1916 when he was not cordially for building up our merchant marine as then proposed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to suggest that those Senators did not sit here and let it go through. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], I know, was very earnestly in favor of it, and proposed it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, that just made him still more wrong.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is just a difference of opinion as to the correctness of their judgment or the Senator's.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course; but in my judgment they were very wrong in voting these special privileges to the great shipping interests that I have named and other shipping interests that are in a similar situation.

Now, Mr. President, I want to return to the program I have mapped out to say this:

Mr. Lasker's testimony on examination in chief and cross-examination makes it absolutely impossible for anyone to vote for this bill for the reasons that he gives; and why do I say that? I hope Senators will listen to me.

Mr. Lasker says that the reason for our taxing the American people and giving this special subsidy to the shipping interests is, first, that there is a difference now in original capital cost of building ships between our country and foreign countries, and that they can be built for less in foreign countries than they can here in our country, and that this subsidy will equalize the costs.

The next proposition is that the interest rates are less in foreign countries.

The third proposition is that the insurance rates are less in foreign countries.

The fourth proposition is that the labor cost is less in foreign countries.

The fifth proposition is that subsistence costs on our ships are greater than they are in foreign countries.

Those are the five propositions.

I maintain that Mr. Lasker himself has disproved every one of those propositions, and I propose to show it by the record. I first call attention to the original capital cost. It is proposed by Mr. Lasker to sell these ships at $30 a ton to the shipowners. He says that is the world's price. By the way, there is no world's price. How can he talk about a world's price for shipping a year like this? It is absurd and ridiculous. Probably nearly half of the world's shipping is hung up in the harbors. Sixty-five per cent of Italy's ships are laid up. Twenty-five per cent of Great Britain's enormous merchant marine is laid up, without business. We have some 10,000,000 tons laid up without business, without cargoes. Who is going to buy those ships? He talks about selling them at world prices. He talks about giving subsidies in order to sell them. Who is going to buy them? Mr. Lasker himself does not claim in his testimony that even if this bill passes he can sell over 100,000 tons out of 10,000,000 tons. Why are we talking about selling them?

While I am on that subject, let me say this, it seems to me that a 10-year-old child ought to know better than to suggest the selling of ships at such a time. America, with the greatest merchant marine in the world, second to that of Great Britain, over 6,000,000 tons of great steel cargo vessels and a very large amount of passenger tonnage, the greater part of it laid up,

doing nothing. It can not be sold at any price. I doubt if it could be given away. He should have said also that that condition obtains throughout the world. It obtains in England, in Norway and Sweden, in Denmark, in France, in Italy, Japan, and everywhere. There never was such a depression in shipping in the world as there is to-day. It is the worst year the shipping interests have ever had. They have not the cargoes; they have not the business.

Why should we take these splendid ships this year and undertake to sell them? They cost us $3,000,000,000. Of course, I do not charge any wrongdoing. I do not know of any wrongdoing anywhere in regard to the matter, but if it were desired to defraud the Government, you could not find a better time to do it than now, nor a better way than by putting these ships on the market at the present time. They can not sell them. There is no way to sell them. They could not sell them if you passed this bill. The Shipping Board have had the authority to sell them, under the present law, for two years, but they have sold practically none, because there is no market for them; and when Mr. Lasker talks about a world market and selling these ships at world-market prices, he is talking about something he knows is misleading.

But I go on about the capital cost. Representative HARDY cross-examined Mr. Lasker. Mr. HARDY had made a study of the needs of the shipping business, as his cross-examination showed. Mind you, Mr. Lasker proposes to sell but 3,000,000 tons of cargo shipping. He wants to scrap the other 3,000,000 tons. He is fixing to organize a trust. He is fixing to give away the 3,000,000 best tons of shipping, as he calls them, to private interests, and pay a subsidy, in these hard times, to run them, and then he proposes to sink or dismantle the other 3,000,000 of what he calls poor tons, so that they may not come in competition with the 3,000,000 good tons in private hands in the future. Was there ever a scheme better calculated to build up a trust in this country? I say there never has been. This is what Mr. Lasker said about the capital cost:

(Hearings, page 25.)

Mr. HARDY. Then, as to that 3,000,000 tons, is there any advantage to the Britisher on the question of original cost—that is, your first element?

Mr. LASKER. Taking it by and large; no.

And again:

(Hearings, page 26.)

Mr. HARDY. Now, then, to get get back to the question, with this little bit that is owned and with the vast quantity that may be sold by the Shipping Board to enterprising merchants in America at the cheapest price in the world, have they not got an equal opportunity, so far as original cost is concerned, with the British?

Mr. LASKER. Over a term of years, the answer is unequivocally "Yes."

And again:

(Hearings, page 28.)

Mr. HARDY. All right. What I wanted to get at is this: That according to your statement, the American shipowner now can get his ships as cheaply as they can be gotten in the world, of the same kind?

Mr. LASKER. Yes, sir.

This enormous shipping, which he wants to sell at zero prices, is already built, and if he is allowed by this bill to sell it at zero prices, that will be cheaper than any other nation in the world can build ships. Even Mr. Lasker knows that. He has learned that much about shipping. It did not dawn on him at first, but at last it has dawned on him that that is cheaper than they could be gotten for in other countries.

INTEREST.

The next item of difference mentioned by Mr. Lasker is interest, and a complete answer to this is the act of 1920. The Shipping Board is authorized under that act to lend money to shipowners at any rate of interest. They can lend it at 1 per cent or 2 per cent or any other per cent. They can lend it cheaper than England lends it to her shipowners. The present bill increases the rate of interest and Mr. Lasker says he is satisfied with the present bill. Besides this, he admits in his testimony that the interest rates authorized by us are less than those of Great Britain. He says:

(Hearings, page 32.)

Mr. HARDY. Do you anticipate the Britisher can get any better terms of interest?

Mr. LASKER. No, sir. If I thought he would be able to do it I would have proposed less than I have.

He proposes 2 per cent. I stop here long enough to say that it took those of us who felt an interest in agriculture in this country some 10 years to get a bill passed by which the farmers could go to the Government and borrow money on a 50 per cent valuation of their farms at 5½ per cent interest. Yet by this bill, recommended by Mr. Lasker and recommended by the President of the United States, they come forward and say, "We sell you the ship at zero, then lend you two-thrids of its value," instead of one-half, as they lend the farmers, "at 2 per cent," instead of 5½ per cent. Who is going to stand for that discrimination against the American farmer? We will lend to the American farmer 50 per cent of the value of his farm, the best security in the world, at 5½ per cent, but we will take the shipping trust and let them appraise their ships, not half as good security as the farm, and we will lend them the money on two-thirds of the appraised value, according to Mr. Lasker, at 2 per cent. I thank the House for having put it up to 4½. What the conferees will make it, I do not know, but I imagine Mr. Lasker will have his way about it, so that he can lend money to these favored interests of his at rates cheaper than British rates.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator that as the Senate committee has approved the House rate that matter will not be in conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a long time before it will get to conference. If it is agreed to it will be 4½ per cent.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The committee recommended it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it has been recommended, but it may be changed before it gets to conference.

Now, I read further from the testimony:

Mr. HARDY. Do you anticipate the British shipper can get any better terms of interest?

Mr. LASKER. No, sir. If I thought he would be able to do it I would have proposed less than I have.

Mr. HARDY. Then, the interest charge here will be no greater than there?

Mr. LASKER. I want to make the interest less here than it is there.

Mr. HARDY. Let us suppose you have it equal.

Mr. LASKER. No; let us suppose we have it less. I won't stand for it being equal.

Mr. HARDY. Then if it is less there won't be any disadvantage to the American shipowner?

Mr. LASKER. Sure there won't.

Under the present law Mr. Lasker can lend money to the Shipping Trust at 2 per cent, or less than 2 per cent, if he desires, and yet he comes before the Congress, thinking that probably Members of the House and Senate would not look into the question, and says that one of the reasons why the American merchant marine should be subsidized is because of the difference between the interest British shipowners have to pay and what Americans have to pay.

INSURANCE.

On the question of insurance, Mr. Lasker testified:

(Page 36.)

Mr. HARDY. I have been with the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House, doing all I can to try to get up a system of marine insurance that would give us equal rates with any other country. I think we ought to have them. I believe we can have them. So far as the Shipping Board is concerned, they own so many ships that probably they can carry their own insurance.

Mr. LASKER. I think they ought to. I think that is our first point of agreement, and I am exploring that now. My mind is running in your direction.

Mr. HARDY. There is no question about that.

Mr. LASKER. The only thing is the setting up of the machinery for making prompt settlement.

Now, since that time an insurance bill in accord with Mr. Lasker's views has been passed and no complaint is made that there is any difference in the matter of insurance, according to Mr. Lasker's own testimony.

LABOR.

Mr. Lasker very shortly disposed of his contention of the difference on labor. He says:

But I do know this, that to-day the labor cost between Britain and the United States is closer together than it ever was before in the history of shipping.

His testimony absolutely refutes the idea that there is any difference in favor of foreign shipowners, in so far as the cost of labor is concerned, and all the tables that are presented and the studies referred to, and the witnesses examined, show that there is essentially no difference in cost. The Americans pay their seamen slightly more, but they have fewer in number, and their efficiency is greater, so that labor costs are substantially the same, and Mr. Lasker destroys by his testimony the very contention he makes on the subject of labor. The labor situation is thus summed up by Mr. Lasker:

Mr. HARDY. If that is left out of this, then I do not want to go into that, except I have a statement here showing the difference in cost of crews amounts to nothing.

Mr. LASKER. I don't know at the present moment that it does amount to anything. (Hearings, p. 36.)

SUBSISTENCE.

The last element of difference claimed by Mr. Lasker was the difference in the cost of subsistence. In his own testimony on cross-examination he just as effectively disposes of this contention:

(Hearings, page 36.)

Mr. HARDY. You pay more for coal and oil in the United States?

Mr. SMULL. We pay the same for them here as there.

Mr. HARDY. Then there is no difference in the fuel cost on coal?

Mr. LASKER. It never has been claimed.

THE LA FOLLETTE SEAMAN'S ACT.

To the credit of Mr. Lasker, he did not claim that the so-called La Follette Seaman's Act, so commonly alleged to be a reason why American shipping could not succeed, was hurtful to the American merchant marine. This contention he very effectively disposed of on cross-examination:

(Hearings, page 43.)

Mr. BANKHEAD I understand from the President's address to Congress, and also from the statement that you have made, that you do not undertake to recommend or urge any material change in the seaman's act that now exists.

Mr. LASKER. You are right. I want to take occasion to say here that I think the seaman's act has been one of the most misrepresented acts of which I have ever heard. I came down to Washington believing, as most people in my part of the country do, if you repeal the seaman's act you would have a merchant marine. That is pure bunk.

CONCLUSIONS FROM MR. LASKER'S TESTIMONY.

So that, Mr. President, if we are to consider this bill from Mr. Lasker's testimony there is no reason for its passage. He himself disproves his own cause. The object of the bill, of couse, is to get a direct subsidy from the Government. He bases this demand for a direct subsidy upon five different contentions, and then proceeds by his testimony to disprove his claim in each case. Mr. Lasker makes out a stronger case than any other witness. The remainder of the Shipping Board's testimony is in line with his, and so, upon the facts in the record, the reasons for a direct subsidy are not only not made manifest but they are actually disproved by the principal proponent of the bill.

Yet with this testimony and the other testimony, with these studies which have been made in the Shipping Board, all upholding these contentions, the President and Mr. Lasker come before Congress and ask Congress to give this favored trust a cash subsidy of from $35,000,000 to $50,000,000 a year, with power in the Shipping Board to double it, and on the ground that there is a difference between the original cost of construction and the present cost, that there is a difference in the rates of interest, that there is a difference in the cost of labor, that there is a difference in the cost of construction, a difference in insurance, and in subsistence. Mr. Lasker disproves everything that was so claimed, and I challenge Senators favoring the bill to dispute the facts brought out on the cross-examination of Mr. Lasker.

SUBSIDY, NOT A MERCHANT MARINE.

The fact is, Mr. President, that our Republican friends are after a subsidy for special interests and not after building up a merchant marine. They have never cared to build up a merchant marine unless it could be used as a vehicle of transferring Government funds to special interests. They were in control of the Government for nearly 50 years following the Civil War. They never took any steps to build up a merchant marine except on one occasion when they undertook to pass a subsidy bill, and therefore it must be apparent to everyone that their main purpose has been throughout their history not to build up a merchant marine save as a method of transferring public funds to the shipping interests. Take Mr. Lasker's testimony. He is not concerned about a merchant marine. He decries the merchant marine. He runs it down as much as possible. He sneers at it. He throws cold water on the entire proposition, but he is strong for the subsidy to the special interests. The whole of his testimony is aimed at subsidy for the special interests. Apparently he has no thought of building up our shipping. He says nothing about getting business for the merchant marine. It is only to get a subsidy for the owners.

ATTITUDE OF SHIPPING BOARD AGAINST AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, the whole attitude of the Shipping Board is unfavorable to the building up of an American merchant marine. They do not try to get business. They do not try to hold on to business. Their actions sometimes indicate they are not loyal to the American merchant marine. I am going to read a correspondence that took place between Mr. J. B. Smull and myself in August, 1921, Mr. Smull being one of the $35,000 a year men employed by the Shipping Board. This correspondence shows that the Shipping Board's policy was even then a policy of tying up as many ships as possible. They did not want business. They not only did not try to get business, but they tried to keep from taking business. I do not charge that Mr. Smull or Mr. Robinson were in the employ of British shipping interests. I assume, of course, they were not, but if they had been in the employ of the British shipping interests they could not have any better served the British shipping interests than they did in their actions in this matter. Mr. Humphreys afterwards chartered an English vessel and carried his cakes to an English port in an English vessel, when, of course, if the American Shipping Board had wanted to take the business they had the first call on it. This is an isolated case, but it shows the policy of the Shipping Board; it shows the thought of the Shipping Board; it shows that as far back as 1921 the Shipping Board was trying to force itself out of the shipping business.

I come to that phase of the question, which I examined very closely a number of years ago. The present Shipping Board is composed of men against whom I have nothing to say personally. Two of them are as warm friends as I have in the world, one of them a lifelong friend, and another one served in this Chamber with me, and I am devoted to both. I have nothing but the highest respect and esteem for them. I have nothing personal against them. But the truth is that the Shipping Board does not want the American merchant marine to succeed as it is going on. They do not want it to prosper. They do not want it built up. They have other fish to fry. They are not attempting to get business. I say they have never attempted to get business. What they have been trying to do is to lay up ships in the harbors of the country and not to put them to work. I have the indisputable evidence of that, and I now submit it to the Senate and to the country. It came about in August, 1921, in a peculiar way, just after the present board went in. I read the first telegram that brought it about:

[Telegram.]

AUGUST 25, 1921.

Senator K. MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

Kindly make diligent inquiries of Shipping Board to ascertain how we may proceed to obtain by charter the services of an American steamer to handle full cargo about 8,000 tons cottonseed cakes late October, loading Houston, Tex., to two United Kingdom ports. We naturally desire secure rates somewhat lower than prevails for lesser quantities. Is there any just reason why we can not charter direct with Shipping Board?

HUGH HUMPHREYS.

Mr. Humphreys is a large cottonseed product dealer in Memphis, one of the best merchants we have there, one of the most influential men we have there, one of the best men I ever knew, able financially, and in every other sense a splendid man, good for any contract he might make. I immediately called the Shipping Board—this Shipping Board to some of whose members is being paid the enormous salary of $35,000 a year to look after American shipping interests—and here is what I was compelled to telegraph my constituent that afternoon:

[Telegram.]

AUGUST 25, 1921.

Mr. HUGH HUMPHREYS,
Memphis, Tenn.:

Telegram received. Called Shipping Board at once. Mr. Smull, in charge of allocation, out of city. Be here to-morrow. Mr. Robinson advises that you can get cakes hauled cheaper by British ships. Will see Mr. Smull when he returns and urge him to let you have ship and at less cost than the British ship.

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Here is the letter I wrote Mr. Smull that very afternoon:

AUGUST 25, 1921.

Mr. J. B. SMULL,
Shipping Board, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMULL: Inclosed please find telegram from Mr. Hugh Humphreys, of Memphis, Tenn., one of the best and most reliable merchants and brokers there, which telegram explains itself.

I have talked to your Mr. Robinson about the matter, and he did not give me much encouragement, saying that the British could haul the freight cheaper than the American ship could be chartered for. If everybody is told this, we might as well sink our ships. It seems to me that every effort should be made to have Mr. Humphreys charter this ship and haul his cottonseed cakes in it. Mr. Robinson told me that you would be back to-morrow, and I will be greatly obliged if you will advise me over the telephone as soon as you come to a conclusion about it.

I am wiring Mr. Humphreys, and inclose you a copy of my telegram.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

It will be seen that this letter and the two telegrams all occurred on the same afternoon. The next day Mr. Smull returned—Mr. Smull, the gentleman to whom we are paying the enormous salary of $35,000 a year to look after the American ships and to look after American business on those ships. Here is the letter which I received from Mr. Smull and which I now read:

AUGUST 26, 1922.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have just returned from New York in connection with the United States mail matters, and find your letter of yesterday awaiting my attention.

I regret I was not here to talk to you in person when you called on the phone yesterday. I have taken this matter up with Mr. Robinson, and while he may have explained himself very bluntly, facts are stranger than fiction, and the fact remains that all full-cargo tramp steamers under foreign flags can operate more cheaply than Shipping Board steamers.

I might add that the conference rate for cottonseed cakes from the Gulf to the United Kingdom ports has been fixed by the American and British interests at $10 per 2,240 pounds. The present market rate for a full-cargo tramp steamer in the same trade is approximately $6.50 to $7 per ton, and your constituent can probably obtain a foreign

steamer at this figure. The Shipping Board would lose money on any steamer they put into this trade at this rate.

Incidentally this explains to you why the Shipping Board is laying up its steamers as fast as they can be laid up, in order to stop losses, and this situation will only adjust itself with an improved condition in the general export situation.

Very truly yours,

J. B. SMULL, *Vice President.*

Thirty-five thousand dollars a year are we paying to this vice president of the Shipping Board to advise American citizens to ship their goods and wares upon British ships and not upon American ships! He is the man who, when business is presented to him and no question raised about price, gives that sort of advice. Mr. Humphreys wanted an American ship; he wanted to move his cargo. He did not demand that the Shipping Board lose money. He did not demand that the Shipping Board even operate the ship. He asked only that he be allowed to charter a ship to carry his goods from Texas to two United Kingdom ports, and this $35,000-a-year man, without whom the Government apparently can not get along, without whom the Shipping Board would go into even worse bankruptcy than it now is, this man, with nearly a thousand steamers laid up doing nothing, recommended to my constituent that he charter a British ship!

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. The statement by the Senator from Tennessee and the letter he just concluded may throw some light on why the Shipping Board has not made money and why it has lost so much money.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is just the reason why I read it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Any business concern conducted upon the principle that the manager rejects business and notifies those offering business to transact it with rivals or competitors would more than likely find the business increasingly unprofitable.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes; what the Senator from Arkansas has said is absolutely correct. What effect is this going to have? Mr. Humphreys is a leader in the business of cottonseed products in my State and in my city. Does anyone suppose any other cottonseed products man or any other merchant of Memphis at all attempted after that time to get an American ship when thus treated by Mr. Smull? And yet he is in charge of allocation; he allots the ships to Americans who want to buy ships, and he is paid $35,000 a year.

I do not charge Mr. Smull with being an agent of the British Admiralty. Oh, no! I am sure he is not. But let us assume for the moment that he was a different kind of man from what he is, and that he was an agent of the British Admiralty in disguise as an officer of the American Shipping Board; could he have done any more to build up the British shipping and could he have done any more to break down American shipping? I say, Mr. President, that Mr. Smull, if he entertains the views that he expressed in that letter, ought not to be an officer of the American Shipping Board. I am surprised that he remains an officer after writing such a letter.

Now, I want to read the completion of that matter. I have it here. I have another letter dated a few days afterwards, August 28, 1921, from Mr. Humphreys, and I want to read that. I want Senators to bear particularly in mind that he is talking about a man who is so important to the Government that we have to pay him more than twice as much as we pay the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, that we pay him more than twice as much as Cabinet officers, and more than four times as much as Senators and Representatives. Here is Mr. Humphreys's criticism:

Memphis, Tenn., August 29, 1921.—Senator K. D. MCKELLAR, Washington, D. C.—

He calls me by an affectionate name; we are very intimate friends—

DEAR K. D.: Thank you for your usual promptness in handling the matter of the Shipping Board, and which is in line with the attention that you always give any request.

I agree with you that the letter you sent is a remarkable one and is a complete admission of the inability of the Shipping Board to handle the ships of the country. In my own opinion, the trouble is that they have never handled themselves in a businesslike way and have never entered the shipping business as other shipping companies conduct their affairs. I simply can not understand why the boats are not leased or chartered to various shipping interests of the world, but instead are endeavoring to handle them in a most unbusinesslike way.

The pre-war rate from Gulf ports to Europe was about 10 shillings. To-day the Shipping Board, with everything at about normal prices, confess they can not operate at more than four times that rate.

Don't wake up the Washington office of the Shipping Board—

It has been so long ago—a year and a half having passed—that I feel it is time they should be awakened when they are trying to tax the American people for the cash subsidy which they proposed—

Don't wake up the Washington office of the Shipping Board, but the conference rate, instead of being $10 per ton, as stated in their wire, is $8 per ton, and is being so quoted by all of their agents.

Mr. Smull missed it only 20 per cent! That is pretty good for a $35,000-a-year man. He is surely a great expert, without whom the Shipping Board could not run, according to the statement of Senators of a year ago when they were apppropriating the $35,000 for his salary, that he could not have come any closer than 20 per cent, so I think we ought to congratulate him for not making a greater mistake. Mr. Smull telegraphed that the conference rate was $10 per ton, when his own agent telegraphed him that it was $8 a ton—

We do not wish this mentioned, because it might result in their tying up still more steamers and allowing the American produce to rot or be sold at perfectly ridiculous prices because of their inability to properly operate the steamers.

I wish you would send the original of the Shipping Board letter and my original telegram over to Senator MCKINLEY, who is president of the Mississippi Valley Association, as I would like for him to see the total impossibility of Americans trying to do business in their own ships. The idea of admitting to other countries that we can not compete, and tying up our ships, is simply beyond my process of reasoning.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly, HUGH HUMPHREYS.

We remember the condition then prevailing. American produce was rotting on our own shores because of lack of vessels to transport it, and the member of the Shipping Board to whom we are paying $35,000 a year was tying up our ships in various harbors. I presume the Shipping Board must take some pride in being able to tell the world that we have a harbor at Jamaica Bay, near New York, completely filled with steel vessels belonging to the Shipping Board; that we have vessels tied up in Delaware Bay; that we have them tied up in the James River; that we have them tied up all along the Atlantic seaboard. They wished to tie them up; they did not want the business.

In his testimony that was given to us Mr. Lasker talks about subsidy and about small salaries the greater part of the time, but rarely mentions the fact that the Shipping Board needs business in order to do well and to prosper.

I read another letter:

Memphis, Tenn., September 10, 1921—

That was about 15 days after the $35,000-a-year agent of the Government turned down Mr. Humphreys's request to charter a ship—

Senator K. D. MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR K. D.: I inclose a copy of the telegram sent you as requested:

"I do not believe that the Shipping Board is trying to further any other interest; they simply are admitting their own incompetency and the further fact that the whole arrangement they have of handling the steamers is wrong. I would suggest that a committee composed of some American exporters and American shipping agents be appointed by the President or some one else to study this Shipping Board problem, not with the view of its expense, etc., but with the view of making it serviceable and available to the public and be operated upon the same principles as other shipping interests are operated in other countries, and not with the view of certain governmental iron-clad regulations of trying to force business to meet those regulations rather than providing something that is efficient."

Yours very truly, HUGH HUMPHREYS.

With a record like this, with a record of inefficiency, with a record of failure to attempt to get business, with a record of refusing business when it is tendered to them on a silver platter, are these gentlemen in any position now to come forward and demand that the American people be taxed in the sum of perhaps $100,000,000 a year for the next 10 years? They wish to make the contract obligatory upon Congress to appropriate the money for the next 10 years, with probably a billion dollars to go to the Shipping Trust in that time, and to put it beyond the power of Congress to abrogate the contracts. Are they in any position to come to us and ask for such a favor for these special interests? I say they are not in that position; their record is not such that they can come to us as they do and make that request.

Mr. President, I have already discussed President Harding's statement. I do not condemn President Harding. It is perfectly natural that he should take the view of the chief of the Shipping Board. Surely he does and we know he does; but, Mr. President, the only thing that I would criticize in the President's message is that he ought to have examined into the matter; he ought to have looked into these figures; he ought to have investigated the reasons before he came here and recommended that the American people be taxed $100,000,000 a year for 10 years; and it may be twice that much in the next 10 years; for we all know that once the camel gets its nose into the tent it is very difficult ever to get him out and that he usually gets his whole body in. The President of the United States, it seems to me, owed it to the American people to examine into the facts and figures presented to him by the Shipping Board before he recommended this proposed legislation to Congress.

Mr. President, I referred a moment ago to the fact that this was not a time to sell ships in any event. Of course it is not a time to sell them. We could not sell any ships if we should pass this law. By the way, Mr. Lasker does not think that we could sell more than 100,000 tons out of 10,000,000 tons. How he fixes the amount at 100,000 tons nobody knows, and he does not himself say. However, why should we select this year of all years to sell ships when the whole world has ships tied up and doing nothing; when ships can be had virtually for nothing everywhere? Why should we require the Shipping Board to sell the ships at such a time as this? It is not good business; it is not prudent; and if we permit it we shall commit a grievous wrong upon the American people.

Now, I come to just one other statement. On page 7 of the hearings, here is what Mr. Lasker had to say:

> Of the 6,000,000 tons of freighters the Government possesses, it is the hope of the Shipping Board that ultimately a great measure of the 3,000,000 good tons will find itself in the hands of American owners, should the legislation here proposed be adopted. It is doubtful if under the happiest conditions the American flag will need the 3,000,000 good tons in its entirety—

I interrupt my reading of Mr. Lasker's testimony long enough to say at this point, Mr. President, that that statement alone is proof positive that Mr. Lasker ought not to be at the head of the Shipping Board. The idea of any American citizen saying that America will never need as much as 3,000,000 tons of cargo shipping! Mr. Lasker establishes a limit, and then proceeds in this statement further to say that the other 3,000,000 tons of cargo shipping ought to be dismantled and put out of business, because it might come into competition with the ships that are embraced in the 3,000,000 tons of good shipping. Such a statement from the chairman of the Shipping Board is unpatriotic. We all know that in the years to come America will have as many tons of shipping as will any other nation in the world, because America has cargoes to carry in her ships. We do a greater business and the products of America which are carried in ships are greater than those of any other nation in the world, and the time is coming, notwithstanding what these advocates of a hothouse merchant marine may say, when we are going to build a merchant marine in this country which will carry our products of every kind, nature, and description to the markets of the world.

Mr. Lasker proceeds—

> and ways and means must be found to dispose of such of the good tonnage as remains, so that American interests will not be hurt.

He wants to sell a portion of these ships and keep the remainder so that those who buy the good ships may not be hurt in the future. I do not charge Mr. Lasker with wrongdoing, but suppose a man wanted to do wrong; suppose he wanted to dispose of our merchant marine to certain favored individuals and fix matters so that they could always make large profits out of the ships thus disposed of, what better arrangement could be suggested than the arrangement which Mr. Lasker suggests, namely, that we shall sell such of the ships as are good; that we shall sell the best cargo tonnage to these favored interests and then destroy the remainder so that they will never have any competition in the future?

Mr. Lasker goes on to say—

> Under no circumstances must the surplus good tonnage that America can not absorb be disposed of so as to bankrupt those who buy from the Government at current prices.
>
> Automatically the 3,000,000 poor tons must be done away with. Part of it can be used by selling to Americans the hulls at low figures for conversion to types of freighters of which we are not possessed. The balance may either be sold in small quantities in local trades abroad, if any, where because of shorter runs and cheaper labor local operation may be possible, or it must largely be dismantled. For if we permit a potential surplus to remain, with the possibility of its use in only abnormally prosperous times when any tonnage can be profitably operated, the burden of loss will fall on the good tonnage in times of adversity without full enjoyment of profit in time of prosperity, and thus we depress the price of all of our tonnage, and so it will come to pass that we shall liquidate the whole for less than we could liquidate the good part.

ONE WAY TO BUILD UP A MERCHANT MARINE—BUSINESS.

Mr. President, there is but one way to build up an American merchant marine, and that is to get business for it, to get cargoes for it. Our merchant marine does not need a subsidy. It needs cargoes. Our ships are not lying idle because of the failure of Congress to grant subsidies to them. They are lying idle because they have not cargoes to carry. And the condition in America is not different from what it is elsewhere. Ships in every country are tied up. They are tied up for the want of business, not because they do not get subsidies or can not get subsidies. It is because they can not get business. If business is obtained for our ships they will not be laid up. They will not be idle. They will be busy. And so, Mr. President, it is a puerile thing to do for the Government to attempt to run our ships, unless they have got business, and to pay for the running of them out of the Public Treasury; and that is what this bill means, and it is easily demonstrated. Take the fleet of the Standard Oil Co. ships. They get no subsidy, and yet they are making enormous profits. Why? Because they have got the business. They have the cargoes, and so with the ships of the United Fruit Co. and the ships of the Steel Corporation. These concerns give them the business, and when they have business they are prosperous. They do not need subsidies. They do not need bounties. They do not need legislation. They are making money right along, even in these, the hardest times ships ever had.

So that I say, Mr. President, that our remedy is not in giving bounties, but our remedy is securing business for our ships. Mr. Lasker says build up our merchant marine by giving subsidies. I answer, build up our merchant marine by obtaining business for our ships. Get them cargoes and they will need no subsidies.

AN ALTERNATIVE PLAN.

It is next claimed by the proponents of this bill that those of us who oppose it have submitted no better plan. The distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES], for whom I have the greatest respect and the highest esteem, says:

> If this plan is not the best plan, he will be for the best plan.

I am not an expert on our merchant marine. I am not an expert on shipping, but it does seem to me that this great Nation of ours has all those things at her command by which and through which a great and successful merchant marine can be built up and maintained, and I want to suggest what seems to me to be a sensible plan, a business plan, of getting business, of getting cargoes for our ships.

Mr. President, I present a skeleton program concerning this matter as follows:

First. I would abolish the Shipping Board and put the affairs of the Shipping Board in the hands of one man and make him responsible for its success. The longer I live and serve in the Congress the more convinced I am that the policy of establishing boards as executives is an unwise policy. It is a dividing of responsibility which makes for divided purpose, which makes for inefficiency, and I believe that executive action should be individual. I believe the best results would come from turning the affairs of this bureau of the Government into the hands of one man and making him responsible.

Second. I have long thought that the American merchant marine should be a part of the Department of Commerce. The agencies of the Department of Commerce—foreign and domestic agencies—should all be used for the purpose of building up our merchant marine and making it successful. Our commerce agents abroad should also be agents of the American merchant marine. I have not thought this out as carefully as it deserves to be considered, but our merchant marine is, or ought to be, simply a carrier for our foreign and domestic commerce, and the agents of our Commerce Department should work in entire harmony with and work for our merchant marine. This Shipping Board admits it has made a failure of operating our ships. Abolish the board and put our shipping in the hands of one man and hold him responsible and it will be more successful.

Third. Our mail should be carried entirely in American ships. In round numbers, last year we paid American vessels about $4,000,000 for carrying our mails and foreign vessels about $2,000,000. All of our mail should be carried in American vessels. This would add $2,000,000 a year of business to our Shipping Board. It would aid in furnishing cargoes for our merchant marine. It would aid in furnishing business for our merchant marine, and this we ought to do.

Fourth. We should pass laws providing that immigrants to this country should be brought in American vessels. Why do we permit this enormous business to go principally to foreign vessels? We restrict immigration. We lay down rules and regulations upon which immigrants shall come to this country. We have an essentially idle merchant marine. These immigrants are very very desirous to come over here. They would be delighted to come in our vessels. Then why should we not take charge of this very lucrative trade for our own ships? If we did not want to take all of it, surely we should take a very large portion of it. It is a business we can absolutely control. It is a business we should control. It would be a most effective aid in, not furnishing a gratuity to our shipping, but in furnishing business for our shipping by which it could grow in a healthy endeavor.

Fifth. Mr. Lasker informs us—and we assume he is correct—that our Government pays to the ships of other nations on trans-Pacific passengers and cargoes alone the enormous sum of $7,500,000 annually. (Hearings, p. 18.) It is fair to say

there seems to be some doubt about what Mr. Lasker means as to this matter.

Why, not a pound of this freight and not a passenger should be allowed to be transported on foreign vessels. It should all be done on American ships. It is unpatriotic in these officers of the Government to travel on foreign ships when they can get American ships that are just as good, and it is unfair in the agents of the Government to ship their cargoes for Government use on foreign vessels. The law should require that they ship these cargoes and passengers on American vessels. This item of business alone would probably amount to $15,000,000 a year, if Mr. Lasker's statement is correct. This will give our merchant marine business. It will not give it a gratuity.

Sixth. Section 34 of the shipping act reads as follows:

SEC. 34. That in the judgment of Congress, articles or provisions in treaties or conventions to which the United States is a party, which restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States, and which also restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on foreign vessels and on vessels of the United States entering the United States should be terminated, and the President is hereby authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice to the several Governments, respectively, parties to such treaties or conventions, that so much thereof as imposes any such restriction on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods as may be required for the giving of such notice by the provisions of such treaties or conventions.

But President Wilson and afterwards President Harding both have seen fit to disregard this mandate of Congress on the ground, I am told, that it interferes with the power of the President and the Senate to make and execute treaties. On the other hand, there is nothing better settled than that Congress has the power to abrogate by law treaties already made. The treaties referred to in this section should be abrogated and Congress should if other nations discriminate against us impose discriminating duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States. Such a law would create an enormous business for our merchant marine. It would alone be enough, in my judgment, to make our American shipping blossom like a rose if our commercial adversaries continue to discriminate against us.

Seventh. The high tariff wall that has been placed around our country by a recent act of Congress should be removed. We should trade with the rest of the world, and the only way we can trade with it is by buying their goods while we sell them our surplus products.

Eighth. We should repeal that provision of the merchant marine act of 1920 which provides for the remission of income taxes of those engaged in shipping. Such a law is un-American and indefensible.

Ninth. Abolish all tax exemptions.

Tenth. Prohibit anyone connected with the Shipping Board becoming interested in the purchase of any ships for a period of 10 years.

Mr. President, if these suggestions were put into law, in my judgment, they would do more to build up and successfully maintain our shipping than all the direct subsidies in the world.

Eleventh. Prohibit any further sale of steel vessels, passenger or cargo, until there is a better market. No vessels should be sold on the present low market. The shipping tied up idle all over the world makes it a futile thing to talk about, this being an opportune time now for selling ships.

NEED OF A REAL MAN.

Mr. President, there never was such an opportunity for a real shipping man as there is now for one at the head of our merchant marine. It we had our merchant marine in the hands of a man who wanted really to achieve something splendidly great for his country, the opportunity is here and now for such a man. But he must be a man with no other interest, no other views, no other purposes, no other desires, except to build up our merchant marine. He must go into it with his whole heart and soul and mind. Think of what an opportunity it would be! He would already have the richest Government in the world behind him. Congress would delight to uphold him in making our merchant marine a success. But he can not win if he is afraid. He can not win unless he is willing to fight. Of course, he has to fight Great Britain on every sea. He will be obliged to come into competition with British ships everywhere, with Japanese ships and French ships and Italian ships, and the ships of all the other nations of the world, but with this Government behind him there is no reason why he should not soon build up for the United States the greatest merchant marine that there is or ever has been on the seas. It will take a man of nerve; it will take a man of ability; it will take a man of the most scrupulous honesty; it will take a man who is capable of doing great things. If we can find such a man, the opportunity is here for him to make the greatest name for himself of any man in our country, because the building up and maintenance of a merchant marine is the one great American governmental project of the future. No man afraid, no mollycoddle, can do it. It will take a real man.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNARY in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he will yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to make a motion to take up another bill in lieu of the bill now pending? I do not desire to take the Senator off the floor, but he can proceed afterwards with his remarks, for my motion will be debatable.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I would rather yield now and proceed later. I yield to the Senator to make such a motion. I hope, then, that an adjournment may be taken until Monday, if it meets with the approval of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no desire to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand that.

Mr. NORRIS. But the motion I intend to make will be debatable and the Senator can resume his remarks on that motion.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I would be very glad, indeed, to be relieved at this time, and I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4050, to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

I should like to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I have no disposition to crowd that motion to a vote this evening, because I understand that many Senators have gone away. The motion, of course, is itself debatable, so that it need not interfere with the debate.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Tennessee yielded the floor or intended to yield the floor; but I am not going to make any point against entertaining the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, because he could make it, of course, when the Senator did yield the floor, and he does not intend to press it to a vote this afternoon. So I will make no point under the rules as to the presentation of the motion while the Senator from Tennessee holds the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON. Would the Senator from Tennessee like to conclude his address this afternoon?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should prefer to conclude on Monday, unless it is imposing a hardship on the Senator from Washington, which I do not want to impose. I think it will take me only a few minutes to conclude; and, as I said, I would rather conclude on Monday. I will say to the Senator that I am substantially through.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I had hoped that we could remain in session until 4 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that he yield to the request of the Senator from Tennessee. There is not a quorum here, and in all probability it would be impossible to get a quorum.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We shall want a short executive session.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator says he would like to conclude Monday, I am not disposed, under the arrangement that has been made, to press him to conclude to-day; so, with the motion of the Senator from Nebraska pending, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend until the Chair states the motion. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4050, to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply desire to renew the statement I made yesterday, that next week I want to press the shipping bill much more than I have during the present week, and I hope that we may run probably from 11 o'clock until half past 5 or 6 o'clock each day during the week.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator will withhold his motion for a moment. A motion having been made to take up the so-called Norris bill, when we adjourn this afternoon, will that be the pending matter after 2 o'clock on Monday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heretofore agreed to recess from to-day until Monday; and the pending question on the reconvening of the Senate on Monday will be the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Regardless of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be no morning hour.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we recess there will be no morning hour, of course.

LLOYD-GEORGE'S WAR MEMOIRS.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, as reflecting an interesting side light on the apparent effort of great European statesmen to influence public opinion in the United States on international political questions, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of this date relating to the cancellation of a contract by the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune for the publication of the memoirs of Mr. Lloyd-George because of his subsequent arrangement with other publishers to give publicity to political articles by the former British Premier.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows.

[From the New York Times of Saturday, December 16, 1922.]

NEW YORK TIMES-CHICAGO TRIBUNE CONTRACT FOR LLOYD-GEORGE'S WAR MEMOIRS CANCELED.

The New York Times and the Chicago Tribune announced on September 15 last that they had jointly purchased for the United States and certain other countries in the Western Hemisphere the serial rights to the war memoirs of Mr. David Lloyd-George, then Prime Minister of England. The price to be paid was £40,000, of which £4,000 was paid in advance. For reasons that will be set forth below, the contract for this purchase has now been canceled, at the instance of the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune, and after legal proceedings had been begun by them against Mr. Lloyd-George.

The contract was signed after representations had been made by the agent that the work had been begun and was then in progress, and that, although Mr. Lloyd-George might soon retire from office and thus gain more time to devote to the work, yet, even if he remained in office, half of it, he hoped, would be delivered to the purchasers by January 1, 1923, and the remainder as rapidly as possible. However, to meet the contingency of Mr. Lloyd-George's long continuance in office and arduous occupation with government labors, a period of two years was allowed for the completion of the work.

With great surprise, therefore, the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune learned on November 23 that Mr. Lloyd-George, who had just retired from the office of Prime Minister, was about to enter into a contract with an American "syndicate" to write weekly and fortnightly articles on current topics for a period that, under a proposed option, might be extended to 108 weeks, overlap the two-year period within which the memoirs were to be completed, and, in the opinion of the purchasers, endangering their delivery and impairing their value.

The two newspapers at once made energetic protest, but on the following day, November 24, Mr. Lloyd-George entered into the new contract, whereupon they urged that the proper course was the cancellation of their contract for the purchase of the memoirs. Mr. Lloyd-George replied that he had not violated his contract with the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune either in letter or in spirit, and that the memoirs would not be delayed. A subsequent communication addressed to the managing editor of the New York Times follows:

18 ABINGDON STREET, WESTMINSTER, S. W. 1,
December 1, 1922.

DEAR SIR: It is with great surprise that I learn that you take exception to the contract I have signed with the United Press for a series of articles on current politics, on the ground that the value of my book on the war will be interfered with by the appearance of these articles before the book is published. I can not take your view that a series of short articles not encroaching in the least upon the material of the book can possibly influence the arrangements you have made for publication of the serial rights.

Moreover, I can assure you that the date of publication of my war memoirs will not be delayed by reason of my contract with the United Press. I am already engaged, and am employing the assistance of others, in accumulating material for these volumes. As the only minister who held high office right through the war I imagine my book will be a contribution which no other person is in a position to make to the story of that tremendous event. Such a work is bound to take time, for all the facts must be carefully considered and verified, and the utmost care will be required in their compilation. It is not desirable, therefore, that the preparation should be hurried, and I intend to take ample time over it, at the same time avoiding any unnecessary delay.

On the other hand, I never supposed for one moment that the contract which I signed with you would preclude me from the publication of political articles. Had there been such a clause in the contract I would never have signed it. Apart from my memoirs, I always intended to write as soon as I left office. I have my living to earn. After 17 years in office I have retired a poor man, and it is absolutely imperative that I should turn to writing as a means of livelihood. The proceeds of the book for which you hold the serial rights are, as you know, to be given to charity.

The terms of my contract are explicit, and I have not deviated from them. But I hate the idea of standing on the legal interpretation. I therefore set forth the above reasons for your judgment lest you should imagine that I am standing merely on the letter of my bond whilst making illegitimate profit for myself by infringing its spirit.

Yours truly,

D. LLOYD-GEORGE.

It was on August 3 that the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune first committed themselves to the purchase of the memoirs, and it was three weeks later when Mr. Lloyd-George, whose prospective profits had in the meantime been criticized in the English press, announced that he would give those profits to charity. The New York Times and the Chicago Tribune were therefore not aware at the time of this commitment of the later announced purpose of Mr. Lloyd-George.

A considerable correspondence by cable ensued upon Mr. Lloyd-George's contracting, on November 24, for the series of articles to be published before the memoirs, but without immediate result. Meanwhile his new articles were being offered to newspapers in America in such phrases as "they will be released long before the memoirs"; "our contract covers everything George will write during the coming year and carries with it option on another year's series," and "new series much more valuable than the memoirs"; "articles being current interest and injuring the value of the memoirs." The originals of some of these messages, as delivered to the persons addressed, are in the possession of the New York Times. Mr. Lloyd-George has expressed strong disapproval of the phrases used in them in offering his new articles to American newspapers, and states that they were issued without his knowledge or authority.

The long cable correspondence failing to produce the desired result, the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune, through their London counsel, the Hon. Sir Charles Russell, began on Wednesday last an action in the High Court of Justice in London against Mr. Lloyd-George, asking for an injunction restraining advertisements disparaging or prejudging or affecting the value of the memoirs, restraining the publication of Mr. Lloyd-George's articles written under the agreement made on November 24 with an American "syndicate," and alternatively asking for the rescission of the contract made by Mr. Lloyd-George with the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune. Leave was granted for a motion to be heard on Friday. On Thursday Messrs. Lewis & Lewis, solicitors for Mr. Lloyd-George, arranged with Sir Charles Russell for the cancellation of the contract of the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune with Mr. Lloyd-George and the return to the two newspapers of the advance payment less a part of the commission that had been paid by Mr. Lloyd-George to his agent.

The settlement was concluded by the two subjoined letters, the first from a member of the firm of Lewis & Lewis, representing Mr. Lloyd-George, to Sir Charles Russell, representing the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune, the second Sir Charles Russell's reply thereto:

ELY PLACE, HOLBORN, *December 14, 1922.*

DEAR SIR: I have seen Mr. Lloyd-George with reference to my interview with you about his contract with regard to the serial rights of his book on the war with your clients. He wishes to state most emphatically that every shilling he has received has been paid to a separate banking account, and he has not used it in any way for his personal expenditure. He also wishes to add that at the time the contract was signed he had written several chapters, and this I can personally vouch for, as I read them.

The advertisement which you tell me was issued in America was issued without his knowledge or authority, and he disapproves of and expressly repudiates it. He has no wish to continue to remain a party to this contract if your clients wish it dissolved, and he has instructed me to so inform you, but he thinks it due to his honor that any misunderstanding as to the use of the money paid as a deposit should be at once removed.

Please let me hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

REG. WARD POLE.

The Hon. SIR CHARLES RUSSELL, *Bart., K. C. V. O.*

LONDON, *December 14, 1922.*

DEAR SIR: I of course accept on behalf of my clients the assurance which you have given me that the amounts paid on account of the price of your client's book have been placed by him to a separate account and have not been touched by him or used for his personal expenditure, and that he always intended to give the whole of the proceeds received by him to charity. I should like to take this opportunity of assuring you that neither I nor they intended to convey any suggestion to the contrary.

I appreciate your offer to cancel the contract, and I am instructed to accept it in the spirit in which it is made. May I conclude by saying that I think your client has met a difficult position in a fair and honorable manner, a view with which I am confident my clients agree.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES RUSSELL.

The New York Times and the Chicago Tribune desire to say that at no time have they suggested that any improper disposition has been made of any part of the money by Mr. Lloyd-George.

How the New York Times first learned of Mr. Lloyd-George's new plans, and how, through the kindly intervention of a friend in London, opportunity was made, but necessarily rejected, to take the new series of articles away from the "syndicate" that had projected it, is shown in the dispatches assembled in the following cable message sent by the managing editor of the New York Times to its correspondent in London:

NEW YORK, *November 23, 1922.*

NYETIM, *London.*

Received to-night following from a London newspaper:

"LONDON, November 23.—Learned to-day Keen, United Press, been negotiating for series 30 articles by Lloyd-George, each article about 2,000 words. Keen guaranteed £7,500, syndicating proceeds beyond that amount to be divided between contributor and United Press. Immediately saw George, begged him not to close with offer until I informed you. He agreed not to close until Saturday, on which day Keen returns to America. Articles will be for publication weekly the first 12 weeks, subsequently at fortnightly intervals. They would be of undoubted world-wide import and interest, the subjects including American relations, reparations, the Irish treaty, the Turkish treaty, the Socialist menace, international trade, our new Parliament. George is strongly impressed by Keen's stating the articles would be published in 150 papers. George values such wide publicity. Reply whether you want his articles. Think could get them for you for definite sum of

£8,500, this to include South American newspaper rights. Only knew at last moment of these negotiations, and only my strongest personal entreaties got the matter held up. If you are interested better allow me to go up to £9,000 if necessary to clinch the matter, relying upon me getting you best bargain possible."

To this I sent the following reply:

"NEW YORK, November 23.—We will have absolutely nothing to do with Mr. Lloyd-George's proposal to sell 30 syndicated articles. On his agent's representation that if he retired from office he would at once set to work to finish his war memoirs, a start on which had already been made the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune purchased the American rights to these memoirs for £40,000. We would, therefore, regard an intervening series of articles as the grossest breach of faith toward us. The memoirs are not yet fully marketed in this country, and not only would the announcement of this new series close our market entirely but we should feel obliged to release those who have already contracted with us, if they so desired. We feel that if we took this new series and offered it to the newspapers that have bought the memoirs we might be justly regarded as having in effect defrauded them, and how much more would we be so regarded if we offered the new series to a new clientele? While we have not yet had time to consult the Chicago Tribune, we can say that we shall not quietly submit to any deprivation of our rights."

While it is difficult to believe such a course is contemplated by Mr. Lloyd-George, the representations made are such that we feel we must act immediately. Will you therefore at once deliver copies of this message to Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Curtis Brown (Lloyd-George's agent in the sale of the memoirs), and Sir William Berry (owner of the London Sunday Times and head of Cassell & Co., book publishers, purchasers of the English rights), and make energetic protest against execution of any such plan, which would destroy serial value of memoirs and greatly impair book value. The new series outlined would inevitably draw upon material properly belonging in memoirs; and, in any case, Brown's assurances justify us in expecting prompt work on memoirs. Since reply was sent to London newspaper have received strong protest from Chicago Tribune, which will doubtless instruct its London correspondent to join in your efforts. We desire immediate assurance that other literary work will not be permitted to delay the memoirs. Answer earliest moment Friday.

VAN ANDA.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until Monday, December 18, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 16, 1922.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Edward Perry Morton, of New Jersey, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vice R. W. Woodworth, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Harry W. Haskell to be postmaster at Indio, Calif., in place of Fred Swartz, resigned.

GEORGIA.

Clifton O. Lloyd to be postmaster at Lindale, Ga., in place of C. O. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Andrew H. Staples to be postmaster at Metter, Ga., in place of J. R. Dixon. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Hanson A. Garner to be postmaster at Chandlerville, Ill., in place of C. W. Jones, deceased.

John F. Flickinger to be postmaster at Lanark, Ill., in place of W. B. Hogan. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Ora C. Hays to be postmaster at Villa Grove, Ill., in place of G. E. Combs, resigned.

INDIANA.

Fred Austin to be postmaster at Birdseye, Ind., in place of W. T. Rowland, resigned.

Oliver A. Potter to be postmaster at Geneva, Ind., in place of W. W. Briggs. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Louis T. Heerman to be postmaster at Syracuse, Ind., in place of B. F. Hoopingarner. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

William W. Andrew to be postmaster at Dexter, Iowa, in place of G. A. Crane. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lorenzo D. Haworth to be postmaster at Dunlap, Iowa, in place of L. S. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Effie M. Brown to be postmaster at Centralia, Kans., in place of M. P. Weyer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Newell R. Kirkham to be postmaster at Lebo, Kans., in place of H. N. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Elam Shaffstall to be postmaster at Luray, Kans., in place of C. L. Gray, removed.

Caroline Boman to be postmaster at Virgil, Kans., in place of C. W. Sharp, declined.

LOUISIANA.

Ethel I. Montgomery to be postmaster at Delhi, La., in place of A. I. Redmond, removed.

MARYLAND.

Thomas B. Griffith to be postmaster at Cockeysville, Md., in place of A. D. S. Harrower. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Henry L. Pierce to be postmaster at Barre, Mass., in place of H. L. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Lucius E. Estey to be postmaster at Brookfield, Mass., in place of E. F. Delaney. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Charles J. Dacey to be postmaster at Conway, Mass., in place of C. J. Dacey. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

Horace W. Collamore to be postmaster at East Bridgewater, Mass., in place of T. E. Luddy. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Henry L. Ripley to be postmaster at Edgartown, Mass., in place of H. L. Ripley. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Thomas J. Murray to be postmaster at Prides Crossing, Mass., in place of E. S. Pride, deceased.

William C. Temple to be postmaster at Rutland, Mass., in place of D. A. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Douglas H. Knowlton to be postmaster at South Hamilton, Mass., in place of D. H. Knowlton. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

Walter C. Ring to be postmaster at Woronoco, Mass., in place of R. M. Mudgett, resigned.

MICHIGAN.

Andrew Bram to be postmaster at Hancock, Mich., in place of D. A. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Etta R. DeMotte to be postmaster at Memphis, Mich., in place of E. R. DeMotte. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

John R. Forsythe to be postmaster at Cohasset, Minn., in place of Albert Newstrom, resigned.

Edith B. Triplett to be postmaster at Floodwood, Minn., in place of J. W. New. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MONTANA.

Laura P. Johnson to be postmaster at Darby, Mont., in place of F. B. Tanner, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Paul R. Lorance to be postmaster at Auburn, Nebr., in place of R. E. Harmon. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

Joseph N. Fuller to be postmaster at Butte, Nebr., in place of C. H. Oldham. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1922.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Fred H. Ackerman to be postmaster at Bristol, N. H., in place of G. B. Cavis. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Edgar A. Noyes to be postmaster at Claremont, N. H., in place of W. P. Nolin. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

William E. Jones to be postmaster at Winchester, N. H., in place of H. A. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Henry C. Almy to be postmaster at Friendship, N. Y., in place of C. M. Estell, resigned.

George W. Van Hyning to be postmaster at Hoosick Falls, N. Y., in place of W. J. Hyland. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Ulysses C. Richardson to be postmaster at Asheboro (late Ashboro), N. C., in place of R. R. Ross, resigned.

OHIO.

Henry R. Kemmerer to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ohio, in place of J. V. Lawler. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Allen E. Young to be postmaster at Medina, Ohio, in place of M. K. Long, removed.

OKLAHOMA.

Ward Guffy to be postmaster at Cleveland, Okla., in place of R. L. Lunsford, jr., resigned.

Clarence S. Brigham to be postmaster at Cushing, Okla., in place of S. R. Staton. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harvey A. McKillip to be postmaster at Bloomsburg, Pa., in place of J. H. Maust, resigned.

Charles O. Wescoe to be postmaster at Fullerton, Pa., in place of L. A. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Clarence F. Ellis to be postmaster at Jamestown, Pa., in place of T. S. Moreland. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

William N. Jones to be postmaster at Johnsonburg, Pa., in place of F. O. Schreiner. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

William J. Winner to be postmaster at Sandy Lake, Pa., in place of R. W. Simcox, resigned.

Franklin Clary to be postmaster at Sharpsville, Pa., in place of Karl Smith. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

John M. Graham to be postmaster at Volant, Pa., in place of J. M. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Sara B. Coulter to be postmaster at Wampum, Pa., in place of J. A. Ketterer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

William A. McMahan to be postmaster at West Pittsburg, Pa., in place of W. A. McMahan. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Benny P. Humphreys to be postmaster at Reliance, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Charles H. Bewley to be postmaster at Greeneville, Tenn., in place of H. H. Gouchenour, removed.

VERMONT.

John T. Dimond to be postmaster at Manchester Center, Vt., in place of C. A. Mattison. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Nora V. Roberts to be postmaster at Glenville, W. Va., in place of W. W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate.

POSTMASTERS.

KENTUCKY.

Mabel K. Kipping, Carrollton.

MINNESOTA.

Edward R. Bell, Akely.
John O. Gullander, Belgrade.
Charles W. Patsold, Cambridge.
J. Arthur Johnson, Center City.
Joseph H. Seal, Melrose.
Will G. Mack, Plainview.
Herman E. Kent, Sanborn.
Mae A. Lovestrom, Stephen.
Jonas W. Howe, Stewartville.

UTAH.

John E. Chadwick, American Fork.
Herschel E. Calderwood, Coalville.
Jesse M. French, Greenriver.
Porter A. Clark, Parowan.
Sidney W. Elswood, Tremonton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 16, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord and our God, we believe that Thou art the Judge of all the earth and can not but do right. May our offering unto Thee be an earnest and a contrite heart. We thank Thee for the hope, the joy, and the love that make life rich. To-day be the inspiration of duty and the restraining power when the way is not clear. Emancipate the hearts of all men from prejudice and intolerance and lead them into the breadth and blessing of true Christian freedom. May the customs, the laws, and the institutions of our land express charity for all. Give us the courage of a great faith that declares in the midst of sufferings and defeat the earth will yet come to its glory. Gladden all our homes this evening and to-morrow and may they symbolize the peace and rest of the Father's house on high. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and had insisted upon its amendments disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. SMOOT, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 248) to provide for the payment of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had agreed to the conference asked for by the House, and had appointed Mr. CURTIS, Mr. WARREN, Mr. LODGE, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HITCHCOCK as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the appropriation bill for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill mentioned, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question? If I understand the action of the Senate in adopting the conference report——

Mr. MADDEN. On the Treasury bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes, the Treasury bill; on the action of the gentleman from Illinois, for the first time in about 30 years it permits the Government of the United States to use improved machinery in one of its departments?

Mr. MADDEN. In the Bureau of Printing and Engraving; yes, sir; and makes it mandatory.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is quite important in that for the first time in 30 years the Government of the United States is not hamstrung.

Mr. MADDEN. Thirty-six years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHREVE, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on strictly Indian affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I have to-day introduced a bill entitled "A bill to ascertain and settle the title to lands and waters in New Mexico belonging to the Pueblo Indians, to preserve their ancient customs, rites, and tribal ceremonies, providing an exclusive forum wherein all controversies as to the rights of the Pueblo Indians may be adjudicated." This bill expresses my thought as to the legislation that should be enacted in order to solve the problems which confront us in the matter of the Pueblo Indian land holdings in the State of New Mexico.

As I stated on the floor on Thursday, I visited some two years ago, as chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, with a select committee, the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., and made an investigation and obtained much information relative to Pueblo affairs. This information can be found in volume 3 of the hearings held at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on the evening of May 16, 1920, beginning on page 646, hearings, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session. There having been, as I stated, much misinformation disseminated since the introduction of Senate bill No. 3855, and that there might be information and a better understanding of the question, I incorporated in my remarks a letter written by an attorney of Santa Fe, N. Mex., which appears in the RECORD of the date named.

The bill which I have this day introduced, as I have stated, represents the substance of what seems to me would in a proper way provide for a satisfactory settlement of the questions at issue. I do not mean to say that it can not be improved, and have no doubt that after full hearings it may be amended in some particulars, and I therefore want it understood that I am not assuming that it is perfect.

I have been making some inquiry for the purpose of informing myself more fully on the legal questions that are involved, and, not being a lawyer, I have consulted Mr. R. E. Twitchell, of Santa Fe, N. Mex., special assistant attorney general in charge of litigation pertaining to this subject. Mr. Twitchell was appointed to do this work because of the fact that he is a thorough Spanish scholar, has given many years to the examination of the Spanish archives of New Mexico, has made translations of the original documents, has written a history of New Mexico, and has published other volumes subjecting, indexing, and analyzing these old Spanish and New Mexican archives. He has resided in New Mexico for approximately 40 years, has been actively engaged in the practice of the law, and is one of the prominent lawyers of the State, and it would certainly seem that he is eminently qualified to handle this particular subject. I learned from Mr. Twitchell that he has prepared a memorandum brief for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs which contains a brief résumé of the points involved and the reasons for the necessity for legislation, and for the information of the House I am submitting same to be incorporated as a part of my remarks:

POINTS IN RE MATTER OF PUEBLO LAND TITLES.

For the COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS:

1. The vast majority of the claims have their origin prior to the date of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, 1848, during Spanish and Mexican sovereignty.

2. There are upward of 3,000 of these claims in areas from town lots to farms and ranches varying in size.

3. The total value of all claims as estimated by attorneys for claimants is from $10,000,000 to $12,000,000.

4. The claims are found in nearly all of the so-called pueblo grants.

5. In a vast majority of the claims the owners declare their title was obtained by purchase or contract with the governing authorities of the pueblo where the lands are situate. In many instances claimants have title from individual Indians and not from the authorities of the pueblo. In some cases these individual deeds were approved by the pueblo authorities, as is claimed by those now occupying the areas so conveyed.

6. Under Spanish law, subsequent to 1571, Pueblo Indians were authorized to alienate their lands under certain restrictions, all of which are set forth in several royal decrees, which are set out in full in my report to the Secretary of the Interior. The Pueblo Indians, under royal decree, were subjects of the Spanish monarchy.

7. Under the plan of Iguala and Mexican law the Pueblo Indians became citizens of the Republic of Mexico.

8. Claimants contend that under Mexican law, being citizens, the Pueblo Indians had the right of property alienation, not only as an entity or community but as individuals.

9. Attorney for the Government does not admit this contention but insists that, even though citizens, still the restrictions of the Spanish law were carried into Mexican law, and were not removed by Mexico until 10 years after the United States succeeded Mexico in territorial sovereignty, and have never been removed by the United States Government.

10. The several pueblo villages in New Mexico were made corporations with the right to sue and be sued by territorial statute which was approved by the Congress of the United States.

11. Since the enactment of the law making them corporations the courts of New Mexico and of the United States have passed upon their political status, although the Supreme Court of the United States has never passed directly as to the claim of citizenship set up for these Indians. (See my report to the Secretary of the Interior.)

12. The question to me is not one of citizenship. It is as to the character and quality of such citizenship.

13. Replying upon local court decisions (U. S. v. Lucero, U. S. v. Joseph, 94 U. S. 614) representatives and leading members of the bar have invariably sustained the claim of right to alienate real property by the pueblo governing authorities.

14. This opinion of the courts and the bar continued until the decision in United States v. Felipe Sandoval (231 U. S. 28), when, in effect, at least, the Joseph case was reversed and a doctrine of tutelage established.

The controversies now existing had their inception in a vast majority of these claims when the decision in United States v. Sandoval was announced.

15. When New Mexico was admitted to the Union and its constitution framed and adopted, a compact was entered into between the people of the State and the United States whereby all control of these Indians was surrendered to the United States and all lands owned and occupied by the Indians was declared to be "Indian country."

16. The Indians and the people of New Mexico therefore are entitled to know what lands are owned and occupied by the Indians, and it is for this reason that decrees of segregation are imperatively necessary.

17. There existed in New Mexico, prior to 1852, no system or provision for the recording of deeds or instruments transferring the title to real property.

18. In Spanish and Mexican times in a majority of cases such as are here under consideration transfers of real property were made solely by delivery of possession, no deeds or other written instruments conveying title being in use.

19. Indians when baptized were given Spanish names and without the baptismal entry in the church records, which in most cases disclosed the racial origin, there is no way, after the great lapse of time and the passing of several generations owning by descent, to prove the racial origin, whether Spanish or Indian, or mixed.

20. There is no competent method whereby, owing to lapse of time, a present owner may identify his source of title as being from the pueblo authorities, nor may he prove any chain of title, owing to the fact that mere change of possession in Spanish and Mexican times served to change ownership.

21. Indians and non-Indians upon pueblo lands have irrigated their lands, at many pueblos, by means of community ditches, in which both classes had ownership and upon which both classes worked jointly in their maintenance. These ditches, in many cases in the Rio Grande drainage area, were built in the first decades of the seventeenth century, and with the exception of the intermission, A. D. 1680 to 1693, during which period the Spaniards were driven out of New Mexico by the Indians, have been used and maintained by both classes.

22. There are a very large number of community ditches in the Rio Grande and tributaries drainage areas in which the Indians have no interest whatever and which do not serve any Indian lands.

23. The priorities in appropriation and beneficial users of all waters in these drainage areas have never been adjudicated.

24. The United States Reclamation Service, for the supplying of the Elephant Butte Reservoir, which lies far to the south of the southernmost pueblo villages, appropriated all the flood waters and natural flow of the Rio Grande and its tributaries, recognising and excepting all waters which had been appropriated and used at the time of the filing by the Reclamation Service.

25. The rights of Indians and non-Indians in and to these waters is a matter of law and any adjudication of rights must necessarily be had pursuant to the laws of the State of New Mexico, having regard to any rights which may legally obtain to citizens in the State of Colorado.

26. On this account (secs. 22, 23, 24) the proper forum for the determination of all water rights, Indian or otherwise, should be the district court of the United States, and all controversies in relation to irrigation of Indian lands, whether between Indians or between Indians and non-Indians, should be finally determined in the courts of the United States and not in the local courts of New Mexico.

With all these facts before us and many others which might be enumerated, the necessity for legislation of some sort should be enacted at the earliest possible date for the following reasons:

"1. Congress had the power in admitting New Mexico into the Union of States to impose conditions relative to the Pueblo Indians within its borders."

Conditions imposed by Congress upon new States through their enabling acts are valid when they result from the exercise of powers conferred upon the Federal Government. The Federal power over Indians is of this character. (Coyle v. Oklahoma, 221 U. S. 559; ex parte Webb, 225 U. S. 663; United States v. Sandoval, 231 U. S. 29 and cases cited.)

"2. The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico are Indians, and, therefore, subject to the constitutional power of Congress over Indians." (United States v. Dick, 208 U. S. 340; United States v. Rickert, 188 U. S. 432; United States v. Sandoval, supra.)

"3. Congressional jurisdiction arises also because of the necessity for Government protection of an inferior race of people."

In United States v. Beebe, 127 U. S. 358, the Supreme Court of the United States says:

"Not only does the Constitution expressly authorize Congress to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes, but long-continued legislative and executive usage and the unbroken current of judicial decisions have attributed to the United States as a superior and civilized Nation the power and the duty of exercising a fostering care and protection over all dependent Indian communities within its borders, whether within its original territory or territory subsequently acquired, and whether within or without the limits of a State. The power must exist in the Federal Government, because it never has existed anywhere else; because the theater of its exercise is within the geographical limits of the United States; because it has never been denied; and because it alone can enforce its laws on all the tribes. Accordingly, plenary authority has been exercised by Congress from the beginning, and the power has always been deemed a political one, not subject to be controlled by the judicial department of the Government." (United States v. Kagama, 118 U. S. 375; United States v. Celestine, 215 U. S. 278; United States v. Heckman, 224 U. S. 413; United States v. Sandoval, supra.)

In the Sandoval case the court declares:

"Long-continued legislative and executive usage and the unbroken current of judicial decisions have attributed to the United States, a superior and civilized Nation, the power and the duty of exercising a fostering care and protection over all dependent Indian communities within its borders."

And in the case of Heckman v. United States (224 U. S. 413) it is declared:

"There can be no more complete representation than that on the part of the United States in acting on behalf of these dependents whom Congress, with respect to the restricted lands, has not yet released from tutelage. Its efficacy does not depend upon the Indians' acquiescence. It does not rest upon convention, nor is it circumscribed by rules which govern private relations. It is a representation which traces its source to the plenary control of Congress in legislating for the protection of the Indians under its care, and it recognizes no limitations that are inconsistent with the discharge of the national duty."

The Pueblo Indians require protection. They were wards of both the Spanish and Mexican Governments, and as such the United States received them under its treaty obligations. Pueblo Indians, while under Spanish and under Mexican rule, under certain circumstances and conditions received this protection, and the transfer of sovereignty to the United States of America neither increased nor diminished the power of the Indians or the duty of the United States to continue the guardian and ward relationship which had existed under Spain and Mexico.

The main question is not whether an Indian could under Spain or Mexico sell his real estate but under what circumstances and conditions, and did those circumstances and conditions continue after the United States acquired the country in which these Pueblo Indian lands are situate? I am convinced that such conditions did continue and that in the performance of its sovereign duty as guardian the United States is in duty bound to require occupants of Indian lands to show a compliance with all such conditions.

To make such compliance under the strict rules of law governing the making of competent proof, in my judgment, in a very large number of meritorious cases will be impossible and in all cases will work a tremendous financial hardship upon individual claimants to lands which were undoubtedly regularly alienated but of which fact proof is entirely lacking when subjected to the strict rules of competency which must be adhered to in our courts. (U. S. v. Ritchie, 17 How. 525; U. S. v. Sandoval, supra.)

"5. That the omnibus actions now pending will be sustained by the courts, if prosecuted to final judgment, against a large majority of the individual defendants cited therein, as well as against other defendants which may be proceeded against in actions yet to be filed."

This result will follow not through any fault of the defendants who perforce must be finally evicted. It will arise in most cases for failure of competent proof, and this failure is directly chargeable to the lack of laws requiring records of instruments during Spanish and Mexican times, to customs of the people whereby transfers were made merely by delivery of possession, through lack of proof in probate and other court proceedings, and also owing to the great expense necessary even if such proofs were available, as in some cases they may be. A further cogent reason lies in the fact that in many of the cases during six or seven generations of open, notorious adverse possession and occupancy there has likewise been no adverse claim advanced or made by the Indians themselves. That at enforcement of the law and the granting of the prayers of the United States in its capacity as guardian under these actions now pending under all the circumstances in each case is beyond the requirements of justice, not demanded by sound governmental policy, unwarranted by the exigencies of the situation and not in the interest of the Indians themselves.

PLEAS OF STATUTES OF LIMITATION AND LACHES CAN NOT BE SUCCESSFULLY URGED.

"6. The ordinary defenses to actions of this sort afforded American citizens are lacking and unavailable for the reason that the supervision of Indian affairs and the protection of the Indians incumbent upon the United States Government owing to its status as guardian creates a public interest as well as a public duty, and for that reason the ordinary defense usually urged and pleaded in cases where the lapse of time has destroyed or removed competent proof of facts of statutes of limitation can not be successfully urged or pleaded by defendants."

The Government is not bound by any statute of limitations where a public interest or a public duty is involved, nor is it guilty of laches through acts of omission or commission of its officers, no matter how gross, in a suit brought in its sovereign capacity to enforce such public right or to assert a public interest.

Mr. Justice Gray, delivering the opinion of the court, in United States v. Nashville, etc., Ry. Co., upon the question of statutes of limitation in such cases says:

"It is settled beyond doubt or controversy upon the foundation of the great principle of public policy, applicable to all governments alike, which forbids that the public interests should be prejudiced by the negligence of the officers or agents to whose care they are confided, that the United States, asserting rights vested in them as a sovereign Government, are not bound by any statute of limitations unless Congress has clearly manifested its intention that they should be so bound." (United States v. Nashville, etc., Ry. Co., 118 U. S., p. 125, citing Lindsay v. Miller, 6 Pet. 666; United States v. Knight, 14 Pet. 301, 315; Gibson v. Chouteau, 13 Wall. 92; United States v. Thompson, 98 U. S. 486; Fink v. O'Neil, 106 U. S. 272, 281.)

"7. Because the prayer for discovery as to defendant's title incorporated in the bills filed by the Government acting as guardian for and on behalf of the pueblos in each instance must be granted, and failing in this regard owing to circumstances and conditions existing in New Mexico from time immemorial, and through no fault or neglect on his part, judgment must be for the plaintiff and defendant eventually ousted from possession. In this manner it is quite possible for the Government to avoid the defect in the criticism of bills heretofore filed for the purpose of determining the title to Indians' lands, that there was an adequate remedy at law, ejectment, to which course, if relegated, the Government would be compelled to bring a very large number of suits the issues of which would be tried before a jury. In this manner the equity jurisdiction of the court will be maintained and any attempt to invoke the right to or procure a trial by jury frustrated.

"8. Many claims to land within the areas admitted to be pueblo lands rest upon ancient transfers from individual Indians. These claims, unless supported by proof of governmental approval, Spanish, Mexican, or American, respectively, must fail, for the reason that the Indian interest is communal and not a separate interest subject to conveyance by any individual or group of Indians, and therefore any deed from an individual Indian or group of Indians is absolutely null and void unless such deed shows governmental participation and approval." (United States v. Joseph, 94 U. S. 618.)

Any such deed is a nullity on its face and no one can derive title under it. Such a transfer was contrary to Spanish or Mexican policy as well as American law, and is strictly forbidden; and where a deed of conveyance is void upon its face, as being in violation of law, the party claiming under it is chargeable with knowledge of the law and of the invalidity of the deed; and this is the rule in Mexican as well as in American law. In such case the party does not even derive a color of title which will give him constructive possession of a tract of land beyond his actual occupation. (Sunol v. Hepburn, 1 Calif. 254.)

"9. Because the decisions of the courts, since the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, have universally recognized the rights of the Pueblos to alienate their lands." (United States v. Lucero, supra; United States v. Joseph, supra.)

On this account, and believing the law settled upon that point, in recent years many purchases of lands within the limits of the grants to the Pueblos have been made after the ordinary safeguards of securing the advice of competent attorneys have been obtained; and in all equity and good conscience if such purchasers of lands have no sufficient title, then they should be reimbursed if the lands are to be restored to the Pueblos, who in truth have never made objection, believing that many years previous the Pueblo had rightfully acted in the disposition of tracts of this character.

The injustice of such a state of affairs is self-evident. The predecessors in interest of many of the purchasers of these lands, during six and seven generations, have passed on to judgment before a court where race, previous condition of servitude, citizenship, or other classification are not material. Their testimony is not available. The records of their acts in securing title from the Pueblos have been lost or destroyed and present owners are unable, except in rare cases, to furnish the necessary proof to support a title, which has always been recognized as sufficient, in Spanish, Mexican, and American times, if the strict rules of law are followed and enforced.

"9. The fact that the United States may, under its authority hereinbefore considered, at any time in the future take steps to oust persons in possession of lands within these pueblo grants, and the continuing uncertainty as to title, has cast a cloud on all lands held by white people within the pueblo areas."

This situation is intolerable and should not continue. It is unsatisfactory to the Indians, and it has created a constant, continuing hardship upon the settlers. The mortgage value of the lands is almost nothing; sales, leases, and transfers have been discontinued, and the feeling between the Indians and their white neighbors is constantly approaching a climax which may result in serious conflict, an avoidance of which is earnestly hoped for by settler and Indian alike; and any clash of parties which may arise suddenly would bring about results deplorable in the extreme and in every possible way imaginable would be detrimental to the interest of the Indian. That any such events may be prevented is a reason of paramount importance why a solution of the problems, which in many instances have arisen through no connivance or inducement of either of the parties in interest, is urgent, insistent, and demanding the earliest possible consideration by the Congress of the United States in the passage of some act whereby justice to all parties may be immediately promised and secured.

"10. The Indians desire that these matters be finally determined upon lines of equity and justice."

Advised by their attorneys, employed at various times and for differing purposes, and by attorneys appointed by the Government of the United States, prior to the decision in the Sandoval case, that the pueblo, acting through its executive officers and its council, had the authority to alienate its communal lands, such officers have made deeds of transfer in good faith and have received fair compensation therefor.

In addition to this source of title, the pueblos have, in some instances, in controversies pending in the local Territorial courts, been subjected to decrees and judgments quieting title against them. As to these, as a most urgent reason why some action should be taken in the premises, it may be added that in my judgment, in a proper case, the United States, as guardian of the Indians, could secure decrees or judgments which would nullify and destroy any and all titles which originate with any such judgment of the Territorial courts, and the fact that such a course is possible casts a cloud upon that class of title, and the Indian, always ready to respect the laws and the judgments of the courts provided by the United States for his government and for the government of his white neighbors, is unable to differentiate as between courts, nor can he understand the reasons for the differing opinions of lawyers or of courts. As a result he is all at sea and is dependent wholly upon the Government and its representatives. This is a situation which should be clarified through congressional action at the very earliest moment.

11. Aggressions, encroachments, and other discriminating practices by settlers upon Indian lands, claiming title of one sort and another, have been in vogue for many years, principally since the advent of American sovereignty. To enumerate instances and methods of accomplishment is not necessary here. It is sufficient to say that such practices have been in evidence and the Indian has always been the losing party. This should be stopped at once and for all time.

Trespasses have been the rule rather than the exception in the use and occupancy of their pasturage lands, and the local courts and juries have yet, in my judgment, to show where the Indian has ever received justice. Assaults have been committed by settlers upon these Indians, where they have sought relief in the courts, and all sorts of charges trumped up for the occasion have been urged in justice of the peace courts, invariably resulting to the discomfiture and disadvantage of the Indian.

"11. Irrigation and the use of water in the cultivation of the lands in this semiarid section is a necessity for the successful raising of crops of almost every kind."

There are instances where white settlers and Indians are joint owners in irrigation canals which serve Indian lands within the pueblo areas and settlers' lands within and without the pueblo areas. In one instance, at least, the irrigating ditch has its source or intake or diversion point upon lands confessedly not Indian. Controversies of a most serious character have arisen over the costs and methods of administering this ditch and the use and content of the water.

As the law now stands, I see no one forum having jurisdiction to settle these controversies, and the judgment of the State court and

that of the United States court might be in conflict to that extent that difficulties of the most serious nature might ensue.

"12. The title of the Indians to the lands occupied by them from time immemorial, while confirmed by act of Congress, which act was followed by the issuance of a patent, did not constitute an original grant; it was simply a quitclaim or confirmation of an already existing title."

These patents each contain the following language:

Now, know ye that the United States of America, in consideration of the premises and in conformity with the act of Congress aforesaid, have given and granted, and by these presents do give and grant, unto the said pueblo of ————, in the county of ———— aforesaid, and to the successors and assigns of the said pueblo of ————, the tract of land above described as embraced in said survey, but with the stipulation as expressed in the said act of Congress "that this confirmation shall only be construed as a relinquishment of all title and claim of the United States to any of said lands, and shall not affect any adverse valid rights should such exist."

Owing to the lack of information as to a proper description of the lands actually belonging to these pueblos and based upon alleged descriptions contained in a so-called archive, which is beyond doubt spurious, these patents and the surveys have quitclaimed to the Indians in some cases lands the title to which was later decreed to other parties by the court of private land claims, and these decrees and resulting conflicts as to boundaries also cast a cloud on the title of both classes of holdings, and this situation demands remedial legislation.

It has come to my notice that certain interests, voiced through organizations perfected for the purpose, are of opinion that a commission appointed by the President would best be able to solve all of the problems presented in the matters under consideration. Personally, I can not entertain a view favorable to this suggestion. The proper forum, as all will admit, under American institutions in which all judicial questions should be settled, is the court, and in handling these matters the United States District Court for New Mexico is, beyond all question, the logical forum for the determination and solution of the many problems which confront us. Now that New Mexico has an additional United States district judge, it is my opinion, which is also the opinion of nearly all of the members of the bar in our State, that within three years at the utmost all of these claims could be passed upon by the district court.

The cost of a commission, whose personnel was made up of men of capabilities equal to those of our United States judges, would command and deserve a salary commensurate with the duties imposed upon them, and a very conservative estimate of the cost of the commission would be not less than $500,000. All of this would be saved by the use of the forum which we now have, and if even a small part of this money so saved should be expended in the betterment of conditions for the various Pueblo tribes it would certainly be a consummation most earnestly hoped for by those who have the real interest and welfare of the Indian at heart.

The reasons before mentioned, in my judgment, are all-sufficient in urging remedial legislation at the earliest possible day.

R. E. TWITCHELL.

I also have a copy of a letter addressed to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs under date of December 11, 1922, which I am informed was written to the commissioner voluntarily and without any solicitation on the part of anyone by a gentleman of high character and a man who has lived for many years in New Mexico. His name is Mr. A. J. Abbott. I think every Member of the House would be enlightened if they could know the contents of this letter, and, that they may have the benefit of knowing its contents, I wish to read it.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *December 11, 1922.*

Hon. CHARLES H. BURKE,
Commissioner Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You do not know me personally or in any official or business way, but, feeling assured of a common interest in the welfare of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, I presume to address this letter to you personally.

During the greater part of the incumbency of Commissioner Jones and all of the incumbency of Commissioner Leupp, I was the special attorney for the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and naturally became very much interested in them.

I have noted with surprise and pain the seemingly concerted attack upon the measure known as the Bursum bill and upon the policy of the Indian Department.

The frame of mind which you have so happily denominated "hysteria," which, like a contagion, seems to have taken hold of a class of people, is inexplicable by any ordinary process of reasoning. I feel sure, however, that if those in charge of the measure persevere discreetly and firmly the fallacy of the so-called objections to the bill will shortly appear. The propaganda which has so industriously, by misrepresenting the purpose of the measure and, I am persuaded, purposely misconstruing its terms and language, has impressed upon the Indian mind that a great intentional wrong against them is contemplated. How easily such a state of mind may be produced among these people is well known by all who have had extensive experience with them. The furor which the newspaper publicity has created is without foundation, and very unfortunate. I have studied the bill with great care and am convinced that its provisions are wholesome and salutary and that amendments are not desirable.

The legal phraseology, such as "without color of title" and other phrases which, as used in this bill, have a purely legal significance, have been made use of ingeniously to cloud the minds of those who do not understand, and to read into the bill a seemingly pernicious and dishonest purpose. It is painful to me, as I know it must be to others who have at heart the welfare of the Indians, to observe the poisoning of the public mind by taking advantage of an excusable ignorance on the part of laymen of the true legal significance of such words and phrases. I am convinced that there is behind it all a deep-laid political scheme to defeat some of our public men when they come up for reelection or public indorsement. I believe, however, that the better-informed element among our people have confidence in the ability and integrity of the gentlemen who framed the bill, and in yourself and your able associates in the Indian Department who have examined and understood its provisions; and may we not hope that the light which may be let in by honest discussion, and the soberness born of careful investigation, will prevail in the end. I already observe a quieting effect, produced, as I believe, by your well-considered, able, and persuasive letter to Mr. George Vaux, chairman of the Board of Indian Commissioners, which was recently published in one of our local papers. Permit me to congratulate you upon your calm, sober, and convincing words, and your forceful appeal for credit, for honesty of purpose and action, on the part of the Indian Office.

There is no more occasion for this attack upon the Bursum bill than there has been for the last 50 years for a like attack upon the legislation by Congress and by the Territory and State of New Mexico, as the same has affected these Indians. It is a flamboyant, misleading, and deceptive campaign; an orgy of lurid words, unsupported statements, and alarming assertions; and we may confidently predict that it will die of its own frenzied paroxysms.

With the sincere hope that the storm of unreason will shortly subside, and the desired legislation may be accomplished without further unnecessary delay, I am, with great respect,

Yours truly,

A. J. ABBOTT,
325 Federal Place, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS E. WATSON.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 471.

Ordered, That Sunday, the 11th day of February, 1923, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. THOMAS E. WATSON, late a Senator from the State of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

THE LATE HON. J. KUHIO KALANIANAOLE.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, the 7th day of January, be set aside for paying tribute to the memory of the late Delegate from Hawaii, J. KUHIO KALANIANAOLE.

The SPEAKER. The Delegate from Hawaii asks unanimous consent that Sunday, the 7th day of January, be set aside for memorial exercises to the late Delegate from Hawaii, J. KUHIO KALANIANAOLE. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AIRCRAFT FOR NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 466 (Rept. No. 1280).

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1924, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, provisions of the bill or amendments thereto relating to appropriations to procure, purchase, manufacture, or construct additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment, including the necessary spare parts and equipment therefor, at a total cost not exceeding $5,795,950.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out the period at the end of line 9, insert a comma, and add also the language between lines 12 and 17 on page 55, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to amend the resolution as follows. The Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Amend the resolution on page 1, line 9, after the figures, the following: Strike out the period, insert a comma, and insert: "and also the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with a view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft."

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the resolution by inserting the language just read.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following as a substitute.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have not yielded the floor. I offer as an amendment the language just read, and upon that I move the previous question.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following as a substitute.

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is voted down the substitute can be offered.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment again reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas moves to amend the resolution by adding at the end thereof, line 9, the following language:

"And also the President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft."

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand what the motion was.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think the gentleman's original motion was that that matter was to be in order. This motion is that "the President is requested;" and so forth.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That can be adjusted when we reach the item in the bill. The resolution makes in order the consideration——

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not so understand it——

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Or germane amendments thereto.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. This amendment makes that matter carried instead of making it subject to consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have the resolution again read?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the whole resolution will again be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 406, as amended:

"*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year 1924, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of a point of order, provisions of the bill or amendments thereto relating to appropriations to procure, purchase, manufacture, or construct additional aircraft for the Naval Establishment, including the necessary spare parts and equipment therefor, at a total cost not exceeding $5,798,950, and also that part of the appropriation bill on page 55, lines 12 to 17, inclusive."

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is very clear as to its purpose. I move the previous question.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOWELL. The statement, "without the intervention of a point of order" is not important in this, and only loses the question. It seems to me that should have been left out of the resolution, because if it is made in order by virtue of this resolution it is not then subject to a point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is just a question of phraseology. The resolution covers the intent.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. It is this: Whether it is possible to separate the resolution and vote on each part of it, or has it to be voted for as an entirety?

The SPEAKER. No. The vote would be taken on the resolution as a whole.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under the rules of the House ought not a resolution like the one that has just been offered by the gentleman from Kansas go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

The SPEAKER. No; the Chair thinks not. The gentleman from Kansas offers a resolution making in order certain provisions of the naval appropriation bill. The Chair thinks the Committee on Rules has the right to make such a report. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late. The Chair had declared that carried and had already put the question.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the gentleman from California withhold his point?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes; I withhold it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the event that the count should develop the fact that there is no quorum present, the question would then be on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The vote now will simply be a call of the House, because there has been no division.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it too late, if the gentleman will withhold his point of no quorum, to demand a division?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from California will withhold it, it is not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman withhold it?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I do.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask for a division on the question.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and seven gentlemen have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Two gentlemen have risen in the negative. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the ayes are 107 and the noes are 2.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 0, not voting 170, as follows:

YEAS—251.

Abernethy	Evans	Lampert	Ransley
Ackerman	Faust	Lanham	Rayburn
Andrews, Nebr.	Favrot	Lankford	Reece
Anthony	Fenn	Larsen, Ga.	Reed, N. Y.
Appleby	Fess	Larson, Minn.	Rhodes
Arents	Fields	Lawrence	Ricketts
Aswell	Fisher	Lazaro	Roach
Atkeson	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Robsion
Bankhead	Foster	Leatherwood	Rogers
Barbour	Free	Lehlbach	House
Barkley	French	London	Sanders, Ind.
Beck	Fuller	Lowrey	Sanders, Tex.
Bell	Fulmer	Lyon	Sandlin
Benham	Funk	McArthur	Scott, Tenn.
Bird	Garner	McClintic	Sears
Bixler	Garrett, Tenn.	McCormick	Shreve
Black	Gernerd	McDuffie	Sinclair
Blanton	Gifford	McKenzie	Sinnott
Boies	Gilbert	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smithwick
Bowling	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Box	Graham, Ill.	McPherson	Speaks
Brennan	Green, Iowa	McSwain	Sproul
Briggs	Greene, Mass.	MacGregor	Stafford
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Vt.	MacLafferty	Steagall
Brown, Tenn.	Hadley	Madden	Stedman
Bulwinkle	Hardy, Colo.	Magee	Steenerson
Burdick	Hardy, Tex.	Mansfield	Stephens
Burtness	Haugen	Mapes	Strong, Kans.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hawley	Michener	Strong, Pa.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hayden	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Mondell	Sumners, Tex.
Campbell, Pa.	Hersey	Montague	Swank
Cannon	Hickey	Montoya	Swing
Carter	Hicks	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hoch	Moore, Va.	Taylor, N. J.
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	Morgan	Taylor, Tenn.
Chindblom	Hooker	Mott	Thomas
Christopherson	Huck	Mudd	Thompson
Clague	Huddleston	Murphy	Tilson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hudspeth	Nelson, Me.	Timberlake
Clouse	Hukriede	Nelson, A. P.	Tincher
Cockran	Hull	Nelson, J. M.	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Humphrey, Nebr.	Newton, Minn.	Turner
Collier	Humphreys, Miss.	Newton, Mo.	Tyson
Colton	Ireland	Norton	Vestal
Connally, Tex.	Jefferis, Nebr.	O'Connor	Vinson
Cooper, Ohio	Jeffers, Ala.	Ogden	Voigt
Coughlin	Johnson, Ky.	Oldfield	Walters
Cramton	Johnson, Miss.	Oliver	Ward, N. C.
Crisp	Johnson, Wash.	Paige	Wason
Crowther	Jones, Tex.	Parker, N. J.	Webster
Dale	Kearns	Parks, Ark.	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Keller	Patterson, Mo.	White, Me.
Darrow	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, N. J.	Williams, Ill.
Davis, Tenn.	Ketcham	Paul	Williamson
Denison	Kinchelce	Perkins	Wilson
Dickinson	King	Poe	Wingo
Dominick	Kirkpatrick	Pringley	Woods, Va.
Dowell	Kissel	Purnell	Wurzbach
Drewry	Kline, N. Y.	Quin	Wyant
Driver	Kline, Pa.	Raker	Yates
Dupré	Knutson	Ramseyer	Young
Elliott	Kopp	Rankin	

NAYS—9.

Begg	Gahn	Logan	Porter
Cooper, Wis.	Lineberger	Moores, Ind.	Stevenson
Fitzgerald			

NOT VOTING—170.

Almon	Edmonds	Langley	Schall
Anderson	Ellis	Layton	Scott, Mich.
Andrew, Mass.	Fairchild	Lee, Ga.	Shaw
Ansorge	Fairfield	Lee, N. Y.	Shelton
Bacharach	Fish	Linthicum	Siegel
Beedy	Focht	Little	Sisson
Blakeney	Frear	Longworth	Slemp
Bland, Ind.	Freeman	Luce	Smith, Idaho
Bland, Va.	Frothingham	Luhring	Smith, Mich.
Bond	Gallivan	McFadden	Snell
Bowers	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stiness
Brand	Gensman	Maloney	Stoll
Britten	Goldsborough	Martin	Sullivan
Brooks, Pa.	Goodykoontz	Mead	Sweet
Browne, Wis.	Gorman	Merritt	Tague
Buchanan	Gould	Michaelson	Taylor, Ark.
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Mills	Temple
Burroughs	Griest	Moore, Ill.	Ten Eyck
Burton	Griffin	Morin	Thorpe
Butler	Hammer	O'Brien	Tillman
Cable	Hawes	Olpp	Tinkham
Cantrill	Henry	Osborne	Towner
Carew	Herrick	Overstreet	Tucker
Chalmers	Hill	Park, Ga.	Underhill
Clark, Fla.	Himes	Parker, N. Y.	Upshaw
Classon	Husted	Perlman	Vaile
Codd	Hutchinson	Petersen	Vare
Cole, Ohio	Jacoway	Radcliffe	Volk
Collins	James	Rainey, Ala.	Volstead
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Copley	Jones, Pa.	Reber	Watson
Crago	Kahn	Reed, W. Va.	Weaver
Cullen	Kelly, Pa.	Riddick	Wheeler
Curry	Kendall	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Davis, Minn.	Kennedy	Robertson	Winslow
Deal	Kiess	Rodenberg	Wise
Dempsey	Kindred	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Doughton	Kitchin	Rosenbloom	Woodruff
Drane	Kleczka	Rossdale	Woodyard
Dunbar	Knight	Rucker	Wright
Dunn	Kraus	Ryan	Zihlman
Dyer	Kreider	Sabath	
Echols	Kunz	Sanders, N. Y.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Echols with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Browne of Wisconsin with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Shelton with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

Mr. Henry with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Hawes.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Underhill with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Temple with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. Anderson with Mr. Ten Eyck.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Beedy with Mr. Gallivan.

Mr. Towner with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Bland of Indiana with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Olpp with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Hill with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Crago with Mr. Cullen.

Miss Robertson with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Radcliffe with Mr. Goldborough.

Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Longworth with Mr. Deal.

Mr. McFadden with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Rucker.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Bland of Virginia.

Mr. Snell with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Sisson.

Mr. Griest with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Upshaw.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The yeas have it, and the amendment is agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SPENCER, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE ON MONDAY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair expects to be detained on Monday at an important meeting of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission after 12 o'clock, and designates the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] to preside until his arrival in case the Chair is not here at 12 o'clock.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILEAGE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the following privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois sends up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 468 (Rept. No. 1281).

Resolved, That the Committee on Mileage be, and is hereby, authorized to hire a clerk for the said committee for the period of one month during the third and fourth sessions of the Sixty-seventh Congress. Compensation of said clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives at the rate of $125.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary resolution, to grant one month's salary to the clerk of the Committee on Mileage. I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FREDERIC H. BLACKFORD AND ELIZABETH F. MULLEN.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 447 (Rept No. 1282).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Frederic H. Blackford the sum of $228.33 and to Elizabeth F. Mullen the sum of $78.33, being the amount received by them per month as clerks to the late Hon. Charles R. Connell at the time of his death, September 26, 1922.

Mr. IRELAND. This is the usual resolution for the employees of a deceased Member.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ANTIONETTE LOUISE FREEMAN.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration for a similar resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 452 (Rept. No. 1283).

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Antionette Louise Freeman, widow of Granville C. Freeman, late a clerk to Representative ARTHUR M. FREE, a sum equal to six months of the compensation of said Granville C. Freeman and an additional sum not exceeding $250 to defray his funeral expenses.

Mr. IRELAND. This is the usual resolution in such cases.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

HARRY NORMAN FLEMING.

Mr. IRELAND. I ask consideration of the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 423 (Rept. No. 1284).

Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House $1,200 to Harry Norman Fleming for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions from December 4, 1921, to the end of the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, as assistant clerk to said committee by detail from the Bureau of Pensions, pursuant to law.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. This is an additional salary. This does not constitute the entire salary of this employee.

Mr. IRELAND. No.

Mr. BLANTON. How much does he draw besides this additional $100 a month that is to be now given him for the past year?

Mr. IRELAND. I think in the neighborhood of $2,000. I will not be positive about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not nearer $2,500 a year?

Mr. IRELAND. It might be. I can not recall from memory now, although I knew at the time the committee passed upon it. It has been customary in the past to grant this additional compensation to these special examiners assigned from the Bureau of Pensions to the different pension committees of the House. The number has been increased at times in the past and, although unauthorized by law, due possibly to the voluminous work of the committee, two appointees have sometimes served one of the Committees on Pensions. This is the usual resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the work before the committee as an advisor any more difficult or any harder than his usual work in the Pension Bureau?

Mr. IRELAND. I am not qualified to answer that, but I should not think so.

Mr. BLANTON. Then why should we increase this salary $1,200?

Mr. IRELAND. It is an appointment always sought by employees of the Pension Bureau. The Members of the House and of the Committee on Pensions and Invalid Pensions have always very strongly advocated this time-honored custom.

Mr. BLANTON. Just before Christmas.

Mr. IRELAND. I can not defend it as a practice in itself, and confess that I personally am not in favor of it.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not think the gentleman, as chairman of the committee, could defend it.

Mr. KNUTSON. In justice to the Committee on Accounts may I say that the Committee on Pensions has lost two examiners by death in this Congress, and the doctors in both instances stated that death was due to overwork. Our examiner comes to work at 7.30 or 8 o'clock in the morning and works until late. He is one of the hardest-worked men in the House Office Building. There is no question about that. He passes upon every pension bill that is considered by our committee. The Committee on Invalid Pensions have two or three examiners, and the Committee on Pensions has only one, notwithstanding we have fully as many cases to consider.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood from the chairman of the committee, who himself is not personally in line with this proposition, that this position is sought after by several of the employees of the Pension Bureau. If it is such an arduous position I would not imagine they would so zealously seek it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Somebody has got to do the work.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; but this is increasing a salary of approximately $2,500 a year to $3,700.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, no, these examiners do not receive any such sum. They are clerks in the Pension Bureau loaned to the Pension Committees of the House, and this is extra compensation in consideration of the extra work which they perform here.

Mr. BLANTON. How much do they receive?

Mr. KNUTSON. Our examiner receives $1,800 and bonus.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman admits that he already receives $1,800 plus the $240 bonus, or $2,040 per year, and to allow him this proposed increase of $1,200 would aggregate a salary of $3,240, which is not far from my first statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

JANITOR TO COMMITTEE ON REFORM IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 50 (Rept. No. 1285).

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $720 per annum for the services of a janitor to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, payment to commence from the date such janitor entered upon the discharge of his duties, which shall be ascertained and evidenced by the certification of the chairman of said committee.

Mr. IRELAND. The Committee on Reform in the Civil Service is one of three active committees of the House that have not been given messengers or janitors. The chairman of the committee has indisputably proven to the Committee on Accounts that his committee requires the services of this employee.

Mr. KING. Can the gentleman state what that proof is? Why are the services of a janitor necessary?

Mr. IRELAND. I will let the chairman of the committee state that if he is here.

Mr. SEARS. What committee is this?

Mr. IRELAND. The Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. SEARS. I would like to ask the gentleman if this committee has any meetings?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Do they make any reforms in the civil service? I have been assured by the association in New York that they were making some reforms. How often does this committee meet?

Mr. IRELAND. I can not tell the gentleman; the Committee on Accounts refuses to be responsible for the action of any other committee.

Mr. SEARS. Can the gentleman tell how often the committee meets?

Mr. IRELAND. I will allow the chairman of the committee to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman's committee has considered this or he would not have introduced this resolution.

Mr. IRELAND. I can not tell the gentleman how often the committee meets. The chairman will give him that information.

Mr. SEARS. I know comparisons are odious when a Democrat undertakes to sustain his position by quoting a prominent Republican.

Mr. IRELAND. Comparisons are odious and I do not want to indulge in them. If the gentleman wants to refer to the Sixty-fifth Congress I want to say that every inactive committee in the House was given all the employees and clerks that they desired. In the Sixty-sixth Congress that was almost eliminated, and in the Sixty-seventh Congress almost no employees whatever were granted to any committee with very few exceptions.

Mr. SEARS. I happen to know that the chairmen of committees were called before the Committee on Accounts and made to state how often they met and what help they were entitled to, and in nearly all cases no help was given to the inactive committees.

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman is getting the Sixty-fifth Congress and the Sixty-sixth Congress confused.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. For the information of the gentleman from Florida, I want to suggest that the present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Accounts has brought in many resolutions which did not have his personal indorsement.

Mr. IRELAND. Well, I will try and live that compliment down. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FLORENCE A. DONNELLY—EDNA RADCLIFFE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following House resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 456 (Rept. No. 1286).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Florence A. Donnelly the sum of $186.66 and to Edna Radcliffe the sum of $120, being the amount received by them per month as clerks to the late Hon. James R. Mann at the time of his death.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is the usual resolution which provides for one month's salary to the clerks of the late lamented James R. Mann, our late colleague of the House. As must be apparent to every Member, it is physically impossible for these clerks to close up his business within the period of one month. We all know that outside of his own work Mr. Mann served a number vastly in excess of any other Member. His work was voluminous. It is impossible for the employees to close up the business within the required time, and the committee did not desire to take the responsibility of breaking precedent even in such an unusual case, but later on in the session I feel sure that it will be necessary to offer an additional resolution to be handled as the House may direct. This, Mr. Speaker, is the usual resolution.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Can not the gentleman suggest an amendment to the resolution and let us dispose of it at this time? I think we are all familiar with the situation.

Mr. IRELAND. Well, that would take some time and there may be some development in the future which may affect it. I wanted to give the House this information.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, the naval appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LINEBERGER) there were 162 ayes and 2 noes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The doorkeepers will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 5, answered "present" 1, not voting 186, as follows:

YEAS—238.

Abernethy	Fenn	Lazaro	Rhodes
Ackerman	Fess	Leatherwood	Ricketts
Andrew, Mass.	Fields	Lehlbach	Roach
Andrews, Nebr.	Fisher	Logan	Robsion
Appleby	Focht	Longworth	Rogers
Arentz	Fordney	Lowrey	Rouse
Aswell	French	Luhring	Sanders, Ind.
Atkeson	Fuller	Lyon	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Fulmer	McClintic	Sandlin
Barbour	Funk	McCormick	Scott, Mich.
Beck	Garner	McDuffie	Scott, Tenn.
Begg	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Sears
Bird	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Shelton
Bixler	Gernerd	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shreve
Black	Gifford	McPherson	Sinclair
Blanton	Gilbert	McSwain	Sinnott
Boies	Graham, Ill.	MacGregor	Snyder
Bowling	Green, Iowa	MacLafferty	Speaks
Box	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Sproul
Brennan	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Stafford
Briggs	Hadley	Mansfield	Stedman
Bulwinkle	Hardy, Colo.	Mapes	Stephens
Burdick	Hardy, Tex.	Michener	Stevenson
Burroughs	Haugen	Miller	Strong, Kans.
Burtness	Hawley	Mondell	Strong, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Montague	Summers, Wash.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hays	Montoya	Sumners, Tex.
Campbell, Kans.	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Swank
Cannon	Hickey	Moore, Va.	Sweet
Carter	Hicks	Moores, Ind.	Swing
Chandler, Okla.	Hoch	Morgan	Taylor, N. J.
Chindblom	Hooker	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Christopherson	Huck	Mudd	Thompson
Clague	Hudspeth	Murphy	Tilson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hukriede	Nelson, Me.	Tincher
Clouse	Humphrey, Nebr.	Nelson, A. P.	Towner
Cockran	Humphreys, Miss.	Nelson, J. M.	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Ireland	Newton, Minn.	Turner
Collier	Jacoway	Newton, Mo.	Tyson
Colton	Jefferis, Nebr.	Norton	Vaile
Connally, Tex.	Jeffers, Ala.	O'Connor	Vestal
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Ky.	Ogden	Vinson
Coughlin	Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield	Walters
Cramton	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver	Ward, N. C.
Crisp	Jones, Tex.	Paige	Wason
Dale	Kearns	Parker, N. J.	Weaver
Dallinger	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, Mo.	Webster
Darrow	Ketcham	Patterson, N. J.	White, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	King	Paul	White, Me.
Denison	Kirkpatrick	Perkins	Williams, Ill.
Dickinson	Kissel	Pou	Williamson
Dominick	Kline, N. Y.	Pringey	Wingo
Dowell	Kline, Pa.	Purnell	Woodruff
Drewry	Knutson	Rainey, Ala.	Woods, Va.
Driver	Kopp	Raker	Wurzbach
Dupré	Kraus	Ramseyer	Wyant
Elliott	Lanham	Rankin	Yates
Evans	Lankford	Ransley	Young
Faust	Larsen, Ga.	Reece	
Favrot	Lawrence	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—5.

Lineberger	Parks, Ark.	Quin	Steagall
London			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Huddleston

NOT VOTING—186.

Almon	Bowers	Cantrill	Crowther
Anderson	Brand	Carew	Cullen
Ansorge	Britten	Chalmers	Curry
Anthony	Brooks, Ill.	Chandler, N. Y.	Davis, Minn.
Bacharach	Brooks, Pa.	Clark, Fla.	Deal
Barkley	Brown, Tenn.	Classon	Dempsey
Beedy	Browne, Wis.	Codd	Doughton
Bell	Buchanan	Cole, Ohio	Drane
Benham	Burke	Collins	Dunbar
Blakeney	Burton	Connolly, Pa.	Dunn
Bland, Ind.	Butler	Cooper, Wis.	Dyer
Bland, Va.	Cable	Copley	Echols
Bond	Campbell, Pa.	Crago	Edmonds
Ellis	Kahn	O'Brien	Steenerson
Fairchild	Keller	Olpp	Stiness
Fairfield	Kelly, Pa.	Osborne	Stoll
Fish	Kendall	Overstreet	Sullivan
Fitzgerald	Kennedy	Park, Ga.	Tague
Foster	Kiess	Parker, N. Y.	Taylor, Ark.
Frear	Kincheloe	Perlman	Taylor, Colo.
Free	Kindred	Petersen	Temple
Freeman	Kitchin	Porter	Ten Eyck
Frothingham	Kleczka	Radcliffe	Thomas
Gahn	Knight	Rainey, Ill.	Thorpe
Gallivan	Kreider	Rayburn	Tillman
Gensman	Kuns	Reber	Timberlake
Glynn	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.	Tinkham
Goldsborough	Langley	Riddick	Tucker
Goodykoontz	Larson, Minn.	Riordan	Underhill
Gorman	Layton	Robertson	Upshaw
Gould	Lea, Calif.	Rodenberg	Vare
Graham, Pa.	Lee, Ga.	Rose	Volgt
Griest	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	Volk
Griffin	Linthicum	Rossdale	Volstead
Hammer	Little	Rucker	Ward, N. Y.
Hawes	Luce	Ryan	Watson
Henry	McArthur	Sabath	Wheeler
Herrick	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.	Williams, Tex.
Hill	McLaughlin, Pa.	Schall	Wilson
Himes	Maloney	Shaw	Winslow
Hogan	Martin	Siegel	Wise
Hull	Mead	Sisson	Wood, Ind.
Husted	Merritt	Slemp	Woodyard
Hutchinson	Michaelson	Smith, Idaho	Wright
James	Mills	Smith, Mich.	Zihlman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Ill.	Smithwick	
Jones, Pa.	Morin	Snell	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Free with Mr. Lea of California.

Mr. Jones of Pennsylvania with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Keller with Mr. Smithwick.

Mr. Brooks of Illinois with Mr. Barkley.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Foster with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Lampert with Mr. Deal.

Mr. McArthur with Mr. Kincheloe.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Kindred.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Anthony with Mr. Rayburn.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Wilson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, the Navy appropriation bill, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, RHODE ISLAND.

For maintenance of the Naval War College on Coasters Harbor Island, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn, passenger-carrying vehicle to be used only for official purposes; and care of ground for same, $81,250; services of a professor of international law, $2,000; services of civilian lecturers, rendered at the War College, $1,200; care and preservation of the library, including the purchase, binding, and repair of books of reference and periodicals, $5,000; in all, $89,450: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for clerical, inspection, drafting, and messenger service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, shall not exceed $50,000.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, in the colloquy day before yesterday on the appropriation of $250,000 for the maintenance of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station it was suggested that our late colleague, the greatly lamented the Hon. James R. Mann, had made an observation to the effect that naval authorities had held the Great Lakes Naval Training Station to be an unsuitable location for the training of recruits. I then stated that when this proposition was before the House and the committee a year ago, "Mr. Mann expressed his regret that, in his opinion, the proper activities were not maintained at Great Lakes," and I added that I was "sorry that Mr. Mann is not here to know to-day that the great Committee on Appropriations has made an ample appropriation for the performance of the activities at the Great Lakes for which that institution was established and on which the Government has spent $10,000,000."

By reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 14, 1922, page 6044, during the consideration of the appropriation for maintenance at Great Lakes for the fiscal year 1923, it will be found that Mr. Mann then made the following statement:

A few years ago the experts in the Navy Department insisted that Congress should provide for a training station on the Great Lakes at tremendous expense and, guided by the experts in the Navy Department, Congress made provision for a training station to be located on the Lakes, in the judgment of a commission to be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, which commission promptly located the station in the district represented by the chairman of the Naval Committee.

And having appropriated great sums of money for the expense of the Great Lakes Training Station, located north of Chicago, and having largely depended upon the men who went through the Great Lakes Training Station during the war, the experts in the Navy Department now conclude that it is not necessary to have a training station on the Great Lakes at all, and under their advice this bill practically abolishes the training station, constructed not as a war measure but provided for long before the war on the advice of the experts.

After making some observations on the subject, I then offered an amendment to increase the appropriation for Great Lakes from $160,000 to $260,000. This amendment was lost in the Committee of the Whole House, but the appropriation was subsequently increased in the Senate to $200,000, and that amount remained in the bill as finally passed. In the hearings before the Senate committee last spring the representatives of the Navy Department agreed that the additional $40,000 would be required to maintain the station during the fiscal year 1923 for the purposes then planned, which included the maintenance of the so-called trade schools but no training of apprentice seamen. At that time it was intended to concentrate the training of recruits at the naval operating base at Hampton Roads, where some temporary buildings were erected during the war and were used for training purposes. For this reason the Navy Department recommended a reduction of the appropriation for Great Lakes of $240,000, namely, from $400,000 to $160,000, and a reduction of the appropriation for Hampton Roads of $15,000, namely, from $375,000 to $360,000.

I proposed to equalize the appropriation for Great Lakes and Hampton Roads by making each of them $260,000, but this effort failed. When the bill went to the Senate, however, the appropriation for Hampton Roads was reduced by $100,000 and this amount was added to the training station at Newport, R. I. It is to be noted that all of these preliminary estimates were based upon a Navy of 67,000 men and were recommended both by the Navy Department and the House committee before the House itself increased the Navy personnel to 86,000 men, its present number. This year the House Committee on Appropriations, as I stated on Thursday, "has made an ample appropriation for the performance of activities at Great Lakes," and the people of the great West, I am sure, will highly appreciate the attitude and action of the committee in this regard. During the last few months a "Committee to Save Great Lakes Naval Training Station," organized in Chicago, has sounded the sentiment throughout the Middle West and found not only a pronounced and aggressive interest in behalf of Great Lakes but as well enthusiastic support for an adequate Navy.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan], as well as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], a member of the subcommittee, on last Thursday presented strong arguments and compelling viewpoints with reference to the continued maintenance of the Great Lakes station for training purposes and showed great sympathy for the policy adopted by the Government when the Great Lakes station was established. It is fair to add, also, that in the recent hearings before the subcommittee Admiral Washington, speaking for the Navy Department, stated that while—

the Navy Department has not formally advocated the training of recruits there, * * * we would very much like to keep a modicum of them at that place even though it cost a little more.

Admiral Washington added that the training of recruits, as recommended by the commandant at Great Lakes, would "meet the public demand and, at the same time, be a great service to the Navy," and that "the general effect of it would be very beneficial to the people." Admiral Washington also conceded that there was a "good deal" of virtue in the argument favoring the location of a training station in a locality where the fathers and mothers and general public may visit the boys who are in training and see the institution where the training occurs.

The appropriation of $250,000 will make possible the training of 1,200 to 1,500 recruits in constant attendance, or about 7,000 to 8,000 during the entire year, in addition to the constant enrollment of approximately 500 men in the trade schools for training radio operators and aviation mechanics. The normal capacity of the station is from 1,800 to 2,400 naval recruits. During the World War this capacity was expanded to 42,500 men. Up to the end of this war a total of 191,552 enlisted men were trained at Great Lakes, not only as ordinary seamen for service in the Navy, but for all kinds of special services needed during the war. The total contribution of this station to our Navy force up to the present time has been over 200,000 men.

The Great Lakes station was originally selected upon the recommendation of a board of naval officers in response to a widespread sentiment and movement for the location of a naval establishment in the interior of the country. It now represents an investment of approximately $10,000,000 in land, permanent buildings, and equipment and has been in successful operation since July 1, 1911. The land was donated by public-spirited citizens in and about Chicago and the population of the surrounding territory has always given the institution its hearty and helpful support. It was desired then, and is desirable now, to maintain some bond of union between our great naval defenses and the constantly increasing population of the great inland States. Obviously, a training station is the only naval establishment that can be located in the interior of the country. Our naval recruits must have some training before being assigned to sea duty, and this training can as well be given on one of our great inland seas as upon our ocean coast lines.

Such an institution must not be permitted to deteriorate and lose its efficiency by inaction or nonuse. It is an integral part of our national defense and serves a necessary purpose, not only by reason of the results obtained through its activities but as well on account of its particular location and especial influence among the people. There should be no suggestion of the curtailment or abandonment of this important establishment so long as a Navy is needed for our national defense.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance: For water rent, heating, and lighting; cemetery, burial expenses, and headstones; general care and improvements of grounds, buildings, walls, and fences; repairs to power-plant equipment, implements, tools, and furniture, and purchase of the same; music in chapel and entertainments for beneficiaries; stationery, books, and periodicals; transportation of indigent and destitute beneficiaries to the Naval Home, and of sick and insane beneficiaries, their attendants and necessary subsistence for both, to and from other Government hospitals; employment of such beneficiaries in and about the Naval Home as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy, on the recommendation of the governor; support of beneficiaries and all other contingent expenses, including the maintenance, repair, and operation of one horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicle, two motor-propelled vehicles, and one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle, to be used only for official purposes, $104,690.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill carries $293,806,538. The first appropriation bill that we passed in the House the other day, the Treasury appropriation bill, carried $115,112,810.37. In its consideration by the Senate there were numerous amendments added to the bill, and it was passed in less than three hours' time. When the Senate passed it with less than three hours' consideration it had added $425,880 in amendments to the bill. The next appropriation bill we passed was that of the Departments of State and Justice. That carried $33,185,051.50. The Senate passed the bill in exactly an hour and 30 minutes, yet added numerous amendments to it, and when it got through with it in this hour and 30 minutes' consideration the Senate had added $303,656.50. The next appropriation bill that we passed was that for the Departments of Commerce and Labor. That carried $26,079,101, and when it went to the Senate it was taken up yesterday and in exactly 30 minutes' consideration was passed. Numerous amendments were added during this 30 minutes' consideration in the Senate, which increased the amount over what had been allowed by the House to the extent of $267,000. Now the conference reports are being rushed through.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If they could add to the appropriations with that rapidity, is not the gentleman thankful that they did not take any more time? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I am just calling attention to such working Members as our new friend from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY], who sits here on the floor, watchful to see if he can take care of the interests of the people. We must watch these conference reports when they come back. We must watch the action taken after the bills leave the House. It is not enough that we shall sit here and watch these various provisions as they come up in the Committee of the Whole, taking out of the people's Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars, but we must watch them when they leave here and when they come back, and must be prepared when these various matters are added without argument or consideration, to strike them out here in the House.

When a bill carrying appropriations of $26,000,000 is passed in 30 minutes it behooves us to watch them and be prepared to oppose them successfully. We can not merely accept the bill when it comes back and is sent to conference, but we must watch the conference report and scan that thoroughly. It is more important that they should be passed properly than that they should be passed hurriedly to get through the business of the Congress by January 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Mr. Chairman, I just desire to have a few words about this four-power pact proposition and this proposition to ask for a further conference with the nations of the earth, and I desire to ask unanimous consent now to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial in the Boston Evening Transcript of December 11 headed "No more four-power pacts," together with a brief comment on it by The State, Columbia, S. C.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an exceedingly interesting discussion by an exceedingly able paper coming from the precincts of HENRY CABOT LODGE. I want to call attention to a few statements made in it before we come to a vote on this proposition.

They start out with the heading, "No more four-power pacts":

President Harding resorts to regrettable exaggeration when he alludes in his address to "the four-power pact" as an engagement "that abolishes every probability of war on the Pacific." If any probability of war on the Pacific existed it arose from the aggressive intentions of Japan. Certainly the United States was not itching for a conflict in that region. Certainly it was not the United States that refused to end the competition in capital-ship construction which the conference of Washington was called to consider. On the contrary, the proposal to end that competition and to limit naval armament by international agreement was proposed by Secretary Hughes at the first plenary session and was pressed upon Japan by the United States and the British delegates for the next 30 days. But without result. Why? Because the Japanese Government refused to consider the proposal seriously until the United States had agreed to surrender all of its naval bases in the Pacific except Honolulu. By the terms of this surrender we agreed to do what no other self-respecting first-class power had ever before been willing to do, namely, to surrender the right to fortify even the islands adjacent to its own home coast.

I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY], who was so concerned the other day about the protection of the Pacific coast, to the language there used.

Then this editorial goes on to say that it has not been lived up to and that the proposition to negotiate a similar treaty with reference to the Atlantic would be turned down and find a ready-made grave in the United States Senate, as this treaty should have found. I will print the whole editorial in the RECORD. It says as a parting shot:

This surrender was agreed to secretly. It was agreed to without the advice or consent either of the General Board of the Navy or the General Staff of the Army. The Committees on Naval Affairs of the two Houses of Congress were not consulted. The Senate was kept in almost complete ignorance of the negotiations until the surrender was finally made public in the form of article 19 of the five-power naval treaty.

The administration is not living up to the five-power treaty. The proof of its delinquency in this respect appears in the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy. As for the "four-power pact," it could not have been ratified, and it ought not to have been ratified if it had been known that the obligations that this Government undertook in the five-power treaty were not to be discharged in the best of good faith. To add to this deplorable record of delinquency by negotiating a "four-power pact" for the Atlantic would be adding insult to injury. Such an addition, as we believe, would exhaust the patience of the American people.

Now you will note that it does not come from any rock-ribbed Democratic minority journal, but from the Boston Transcript, which comes from the home of Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, who is chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Senate, and if there is anything in the statement of this editorial, anything true in it, certainly we had better look out before we seek for any more of these conferences and any more of such treaties as that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The article from the State, Columbia, S. C., is as follows:

UNPALATABLE FACTS.

In all the riot of criticism and objurgation hurled at President Harding and his administration by members of his own political party, amid the "boring from within," while the progressives of the West bombarded and the heirs of the "Roosevelt tradition" of the East raised barbed wire entanglements, one had believed that at least "one achievement" of himself and "the best minds" was looked upon as altogether righteous and expedient—the disarmament conference and its "four-power pact." Alas, it is not so!

Hear this from the Transcript, of Boston, the voice most refined of orthodox republicanism:

"President Harding resorts to regrettable exaggeration when he alludes in his annual address to 'the four-power pact' as an engagement 'that abolishes every probability of war on the Pacific.' If any probability of war on the Pacific existed it arose from the aggressive intentions of Japan. Certainly the United States was not itching for a conflict in that region. Certainly it was not the United States that refused to end the competition in capital-ship construction which the conference of Washington was called to consider. On the contrary, the proposal to end that competition and to limit naval armament by international agreement was proposed by Secretary Hughes at the first plenary session and was pressed upon Japan by the United States and the British delegates for the next 30 days. But without result. Why? Because the Japanese Government refused to consider the proposal seriously until the United States had agreed to surrender all of its naval bases in the Pacific except Honolulu. By the terms of this surrender we agreed to do what no other self-respecting, first-class power had ever before been willing to do, namely, to surrender the right to fortify even the islands adjacent to its own home coast. This surrender was agreed to secretly. It was agreed to without the advice or consent either of the General Board of the Navy or the General Staff of the Army. The Committees on Naval Affairs of the two House of Congress were not consulted. The Senate was kept in almost complete ignorance of the negotiations until the surrender was finally made public in the form of article 19 of the five-power naval treaty."

So what the United States got in the "pact" was obtained by "surrender" which, if not base, was not far from pusillanimous: And it was engineered under a bushel, besides. This, mark, is not a Democratic accusation. It proceeds from one of the most reputable of the Republican newspapers, from the home of Senator LODGE, from a supporter of Senator LODGE, loyal to the point of enthusiastic adulation of him and of all his works.

The President in his latest message alludes, with a solemn air of mystery, to the four-power pact "as a model for like assurance wherever in the world any common interests are concerned" and Republicans, ashamed that their country has run away from its obligations to the distracted world, have been snatching at it as a hopeful path by which to return the Republic to respectable company without pronouncing the name of the League of Nations and the treaty of Versailles. But the Transcript says that the suggestion is "surprising." "If any such treaty (the four-power pact) is ever again negotiated by this or any subsequent administration with any group of European powers we hope and believe that it will only have to reach the Senate to find a diplomatic graveyard from which it will never be resurrected." Well, Colonel Watterson used to say:

"Things have come to a h—l of a pass,
When a man can't wallop his own jackass."

And the Transcript perhaps feels that it is indulging its family privileges. But where shall the punishment stop? Somewhere a point will be arrived at where the "best-mind administration" can not endure incessant enfilading, where, shot to pieces, it will lose heart as well as head. If the four-power pact was an "evil thing" accomplished clandestinely, "put over" on an unsuspecting Republican statesmanship, what assets will be left when the administration passes into the hands of a receiver? Have Mr. Harding and Secretary Hughes magnified the "yellow peril" by "surrendering" to it? It is in the face of what it calls "unpalatable facts" that the Transcript draws its bead and fires its conclusions.

The article from the Boston Transcript is as follows:

NO MORE "FOUR-POWER PACTS."

President Harding resorts to regrettable exaggeration when he alludes in his annual address to "the four-power pact" as an engagement "that abolishes every probability of war on the Pacific." If any probability of war on the Pacific existed, it arose from the aggressive intentions of Japan. Certainly the United States was not itching for a conflict in that region. Certainly it was not the United States that refused to end the competition in capital-ship construction which the conference at Washington was called to consider. On the contrary, the proposal to end that competition and to limit naval armament by international agreement was proposed by Secretary Hughes at the first plenary session and was pressed upon Japan by the United States and the British delegates for the next 30 days. But without result. Why? Because the Japanese Government refused to consider the proposal seriously until the United States had agreed to surrender all of its naval bases in the Pacific except Honolulu. By the terms of this surrender we agreed to do what no other self-respecting first-class power had ever before been willing to do, namely, to surrender the right to fortify even the islands adjacent to its own home coast. This surrender was agreed to secretly. It was agreed to without the advice or consent either of the General Board of the Navy or the General Staff of the Army. The Committees on Naval Affairs of the two Houses of Congress were not consulted. The Senate was kept in almost complete ignorance of the negotiations until the surrender was finally made public in the form of article 19 of the five-power naval treaty.

When the "four-power pact" was negotiated it was assumed that before the conference adjourned an agreement would be reached limiting naval armament in line with the United States' proposal. It was upon this understanding and without any knowledge of the terms of article 19 of the naval treaty that a favorable public opinion in this country was evoked by the publication of the terms of the four-power treaty. It is doubtful whether the four-power treaty would have ever been approved by any considerable body of public opinion, much less ratified by the Senate, if the American people had been thoroughly informed of the unprecedented political surrender of national interests involved in article 19 of the five-power treaty. The Senate was not told during the debate of the very serious opposition in the Navy to this surrender. Ever since the four-power treaty was ratified public opinion has been increasing against it. And to-day the failure of the United States to live up to the spirit of the five-power treaty has so discredited the treaties of Washington in the eyes of the people of the United States and in the eyes of the world that France and Italy have thus far refused to ratify them.

In the face of these unpalatable facts it is surprising that President Harding should refer to the "four-power pact" as a "model for like assurance wherever in the world any common interests are concerned." If any such treaty is ever again negotiated by this or any subsequent administration with any group of European powers, we hope and believe that it will only have to reach the Senate to find a diplomatic graveyard from which it will never be resurrected. Certainly the administration that clutters up the calendar of the Senate with any such treaty during the next two years will be riding for a fall.

Friendship with all nations of good will, safeguarded by treaties of amity and commerce, but entangling alliances with none, is America's traditional policy in foreign affairs. To live up to the spirit no less than to the letter of every treaty negotiated is also traditional American foreign policy. The administration is not living up to the five-power treaty. The proof of its delinquency in this respect appears in the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy. As for the "four-power pact" it could not have been ratified and it ought not to have been ratified if it had been known that the obligations that this Government undertook in the five-power treaty were not to be discharged in the best of good faith. To add to this deplorable record of delinquency by negotiating a "four-power pact" for the Atlantic would be adding insult to injury. Such an addition, as we believe, would exhaust the patience of the American people.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS.

PAY OF THE NAVY.

For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders—pay, $26,029,247, rental allowance, $6,071,049, subsistence allowance, $3,327,593; in all, $35,427,889; officers on the retired list, $3,752,510; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, $20,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, $1,162,089; extra pay to men reenlisting under honorable discharge, $1,839,525; interest on deposits by men, $10,000; pay of petty officers, seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Fish Commission, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, $70,617,419; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court-martial, $549,120; and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; and apprentice seamen under training at training stations and on board training ships, at the pay prescribed by law, $1,512,000; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors—pay, $637,720, rental allowance, $28,800, subsistence allowance, $22,140; in all, $688,660; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps, $7,680; retainer pay and active-service pay of members of the Naval Reserve Force class 1 (Fleet Naval Reserve) $5,700,000; reimbursement for losses of property under act of October 6, 1917, $10,000; payment of six months' death gratuity, $150,000; in all, $121,446,892; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay of the Navy," shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law as "Pay of the Navy," and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the medical department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Bureau in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers appropriated for in this act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman whose admission, subsequent to the class entering the Naval Academy next after the approval of this act, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of three midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of one midshipman for Porto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the governor, and of one midshipman from Porto Rico, appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of two midshipmen for the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large or from the enlisted personnel of the naval service.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso in the paragraph, and I am wondering if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations intends to tell the House something about this particular part of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. If the point of order is made on the paragraph and is sustained, it would take out the proviso.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am not so sure that under the phraseology of the proviso it might be held in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Under the rules of the House if there is any part of this paragraph subject to a point of order upon the insistence by the one making the point of order the whole paragraph will go out. I am making the point of order against the whole paragraph for the present to get a ruling of the Chair, because of its containing matter unauthorized by law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that this paragraph contains legislation on an appropriation bill that is unauthorized by law, in that it increases the amount of the appropriation allowed this Bureau of Supplies and Accounts beyond the maximum authorized by law. This is a matter that has been up here before for several years. This Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has been trying to increase this appropriation, but points of order made against it have been sustained by the Chair.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amount carried in this paragraph is based entirely upon existing law. It is a matter entirely of mathematical calculation. There is no new legislation in it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Of course the sums will vary from year to year, depending upon the number of men and officers in the various classes and ratings at a particular time. But the rate of pay is all prescribed by law, and we are only carrying the necessary sums of money to meet the pay roll.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any authorization of law which now permits a land Navy of 30,000 men?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes. The distribution of the personnel is entirely in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy. He has authority under the law to assign men to ships or shore as he sees fit.

Mr. BLANTON. I will ask the gentleman if the provision on line 10, of page 27, for $35,437,889 is not an increase over the maximum provision authorized by the present law?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. The amount carried in the bill is based entirely upon the law fixing the pay and allowances of officers and men. It is purely a mathematical calculation.

Mr. MADDEN. I am sure the Chair remembers the matter. It has been up here before. I just merely suggest the question to the Chair.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The pay of the officers of the Navy, amounting to $35,000,000, is based upon the statute passed recently by Congress, the legislation having been brought in by a special committee, of which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] was the chairman, and all the other figures of the paragraph are based upon statutory provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to see any force in the argument of the gentleman from Texas. As long as there is no substantive legislation contained in the paragraph, the paragraph is in order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the proviso beginning on line 24 of page 28 and extending over to line 12 on page 29. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to say just a word or two in connection with this proviso.

Mr. Chairman, this proviso brings forth another evidence of the autocratic powers of the Committee on Appropriations, usurped unto themselves, without warrant, and promoting that committee to be the sole appropriating and legislative committee of the House. It is just a matter of time before every other committee in the House might just as well be wiped out of existence entirely.

Here is a question of policy in the Navy Department as to the number of men to be appointed to the Naval Academy by Members of Congress. The act of July 11, 1919, provided that each Member of the House shall be entitled to appoint five midshipmen to the Naval Academy. This proviso, worded in an ingenious manner in order to come within the Holman rule and not be subject to a point of order, reduces that number to three and reduces the number of appointments for the District of Columbia from five to two.

Now, certainly, under the rules of the House, legislation of that character belongs to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I do not think there is any question about that. I have gone into the hearings very thoroughly, and I find that the Committee on Appropriations wasted as much as six or seven minutes on this important change of existing law. They heard Admiral Washington. The substance of Admiral Washington's opinion was that the Naval Academy should be maintained at its present status; in other words, five midshipmen should be appointed by each Member of Congress. A reduction to three appointments will easily maintain 4,500 line officers, according to the testimony, or, at least, according to the language of the chairman of the committee; it will more than care for the 4,500 commissioned personnel in the line, such as we have there now. But is it going to give us a proper flow of commissioned force in the Navy?

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I understood the gentleman to say 4,500 per annum.

Mr. BRITTEN. No. I mean that there are approximately 4,500 commissioned men in the line to-day, or, speaking more exactly, 4,382. There are authorized by law 5,499, which figure no one contends should be made effective. But those of us who are interested in the Navy—and we all are, of course—feel that by graduating a surplusage over the actual requirements of the Navy we can get better men and we can more easily get rid of those in the line who are not filling their places to their best advantage or to the best interests of the service.

Now supposing, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] contends, that 4,500 officers in the line is sufficient, and we can accommodate that number by allowing the appointment of three to the academy by each Member of the House and Senate, and so forth, as contemplated in the proviso, what condition are we going to find ourselves in in the event of an emergency? We shall have enough officers to man the ships in active service and to man the shore stations, but we can not spread as we would like to. We ought to train men in the Naval Academy for the merchant marine, if need be, and for the Marine Corps, and for the staff corps of the Navy, and not depend on getting these men out of private life, as we are doing now. That can not be done if we reduce the number of appointments to the academy from five to three, as proposed in this bill.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Has the gentleman considered the possibility of using this surplus of graduates from the academy in building up a naval officers' reserve corps, which would seem to me to be very feasible and helpful in the case of an emergency?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is just another way of using the surplusage which may come from the Naval Academy through this excess number to be appointed. We are carrying the overhead there with a great institution and the training force. Why not allow these men to come out of that school?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask my colleague, who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and has been for some time, and has always expressed his interest in the Navy, if he does not think it would be well and appropriate for the Committee on Naval Affairs to take up the whole matter of the reorganization of the Navy, not only of the academy at Annapolis, but the matter of the commissioned personnel of the Navy, the matter of retirement, the matter of retainer pay, and a number of other things that have been pieced on to the naval legislation of this country, so that it is difficult for an able seaman like my colleague to understand what the law is covering the Navy? I will ask him if we can have any hopes held out to us of something being done along the same line as has been done in regard to the reorganization of the Army?

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes. I think the suggestion of my colleague from Illinois is a very good one. A reorganization of that kind might very reasonably be considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs. But with this constant usurpation of power by the Committee on Appropriations there is no incentive for these other committees to do any work at all. Bills are repeatedly brought in here by the Committee on Appropriations with such legislation as was made in order this morning by rule; legislation that properly belongs to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They will do the same thing with respect to the Army bill, and with respect to the rivers and harbors bill. They will do it with every bill that is brought in here, unless the House objects.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. I tried to get the attention of the Chair several times on a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair was looking right at me. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not take a Member off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry without his consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Florida that he can not take a Member off the floor in that way.

Mr. SEARS. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members present, a quorum. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] make a point of order?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have not concluded my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is up to the Members of the House to call the attention of the House from time to time to these usurpations of power by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes, I do.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does not the gentleman consider that one of the best examples of the usurpation of the powers of the other committees of the House and the autocracy of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations was the case which we had this morning in the adoption of this rule making in order legislation affecting the limitation of armament on a naval appropriation bill when it ought to have come out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. BRITTEN. The matter of calling an international conference is apparently of little importance to the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs should not be in existence. The Committee on Appropriations should conduct the business of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Committee on Naval Affairs need not be in existence. The Committee on Appropriations can take care of everything applying to the Navy, in an indirect manner, if not in a direct manner. Of course, I do not think this proviso is subject to a point of order, because it has been adroitly worded in order to come within the Holman rule, but its positive effect is to reduce the number of appointments to the Naval Academy by Members of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. As long as the Committee on Appropriations have with them the chairman of the Rules Committee they can do anything they please.

Mr. BRITTEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. McKENZIE. Just so long as the membership of this House stand back of the Committee on Appropriations, as they did this morning, we are not in a position to make any very great complaint, are we?

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is entirely right. It is because of the feeling in the House that we wanted to give this new rule for procedure a trial under the leadership of that great and distinguished leader, MARTIN B. MADDEN, who is a real leader of men. [Applause.] I am for him for anything he wants in this House. [Applause.] But if the Committee on Appropriations is going to continue to usurp the powers of other committees from time to time and take action on matters of policy as important as this one to-day, and do so after a hearing of four or five minutes, I think it is time that the House should assert itself and change the rule.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order——

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman has said this is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am just about to make my point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman said it was not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I make the point of order against the proviso.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I make the point of order——

Mr. LINEBERGER. Regular order.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. This is the regular order. I am making the point of order that this paragraph is no longer subject to a point of order for the reason that the Chair overruled a point of order directed to the whole paragraph.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; but there was a reservation pending.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That does not make any difference. The greater includes the less, and when a point of order against the whole paragraph is overruled that disposes of a point of order reserved or made to any part of the paragraph. That has been frequently held. I am not able to cite the Chair to the precise decision just at this moment, but the reason for that is an obvious one. If a point of order is made to the whole paragraph and any part of the paragraph is subject to the point of order, then the point of order must be sustained to the whole paragraph. Of course, a gentleman may choose to make the point of order to a part of the paragraph, and then that is the only thing that is involved; but if some other gentleman makes it to the whole paragraph that disposes of the paragraph as a whole and of every part of it.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman said this was not subject to a point of order and the Chair has already ruled that the paragraph is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in some doubt, but thinks that in view of the fact that the gentleman reserved a point of order to the particular proviso and the gentleman from Texas made a point of order directed at the entire paragraph on entirely different grounds, the gentleman from Illinois would still have the right to make a point of order to a special proviso of the paragraph.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso at the bottom of page 28, because it changes existing law; and even though it may do so with a view of coming within the Holman rule, it does so under a subterfuge and it should not be permitted in the bill. I maintain it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the proviso is to reduce the number of appointments for each Member of the House and Senate and each Delegate from five to three. The obvious effect of that is to reduce the number of officers of the United States, because the midshipmen in the Naval Academy have been held by the courts and the disbursing officers of the Government to be officers of the United States. Therefore, it comes squarely within the Holman rule. While it is legislation, it is proper legislation on an appropriation bill, reducing the number of officers, and thereby bringing about an obvious retrenchment in the expenditures of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Even if the Chair was not called upon to consider the question of the applicability of the Holman rule, if there were any doubt on the face of it that it reduced expenditures, the Chair is inclined to think this is distinctly a limitation of an appropriation. The present occupant of the chair has ruled a number of times that where an appropriation was within the law it was within the power of the committee to limit that appropriation as to the precise direction in which it should be expended. This is unquestionably a limitation of an appropriation, and the Chair thinks that both on that ground and probably also on the ground stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] it is in order; and the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I want to say a word in reply to what has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. I think what the gentleman has said in the main is accepted and approved by the Committee on Appropriations, that general matters of legislation should come from the proper legislative committee. In this particular instance I am quite sure that we have not at least violated the spirit of that policy. There is now, I think, on the calendar of the House a bill reported from the Naval Affairs Committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] is an influential member, effecting this very same legislation—reducing the number of appointments to the Naval Academy from five to three. The number of that bill is H. R. 11002. Under the circumstances the Committee on Appropriations felt that we were but carrying out the official purpose of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and while the legislation recommended has not been acted upon, we have at least not done great violence to the gentleman's committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRITTEN. I realize that the gentleman desires to be entirely fair at all times, and he always is. My objection to this proviso is the mere policy of taking legislation away from the Committee on Naval Affairs, where it belongs, and putting it in a bill coming from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Then the gentleman's objection is not to the action of the committee but the policy?

Mr. BRITTEN. I have made no objection to the proposed action.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Am I not correct in understanding that this was asked for by a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and did not come as a suggestion from the Appropriations Committee at all?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I do not know except that a member of the Naval Affairs Committee was anxious to have it made in order and carried on this bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. In order to apparently preserve the rights of the Committee on Naval Affairs. In other words, your committee is taking away from the Committee on Naval Affairs every right to existence.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It was the determination of the Committee on Appropriations that it would not include anything of a legislative nature in the bill—anything that was taking away the rights of the legislative committee, and I am satisfied that this would not have been included except that the gentleman from New York asked for it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Did any representative of a legislative committee come before you and request the calling of that naval conference?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I am speaking of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS]. As far as the conference was concerned, there was none.

Mr. BRITTEN. But the committee did take up that legislation and put it in the bill.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is absolutely true, and this morning the House made it in order.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the House by its previous action has indorsed it, because the other resolution for a conference was carried in an appropriation bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. The other one went through the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER. The Hensley resolution or amendment was carried in a naval bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. There was no appropriation committee of this character in existence at that time.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think when a thing of this sort is done by the House and it is for the interest of the country that no committee which is a mere agency of the House is injured or has any right to complain?

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not think so, otherwise you do not need separate committees. You might just as well put the House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and let it be a standing committee and wipe out all the other small committees or so-called agencies.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I think it has developed this morning that there is a vast amount of business under the jurisdiction of the Naval Committee outside of the matter of appropriations.

Mr. BRITTEN. There will not be when this Appropriations Committee gets through.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, line 1, strike out "$70,617,419" and insert "$62,097,419."

On page 28, line 15, strike out "$121,446,892" and insert "$113,526,892."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, these figures are figures which will be for the enlisted personnel of the 75,000 men in place of 86,000 which the committee has provided for. There is another amendment if you adopt this that it will be necessary to make to carry out the change from 87,000 enlisted men to 75,000. If you pass these two amendments you will save to the Government $9,308,970, and by so doing you will not make it necessary to take any man off from any ship now in the Navy.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. No; not now. I have only five minutes, but when I get through I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut. I want to make a statement, and I want to show that the committee that is in charge of this bill a year ago wanted a Navy of 67,000 men. If they were right then, and I think they were, they are absolutely wrong to-day. They prove it by their own figures in their own report made to the House in this bill, written within the last 10 days, and in my opinion they were right. I want to quote from their own report on page 4, paragraph 3, where they say:

In passing, it may be remarked that on September 30, 1922, although the House voted 19,000 more men than the committee proposed, there were but 52,538 men with the fleet, or but 2,538 more than the committee had proposed; there were 10,643 men specifically assigned to shore billets, or but 678 more than the committee had proposed. The remainder, out of a total of 86,985 men, or 23,754, are accounted for as follows:

Prisoners	760
Hospital patients	1,841
Recruits	6,935
In transit	3,301
Shore-based submarine tenders	2,116
Naval district craft	1,367
General detail	2,383
Decommissioning vessels	3,889
Miscellaneous	1,162
Total	23,754

It was the committee's belief that whatever slack there was existed in the foregoing list, and that holds true to-day.

If that is true, and you are voting to pay a Navy of 86,000 men to-day, you are practically voting to pay for over 30,000 men on land; and I say to you that it is absolutely unnecessary for the Navy to have an army of 30,000 men on shore. [Applause.] If these gentlemen will read their own remarks made in this House one year ago, they will find that they themselves told you that it was not necessary to have over 15,000 men on shore, and yet they are providing in this bill for over 30,000 and you are voting $9,308,970 of the people's money away to pay for an army on shore with which to run the Navy.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. HULL. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], but I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman's statement is correct, there are possibly thirty thousand and odd men in the Navy now on shore.

Mr. HULL. Practically so.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman from Iowa know how many enlisted men there are in the Navy at the present time?

Mr. HULL. Yes; there were 86,985 September 30, 1922.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield first to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. I wish to ask the gentleman how carefully he has figured how much injury such a proposition would do to our Navy. He has so carefully figured the amount of money saved as $9,000,000 that it seems to me, as it was presented to us a year ago, he would do more than $9,000,000 worth of injury to the Navy, and I think this Congress and the people of the country thought so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more to answer that question.

Mr. TILSON. Oh, it will take more than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. No; it will not take more than that. I will answer the gentleman's question in two minutes. I have thought seriously about this proposition for the last two days, and I have talked with men well posted on the matter, and all, with the exception of one, have told me it would not injure the Navy one iota; and I do not believe it will, else I would not have offered the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I heartily agree with the gentleman's amendment. I want to ask if it is not a fact that many reserves, of these 34,000 land naval forces, drawing salary from the Government, are not engaged in private businesses over the United States?

Mr. HULL. I do not know anything about that. The gentleman from Texas is better informed about that.

Mr. BLANTON. In the insurance business, in the loan business, and in the real estate business.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I would not offer this amendment to-day if I thought it would hurt the Navy at all, but it will not hurt the Navy. The situation has not changed at all from last year. They do not need 30,000 men on shore, and when you have not money to provide for the school system in the city of Washington for your school children, you better look out how you provide $9,308,970 more than the Navy needs.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman has made an interesting statement. Can he designate approximately the men who are idle or useless or tell us what they are doing. Thirty thousand men on land is a surprising number for a Navy.

Mr. HULL. There are 10,643 men assigned to shore billets. I presume that most of these men ought to be assigned to shore billets. You have to have some slack, but here further is what the committee says, and they could not change the items. They have prisoners, hospital patients, recruits, those in transit, shore-base submarine tenders, naval district craft, general detail, decommissioning vessels, and miscellaneous. All those total 23,754 men, to be added to the 10,643 men in shore billets. And then they conclude their own statement in their report:

> It was the committee's belief that whatever slack there was existed in the foregoing list, and that holds true to-day.

Yet you are asked to vote $9,308,970 for a sentimental idea on the part of the committee, that because they were outvoted a year ago that they should not be expected to stand firm for what they believe to be right, but should vote the people's money away, because if they did stand firm they might be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. I am surprised at the gentleman from Iowa. The House will recall that after debate of some days with reference to the strength of the Navy, something like eight or nine months ago, after a great deal of information had been given on both sides in reference to the proposition, the House by a decisive vote determined upon a Navy of 86,000 men. We won that fight without the assistance of our good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. We now have him converted. I am surprised that the gentleman from Iowa, after we have been reinforced with the ability and grace of the gentleman from Michigan, should attempt to cut down the personnel of the Navy.

Be that as it may, the gentleman from Iowa has stated that we have a Navy force of something like 30,000 men on land. The gentleman is not wholly accurate in that statement. In the first place, I think we may divide the Navy into three forces—the operating fleet, those upon strictly shore duty, and miscellaneous. At the present time there is in what is known as the fleet something like 52,538 men. To this there should be added the men who are not properly credited to any shore force. In order to make up his 30,000, the gentleman has to add to the shore force, for example, all of the prisoners and all of those confined to hospitals. They are not engaged in shore duties. I submit it is not a fair statement to the House that in order to run a fleet of something like 52,000 men we have to have "an army on shore" of 30,000 men.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I can not yield now.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. In a moment. The gentleman has the recruits, amounting to 6,905, included in the 30,000, and certainly a considerable portion of those should be subject to training every month.

Mr. ROGERS. And that includes those that are in trade schools also.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct. Then there are those in transit. It happens that on the 30th of September of this year, when the figures in transit—3,301—were given, there were something like 1,771 on board a naval transport going over to the fleet in the Pacific, chargeable to that fleet, and yet the gentleman says these men are shore sailors. He includes them in his estimate of 30,000 men.

I submit its unfairness. Then ship base submarine tenders. We have submarine tenders. The men who man them are on the water, but because of inadequate facilities they must necessarily be located very close to stations and at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan a year ago those were taken off from the seagoing force and credited up to either miscellaneous or shore, but they certainly are not properly credited to shore billets. They belong to the sea force and properly so. Now you have the decommissioning of vessels. Almost 4,000 men are now engaged in decommissioning vessels, placed there because of the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations and at their suggestion. Now those men are at sea at work upon vessels. Surely it is not fair to credit them to the shore force. They belong to the Navy and are a part of the sea force. They ought to be kept there, and they must be kept there until these vessels have been decommissioned.

Mr. HULL. The gentleman questions my statement. I read the report of the committee, and I submit there were some of these men in prison and some in hospitals. That is all you have said, and the number is given on page 4.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I will admit that if we cut the Navy down 11,000 men they will simply have to do a little better figuring down here as to where they keep these men. We have cut the Army down and we ought to cut this down and make them do better figuring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that while he read those figures he was very careful to emphasize the fact that there was a Navy with something over 50,000 men at sea and "an Army of 30,000 men on land." It was not an accurate statement according to the information presented to this House by this committee.

Mr. ROGERS. May I interrupt the gentleman's remarks long enough to read this clause from the report of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. ROGERS. The committee's report says:

> Nothing has arisen during the two intervening months since last April that would warrant the committee in proposing a smaller number than the House so recently expressed itself as favoring.

As the gentleman has said, this whole question was gone into as recently as last April, and nothing has happened since, as the chairman of the subcommittee so well says, to warrant a reversal of our action.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman talks about saving $9,000,000. If we only want to save money, why not adjourn and appropriate nothing for anything or anybody?

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement; but the gentleman failed to give the information wanted. The gentleman says there are 30,000 on shore. The number accounted for was 20,000, and finally accounted for and useless, 10,000 or 11,000 and——

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman and myself disagree as to "useless." I said nothing about 10,000 useless men. The gentleman from Iowa made that statement.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman has accounted for a few——

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman from Wisconsin can not expect me in the course of 5 or 10 minutes to detail to the House all the duties and all the service of eighty-six odd thousand men in our Navy. I am prepared to take the word of the Naval Affairs Committee, the men who participated in the debate a year ago, reinforced to-day as they are by the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman says 30,000, and concedes 20,000 as serving a useful purpose. He does not controvert that. Now, there must be 5,000 or 10,000——

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The gentleman from Minnesota controverts any idea that there are any considerable number of useless men in the Navy.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Wisconsin is making a mistake in assuming that the gentleman from Iowa is correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. I desire to ask for information just how many men are engaged on shore duty after subtracting the ones mentioned?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. In strictly shore duty there are 10,643 men assigned to what are known as shore billets.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The major portion of those are met by the items mentioned?

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Yes; as I read to the House.

Mr. HICKS. I desire to say, because I think we are possibly laboring under some misapprehension, that whenever shore duty of these men of the Navy is mentioned we think of them instinctively as sailors. Now, as a matter of fact, of this number on shore 2,233 are men who are engaged at air stations which perforce must be on land. There are 2,233 who are technically sailors who must be stationed on shore duty, doing work at air stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the membership has forgotten what the debate was about concerning the Navy a few months ago, and I am inclined to side with the committee. I do not think anything has transpired to warrant the committee in trying to reduce the Navy. [Applause.] However, the debate a few months ago was on this question, and the loyalty of some of us was questioned by some of our very loyal and distinguished brethren because we were willing to follow the committee, who said that so many men could man the treaty Navy.

Mr. MCARTHUR. How many men?

Mr. TINCHER. The committee said 52,000, and the proponents of a big navy stated it would take nearly 60,000. I am giving you the round figures. I am not a member of the committee, and I do not remember the exact number—65,000, I think it was.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] stood on this floor and said that his inquiry had prompted him to state that they would put the men on the boats and would not man the Navy in the way that we thought, if we gave them the men. I have followed these reports and I follow the committee this time.

The gentleman from Michigan is leaving Congress. He will not be a Member of the next Congress. But the fact will remain that he was right, and they are not using the men on the boats, but have them on shore. [Applause.] And he is warranted in saying that we can not reduce it because the same men are here now to vote who were here before, and the same influences are now at work that were at work before to maintain the size of the Navy. But we, who acted on the theory that we could do that and still be patriotic, have been vindicated by the action of the Navy Department itself, and they have these men and they have them on shore instead of manning the treaty Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman recall, as he probably does, that every first-class navy on earth aims to keep on shore approximately one-third of its enlisted personnel?

Mr. TINCHER. I recall the gentleman from Illinois himself taking the floor and pleading for a big navy on the ground that we must man the treaty navy, and holding out to the country the idea that those supporting the committee were opposed to manning the treaty navy and trying to reduce the naval force. Now they admit that the men are on shore, and then they criticize the committee because they do not say "Come in."

I speak in behalf of the subcommittee that brought in this report. I know how they feel. I know that the only reason in the world why they did not bring in a report to reduce the Navy was because they considered, as far as this Congress was concerned, that the matter was res adjudicata—a matter that had been tried out and settled.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is revealing the secrets of the subcommittee. [Laughter.]

Mr. TINCHER. I am not on the subcommittee.

Mr. MCARTHUR. I still make the same point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is revealing the secrets of the subcommittee.

Mr. TINCHER. I am not on the committee.

Mr. MCSWAIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that joke ought to be adjudged.

Mr. MCARTHUR. The gentleman has not yet answered. He ought to answer, especially for the edification of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. TINCHER. I suppose my friend from the West coast will admit that the naval stations in Chicago are competent to fight their own battles. I am just as friendly to the Chicago navy as I am to the navy of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MCARTHUR]. But I insist that those who stood with the committee and were right before, and did not get our orders from the department before, have the right to have it go into the record to-day that they are not using the men on the ships. You can find them out at the Wardman Park Hotel or at the Raleigh or at the New Willard, but they are not at sea. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have a situation here, created by the amendment which has been offered, that is well worthy of the careful consideration of the committee. A year ago it was determined that it was necessary for the manning of the ships that we should have a Navy of 86,000 men. It was contended then by the committee that 67,000 was adequate. It was, however, determined by the Congress that we ought to provide for a Navy of 86,000 men. This was done, and we now have a Navy of 86,935 men.

Now, what condition do we find, Mr. Chairman, with regard to these men? Has the number of men on the ships been increased? It has not. There are only 52,538 men on the ships of the Navy to-day, while 34,392 men are on shore. It will not do for gentlemen to say that the country will be satisfied that the enormous number, proportionately, of 34,392 men are necessary on shore. When over 52,000 men are needed with the ships it will not appear to the public reasonable that 34,000 men should be still kept on shore.

These are conditions that we have got to meet when we consider this proposition. The amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is not to strike out the 34,000 men. It is only to reduce the amount down to 75,000 men instead of 86,000. Is that an unreasonable reduction? If we take out these 11,000 men that he asks us to reduce by his amendment, there would still be more than 23,000 men on shore. Is any gentleman qualified by expert knowledge or otherwise to say that 23,000 men, with this character of a Navy, nearly one-third of the men of a Navy of 75,000 men, would not be a sufficient number for shore service? It occurs to me that it will be extremely difficult for anybody to make that kind of a showing.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. How does the gentleman feel about expert advice or expert opinion as to the maintenance of one-third of the force on shore by England, France, and Japan, and our best authority?

Mr. TOWNER. I have not that knowledge.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is a fact, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. That one-third of the men are necessary on shore?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. If that is the case, I should certainly adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa. With 75,000 men in the Navy you would still have over 23,000 men on shore.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is not calculating on the proper figure. If you take one-third of 86,000 you will find it is 29,000, and 29,000 is about what we shall need on shore to maintain our Navy if the best expert advice knows what it is talking about.

Mr. TOWNER. Well, we have too many men on shore, even according to the gentleman's idea, and if we reduce the number, as we shall if we adopt the amendment reducing the

number to 75,000 men, we shall then have practically one-third of the men provided for on shore.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the House by a very decisive vote last April decided in favor of a personnel strength of 86,000 for the Navy.

Mr. BEGG. How decisive was it?

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not recall the figures now, but it was quite decisive.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. It was sufficient.

Mr. KNUTSON. It was sufficient for all purposes, and it will be repeated again to-day. Nothing has occurred within the last six or eight months to warrant us in making a reduction at this time. We are hopeful that the agreement entered into at the Conference on the Limitation of Armament in Washington last winter will be carried out by all the powers subscribing to the naval treaty, but my information from the Navy Department is that little progress has as yet been made toward carrying into effect the provisions of that treaty except by our Government.

Now, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is merely an entering wedge for the reduction of the Navy. I am firmly of the opinion that the American people want a Navy that is second to none. I believe it is the best guaranty we can have for the national security. It is the cheapest insurance we can have. If the gentleman's amendment carries, we will have to go through the fight again next year, when some one will, without regard to the needs of the country, offer an amendment to reduce the enlisted personnel to 50,000, and probably the next year to 25,000, and then we will find ourselves on the same level with China and other countries that are too proud to fight.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the distinguished assistant floor leader yield for a question?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is conferring upon me honors which are not mine——

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; I recognize that title.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask how many of these 30,000 land seamen are stationed in Minnesota?

Mr. KNUTSON. None. The wisdom of the Navy Department places these men where they are needed, and they are not needed in Minnesota. We do not have even a recruiting office in Minnesota. I have no interest whatsoever in this matter except as an American who wishes to protect his country against all possible contingencies. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We seem to be proceeding upon the idea that it is some sort of crime for a sailor to be assigned to shore duty. Our very well-informed colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], has spoken of it as "shore leave," as if all these men who were not on the ships were loitering on shore.

Mr. KNUTSON. Or sitting in the parks.

Mr. TILSON. Or sitting in the parlors of hotels in Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. BLANTON. Or the Army and Navy Club.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, such a motion as this is not at all consistent with the facts in the case. It has been already stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN], who is well informed on these subjects, what is the usual percentage of shore duty to sea-duty personnel in the best-regulated navies of the world, and it corresponds quite closely to the present distribution of our own Navy. I wish to call attention to the facts as they exist in regard to assignments to land duty.

On January 1, 1922, according to the hearings, there were 35,500 men on shore. Of course, that includes hospital patients, prisoners, and so forth, the number of whom can not be affected in any way by any change of appropriation that we may make. On September 30, 1922, this number had been reduced to 28,735. This was in accordance with the general understanding last April when we were discussing this question that a larger proportion of the men should go on board the ships.

The proposition of the Navy now is to put on shore 27,924 men; that is, that during the fiscal year 1924 the number on shore duty will be reduced to 27,984, which seems to be about as far as the number can be well reduced if we take into account the large number of recruits who ought to be trained on shore before they go on board ship, the number of men in transit, some of whom are in transit on the water, but still charged to land duty, the number of men in prison, in hospitals, and so on. In order to take up the slack, as it is called, it will require just about the number now proposed.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I notice from the report of the committee that it is stated that on September 30 the number on shore was 34,000. Where did the gentleman get his information?

Mr. TILSON. I read from page 27 of the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The committee report on page 4 says there were 52,000 men on ships, and the remainder being on land would make the number about 34,000 on land.

Mr. TILSON. I do not know how the report was made up, but I am speaking from the information furnished to the committee on page 27 of the hearings.

In the discussion last year it was brought out very clearly, I think, that a reduction to 67,000 men, as then proposed, or even to 75,000, as now proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL], would seriously affect the efficiency of our Navy. If we should attempt now, after the limited discussion that we have had here under the five-minute rule, to make a change in the number of the personnel, we should be taking a leap in the dark, the result of which would be a very serious injury to the Navy.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion this afternoon about 52,538 men being the personnel that we have afloat. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that on September 20 of this year that number represented the actual number of men on service in the fleet, but that in addition to that 3,889 men were in decommissioning work, 1,700 on transports, 1,367 on district craft, and 2,116 on shore base subtenders, or a total of 61,610 men actually on ships of various kinds. Subtract that from the total of 86,000 enlisted personnel and it does not give the number on shore duty that gentlemen have indicated. Gentlemen have been talking about the men who were not on actual fleet duty. The real figures show something like 25,000 men on shore duty, really less than the well-established rules for the conduct of all navies require, namely, one man on shore for every two men afloat. I submit that the Navy Department has made an excellent showing in this matter and that it has carried out the spirit and purpose of the instructions in the last naval appropriation bill in providing for a Navy with an 86,000 enlisted personnel, and that we have no more men actually on shore duty now than are absolutely necessary to maintain the Navy in its proper relative strength of one man on shore to two men afloat.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McARTHUR. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS. When the bill was up before the House last April there was an estimate furnished by the Navy Department officially to the Congress stating what disposition the department proposed to make of the 86,000 men if Congress granted the 86,000. That estimate shows that 57,268 of the 86,000 would be kept for sea duty. Now, the evidence is, as the gentleman has just brought out, that the Navy Department has done a little better—if you want to call it better—and has 58,200 men afloat instead of 57,200.

Mr. McARTHUR. I think there are more than that.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a short statement to the House relative to the enlisted force of the Navy and the attitude of the Appropriations Committee toward this matter at this time. Last year the duty fell upon the Committee on Appropriations to prepare a bill immediately following the action of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament. By reason of that conference it was possible to reduce the number of men in the Navy, and under the circumstances it seemed proper for the Committee on Appropriations to recommend the proper reduction. There was not time for the legislative committee to act prior to the time for considering the naval appropriation bill in the House. We had to act promptly because there had been a reduction in naval armament, and it was necessary to translate that reduction in the Naval Establishment into a reduction of expenses for the current year.

The law fixes the maximum number of men for the Navy at 137,000. The Committee on Naval Affairs reported a bill to the House on March 22, as I recall, fixing the minimum number of men at 86,000. The Committee on Appropriations recommended 67,000. For several days the matter was discussed in the House with a thoroughness that challenged the attention

of every Member of Congress and, in fact, the whole country. The number was finally fixed at 86,000. So we have the action of this present Congress fixing the minimum at 86,000 with a maximum of 137,000 fixed by prior law.

This year the Committee on Appropriations faced an entirely different situation because we had the action of Congress to guide us both as to the minimum number of men and the maximum number of men, one at 86,000 and the other at 137,000, and between those limits our action had to be confined. We have brought the bill here carrying an appropriation to pay for the minimum number of men provided by act of Congress.

If Congress wishes to change either the minimum or maximum limit which it has heretofore fixed, in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations such a proposal should come from the proper legislative committee. Therefore we have presented this bill to the House carrying sufficient appropriations for 86,000 men, regardless of the fact that we presented a proposal for a smaller number eight months ago. The Appropriations Committee, like every other committee, is the servant of the House and cheerfully takes orders from the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have two minutes more in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. The gentleman from Michigan attracted the attention of the House when he first came here because of his wonderful grasp of naval affairs. I know he impressed me as a man who has mastered the subject, and when he went on the Committee on Appropriations he made the same impression because he was so thorough, and I have great confidence in his judgment. I would like to have him suggest, although I know he can not advocate a reduction—I would like to have him point out where, in his opinion, men have been stationed on shore duty that might have been dispensed with and that amount of money saved to the country.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to my friend from Wisconsin that, of course, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill on the floor I am the agent of the full Committee on Appropriations, and the committee is committed to 86,000 men. We have agreed to the provision of the bill making the personnel 86,000 in order to carry out the will of the House. I will say, however, answering the gentleman from Wisconsin directly, that the policy of the department in regard to many matters has a direct bearing on the number of men required for the naval service. In my opening statement I discussed the question of keeping men on shore for long courses of training instead of putting them into the fleet after brief courses, as was done during the war. Many other economies of men, in my judgment, could be effected, but I do not desire to detain the House with a recital of them at this time. I went into them fully last year and the general situation has not changed since that time.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. A year ago I stood by the committee on its figures for the personnel of the Navy. I did not believe that the increase that was proposed and carried was wholly justified. I believed then, and I am still inclined to believe, that we could have maintained the Navy in first-class condition with fewer men than were authorized, but the House increased the strength of the Navy and the Senate concurred. The committee has reexamined the matter and has fixed the number. I am still inclined to think that perhaps we could get along very well with a somewhat smaller number of men than has been proposed by the committee, but I think it would be a very unwise thing. Now that the committee has examined the matter and given it their best attention—and the committee is not disposed to maintain a Navy unnecessarily large—I think it would be a very great mistake to make a reduction below the number that in the judgment of the subcommittee and the committee are essential. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. As I understand it, the committee has no judgment upon it at all. It simply has not changed from the rule. It does not pass upon the necessity of the Navy.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sure the committee does not believe that there should be a reduction such as has been proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 25, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas: Page 39, line 12, after the word "service," insert the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for the pay of any enlisted man or officer who may be assigned to recruiting men or boys under 21 years of age without the written consent of the parent or guardian of such minor or minors."

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House——

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But I have begun to debate the matter and it is too late.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the first part of the amendment. Is it in the form of a limitation?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No point of order has been made, and I propose to debate it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman from Illinois comes too late. The gentleman from Texas had been recognized.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] was on his feet asking for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TINCHER). The present Chairman has just come to the chair, and the regular Chairman was leaving and in conversation with him when the gentleman from Illinois rose. The present Chairman was looking at the gentleman from Illinois and did not recognize the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the point of order is.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. As I understand it, the point of order is reserved.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman want the point of order disposed of now or reserved?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to address myself to the point of order when that question is presented. We have had it admitted in argument by the leader of the majority, Mr. MONDELL, that he thinks the Navy can get along very well indeed during the next fiscal year without the number of men provided for in the bill. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], who has the affection of everyone who really knows him, thinks that the Navy can function adequately during the next fiscal year with less than the number of men provided for in the bill. A very considerable proportion of the majority side of the House is of that conviction, and the predominating part of the minority side of the House entertains that conviction. Yet every few days Members of Congress get appeals from fathers and mothers setting forth the fact that some individual recruiting officer has, with the blandishments of persuasion, with beautiful lithographed pictures of foreign lands, seduced some boy who is not 21 years of age to the belief that the proper place for him is in the Navy of the United States.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Not just now.

Mr. BEGG. I want to ask a serious question.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. But I want to finish this suggestion. Members are then forced to secure affidavits establishing a case of dependency to the authorities of the Navy, which seems to be hungry for men. Without such proof it will never release the boy over 18 and under 21 from the Navy, although he may have been enlisted without the consent of his parents or guardian. The law now is that one may be enlisted who is over 18 years of age without the consent of the parents or guardian, but the laws of our States all provide, as far as I know, that until a boy becomes 21 years of age, or until his father emancipates him, the father does not lose control over him or his earnings.

I believe it is unfair and unwise for the Federal Government to permit the Navy to go into the homes and, without the consent of parents, take away boys of 18 years of age, some of whom are breadwinners, some of whom are supposed to provide for their fathers and mothers. At the very period when they ought to be in school or learning a trade boys who have not reached the age of discretion are lured into the naval service. The Navy ought not to want men so badly as that,

and this Congress ought not to permit their enlistment. I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. Does not the gentleman believe that if he wants to accomplish what he has in mind, the way to do it would be to prohibit the enlistment of boys in the Navy under a certain age?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Theoretically that would be the proper procedure, but the gentleman knows that under the present organization of the House the Appropriations Committee is the predominating committee, and in order to get any effective legislation through this House you must put it on an appropriation bill, because the sessions of the House are largely consumed with appropriation bills; and the gentleman furthermore knows that the program of his party now is not to pass anything through this session except the ship subsidy bill and the appropriation bills.

Mr. BEGG. If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it withholds any money from recruiting officers sent out to recruit boys under age without the consent of the parents.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Has a recruiting officer ever been sent out to do that?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. They are all sent out to do that.

Mr. BEGG. None of them are sent out for that purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman's contention is true, then my amendment would be ineffective and unobjectionable from his standpoint.

Mr. BEGG. It is a farce.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Then why does the gentleman object to it?

Mr. BEGG. I do not object to it.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Then it seems to me the gentleman is taking up a lot of time unnecessarily.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they are prohibited by law now from enlisting them under 18 years of age. They do it, and they should be stopped from doing it, and the gentleman's amendment would stop them from doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, has the point of order been made?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been reserved. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes; I make the point of order.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that this is not subject to a point of order. I am heartily against this amendment and feel that it should be defeated, but I think the amendment is in order, because it is nothing but a limitation.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order before the Chair rules?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. The amendment is not subject to a point of order; it is just foolish.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The gentleman is an authority on that.

Mr. MONDELL. The amendment of the gentleman from Texas says that no officer shall be appointed to recruit boys under age. Of course, no officer is appointed to recruit boys under age. They shall not be placed on that duty without the consent of the parents of the boys that are to be recruited. Just how the Navy Department intending to send out recruiting officers instructed to recruit boys under age would secure permission of the parents of the country to recruit their boys under age before being so commissioned I do not understand. Of course, no one does. The point of order does not lie, but the amendment is simply silly.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman read the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do, Mr. Chairman. I made this point of order not because I am particularly anxious to press a point of order against this particular amendment, but I think we are going pretty far afield in the matter of legislating upon appropriation bills if we allow an amendment of this character to stand without any objection. It is true a limitation may be imposed upon an appropriation, but it has been held also that it must be in fact a limitation upon an appropriation and not a limitation upon the functions of an executive officer. In the House Manual, under paragraph 825, it is stated as follows:

The limitation may not be applied directly to the official functions of executive officers, but it may restrict executive discretion so far as this may be done by a simple negative on the use of the appropriation.

In Hinds' Precedents, fourth volume, paragraph 3957, I read as follows:

The limitation must be upon the appropriation and not an affirmative limitation of official functions.

On April 24, 1900, the Post Office appropriation bill being under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. W. T. Crawford, of North Carolina, offered to the paragraph appropriating for inland transportation by star routes the following amendment:

"Of which sum $50,000 shall be used, under the direction of the Postmaster General, in supplying temporary service to the newly established offices in cases where the establishment of star routes is contemplated."

Mr. Eugene F. Loud, of California, having raised a point of order, the Chairman held:

"It is not a limitation upon the appropriation; it is a limitation upon the functions of the Post Office Department. It takes away from the Postmaster General that discretion that he now has and is, therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, obnoxious to the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order."

In the present case the amendment, in effect, does not limit the appropriation. The appropriation is available, the appropriation is going to be expended, men are going to be recruited, and it is merely proposed to amend the existing law by directing that the recruiting of men for the Navy shall be done in some other manner than that now provided by law. I find at the bottom of paragraph 825 in the House Manual the following:

The fact that a provision would constitute legislation for only a year does not make it a limitation in order under the rule. Care should also be taken that the language of limitation be not such as, when fairly construed, would change existing law or justify an executive officer in assuming an attempt to change existing law.

What difference is it going to make in reference to the expenditure for recruiting, or how does it limit that expenditure if we say that minors shall not be recruited without the consent of their parents? That will not affect the recruiting. That will not produce one cent of saving in the appropriation, nor does it limit the appropriation. It is simply a change of existing law, and I for one, Mr. Chairman, have begun to feel that the time has come when the House at every opportunity, or some Member of the House, should raise objection to attempts constantly to change existing law. I think we have gone far—in fact, to the extreme limit—in the matter of changing laws by appropriation bills and by amendments to appropriation bills. Very soon there will be no substantive legislation whatever except by way of original proposals in, or by way of amendments to, appropriation bills. I make this argument because I think it is the duty of every presiding officer in the House to preserve the rights of the House and preserve the methods of legislation, to the end that this custom of legislating on appropriation bills or through appropriation bills shall at least not go any further than it has gone already.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] made the argument on the point of order that this particular amendment was not in order because it was foolish. That was to be expected from the gentleman from Wyoming, for phrenologists tell us that those individuals with small capacities and largely developed bumps of self-esteem consider always those who differ with them as being foolish. Now, Mr. Chairman, the point of order as made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] is to the effect that the amendment is legislation. It is not legislation in the sense that the point of order was urged, but it is a limitation; and if the Chair will bear with me for just a moment—because in all frankness I know that the Chair wants to decide this question fairly and properly—I believe I can convince the Chair. What is a limitation? A limitation on an appropriation bill is that which limits the use of money which is appropriated to certain purposes. As was so well pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, on one occasion, and as was concurred in, as I remember now, by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Clark, an amendment similar to this amendment could be so worded as to provide that no part of this appropriation shall be paid to red-headed men, and it would be a limitation within the rules of this House. This amendment could provide that no part of this money should be paid to any man who performs duty on land. You could destroy every one of the shore stations and shore duty if the Congress wanted to do it, because such a provision would be a limitation on an appropriation.

Now, in all frankness, if I had to write a statute governing the subject I would not draft it as I have drafted this amendment. I would write it so as to win at least a degree of approval from the gentleman from Wyoming. But in order to draft it so as to escape points of order I had to make it rather awkward in its form; I had to draw it so that it would be a limitation. Therefore I provided that no part of this appropriation shall be applied to the pay of any officer or any man—I could not say "assigned to recruiting duty," because that would destroy all of the recruiting duty; I had to say that none of it should apply to officers and men engaged in recruit-

ing boys under 21 years of age without the written consent of their parent or guardian.

Now, what is the object of the amendment? The object of the amendment is to let the Navy Department know that this Congress wants it to stop enlisting boys under 21 years of age without the consent of their parents; and if it is put in here, although it might not suit the ideas of the gentleman from Wyoming, the Navy Department will not enlist another one if it knows it. The object of this amendment is to withhold payment from any officer or any enlisted man who recruits a boy under 21 years without the consent of his parents. This is a direction that the Navy Department shall not pay that officer or enlisted man one cent.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I just wanted to suggest to the gentleman that the other day Mr. Speaker GILLETT ruled on the precise point, on a resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM], where the gentleman from Massachusetts proposed that no part of the appropriation should be paid to any employee who did not come in under the civil-service law, and the Speaker overruled the point of order and held that it was a mere limitation on the appropriation.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not favor the gentleman's amendment, but I do agree with him on that point.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes; I thank the gentleman. There have been hundreds of cases of amendments offered on the floor of this House in the nature of limitations which have been sustained.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In a moment.

As I recall it, the other day, when the House had under discussion the question of prohibition enforcement in the Treasury Department bill, quite a number of amendments were offered from the floor providing that no judge or district attorney should be paid any part of the funds appropriated if he did not perform his duty; and while the Chair said that perhaps they were foolish amendments, yet he held them to be in order as a limitation.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In justice to the recruiting officers, I think the gentleman is aware of the fact that where the boys are recruited under the age of 18, the boys have misstated their age. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's position. I think that often a boy does not know. He is not yet a man when he is only 18 years of age.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is the gentleman in favor of my amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. I may not vote for the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I presumed that the whip on the majority side was going to ask me something about the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, in answer to the statement of the whip on the Republican side, that the officer may claim that he could not find out the boy's age, but when they discharge them they make them produce the proof of their age. I think they could find out his age when they enlist a boy just as well as when they discharge him.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes. When they get them in they are not quite so searching in their attempt to find out the age. When they put them out they are quite careful.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. No; I regret I can not yield to more interruptions.

Mr. TILSON. We are trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I could cite hundreds of precedents from Hinds' volume, and I submit that it is quite clear that this is simply a limitation. I think the point of order ought to be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is quite clear that the amendment is a limitation, especially in view of recent rulings by several Chairmen.

I recall that the first time the question was discussed in my hearing an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] on the Army appropriation bill, depriving certain Army officers of pay if they did certain acts in social relations with regard to privates and other officers, and the Speaker sustained the amendment. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that on day before yesterday I raised this same question. Page 490 of the RECORD shows that I offered evidence here, conclusive evidence, of the fact that recruiting officers not only enlisted boys under 21, as they are authorized to if they are 18, but they enlisted a boy named Bradshaw as young as 15 years of age, without the knowledge and consent of his parents; and when application was made for his discharge by his parents the Bureau of Navigation, while promising to discharge him, wrote that the boy had sworn so-and-so, which intimated that action might be taken against him.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Did the boy make a false affidavit as to his age, or did the recruiting officer falsely enlist him?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the boy, as stated by my colleague [Mr. CONNALLY of Texas], seduced by the blandishments of the recruiting officer, swore falsely that he was 18.

Mr. BEGG. Then the recruiting officer was not to blame.

Mr. BLANTON. He stated that he was 18 years of age in order to get into the Navy, to make these trips around the world.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In a moment.

Also, I showed, day before yesterday, that a young man named Eddy was recruited under 18 years of age, and I produced a letter here from a reputable firm of lawyers in Texas—Messrs. Walters & Baker, of San Saba—and a letter from his mother, that this young boy Eddy was enlisted by a recruiting officer without the knowledge and consent of his mother; and I showed that it was brought to the attention of the Bureau of Navigation that the young man was under 18 years of age. A telegram was sent to his mother asking for her consent. She wired back saying she refused to give her consent, and stating that he was under 18 years of age, and protesting against his acceptance.

Yet he was accepted into the Navy and sent to San Francisco; and when I wrote the Bureau of Navigation, showing that this good woman was a widow in destitute circumstances with five little children to support and that this minor son was her main stand-by for her support, and asking that the boy be discharged, the Bureau of Navigation sent the same letter that it sends to all parents, while promising to discharge him, stating, in effect, "Your boy swore that he was 18 years of age. We had a right to enlist him," which intimated that he might be discharged dishonorably and that some court-martial might take place against him. Then this destitute widow wrote a letter to me, which I put into the RECORD on page 490, saying, "I do not know what my boy swore. I am afraid I will get him into trouble, and under the circumstances I withdraw my application for his discharge."

That is the situation with which we are confronted, and yet it is called foolish because we want to stop it. It is called silly because we want to stop it. It may be silly or foolish to some Members, but I want to say that I am in favor of the amendment offered by my colleague. In war time the Government has a right to take these boys, but in peace time it ought not to take them without their parents' knowledge and consent unless they are 21 years of age.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, regardless of what our views might be with reference to the enlistment of minors and the precautions necessary to protect them, I think it would not be wise to place this amendment on the appropriation bill. This amendment is drawn as well as it could be drawn and make it get past the point of order. It simply provides that you can not use any of this appropriation to pay these officers if this thing is done, that no part of the money appropriated can be used for that purpose, and we have the incongruous situation that we have a positive law and regulation covering the entire subject, and yet notwithstanding that we put in this language providing that they can not use this fund to pay the officers.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is that situation any more anomalous than the one with which we are confronted when the law says the strength of the Navy shall be 187,000 and the naval appropriation bill says that strength shall be 80,000? Is not that a similar proposition?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I do not think the two are analogous at all.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If a deduction is to be made from the pay of the recruiting officer, when will it be made and how much will be deducted?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The gentleman might get that information from the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is easy enough to work yourself up into a passion of sympathy for the son of a widowed mother, but there were two or three peculiar things suggested to my mind in the case mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. In the first place, a boy of 15 years of age voluntarily joined the Navy, and then his mother sent a wire asking for his release on the ground that she was dependent on him for support. Now, in every one of these cases of these boys who enlist under age the chances are nine out of ten that instead of being an asset to the parent they are a liability, and most of these boys run away from home and file a false affidavit as to their age in order to get into the Navy. I am not sure that the future of the boy is not in better shape if he is allowed and compelled to serve his three or four years in the Navy than if he is discharged and allowed to go on his wayward way.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman think it would be unreasonable that the Navy Department should require any boy under the age of 21 who seeks to enlist to submit to the recruiting officer a certified copy of his birth certificate? It seems to me that is the way to reach this thing. We have a law as to who may enter the Navy with or without the consent of parents and who may not. Why not require the recruiting officer to have real evidence as to how old the applicant is?

Mr. JONES of Texas. He probably would get it if we should pass this amendment.

Mr. BEGG. I would not object to that requirement. I am not out of sympathy with the proposition to require these boys to be a little older before enlisting without the parents' consent. The point I am making is that there is no occasion for too much sympathy with the boy who lies about his age in order to get in. What does this amendment say? It says pay shall be withheld from the enlisting officer who is assigned to go out and enlist boys under age. Now, I maintain that if this amendment should be passed it would not do any good, because no officer in the Navy is ever assigned to go out and violate the law. If a false oath is filed with him as to the boy's age the officer is not guilty, and the pay of the officer could not be withheld from him. If he has exercised all the precautions necessary in the discharge of his duty you could not take away his pay if a boy came in and filed an affidavit stating that he was 21 years old when he was in fact only 19. This amendment is surplusage, to say the least; and under it you could not withhold the officer's pay, because, as I said in the first place, he does not get any such assignment.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does not the gentleman think, if this amendment were adopted, all the recruiting officers would require either a birth certificate about anyone as to whom there was any doubt, or else the consent of the parents?

Mr. BEGG. I would have no quarrel with this amendment if it simply said that no recruiting officer was to receive any part of this pay unless he required an affidavit or a birth certificate showing the boy's age before he enlisted if he was under 21. I would not quarrel with that. I am not out of sympathy with the amendment, but the amendment will not do anything if it is written into the bill except to make a jumble and a jargon of the actual operation of the law.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the substitute which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers a substitute, which will be reported by the Clerk.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the committte do now rise, and on that motion he asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. KELLEY of Michigan and Mr. WINGO.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 1, nays 95.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TINCHER). On this vote the ayes are 1 and the nays are 95; 5 are present and not voting. A quorum is present. The noes have it, and the committee refuses to rise.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment by way of a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FIELDS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas:

"Page 29, line 12, after the word 'service,' insert: '*Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be applied to the payment of the salary of any recruiting officer of the Navy of the United States who shall enlist recruits under 18 years of age without the written consent of their parents or guardian.'"

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the substitute is not germane. My amendment provides for men 18 to 21, and the effect is to extend the present law from 18 to 21. The gentleman's substitute only applies to boys under 18 and really does not touch the question that my amendment applies to. Under the present law enlistments are legal over 18 years of age without consent of the parents. The effect of my amendment is to require the consent of the parents to enlistment over 18 to 21. The gentleman's substitute is not germane to that question.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I will offer it as an amendment to the section and not as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. LONGWORTH). That is not in order at the present stage of proceedings.

Mr. FIELDS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that it is germane to the general subject and overrules the point of order.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in all sincerity, because by the adoption of it Congress can cure an evil of which we hear complaints from every quarter of the country almost every day. The recruiting officers of the Army and the Navy, as has been stated on the floor of this House, time and again have followed the practice of enlisting into the service recruits who are not of legal military age. Boys of 15, 16, and 17 years of age are enlisted into the service. Oftentimes they are induced to do so by the flowery stories of the recruiting officers of an opportunity to go round the world, and oftentimes they are advised by the recruiting officer to falsify in their application.

Not long since a boy 17 years of age in my district enlisted. His mother, who was in delicate health, appealed to me to secure his release. I talked with the boy and asked him why he enlisted and why he made a false statement in his enlistment. He said he told the recruiting officer he was not 18 years of age. The recruiting officer said, "Oh, that will be all right; just sign this paper." And so the boy said he signed it, but did not know that he was subscribing to a falsehood.

Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, if that recruiting officer had been under the penalty of losing his pay for recruiting a boy under 18 years of age he would have ascertained whether or not that boy was 18 years of age, and moreover he would not have enlisted him with the knowledge that he was under 18.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. When and how much would you deduct from the officer's pay?

Mr. FIELDS. When found guilty I would strike him from the Federal pay roll. The gentleman from Nebraska will recall that there was a few years ago a practice adopted in many of the Army camps of the country where written orders were issued prohibiting enlisted men from attending certain public functions where officers happened to be. I offered an amendment to the Army appropriation bill providing that no part of the fund herein appropriated shall be applied in payment of the salary of any officer of the Army of the United States who shall issue or cause to be issued any order, written or verbal, establishing social distinctions between the officers and men of said Army while not on military duty.

Oh, they said, it would affect the discipline, it would disorganize the Army, but the limitation was adopted, and, Mr. Chairman, they have been getting along nicely ever since. They have been attending the same church ever since without demoralizing the Army, and I imagine that they could go to heaven together without the slightest reflection on the officers. [Laughter.]

I say to you gentlemen of the House that this limitation should be adopted. I offer it as a substitute to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas because the law provides for the enlistment of boys of the age of 18.

I would prefer his amendment to my own if his was not in conflict with law—because I do not believe that the law ought to go below 21, but it does. But if my amendment is adopted

it harmonizes with the law and it will stop this practice which is going on day in and day out of recruiting boys under 18 years of age who are not of military age. It will simply strike from the pay roll the recruiting officer who recruits boys under 18 years of age, and I assure you that when that limitation is put on the recruiting officers they will be able to ascertain the ages of the applicants before enlisting them into the service.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If I understand the gentleman's amendment he keeps back the pay of the officer who enlists the boy under 18.

Mr. FIELDS. Without the written consent of the parents or guardian.

Mr. BEGG. Suppose a big, strapping, healthy-looking fellow walks into the recruiting office who is only 16 years of age and makes the false oath that he is 19 years old and the officer enlists him, what are you going to do?

Mr. FIELDS. Under this limitation the officer would require him to file a birth certificate or a sworn statement from the parent or guardian showing that he is 18 years of age. That is what I would do if I were the recruiting officer.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky. I am in hearty sympathy with the general purposes of his amendment, but I do not think the amendment goes far enough.

Mr. FIELDS. It goes as far as the law will allow.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It will not if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is adopted. As a matter of fact, the law as it exists to-day in a measure protects the boys under 18 years of age, except as to the form of the discharge, but no protection exists as to boys between 18 and 21 years of age. I concede, as the author of the amendment concedes, that it is not drawn in the best way, if one would be permitted to draft and propose legislation just as he wanted it proposed, but it had to be drawn to fit into this bill. However, I do not believe there is a man in the House who does not know that if the amendment offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is adopted, no recruiting officer will enlist any boy about whose age he is in doubt without getting the consent of the parents, or without procuring a birth certificate showing that the boy is 21 years of age. That will not lay any great burden upon the enlisting officer. It will not be much trouble for him when a boy about whose age there can be no doubt applies, to say to the boy that he must obtain a copy of his birth certificate or get the written consent of one of his parents. Here is the trouble with the situation as it exists to-day: They enlist these boys who are not 21, and in some instances under 18 years of age, and then a showing is made that the parents are dependent upon the boy, or have a claim to his services, and the boy is given an ordinary discharge, and if you can find any great legal difference between a dishonorable discharge and an ordinary discharge you will do more than I can find. They are both without honor and both call for explanation. I have had instances where boys of 16 years of age have been discharged with an ordinary or blue discharge, which for all purposes of law amounts to a dishonorable discharge, without carrying its discredit. Why not get the information beforehand on the part of the recruiting officer?

Mr. STEPHENS. Suppose the boy has no parents and can not produce a birth certificate.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Oh, there are no boys who have not either parents or guardians, who are under 21 years of age, or who can not secure a birth certificate. If there is a State in the Union that does not require the filing of a birth certificate I would like to know what State it is. Does the gentleman know of such a State?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. I understand there are only 28 States in the Union that have provision for the registration of births. Such was the information furnished me some four years ago and was correct as of that date.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I have understood that there are a great many more than that.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately even in those States that have a law such as is mentioned it is not always observed.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That may be true, but the amendment of my colleagues does not require the securing of a birth certificate. I state that as one way in which the officer may protect himself. Most assuredly he could require the affidavit of some disinterested person who knows how old the boy is. In the rare instances in which a boy who has no guardian or parents the recruiting officer can compel the boy to get the affidavits of two disinterested persons to the effect that he is 21 years of age, and he can get that in a very few minutes or require the boy to do it, and that is much easier than having the Government go to the expense of taking the boy away from his home and bringing him back again, and going to all the trouble incident to the final disposal of such a case.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word or two in reference to the matter brought up by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. He would have it appear here that the widowed mother of some boy was harshly treated by the Navy Department, and he paints a picture of her sufferings and being threatened and fearing some legal action would be taken upon the part of the Navy Department because of violation of contract. In all fairness I am going to read a letter which was written to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] by the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department, and I think when a letter is read in whole, not merely in part, it will show that the Navy Department, instead of being harsh, was extremely gentle and liberal. This is a letter written to the gentleman from Texas by the Bureau of Navigation on the 7th of July in reference to this boy referred to, the son of this widow. After reciting that the boy had gone into the Navy and had established a contract, then the letter says:

> However, I note your statement as to the boy's correct age, but regarding that I can take no action with regard to authorizing his discharge until evidence has been presented showing the correct date of birth.
>
> I would suggest, therefore, that you advise the mother to present a birth certificate, a certificate of baptism, or her own affidavit, setting forth the exact date of the birth of her son, and if, upon receipt of evidence, it develops that young Eddy enlisted while under 18 years of age, the bureau will promptly direct his discharge on account of under-age enlistment.

And that boy was discharged.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; he never has been discharged. He is still in the Navy.

Mr. HICKS. That is what the Bureau of Navigation tells me. He was discharged.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; the gentleman ought to read the subsequent letters.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think it may help us a little bit to understand the situation if we first consider the law that is in effect at the present time. By act of Congress passed March 3, 1915, it was provided:

> That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the naval service shall be expended in recruiting seamen, ordinary seamen, or apprentice seamen unless in case of minors a certificate of birth or a verified written statement by the parents, or either of them, or in case of their death a verified written statement by the legal guardian, to be first furnished to the recruiting officer, showing the applicant to be of age required by naval regulations, shall be presented with the application for enlistment.

That is the law at the present time.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then we ought to cut off their pay if they violate the law.

Mr. FIELDS. They are not obeying the law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It provides that no part of any appropriation shall be used hereafter unless these regulations are complied with. And the law continues:

> And when it is afterwards found upon evidence satisfactory to the Navy Department that the recruit has sworn falsely as to his age and was under 18 years of age at the time of the enlistment, he shall upon request of either parent, or, in case of their death, by the legal guardian, be relieved from service in the Navy upon the payment of full cost of first outfit, unless in any given case the Secretary in his discretion shall relieve such recruit of such payment.

So that I think that the law as it stands——

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In just a minute. The law as it stands now contains practically all the restrictions that various gentlemen have suggested, and this discussion will have the effect of calling the attention of the Navy Department to the whole matter, so that in the future greater care may be exercised in the enforcement of this statute in reference to recruiting.

Mr. FIELDS. I will say to the gentleman if my substitute is adopted it will most surely call the attention of the recruiting officers to the fact——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I have not had an opportunity to examine the substitute carefully, but it seems to me that it is not as comprehensive and not as likely to protect recruits as the existing law, and my own judgment is that we had better let the law stand as it is, and if corrective legislation is found necessary later let it come from the proper legislative committee.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have had considerable experience in the way of getting boys who were under 18 years of age out of the Navy, and I want to state

that there is one phase of the matter which has not been brought out by those who have participated in the debate thus far, and that is that boys frequently take the birth certificate of their older brother and they also assume the older brother's name. They present it to the naval or military officer and by means of the name and the birth certificate of their older brother they are thereby enlisted in the Army or Navy, whichever the case may be. I can not understand why the enlisting officer should be censured or deprived of his pay for his part in the transaction, and after the boy has been in the service a short time he gets tired or dissatisfied and then he discloses that he used the brother's certificate. I see nothing in the two amendments proposed that covers the proposition to change the existing law so it would cover the cases which so frequently have been brought to my attention. I live within 18 miles of Newport, which is a naval station, and there is also a naval station at Providence, 18 miles away, and there are both naval and military officers who have enlisting offices in the city of Fall River, where I have resided almost all my life. There are men enlisting all the time. The naval officer or the military officer is not to blame for enlisting those boys because they bring with them the birth certificate and assume the name of their brother, and there is no way for the naval or military officer to tell whether it is genuine or not, and because the person seeking enlistment brings a certificate of birth and age it is readily accepted as sufficient evidence to the officers, even though he assumes his brother's name.

Mr. FIELDS. If my substitute is adopted, it will doubtless cause the recruiting officer to require the applicant for enlistment to bring the written statement of his parent or guardian, which would disclose the fact that he had his brother's certificate.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I doubt it very much. I think the presentation of the certificate is sufficient, and I think it would be very unwise to adopt either of the proposed amendments. It would be far better to allow the law to remain as it now is.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it seems that we have pretty well exhausted the matter. How much time does the gentleman from Texas want?

Mr. BLANTON. Three minutes.

Mr. WINGO. If we are going to waste more time on this business, I make the point that there is no quorum present. You were in an awful hurry yesterday when you had a serious matter, and you kept your political absentees here and you had better bring them in. I make the point of order there is no quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman from Arkansas said if we wasted any more time on this proposition he was going to make the point of order of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made the point of order. One hundred and four gentlemen are present—a quorum.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I move that debate close on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 0.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that some gentlemen did not vote on either side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just counted and found a quorum was present.

Mr. WINGO. Does the Chair say that there are 100 men in this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counted just a moment ago.

Mr. WINGO. Does the Chair say there are 100 men in this room?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair made no such statement. The Chair said two minutes ago there were 100.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has no right to interrogate the Chair.

Mr. WINGO. What is the gentleman going to do about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division; I would like to bring in the 104.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 21, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROVISIONS, NAVY.

For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers of messes in case of death or desertion upon orders of the commanding officers, at 50 cents per diem, and midshipmen at 80 cents per diem, and commuted rations stopped on account of sick in hospital and credited at the rate of 75 cents per ration to the naval hospital fund; subsistence of men unavoidably detained or absent from vessels to which attached under orders (during which subsistence rations to be stopped on board ship and no credit for commutation therefore to be given); quarters and subsistence of men on detached duty; subsistence of officers and men of the naval auxiliary service; subsistence of members of the Naval Reserve Force during period of active service; expenses of handling provisions and for subsistence in kind at hospitals and on board ship in lieu of subsistence allowance of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service at the expiration of such confinement; in all, $16,424,000, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for such general courts-martial prisoners in such amounts as seem to him proper, which may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, but which shall in no case exceed 30 cents per diem for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency rations as required.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise on the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to correct an error made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], if the committee will indulge me a moment. I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, page 490, the letter from Mrs. Selma Eddy. I read:

WILLOW CITY, TEX., *September 5, 1922.*

DEAR MR. BLANTON: I received your letter last night concerning the discharge of my boy, Terrel Robert Eddy. I have decided to let the matter drop, as I don't know what the boy swore, and I am afraid I might get him into trouble. He has one more year to serve in the Navy, and I think it best to leave him alone. However, I thank you very much for your trouble.

Yours very truly, MRS. SELMA EDDY.

Now, what scared the woman was the part of their letter which came from the Bureau of Navigation, which the gentleman from New York did not read, but which, from page 490, I read, as follows:

When young Eddy enlisted, December 1, 1920, he made oath that he was born August 12, 1901, from which it would appear that his enlistment was taken in good faith, and considered legal and binding in all respects under the Revised Statutes, which make the enlistment of a boy 18 years of age or over, without the consent of his parents or legal guardian, a valid contract.

So the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], with whom I have no controversy, except I do not want to let him make statements here that are not in conformity with the facts, when he stated that this boy had been discharged and that the Bureau of Navigation had accorded everything to this woman, was in error. It was probably a mistake based upon some misinformation that he had. As a matter of fact, in the same RECORD, that of day before yesterday, on page 490, I showed that Messrs. Walters & Baker, a reputable firm of lawyers at San Saba, Tex., had proved beyond question or doubt that this woman was a destitute widow with five little children to support and that the boy, who was wrongfully taken into the Navy, was her mainstay; and yet, when promising to discharge him, the Bureau of Navigation wrote this letter asserting that the boy swore he was 18, from which she was afraid the boy would be given a dishonorable discharge or that he might be prosecuted. The gentleman from New York ought to be fair. All this happened after what occurred in the letter he read had transpired.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The woman withdrew her request that her boy be discharged, and there is nothing in the letter to show that the woman was acting through fear.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not she write "I am afraid I might get my boy into trouble"? Oh, if you send to the mother a statement like that from the Bureau of Navigation, from Admiral Washington, who never saw it, although his name was signed to it, "Your boy swore to a lie," what does the woman imagine? She imagines that her boy might be taken up before a court-martial and that he may be dishonorably discharged and punished for making a false statement.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. The gentleman is drawing on his imagination. There is nothing of that kind in the letter.

Mr. BLANTON. No English language could be plainer. She said, "I do not know what my boy swore." She said, "I am afraid I may get my boy into trouble." And she waives his discharge. That comes from a poor destitute widow, the mother of five little children. Yet the gentleman takes issue and

says her boy ought to be left in the Navy. He may be able to take that position before his people of South Dakota, but my constituents in Texas do not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

For surgeon's necessaries for vessels in commission, navy yards, naval stations, and Marine Corps; and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy yards, naval medical supply depots, Naval Medical School and Dispensary, Washington, and Naval Academy, $1,760,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical service in naval hospitals, dispensaries, medical supply depots, and Naval Medical School, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, shall not exceed 150,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may insert the dollar mark in front of the "150,000" on line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy yard, Mare Island, Calif.: Rebuilding dikes, wharves, and quay walls, and maintenance dredging (limit of cost, $2,800,000), $1,500,000, to be available immediately.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HICKS. I want to ask the chairman, if I may, in reference to the Mare Island item, the amount provided here for dredging. I presume that is the dredging over those shoals that obstruct the free passage between San Francisco Bay and Mare Island Bay. Or is that in the harbor itself?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that it is the dredging immediately in front of the yard.

Mr. HICKS. It does not include those shoals 4 or 5 miles below the island?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No.

Mr. HICKS. Does the gentleman know whether that channel that I refer to is kept open at a reasonable expense to the Government?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; it is. The Army has jurisdiction, as the gentleman knows, over the maintenance of the channel from San Francisco Bay to Mare Island. The last information we had through the Army engineer was that the depth of the channel was not sufficient and that the dredging would continue to make it 500 feet wide and perfectly ample to take care of our largest ships when the present project is completed.

Mr. HICKS. As I remember, when I was there two years ago there was a large wooden dike built just as you approach Mare Island, around inside the harbor at Mare Island; and that dike, being of wood, was becoming deteriorated. I was wondering whether this was not the appropriation for that instead of for the harbor.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The appropriation of $1,500,000 includes the repair and restoration of the piers and wharves along the water front and also the replacement of the dikes. Congress last year authorized a project there of $2,800,000. We appropriated $750,000 last year. This is one of the items that we increased above the Budget figures—providing $1,500,000 this year instead of $750,000 this year and $750,000 next year. The reason for allowing the $1,500,000 now was that the dikes are breaking down, owing to attack some two or three years ago by the teredo, which bored into the wooden piling. The giving away of the dikes will permit the silt and other deposits to fill up the basin in front of the yard and thus necessitate extensive dredging later on unless this project is hastened. We believed it to be more economical to appropriate a larger sum of money this year and push the work along and thus prevent further damage and resulting expense.

Mr. HICKS. How long will these dikes last?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The new dikes are to be made of reinforced concrete.

Mr. HICKS. Out of concrete?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is to repair the sea wall and dikes and not for dredging, except right in front of the yard and that made necessary in the work on the quay wall and dikes. The dredging in front of the yard will be done by a clam-shell dredger that the yard already has. These dikes and sea wall were almost destroyed by the teredo during the four years of low water that they had in California. The teredo can not live in fresh water. The water in front of Mare Island Navy Yard and down through the Pinole Shoals is fresh water, except in exceedingly low water, when there has been several dry years in succession in the mountains and valleys. If the $750,000 had been used for this purpose when I first asked for it, the work would have been completed within the $750,000; but the Bureau of Yards and Docks did not use any of the lump sum that was appropriated for yards and docks for that purpose. The result is as I anticipated, that it will cost about four times as much now as it would had the sea wall and dikes been repaired then and not allowed to go out. There will be no teredo in the Mare Island Navy Yard channel probably for the next 20 or 30 years, but in order that this condition shall not occur again in the future the Navy Department is using reinforced concrete instead of wooden piling, and I believe it will complete the work within the authorized appropriation. So far as the channel is concerned, it is under the control of the War Department. The project of the War Department is for a channel 500 feet wide and 35 feet deep at lower low water with a turning basin of 1,000 feet. The channel has been maintained by the Army Engineers at an annual cost of about $50,000. The estimate of the Army Engineers of the cost of maintaining the channel was not to exceed $100,000 per annum.

At the present time the channel is 500 feet wide, and the water is 35 feet deep at lower low water through the channel in front of Mare Island Navy Yard and the Pinole Shoals and in the turning basin. There is a tide of 7 feet there which makes it 42 feet at high tide. The channel is adequate to accommodate the largest battleship afloat of any nation or the largest merchant ship afloat of any nation, and would be maintained by the War Department for commercial purposes regardless of whether the Navy Yard were there or not. There are two railroads that have their termini at Vallejo, and the commerce of that port alone has justified, and will justify, the maintaining of the channel.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman in what way this item is objectionable to him?

Mr. CURRY. It is not objectionable to me. I am making an explanation.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURRY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. What was the idea in allowing Mare Island Navy Yard to get into such a state of decay as to require such an appropriation as this? Have the dikes heretofore been constructed of wooden piling or something of that character?

Mr. CURRY. The dikes have always been wooden piling. The teredo never got into the Mare Island channel before. The reason it got in this time was because we had four years of drouth and the water in the channel was so low that it was salt instead of fresh. The teredo lives only in salt water.

Mr. HICKS. Bad timber from Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. CURRY. The timber was all right, and it was from Washington.

Mr. MILLER. It was good timber then.

Mr. CURRY. The reason it has gotten into this condition is because four years ago in the lump-sum appropriation there was an item of $750,000 which was supposed to be spent at the Mare Island Navy Yard for the repair of these dikes and quay wall, but it was not so expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CURRY. I ask for two minutes more to answer this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURRY. I told the committee at that time that unless they made a specific appropriation, in my opinion the money would not be so used. At that time Admiral Parks, the then Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, came before the subcommittee and stated that it would be used for that purpose. It went through in a lump-sum appropriation and the Navy Department did not allocate one dollar to the Mare Island Navy Yard for this purpose. Admiral Parks stated that the reason he did not allocate any money to the Mare Island yard was because the appropriation was not large enough to do some other things that he wanted to do. Since that time I have always insisted on a specific appropriation.

Mr. MILLER. That was the explanation I expected to receive.

Mr. CHALMERS. The statement that this channel will accommodate all ships, both of the Navy and the merchant marine, is perhaps not exactly correct. I understand that the *Leviathan* when loaded draws 38½ feet, so that at low water in this channel the *Leviathan* could not go through.

Mr. CURRY. I think if the master of the *Leviathan* should try to take her in on low water he ought to have his epaulettes taken off, but she can easily be taken in at high tide and have 4 feet to spare under her keel. You add 7 feet tide to 35 feet at lower low water and it makes 42 feet, which gives plenty of water under the keel. The water over the Pinole Shoals and in the Mare Island Channel is deeper than on some spots on the bar at the entrance to San Francisco Bay.

Mr. MILLER. She would come naturally to the Puget Sound Navy Yard.

Mr. CURRY. Well, the Puget Sound Navy Yard is all right, and so is Mare Island, and so is the Puget Sound Representative. Any ship that can be taken to the Bremerton yard can just as easily be taken to Mare Island.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS.

AVIATION, NAVY.

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1923, $275,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, helium plant, air stations, fleet activities, testing laboratories, and for overhauling of planes, $6,290,000, including $350,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, $1,573,224; for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service, $710,000; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, $5,798,950; in all, $14,647,174, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing laws as "Aviation" and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft, where such claim does not exceed the sum of $250: *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during any fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice on page 40, lines 18 to 24, there is a provision for the settlement of claims of private property not to exceed $250. What is the argument in favor of keeping it down to $250, where by Navy plane it is $1,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think it is $500.

Mr. WINGO. We had the question up, and I had forgotten whether it was put at $500 or $1,000.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Five hundred dollars is the limit for damage by ships. I think the gentleman can see that in the case of ships the opportunity for damaging property would be greater than by airplanes.

Mr. WINGO. I advocated when the question was up before that we ought to have a uniform rule covering the amount that the executive department might use in the settlement of claims, so as to avoid these little, petty claims coming to Congress. Does the gentleman think it would be unwise to bring this up to the $500 or $1,000?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We thought this had better be left as it is until the legislation to which the gentleman refers is enacted into law.

Mr. WINGO. Then that has not become law?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It has not. I will say to the gentleman that I am in hearty accord with him, but there has been as yet no action by the Senate on the bill referred to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On page 41 there is a provision that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of the continental United States. What stations has the department in mind in the establishment of these stations?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This is legislation that has been carried for some time.

Mr. MILLER. That may be; but that does not answer my question.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was proceeding to answer the gentleman's question. These stations are Cape May, Chatham, Hampton Roads, Lakehurst, San Diego, and one other that I do not just now recall.

Mr. MILLER. Then there are five stations on the Atlantic coast and one on the Pacific. Does it not occur to the gentleman there should be more than one air base on the Pacific coast?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It would seem, offhand, as though the gentleman might be quite right. The gentleman is a distinguished member of the Naval Affairs Committee——

Mr. MILLER. No; I am a member of the Military Affairs Committee. I was wondering why, when the activities are being pressed on the Pacific coast and half of the fleet is practically on the Pacific Ocean and the eyes of the world are on the Pacific coast, why the bill should not provide for more than one station on that coast.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There was the suggestion last year that another base be established on the North Pacific in the neighborhood of Seattle. I recall that the distinguished gentleman was very much interested in an air base in the Northwest and urged with great force that one be established there.

Mr. MILLER. That is right, and that is the one we are inquiring for in an indirect application to this bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman understands that the Appropriations Committee has its hands tied in so far as starting new projects is concerned. He must go to the proper legislative committee.

Mr. MILLER. That is startling to me that the Appropriations Committee has its hands tied. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any sum in this act appropriated shall be expended in the pay or allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty as professor or instructor at the United States Naval Academy to perform the duties which were performed by civilian professors or instructors on January 1, 1922, whenever the number of civilian professors or instructors employed in such duties shall be less than 80: *Provided*, That in reducing the number of civilian professors no existing contract shall be violated: *Provided further*, That no civilian professor, associate or assistant professor, or instructor shall be dismissed, except for sufficient cause, without six months' notice to him that his services will be no longer needed.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman if the requirement that a candidate for appointment to the Naval Academy shall report at Annapolis for physical examination, and when he fails to pass must pay his own expenses to the academy and back home, is one of law or is a departmental regulation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection is, although I am not entirely clear about it, that if the boy goes to Annapolis for his physical examination and fails to get into the academy his expenses must be borne by himself. The Government pays 5 cents a mile for travel to the academy, but if he fails he must pay his own expenses back.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is required that he report to the Naval Academy for physical examination?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am not quite sure that that is uniform. In certain instances a physical examination is conducted at a point near the boy's home.

Mr. BARBOUR. The instructions recently sent out to candidates appointed by myself contained the requirement that the boys report to the Naval Academy for physical examination, and if they fail to pass the examination they will be required to pay their own expenses home.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It may be that they are given a preliminary examination at a point near home, and that the final examination is at the academy.

Mr. HICKS. I think probably that is true. Here is the case that I have to deal with, and it is probably the same case that the gentleman from California might have to deal with. In my district an applicant comes to me, and I give him a letter to the admiral of the Brooklyn Navy Yard and ask the admiral to give him a physical examination. That examination is identical with the Annapolis examination, and if he passes the one in Brooklyn the chances are that he will pass the one in Annapolis.

Mr. BARBOUR. In two of these cases that I refer to they are already enlisted men in the Navy, stationed at San Francisco, and their directions are to report to the Naval Academy for physical examination.

Mr. HICKS. I think if the gentleman would ask those men to go to the navy yard in San Francisco and then ask the admiral to examine them, he would subject them to the physical examination, and if they passed that they would probably pass the examination at Annapolis.

Mr. BARBOUR. It may be that they would pass in San Francisco, then come on to Annapolis and be rejected, and it seems to me that in such case some provision should be made for paying the fare of those boys back to their homes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think there is some virtue in what the gentleman says.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But on whose shoulders is the obligation, the man who is going to get a free education or the Government that is going to pay for it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Provision for these physical examinations could be and should be made nearer the home of the candidate.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am not debating that point. It is a question of failing to pass the examination. Why, we might have the country swamped with men who are willing to take an examination, whether they could pass it or not, in order to get a transcontinental ride.

Mr. BARBOUR. But if he takes the examination near home he is there, and does not get a long transcontinental ride if he fails.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not pose as an expert on this matter, but I know in the Army side of things a candidate for the Military Academy at West Point is advised to have himself examined at the nearest Army post, with the reasonable assurance, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] says, that if he passes in the fundamentals of that examination he will qualify in the technical and record final examination at West Point.

Mr. BARBOUR. Why should not the first examination be final?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Because, I think, every institution would prefer to pass on all finalities at its own threshold, rather than have agents in the field who might vary in their terms and forms.

Mr. BARBOUR. But if they reject a man who comes across the continent I think they should provide for his transportation home.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no; because the obligation is upon the man who gets a free thing rather than upon the person who gives it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistant librarian, $2,500; cataloguer, $1,800; 2 shelf assistants, at $1,400 each; secretary of the Naval Academy, $3,000; clerks—2 at $2,100 each, 2 at $1,900 each, 2 at $1,800 each, 9 at $1,600 each, 4 at $1,400 each, 23 at $1,300 each, 7 at $1,200 each; repair man or seamstress, $1,000; surveyor, $1,700; services of choirmaster and organist at chapel, $1,700; captain of the watch, $1,600; captain of the watch, $1,500; 30 watchmen, at $1,400 each; 5 telephone switchboard operators, at $840 each; mail messenger, $1,200; in all, $134,900.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in line 19, page 42, after the figures "$1,600" and the semicolon, the word "second," which was omitted by mistake, so that it will read "second captain of the watch."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the change will be made.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for the maintenance of Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, $8,604,943; and the money herein specifically appropriated for the maintenance of the Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the existing law as maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps; and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that finishes the bill except the item for the increase of the Navy. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13374 and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and had agreed to the conference asked by the House and had appointed Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SPENCER, and Mr. OVERMAN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1922.

The SPEAKER. The Chair earlier in the day designated the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] to preside in case the Chair was late on Monday. Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas will not be able to be here, and the Chair designates in his stead the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

CONFERENCE REPORT—DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for printing under the rule.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 18, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

834. A letter from the Director of the United States Veterans' Bureau, transmitting a statement as of December 1, 1922, indicating the total number of positions at a rate of $2,000 or more per annum, the rate of salary attached to each position, and the number of positions at each rate in the central office; also attached a statement indicating the corresponding information as of November 1, 1922, for the district and subdistrict offices; to the Committee on Appropriations.

835. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill for the relief of the East La Have Transportation Co. (Ltd.), owner; A. Picard & Co., owner of cargo; and George H. Corkum, Leopold S. Conrad, Wilson Zinck, Freeman Beck, Sidney Knickle, and Norman E. Le Gay, crew of the schooner *Conrein*, sunk by the U. S. submarine *K-4*; to the Committee on Claims.

836. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, supplemental and deficiency estimate of appropriations for the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, amounting to $2,756,571.23; to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 12790. A bill authorizing the publication of information presented at the World's Dairy Congress to be held in the United States during October, 1923; with amendments (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 13351. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the Daughters of the American Revolution of the State of South Carolina the silver service which was used upon the battleship *South Carolina*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13139. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a railroad bridge across Pearl River at approximately 1¼ miles north of Georgetown, in the State of Mississippi; with amendments (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SCOTT of Tennessee: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10088. A bill for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13448) to prohibit the importation and the mailing, shipment, sending, carrying, or transportation of inflammable films in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13449) to authorize the sale of certain Government property and appropriating the proceeds thereof for the erection of buildings, and the purchase and the installation of equipment for use of the Engineer-

ing Division of the Air Service of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 13450) to amend section 108 of the Judicial Code, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 13451) providing for retirement of officers of the Army in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 13452) to ascertain and settle the title to lands and waters in New Mexico belonging to the Pueblo Indians, to preserve their ancient customs, rites, and tribal ceremonies, and providing an exclusive forum wherein all controversies as to the rights of the Pueblo Indians may be adjudicated; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COUGHLIN: A bill (H. R. 13453) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the post-office building at Wilkes-Barre, Pa., on the present site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13454) to enlarge, extend, and remodel the post-office building at Hazleton, Pa., on the present site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13455) to provide for the erection of a public building at Corbin, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13456) to provide for the erection of a public building at Pineville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13457) to provide for the erection of a public building at Barbourville, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13458) to provide for the erection of a public building at Harlan, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 13459) extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission and making available funds appropriated under authority of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, for the purpose of controlling the floods of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to Rock Island, Ill., and for the purpose of controlling the floods of the tributaries of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Ohio River and Rock Island, Ill., including levee protection and bank protection, in so far as said tributaries are affected by the flood waters of the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DEAL: A bill (H. R. 13460) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land in the city of Norfolk, Va., as may be necessary for the enlargement of the post-office building in said city, to cause said building to be enlarged, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LINEBERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 413) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 13461) granting a pension to Jesse Angle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 13462) for the relief of Daniel F. Healy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 13463) granting an increase of pension to Harry W. McCammon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13464) granting a pension to Charles F. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13465) for the relief of Alvin Harder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 13466) granting a pension to Johanna Malone; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13467) granting a pension to Richard A. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13468) for the relief of W. E. Knickman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13469) granting a pension to Emma Gwinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13470) granting a pension to Nellie A. Farley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 13471) granting an increase of pension to Mary Tichenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13472) granting a pension to Elizabeth Fry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13473) granting a pension to Charles Fremont Kuntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRELAND: Resolution (H. Res. 472) providing for six months' salary to be paid the widow of John Rome; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6618. By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the Athena Woman's Club, Algonac, Mich., urging that our Government take the necessary steps to put an end to Turkish rule over the Christians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6619. Also, memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Kingston, Mich., urging the influence of the United States be used to save the remnant of the Armenians from extermination by the Turks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6620. Also, memorial of the Alexander Macomb Chapter, Daughters American Revolution, Mount Clemens, Mich., urging the checking of future immigration from Europe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6621. By Mr. FOCHT: Petition from citizens of Pennsylvania in regard to Sunday blue laws in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6622. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Lawyers Mortgage Co., Richard M. Hurd, Esq., president, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Green resolution, which provides for a constitutional amendment eliminating tax exemptions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6623. By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Resolution adopted by the New Jersey Society Sons of the American Revolution urging the erection of a memorial bridge across the Delaware River to commemorate Washington crossing the Delaware, December 25 and 26, 1776; to the Committee on the Library.

6624. By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of L. G. Hancock and others, Fosston, Minn., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6625. Also, petition of the First State Bank of Dalton, Minn., and others, to relieve or help relieve the situation of the farmer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6626. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of citizens of the Republic of the United States assembled in mass meeting at Symphony Hall, Boston, Mass., on December 3, 1922, expressing faith in the Irish Republic and the wise statesmanship of Eamonn De Valera; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Saturday, December 16, 1922.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

HOLM O. BURSUM, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, and JAMES A. REED, a Senator from the State of Missouri, appeared in their seats to-day.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the folowing Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson
Ball	France	McCumber	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McKinley	Shortridge
Borah	Glass	McLean	Simmons
Brandegee	Gooding	McNary	Smith
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Bursum	Harreld	Myers	Spencer
Cameron	Harris	New	Stanley
Capper	Harrison	Nicholson	Sterling
Caraway	Heflin	Norbeck	Sutherland
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Townsend
Couzens	Johnson	Overman	Trammell
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Page	Underwood
Cummins	Kendrick	Pepper	Wadsworth
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Ladd	Pomerene	Warren
Dillingham	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson
Ernst	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

I was also requested to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

ELECTIVE FRANCHISE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. BALL presented a resolution of the Kalorama Citizens' Association of Washington, D. C., which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KALORAMA CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1922.

CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: At the last meeting of the Kalorama Citizens' Association, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved by the Kalorama Citizens' Association in regular meeting assembled*, That the so-called Poindexter bill (S. 14) providing for the election of a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the District of Columbia, in no manner meets the legitimate and just claims of the District for a voice in the affairs of the Government, and therefore should not receive the support of those who believe that the District is entitled by every consideration of equity, justice, and Americanism to share the privilege and responsibilities of complete national suffrage accorded to all other citizens of the Republic.

"*Resolved further*, That the association unreservedly indorses Senate Joint Resolution 133 (the so-called Jones resolution) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, under which Congress will be empowered to remove the stigma of disfranchisement from the citizens of the District and grant them the right of representation so dearly prised by every free man and woman.

"*Resolved further*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the respective Committees of the District of Columbia of the two Houses of Congress and to each citizens' association with the request that such association take similar action, and further requesting the chairman of the District Committee of the Senate to have this resolution printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

It is respectfully urged that your committee do all that is possible to further the desires and sentiments of the members of the association as expressed in the resolution.

Respectfully,

EDW. R. WALTON, Jr., *Secretary.*

PATROL DRIVERS, METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3252) to amend paragraph 8 of the act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 951) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4194) granting a pension to Nellie Berry; and

A bill (S. 4195) granting a pension to Harrison Sperry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 4196) defining the legal status of all children under 18 years of age in the District of Columbia; creating a parental court; and providing for a child relief allowance for the assistance of certain mothers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 4197) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to certain persons and certain corporations permits to explore, or leases of, certain lands that lie south of the medial line of the main channel of Red River, in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 4199) to refund to Clinton G. Edgar income tax erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

WORLD WAR FOREIGN DEBT COMMISSION.

Mr. HARRIS. I introduce a bill which I ask may be read at length.

The bill (S. 4198) to increase the personnel of the Foreign Debt Commission, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act to create a commission authorized under certain conditions to refund or convert obligations of foreign governments held by the United States of America, and for other purposes," approved February 9, 1922, is amended to read as follows:

"That a World War foreign debt commission is hereby created consisting of eight members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall serve as chairman, and seven of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four members so appointed shall be from the same political party."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, this measure is not offered in any partisan spirit. In fact, it is offered to prevent any partisan spirit in the solution of the great problem involved which will have to be solved ultimately by the Foreign Debt Commission and Congress. I have no criticism whatever of the splendid men who were appointed on the commission. They are among the very best men in our country. But they are all five Republicans, and I believe if both parties in Congress were represented on the commission we would get it away from partisan politics and solve the problem much better than if handled by a strictly partisan commission. My bill would increase the commission to eight members, permitting the President to appoint three Democrats, preferably Members of Congress. This would not be any expense.

The Sixty-ninth Congress and others after that may have a majority of Democrats. A Democratic President may be in office, and if the debt-funding commission is now made nonpartisan, it will prove a continuous body instead of furnishing agitation to turn out all the Republican members of the commission and substitute Democrats.

Mr. President, I introduced in the Senate the first resolution on this matter declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that no debts owed the United States by European governments should be canceled, and I still believe these countries in the course of time will be able and should pay to our country all of their indebtedness.

I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

REGENT OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. STANLEY. I introduce a joint resolution which is a mere matter of form—the selection of a regent for the Smithsonian Institution to fill a vacancy. I ask that it be read at length.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 258) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the expiration of the term of Alexander Graham Bell, of Washington, District of Columbia, be filled by the appointment of Irwin B. Laughlin, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. STANLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will not object, Mr. President, on the theory that it will lead to no discussion.

Mr. STANLEY. It will lead to no discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on December 16, 1922, the President approved and signed the act (S. 3195) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept completion of Carey segregation No. 11 and to issue patent therefor.

STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submit a conference report. I do not ask for its consideration but simply present it.

The report was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,
KNUTE NELSON,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,
Managers on the part of the House.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. RANSDELL addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for just a moment?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate agree to vote upon the Norris motion to-morrow at 4 o'clock, with the understanding that when the Senate closes its business to-day it shall recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. RANSDELL. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the proposal.

The READING CLERK. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work to-day it shall recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, and at 4 o'clock to-morrow vote upon the motion submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4050, to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REED of Missouri. We want to know something more about it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is satisfactory to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FLETCHER. I rose to ask if it would be satisfactory to the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I am concerned, it is agreeable to me. It is not fixing a time for a vote on the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is for a vote on the motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Simply a vote on the motion to take up the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. To take up the bill the Senator from Nebraska reported?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; to take up the bill I reported.

Mr. SMITH. At what hour does the Senator propose to have the vote taken?

Mr. JONES of Washington. At 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Washington is that when the Senate completes its business to-night it shall take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, and that at 4 o'clock to-morrow a vote upon the pending motion shall be taken.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent proposal offered by the Senator from Washington, but I think I ought to inform the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings on several bills which have been introduced by Senators covering the agricultural credit situation, and we are to have hearings this afternoon at which we expect important witnesses to appear. I think it will be the desire of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to attend that meeting this afternoon at 2 o'clock. For that reason I hope that during the two hours which will be allotted to the consideration of the motion to-morrow the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency will have a fair portion of the time. I would like to have five or six minutes to express my views in regard to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest that if any Senator desires to talk on the motion we will have all the time between now and 4 o'clock to-morrow, as far as that is concerned. My suggestion that we take a recess from to-day until 12 o'clock to-morrow was made to accommodate the committee which is holding hearings, and also I had in mind what the Senator has said with reference to the hearings this afternoon.

Mr. McLEAN. I simply want to give notice that I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes to-morrow afternoon to make a brief statement.

Mr. JONES of Washington. All right. There will be four hours to-morrow to debate the motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to cut anybody out who wants to make any remarks on the motion, but the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] told me that he expects to speak on the motion, and I judge from what he said that his remarks will be at some length—not a very long address, but longer than the Senator from Connecticut has intimated he wants to speak. I do not desire to have any understanding which will cut the junior Senator from Iowa out. As far as I know now the time suggested by the Senator from Washington will give ample opportunity for everyone who has signified any idea that he wants to talk to speak as long as he may wish.

Mr. SMITH. What is to hinder any Senator who desires to discuss the proposition under consideration from talking on it to-day?

Mr. NORRIS. Nothing.

Mr. SMITH. We have from now until 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon to discuss it.

Mr. McLEAN. But the Committee on Banking and Currency will be engaged this afternoon in a very important hearing, and it will be impossible for the members of that committee to be in both places.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There will be four hours to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut, who is chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, a question? That committee has been holding hearings for several days, I understand, on some bill. Can the Senator tell the Senate when, in all probability, they will conclude the hearings and be able to report?

Mr. McLEAN. We expect to conclude the hearings to-morrow or Wednesday, and in all probability we shall be able to report out a bill early next week.

Mr. HARRISON. About Monday of next week, does the Senator say?

Mr. McLEAN. Early next week. I would not fix the exact day.

Mr. HARRISON. The Christmas holidays are coming on. Is it the intention of the Senator to report the bill before the Christmas holidays?

Mr. McLEAN. It is my understanding that the adjournment over the Christmas holidays will be but two days, but I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the Senator is mistaken, and I think he is. I do not think there will be a quroum here during the holidays.

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know; I am not responsible for that.

Mr. SMITH. Did I understand the Senator to say that he thought by Monday or Tuesday of next week the Committee on Banking and Currency would be ready to report their bill?

Mr. McLEAN. We hope to do so.

Mr. WATSON. Monday will be Christmas. Of course, there will be no session on that day.

Mr. McLEAN. We certainly will get the bill out immediately after New Year's. If the Senate is in session, I think we will report it next week.

Mr. WATSON. My understanding is that it is the present intention to adjourn from Friday evening until Tuesday morning. In that event the committee could bring out its bill next week, according to the statement of the chairman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HARRISON. Was the last request to agree to vote at 2 o'clock or 4 o'clock?

Mr. NORRIS. At 4 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So that there may be no misunderstanding, the Chair will state the proposed agreement again, as the Chair understood it. It is that when the session of to-day ends the Senate will take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, and that at 4 o'clock to-morrow the Senate will proceed to vote upon the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON. Reserving the right to object, can we not have it understood that the time for discussion will be divided equally between those who are for the motion and those who are opposed to the motion? Will not the Senator who made the request incorporate that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It would be very unusual for the Senate to do that. I anticipate that everybody who will desire to talk on the motion will have full opportunity to do it beween now and 4 o'clock to-morrow. I do not know of anyone on this side who wants to speak on it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, it has been suggested that at least one Senator might desire to speak at length upon the motion. I do not know what that means. It may mean one hour, it may mean four hours, under the rule of unlimited debate. It is hardly a fair proposition to say that we are going to vote on an important matter of this kind at 4 o'clock without having some kind of an understanding as to a division of

time. It is not quite the right thing to be advised in advance that 1 Senator may want a considerable time and the other 95 Senators may not have any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to say that I have no objection, personally, to providing as a part of the agreement that the time shall be divided equally between the opposition and those favoring the motion. I suppose the time would be divided and controlled by the Chair. It is such an unusual proceeding for the Senate that I do not know how it would work, but I, myself, have no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to propound this inquiry to the Senate: Inasmuch as a Senator can speak on any subject and may be speaking neither for nor against the motion, how can the Chair control the situation?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We are not going to displace the unfinished business between now and 4 o'clock to-morrow. The unfinished business will be before the Senate to be proceeded with.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the intention of the Senator from Nebraska between now and 4 o'clock to-morrow to make a speech explaining this bill? I think the Senate ought to know something about the bill before we vote on taking it up, and I think we ought to have sufficient time for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I presumed that Senators knew about it. I do not want to inflict a speech on the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will say very frankly to the Senator that I have been busily engaged on the shipping bill, and I have not examined his bill. I would like to examine it. It seems to me that the time between now and 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon is very short.

Mr. NORRIS. I assume it is going to be discussed by those who debate the question, and I may want to discuss it before we get through. But since there seems to be some doubt, may I ask the Senator from Washington to withdraw the request and let the debate on the shipping bill proceed?

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will do that for the present.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well; I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request for unanimous consent is withdrawn, and the Senator from Louisiana will proceed.

Mr. RANSDELL resumed and concluded his speech, which is, entire, as follows:

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, a few days ago I gave notice that at the opening of the session to-day I would discuss the pending shipping bill, and I should like to do so at this time.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there are a great many interesting and important features in the bill in addition to the so-called aid or subsidy feature thereof. Those matters have not been emphasized very much to date, and I wish to discuss them briefly, not in detail, but to have Senators understand that entirely aside from the so-called subsidy feature it is a most excellent bill. I wish to say right here, however, that in my judgment it would not be effective and would not produce the results we seek to obtain unless one of two things happens: First, to make effective the discriminating duty provisions now on the statute books and held in abeyance because of our treaty relations with many of the nations of the world, to make effective the provisions referred to in section 34 of the shipping act of 1920, which section instructed and authorized the President of the United States to denounce the treaties with foreign countries which contravened the discriminating duty provision of the law—place that provision in effect, I say, and give us the benefit of discriminating duties which built up our merchant marine in the early days, for, Senators, it is a fact known to all who have studied the matter that one of the very first acts of Congress in 1789 was to provide discriminating duties in favor of goods brought to this country in American bottoms.

It seems, sir, impossible to put into effect that discriminating duty provision, and in lieu thereof the only thing that so far has been presented to the Congress which in my humble opinion promises any real measure of relief is the direct aid, the so-called subsidy. I do not intend to discuss that in detail. It has already been gone into by others.

But, Mr. President, there are other features of the bill to which I wish to call special attention. One, sir, is the revolving loan fund of $125,000,000, provided for the purpose of assisting shipbuilders and ship companies to construct the many vessels which are needed to constitute a well-balanced fleet. Mr. President and Senators, we have not a well-balanced merchant marine at this time. We have a very large tonnage, but most of our ships are not of the combined freight and passenger type—fast vessels, vessels that can build up our trade with foreign lands not only by carrying freight to and from those lands but by carrying passengers as well; vessels which in time of war may, if necessary, be converted into auxiliary cruisers. We are very short of vessels of that character. I will go into that more in detail later, but let me say at this moment that in the merchant marine of Great Britain there are 194 magnificent steel vessels of the combined freight and passenger type which have a speed of from 15 to 27 knots an hour. Every one of those vessels, sirs, is a potential auxiliary cruiser, and we have only 50 such vessels. We need a great many more such vessels in order to build up our merchant marine and to strengthen our Navy, and aid for ships of this character is provided in the revolving loan fund of $125,000,000 which is proposed in the pending bill.

This fund is in no sense a subsidy. Not more than two-thirds of the cost of a ship or two-thirds of the cost of reconstructing and refurnishing such ship is ever to be loaned under this fund. The Government is to be secured by a first mortgage on the ship and the interest rate, it is provided, shall not be less than 4½ per cent. It is a strict business proposition. In the same sense that we established the Federal Reserve Board for the business interests of this country, for the benefit of bankers, merchants, and others, and that we established the Federal land bank in order to aid agriculture by lending money to our farmers, so this revolving loan fund would provide money for shipbuilders. It is a most important feature of the bill, and I hope those who oppose the measure so strenuously will bear that feature in mind.

Another feature of the bill which is also very important is that which provides for the creation of a national insurance fund for the purpose of insuring the cargo and the vessel which is engaged in foreign trade. It is very important, Senators, that the great business of insuring our foreign commerce be placed in American insurance companies. The premiums paid out for that purpose aggregate very large sums. We have only a limited number of marine insurance companies in America, while there are a great many such companies abroad, and a large percentage of the marine insurance of this country has in the past been written by those foreign insurance companies. The insurance provisions of the pending bill seek to do this: If foreign insurance companies offer a lesser premium rate than that which is offered by American insurance companies, then the insurance loan fund will allow that insurance to be placed by American companies at the rate offered by the foreign companies, so the insured will receive the benefit of the lowest possible rate and the money will remain in this country.

Another good provision of the bill, sirs, is that which provides for the payment of extra compensation to vessels for carrying the mail. Not only will the fast vessels which carry the mails receive the compensation or subsidy, as do other vessels, but they will be paid for service rendered a fair amount for carrying the mails. That will be of immense benefit in a business way.

Another feature of the bill to which I call attention is that which provides that one-half of the immigrants coming into this country must hereafter, if this bill shall pass, come in American ships. In the past most of the immigrants who have come—and the passage moneys which have been paid by them have aggregated very large sums—have come in foreign ships. This bill provides that not less than 50 per cent of the immigrants must come in American bottoms.

There is another provision of the bill to the effect that in the case of any company or any individual owning and operating ships and desiring to receive the benefit of the direct aid provided in the pending bill, not less than one-half of the tonnage of such individual company must be registered under the American flag; in other words, if an individual owns a few American ships and a great many foreign ships he can not receive the benefit of the direct aid provided in this bill, as not less than 50 per cent of all his tonnage must be registered under the American flag in order to receive such benefit.

MAINTENANCE OF TRADE ROUTES ESSENTIAL.

Then there is a provision which is of especial benefit to the people of the West, of the South, of the Gulf, and of the South Atlantic. That provision is that service must be maintained on routes which have been established by the Shipping Board. There have been a great many routes established from the South Atlantic, the Gulf coast, and the Pacific coast cities. The pending bill provides that the routes and service thereon must be maintained for a reasonable time in order to ascertain

whether or not such service may be profitable and businesslike. It is most important for the small communities whose people in the past have not been sea minded to have lines of ships running from their localities to the ports of the world.

Then there is in the bill a provision requiring that in time of war all vessels of every kind and sort which receive any direct aid under this bill shall, on request of the President, be requisitioned for the public service. It is needless for me to comment on the value of that provision.

The bill further provides that the Army and Navy transport service between this country and our island possessions, or between this country and foreign lands, shall, as soon as practicable, be carried on in the vessels which receive the direct aid; that we shall do away with the Army transport service and the Navy transport service, and also do away with a number of ships which really would be useless if we had a well-developed merchant marine, and hereafter conduct that service in our regular merchant vessels.

Next, there is a provision to which I call the especial attention of all friends of inland waterways. That provision is clear, plain, and unmistakable, and I shall read it into the RECORD. For many years, Senators, we have been trying to encourage and develop water transportation. I see some good friends of water transportation on the floor, and I hope they will do me the honor of listening to this plain and simple provision:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote, encourage, and develop water transportation service and facilities in connection with the commerce of the United States, and to foster and preserve in full vigor both rail and water transportation, and the board—

That is, the Shipping Board—

and the commission—

The Interstate Commerce Commission, previously referred to—

are hereby severally authorized, empowered, and directed to cooperate to that end.

Then the provision proceeds to make it perfectly clear, emphatic, and positive, so that no one can misunderstand, that it is the intention of Congress to build up and maintain a fair spirit of cooperation and coordination of service between the railroads and the waterways of this country; not alone, sir, the ocean waterways, but the interior, the internal waterways. This is the most comprehensive declaration on that subject ever suggested to Congress, and if the bill containing this provision shall become a law the internal waterways of this land, which in the past, to a very great extent, have been strangled by the unfair efforts of railroads, will come into their own again. The provision will not be enforced in any way, nor is such a thing contemplated, to injure the railroads. We simply ask fair play and justice for the waterways and fair play and justice for the railways.

The last provision to which I call attention is one making it imperative that hereafter when officials of this Government, those who receive their pay from the public, take an ocean voyage on official business they must travel in ships flying the American flag. Mr. President and Senators, it has been almost a public scandal in the past, at least until very recently, that public officials, public servants, in traveling abroad have not sought American ships, but have used foreign ships. Of course, no one seeks impossibilities. This measure does not provide the impossible; but it says that if it be reasonably possible for these officials to use American ships they must do so, under penalty of having the charges for their trip disallowed and not paid by the Government. There is the same provision in regard to freights across the water. Those freights must also be carried in American ships.

Senators, I have gone into this matter very briefly, with the hope that those of you who are inclined to oppose this bill will study its features other than the subsidy feature, for I say to you that there are many wise provisions in the measure, many provisions which will tend to assist to build up and to strengthen the American merchant marine, entirely outside of the subsidy feature. Again I wish to emphasize, however, in that connection that unless we get either this subsidy feature, this direct aid, or by some hook or crook put into operation the discriminating features of existing law we need not adopt any provision whatever in this bill.

ONLY ALTERNATIVE IS GOVERNMENT OPERATION.

Mr. President, the only substitute offered so far by the opponents of this measure is a continuation of Government ownership. One of the Senators, in what appears to be rather an indefinite manner, seems to suggest some kind of a body or some individual to carry on Government operation of our present great fleet for an indefinite period of time—perhaps until times get better. He intimates that later on we can sell these ships for a very much larger sum than they would sell for now, and in the meantime he suggests having them operated by somebody. The indication is that he wants to get rid of the present Shipping Board.

Another Senator suggests that we turn over the fleet to the Department of Commerce. Now, Senators, it seems to me that after the experience of this country with the Government operation of railroads, and the experience of this country so far with the Government operation of ships, we should go very slowly to establish any new governmental agency to handle such a large enterprise as our merchant marine.

We did not make a success, Senators, when we operated the railroads. We have not made a success of our operation of the merchant marine so far. I am not criticizing individuals. I have nothing but kind thoughts about the men who undertook the mighty task of operating the railroads of this country in war times. I have nothing but kind thoughts and kind words about the men who, at the request of the former President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, and our present President, Mr. Harding, have given the very best there was in them toward handling our great fleets. My statement is this: These gentlemen undertook impossible tasks. They did the best they could with them. They did not succeed, through no fault of their own; and it is our duty, sirs, to place the ships in private hands, just as we placed the railroads back in private hands some time ago.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield for a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. I call to the Senator's attention the testimony of Mr. Lasker, who said that he had not sought business with these ships; that they only took that which was offered. I submit to the Senator and to the Senate that it does not seem that a very great effort has been made to get business and to make this business a success.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I do not intend to be diverted from the line of my remarks. I do not recall the testimony to which the Senator refers. If he says it, I have not a bit of doubt that Mr. Lasker made some such statement; but, Mr. President and Senators, I have been in close contact with the Shipping Board since we passed the first shipping law in 1916.

I have known personally every one of the men connected with it, the various members of it, and I know that they have done the very best they could to carry on the mercantile business of this country. I have talked to them, conversed with them many times, and heard them testify before committees. I am not familiar with all the details of this particular statement; but, just as the devil can quote the Scriptures for his own purposes, I have no doubt that the able Senator from Alabama can pick out some isolated statement of Mr. Lasker's testimony or Mr. Anybody Else's testimony and let it fit in with the views he advocates.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I decline to be interrupted further. I have a long speech, and I want to go on with it. I will ask the Senator to speak in his own time.

Mr. HEFLIN. I simply wish to suggest to the Senator that the devil is for the subsidy.

Mr. RANSDELL. He may be, but he has some pretty good company. I think there are some angels for the subsidy, too, and I have no doubt that there are some devils who are opposed to it as well as perhaps some angels, including my very genial and handsome friend from Alabama.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator includes him among the angels?

Mr. RANSDELL. I include him among the angels. I accept the suggestion. I know he is an angel; at least, he looks like one.

So far the operation of our ships has been a losing business. Do you not think, Senators, we have had about as good men handling the Shipping Board up to date as we could get? Do you believe, sirs, any one of you, that if you were President you could pick out a much better board than we have now, or better than the boards have been in the past? I doubt it very much. Let us see who are the members of the present board.

First there is Mr. Albert Lasker, of Chicago, one of the most successful business men in America, a man who by his own private efforts accumulated a large fortune, who stands very high among those who know him.

Then there is Mr. T. V. O'Connor, of Buffalo, who was familiar with shipping for many years in the stevedoring business, and for years president of the International Longshore-

men's Association, a man who enjoys the respect and esteem of all his associates, and who was for years connected with business closely allied to shipping.

Then there is our own George E. Chamberlain. I do not need to say anything about ex-Senator Chamberlain in this body. He was a successful lawyer for years, governor of his State for seven years, a Member of this body for 12 years, a real, live, vigorous, forceful statesman, and a man whom everybody in the Senate honored and loved.

The next is Mr. Meyer Lissner, of Los Angeles, a man very active in civic affairs of that city for many years, president of the first Board of Public Utilities of Los Angeles, from 1909 to 1911, and largely responsible, sir, for the creation of the great port of Los Angeles, one of the most important on the Pacific coast. Everything connected with his life indicates that he is a sound business man of high character.

Then comes Admiral William S. Benson, for 47 years active in the service of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations of this country during the greatest war that ever afflicted mankind, and the Navy was a great success during that war under the direction and management of William S. Benson. This gentleman has filled very many important positions, and has received many national and international honors. His whole life has been spent upon the sea in connection with seafaring matters, and he is certainly a wise and able man.

The next member is Mr. Frederick I. Thompson, one of the leading newspaper men of the South, chief owner of the Mobile Register, the Mobile News-Item, and the Birmingham Age-Herald, a man who by his keen mind and his hard and intelligent work has built himself up to affluence, and a very strong and forceful man.

The next is Mr. Edward C. Plummer, who is and has been for over 30 years a lecturer on shipping matters. In early life he worked in shipyards. He has been a close student of this subject for a long time. It has been my pleasure to know Mr. Plummer for over 20 years, and I regard him as one of the sanest, wisest men of my acquaintance, and familiar with every matter connected with shipping because of close study.

These are the seven men who now control the policies of the Shipping Board. Does anyone conceive that we can get a better body of men? How could you pick them out? Mr. President and Senators, the fault is not with the membership of the board. The fault lies deeper than that. The fault is because we are not a seafaring people. We have not been in the game long enough to learn it. The seafaring countries of the Old World, like England, have been studying ships for centuries. They have been following the seafaring life for centuries. They understand every feature and every phase of it. They know how to practice all the economies connected with it. The sea is their life's blood. England is a "tight little island." She gets her wealth from foreign lands. She can not reach those foreign lands except in ships, and her people understand the game. In the early days of our Republic, the days of the old sailing vessels, the clipper ships, we had a hardy race of seamen on the New England coast.

WHY OUR SHIPPING DECLINED.

They made a big success of shipping in those days, and but for the intervention of steam in the early fifties we would still have a successful race of hardy seamen along the Atlantic coast. But the intervention of steam and the Civil War of the sixties, which drove so many of our ships from the seas, which practically destroyed the American merchant marine, put us out of the business. Then for years and years there were so many attractive enterprises in various parts of the country in which men could make more money in other kinds of business than they could hope to make on the sea that the enterprise and skill of America were engaged in those kinds of business.

Mr. President, you can change the organization if you wish, put the ships under the Department of Commerce if you wish, but I predict that you will not meet with greater success with some new Shipping Board or with some new department than we have met with in the past.

Let me remind Senators of this fact, that the Shipping Board is a creature of the Congress, responsible directly to Congress, making its reports to Congress. Do Senators wish to do away with our creature, with this body which reports to us, and place the duty of handling our ships in some bureau of the Department of Commerce, where the shipping of the country will be only a side issue? That would not do, Senators. If you intend to create some new agency, certainly you had better create a department of shipping and place at its head a secretary whose sole duty it will be to look after ships. Do not attach this great task to some one of the present departments of the Government.

A great deal has been said about the Government operation of ships in Canada and in Australia and by the Panama Railroad Steamship Co. Let me give some actual facts and figures in regard to that. One of the first acts of the British Government after the armistice was to do away with the State control of shipping. That the step was well taken in the interest of British commerce is shown by the fact that to-day the British merchant marine has regained practically all the ground it lost during the war. The ships of Great Britain again carry more than one-half of the trade of the entire world.

Think of that! This wise old ancestor of ours, as soon as the war was over, placed all her ships in private hands, and those she owned herself she sold immediately to her private citizens and private shipping companies. She is not operating any ships. She has not tried to play that game of Government operation as we have tried. She was too smart for it. She never did anything wiser in her life. But her colonial possessions were not so wise. One of the British possessions essayed the experiment of a State-run merchant marine, and in the first blush of postwar trade, when all the ships of the world fell far short of carrying the cargo offering, and when ocean freights were $30 to $40 per ton and even higher, Government operation was carried on at a profit, which inspired its advocates to declare that it would be criminal for the Government to sell its ships.

We heard the same kind of talk here. Even so great a ship authority as Lord Pirie, probably the world's leading shipbuilder, declared that if all the nations built vessels at top speed for five years after the armistice they could not produce too much tonnage for the world's trading needs. The five-year period is not yet up, but the acid test of time has worked, and already world shipbuilding is back below the pre-war level.

At this point Mr. RANSDELL yielded to Mr. JONES of Washington to submit a request for unanimous consent.

CANADA'S EXPERIMENT COSTLY.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I was proceeding to speak about the government operation of ships in Canada, and will continue.

Canada has tried government operation under the most favorable auspices, and still found it a failure. With government-owned railways to act as solicitors and collectors of freight for government-owned vessels she has, nevertheless, been unable to make both ends meet. She had also the very marked advantage of entering upon government operation of shipping with a trained staff of transportation experts serving its railways, which embrace more than a third of all the railroad mileage of Canada. For 1919 the Dominion Government was able to show an operating profit on voyages of $1,056,000 and for 1920 of $1,293,000; but in neither case was depreciation or interest figured. And in 1921 the result of voyage operations was a loss of $2,210,000, or almost as much as the profits for the two preceding years. But this is only part of the story. Interest for 1921 amounted to $3,352,000, depreciation to $2,374,000, and other charges to $111,000, so that the actual loss on the year was $8,047,000. But this is not the full picture of losses, for there was carried forward from the years when a profit was claimed on operations $1,745,000 interest due and unpaid to the Government and a deficit of $328,000 on insurance. Subtracting from this the surplus of $1,004,000 claimed to be available at the end of 1920, the result of Canada's first three years of government operation was a loss of more than $9,100,000.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. What rates were made on the government-owned vessels as compared with the rates made by vessels when there was no government interference?

Mr. RANSDELL. I can not give the Senator the details about that. In 1919, when the rates were very high, $30 to $40 per ton as general commercial rates throughout the world, the government-owned vessels in Canada made a large profit; but when the general commercial rate fell in 1921 there was a big loss. I am unable to give the Senator the detailed figures in response to his question. I assume, however, that the government-owned vessels of Canada had to compete with the ordinary privately owned vessels of England, Norway, and other countries.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has given us some figures. I am not trying to get into a dispute with him, but the figures are manifestly incomplete. The Senator told us that the vessels were operated at a loss. That loss might all be chargeable to the fact that they charged too low a rate and that the rate which they did charge was less than the ordinary rate which would have obtained if there had been no government-owned vessels in competition.

Mr. RANSDELL. I was speaking about the Government-owned vessels of Canada which made a loss, and not the privately owned vessels.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand; but to illustrate—I am taking the Senator's time in order that we may have enlightenment.

Mr. RANSDELL. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Let us suppose that the vessels could have been operated—I shall use a purely illustrative figure—at $1 a ton and a profit made, and that the commercial rate would ordinarily be that dollar a ton; but those vessels, when they started to operate, proceeded to operate at 80 cents a ton, either because they wanted to give a cheap rate or because the private competitors had seen fit to cut the rate to put the Government vessels out of business. Accordingly they operated at 80 cents and showed a loss. Now the mere fact that the vessels showed a loss, as has been stated, does not mean anything as a conclusive proposition until we know what their rates were and what the rates would have been if they had not been in competition. I wish the Senator would investigate the question and give us some light on that matter.

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall be glad to look further into the question. If there has been anything in the nature of a rate war in Canada over the foreign trade or overseas trade, I have not heard of it. The figures I am giving are taken from official Canadian sources and there is nothing said, so far as I understand, about any rate war which would present the question suggested by the Senator from Missouri. He very correctly said that had there been a rate war and the Canadian vessels in order to meet it had put their rates down below a proper commercial figure, then the fact that they had lost money would mean nothing. I agree to the correctness of the Senator's conclusion in that particular. But I am quite sure there has been nothing of that kind. However, in order to make assurance doubly sure I shall go into it more fully and present the figures later.

Canada is still holding the bag, but she is finding that it is getting too heavy for her. The last official report shows the Government fleet to be composed of 65 vessels, aggregating 380,000 dead-weight tons, which cost over $78,000,000, and which is carried on the books at $69,000,000, and this is conceded to be far above its value. The report further states that the average cost of the fleet was $191 per ton, and that the ships could be replaced at an average of $75 per ton. It is recommended on behalf of the Government that all of the ships under 4,000 tons and five larger ones be disposed of. It is also recommended that for five years the interest due the Government shall be payable only if earned, after allowing for depreciation. The outlook for the Government's pocketbook, therefore, can not be said to be a bright one.

The net results of Canada's first three years of Government operation of shipping therefore may be said to be: 1. A recorded loss of over $9,000,000. 2. The possession of a fleet carried on the books at more than double its replacement value. 3. A Government admission of failure in the plan to sell more than half the total number of ships. 4. A dubious outlook for returns to the Government in the request that interest payments be made the last charge to be satisfied. 5. Even at 5 per cent per annum depreciation charges will amount to more than $3,000,000, or more than the fleet earned in 1919 and 1920 combined, when freights were high. It does not require any stretch of the imagination, therefore, to write down Canada's experiment in Government operation of shipping as a failure.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am merely seeking light.

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall give it to the Senator if I am able to do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The question is, why was it a failure? That question has not been answered by the Senator in the figures which he has given. Was it a failure because of mismanagement? Was it a failure because the rates had been made too low? Was it a failure because there was a general slump in the shipping business and privately owned vessels were possibly being run at a loss? In other words—I make the point merely for the purpose of emphasizing the necessity for further light—to say that a business has been a failure does not get us anywhere. Thousands of private enterprises have failed, yet that does not argue that another private concern might not succeed in the same business.

The Senator has stated one thing that I think tends to throw a little light on the matter, that the vessels cost undoubtedly more than twice their replacement value. If any private concern had bought vessels and paid two or three times their value and then had to pay interest upon them, that private concern would probably be verging upon bankruptcy. It would certainly be doing so unless it was able to make very large profits. Why did the Government of Canada pay those excessive prices? Did it get the vessels during the war at war prices, and, if so, would it not be necessarily obliged as a business proposition to charge off the excess value and stand the loss as a war loss and start the enterprise at a fair valuation of the vessels? I think the Senator, with all his industry, and he has a good deal of it—his power of analysis is superb—ought to carry the figures further and show us why the Government can not successfully operate the vessels.

FAILURE ALMOST UNIVERSAL.

Mr. RANSDELL. If I could answer that question, I think I could answer a question that the American people would like very much to have answered. I would be able to tell the Senator why we failed so miserably in the Government operation of our railroads. I would be able to answer the Senator why Government operation throughout the world, so far as my information goes, has been a failure, except perhaps in the Empire of Germany, where, if I am correctly informed, the German railways and the German water-borne commerce were operated at a profit under the autocratic rule of the German Government.

For some cause or other, however, it has not been profitable in other lands. The only really successful Government enterprise in America about which I know anything is the operation of the mails; but the mail service has been a complete monopoly from the birth of our Republic to the present time.

Mr. FLETCHER rose.

Mr. RANSDELL. I decline to yield for the moment. Let me answer the question of the Senator from Missouri, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

The Government operation of the mails has been a success. Nobody other than the Government has gone or can go into the business. The Government does make a little money out of the operation of the mails now; but I do not know of any other business that has been persistently a success when governmentally owned and operated for any length of time, and I do not believe, as a general proposition, that the Government can in a big way make a success of the operation of business.

Now, answering further the question of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] about conditions in Canada, I desire to say that I do not know why the Canadians paid $191 per ton for their ships. I presume that it was for exactly the same reason that we paid $200-plus a ton for our ships. Those ships were constructed in war times, and it was a war expenditure. I think, sir, that it would be wise to charge off that present high cost and to start afresh. However, let me say that the figures that I have presented here indicate that there was no interest whatever charged in making up this loss, and the Government of Canada is advising that there be no interest charged. They wish to see if they can not earn something exclusive of interest. They sustained an actual loss in 1921 of $2,120,000, exclusive of any interest.

Now, to say that private shipping companies were making some money in 1921——

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. RANSDELL. Let me answer, and then I will again yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wished to say a word in relation to what the Senator from Louisiana has just stated.

Mr. RANSDELL. I have figures here to show that private English companies have been making very considerable profits recently. I have figures from the New York Journal of Commerce of October 31 last indicating that the Peninsula & Oriental Steamship Line has made large profits. I will not take the time to read them, but I will insert them in connection with my remarks.

The figures referred to are as follows:

The Peninsula & Oriental Steam Navigation Co. accounts for the year ended September 30, 1922, show that, after providing for depreciation, also the expense and discount on the issue of £3,500,000 debenture stock amounting to £191,858, there is a credit balance on the year's accounts (including £100,305 brought forward) of £744,901. The following table shows the figures for the previous two years:

	Year ended—	
	Sept., 1920.	Sept., 1921.
Net profit	£667,377	£571,465
Brought forward	£115,230	£111,939
Preferred dividend	£152,000	£152,000
Deferred dividend	£508,668	£431,100
Rate of dividend	15%	12%
Carried forward	£111,939	£100,305

Mr. RANSDELL. I have also from the New York Journal of Commerce, of October 31 last, figures to show that the Prince Line, which is another big English line, has made large profits. At the same time I have been unable to find any figures or any reports to the effect that privately owned American lines have been making any profit during the last year. If such lines have made any profits, I can not find any record of them.

I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD at this point the clipping from the Journal of Commerce showing the profits of the Prince Line.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered printed in the RECORD as follows:

The accounts of the Prince Line (Ltd.) for the year ended June last show a net profit, after making an allowance for depreciation and taxation, of £159,686, while £138,892 was brought forward. The directors announce a final dividend of 7½ per cent, making 10 per cent, free of tax, for the year, leaving to carry forward a sum of £178,299. For the previous 12 months the net profit amounted to £286,815, making an available balance, with £72,376 brought forward, of £359,191. A total dividend of 10 per cent was paid, free of tax, while £100,000 was placed to general and insurance reserve.

Mr. RANSDELL. Why the privately owned American lines have made no profits and the Government-owned Canadian lines have made no profits I am unable to say. I learn from the reports of the Shipping Board that our Government-owned vessels have not, as a whole, been making any profits. I understand that one of the lines has made some profits. That line was referred to by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and was the line which is operated by Mr. Rossbottom. That is an exceptionally advantageously located line, and it has made some profits; but, as a whole, the operation by the Shipping Board of our vessels has been very unprofitable for the last 12 months, just as the Canadian operation of their vessels has been unprofitable. At the same time, however, certain English privately owned lines have been profitable.

It would take a much wiser man than myself, or even, I think, than the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], to tell us why private individuals can make money and the Government can not make money in carrying on the same kind of business. I assume that one reason why the railroads of this country did not make a success when operated by one man was that the business was too big for one man to make a success of it. I have known farmers who could live on farms of a few hundred acres and make a success, but when the same farmers tried to operate farms miles away they failed.

I speak feelingly about the matter, for when I tried to farm 1,200 miles from base I did not make a success. So when a man sitting here in Washington attempts to operate 234,000 miles of railroad, running throughout this great country of ours, it is too much; it is too big an undertaking; he can not make a success of it; and when the Shipping Board attempts to operate a great fleet of 7,000,000 tons on all the seas of all the world, involving in many instances the necessity of making decisions instanter, I do not believe it can conduct the operation successfully. I think the private initiative, the personal interest, the energy, the enthusiasm, the skill, and the determination which a private individual will put into his own business is lacking in any kind of Government operation. I assume that it was for just such reasons that the people of Canada were unable to make a success of the shipping business. I now yield to the Senator from Florida, and then I will yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I merely wished to make a statement in the nature of a correction. I understood that the Senator from Louisiana carried the interest charges in his total.

Mr. RANSDELL. No; I will read the figures again.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well, if he did not; then he need not read the figures again.

Mr. RANSDELL. I did not.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish merely to follow up the thought of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] by suggesting that it will be well, of course, to understand upon what plan or basis the Canadian Government is operating its ships. If the Canadian Government is operating them as we are under the MO-4 contract, where the Government stands all the losses and the private operators, the managing agents, get their commissions on the business no matter what it may amount to, the Canadian Government may expect to lose money. The result depends a good deal on the plan of operation so far as the force and effect to be given to the shipping activities of Canada is concerned. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Louisiana has examined the question sufficiently to determine just how and upon what basis or plan Canada is attempting to operate her lines.

With reference to governmental success elsewhere, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that Australia has built a splendid fleet of Commonwealth ships and has operated them successfully; that the figures show a profit last year of something like $33,000,000 on the operation of that fleet; and that the Government operation there is direct government operation and not a mere pretense, not a mere figure of speech.

We, however, in the United States have had no Government operation except of the Panama Steamship Co. and the United States Line. Recently both of those lines have been operated successfully, but the operation of our other ships has not been Government operation, as I understand it, and as I think the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me when he analyzes it, for it is on its face conducted on the basis of managing agents, the Government standing all the losses and those operating the ships having no responsibility except to earn their commissions and to get what are called "husbanding fees" in addition to their commissions.

With reference to private operation, I shall not attempt to go into that, but if the Senator will allow me just a moment more, I happen to have here a clipping taken from a newspaper issued on December 12, which states:

BOSTON, December 12.—Directors of the United Fruit Co. at a meeting here to-day voted an extra dividend of 2 per cent in cash with the regular quarterly dividend of the same amount.

The profits may have been derived in part in connection with their other business in selling their products, but they have a splendid fleet, and I have no doubt a good deal of their profit comes from the operation of the fleet.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will assume——

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator from Louisiana will allow me, I will merely say that later on I shall put into the RECORD a fuller statement regarding the experience of Australia in the operation of ships.

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so, for I am going to say something about Australia.

Referring first to the last portion of the Senator's statement in regard to the United Fruit Co., let me say that is a wonderful enterprise. I have had the pleasure of traveling on some of the ships of the United Fruit Co., and they are very fine ships; but those ships are merely an incident to their commercial enterprise. The United Fruit Co. are great fruit merchants; they have enormous plantations, principally banana plantations, in many tropical countries. I had the pleasure of traveling on one occasion for 12 continuous miles through a banana plantation; my journey was on a railroad on both sides of which stretched this great plantation owned by the United Fruit Co. It was at Port Limon, in Costa Rica. That company is absolutely a commercial enterprise, and their ships merely an incident. It might just as well be stated that the Standard Oil Co., through their tankers and their great lines of ships for handling their own business, conducts a successful shipping business because they declare large dividends. The Standard Oil Co., as we all know, is a tremendous commercial enterprise, and the same statement is true of the United Fruit Co.

Now, to come back——

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I will ask the Senator to pardon me. I must answer the Senator from Florida first, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri. Coming back to what the Senator from Florida said about the situation in Canada, I do not know whether the Canadians have been operating under the MO-4 contracts or what kind of contracts they have employed. The Canadians, however, are proverbially a wise people; I often wish the people of the United States would emulate the people of Canada in a great many things, for if there be a wiser people on this globe than those of Canada I wish somebody would point them out. When they have been so wise in connection with all their transportation problems, including their transcontinental railroad problems, their problems of good roads, and everything connected with business, to say that they have done something very unwise in connection with their shipping is beyond me. I can not answer the Senator's question, but I will try to accommodate him by securing more data on the subject and go into it more elaborately at some later time.

In regard to the Panama Steamship Co., I wish to give the Senator some actual figures as to that company and also with reference to the shipping venture of Australia. The Senator tells us about the wonderful success in the shipping business which Australia made last year. I do not agree with the Senator at all as to that. It is said that doctors disagree; but my figures are altogether different from those of the Senator. Here they are; I will state them to the Senate.

WHAT IT COSTS AUSTRALIA.

Australia has been cited as a golden example of the benefits of Government operation of shipping. Official figures in proof of this are difficult to obtain. No annual reports covering the period of operation have been issued, with the exception of one

for the year ending June 30, 1922. The position taken by the Australian Government has been that making public the results of the operation of its fleet would aid competing lines. On November 16, 1921, however, Premier Hughes, in an address to the Australian Parliament, stated that the net earnings of the Government's ships for the five years ended June 30, 1921, had been £7,144,000, or about $30,000,000. I assume that is the $30,000,000 to which the Senator from Florida has referred. No allowance whatever—I will ask Senators to listen to this—had been made for depreciation or interest on the Government's investment, which amounted on the first cost of the ships—listen to these figures, Senators—£10,706,000, representing 51 vessels, aggregating 257,000 gross tons. No account is taken of the loss on the fleet of wooden steamers ordered by Australia, which amounted to £2,323,000. No mention is made of the fact that the earnings of the fleets were invested in building passenger ships after the armistice.

In other words, the profit from Government operation was turned, not into the Treasury but into new tonnage, and that tonnage is now being operated at a loss.

Because of the great curtailment of independent Australian shipping services during the war the opportunities for a Government-operated fleet were then exceptional, and with ocean freights at high levels large profits were made; but with the application of interest and depreciation charges the paper profits for this period would be converted to a loss. It is also interesting to note that more than a third of the Australian fleet is composed of ex-enemy ships, and that 18 of these, aggregating 83,000 gross tons, were acquired at a first cost of only £909,000 and that their net earnings were £4,056,000.

But only recently the Australian Government issued the first of its yearly reports on the operation of its State fleet. This shows that with war and partly post-war freights a thing of the past, the Government can not make the income from voyages exceed the voyage expenses. For the fiscal year 1922 it is stated operating expenses were £2,722,000 and operating receipts £2,718,000, and on top of this capital expenditures are given as £3,811,000. The voyage losses were not large, it is true, but they are likely to represent only an entering wedge of loss, while the capital expenditures for this one year were more than half the profits—in which no allowance is made for depreciation and loss—of all the previous years combined.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. Let me finish my statement and then I will yield.

That further losses may be expected is not an unreasonable prediction, especially in view of the statement made to the Australian Parliament by Mr. Hughes, in which he read a cablegram from private English shipping interests urging that either the Australian Government buy the ships of competing British lines or sell the Government ships to the competing companies in order to eliminate the present ruinous competition. Mr. Hughes claimed to see in this, however, an additional tribute to Government operation, on the ground that if the ships were worth purchasing by the independent lines they were worth keeping by the Government. He seems to have overlooked the point, however, that Government operation has resulted in losses to both State and private shipping, and that the Government losses must come out of the pockets of the taxpayers; but these phases of the question are realized in Australia, and it is now a vital political issue whether the ships shall be kept by the Government or sold.

Here, then, are two instances of the workings of Government operation in shipping—Great Britain, the sea-wise mother, casting the yoke of State control off at the first opportunity, while her young offsprings, Canada and Australia, continue to stagger under it. Need it be asked: Which course should we follow?

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was just going to ask the Senator if he would be good enough to state what his authority is—whether this comes from some statement that has been furnished him in an authoritative way, or from an article written by some one on the subject?

Mr. RANSDELL. From Commerce Reports, published by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have been examining some literature on the subject, and I may have found the same source of authority; I do not know; but that is the reason why I was interested.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no information on the subject, and I am asking for information; but it seemed to me that there was one thing in that statement which was not quite fair. The percentage of loss, I think, was based on the cost of the vessels. Then, later on, part of the cost of the vessels was given at a very low figure, because they were enemy vessels that had been captured in the war. To be absolutely fair, it seems to me, the statement ought to give the facts as to the construction of the balance of that Australian fleet. Were those ships built in time of war? If so, it would appear to me to be manifestly unfair to reckon the percentage on their cost. I should like to inquire if the Senator knows whether or not those ships were built during the war at war prices?

Mr. RANSDELL. I think, from the best information I have, that a good many of them were built during the time of the war and perhaps at war prices.

Mr. NORRIS. If that be true, the figures ought to be changed.

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish, however, to make this point: Just as our own ships were built in time of war and at war prices and have been operated since, and we have lost money on them, so I am trying to show by these figures that the Australians have lost money, exclusive of any question of interest on the cost of the vessels; and my figures bear out that fact, as I construe them.

Mr. NORRIS. As I got the figures, the percentages were based on the cost of the various vessels. If that cost was a war cost, it is not a fair basis, it seems to me, on which to reckon the percentage of loss.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am putting the figures in the RECORD just as I read them. The Senator may draw a different conclusion from them if he chooses.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida with pleasure.

Mr. FLETCHER. Premier Hughes has stood for government ownership and operation of ships in Australia; and whereas there has been opposition, and, as the Senator has said, the question was a matter of issue in the recent election, he will note that according to the dispatches from London dated December 16, Premier Hughes has been reelected premier by a considerable majority, and his policies have been thereby indorsed by the Australians.

Mr. RANSDELL. I do not deny the correctness of that; but the facts and figures which I have read show that the operation of vessels in Australia has not been a success recently, and they show that there is a great deal of unrest there—not enough so far to oust Mr. Hughes from office, but certainly the enterprise has not been the kind of a success that the friends of Government operation can point to with pride and say to us, "Go thou and do likewise"; and yet that is what they are trying to do. They are trying to point to this so-called Australian success and this so-called Canadian success and ask us to go and do likewise.

PANAMA RAILROAD STEAMSHIP CO. SHOWS A DEFICIT.

In regard to the Panama Railroad Steamship Co., I have a statement about that that I wish to put in, in further answer to the Senator from Florida.

Another example of Government operation in shipping is furnished by the annual report of the Panama Railroad Steamship Co. This is the line to which reference was made in the minority report of the Commerce Committee as an example of how ships could be operated profitably under the American flag. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] referred briefly to this matter in his speech a few days ago, but I should like to add some additional details, which I think should be spread upon the record.

Instead of a profit, this company reports that for the fiscal year ended June 30 last there was a net deficit of $587,322.45. The previous year the report showed a loss for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, of $700,810.22.

For the past fiscal year the report shows that $358,420.44 was charged off to depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs. No allowance was necessary for interest.

The following comparison for 1922 and 1921 was submitted:

	1922	1921
Gross revenue	$2,862,898	$5,136,445
Gross expenses	3,450,231	5,837,257
Deficit	587,332	700,810

Vessels in operation during the year were decreased from 12 to 5 on account of the depression. The report points out

that part of the loss was due to the fact that Government freight and passengers were carried below the commercial tariff. If these had been booked at ordinary commercial rates, the loss during the year would have been $125,000.

A heavy deficit also was reported for the account of the railroad company. The combined loss for the railroad and steamship lines for the year was $1,297,634, as compared with $617,528 for the preceding 12 months. The report says:

The total operating revenues of the company's steamship line were $2,723,985.58, a decrease of $2,268,765.54, as compared with the 12 months ending June 30, 1921; operating expenses for the same period were $3,443,490.39, as against $5,850,407.22 for the preceding year, a decrease of $2,406,916.83. The net operating deficit resulting therefrom decreased $138,151.29, as compared with loss for prior year. Passenger traffic shows a decrease in revenue of $115,591.71. Revenue from the transportation of mails and treasure decreased $75,442.01 and $20,099.83, respectively.

Of the total tonnage transported in the 12 months ending June 30, 1922, 197,099 tons were carried by the company's steamers and 55,767 by chartered steamers. In the previous fiscal period the former carried 314,877 tons and the latter 100,282.

The operations of the Panama Railroad Steamship Line during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, although more favorable than for the preceding year, resulted in a deficit of $587,382.45, after charging to operating expenses $358,429.44 account of depreciation and general and extraordinary repairs. The primary cause for loss was the continued world-wide depression in business, with its consequent heavy decrease in tonnage transported; the marked lowering of rates of freight, owing to the severe competition of direct lines operating between South Pacific and east coast Colombian ports and New York; the unsettled exchange situation, which, with the curtailment of credits previously granted by American merchants to South American merchants, compelled the latter to buy and sell in Europe instead of as formerly buying and selling in the United States; and the continued high cost of foodstuffs, stores, and material.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that the three instances cited by the opposition—Canada, Australia, and the Panama Railroad Steamship Co.—when examined into carefully, fall to the ground, and show that so far from Government ownership being a success it is a failure.

FOREIGNERS OPPOSE OUR SHIP BILL.

Mr. President, I next come to a phase of the subject which I discussed some time ago—foreign opposition to this bill. I hope Senators will listen carefully to what I have to say on this subject, because there is, or at least there was, a great deal of foreign opposition. I spoke at length before you on this topic on July 20 last. I laid before you opinions voiced by the press of Great Britain, views of British shipping and commercial leaders, members of Parliament and other individuals, and quotations from official reports of the British Government. There were objections and remonstrances, threats, veiled and unveiled, and even intimations of war upon us if we took steps to protect our place upon the seas. The question squarely put up to the people of the United States was whether we should choose our own sea policy or allow Britain to dictate it for us. We, who carry perhaps a tenth of the world's trade—and I doubt if it is that much—were accused by a nation whose ships transport more than a half of all sea commerce of seeking a monopoly on the seas.

It is not my purpose to lay before you again all the record of the bitterness of foreign opposition to legislation to aid our merchant marine to a point where we would carry not even a fair share of the world's trade but at least a fair share of our own. I do want, however, to recall to your attention a few expressions that I quoted then, and to supplement them with some recent developments.

It is said that British capital controls the policy of many great American journals. Is it possible that there is any connection between the opposition of foreigners and that of our home people? I do not make this charge, sir; but, recalling the extraordinary Tory sentiment during the Revolutionary War and the extreme partiality of a large percentage of our people to Great Britain during all our history, I wonder if some of our good people are not insensibly influenced that way? Shall we regard international unions as the true spokesmen? The real Americans, sir, who work on American ships, favor this bill, and they have gone on record to that effect. Here are some of the organizations that are in favor of the pending shipping bill:

The Neptune Association of Licensed Masters and Pilots, 6,000 strong; United Associations of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, 8,000 strong; United Radio Telegraphers, 7,500 strong; United Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, No. 80, 3,500 strong; Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, several thousand; Fidelity Marine Association, restricted to captains and first mates, several thousand; National Board of Steam Navigation; American Society of Marine Engineers; Licensed Tug Men's Association; International Longshoremen's Association; and others I have not before me at this time.

It is interesting to note that all international interests, whether of labor or commerce or defense, are arrayed against the pending bill. International money, which is in control of Wall Street, opposes anything that will affect the prosperity of the European interests with which it is connected and from which it draws its profits. The profits of an American merchant marine will come to America, and those profits should approximate $500,000,000 every year.

The boldness of the British press in discussing the American shipping bill is unexampled. I quoted to the Senate last July an article from the Liverpool Courier entitled "Westminster watchdogs awaken," in which it was declared there was a pro-British party in the United States. Think of that, Senators, a great pro-British journal declaring that there is a pro-British party in the United States, under the caption "Westminster watchdogs awaken." I appeal to my brethren of America to awaken when such charge as that is made. The writer then urged that encouragement be given this pro-British party, and said:

There are in the States two sections very well defined, the pro and the anti British. The division runs athwart even the strong line of cleavage separating free traders from protectionists. This means that some pro-British protectionists, while wishing nothing but well to Great Britain, are compelled by party attachment to back the present bill. On the other hand, there are conscientious free traders who would be against its passing but for the fact that their anti-British bias is stronger than their adherence to an economic theory.

Not content with this, the Courier's writer continued:

The general attitude of Great Britain, both officially and in her trading units, must be such that the pro-British party in the States is encouraged, and the anti-British party made aware that the subsidy is not the concern of Americans only.

I ask those Senators who oppose this subsidy to listen to me while I repeat what the great British paper said:

The general attitude of Great Britain, both officially and in her trading units, must be such that the pro-British party in the States is encouraged and the anti-British party made aware that the subsidy is not the concern of Americans only.

They did not propose to let us run our own affairs. They were going to dictate to America what it should do in regard to this subsidy.

This writer continues:

There should be no empty threats of retaliation, either from Westminster or from the constituencies. There should be no waving of the Big British Stick—

He capitalizes "Big British Stick"—

There should be instead the actuality.

Not wave the stick at us, but hit us with the stick; not a waving, but a striking. He adds:

It is, of course, perfectly open to any Britisher legitimately to regard the subsidizing bill as *treachery to his country*.

(The italics in this quotation are mine.)

Great Britain, out of pure sentiment toward America, has agreed to alterations of her naval power standard.

Great Britain, out of genuine love for America, agreed to the 5-5-3 naval reduction treaty! Did anyone ever hear such a remarkable statement? Out of genuine love and sentiment to us Great Britain consents to the reduction of her navy.

She has consented to the supersession of the Anglo-Japanese alliance by a pact more favorable to the United States; she has allowed the trans-Atlantic consideration to affect her handling of the Irish situation.

I never imagined that before, but if anything on earth has finally induced her to be kindly to the Irish, I am glad of it.

"And in return what has America done?" the writer asks, and his answer is, "Worse than nothing." We not only abstain from assisting Great Britain in her efforts to reestablish European social life, he says, but he adds that we actively menace her by proposing a *breach of commercial morality*.

The United States has the audacity to propose a breach of commercial morality by introducing this shipping bill and trying to secure its passage. That is a breach of commercial morality!

There are three things that the British must do, the writer says, and he enumerates them thus:

1. Diplomatic suasion must be brought to bear upon Washington.
2. Capital and labor must combine, in the most actual sense, to produce and to transport at the cheapest rate.
3. America must be left under no misapprehension as to the solidity of the Empire as one vast commercial unit, in the face of the sustained aggression which the subsidizing bill foreshadows.

Those are strong words, Senators. I hope that every Senator in this body who contemplates voting against this bill will read and consider them. His way of having "pressure brought to bear upon Washington" was to have members of Parliament "insist that the British Government do its duty." Is it the duty of Parliament, or the British Government, to instruct the American Congress about the legislation it shall pass? I do not think so, and feel sure there is no man in this Chamber who does think so.

The Liverpool Courier is acknowledgedly an authority on things maritime, so its comment on June 9 last urging retalia-

tion when our shipping bill passes is of both value and interest to us in considering the bill. I quote verbatim:

It is quite untrue historically that subsidies necessarily fail.
The Japanese merchant service, which so lately as 1890 had only 171,000 tons of shipping, has risen to its present figure of 3,254,000 tons largely through State aid and encouragement at British expense.
The German merchant service was built up from small beginnings by subsidies, preferential railway rates, and pressure on emigrant traffic to 5,500,000 tons before the war.

SAYS SUBSIDIES AIDED RIVALS.

Mr. President and Senators, here is this great English newspaper, which is an authority on things maritime, admitting that subsidies do build up in a wonderful manner, and have built up in a wonderful way, the commercial marines of Japan and Germany. It says so in the plainest language. If subsidies have built up the German merchant marine and the Japanese merchant marine, why will they not build up an American merchant marine?

And while we are still on the subject of subsidies another British shipping journal of prominence, the Liverpool Journal of Commerce, reprints a dispatch to the Deutsche Bergwerks Zeitung from its Hamburg correspondent, in which it is stated:

In secret the British Government certainly is already granting large subsidies to many shipping companies.

Of course, I can not prove that, but here is a great British paper reproducing a telegram from a German paper saying that in secret the British Government is already granting large subsidies to many shipping concerns.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RANSDELL. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If governments are granting subsidies to privately owned shipping concerns, it must be because without the subsidy they could not operate at a profit. If that is true, what is to become of the argument that we must turn our vessels over to a private concern because the Government has not been able to make a profit? It seems to me the two cases stand on the same bottom. Neither of them is running at a profit. I am following the line of the argument, not stating a fact.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will try to elucidate that point for the Senator. I am not contending that these governments have always given or always will give subsidies, but I do contend, and history confirms the statement, that Japan when a very weak power commercially, when it had, according to this paper, only 171,000 tons, inaugurated a policy of very large government aid, and as a result of that it built up a very strong merchant marine. I do not understand that Japan is giving very much aid now, though she is proposing the identical loan proposition we are proposing here. She is proposing, and I believe is going to carry out, a loan of 250,000,000 yen to assist in building ships, reconditioning ships, and things of that kind. The yen, I believe, is equivalent to half a dollar in our money, so that would be $125,000,000.

I contend that Germany, when a weak nation on the sea, did establish a subsidy policy, for years maintained that subsidy policy, and as the result of that policy she became very strong on the seas.

Great Britain gave a great deal of aid to her shipping in the early days and she became so strong on the seas that she does not need to help all of her ships now, but she does very largely help her ships by naval subventions and mail pay. I have the figures here to show that Great Britain now aids her ships to the extent of about $9,000,000 per year, not all of them, as we are proposing to do, but certain classes of her ships.

My contention, sir, is that if we pass the pending bill and get our ships on a permanent basis, make the American people ship minded, train them to go down to the sea in ships, make them turn their investments to the shipping business for a period of 10 years, as proposed in the bill, then we can carry on the business in all probability without further Government aid.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator pardon just a further word? I am unable to discuss the question because of the condition of my throat.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator's argument this morning was that the vessels must be turned over by the Government because they were being operated at a loss and that all Government operations were a failure, because Canada's government-owned vessels lost some money last year and the conclusion from that loss was that they must be turned over to private ownership, where they could be made profitable.

Now, the Senator has said, in substance, that private ownership has also been a failure except when the Government makes up the loss by a subvention. If that be true, then the argument against Government ownership fails, because we might as well lose the money directly on ships that we own as to pay out a subsidy on ships that we do not own. At least that part of the argument answers itself.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, if the Senator can get any consolation out of his argument I leave it to him. I can not follow him in that conclusion and shall, therefore, proceed with what I was saying.

Quite the bitterest of the comments against the shipping bill appeared in Fairplay, an English shipping weekly, that since has changed its tone materially. "Lookout Man," as he signed himself, entitled his article "Fights with the raw 'uns," meaning of course, a bare-knuckle battle, and went on:

Fights with the raw 'uns are barred in this country for moral reasons; they tended, I believe, to brutalize the onlookers; or, perhaps, they gave them a shorter run for their money than they seem to enjoy to-day, when a 20-round affair has even been known to last for six rounds, not seconds, though I fancy that the record has been almost reached. When, however, we are battling for existence, or at least for our purse, down the other fellow's yard, the gentler teachings of civilization and lecture-room logic have to go away and hide themselves. And that, I am pretty sure, is what would happen were the two great Anglo-Saxon races to find themselves at commercial death grips on the waters.

If that is not a threat, and a very serious one, I do not understand the English language. That the British realized their press comments in opposition to the American shipping bill were going too far is revealed here and there in their leading papers. For instance, the London Times of June 23 last, said:

American memories go back 12 years to the discovery by Congress that the German shipping companies then maintained a lobby in Washington for the purpose of thwarting any attempt to give legislative aid to American shipping.
And then follows what, in the correspondent's own words, may be called "passages discreetly worded," thus:
Congress and the country generally are perhaps inclined to be hypersensitive on the subject of foreign propaganda just now, and any interests who might think it desirable to follow the German example will unquestionably be defeating the object they seek to attain.

Another great British paper, the London Post, words its warning to us more adroitly when it says:

Mr. Harding's views, however, are not entirely agreed in by his party. Many Republicans believe that the proposed legislation is dangerous and will be bound to create friction with England and other maritime nations, and will not be productive of the results Mr. Harding anticipates. That the bill will be harmful to British interests is admitted.

And the British Government itself, in an official document discussing the postwar shipping situation, decides bluntly against "flag discrimination" because, it adds:

We have only to examine the nature of our carrying trade to see the undesirability of adopting any such policy.

I want to pause just a moment to point out the significance of the wording of that last sentence. Note that nothing is said about *equal opportunity for the ships of all nations*. The question is considered not on the basis of the world's carrying trade but on the basis of the carrying trade of Great Britain. A cold, clear-cut business proposition. And then follows the admission of this British Government committee that the ships of Great Britain carry more of the world's trade—not merely British trade, mark you—than the ships of all the other maritime nations of the world rolled together. And this is the country that charges us with seeking a monopoly of the seas.

This very report carries the matter even further in its conclusions when it says:

Our conclusion then is, and must be, that the only policy which can meet the position is one which, instead of giving preference at home, will secure the grant of national treatment to British shipping in the fullest sense abroad. Action should be directed toward maintaining this treatment where it is already given and toward securing it where it has hitherto been withheld. So far as maritime policy is concerned, this is the most effective support that His Majesty's Government can give to British shipping during the difficult period of reconstruction.

ATTITUDE MUCH CHANGED LATELY.

It is only fair to state that the truculent attitude of the British press is not nearly as pronounced now as it was six months ago. We can only conjecture the cause of this, but we can rest assured that it in no wise signifies a change of the British heart toward our plans for establishing a merchant marine. Perhaps some light is cast upon the situation by a cable dispatch from Washington to the London Post, "from our own correspondent," which appeared in that paper on July 24, last, just subsequent to my address on the British opposition to the shipping bill.

Referring to the Senate address, the London paper says that it "merits the attention of English readers, and shows the mischief done by injudicious utterances, printed or spoken."

Discussing the declaration from English sources that there is a "pro-British party" in Congress, the London Post corre-

spondent says that it is absurd to discuss it, because there is no such thing; but, he adds, "if there was such a party, the least said about it the better."

It is unnecessary—

He continues—

to go into the Liverpool paper's article further, but Mr. RANSDELL was warranted in saying that it was offensive and opposed to the friendly spirit which should exist between the two countries.

And in closing, the correspondent states:

That the subsidy bill, if it should ever become law, will be harmful to British interests is, of course, well known on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. RANSDELL quoted one of my dispatches, in which those words were used, but that is not the moral to be drawn from his speech. The moral to be driven home—

Senators will note that "home" in this case means Britain—

is the absurdity and harm done by talking about "a pro-British party," which puts a dangerous weapon in the hands of men who will not scruple to use it.

Apparently Britain has taken the moral to heart, and its foot is on the soft pedal, for, as I have indicated, the tone of the British press is now in marked contrast to what it was a few months ago.

In fact, we find one British publication, the shipping weekly, Fairplay, in August last, in commenting on the address in the Senate, trying to make out a case to the effect that the British—

instead of showing open hostility to the subsidy bill, know no more about it than they do of the fourth dimension and care less.

This is the paper which a few weeks ago was jumping on us and jumping hard.

Presumably because we have shipping in our bones—

This paper adds—

shipping questions are of as little concern to the average Englishman as the Tower of London to a city man. But though the thing is not impossible, it would take something very serious indeed to rouse public opinion to such an extent as to make it react on Parliament and compel our legislators to do anything to help the British mercantile marine.

The paper then goes on, and note the echo, albeit a faint one, of its "fights with the raw 'uns,'" when it approaches its climax:

Therefore, as most of us are rather anxious that our merchant fleet should never be handicapped by a subsidy, or even by such other retaliatory measures as unfair competition might render necessary, it is greatly to be hoped that nothing will be said or done in the United States capable of being employed as a frenzied electioneering cry on this side. We are a peculiar people, but, though we are willing to grasp either Excalibur or the sword of Don Quixote, we are an intensely businesslike one, too, as witness the fact that it is eight years ago that we went to war simply because we were under contract to do so.

THREATENED BY ENTIRE EMPIRE.

But we are threatened not only with Great Britain's big stick, but with the big stick of all the forces of British imperialism as well. Note how unmistakably the note of anti-American aggression is struck in the latest annual report of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom. Therein it is asserted that it is unreasonable for any country to expect to receive continued free navigation and equal trading rights within the British Empire if it adopts legislative measures hurtful to the empire's shipping. It must be recognized, it is further asserted, that in handling these questions other countries are dealing not with the United Kingdom, but with the British Empire. The obvious necessity for a great mercantile marine to that empire, it is added, need not be stressed, and it is declared that there have been recent indications that the British Government has definitely adopted an imperial attitude toward shipping questions as, for instance, in the discussions at recent imperial conferences and by the appointment of the imperial shipping committee.

To those who say that subsidies will be of no aid in the development of our merchant marine, I would point to the reference in this report of the leading British shipping body to measures that will be hurtful to the British mercantile marine. When they say "hurtful," is it to be doubted that they mean measures that would enable the shipping of other nations to gain a fair share of the worlds' carrying trade, which is now more than half British dominated, with the ships of Britain alone carrying more than the vessels of a dozen or 15 other maritime nations combined, including ourselves? Need it be doubted that Britain is opposed to anything that would cut into her huge and wholly disproportionate share of that commerce? She carries more of our own trade than we do ourselves, and she is perfectly content to have us continue under conditions that will assure her of continuing to do as she is now doing. And with the British taking the stand they do, can we doubt that the measures we propose to take will be effective?

Mr. President, I wish to give here a concrete instance of British discrimination against the United States. In this connection I call attention to a statement by Harvey S. Firestone, president of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., at the annual meeting of that organization at Akron, Ohio, on December 15, only a few days ago. Mr. Firestone declared that unless action taken by England and certain colonial governments relative to the production and exportation of crude rubber is rescinded or modified in a drastic manner, the effect will be far-reaching. He added that the British policy had already caused an increase of 100 per cent. "This present advance," he said, "represents an increased cost to the United States of over $100,000,000 on the estimated consumption for 1923, and this must be passed on to the tire user."

Mr. President, I am sorry there are none of our farmer brethren present to listen to me just now. I would like them to see what the British discrimination is doing to the farmer, because he uses more than half of the rubber, I imagine, which goes into automobile tires.

TIRE USERS TO PAY THE BILL.

In this connection, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, without reading, an excerpt from a newspaper giving exactly what Mr. Firestone said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

CHARGES BRITISH CUT UNITED STATES RUBBER SUPPLY—COST INCREASE OF 100 PER CENT WILL BE PASSED TO CONSUMER.

AKRON, OHIO, December 15 (by the Associated Press).—Harvey S. Firestone, president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., in an address here to-day at the annual stockholders' meeting, declared that "unless action taken by England and certain colonial governments" relative to the production and exportation of crude rubber "is rescinded or modified in a drastic manner" the effect will be "far-reaching."

Mr. Firestone declared that "the limiting of production and exportation already has caused an increase of 100 per cent in the cost of the crude product since announcement of the new program was made in October."

"This present advance represents an increased cost to the United States of over $100,000,000 on the estimated consumption for 1923," he continued.

"This must be passed on to the tire user. This is the time for the United States to pass such legislation as will encourage American capital to develop rubber plantations in the Philippine Islands, where the soil and climatic conditions are equal to any rubber-producing belt, and to negotiate with the South American republics to develop production in their rubber regions.

"Rubber is growing each year to be more important to the economics of commerce and transportation and great opportunities are before us to make the Philippines one of our most valuable possessions and to have a secure supply of this important product."

Mr. RANSDELL. Now, here is an example of British discrimination that reaches even into the American farm, for the American farmer is vitally interested in the tire question and he will pay a large proportion of that additional $100,000,000 next year. The increase that he and other automobile users will pay will not benefit American industry, but will go abroad to pay the British interests double what they have been getting for the same amount of material. This one instance of British discrimination will give a free and equal opportunity to all Americans to turn over to Britain in one year an amount equal to all the proposed subsidies for shipping for years to come.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask to insert in the RECORD, as part of my remarks without reading, a clipping from a New York newspaper, quoting from Mr. Winthrop L. Marvin, vice president and general manager of the American Steamship Owners' Association, one of the best-known shipping men in America, who denounces the British mail ban against United States ships and says that the discrimination has extended over many years and more than counteracts the efforts which are made here to favor American vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clipping referred to by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MARVIN DENOUNCES BRITISH MAIL BAN AGAINST UNITED STATES SHIPS—SAYS DISCRIMINATION EXTENDS OVER MANY YEARS AND SURPASSES EFFORTS MADE HERE TO FAVOR AMERICAN VESSELS.

The British Government's refusal, reported from London, to send Christmas mail by the United States liner *George Washington*, holding it for the slower British ship *Caronia*, which sails a day later, was denounced yesterday by Winthrop L. Marvin, vice president of the American Steamship Owners' Association, as an unjustified discrimination against American steamers.

"The United States has been paying of late years five or six million dollars annually for the conveyance of its ocean mails," said Mr. Marvin. "It pays American ships a higher rate than foreign ships, but it gives about half of its total mail pay to foreign shipowners. The British Government, on the contrary, pays not a penny to foreign and particularly to American ships if it can be prevented.

"This boycott of the American steamer *George Washington* by the British post office is nothing new. It is in exact accord with the proscriptive policy pursued for many years by the British authorities. When the long famous American Line of the International Mercantile Marine Co. was established in 1895 and thereafter, with the 20-knot flyers, *New York*, *Paris*, *St. Louis*, and *St. Paul*, it provided the swiftest weekly mail service across the north Atlantic. These Ameri-

can steamers were operated with the utmost regularity throughout the year. Only two British steamers were then faster than these four American steamers; yet the British Government would allow to the American line only letters specially addressed and insisted on sending the bulk of the western mail by the slower Cunard and other British steamers. It often happened then that goods consigned to New York merchants by the fast American ships reached piers here two or three days before the documents sent by the slower British steamers. New York business men protested again and again in vain against this excessive favoritism to slow British ships by the British Government.

"In 1905 Great Britain paid only $10,511 in mail money to the four fast American liners, though the American Government in that year paid $313,000 to British steamers on the same route."

NEWCASTLE INCIDENT AN EXAMPLE.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, there is fresh in the minds of all of us the so-called Newcastle incident, which might well be classed as British discrimination against American shipping. Our consul and vice consul in that British seaport were accused of being too active in getting business for our ships. The British Government saw fit to think their activities transcended the bounds of diplomatic privilege. Our State Department, after investigation, thought otherwise; but under the customs governing diplomatic intercourse, the British Government canceled the exequatur of our representatives and perforce there was nothing to do but transfer them to other posts. Our consulate in Newcastle was closed, and I believe it has not yet been reopened, although representations have come from London that, perhaps, the British Government should not have acted as they did. Newcastle itself is feeling the effect of this action of His Majesty's officials, and has petitioned for a reopening of the American consulate there.

We all remember the Egyptian cotton case, which constitutes another example of how British commercial and shipping influence militates against the entrance of any foreign ship in its chosen, select trade. As at Newcastle, the British decided it was better to let us carry in our own ships some of the cotton from Egypt that we need; but it took considerable diplomatic persuasion to make them see this.

The barring of American tankers from using the Suez Canal was another instance of British influence working against our ships, but happily that matter was settled without recourse to any diplomatic measures. Our own American Bureau of Shipping had an able representative in Europe at the time, and his call at the London office of the Suez Canal Co. was productive of the essential modification of the new rules that had barred tankers classified by that society.

FOREIGN SHIP SUBSIDIES.

Mr. President, I now wish to give some figures as to the amount which is paid by foreign nations for ship subsidies.

When we consider the general subject of foreign ship subsidies, there must be taken into consideration not only the direct payments of Government money to shipping lines but several other important aids as well. It has been asserted that all aid to shipping by foreign nations totaled only $17,000,000. Mail subventions, of course, are the most easily traced of all ship aids granted by our maritime rivals. The annual governmental budgets probably are the fairest way of estimating just how much these direct foreign aids amount to, and I would offer for the Senate's perusal a table, with certain explanatory notes, of the several amounts annually authorized to be spent or being spent as aid to shipping.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the table will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Annual amount of foreign-ship aids.

Nation.	Character.	Amount.
Great Britain	Packet service	$3,018,178
	Naval reserves	2,439,417
	Merchant ships, etc.	845,750
Canada	Mail pay	1,100,775
Australia	do	846,365
South Africa	do	767,790
France	Navigation bounty	216,000
	Mail subventions	4,708,655
	Fisheries	182,448
Norway	Subsidies	2,760,000
Denmark	Mail pay	229,256
Sweden	do	21,000
Italy	Mail and navigation	14,100,000
Japan	do	4,833,411
Brazil	do	2,956,160
Spain	Mail and subsidies	3,300,214
Total		42,265,220

Mr. RANSDELL. Great Britain naturally, because of its commanding position in ocean carrying, is the one nation to which we should look closely. Picking apart the direct aid of $6,243,345, we find that the mother country pays $3,018,178 for "foreign and colonial packet services." All that goes in British ships, as I have pointed out elsewhere. The next largest item is $2,439,417 for "naval reserves," a direct subvention to merchant ships and merchant officers to enable the nation to command services of ships and men immediately in time of war. The balance is made up of appropriations for "royal service of merchant cruisers" and for merchant ships direct; that is direct from the British exchequer itself.

When we delve into the direct aids given by the colonies, the sums for merchant ships from the public funds grow rapidly. There is Canada, for instance, that in mail pay alone, as was shown by a detailed table on page 523 of the RECORD by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], paid $1,050,800 in 1921–22 and is paying $1,100,775 in 1922–23. Much comment has been made about our own mail pay bills of about $5,000,000, and yet Canada, with about one-twentieth of our population and with actual resources infinitesimal as compared with ours, can afford to pay more than one-fifth that sum.

Taking the much-disputed Australian figures, we can safely extract without fear of comment the $846,365 which she pays to ships for mail carrying, including the Fiji Islands service. Add to this the $767,790 paid by South Africa and we have from Great Britain itself and only three of its many colonies a grand total of almost $9,000,000—to be exact, $8,958,275.

That aid is of substantial benefit to British shipping without doubt, but Great Britain did much more indirectly for her marine workers when immediately after the war she lifted the ban of State control. That angle of the shipping situation is so important to merchant marine development that its value can not be estimated. It is best reflected in the comparative figures of idle tonnage, to which I refer elsewhere. Would to heaven, Mr. President, we had had the wisdom to follow the example of Great Britain and have made some disposition immediately after the war of our ships, thereby placing them in private hands.

Continuing our analysis of other foreign aids we find France increasing its mail subsidies for Far East service from 20,000,000 francs in 1922 to 45,000,000 francs for 1923. With 16,000,000 francs allotted to lines running to Portugal, Brazil, Argentina, and Uruguay; 6,398,000 francs for trans-Atlantic and 2,500,000 additional for New York runs, we find France paying 70,438,000 francs in 1923 for mail service alone. Even at the depreciated value of the franc this grand total almost equals our mail pay bill, yet France has less than half our population. Adding to the French mail pay the actual appropriated navigation and fisheries bounties, we find France directly aiding its shipping to the extent of $5,107,104; and this in the face of a financial crisis that is the comment of all the thinking world to-day.

Norway, in proportion to its size one of the most important ocean carrying nations in the world, is so impressed with the importance of maintaining its ships on the seas that this coming year it is granting direct aid of $2,760,000, an amount per capita that is staggering and which makes our own plea for $30,000,000 for American ships fade into insignificance.

Before leaving this subject of direct aid, I will say that the value of national cooperation in business is wonderfully exemplified by little Denmark, as much a shipping country as a farming and dairy country. It was on Friday last only that I saw it stated in a shipping journal that Denmark's merchant fleet was 100 per cent active. Thus Denmark is the only nation in the world with all of its ships busy. There is much food for thought in that brief statement; but the answer lies in the intense nationalism that makes all her people only too eager to help one another and which leads her farmers to insist that Danish ships carry Danish products wherever possible.

We must not forget, too, that Japan is preparing, if she has not already done so, to grant a construction loan fund of 250,000,000 yen to her merchant-ship builders, to be spent for fast liners only—the very type of vessel most needed as naval auxiliaries. By a strange chance—I will not say design—this amount equals the $125,000,000 we wish to have in our own construction loan fund for practically the same purposes—the building in American yards of the very types of vessels now lacking in our national merchant fleet.

COMPARATIVE COST OF OPERATION HERE AND ABROAD.

Mr. President, I now wish briefly to discuss the comparative cost of operation of ships here and abroad. Much has been said and written about the difference in operating costs of American ships and those of our maritime rivals. Wage scales on our ships in foreign trades easily average 30 per cent above the scales paid by our closest rival—Great Britain. They average so far above the others—the Scandinavian, Dutch, Japanese, and German—that the difference is not worth discussing here in detail.

These facts were just as glaring before the World War as they are to-day. They operated effectively then to prevent our entrance into our own foreign carrying trade to such an extent that in 1913 less than 10 per cent of our commerce was carried in our own ships. On its face, that might seem a shameful thing for any nation with such wonderful access to the sea as we have. In extenuation of that helpless maritime condition we can only say that our men who did go to sea were better paid, better fed, better housed, and better safeguarded than the seafarers of any other maritime nation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RANSDELL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Louisiana has just pointed out the large increase in the cost of operating ships in Great Britain over what it is in other countries. If that be so, then how is British shipping able to compete with the shipping of other countries?

Mr. RANSDELL. I said that the cost in this country was about 30 per cent higher than the scales paid by Great Britain, and that Great Britain's scales were higher than those in other countries. That is true. The only way I can account for Great Britain's doing so much business when the wage scales are higher is because of the very great efficiency of the British merchant marine. It is so large; it forms such a very great percentage of all the marine of the world; the British have been masters in that line for so many years, I may say for so many centuries, that they have attained a commanding position and held it; but I should like to remind the Senator that many thinkers believe that the late World War was really the result of commercial jealousy and rivalry between Great Britain and Germany. Germany had built up a marvelous merchant marine prior to the outbreak of the war, and it was said that it was cutting into Great Britain's business in many of the countries of the world. It was taking a very large percentage of that business. Now, of course, the German fleet has been destroyed. Great Britain now has a great part of that fleet. We have a large part of it. I suppose France and Italy got their portions of the fleet. I have just brought out figures here to show that Australia received quite a number of those German vessels. Since the war we have had only a comparatively few privately owned and operated vessels to compete with Great Britain. The French merchant marine never seems to have been a success for some cause or other. The Italians have had a moderate degree of success, but they are not in a position to be world carriers. To a great extent they have handled their own business, but they have not been carriers for the rest of the world. The Norwegians have been to a great extent world carriers; but they, too, have only a limited number of ships, and there is plenty for them to do and at the same time for the British to do. The Japanese have come into the world of seagoing shipping very actively during the last few years, and my prediction is that they are going to be very powerful rivals both to Great Britain and to the United States.

Unless we can build up a merchant marine on some basis to compete with England, I do not see how it is possible for us to get a fair share of the world's commerce. I think the British are so much more skilled than we are in these marine matters, so much more skilled than any other nation, that they are going to continue to do the business. That may not be a very complete answer to the Senator's question, but it is the best I can give at this moment.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, some of these reports—I think the report made by the minority members in the House; I thought I had it here; I have it somewhere—point out that the labor cost of operating our merchant marine is only 2 per cent higher than it is in Great Britain. Does that accord with the Senator's recollection?

Mr. RANSDELL. No; that is not so, as I understand it. I have here a table which I do not want to take the time of the Senate to read in its entirety, but I should like to call to the Senator's attention some of these actual cases.

For instance, I have here the ship *Bantu*, a United States vessel of 4,229 tons. The monthly pay of that vessel, speaking of wages now—I am not going to discuss all of these features—the monthly pay of that vessel was $3,235 for the 46 men of the crew. Compare that with the British ship *Bonny*, of 4,229 tons. It happens to be exactly the same size. In the crew of the British ship there were 43 men, as compared with the 46 in the American ship, and the monthly pay there was $2,466, as compared with a pay of $3,235 in the American ship.

Take the next case, the *Galesburg*, an American ship of 5,138 tons, compared with the *Ballygally Head*, an English ship of 5,179 tons. The United States ship had 39 men in her crew, the British ship 42 men. The wages of the American ship were $3,097; the wages of the British ship, $2,350.

So in quite a number of cases I give you the actual vessels of both Great Britain and America, and give you the actual wages; so it is not theory at all, but it is a plain, simple statement of facts which may be verified.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not find just what I had in mind, but here is something bearing on the subject. The report of Congressman DAVIS on this bill, when it was in the House, quotes from Mr. Lasker:

> Chairman Lasker stated at the hearings that "There has been a difference."

Note, he says—

> there has been a difference—

A difference of 25 to 30 per cent.

> There has been a difference of 25 to 30 per cent, almost constant, in the wage between the American and British ship. That difference is cut away down now.
>
> During the discussion of the question of comparative wages of American and British crews, the following question was asked and answer given:
>
> "Mr. HARDY. * * * I have a statement here showing the difference in cost of crews amounts to nothing.
>
> "Mr. LASKER. I do not know at the present moment that it does amount to anything."

There is a great deal of other evidence to the same effect. I realize that witnesses have testified to substantially what the Senator stated, and I am at a loss to understand why there is this difference of opinion as between experts who at least ought to have investigated this subject before they testified.

WAGE DIFFERENCE FAVORS BRITISH.

Mr. RANSDELL. I will say to the Senator that so far as my examination goes there is a very great difference between the wages paid on American vessels and those paid on British vessels. There does seem to be the difference of opinion that he states, but I have gone into the matter just as fully as I can.

I am citing the tables showing the actual wages paid, and I shall be glad to look into the matter further, if I can, to see which set of witnesses has told the exact truth in this matter. The Senator knows, as a matter of common knowledge, that wages in America are higher in nearly everything than in Great Britain. I will say to the Senator that there is another question connected with that, if we are going to go into that discussion. There is the question of better food. We are required to give our men very much better food than they do in British ships. We are required to furnish them a great deal larger amount of air space. We are required to make them a great deal more comfortable than the requirements of the British marine. There is no doubt that the expense of operating our ships is very considerably higher, when all things are considered.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I realize that our food requirements are better than they are in other nations, and they ought to be better.

Mr. RANSDELL. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. There is not any difference of opinion between us on that subject; but Congressman DAVIS evidently refers here to the testimony of Mr. Rosseter, who is a man of large experience; and this question was asked:

> Mr. VARE. Have you any figures showing the cost of manning an English ship as compared with the cost of manning an American ship of the same size?
>
> Mr. ROSSETER. Yes, sir. The prejudice on account of the somewhat higher wages and of the larger manning scale amounts to about 2 per cent of our operating cost.

And at another place here:

> This feature was aptly expressed by Mr. J. S. Rosseter in a letter to Mr. E. N. Hurley, chairman Shipping Board, in 1919.

Not to quote the whole of it, he used this language—I am reading now from page 26 of Congressman DAVIS's report:

> The prejudice of higher costs of manning, by which I mean larger crews at higher pay and extra cost of victualing, can be fairly stated as amounting to less than 2 per cent of the total operating expense. This can be entirely offset, and more, by a reasonable increase in the speed of our ships and by improving loading and discharging equipment, thus reducing the time in port as well as on voyage.

At another point, I think in this same report—in any event, it appears in the testimony—it was said that the cost of manning the vessels and the cost of the foodstuffs was only a comparatively small per cent of the total cost of operating the ships. I have in mind at the present time one witness who testified that the cost of victualing and manning the ships was only 7 per cent of the total expense. Can the Senator inform me as to whether or not that is correct?

Mr. RANSDELL. I can not give the Senator any information on that subject. The Senator will bear in mind that there were a great many witnesses. This testimony was taken for several months. It went through a long, long period, and there was a great deal of difference of opinion in regard to the matter, but the best evidence, as I say, as I have been able to analyze it—I should be glad to try to go into it a little bit more in detail in response to the Senator's question—from the best evidence that I can gather it costs considerably more to man and operate an American vessel than it does a British vessel. Let me remind the Senator that even if the difference were only 2 per cent for the actual cost of operation, that is a very big item. The cost of operation is the biggest thing connected with a vessel. This subsidy that so many people are objecting to amounts, experts tell us—and I do not know whether they are stating it correctly or not—to only about one-fifth of the fuel cost of operating a vessel. The cost of operating is a tremendously expensive thing. It includes the fuel, of course; it includes the wages; it includes everything connected with a ship; and even if you take Mr. Rosseter's figures there and say that it costs only about 2 per cent more for the operating cost in America than in England, that difference alone would be a very, very large one in favor of the British merchant marine.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have been having serious trouble in coming to a conclusion as to what I ought to do on this subject. I sometimes hear the men who are insisting upon a subsidy declare that it is utterly impossible to operate without a subsidy. I find others who apparently are worthy of equal credence who tell me that it is not necessary. Now, it does seem to me that with all the actuaries we have, we ought to have some definite statement from the Shipping Board bearing on this subject, and we ought not to be left entirely in the dark about it.

Mr. RANSDELL. May I say that I quite agree with the Senator that we ought to have something a little bit more definite than we have; but I believe we have fairly definite information. The proof of the pudding is always in the eating, and we learn from the Shipping Board experts that it has been costing a considerable sum to try to operate American vessels. They have not been making money; they have been losing money. The Shipping Board has been trying its level best to operate them so as to make money, but they have told us they are losing around $50,000,000 a year, including the care of the vessels, their operation, and so forth.

Mr. POMERENE. I recognize the fact that that statement has been made, but I have no figures which will enable me to make comparisons. Of course, we recognize the fact that the shipping of the world is about as low as it can possibly be. It is not a question of financial difficulties with Government-owned ships alone but there are financial difficulties on the part of privately owned vessels.

I have information to the effect that one certain company is willing to take a number of these vessels and operate them with or without subsidy, whether this bill passes or does not pass. I am not a shipping expert, but I would like to have some evidence from some expert if I can get it which will enable me to come to a conclusion.

COST TABLES IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to call the Senator's attention to page 169 of volume 1 of the hearings, which gives tables submitted by the Shipping Board itself. The Senator will find the tables of wages on various ships, American, British, German, Norwegian, and so forth, giving the compensation of the crew. I gave the Senator the page, and he can examine it. I will give just one instance. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a survey of the whole situation was made by the Shipping Board and presented to the committee. This gives the crew list, the monthly wages on similar American, British, and German steamers, as of December, 1921. The figures are as follows:

American steamship *Munwood*, 3,190 gross tons.

German steamship *Amassia*, 3,300 gross tons.

British steamship *Munardan*, 3,813 gross tons.

Here is a statement of the pay of the crew of the American ship, including officers, per month. It amounts to $3,107.50. On the British ship it amounts to 538 pounds and 10 shillings. If you count the pound at even $5, there is still quite a difference between the two. On the German ships the cost is 33,200 marks. I do not know how you could figure that, the way marks are now. But we can compare the British and American ships. The Senator will find several statements there with reference to that subject. Like the Senator, I am not a shipping man; I am not an expert; but these are figures which are submitted by the Shipping Board after a very careful investigation and survey of the situation.

Mr. POMERENE. I recognize the fact that it is almost impossible to make comparisons as to cost under present rates of exchange between the various countries, but it does seem to me we could get some figures which would tell us what the total cost of the operation of a ship is, what the wage cost is, what the ratio between wage cost and total cost is, and then we can probably reach some sort of a conclusion, even if it is not entirely satisfactory.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator will find these figures to which I have just referred as definite as any figures anyone can hope to get. They give different exchange rates, and the Senator can figure any rate he sees fit to. If the highest possible value of the pound is taken as $5, there is still quite a difference.

Mr. POMERENE. Of course, I intend to look into this further, but it seems I can get more misinformation on this subject than upon any other subject I have been in contact with for some time, and I do not know what to depend on.

Mr. RANSDELL. This is one of the most difficult subjects this Nation or any other nation has been confronted with. We know very well that the present merchant marine was a war necessity, and that it cost us over $3,000,000,000. That is such a staggering sum that I can not comprehend it, and I do not believe anyone else can. It is a colossal study; it is a difficult study. We have been doing the very best we could to work it out, and I think the Shipping Board have been doing the very best they could to work it out, and that is a board composed of as good men as we can find. This bill is their unanimous verdict of what should be passed, and they agree unanimously on the facts in support of this bill.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not mean to reflect upon this board at all, because my judgment is that they are high-minded men, and I have no doubt but what they are doing the best they can; but when these figures are brought to me, necessarily I am prompted to inquire what information have they on the subject. Are they experienced shipping men?

Mr. RANSDELL. They have a number of shipping men in their employ.

Mr. POMERENE. I understand that; but some weeks ago the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] read into the record an opinion by Mr. Dollar, one of the very successful shipping men of the country, in which he contends that a subsidy is not necessary. I have talked with other shipping men, who have told me, as I said before, that they were ready to buy these ships, or a certain number of them, and operate them, and they did not care whether there was a subsidy or not. When I am confronted with evidence of that kind, and other men who have had no experience in shipping come and tell me it is utterly impossible to operate the ships without a subsidy, what conclusion am I to reach? Above everything else, I want a merchant marine. I think it would be a calamity if we let this get out of America's hands. I am not enamored of Government operation, either of shipping or of railroads.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator knows we have not had a merchant marine in the past. When the war broke out we were carrying only 9 per cent of our commerce, and we have the ships now, and this is the only plan that has been offered, except continuation of Government ownership. There may be some difference of opinion as to what it cost to operate a ship here and what it cost to operate a ship there; but it is a fact that nobody can deny that it has been a very expensive thing to the American people to build these ships, and we are continually losing money on them. Nobody can deny that.

Mr. POMERENE. There is no doubt about that; but my history informs me that before the Civil War we did have a merchant marine, and it was a merchant marine of which we were very proud.

Mr. RANSDELL. The Senator's history also tells him that we had a discriminating duty at that time, and the merchant marine was built up on a discriminating duty. If we could have the discriminating duty now I would infinitely prefer it to this. I would put this subsidy bill aside in a second if we could enforce the discriminating duty provided for in existing law.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has brought up a subject I have been thinking a great deal about. I recognize the fact that we have authorized the denouncement of treaties so that we could have this discriminating duty, and two Presidents of the United States did not see fit to use the power which was

given to them by the Congress. That has not as yet convinced me that it ought not to have been done. It has seemed to me, as I have gone into this, that there are two things we could do: One is to enforce a discriminating duty in favor of goods that are brought into this country in American bottoms. The other is to do as Germany has done—give a preferential freight rate to goods going out of the country. In that way Germany has been able to indirectly defeat the provisions in these very treaties which are in force at the present time. Other countries can do this by indirection, but I love the American way of doing things by direction.

As I have said, I am disappointed when I think that while the minority of the committee have presented their views they have not come with a concrete suggestion of some sort of a substitute measure for this bill. The fleet is here. We have to deal with it. What are we going to do with it? I want to do the best thing I can.

DISCRIMINATING DUTIES PREFERRED.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, in regard to this discriminating duty, I will say that we tried to put that into effect some years ago—I think it was in 1914 that the act was passed—and it has been on the statute books. The courts held it was in contravention of our treaties with other nations; and to overcome that, in 1920 we included in the merchant marine act of that year section 34, instructing the President to denounce these treaties—if there were any treaties in contravention, to get rid of them by denouncing them in accordance with the regular treaty arrangement. He did not do it. When Mr. Harding came in, 15 months ago, he did not do it either; and so it goes. It does not look to me as if we can get rid of them as a practical proposition; and even if we go to denouncing them under that law, I presume it would take well on to a year to get rid of them and get other treaties; and in the meantime what is going to happen to us?

I want to say to the Senator that personally I would infinitely prefer that the discriminating duties which are provided for in the law should be carried out in good faith; and if we can have that, I, for one, will never support a subsidy. But I do not know how to get it. If the Senator or anybody else can suggest a reasonable way in which we can put these discriminatory duties in force, then in heaven's name let us get them. But until we do get them, let us do the next best thing—pass this bill—for nobody else has suggested anything in lieu thereof.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator has just suggested that if we did denounce these treaties it would take a year before we could do anything. It will be a year before we get anything done under this bill that will be of any particular consequence to the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. We could not sell the ships now, anyway.

Mr. POMERENE. I may vote for this bill before we get through with it.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not think the Senator is hoping very strongly that I will, in view of the fact that he himself confesses that he prefers some other plan to this subsidy feature. The Senator has given a great deal of study to this. I wish he would prepare a bill along the lines of what is his best thought and what harmonizes with his preferences on this subject. It would help me immensely in coming to a conclusion. I hope we will have a little more light before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am very hopeful, with the Senator from Ohio. I know he wants to do the same thing I do. I just want to call his attention to the fact that the minority, in the views to which he has referred, declare themselves emphatically against Government ownership and operation.

I rose to call to the Senator's attention an article in the August, 1922, number of the World's Work. I heard him refer to Robert Dollar. This is an article by Robert Dollar, and I want to read to the Senator just a brief paragraph. This is at page 447 of that work. Listen to what Mr. Dollar says:

> Under present conditions it costs the American shipowner more to operate his vessels than those of any other nation. This is not hearsay; I have before me recent figures, not made up for the occasion but taken off the reports that come to me regularly for my private information, concerning vessels in our own fleet. Here they are:

Kind of vessel.	Number of men.	Monthly cost.
Shipping Board steamer (American crew)	34	$3,718.50
American steamer (Chinese crew)	40	2,124.50
British steamer (Chinese crew)	44	1,567.20
Japanese steamer (Japanese crew)	36	1,403.12

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought perhaps the Senator from Washington would be willing to take the figures as presented by the author of the bill, Mr. Lasker, and I want to read what Mr. Lasker said about the difference in labor costs. He said:

> But I do know this, that to-day the labor cost between Britain and the United States is closer together than it ever was before in the history of shipping.

Again, while he was being examined by Congressman HARDY, he was asked:

> If that is left out of this, then I do not want to go into that, except I have a statement here showing the difference in cost of crews amounts to nothing.
>
> Mr. LASKER. I do not know at the present moment that it does amount to anything.

In other words, Mr. Lasker admits that there is no difference in labor cost between Great Britain and the United States at this time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I merely want to suggest that I have not had the time to read all through Mr. Lasker's statement. I do know, however, that frequently and very naturally during his testimony in answer to questions he referred to the experts of the Shipping Board. Mr. Lasker is not a practical shipping man, as he frankly admits.

Mr. McKELLAR. The quotation which I cited will be found on pages 33 and 36 of the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know how easy it is to take out of the testimony of a witness sentences or clauses that support a particular view, and it may appear that this was an opinion of the man or an express statement of the man when, if one would read his whole testimony, it would be seen that it does not correctly give his view and his idea. But it is certain that what I called to the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] a moment ago was prepared by the experts of the Shipping Board and submitted to the committee and perhaps to the Shipping Board and Mr. Lasker. Mr. Lasker refers to it in his testimony. But what I have just read from The World's Work came from a really practical shipping man, and he said that these are his private advices which came to him for his particular information and not to satisfy any particular occasion.

I frankly say that I do not attach very much importance to a statement of opinion from Mr. Lasker as to the wage cost on a ship, because his experts submit the testimony that they gathered with reference to the actual cost. I have not had an opportunity to read Mr. Lasker's testimony through. Taking what the Senator quoted just by itself and standing alone, of course, we see what he expresses there, but I am satisfied that is not in harmony with the report of the experts. I am satisfied, if the Senator will read the whole of the testimony of Mr. Lasker, he will see what Mr. Lasker intended to express.

Mr. DIAL and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I have been very indulgent, but I wish to proceed with my presentation of the subject. I was anxious to give Senators an opportunity to present their views, but I prefer that they do it in their own way and in their own time. I have been glad to have the interruptions, but I wish to go on now with what I was saying on the subject of comparative costs.

It is a matter of shame to this Nation, to every one of us personally, that we did not see to it that this field for marine endeavor was broadened by some protective measures for our shipping, so that this great opportunity for useful work would be opened to thousands of other Americans at American wage scales, under American living conditions, and to the lasting benefit of America in peace or war.

It is to give that opportunity, to gain that important field of work, that the present bill has been drawn.

MANY OTHER COSTS ARE HIGHER.

Under its protection and with Government aid shipowners will be able to partly offset this great prime differential against our ships. Of course, there are other differentials in the shipping business that react against our vessels. I need only mention the higher cost of repairs which must be made in American shipyards if the ship is to receive Government aid; the higher administrative costs, due to better paid clerks, agents, stevedores, and so forth; and all of these higher wage costs are due to our better standard of living and the broader chance for advancement this country affords to the individual. We do not wish to restrict that chance for advancement, nor would we lessen the opportunity our ways of living provide for us all. And it is to extend and perpetuate that chance and opportunity that we are seeking to assist America's shipping enterprise.

I will not burden you with the technical details of how foreign wage scales at sea cut so far under American wage scales at the present moment that oversea carrying is not profitable for us. Without objection, I will offer for the RECORD a table of American and foreign ships so arranged and compared that anyone may see at a glance how great the American handicap is in this regard. All these wage scales have been taken from the actual ships' articles, and have appeared either in the hearings on the bill or in the RECORD, and all of them are of this year's date. They speak for themselves more potently than I could speak for them and furnish ample reason by their very being for the immediate passage of this bill.

Wage scales.

Nation.	Ship.	Tons.	Fuel.	Number men.	Monthly pay.
United States	Bantu	4,229	Coal	46	$3,235.00
British	Bonny	4,229	do	43	2,466.56
United States	Galesburg	5,138	do	39	3,097.50
British	Ballygally Head	5,179	do	42	2,350.71
United States	Hog Island	7,800	Oil	32	2,792.50
British	Cornish Point	8,200	Coal	40	2,057.50
United States	America	21,114	do	612	37,916.25
British	Baltic	23,884	do	364	18,464.75
United States	Susquehanna	11,700	do	174	11,715.00
British	Berrima	11,202	do	174	8,067.75
United States	8,800 deadweight type		do	41	3,135.00
British	8,800 tonnage type		do	41	2,351.00
United States	Independence Hall	5,050	Oil	34	2,707.50
British	Matoppo (Lascar)		Coal	47	1,799.49
United States	Orleans	9,638	Oil	33	2,862.50
British	Mongolian Prince	9,670	Coal	42	2,269.50
United States	5,500 deadweight type		do	34	2,675.00
British	do		do	34	2,002.50
United States	Dakotan	10,200	Oil	33	2,762.50
British	Rexmore	10,200	do	42	2,231.00
United States	5,070 deadweight type		do	30	2,475.00
British	5,000 deadweight type		do	30	1,795.50
United States	3,300 deadweight type		do	27	2,305.00
British	do		do	27	1,651.50
United States	8,500 deadweight West type		do	34	2,795.00
British	do		do	34	2,035.00

Here is a mixed fleet employing 1,169 men for 13 American ships and only 960 men on the 13 British ships. The total monthly pay roll for the American vessels is $80,473.75, an average of $68.91 per month per man, while the monthly pay rolls of the 13 British ships total $49,532.70, an average of $51.90 per month per man.

Nation.	Ship.	Tons.	Fuel.	Number of men.	Monthly pay.
United States	President Harrison	13,000	Oil	94	$7,872.50
Japan	Rakuyo Maru	12,500	Coal	133	4,907.00
United States	Cananova	1,920	Oil	25	1,999.00
Danish	Borglum	1,909	Coal	25	1,653.00
United States	President Taft	14,123	Oil	100	9,969.50
Japan	Tenyo Maru	13,398	Coal	275	8,870.00
United States	Norlina	4,506	Oil	32	2,132.50
Swedish	Tasmanic	4,079	Coal	35	1,988.28
United States	Bird City	5,562	Oil	31	2,887.50
Dutch	Madiora	6,803	Coal	57	2,485.47
United States	Catherine	2,130	do	32	2,232.00
Swedish	Karlsvick	2,373	do	26	1,401.88

In this mixed fleet we find the six American ships with a monthly pay roll totaling $27,033 for its 406 men, an average of $66 per man, while the six foreign vessels are run with an aggregate monthly pay roll of $21,185.63, or an average of $38.45 per month for each of its 551 men.

In regard to the differential against American ships, due to subsistence cost and to accommodations for the crew, you have only to look over the requirements of the seamen's law and contrast the home living conditions ashore of the American sailor and his foreign rival. There is no comparison as to quantity and quality of food served, nor can the living quarters of American and foreign ships be contrasted without everyone admitting that American standards are maintained afloat as they are ashore.

While on the subject of subsistence let me call attention to the increasing cost of Asiatics aboard British ships. The lascar makes a good seaman from the British owner's viewpoint, because he is cheaply fed and cheaply paid. Our bill bars the employment of persons not eligible to become citizens from both deck and engine-room forces and requires after a brief time that two-thirds of the crew must be citizens of the United States. This is one of the wisest and most important provisions of the bill.

OUR TONNAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE.

Mr. President, I ask permission to insert in the RECORD without reading the tabulation and statement in regard to our tonnage in foreign trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be inserted in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

If American shipping needs no aid, if it can meet foreign competition, and is meeting it successfuly, as the opponents of the shipping bill assert, then they must have sources of information that are denied to me, and which, apparently, are denied to the Government of the United States. I have had some research made of the status of our foreign trade, from a number of angles, and no matter from what angle the situation is approached the analysis reveals one fact strikingly and unmistakably, and that is that the American merchant marine not only is not standing up under competition but is falling back steadily and continuously. This is the fruit of delay in securing legislation and the enforcement of that legislation so as to assure the permanency of an American merchant marine that will be consonant with the importance of our position in the international trade of the world. The merchant marine that we now have, under a continuance of the conditions we now have, is a helpless giant, mighty in tonnage but weak almost every way save numerically.

We need look no further than the record of the past few years. We came upon the seas, we saw an opportunity for strength where before there had been only weakness, but we did not conquer. No; we are being conquered.

The most recent figures that I have of our sea trade are for the nine months of this year ended September 30 last, and for the similar periods of the years 1919, 1920, and 1921. These figures represent the values of our imports and exports combined carried in American and foreign vessels.

In 1914 the entire foreign-trade fleet under the American flag aggregated only 1,076,000 gross tons. At the beginning of 1919 our merchant marine for sea commerce totaled about 5,000,000 tons. In 1920 it was 8,000,000 tons; in 1921, about 10,400,000 tons. At the beginning of this year it was about 10,300,000 tons, and it is now about 9,800,000 tons, or practically double what it was at the beginning of 1919, a gain in the past four years of 100 per cent. If with 1,000,000 tons before the beginning of the war we carried 10 per cent of our foreign trade, the natural thought would be that with ten times that amount of tonnage we would be in a position, so far as cargo space goes, at least, to carry all our imports and exports, especially as the volume of trade now is and has been less than it was before the war. Of course, however, a monopoly of the ocean transportation of all the commodities we exchange with other nations is neither possible nor to be desired. What we want and what we are entitled to is a fair share of our sea trade. With Great Britain transporting nearly 70 per cent of her foreign trade, how can she oppose our aspiration to carry at least half, and ultimately as much as two-thirds, of ours?

There is no reason why we should not be transporting half of that commerce right now—no reason but one, and that is that we have left foreigners in exclusive possession of advantages under which they are steadily increasing their control over the distribution of our goods. It will cost us some millions of dollars to offset these foreign advantages, but it will cost us billions if we do not take steps to overcome them and give our merchant marine a chance for existence.

Permit me to lay before you briefly the records of the past four years to which I have referred. In the 1919 period—comprising the first nine months of that year—the carriage of our sea trade was practically equally divided between three groups of shipping—one composed of our own vessels, another of British ships, and the third of the tonnage of all the other foreign maritime nations combined. The value of the imports and exports carried and the percentage for each group of carriers was as follows:

	Value.	Per cent.
American	$2,580,000,000	34.3
British	2,496,000,000	33.2
Other foreign	2,448,000,000	32.5
Total	7,524,000,000	

This may be regarded as the start of the post-war race for ocean commerce. In the three-cornered contest we held a slight lead. Competition had not come into play, for there was employment for all ships that could carry cargoes. American shipyards were at the peak of production, others had not begun to catch up on their war losses of tonnage, and we were in a position to utilize the output of our yards and gain new trade before the other maritime nations were in a position to compete. To get and hold that trade meant the establishment of an adequate American merchant marine. We got it, but we did not hold it.

The record for the 1920 period shows how we got it. In 1919 our vessels carried American imports and exports valued at $84,000,000 more than those transported by British vessels. In 1920 our lead over the British jumped to $840,000,000. But a more remarkable contrast is to be found in the comparison of what our vessels carried and what those of the other than British nations did. For the 1919 period our lead was $132,000,000, while in the 1920 period it was $2,132,000,000. It is worthy of note, also, that while in the 1919 period British ships carried only $48,000,000 more worth of goods in our trade than all other foreign ships, in 1920 she led by $1,292,000,000.

These were the days of high prices and high freights and little competition. Our share of the carrying trade jumped 10 per cent in the 1920 period and Britain's 2 per cent, but the proportion for the other foreign countries dropped 12 per cent. But the 1921 period presents a very different picture. Our $840,000,000 lead over Britain was reduced to $65,000,000, and our $2,132,000,000 lead over the other foreign nations fell to $452,000,000. Competition was again under way and instead of cargoes seeking cargo space, cargo carriers were seeking cargo. Our percentage gain of the previous period was more than cut in half, while Britain held her own and the other maritime nations scored an advance of 5 per cent.

The 1922 period has witnessed the relegation of our merchant marine to second place. Instead of leading Britain by $65,000,000, as

in 1921, she led us by about $20,000,000, and instead of a $452,000,000 lead over the other foreign nations we had one of $311,000,000.

Here we are, then, practically back to our 1919 status, so far as the proportion of commodities carried in our own vessels is concerned, and with the lead we then held taken over by Great Britain, and this despite the doubling of our tonnage in the four years under review. As against that 100 per cent gain in cargo space we have made a gain of 1 per cent in the proportion of cargo carried by American vessels. Already Britain is leading us and the other foreign maritime nations are enlarging their slice of our trade at a rate that, if long continued, will put them ahead of us and we shall have moved from the head to the tail of the procession. That is the record of American shipping in competition with the cheaper built and cheaper operated foreign ships, whose owners are able to keep us from getting more than a nibble of their trade, while they carry off the bulk of ours.

So long as the foreigners continue to increase their share of our carrying trade and there is no increase in the volume of that trade there can be but one outcome, and that is more idle tonnage under the American flag. Here is another phase of the situation which those who claim that the American merchant marine can meet competition will do well to study.

It is true that we lack in this country close "cooperation on the part of shippers and shipowners and people generally." Business the world over is cold-blooded. The best service at the lowest rate is the universal motto. If American ships can not give as low rates as foreign ships because of their higher capital and operating costs, they can not get cargoes. If they can not give as good service when those first costs have been equalized by Government aid, they still will not get cargoes. But in every line of endeavor—invention, manufacturing, production—American genius and ability have triumphed, and only need something near an equal chance in the competition, whether that be an international sporting event, a world-wide financial deal, or an improved process of manufacturing a general utility. The world's history in the last century has shown American success in every field of endeavor, in spite of many handicaps, and knowing this one can not fail to believe that in the contest for world trade America will win if given half a chance.

Mr. RANSDELL. I also ask to insert without reading a tabulation and statement in regard to the idle vessels here and in Great Britain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be inserted in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

IDLE VESSELS HERE AND IN GREAT BRITAIN—FOREIGN SHIPS PAY DIVIDENDS.

At the beginning of July last there was said to be laid up in the ports of the world 7,750,000 net tons of shipping. On the same date there was laid up in British ports 1,112,000 net tons.

Commenting on this fact, a British publication, Syren and Shipping, in its issue of November 22, 1922, says:

"Even grouping the foreign ships in British ports to swell our total we are confronted with the pleasing fact that whereas we have under our flag two-fifths (or fourteen thirty-fifths) of the world's tonnage, we had only one-seventh (or five thirty-fifths) of the world's idle shipping on our hands. This is a gratifying tribute both to British ships and their owners."

The same publication, in the same issue, gives comparative figures of laid-up tonnage in British ports at various dates, as taken from the records of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, as follows:

	Ships.	Net tons.
Oct. 25, 1921	742	1,296,000
Jan. 1, 1922	712	1,307,000
Apr. 1, 1922	484	836,000
July 1, 1922	583	1,112,000
Oct. 1, 1922	456	824,000

Speaking of the lessening of inactivity apparent on October 1 last, the British paper says:

"Whether the greater buoyancy which has recently characterized the trade marts of the world will be continued, time alone can show. One thing is certain, viz, that the British shipowner is better prepared than any other of his rivals to immediately exploit any market which may open out. Just as he can keep running, thanks to economical ships and efficient methods when many of his competitors are unable to do so, so is he readiest to take the field when a chance of new employment presents itself."

This tribute to the ability of British ships to meet competition and their readiness to grasp any opportunities that may be offered by the expansion of foreign trade are well borne out by the figures cited. The moral to be drawn from our share in the world's laid-up tonnage is a very different one, however.

The British shipping paper Fairplay, in its issue of November 23, gives a table showing that at the middle of this year there were laid up in British ports 1,780,000 gross tons of vessels, while for the United States the figures were 3,978,000 tons. It is pointed out that of the ships tied up in Britain not all are British, but even if they had been the total would have represented only about 10 per cent of the entire British fleet. Our 3,978,000 tons, on the other hand, does not include wooden steamers, but the total is more than a third of our seagoing fleet. In other words, Britain, with a foreign trade fleet practically double ours, had less than half the amount of tonnage tied up. It is apparent that in the competition to secure employment for ships we have lost heavily.

If we consider the position now as compared with about a year ago, the contrast between the American and the British merchant marine is striking. British figures prepared by the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom show that on October 25, 1921, the laid-up British tonnage totaled 1,158,000 net tons, and that on October 1, 1922, the total was 752,000 tons. Records of the United States Shipping Board give the total for the ships of the board laid up on November 5, 1921, as 6,989,000 dead-weight tons, and on October 28, 1922, as 6,426,000 tons. It should be noted that while the British figures are in net tons ours are in dead weight, and that therefore the apparent reduction in the year of 406,000 tons of idle British ships and 563,000 tons for American vessels does not give a true picture of comparison. By applying percentages, however, it is found that the reduction in Britain's idle tonnage for the year represented 35 per cent, while the reduction for Shipping Board vessels was only 8 per cent. The ratio in favor of the British merchant marine therefore was more than 4 to 1.

Perhaps the picture will be clearer if we talk in terms of ships, and not of tonnage. Idle British vessels during the year under review were reduced from 654 to 419, a drop of 235, or 36 per cent. The Shipping Board's inactive vessels were reduced from 1,028 to 989, a decline of only 39 ships, or 4 per cent. In the reduction of inactive ships, then, Britain's gain was nine times ours.

The American figures shown take into account only the Government's steel vessels; but there is also a large volume of tonnage privately owned under the American flag which is out of commission for lack of cargoes. I have no official figures for this, but it can be conservatively estimated that at least 1,000,000 gross tons of private American shipping is inactive. That would represent about 20 per cent of the private foreign trade fleet. Of the Shipping Board's total steel tonnage two-thirds is idle, and the position has been practically unimproved during the past year. On November 8, 1921, for instance, 66.9 per cent of all the board's steel tonnage was tied up, while on October 8, 1922, the figure was 65.7 per cent, an improvement in a period of almost a year of only 1.2 per cent.

If American ships can compete on even terms with foreign ships, why are they not doing it? Let us not forget that even with only about one-third of its tonnage in operation, the Shipping Board is losing at the rate of about $50,000,000 a year. And if you say that privately operated American tonnage is competing successfully, if they, too, are not losing money, I am at a loss to understand why British and other foreign shipping enterprises are declaring dividends of from 10 to 15 per cent and American companies are giving none.

At present we have more than a thousand steel vessels tied up, each one of which costs $3,600 a year to maintain. To-day they may be worth about $200,000,000,000. Depreciation of ships not in service is estimated at 10 per cent a year. The salvage value, therefore, of the idle fleet decreases automatically at the rate of $20,000,000 a year. They are not salable without the subsidy and can not be operated by the Government without vastly increasing the Shipping Board deficits. These ships can not be sold unless the foreign handicap of cheaper operating cost is offset. Without this bill that handicap will be just as potent five years from now, and meanwhile the fleet will have been reduced in value by one-half.

If American ships can compete on equal terms with foreign carriers, they will obtain ample cargoes. Service being the same, the shipper will choose the lower rate. If foreign operating and capital costs are lower than American charges, foreign freight will be lower. If those differentials are offset by Government aid to American ships we can meet the foreigner on equal terms and obtain our share of the business.

BILLIONS PAID TO FOREIGNERS.

Mr. RANSDELL. Now, Mr. President and Senators, I call the attention of the Senate particularly to a brief tabulation which I have made about the colossal sums that have been paid by this country to foreigners during the last 100 years for carrying our goods to and fro. I hope Senators will listen to the figures as I present them.

COLOSSAL SUMS PAID IN FREIGHTS, ETC., TO FOREIGN SHIPS.

In the past 100 years foreign interests have been paid more than $28,000,000,000 in connection with the transportation by sea of American imports and exports. These figures are based on data of the Department of Commerce and the Shipping Board.

It is stated that freights, insurance, banking, brokerage, and other services connected with the shipment of goods in foreign trade approximate 25 per cent of the value of the goods themselves.

For the 100 years ended at the beginning of this year the value of American exports and imports by sea was as follows (1821–1921, inclusive):

Imports	$62,174,000,000
Exports	86,629,000,000
Total trade	148,803,000,000

The division of this trade between the vessels carrying it was as follows:

	Value.	Per cent.
United States ships	$35,631,000,000	24
British ships	56,545,000,000	38
Other foreign	56,627,000,000	38

During the century under review the shipping earnings in the carriage of American imports and exports were as follows:

	Value.	Per cent.
American	$8,908,000,000	24
Foreign	28,293,000,000	76
Total	37,201,000,000	

From 1821 to 1862 an average of 80 per cent of our total foreign commerce was carried by American ships, but from 1862 to 1922 American participation decreased to an average of 19 per cent.

During the period from December 31, 1914, to December 31, 1920, the total value of our commerce by sea was $47,626,000,000, the distribution of values carried by vessels being as follows:

	Value.	Per cent.
United States ships	$12,130,000,000	26
British ships	19,810,000,000	42
Other foreign	15,686,000,000	33

The total paid to foreign interests during the 100 years was, therefore, $28,293,000,000.

From the foundation of the Republic to the present time the Federal Government has expended for improvements of rivers, harbors, and canals, exclusive of the Panama Canal, the sum of only $1,036,000,000, and for the construction of the Panama Canal, $479,000,000—a total of only $1,515,000,000.

Compare this sum of one and one-half billions paid for all our waterways, including the Panama Canal, in the 140 years of our national life with $28,250,000,000 paid to foreign ships in the last hundred years.

If we had maintained an effective merchant marine during all these years and carried one-half our foreign commerce instead of 24 per cent thereof, the sum of $9,608,666,666 out of this colossal sum of more than $28,000,000,000 would have remained in this country. One year's interest at 3 per cent on this amount would have exceeded the subsidy proposed in the pending bill. In other words, if we pay the subsidy and thereby build up a strong merchant marine, the vast sums heretofore paid to foreigners will remain at home to enrich our own people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. It occurred to me that we ought to have an estimate as to what it would have cost us to maintain the merchant marine by subsidy during the one hundred and odd years to which the Senator referred.

Mr. RANSDELL. If we had just carried out the wise shipping policy with which our forefathers started in 1789, the discriminating-duty policy under which we built up our merchant marine from nothing during that crucial year of our history, when we were carrying less than 9 per cent, so that five years thereafter we were carrying 90 per cent and also carrying much of the commerce of other countries—if that policy, sir, could have been kept up consistently, if we had not been hoodwinked by Great Britain into making treaties with her which were favorable to her and hurtful to us, if our old-time shipping policy could have prevailed, we would have carried continuously 90 per cent of our commerce or certainly more than three-fourths of it. I have just presented figures to show that from 1779 to 1860 we carried 80 per cent of our foreign commerce in our American ships. If we had continued to do that, we would have been better off, but we got away from that old policy, the Civil War intervened and the American merchant marine was destroyed during that war, and we have never had the vision to go back to the old policy. But for that, sir, we would have had a merchant marine without a subsidy.

OLD POLICY IS PREFERABLE.

The point I have tried to make is that I prefer the old policy, but we have been unable to go back to it. We adopted a discriminating duty in 1914 and it is in effect yet. In 1920 we adopted a provision in the shipping act of that year, section 34, directing, in the most positive manner, the President of the United States to denounce those treaties and go to the discriminating duty. He has not done it. Mr. Wilson did not do it and Mr. Harding has not done it. My contention is that the subsidy is the only thing practical that is offered. If the Senator can devise any reasonable method of relief so we can go to that discriminating-duty policy, I shall for one be glad to have it. I am only taking the subsidy because it is the best thing I know of and because other countries have taken it and made a success of it.

Mr. BORAH. That is a proposition about which the Senator and I disagree, as to other countries making a success of it through a subsidy.

Mr. RANSDELL. We may disagree on that just as we are likely to do as to many things, but I have argued that fully and I am not going to go into it again. The Senator did not do me the honor of listening to that portion of my address, and I have already occupied so much time of the Senate I do not care to repeat; but I will ask him to read my speech, and, if he does so, I think he will find that a great deal of success has come to other countries from the subsidy policy.

Mr. BORAH. I read the speech which the Senator delivered before the termination of a recent session, from which I derived a great deal of information.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am very glad, indeed, to know that; and I assure the Senator from Idaho that I appreciate his statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. RANSDELL. I will yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to do more than to ask a question. I wish to correct a mistake which I think the Senator from Louisiana has made; and it is a mistake which I know he would not want to make.

The Senator states that our great merchant marine was built up under discriminating duties prior to the Civil War, beginning almost with the commencement of our history. The historical facts are these: In our early history the merchant marine of the world was built up or was attempted to be built up by various kinds of discriminating duties; but in 1832, while Andrew Jackson was the President of the Republic, a law was passed which abolished all discriminating duties as against any nation which did not discriminate against us. It was thereafter, between 1832 and 1859, when there were no discriminating duties at all, that America made the greatest strides in building up her merchant marine. That merchant marine became so great, indeed, that it controlled nearly all of our overseas business. The Senator from Louisiana made the statement that our merchant marine before the Civil War was built up by reason of discriminating duties. He is in error in that respect. After 1832 there were no discriminating duties; and it was after 1832 that the great volume of our merchant marine was built up.

Mr. RANSDELL. There was a long period, from 1789 to 1832, a period of 43 years, which were the real halcyon days of the American merchant marine. During all that long period of 43 years, as I recall history—I have not read it for some time—we imposed discriminating duties.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. RANSDELL. Wait a moment; the Senator will pardon me. Beyond question during that period we pursued the policy of discriminating duties. I recall the law to which the Senator refers which was passed under President Jackson.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was passed in 1832.

Mr. RANSDELL. But a wonderful impetus had been given to our merchant marine under the discriminating duty act, which was passed, if I recall correctly, in July, 1789. From the very beginning of our Government we discriminated, and we placed our flag on every sea in the world. During that 43 years our merchant marine became very strong. As the result of some treaty arrangements and the law of 1832, to which the Senator refers, we did not discriminate thereafter; but we did considerable to aid our shipping. Does not the Senator from Tennessee remember the practical subsidy which was given to the Collins Line and to other lines of those days, to which we paid very large sums?

Mr. McKELLAR. Out of which there grew a great scandal.

Mr. RANSDELL. There may have been a scandal; suppose there was; there have been many scandals in the history of the world, but we did aid our merchant marine very materially down to the very time of the Civil War. We either imposed discriminating duties or we granted mail subventions; at any rate, we always helped our merchant marine.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to add by way of correcting what I think is an error on his part, the Senator will recall that after the War of the Revolution we were in a constant struggle with Great Britain for trade. Then war came on between Great Britain and France, in which the United States became very nearly involved, all of which sufficed almost to blot our shipping off the seas. Then came the War of 1812, when our shipping was driven off the seas, and from that time until 1832, instead of the American merchant marine being built up it was in the greatest confusion and we were fighting for our life on the seas. It was only after 1832, when Andrew Jackson secured the passage of the law against discriminating duties, that our merchant marine really became a vital, splendid, living thing. It increased until the Civil War, when our shipping was again run off the seas, and it has never since that time come back.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Tennessee thinks he has stated the historical aspect of the case correctly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely refer the Senator from Louisiana to history.

Mr. RANSDELL. Very well, I shall be very glad to look up the matter, but I do not agree with the Senator's historical statement at all. I think we had a wonderful merchant marine before 1832, and I should like the Senator to examine some of the subsidy acts which were passed by our great Democratic Congresses prior to 1859 up to the time of the Civil War. Should he do so, he will see that a great deal was done to aid the American merchant marine during those days.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it was not done by direct subsidies.

Mr. RANSDELL. I do not know what the Senator may call what was done during that time, but the aids provided were certainly very closely akin to subsidies. To me—

That which we call a rose,
By any other name would smell as sweet.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator that we ought to do everything in our power to build up a merchant marine in this country; I am just as much in favor of that as is he. The difference arises from the fact that he favors a direct cash subsidy, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, from the taxes of the people, to the Merchant Marine Trust, while I am opposed to that form of aid.

LITTLE INTEREST FOR MANY YEARS.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am glad to know the Senator from Tennessee wishes to build up an American merchant marine. We are together to that extent, anyway. The American Congress for many years has not evinced any real interest in the American merchant marine; but there is one thing certain, namely, that we have this big asset, and I think we ought to do something with it. The Senator from Tennessee proposes to turn it over as a side issue to the Department of Commerce, if I interpret his remarks correctly. I do not want to do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Senator from Louisiana has read my remarks, or he would have understood very differently.

Mr. RANSDELL. I do not know what the Senator would do, for his remarks and those of other Senators on the subject, and their reports, are so absolutely hazy, so difficult to understand, that I do not know what they want.

If Senators who oppose the pending bill would come here with a clean-cut substitute for it and state their proposals specifically and clearly and definitely, so that a child of 10 years would understand them, I should like to see them do it, for I am confronted with the difficult problem of letting our ships go to the demnition bow-wows or of voting for the passage of the pending measure.

I do not like subsidies any more than do others, but I can not overlook the fact that in the history of this country we have given what are substantially a great many subsidies. Will the Senator please tell me what but a subsidy were our tremendous donations to the railroads of 200,000,000 acres of land, worth from five to ten billion dollars, and probably as much additional given by the States and counties and municipalities in the way of taxes, bonds, and all kinds of exemptions? What were those if not subsidies? What is the aid which has recently been given by the National Government to highways, amounting to over $500,000,000 in the last six years, and more contributed by the States and local municipalities, amounting in all to over a billion dollars? What is that, if you please, but a subsidy? What is the $479,000,000 we gave to the Panama Canal in order that transportation might be cheapened between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans but a subsidy to world transportation? What is the $1,036,000,000 we have given to the waterways of this country during our national life in order to cheapen and better transportation facilities? What is that but a subsidy? What is the protective tariff, which at least the Republican side of the Chamber stands for, but a subsidy? What is a subsidy but an aid?

The Republicans stand for a protection to our industries through the tariff law, and many a Democrat stands for sufficient aid through the tariff law to equalize the cost of production at home with the cost of production abroad. I do not hesitate to say that I am one of those who stand for measures to bring about an equality in production costs at home and abroad, even if they have to be provided in a bill which is called a protective tariff bill. What are all those matters but aid? Senators object to the pending bill because it is called a "subsidy" measure, but they have given all kinds of aid in the various directions I have indicated. They are afraid, however, to vote for this bill because it is denominated or designated a "subsidy" measure.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator is quite correct in his recounting of the number of subsidies which have been granted. I think they may all be termed subsidies. It is a study of the effect of those subsidies upon American taxpayers that has led me to believe that subsidies are a great evil.

MANY INDORSE THE SHIP BILL.

Mr. RANSDELL. Now, Mr. President, to proceed—and I have already occupied a great deal of time—the Senator from Wisconsin placed in the RECORD a list of organizations which he said were opposed to the pending bill. I wish to have inserted in the RECORD without reading a list of organizations which are just as strongly in favor of the bill. There are two sides to this question. Our great American electorate and citizenry like to take the opposite sides of many questions. There are, in my judgment, a great many more favoring this bill than are opposed to it. In connection with the list which I shall print in the RECORD I particularly call the attention of Senators to the resolution passed in the city of New Orleans on the 18th of last October by the American Legion, the boys of the Army who went overseas to fight. Some of them were anxious to get ships when we did not have any and had to have all our boys carried over to save the world for democracy in ships of foreign nations. I ask unanimous consent to insert the list in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICAN BUSINESS AND THE SHIPPING BILL.

Representative organizations of American merchants, manufacturers, and other men of business headed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States have studied the shipping subsidy bill and give their endorsement to the bill or the constructive maritime policies of President Harding. The national chamber, after two referenda of its great membership throughout the country—business men of both political parties—states that it "repeats its recommendation in favor of the aid from the Government which is essential to the maintenance of a privately owned merchant marine. It accordingly asks that Congress expedite consideration of legislation which has in view the accomplishment of these purposes."

The American Bankers' Association at its annual meeting in October declared that "our merchant marine should be developed through individual initiative and not be placed under Government management. We approve the efforts of the President of the United States to bring about such a development."

Business men most familiar with the export trade spoke through the American Manufacturers' Export Association at its October annual meeting, declaring that "we approve the constructive policy of President Harding on the subject of the American merchant marine and pledge ourselves to devote our best energies to securing action along the progressive lines advocated by the President."

Similar action has been taken by many other national organizations of business men and also by the chambers of commerce and boards of trade of all of the larger cities of the United States and of the more important cities and towns in all sections north, south, east, and west. Support has been notably strong in the West and South through the Mississippi Valley Association, the Wisconsin Deep Waterways Commission, and the Iowa Manufacturers' Association, and boards of trade and chambers of commerce of Milwaukee, St. Paul, Omaha, Des Moines, Charleston, Mobile, New Orleans, and Galveston. It is stated that in the entire country not one commercial organization that has considered the shipping bill has failed to approve the bill or the principles embodied in it. A list of commercial bodies that have acted favorably on the shipping legislation follows:

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
American Manufacturers' Export Association.
American Bankers' Association.
Bankers' Association for Foreign Trade.
National Association of Manufacturers.
Millers' National Federation.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
National Industrial Traffic League.
Mississippi Valley Association.
Middle West Merchant Marine Association.
Investment Bankers' Association of America.
Southwestern Millers' Association.

ALABAMA.

Mobile Chamber of Commerce.
Mobile Clearing House.

CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.
San Francisco Foreign Trade Club.
California Development Association.
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
Los Angeles Association of Jobbers.
Los Angeles World's Traders.
San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

FLORIDA.

Tampa Board of Trade.
Pensacola Chamber of Commerce.
Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce.
St. Augustine Chamber of Commerce.
Miami Chamber of Commerce.

GEORGIA.

Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.
Savannah Board of Trade.
Columbus Chamber of Commerce.
Macon Chamber of Commerce.

ILLINOIS.

Illinois State Chamber of Commerce.
Illinois Manufacturers' Association.
Institute of American Meat Packers, Chicago.
Chicago Association of Commerce.
Chicago Board of Trade.
Chicago World Trade Club.
Decatur Association of Commerce.
Cairo (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.
East St. Louis (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce.

INDIANA.

Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce.

IOWA.

Iowa State Chamber of Commerce.
Iowa Manufacturers' Association.
Des Moines Chamber of Commerce.
Dubuque Chamber of Commerce.
Council Bluffs Chamber of Commerce.
Davenport Chamber of Commerce.
Sioux City Chamber of Commerce.
Boone Chamber of Commerce.
Greater Des Moines Committee.
Cedar Falls Commercial Club.
Fort Dodge Commercial Club.

KANSAS.

Kansas Millers' Club.
Kansas City Chamber of Commerce.
Topeka Chamber of Commerce.
Wichita Chamber of Commerce.
Atchison Chamber of Commerce.
Junction City Chamber of Commerce.
Salina Chamber of Commerce.
Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce.

KENTUCKY.

Louisville Board of Trade.
Louisville Hardware Club.

LOUISIANA.

New Orleans Association of Commerce.
New Orleans Board of Trade.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Boston Maritime Association of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

MICHIGAN.

Detroit Board of Commerce.
Battle Creek Chamber of Commerce.

MINNESOTA.

Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association.
Minnesota Deep-Water-Ways Association.
St. Paul Association.
St. Paul Lions' Club.
Duluth Chamber of Commerce.
Duluth Commercial Club.
Hibbing Commercial Club.
Curtis Falls Commercial Club.
Virginia Chamber of Commerce.
Commercial Club of Alexandria.
Red Wing Chamber of Commerce.

MISSOURI.

St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.
Manufacturers and Merchants' Association, St. Louis.
Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis.
Kansas City Chamber of Commerce.
Kansas City Board of Trade.
St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce.

MONTANA.

Butte Chamber of Commerce.

NEBRASKA.

Nebraska Millers' Association.
Nebraska Manufacturers' Association.
Nebraska Chamber of Commerce.
Omaha Chamber of Commerce.
Rotary Club of Omaha.
Lincoln Chamber of Commerce.
Columbus Chamber of Commerce.
Alliance Chamber of Commerce.
Falls City Chamber of Commerce.
Hastings Chamber of Commerce.

NEW YORK.

Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.
New York Board of Trade and Transportation.
The Maritime Association of the Port of New York.
Merchants' Association of New York.
American Marine Association.
Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
National Board of Steam Navigation.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Fayetteville Chamber of Commerce.
Greensboro Chamber of Commerce.
Charlotte Chamber of Commerce.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Minot Association of Commerce.
Bismarck Chamber of Commerce.
Jamestown Chamber of Commerce.
Grand Forks Commercial Club.

OHIO.

Cleveland Chamber of Commerce.
Cleveland Chamber of Industry.
Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce.
Cincinnati Foreign Trade Association.
Toledo Chamber of Commerce.
Columbus Chamber of Commerce.
Columbus Manufacturers and Jobbers' Association.
Lakewood Chamber of Commerce.

OREGON.

Portland Chamber of Commerce.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Philadelphia Bourse.
Philadelphia Board of Trade.
Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.
Maritime Exchange, Philadelphia.
Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia.
York Traffic Club.
York Manufacturers' Association.
Lancaster Chamber of Commerce.
Reading Chamber of Commerce.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Greenville Chamber of Commerce.
Charleston Chamber of Commerce.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Huron Chamber of Commerce.
Huron Commercial Club.
Aberdeen Commercial Club.
Watertown Chamber of Commerce.
Yankton Chamber of Commerce.

TENNESSEE.

Memphis Chamber of Commerce.

TEXAS.

Houston Cotton Exchange and Board of Trade.
Galveston Commercial Association.
Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

UTAH.

Salt Lake City Chamber of Commerce.
Salt Lake City Commercial Club.
Ogden Chamber of Commerce.

VIRGINIA.

Richmond (Va.) Chamber of Commerce.
Norfolk Chamber of Commerce.
Norfolk Foreign Trade Club.
Newport News Chamber of Commerce.
Hampton Roads Maritime Exchange.
Hampton Roads Foreign Trade Club.

WASHINGTON.

Seattle Chamber of Commerce.
Tacoma Chamber of Commerce.
Olympia Chamber of Commerce.
Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce.
Everett Chamber of Commerce.
Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
Hoquiam Chamber of Commerce.
Bellingham Chamber of Commerce.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Huntington Chamber of Commerce.

WISCONSIN.

Wisconsin Deep-Water-Ways Association.
Milwaukee Association of Commerce.
Superior Civic Association.
Madison Chamber of Commerce.
Ashland Chamber of Commerce.
Fond du Lac Association of Commerce.

ORGANIZED MARINE WORKERS WHO ARE IN FAVOR OF THE PENDING SHIPPING BILL.

Neptune Association of Licensed Masters and Mates, 6,000.
United Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, 3,000.
United Radio Telegraphers, 2,500.
Ocean Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 80, 3,500.
Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 33 (several thousand).
Fidelity Marine Association (restricted to captains and first mates), several thousand.
National Board of Steam Navigation.
American Society of Marine Engineers.
Licensed Tugmen's Association.
International Longshoreman's Association.

Resolutions favoring the shipping bill adopted at the American Legion convention, New Orleans, October 16–20, 1922:

To maintain our ratio 5–5–3 it is necessary to have a sufficient merchant marine. The departments of the Navy and merchant marine should be closely connected so that both could be operated in harmony with one another at a moment's notice. In order that a merchant marine may be aided, to economize on our naval expenses, and to train our regular naval personnel on combatant ships, naval auxiliary vessels should, as far as possible, be chartered from well established merchant lines.

We are heartily in favor of the ship subsidy bill as a means to establish our trade routes. If carried out, the ship subsidy bill will automatically increase the available personnel of the Navy, add materially to the efficiency and strength of the Navy, and at the same time be a great aid to all business throughout the United States.

Since the earliest days of history the control of the trade routes has been a secret of the growth and greatness of all world power, and this country, because of the paltry sum necessary to carry out the requirements of the ship subsidy bill, must not take the place of a decadent nation.

Whereas it appears that foreigners are in command of American ships in preference to Americans, particularly those operated under the United States Shipping Board: Therefore be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we urge that the national legislative committee take necessary steps to petition Congress and the Shipping Board to give preference to American citizens in securing officers and men for all ships operated by the United States Shipping Board; and be it further

Resolved, That the posts of the American Legion located at all shipping points be urged to take an especial interest in the affairs of the American merchant marine and the interests of the American seamen.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish to read a little parable to the Senate. I am not its author; one of my friends prepared it for me, but it seems to me so apropos that I should like Senators to listen to it if I may have their attention:

A certain farmer with his five sons lived on an island where they raised wheat. They owned a boat big enough to carry the wheat to the mainland market. This boat should have cost not more than

$2,000, but was bought at a time when there were few to be had and it cost them $10,000. There were many boats now, and its market value had dropped to about $1,000—

Note the parity with our present situation.

Mr. BORAH. I can imagine who wrote that.

Mr. RANSDELL. To continue the parable—

The question arose in the family, What should be done about it? The boat was still in excellent condition, but it would cost $1,100 a year to operate it, and mainland boats would carry the grain for $1,000 a year. One of the sons argued that since the other boats would charge $100 less freight, it was obviously bad business to try to compete. He was for charging off the boat to profit and loss and letting it rot. Another believed the boat could be run as cheaply as mainland boats, but he could not produce any figures to show it—

We have had a great deal of that same sort of talk here—

An agent from the mainland came over and tried various arguments and schemes to induce the family to get rid of the boat, and pretty nearly succeeded—

Senators here have surely read a lot of that kind of stuff from "mainland" representatives in this country, camouflaged, of course, but I "jumped" on them so hard here last July on account of their direct accusations against us that they let up on that part of it, although I am satisfied they have been carrying on their attacks all the same—

But the old farmer after hearing all sides of the question called a family council. He said to the boys, "It is true that we paid a high price for the boat and that it can never yield an interest return on the investment—

No more can our Government shipping expenditures yield an interest return—

"but we do own the craft. So the best thing to do is to write off its cost and start afresh. It is true that it will cost $1,100 a year to operate it; but, after all, we own everything necessary to keep it going. It is also true that we can get the same service from the mainland for $1,000. But if we run our boat we can keep that $1,000 in the family, and as a family we will be out only the $100 difference on the cost of shipping our wheat. As a matter of fact, the whole $1,100 will be coming right back to us."

I have just shown you that we have paid out $28,000,000,000 to these foreigners during the last 100 years for carrying our commerce, insurance charges, brokerage, and other things connected with it.

He went on to say that they nearly went broke one year when they had no boat and there was trouble over on the mainland.

SHIP SHORTAGE OF 1914 RECALLED.

I should like my friend from Tennessee, whose constituents nearly went broke because they could not ship their cotton in 1914——

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am not going to yield now. I will yield to the Senator later as much as he pleases.

Mr. McKELLAR. All right. I want to tell the Senator something about my constituents and their experience with the Shipping Board.

Mr. RANSDELL. I am not going to let the Senator break in on my speech. He took several hours here, and I want him to take all he wants in his own time; but this is my time now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, if the Senator will not yield I will not say what I had in mind.

Mr. RANSDELL. I was a cotton planter that year, too, and the Senator had a lot of cotton-planter friends, and I know that cotton went down to 5 cents a pound because we did not have any vessels in which to ship it. There was a good deal of demand for it, and if we had just had the ships it would not have gone down that way. That was in the fall of 1914.

There was trouble over on the mainland, and all their shipping was in use carrying soldiers and supplies, and there was none available to run to the island. Another time he wanted a lot of lumber to build a barn. Lumber was cheap on a neighboring island, but having no boat he had to buy it on the mainland at double prices.

The old man's view prevailed. By unanimous vote the family agreed to run their own boat, subsidize it for $100 a year, and thereby save $900 to the family coffers.

Now, are we going to take the old man's advice—use our own ships and put the freight charges in the national pocket, or are we going to quit in the middle of the job and let our competitors ship all that freight money out of the country?

Senators, that is a nice little parable. I hope you will read it carefully, and if it has any fallacies about it that you will pick them apart.

Mr. BORAH. I should be glad to know the author of it, and then I would have more respect for it.

Mr. RANSDELL. He is a very good man, and he is not connected with the Shipping Board. I see what the Senator is driving at. He has no connection with the Shipping Board. The Shipping Board does not know that there is such a document as that which is in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will he be one of the beneficiaries of the Board.

Mr. RANSDELL. Absolutely not. He is an official of this Government of high rank but not connected with the Shipping subsidy?

NATIONAL DEFENSE THE CRUCIAL POINT.

Now, Senators, I come to the crucial point of this debate, in my judgment. It is not going to be very long. I will not tire you much longer. There is one thing that has not been emphasized much here yet, and that is, What position does our merchant marine occupy in connection with our national defense? Can we maintain a Navy that will enable us to hold our proper place among the naval powers of the world unless we build up and maintain a strong merchant marine? I say "no," and I am going to give you my reasons for it in as clear language as I can.

Situated geographically as we are our national defense rests upon our sea power. The only means of applying our power to influence the action of those who might seek to do us injury is by way of the sea. Bear in mind, Senators, that with the exception of Canada and its few millions to the north, and Mexico with its few millions to the south, all of our intercourse with mankind is by way of the sea. We must carry on our great commerce with the world in ocean-going vessels, except to a limited degree with Canada and Mexico. The only means of insuring our prosperity is through our ability to sell to the rest of the world the surplus products that we can not ourselves consume, and this we can not do except by way of the sea.

We have to-day a foreign trade that has increased by leaps and bounds in the last 10 years. Our foreign trade in 1914 was about $4,000,000,000. In 1920 it was $13,000,000,000, with exports of over $7,000,000,000. We American people are engaged in a foreign trade that is the greatest business in the history of the world, and history shows that such a trade can not long endure without adequate means to maintain and protect it.

War itself is but an ultimate form of economic competition, and for all great wars of the past it is not difficult to trace a basic cause in the friction and bitterness engendered by economic conditions that involve the question of trade. This was preeminently true in regard to the late World War.

A great power, to be truly independent and free from commercial subserviency, needs a great merchant marine to carry its commerce. During peace, with the commercial organization and standards of life as they exist in our country, we must to-day have foreign trade. In order that we may not pay toll to foreign shipping and have our foreign trade at the mercy of competitors, we must have a fair share of our foreign commerce carried by our own merchant marine.

When war comes, and the entire military strength of the Nation is to be exerted, the Navy must draw vessels from the merchant marine for Navy use—cruisers, transports, supply ships of all kinds, and so forth. In addition, the merchant marine must continue the transportation of articles of commerce essential to the welfare of the people as a whole. When we organize for war the Navy and the merchant marine become practically one service administratively. During the World War 95 per cent of our merchant shipping was under Government control, particularly as to cargoes and routes.

As an addition to naval strength, the personnel of the merchant marine—a body of men with the sea habit—is a naval asset, whether in war it be employed on regular naval vessels, or merchant vessels converted to naval use, or whether it remains on merchant shipping for naval or merchant service. When we entered the World War practically our entire fleet had to devote itself to the training of raw recruits in the most elementary duties of the seamen, because we had no merchant reserve to call upon.

All great maritime nations have made provision in some way for taking merchant shipping into the naval service in time of war. This has taken the form of subsidies or subventions, direct or indirect, discriminating rates to further the growth of the merchant marine, and so forth. At least the merchant ships can be listed and classified and plans made for their transfer to the Navy. In 1898 we armed the few large passenger lines we had for distant scouting and general cruiser service. They did what they could, but due to lack of numbers Cervera's fleet cruised at liberty in the West Indies, and was discovered only after it had been in Santiago for some time. Other passenger and freight vessels were converted for blockade and patrol duty. Yachts, and even tugs, were armed and used for blockade and general duties devolving on small craft in war. In addition, there were hospital ships, transports, repair ships, and the entire service of supply—this with a war at our very doorstep, and against a power that was even worse off than we were.

VALUE OF MERCHANT CRUISERS IN WAR.

In the employment of converted merchant ships as cruisers many conditions may arise. Our Navy may be employed in protecting trade routes used by our merchant marine. It may be engaged in raiding the sea lanes used by the enemy, or denying him the use of them. Its operations may or may not lead to fleet actions. Our merchant marine may be carrying on

foreign trade, or it may be shut up in port. In any case, the Navy will be short of regular cruisers, and the converted merchantmen must fill the deficiency. As the regular Navy is reduced, the importance of the converted merchantmen increases. A large merchantman, converted to a fighting ship, may carry a battery formidable for a cruiser and have a great fuel endurance, and if there are no regular cruisers available for operations in a particular theater the converted merchantman becomes of prime importance there.

It would be impossible by agreement to prohibit or limit the use of merchant ships as converted vessels of war. Even without previous preparation, a vessel can be converted simply and quickly in about two weeks at a navy yard. The main items of purely military character needed are the guns, mounts, and ammunition, and these are generally in store.

Should navies become small by agreement, and remain so, nations that have funds available will seek to increase their naval strength by adaptation of their merchant shipping to purposes of war. Subventions are given to induce shipping companies to build with reference to war use, and at the same time to foster the growth of the merchant marine, as was done in the case of the Cunard line.

When our old cruisers are scrapped for age we will have only 10 cruisers of the *Omaha* class. It needs no argument to show that even with such assistance as can be given by destroyers, submarines, and a few aircraft carriers this number will not suffice in war. To supplement the deficiency it will be necessary to convert merchant vessels into auxiliary cruisers for the supply of the fleet, which will by so much reduce the merchant marine for commercial purposes.

Should all regular navies disappear, the large, fast, armed merchantman would be the most powerful fighting ship, and therefore the capital ship.

Secretary Denby said:

If we sank every ship of war in the world at this moment, Great Britain would rule the world beyond a question of doubt. Therefore, from a military standpoint, it seems to me that the creation of an American merchant marine is a vital necessity to our country.

Let me beg, Senators, that you pay close attention to those wise words of our Secretary of the Navy, that from the military standpoint alone a powerful merchant marine is essential to the safety of our country.

BRITAIN'S POWER FOUR TIMES OURS.

The following table brings the situation sharply in relief. The number and speeds of passenger vessels able to make 15 or more knots belonging to the United States, Great Britain, and Japan are tabulated below. I will not read all of them, but just a few of them. I find that the *Mauretania*, with a speed of 27 knots, belongs to Great Britain. We have no such vessel. The *Majestic*, with a speed of 26 knots, belongs to Great Britain. We have no such vessel. The *Leviathan*, with a speed of 25 knots, belongs to us. Great Britain has no counterpart of the *Leviathan*, but two vessels, the *Mauretania* and the *Majestic*, with a speed of 26 to 27 knots, respectively. The *Aquitania* belongs to Great Britain. She has a speed of 24 knots. The *Berengaria* and the *Olympic* belong to Great Britain, each of them with a speed of 23 knots. As an offset, we have one, the *H. F. Alexander*, with a speed of 23 knots; and so on down the list. I ask to have the balance of the table inserted, without reading.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speed.	Great Britain.		United States.		Japan.
	Number.	Name.	Number.	Name.	
					Number.
27 knots	1	Mauretania			
26 knots	1	Majestic			
25 knots			1	Leviathan	
24 knots	1	Aquitania			
23 knots	2	Berengaria and Olympic.	1	H. F. Alexander	
22 knots			2	Mount Vernon and Agamemnon.	
21 knots	2	Empress Asia and Empress Russia.			
20 knots	1	Empress France			
19 knots	1	Royal George	1	George Washington	1
18 knots	22		2	Resolute and Reliance (Panama flag).	
17 knots	40		19		5
16 knots	47		9		2
15 knots	76		15		15
Total	194		50		23

Mr. RANSDELL. From this it will be noted that Great Britain possesses 194 steel merchant steamers of seagoing charactertistics able to make 15 knots or more, the United States 50 vessels, and Japan 23. Each of that 194 is a potential auxiliary naval cruiser in time of war, and Great Britain has four times as many, practically, as we have. Consequently, in case of war, she would be substantially four times as strong as the United States.

Vessels over 25 years of age have been excluded, for whereas, if not nearly useless, they soon will be. It will readily be seen that Great Britain possesses four times as many fast passenger vessels as the United States. These can readily and quickly be converted into troop transports, scouts, commerce destroyers, and airplane carriers, for which in time of war every big nation would have immediate need. The possession of such ships enables a nation to keep its fighting forces at sea intact and not be compelled to detach units for other than fighting purposes. The possession of a big, fast seagoing merchant marine would enable this country greatly to hamper the foreign and seagoing commerce of an enemy and maintain an economic blockade in an efficient manner. The ability of Great Britain during the past war to accomplish this played a large part in the eventual strangulation of lines of supply into Germany. The comparative impotence of the United States would greatly hamper, if not indefinitely delay, the carrying out of the important naval strategy of any war in which we might be engaged.

Aside from the many auxiliary needs of the fleet, such as colliers, tankers, munition ships, repair ships, hospital ships, tenders, refrigerator ships, distilling ships, and so forth, any big nation at war in the future will find an urgent and enormous need for the transportation of scouting and fighting planes, possibly in vast numbers. Coast-defense planes will play hereafter as little part in modern war as coast-defense guns did during the last conflict. A nation in arms will have need for fast airplane carriers capable of great speeds and radius of action, carrying in their holds great numbers of airplanes for scouting, bombing, and fighting purposes. Certain ships of the passenger type will be peculiarly suited and readily convertible for these purposes. A nation in possession of such possible aircraft carriers will be able to take the offensive at sea without difficulty, and because of its far-flung battle line of air scouts be enabled to make its strategic and tactical dispositions to its own advantage, denying at the same time to the enemy information of the disposition, location, and size of the opposing fleets.

OUR SHIPS LACK THE SPEED.

With the exception of tankers and cargo carriers but few of our merchant vessels possess the requisites necessary to fit them for auxiliary service. Most of them lack speed sufficient for scouts or airplane carriers, while many of these same ships have insufficient radius of action for any duty they would probably be called upon to perform. It is not likely that this country will ever be at war with a power on this continent. Without bases in the area of probable operations great radius of action will be a sine qua non for our auxiliaries.

Neutral shipping may not be available to us for the transportation of the rubber, nitrates, manganese, and tin we are forced to import. Even if available the shipping will only be so at war-time prices. Bottoms enough we now possess, but they are inactive, and those not now considered worthless will soon be so through lack of use and care.

Personnel to man a great merchant fleet will come with the arrival of the ships themselves. In time of national peril we must have them, for the first operations are inevitably those at sea. During the last war the Navy of this country manned hundreds of ships, which should have been manned by sailormen taken or recruited from the merchant marine or a reserve. Without the possession of either class this country was suddenly forced to denude its fighting craft of men long trained to fight and place many of them upon vessels not destined to be combatant. Hundreds of thousands of green men were trained ashore and afloat, seriously handicapping the war vessels and rendering many of them incapable of taking part in a successful action. What our suddenly expanded Navy would have done without the buttress of the English Grand Fleet while we were using our seamen for the personnel of transports, cargo carriers, tankers, and other noncombatant ships can only be conjectured. Great Britain, on the other hand, with a large population long accustomed to the sea, either as merchantmen sailors or as fishermen, soon fell back upon a trained reserve. This is another cogent reason for a merchant marine.

When President Roosevelt in 1907 sent the United States Atlantic Fleet around the world, this fleet consisting only of 16 battleships, 6 destroyers—that went only as far as the Pa-

cific coast—and 3 auxiliary vessels, there were at that time only 5 United States colliers with which to fuel the fleet. To make this voyage possible we were dependent on the services of 50 colliers under foreign flag that supplied a total of 320,390 tons of coal, whereas our own colliers supplied over 26,418 tons. This was in a time of profound peace, when the fleet received a friendly welcome in every port and was able to purchase its food and supplies in every market. The impossibility of performing such a feat in time of war was apparent to none more than to President Roosevelt, who repeatedly called the attention of Congress to the military necessity of a merchant marine in support of the Navy.

It is estimated that in time of war to maintain our fleet in Philippine waters would require a minimum of 200 colliers and tankers for fuel alone. This leaves out of consideration vessels required for cargo ships, ammunition ships, repair ships, hospital ships, distilling ships, and so forth, that would be required to maintain the fleet itself, without directly supplementing its fighting strength, and which we should rely on obtaining only from our own merchant marine.

When we entered the World War in April, 1917, after that war had been in progress for nearly three years, we were confronted with the problem of transporting an army to Europe. Although there were ultimately transported 2,079,880 troops across the Atlantic, 1,027,300 of them were carried in foreign ships, principally British. By using our own battleships and pre-war transports we were able to transport only 76,812. Thanks to our use of the ex-German vessels, which, fortuitously, had sought refuge in our ports in 1914, there were transported 566,921. Ultimately, by the seizure of the Dutch vessels, which were also lying in our ports, we carried an additional 36,949. Privately owned American vessels transported 237,371, and the Shipping Board was able to transport 34,728, making a total of 925,781 eventually carried across by these various agencies that we were operating. Were it not for these peculiar circumstances, which we can not reasonably hope would ever be repeated, there would have been probably transported not more than 300,000 men, which would have been too few to have effected military results. We may well shudder to think what the neglect of our merchant marine might have meant to us and to the world.

When war breaks out every navy must turn at once to its merchant marine to supplement the fighting strength of its fleet. Large numbers of vessels are required at once as mine layers, mine sweepers, submarine tenders, destroyer tenders, patrol vessels, subchasers, and the like. In addition, as we have seen, an enormous transport service would be required if the operations were to be conducted overseas.

At the opening of the war there were in the Navy 344 vessels of all classes, with 75,074 men. When the war ended there were 2,202 vessels, with a total of 500,000 men. Eighteen months were required to assemble a force that should have been immediately available. Due to antisubmarine operations, the numbers of vessels in the British fleet was probably over double this number.

CRUISERS MOST SERIOUS MATTER.

But the situation of the United States as affects the national defense is most serious, when we consider the question of cruisers. Of modern cruisers capable of making 27 knots or better the United States has none, Great Britain has 44, and Japan has 10. Of those building or projected, the United States has 10, Great Britain 4, and Japan 15.

When we consider that Great Britain has, in addition, 194 modern passenger vessels capable of making 15 knots or better, all of which are capable of transformation into cruisers, while the United States has only 50, we at once see how fallacious is our estimate of equality of naval strength with Great Britain. If we consider the great passenger vessels of 18 knots or above, which would be capable of overtaking and destroying 99 per cent of the merchant ships afloat, we see that Great Britain has 31, where we have but 7. In addition, the naval bases which Great Britain has established all over the world, providing fuel and repair facilities, gives her great merchant fleet a mobility that none of our ships could enjoy.

The object of a navy in time of war is to gain control of the sea in order that one's transportation may proceed uninterrupted while that of the enemy is immobilized. To obtain this control it is necessary to fight for it and destroy the enemy's offensive power. But once command of the sea is achieved, it is necessary to have a very large force of cruisers in order to exercise that control. There is no military object to be gained in the destruction of the enemy's fleet if we are not prepared to reap the fruits of the victory by driving his merchant fleet from the ocean. It is not probable that we will ever have cruisers enough to accomplish this end, so our only recourse is to have at hand sufficient fast merchant ships on which to draw in time of war to supplement our cruiser force so that the sea may be made safe for our trade. What other guaranty have we that our vast foreign trade in which we are engaged—the greatest in the history of the world—shall not collapse in time of war. For if we are not able to drive the enemy's cruisers off the sea the billions of exports and imports, which are the lifeblood of the Nation, will be lost by us to the enemy.

The ship subsidy bill is a plant of national defense insurance. It hurts no interests that are our interests. What we pay to foreigners for carrying our freight is nothing more or less than a subsidy to the foreigner. Why pay him and deny our own people? The powerful interests that are seeking to dissuade the United States from maintaining a merchant marine are playing their own game. They are not seeking our welfare but their own. In time of war they would be found ranged alongside our enemies. At a stupendous cost this merchant marine was constructed. If it is not maintained, another fleet, at extravagant cost, must be constructed sooner or later. But the advantage of maintaining the fleet that we have and not waiting for war to build another is that, while adding to our national prosperity, we are providing a national insurance against future disaster and possible defeat.

Mr. President and Senators, I thank you for your patient attention to me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, bearing upon the proposition suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], I want to call attention to page 124, volume 1, of the hearings where is set forth the report of a survey of the Shipping Board's people with reference to the differential in wage and subsistence cost between American and foreign vessels. Then there will be found the tables on page 167 to which I cited the Senator from Ohio a moment ago.

On page 458 of the hearings will be found a statement of wages in national currency. This shows the wages on Shipping Board vessels, wages on privately owned vessels, and wages on British, Japanese, French, Spanish, Italian, and German ships.

Then on page 161 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 24 of the last session will be found several statements with reference to various ships, showing the wages paid on American and British ships, and so on.

I understand that these tables were prepared by the Shipping Board people and they are brought right up to date, and that they are taken from the actual pay rolls of the vessels coming into our ports at the close of their voyages. I think they will furnish just as definite information to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senate with reference to wages paid crews on ships as can be found.

I want to call attention to the fact that it will be found from the tables referred to that not all the difference, but the great difference, in the pay of the crews of British ships and American ships comes from the difference in pay of the licensed officers of the ships. For instance, from the table it is found that the licensed officers of an American ship are paid $1,390 a month in the aggregate, and the licensed officers of a British ship are paid $746.70 a month in the aggregate. There is a difference against the American ship of $643.30 a month, or for the year a difference against the American ship in operation of $7,719.60.

Mr. McKELLAR. In reply to the statement just made by the Senator from Washington it seems that the principal difference in the cost of labor is in the cost of the labor of the officers of the ships. That could be obviated by the Congress itself if it so desired without interfering with the general labor at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does the Senator mean that Congress should reduce the pay of officers on American ships?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so. It seems to me that $16,680 a year is a pretty good salary for an officer on a ship. It is more than twice as much as a Senator gets and more than the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States gets. These salaries of the licensed officers should not be included in estimating cost of labor on our ships. I take it that the $35,000-a-year chief of operations felt he must be liberal in fixing the salaries of the licensed officers. All of which goes to show how easy it is to be liberal with the taxpayers' money. No wonder the present Shipping Board is confessing that it can do nothing but lose money on our shipping operations.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the motion which is now before the Senate, as I understand, is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to displace the ship subsidy bill by the bill which he has introduced with reference to agricultural legislation. I want to address myself briefly to the motion, but before I do so I am going to digress for a moment to consider

the last argument presented by the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] that the ship subsidy proposition is, in fact, another phase of preparedness and that the necessity for greater preparedness is an unanswerable argument for the building up of a merchant marine at the expense of the American taxpayer. It would seem that the strongest argument they have to present is that we prepare at once and hastily for war.

If that be true and if that is the strongest argument in favor of it, then the ship subsidy ought to be able to wait until we can deal with another interest in this country which can not very well wait. I observe in the President's message delivered to the Congress a few days since this paragraph, which ought to dispel the increasing alarm of the Senator from Louisiana:

> I bring you no apprehension of war. The world is abhorrent of it, and our own relations are not only free from every threatening cloud but we have contributed our larger influence toward making armed conflict less likely.

Now imagine, Mr. President, the dire distress of the advocates of subsidies, arguing it on the basis of preparedness, in the face of that message from the Chief Executive and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. "No cloud in the sky; no threat anywhere." In fact, while it was assuring, it was not necessary for the President to tell us that. He only repeated what is apparent to all who observe the present situation. And yet the closing appeal of those arguing for the ship subsidy is that we must prepare for war.

I read another sentence from the message of the Chief Executive:

> The four-power pact, which abolishes every probability of war on the Pacific, has brought new confidence in a maintained peace, and I can well believe it might be made a model for like assurances wherever in the world any common interests are concerned.

The four-power pact was a pact offered by the President and his advisers to insure peace on the Pacific. Although it has not yet been ratified, we are told that its influence has been such that peace has preceded the ratification of the treaty and that the Pacific, from whence it was supposed some threatenings of difficulty were to be heard, is now in a peaceful status. Everything is peaceful, the war clouds have been chased out of the sky, and still millions more must be hurriedly put upon the taxpayer to make ready for war.

Where is the necessity, Mr. President, for going further into the Treasury of the United States upon the question of preparedness? Is there danger from Germany, which is slithering down day by day to deeper ruin and misery? Is there danger from Russia? Is there danger from England, from France, from Japan? From what source comes the menace that there should be heard here in the Senate Chamber day after day and from the rostrum throughout the country week after week this cry of preparedness? Tax the American people a little more. Lay on an additional burden. War is imminent. It occurs to me, Mr. President, that it has reached a point of sublime absurdity. If the gentlemen who are arguing it do not think so they had better present it again in the coming campaign to the American voter, who is already overburdened with unbearable taxes.

Let me call your attention to the fact that this year, according to the Budget presented, we are to spend about $300,000,000 on the Navy. Is it necessary to go beyond that, in view of the fact, as the President tells us, that there is no threatening cloud anywhere? In 1914 we expended less than $170,000,000 upon the Navy. Now, four years after the World War, at a time when the whole world is in distress and overburdened with taxes, when the real disturbance is not that of war between nations but war between peoples and governments on account of oppression from fearful burdens of debt, we are expending $300,000,000 upon the Navy. We are told, in addition to that, that the just argument for a departure from our national policy in granting subsidies to ships is to increase our preparedness. While we are expending $300,000,000 this year for the Navy we are expending $24,876,000 for agriculture.

How long, Mr. President, can we continue that kind of program? I advise my friends, in all seriousness, that if this subsidy proposition can not be sustained upon the theory that it is to aid American business, American agriculture, to aid in the restoration of those activities which are absolutely essential to the economic life of the Nation, it had better be abandoned. We shall expend this year, Mr. President, for war purposes, $2,650,000,000; for agriculture, $24,876,000; for the public health, $15,877,000; for promotion of education, $10,151,000; for labor interests, $4,718.00; to study the causes of and the remedy for war, not one cent.

However, it was not my purpose, Mr. President, to do other than to refer briefly to the real merits and demerits of the measure to-day. Later, if the bill remains before the Senate, I shall discuss the merits.

I have stated a motion has been made to displace the pending bill and to take up another kind of legislation, designed to aid in some way the agricultural interests of the country.

The pending measure was withheld from consideration prior to the election. It was so withheld, as we all understood and as we all know, for the reason that it was thought unsafe and politically inexpedient to force it to a vote prior to the election. It seemed to be a matter of reluctance upon the part of the other body to vote upon the measure and to go home at once to see their constituents with reference to returning. Therefore, while the other House had ample time in which to consider the measure—much more time at their disposal than they gave to it when they did come to consider it—they passed it by until after the election. Now it is proposed, between the time when the election took place and the time in which the new Congress comes into power, to pass this measure; a thing which, to my mind, is not only unjust and unfair but, if one may consider it from the other standpoint, politically most inexpedient.

If this measure can rest upon its merits, can stand the test of debate, if it is in accordance with the wisdom and the wishes of the American people, there will be ample time to pass it after the Congress has come into power which was elected after the ship subsidy question was made an issue in this country. I am aware, of course, that Congress has technically the right to legislate just the same between now and the 4th of March that it had previously, and upon all ordinary legislation and routine matters, of course, it would make no difference; but here is a measure which has to do with establishing, in a sense, a new policy in this country, a measure upon which there is a wide difference of opinion and one upon which the voters of the country feel deeply. Such a measure should await the new Congress. A great national policy should not be forced in a way that savors of bad faith with the people who have to pay the heavy taxes to maintain the policy. Aside, therefore, from the technical right to enact the measure, if we have the votes to do so, it is certainly inexpedient to force a change of policy in the country between the time the election is held and the new Congress is coming into power.

Mr. President, that is not the most serious feature of it. It is not only proposed to enact this legislation by a dying Congress, but it is proposed, in so far as it is in the power of those favoring the measure to do so, to take out of the hands of the new Congress or of any other Congresses the power to control the execution of the bill when it becomes a law. It is proposed to take from Congress the power to control by appropriations the money necessary to execute the law. Every method and means possible for a bill to carry has been written into the pending measure to make it impossible or embarrassing for the future Congress in any sense to control its execution. It is not, therefore, alone the proposition of enacting such a measure, but the terms of the bill are such as to make it obnoxious, for the reason that it is an attempt to control the action of future Congresses. I now read a statement from the report of the committee, which is found upon pages 2 and 3, and which is as follows:

> The provision in the House requiring specific appropriations from the merchant-marine fund to be made annually by Congress has been stricken from the bill. This is vital to its success. One main object of the bill is to bring about the purchase by private parties of the ships owned by the Government. This will require capital, which must be secured from banks and those who are willing to invest in shipping securities. This can not be borrowed by proposed purchasers and operators of the ships if there is the least uncertainty of the payment of the compensation provided in the bill. By reason of the changing of the political complexion of Congress and because of the bitter opposition to aid of this kind to shipping, no man would loan his money upon security of this kind, and thus one of the great purposes of the bill would be defeated.

In other words, Mr. President, recognizing the opposition in this country to the bill, recognizing the opposition to the policy which it involves, and recognizing the possible change of political complexion, both without our party and within our party, after it comes into power on the 4th of March, it is stated that the right to control the appropriations incident to the bill is absolutely vital to its success; that, if possible, the power must be taken away from future Congresses. This is the most interesting confession I have ever seen recorded in the solemn archives of this body, "change in political complexion;" in other words, the people must not be permitted to change this sacred law, it must be put beyond the reach of the taxpayer. He is to be yoked to his task and only the merciful considera-

tion of those who are to receive the subsidy shall remove the yoke. A dying Congress is to fasten on the burden and the new Congress is not to be allowed to lift the burden.

I submit to my Republican friends upon this side of the Chamber, we have trifled with our 7,000,000 majority about as long as we ought to. In the short space of two years we have about dissipated a majority of 7,000,000. My friends, it takes two things to make a party: First, you may have your organization; but, secondly, it is absolutely necessary to have votes; and the program which it is now proposed to carry out, an attempt to put over a measure which it is conceded the next Congress in all probability will not enact, is about as inexpedient politically, aside from its injustice and its unwisdom, as anything I can well imagine.

It is not for me to advise those who have in hand the running of the party of which I am an humble member, but there are some things, Mr. President, so utterly plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, may see; and one of those things is that the passage of this measure between now and the 4th day of March will not settle the question at all and will arouse the already pronounced opposition to greater opposition. If the new Congress, which has been elected upon this issue, should pass its judgment upon this matter, the American people, recognizing the right of a majority to legislate, would in all probability accede to that judgement; but a dying Congress, a Congress elected upon another issue, undertaking to tie the hands of the incoming Congress, will not settle this question at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in a moment. I venture to say that if there shall be an extra session after the 4th of March, at that extra session, should this bill pass, there will be a bill to repeal it introduced before the extra session is 24 hours old.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator is in the highest degree possessed of intellectual integrity. I know that; I have known it for years and I am glad to know it; but is not the Senator unconsciously making a little misstatement there?

Mr. BORAH. Perhaps so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not the same thing, because if this bill is passed now under this accidental majority and the next Congress should by a majority repeal it, as it undoubtedly would, it would require a two-thirds majority to overcome the President's veto, and the President is committed to the measure.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator carried my argument a little further than I carried it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I carried it to the constitutional limit.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but what I said was that the passage of the bill at this time would not settle the question, for, whether we have votes enough to pass it or not, it would be a live issue here and a matter of agitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would be a live issue and a matter of agitation, but it would not be a live issue as a matter of legislation, for it would remain upon the statute books, because, although a majority might want to repeal it, they could not muster a two-thirds majority to overcome the President's veto.

Mr. BORAH. Of course the Senator is correct in his construction of the matter if he carries it to that extent, and as a matter of logic it must necessarily go to that extent. I concede that proposition.

But, Mr. President, another equally serious proposition in regard to this legislation at this time is this:

We have only until the 4th of March to pass the appropriation bills and to legislate on other subjects during the time when we are not actually considering appropriation bills. It is very clear that if this bill stays upon the calendar we are not going to have any time to consider as they ought to be considered other measures. We may pass through some hurried legislation with reference to farm credits or the agricultural interests, or with reference to transportation; but no one knows better than those who are dealing with those subjects that if we should give all the time between now and the 4th of March to those two subjects, which are absolutely essential to the economic life of this country during the next few years, we would not have sufficient time to deal with them effectually or properly.

There is no more intricate or difficult question with which to deal than that of rehabilitating the agricultural interests of this country. There is no more vexed or involved problem than that of providing sufficient and efficient transportation for this country; and yet while those two matters wait, pushed aside, we are hastening to pass a subsidy bill which will not in the least, in my opinion, as I shall undertake to show later, assist those whom a proper transportation system or a proper agricultural system would assist.

When are we going to legislate upon those two subjects? The President has told us that he does not want an extra session. Is it seriously proposed to take up practically all the time between now and the 4th of March to pass appropriation bills and a ship subsidy bill, and to let Congress stand adjourned until the 3d of next December and leave the farmers of this country in the situation in which they are now found? Why, my good friends, if you do that you will not have enough votes at the next election to count. Ship subsidy, whatever its merits or demerits may be, can wait. It will be just as beneficial to the people six months from now as it is now; and, notwithstanding the argument, not a dollar will be saved in the meantime with reference to the running of the ships by reason of its passage. The farmer, however, can not wait. The cropping time is coming. He must have his security, he must have his aid, he must have his outlook for better transportation, or the decrease in acreage in this country during the next year will be startling to the American people. Therefore, whatever the merits of this bill may be, it should be put aside until we can deal with those things which are immediate, imminent, and menacing if measures to deal with them are not perfected.

What is it that the American farmer just now needs? First of all, he needs to get to the seashore, to the ports, or to the markets. It is transportation by land which is now bothering the American farmer more than anything else.

I have here, I think, if I can put my hand upon it, a statement of something of the condition which confronts the farmers of the far West with reference to freight rates. There is no need of building ships under the present condition of affairs if it is impossible under the land transportation condition to reach the ships. In order to keep from freezing to death we are charged $202.50 for every 50-ton car of lump coal brought to us from Utah; that is, to Idaho from the near-by State of Utah. Seven hundred dollars is demanded for every car of binding twine shipped to us; $704 is demanded for every 40-ton car of wheat which leaves the station headed for Galveston—the seashore. Those are the conditions; and that, of course, is simply an indication of what the conditions are with which we ought to deal, if we can, and deal immediately.

The able Senator occupying the chair [Mr. CUMMINS in the chair] has given a vast amount of time to this subject of freight rates and railroad legislation; and no immediate, quick remedy seems to be in sight. It will take some time to deal with it; but we have bills pending relieving another situation with reference to the agricultural interest which ought to be taken up and considered.

The second thing which the farmer needs above all things is a market. After he reaches the seashore and after he has found his market there is an abundance of ships to carry it from the seashore to the markets. But where are the markets? There are now 22,000,000 gross tons of shipping lying idle, waiting to carry the products of the American farm or the products of the American producer to the markets if the markets can be found. It is not a want of transportation across the water; it is not a want of water carriage; it is inability to reach the seashore on account of freight rates and inability to find a market which is now distressing the country from one end of it to the other.

So, Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is only the part of expediency, the part of justice and of wisdom, to put aside this measure now, and take up the bill which is proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS.] If it is not satisfactory, it can be made so by discussion and debate or by substitution; but we ought to address ourselves to the question of legislating upon those subjects of farm credits and railroad transportation rather than to deal exclusively with a matter which ought not to come up at this session at all, and which, if it is to come up at any time, can just as well come up after the new Congress comes into power.

Mr. President, I said that the thing which the American farmer desires now to find is a market. It is not carrying capacity upon the water that is wanted. The trouble is not the inability to find shipping; it is the inability to find a market abroad and the inability to reach the farmer's own home market by reason of freight transportation. There is no reason which occurs to me why this measure should be pushed in ahead of this other legislation. Of course I would not be misunderstood for a moment as being in favor at any time of a ship subsidy; but, if I were in favor of it, it seems to me that I would be willing to let it go to a test before a Congress which was elected after the issue was raised and after we had

disposed of legislation which is far more imminent and far more necessary at the present juncture of affairs.

The farmer will soon be planting his crops, if he is going to plant at all. With his crops now rotting in the ground from last year's planting, with his potatoes rotting, with inability to find markets, with no assurance as to credit to carry him over, with no assurance as to transportation, what do you think the effect would be upon the farming interests of this country if we should adjourn upon the 4th of March without doing anything except imposing some additional taxes?

Later, Mr. President, I shall discuss the merits of the bill, if necessary; but this is all I desire to say at this time. I feel most sincerely that we ought to give all the time at our disposal from now until March 4 to relieving the agricultural conditions and to the vital problem of transportation. These matters are pressing. If relief is not had and speedily the loss, the widespread injury, will be almost incalculable. We have promised to deal with these matters and let us speedily and in good faith keep our pledge.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business for the day it recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. I suggest the hour of 12 o'clock because of the meeting of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its session to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] desires to address the Senate. Just a few minutes ago he went out after some documents and papers; and I think, in order to give him notice, I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	France	Lenroot	Robinson
Ball	Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Sheppard
Bayard	George	McKellar	Shortridge
Borah	Glass	McKinley	Simmons
Brookhart	Gooding	McLean	Smith
Broussard	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Harreld	Moses	Spencer
Cameron	Harris	Nelson	Stanley
Capper	Harrison	Nicholson	Sterling
Caraway	Heflin	Norris	Sutherland
Colt	Johnson	Overman	Swanson
Couzens	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Townsend
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Pepper	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Wadsworth
Dial	Keyes	Poindexter	Warren
Dillingham	King	Pomerene	Weller
Ernst	Ladd	Ransdell	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BROOKHART obtained the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has just hurried in, and he will excuse me a moment while I make one or two statements with reference to this motion, while he is arranging his data before proceeding.

I hope the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska will prevail. In saying that I do not mean to say that I am in favor of the bill reported by the Senator from Nebraska just as it is. I do not understand that the Senator from Nebraska insists that that bill shall pass without the change of a word or a sentence in it. I do believe that if an amendment can be offered to the bill which would better it in any respect the Senator from Nebraska would welcome such an amendment. I am in favor of taking the bill up because it brings the whole subject of agricultural finance before the Senate, and that is a subject of vital importance to-day.

When that bill is laid before the Senate, as I hope it will be, then it will be open to such modification and changes and to such discussion as will result, I believe, in legislation which will relieve the distressing conditions which prevail with reference to agriculture all over the country, and which is fairly well set forth in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture which has recently been submitted.

I therefore hope the motion will prevail, in order that this whole subject may come before the Senate now, and may be fully discussed and considered, with the prospect that legislation beneficial in character, and meeting the needs of the farmers of the country, will result before this session closes.

I wanted to say that, in explaining that while I shall vote for the motion to take up the bill as reported by the Senator from Nebraska, it does not follow that I shall support all the provisions of that bill, or shall not support amendments or modifications which may be suggested, which I believe the Senator himself would welcome.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will ask the Senator to permit an interruption for about three or four minutes. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] just explained his position, I want to explain mine; not that I think the country cares a particle about my position. On the 4th of March I am going out, and I rather thank God that I am.

Mr. President, I did not think it was within the power of human ingenuity to originate any sort of a bill to present to this body, while I was a member of it, for which my vote was asked in preference to the ship subsidy bill that I would not vote for; but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has accomplished the impossible. I think of all the bad things I know of, a ship subsidy bill is about the worst, and when I see a man who pretends to belong to the holy, sacred new party which is standing for special privileges to none and equal opportunities to all, and find him advocating a bill even worse than the ship subsidy while he is opposing the ship subsidy upon the ground that it is special privilege and a taxation of equal opportunity, I find myself in an awful sort of a fix.

For me, I could not imagine a worse position than being reduced to a condition of nonaction. I have always thought that the Scriptures were right about the neutral; he is the most contemptible creature in the world. A man ought to be on one side or he ought to be on the other. He ought to vote with God or he ought to vote with Mammon, and I find myself to-day where I am absolutely a neutral and self-contemptible.

Nobody who is a Democrat, nobody who believes in special privilege for none and equal opportunities for all, could vote for the ship subsidy bill, and nobody who believes that this is a Government of limited powers and delegated powers could vote for the Norris bill, which involves the idea that the Federal Government is to become a commission merchant at a possible percentage to deal in agricultural products, to buy and sell them, and an owner and operator of elevators and a warehouseman—mighty near as bad as—

> The bo'sun tight and the midshipmite,
> And the crew of the captain's gig.

The old Ocala platform which the Populist Party adopted 30 years ago in this country was an angel of light in comparison with the Norris bill. After nearly 30 years of public service I have the honor to say that I still believe that the best government in the world is the government which a man exercises over himself. I still have the honor to believe, with Thomas Jefferson, and even with George Washington, that the power of government over the individual and over business ought to be restricted; and I still believe with Thomas Jefferson—not to the extent to which he went, but to some extent, at any rate—that "the least-governed people is the best-governed people."

I would not want to live in a country where the State government under which I lived, much less the Federal Government, should be my commission merchant and my warehouseman and elevator dealer. Government is one thing; individual affairs constitute another thing. I never for one moment have surrendered to the idea that government has a right to carry on private business. I do not mean by that that I have not gone very far in the other direction during war times. Government has a right then to carry on a lot of things which hitherto have been called private business. I believe the Government has a right then to carry on a lot of quasi public business of every sort. But to put the Government in the pawnbroking business, to put the Government in the warehousing business, to put the Government in the elevator business, to put the Government out as a competitor against every man in the world engaged in any sort of business strikes me as an absolute prostitution of the purposes of all government.

Mr. President, government was not intended to be you and me. Government was intended to restrain you and me from transgressing against one another. Government was not intended to carry on the business of a nation. Government was to see that in carrying on the business of a nation justice and fair dealing and honor were maintained. I say honor, although, so far as I know, the idea that honor should be maintained in private business has never been suggested as a question of government regulation, but I believe in it. I believe, Mr. President, that the State or the municipality or the Federal Government or somebody ought to provide that whenever a man tells a lie in selling anything he ought to be subject to being sent to the penitentiary for having "got money under false

pretenses" when he told the lie. That is rather a new ground, too. But that is at least a Government regulation of private enterprise in order to bring about honesty between A and B and C and D in carrying on private enterprise.

But to prostitute the Government to being a pawnbroker, to being a commission merchant, to being an elevator owner or elevator seller or elevator warehouseman is a totally different thing. So far as I am concerned, I would just as soon live in Prussia as to live in any country, whether my own or any other, that undertook to say that the Government had the right to carry on with me every sort of business.

Mr. President, Senators may say that they are not contending that the Government has a right to carry on any sort of business or every sort of business; but if they say by law, as the Norris bill will say if it is ever enacted, that the Government has the right to be a warehouseman or elevator owner, that it has a right to buy and to sell agricultural products for export or for import or for domestic storing, then they have substantially said that Government ought to take the place of the individual citizen in every private enterprise.

God knows I did not know that there was anything mean enough, contemptible enough, low enough, radical enough, sovietistical enough to make me hesitate when the question was presented as to whether I should vote for it to take the place of a ship subsidy bill; but the Senator from Nebraska, out of his own radical ingenuity, has originated something that does bring me to that point. Mr. President, I want to announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], with whom I am paired, is at perfect liberty to vote on this question. I would consider myself absolutely disgraced if I ever voted to let the ship subsidy bill keep its place against the Norris bill or if I ever voted to allow the Norris bill to take the place of the ship subsidy bill. I shall, therefore, not vote for either of the eternal and everlasting monstrosities from the standpoint in which I have been taught to view them.

I have been taught by my English-speaking ancestry in Great Britain and here to believe that man was not made for government, but that government was made for man, and that government is a mere instrumentality which man exercises in the interest of the liberty and of the freedom and of the happiness of all, and not for the sake of the special privilege of any. And believing that, I could not vote for a ship subsidy which would give to a class already enjoying a monopoly of the coastwise trade of America in shipbuilding and in ship operation and in ship owning, to the utmost extent the Federal power could give it, a likewise monopoly in foreign commerce. Speaking of special privileges, it is the worst that I can dream of. Thinking that about it, Senators can imagine how astonished I was to learn that even the Senator from Nebraska could originate something that could vie in infamy, in my opinion, with its infamy.

There are men who do not believe in a protective tariff because it gives special privileges to certain classes by enabling them to tax the entire people through the higher prices of their products. But I find some of these same men want to extend the monopoly of the shipbuilding business beyond the coastwise trade, where it already has infamous lodgment, to the entire commerce of the world, so far as the United States Government can extend it.

When the question comes as to my selection of which of those two bills is the greater evil I shall solemnly confess in the presence of God and of all men that I do not know, and therefore I shall not vote upon the question, but I shall leave the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] free to vote as he pleases without my pair.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the pending motion to proceed with the immediate consideration of the agricultural marketing bill and thereby displace consideration of the ship subsidy bill gives to the Senate itself the direct power to determine whether the short session of Congress shall be used to consider the great questions of agricultural credit and marketing as against the question of changing a government merchant marine to a private merchant marine sustained by Government aid.

The question is presented under peculiar and unusual circumstances. It follows a general election in which both the agricultural and merchant marine questions were at issue. The universal result of the election was an emphatic demand for immediate and effective relief to agriculture by legislative action upon both credit and marketing. At the same time by a very large majority the people decided against Government aid to privately owned shipping. Good proof of this is found in the vote of the House of Representatives when the shipping bill passed by but 24 majority. Sixty-nine Members voting for the bill will be displaced in the next Congress by new Members opposed to it, thus giving a real majority of 90 against it.

This voice of the people, so clearly expressed at the ballot box, is the sovereign power of our Government. It is entitled to more than mere respect and consideration. It is entitled to obedience from every department of the Government. In spite of this sovereign command from the people of the United States, the President has seen fit to call the Congress in extra session and to urge the passage of the shipping bill to the practical exclusion of agricultural legislation. Republican leadership in both Houses has adopted the same view. I regret this exceedingly, and I can only regard it as a filibuster against the sovereign voice of the American people. I do not believe in the filibuster, and, above all, I do not believe in a filibuster against the supreme mandate of the people themselves. The issues in this case are so great, and the subject of such vital and urgent importance to the farmers of the United States, that I shall fight the filibuster to the utmost. I am ready to fight it upon its own ground and with its own weapons. Its only chance of victory is in the technical rules keeping retiring Members here until the 4th of March. Its sure defeat is in the technical rule of unlimited debate. When the Republican leadership places itself beyond and above the voice of the common people, it is not only inviting defeat in this Congress, but abdicating its right to organize the next, and is pulling down upon itself dire disaster in the elections that follow.

This voice of the common people is not new, but it is becoming exceedingly efficient. The common people may now be definitely identified as the farmers, the laborers with hand or brain, the soldiers, and the mothers, united upon a common ground for the common purpose of achieving the political and economic rights of the common people. This collective thought has decided that Government aid to private enterprises for profit is fundamentally wrong. It has further decided that present economic conditions are disastrously oppressive to agriculture and in a large measure are produced by improper laws and unwise governmental action.

One of the best illustrations in support of this conclusion is the transportation act. This ill-fated law is the first great Government grant of subsidies to the profits of private enterprises, and in this case for the operation of a public utility. Under the common and constitutional law the public utility has a guaranty of the right to charge rates high enough to yield a reasonable or adequate return upon its honest investment, subject, however, to the paramount rights of the public. Under the transportation act this rule of rate making is changed and the paramount rights of the public are eliminated. The commission is now commanded to levy the rates high enough to yield a return of 6 per cent upon a valuation of $18,800,000,000, and for the first six months the deficit is guaranteed out of the Treasury of the United States. No reactionary leader in Congress and no reactionary newspaper ever called this state socialism; but if the farmers could have had a like guaranty during the first six months of their deflation it would have saved them $7,000,000,000 and would have prevented widespread agricultural bankruptcy. Such a "wild" act as this, however, would have made the thrones of Wall Street tremble and filled its sympathetic newspapers with the red ink of Bolshevism. The guaranty of a half billion dollars to 8,000 millionaires to keep full the measure of their war profits is a wise, businesslike, conservative, and patriotic use of the Public Treasury, but the guaranty of the cost of production to 7,000,000 farmers for a crop produced at the command of their Government at the oppressive cost of war prices is unwise, socialistic, and treasonable. This distinction is easily explained by the corporation lawyer, whose supermind lifts it up into a superworld of legal thought, but the common sense of the common man will never understand it.

For the next year and a half the commission was commanded without discretion to levy rates that would pay all operating expenses and yield a net return of 6 per cent upon this full valuation.

This it tried and failed, because the operating expenses climbed up to the sky and the common people went broke and were unable to pay the bill upon any rates whatsoever. Since then the rate has been reduced to 5½ per cent, and if the farmers and laboring people ever get money enough it will all be collected.

The valuation of $19,000,000,000, in round numbers, as the basis of rates is unjust. It was made under the rules set forth in this law. Since it was made the railway executives themselves published a statement of the editor of the Wall Street Journal to the effect that the total railway securities were selling on the market for $12,000,000,000. This means that all the

stocks and all the bonds representing the entire value of all the railroads in all the United States can be bought on the market for $7,000,000,000 less than the valuation fixed by this law.

This is the first time that watered value has been legalized. We have always had watered stocks and watered bonds, but they had to shift for themselves. This water value is now given the sanction of law, and it will cost the American people $400,000,000 a year to pay the return upon it. The transportation act should be repealed, and the water pumped out by the simple provision that the valuation of the railroads shall not exceed the market value of their securities.

The law makes no attempt to stop the capitalization of the unearned increment of property value of the railroads. This value is created by the general public, the same public that must guarantee the reasonable or adequate return to the railroads. It belongs to the public, and its capitalization should be prohibited by affirmative provision of law.

What has accrued in the past may become a vested right, but even that is disputed by good lawyers and by better common sense. In the future it will amount to three hundred or four hundred million dollars a year; and the capitalization of that the law can prevent.

The railroads are now getting over $10,000,000,000 of the bonded portion of their capital at less than 4½ per cent. Under the present transportation law we must pay them 5½ per cent, or a bonus of about $150,000,000 a year. This is unjust. The law should define an adequate or reasonable return so that it shall not exceed the interest rate on the bonded portion of the capital.

Other gigantic items are excessive profits of subsidiary corporations and the waste of competition. These certainly amount to several hundred million dollars per year. Altogether there is an excessive charge upon the American people of perhaps more than $1,200,000,000 per year, without considering the wages of any man who works.

I have not taken up the railroad law with a view of discussing it in full detail, but only for the purpose of showing that under that law the Government itself has imposed these excessive burdens upon the American farmer and is to that extent to blame for his present plight.

I wish to conclude this part of my statement with a review of the psychology that produced this law. The roads were being operated by the Government. I do not question the integrity of the Director General of Railroads; he was both able and loyal to his country; but down below him, perhaps, below his possible personal touch, were managing officers who were neither loyal to him nor to the Government of the United States. They served the owners of the railroads. They wanted to discredit Government operation so that the roads would be turned back. They were traitors as truly as was Benedict Arnold. They deliberately muddled and mixed up the service. They hired excessive numbers of inefficient employees and paid them excessive wages for the deliberate purpose of increasing operating expenses. They advertised their own crimes as the evils of Government operation. They created a general sentiment and demand for a return of the roads to their private owners. With that they coupled the demand for this law. Then the propaganda went forth that it was either this law or continued operation by the despised Government of the United States.

Everybody forgot that the law authorizing the Government to take over the railroads also provided that the President should turn them back under the same law which had sufficed them for a whole generation. The President even issued a proclamation ordering them back on the 1st of March, 1920; but everybody forgot that. Even a Senator in this Chamber told me he voted for the conference report on the transportation act because he understood there was no alternative between this law and Government operation. The law never should have been enacted. The roads should have been turned back under the old law. A railroad manager stated to me that that would have meant bankruptcy to many roads. Perhaps it would to some, but nobody came along with a special privilege law to keep the farmers out of bankruptcy. Furthermore, we had 44,000 miles of railroads in the hands of receivers before the war, but they did not stop running. The Great Rock Island system was one of them. Dishonest private management had wrecked it, but a United States court restored both its solvency and efficiency in a few months.

In spite of the disloyalty and inefficiency in Government management, in spite of the increased and unnecessary expenses, the first year after the roads were turned back the private owners further increased their operating expenses by over $1,400,000,000. About $480,000,000 of that amount was represented by wages, but the other $926,000,000 must be attributed to the causes heretofore described. Since that time wages have been reduced in a lump sum by over $400,000,000, and by a further reduction which caused the machinists' strike, but the rates until recently have been reduced less than $100,000,000.

A similar situation and a similar propaganda is now developed in reference to shipping. The principal difference is that the Government did not own the railroads but it does own over 10,000,000 tons of shipping. The first demand of the shipping propaganda is that American shipping must sail under the American flag. It wraps itself in the garb of superpatriotism; it breathes the inference that now our flag is not on the seas and that the present situation is un-American and unpatriotic.

It is a strange and weird psychology when the mind refuses to see before its very eyes the flag nailed to the masthead of every ship by the hand of the Government itself, and it is more strange and more weird if our patriotism shall not become genuine until it is garnished and supported by unfurling the yellow flag of Wall Street above the Stars and Stripes. I believe the most patriotic ship is a Government ship, manned by Americans, and operated under the American flag in its own right. No American will complain of a small deficit when patriotism is at issue, but in the present case the deficit is not a loss to the American people, and especially to the American farmer.

I inquired of the Shipping Board as to the general rates before the war and at the present time, and I have the following letter from Chairman Lasker dated December 8, 1922:

DEAR SENATOR: Responding to the oral inquiry from your office with regard to comparative freight rates prior to the war and to-day, it gives me pleasure to furnish you the following information:

Taking our chief export, grain, the rate from North Atlantic ports to the United Kingdom in 1913 was approximately $3.50 per long ton. This rate declined until in 1914, just prior to the outbreak of the World War, it reached approximately $2.25. The rates to the continent were approximately 50 cents higher than these rates. Flour in 1913 was approximately $3.80 per ton to the United Kingdom, and in 1914, $2.69. General cargo over the same run approximated $4.50 per ton, weight or measurement, ship's option.

In 1922 the rate for grain from North Atlantic ports to the United Kingdom approximated $2 per ton of 2,240 pounds—

And grain is the largest item of our ocean cargoes, says this letter, and I may add the most important item to our farmers—

and the flour rate about $3.50. The general cargo rate is difficult to give because of the large number of commodity rates now prevalent. As an estimate solely, $6 would probably represent the average rate.

The foregoing rates are based upon an estimated average for the last 12 months. The actual rates of to-day are in most cases much lower. For instance, the grain rate, which was 5 shillings per quarter on July 1, 1921, was but 2 shillings on October 1, 1922. Similarly, flour was 25 cents per hundred pounds on July 1, 1921, and 15 cents per hundred pounds on October 1, 1922.

In the same period the cost of operations has tremendously increased. The cost of shipbuilding is nearly twice the pre-war level. Bunker coals are more than twice the 1914 price, and wages of crews have increased about 50 per cent.

I hope this information is that which you desire, and that you will not hesitate to call upon me for any further assistance I may be able to render.

Yours very truly, A. D. LASKER, *Chairman.*

The principal proposition of the situation, as disclosed by this letter, is that on grain the rate before the war was $2.25, and for an average of last year it was $2, and at this time it is considerably reduced, from 40 to 60 per cent below that. This has been done at the same time that ships have been operated with higher wages and higher costs in every respect, and at the same time the President informs us that they have reduced the deficit from $16,000,000 a month down to $4,000,000 a month. Viewing this matter from the standpoint of the farmer, I want to say that that four millions of deficit is not badly spent. It is worth while. It has accomplished something perhaps several times its value to agriculture in this country.

If that be true, why should any farmer want a ship subsidy which would turn these ships over to private interests and turn the rate-making power over into their hands? There is nothing in this bill which in any way regulates rates. There is nothing in this bill reaching out to say how these rates shall be controlled. We have had enough experience with the great financiers who will take over these ships to know that about one week is all the time they need for an agreement within the country or without, and rates will be made at their sweet will, and there will be no governmental power to compete with the schedules which they may establish.

On this basis alone I say, then, these ships are now worth to the United States all they are costing. Of course, I do not know just what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will do. He is 50 per cent with me and he is 50 per cent against me. He is 50 per cent for everybody and 50 per cent against everybody. He will vote against the ship subsidy bill, and that will leave these ships in the control of the Government of the United States, which, if I understood the trend

of his remarks, is also a very offensive situation to him, but it is not to me.

I want to speak this voice of patriotism: I want to say it is an unpatriotic position for officers of their government to be denouncing it as inefficient in the management of its business and its enterprises. If that situation be true, it is the patriotic duty of officers of the Government to see that it is corrected. I believe, so far as the Government operation of these ships is concerned, that it can be efficiently and economically done; and with the power it gives them over doing justice in rates and doing justice in commerce generally there is no question in my mind but that the highest patriotic duty demands that we keep them exactly where they are now.

There is no hurry about disposing of these ships. The new Congress will come in after the 4th of March. There will be only $8,000,000 more lost up until that time, and the new Congress has the right to determine the question better than this Congress, because the new Congress was elected upon this issue; and in that proposition I agree most heartily with the eloquent Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

I believe from these facts it is evident that the rates on grain are greatly reduced as the result of our having the Government-operated ships. The farmers are saving many times more than the deficit. What would happen to rates if this Government shipping were turned over to private—which means Wall Street—control? That crowd never operates at a loss when a combination can be made. In one week it would reach an understanding that would boost rates to a point far higher than the present deficit. There is no provision in this law, as I have set forth, for the control of rates.

There is one other view of this deficit which I desire to present, and that relates to taxation to pay it. I have reached the definite conclusion that excess profits are the excess evil of this generation. Profits taken by the power of monopoly are taxation without representation just as truly as the tax on tea which started the American Revolution. There is no source of Government taxation so much justified as the source of excess profits.

I desire to present a few newspaper references in regard to recent financial operations in our country. I have here one statement which is headed:

Stock dividends voted in one day throughout country make vast sum. Total now $1,600,000,000.

These same stock dividends are collected in profits charged to the American people in the operation of the various businesses. It makes no difference whether they are collected in one year or carried over from year to year; they are collected in the same way, and then when they are turned back to the stockholders in the form of stock certificates their property and their holdings are increased by that amount.

I should like to have these clippings inserted in the RECORD. They show a long list of these companies, with their names and with these stock dividends. I think it is well that the American people should have the best possible opportunity to contemplate what is going on in this direction, so I will ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday morning, December 5, 1922.]

1922 STOCK DIVIDENDS NOW OVER $1,000,000,000—STANDARD OIL COS. DECLARED OVER THREE-FOURTHS OF THIS RECORD-BREAKING FIGURE—TOTAL OF DECLARED STOCK DIVIDENDS MAY SOON REACH $1,500,000,000 IN PAR VALUE IF STOCKHOLDERS APPROVE PROPOSED STOCK INCREASES—PRACTICALLY ALL THIS YEAR'S STOCK DIVIDENDS ARE SPECIAL EVENTS.

Over $1,000,000,000 in stock dividends have been declared since January 1, 1922, by 79 corporations.

The greater part of this vast total can be credited to Standard Oil companies, as follows:

	Par value.
Standard Oil of New Jersey	$393,353,200
Standard Oil of New York	150,000,000
Standard Oil of California	100,971,111
Ohio Oil	45,000,000
Vacuum Oil	45,000,000
Atlantic Refining	45,000,000
Standard Oil of Kentucky	2,000,000
Total	781,324,311

When Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey was ordered dissolved, the $100,000,000 capitalization was selling for about $400,000,000. Stock dividends declared over the last 11 months by Standard Oil companies have a par value almost double that.

STOCK DIVIDEND NO DISBURSEMENT OF ASSETS.

A corporation that declares stock dividends out of accumulated surplus loses nothing. It is simply capital adjustment made possible by added value. As a rule the greater part of the corporation's earnings are spent for new construction and acquisitions and added to working capital to take care of expanding business.

Thousands of additional men are put to work in new mills, factories, mines, etc. One corporation for a number of years has been averaging around $60 a share annually on its stock. Stockholders have received an average of not much more than $10 annually. Surplus after dividends were put in working capital and new construction and the pay roll increased year by year. Had the management disbursed $50 a share annually in dividends and spent $10 a share for construction, etc., few men would have been added to the pay roll and little headway made in efficiency and economy. No progress in reducing costs would probably mean higher prices to the consumer.

RETAINED EARNINGS BENEFIT EMPLOYEES.

One manufacturer says: "A tax on accumulated surplus would mean a tax on efficiency and labor. It would mean hundreds of millions taken from new construction. It would mean smaller dividends, and the tax on dividends makes up a big per cent of Government revenues."

It is well known that prosperous companies pay the largest wages and take better care of their men. They experience less labor trouble than less prosperous companies. Labor troubles are almost unknown to Standard Oil companies. Few of the 79 corporations in the list accompanying this article have experienced serious labor troubles, partly due at least to continued progress and prosperity.

DIVIDS HIGH-PRICED SHARES INTO POPULAR VALUES.

Stocks selling for, say, $200 to $1,000 and above a share, are looked upon as rich men's investments. They are out of reach of the average investor and the employee who wishes to share in the profits of the company employing him. Splitting up the shares into smaller units through stock dividends places them within their reach. Employees who purchased Standard Oil shares over the last 15 years have seen some of their stocks increase in value 1,000 per cent. This is correspondingly true of scores of other companies, although no group of industrial companies can boast of an appreciation in value as great as that of Standard Oil. From an investment of several hundred millions less than two decades ago, Standard Oil's properties and working capital have grown to several billions. Number of men employed has grown proportionately.

Stock dividends mean little to the shareholder of record. He gets, say, 10 new shares for each old one. Nothing is added to the value of his holdings and nothing is taken away from his company.

Scores of corporations would be warranted in declaring stock dividends, and many may over the next 12 months. Few corporations that have been over liberal in paying cash dividends to shareholders at the expense of new construction and working capital are in a position to declare large stock dividends.

Corporations like United States Steel, Baldwin Locomotive, American Locomotive, American Car & Foundry, National Lead, General Electric, and United Fruit are among those in a position to declare large stock dividends.

MORE STOCK DIVIDENDS TO COME.

There are also proposed capital increases awaiting approval of stockholders. For example, Prairie Pipe Line's proposed stock dividend will be $54,000,000 and that of Prairie Oil & Gas $30,000,000. If these and others contemplated go through, they should aggregate about $500,000,000, which would bring the year's total above $1,500,000,000.

Following table shows for 79 companies stock outstanding January 1, 1922, or at the time dividend was declared, dividend in per cent, and par value of the stock dividend.

Some companies, as American Light & Traction Co. and General Electric Co., have paid stock dividends regularly for several years (General Electric Co. since January, 1918). Others listed are all special dividends.

Company.	Stock outstanding Jan. 1, 1922.	Stock dividend, per cent.	Stock dividend, par value.
Allen Consol. Oil	$2,192,095	5	$109,600
Alliance Realty	2,000,000	25	500,000
Am. Bank. Note	4,495,700	10	449,570
Am. Gas & Elec	5,604,480	1 & 1	116,031
Am. Lt. & Trac	28,077,280	1&1&1	858,000
Am. Mach. Fdy	2,000,000	200	4,000,000
Am. Manufact'g	8,000,000	10	800,000
A. Radiator	13,806,225	50	6,903,112
Arundel	4,637,360	6	278,238
Atlantic Refining	5,000,000	900	45,000,000
Bank of N. Y	2,000,000	25	500,000
Beech-Nut P'g	955,400	400	3,821,600
Belding Bros	3,000,000	100	3,000,000
Bigelow-Hrtd Carpet	13,500,000	100	13,500,000
Borne-Scrymser	200,000	400	800,000
Bost. Sand & G	[1] 400,000	[2] 37½	150,000
B'rr'ghs Add. M	24,750,000	25	6,187,500
Bush Terminal	6,722,200	2½	168,055
Cal. Tel. & Lt	[1] 343,387	[2] 36	123,500
Canad. Gen. El	10,800,000	30	2,160,000
Cin. Un. Stk. Yd	1,531,000	[2] 14	219,000
City Ice & Fuel (Cleve., O.)	3,600,000	35	1,260,000
Commerc. Credit (Baltimore)	1,500,000	30	450,000
C'mm'nw'lth Fin	[2] 59,354	10	
Crane	41,290,731	2½	1,032,269
Cumberl'd P. & L	[1] 2,300,000	10	230,000
Detroit Creamery	3,200,000	50	1,600,000
Du Pont Chem	600,000	112½	675,000
Du Pont Chem	[1] 2,942,710	[2] 112½	3,310,549
Exchange Buffet	[2] 62,500	300	
Fed. Lt. & Trac	[1] 2,500,000	[2] 42	1,050,000
Fidelity & Cas'lty	2,000,000	100	2,000,000
Finance Service	163,370	5	8,170
Gas & Elec. Sec	1,143,561	¾	114,356
General Elec	147,536,814	5	8,609,715
Gibson Art	500,000	25	125,000
Gillette Saf. R	23,320,000	5 & 5	1,428,000
Great Am. Ins	10,000,000	25	2,500,000
Great Nor. Paper	8,272,000	200	16,544,000
Hanover Nat. Bk	3,000,000	66⅔	2,000,000
Hayes Wheel	1,633,320	22	359,000
Hercules Powder	7,130,000	100	7,130,000
Heime, G. W	4,000,000	50	2,000,000
Humphreys Oil	8,577,500	75	6,422,500
Ingersoll-Rand	10,900,035	100	10,900,000
Int. Comb. Eng	[2] 59,000	200	
Int. Harvester	90,000,000	2 & 2	3,782,970
Intertype Corp	[2] 20,125	10	
Kellogg Switchboard and Sup	5,000,000	15	750,000

[1] Preferred. [2] Including preferred. [3] Shares.

Company.	Stock outstanding Jan. 1, 1922.	Stock dividend, per cent.	Stock dividend, par value.
Manhattan Shirt	$5,000,000	10 & 2½ & 2½	$777,000
Minute Tapioca	200,000	50	100,000
Nat'l Biscuit	29,226,000	75	21,920,000
Nat'l Sugar	10,000,000	50	5,000,000
North-Am	[1] 15,033,200	[2] 1	150,232
Ohio Oil	15,000,000	300	45,000,000
Pac. Gas & E	34,004,058	2	680,081
Packard Mot	11,885,100	100	11,885,100
Reo Motor Car	6,937,250	100	6,937,250
Reynolds, R. J	60,000,000	33⅓	20,000,000
Royal Typewriter	[3] 3,771,700	[4] 61.25	2,308,971
Saco-Low'll Shops	3,525,000	50	1,762,500
Schrafft, W. F., & Sons	500,000	300	1,500,000
Scotten, Dillon	2,250,000	33⅓	750,000
South States Oil	2,000,000	8	160,000
Spalding, A. G., & Bros	2,606,900	100	2,606,900
Standard Milling	7,410,142	60	4,446,085
Stand. Oil, Cal	100,971,111	100	100,971,111
Stand. Oil, Ky	6,000,000	33⅓	2,000,000
Stand. Oil, N. J	98,338,300	400	393,353,200
Stand. Oil, N. Y	75,000,000	200	150,000,000
Stand. Steel Car	4,000,000	900	36,000,000
Stand. Undgrd C	5,250,000	20	1,050,000
Texon Oil & Ld	1,904,761	5	95,239
Torrington	3,500,000	100	3,500,000
Union Nat. Gas	9,840,000	75	7,380,000
Union Oil of Cal	50,000,000	80	40,000,000
U. S. Guarantee	205,000	120	300,000
Un. Royalties	250,000	100	402,690
Vacuum Oil	15,000,000	300	45,000,000
Va. Ir. C. & C	10,000,000	50	5,000,000
Victor Talk'g M	4,999,000	600	29,994,000
Yale & T. Mfg	4,998,774	100	4,998,774
Yellow Cab	500,000	300	1,500,000
Total par value of stock dividends			1,007,705,638

[1] Common. [2] Preferred.
[3] Including preferred. [4] Including common.

Dividend declarations.

	Books close.	Books open.	Dividend.	Payable.
Union Traction (Phila.) [1] ..... sa.	Dec. 9	.....	3%	Jan. 1
United Dyewood com. [1] ..... q.	Dec. 15	.....	$1.50	Jan. 2
Allis-Chalmers Mfg. pf. [1] ..... q.	Dec. 23	.....	$1.75	Jan. 15
Bangor & Aroostook pf. [1] ..... q.	Dec. 15	.....	1¾%	Jan. 1
Buffalo Gen. El. com. [1] ..... q.	do	.....	3%	Dec. 30
Detroit & Cleve. Nav. [1] ..... q.	do	.....	$1.00	Jan. 2
Endicott Johnson com. [1] ..... q.	do	.....	$1.25	Jan. 1
Endicott Johnson pf. [1] ..... q.	do	.....	$1.75	Do.
Illinois Cent. L. Lines [1] ..... sa.	Dec. 11	.....	2%	Do.
Imperial Tob. (Can.) ord. final		.....	1%	
Pitts., F. W. & Chic. com. [1] ..... q.	Dec. 9	.....	1¾%	Jan. 2
Pitts., F. W. & Chic. pf. [1] ..... q.	do	.....	1¾%	Do.
Rochester & Syracuse pf. [1] ..... q.	Dec. 2	.....	$1.00	Dec. 15

[1] Stock of record.

STANDARD GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Report of the Standard Gas & Electric Co. and its properties shows gross of $36,726,524 for the 12 months ended October 31, 1922, an increase of $1,962,040 over the same period of 1921. Net after taxes was $13,464,475, an increase of $1,498,855.

GENERAL GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Report of combined earnings of the General Gas & Electric Co. and its subsidiaries shows gross of $12,105,941 for the 12 months ended October 31, 1922. Net after taxes was $3,197,304, and balance after charges $762,752.

[From the Sun, Baltimore, Wednesday morning, December 6, 1922.]

$211,500,000 GIVEN TO STOCKHOLDERS—STOCK DIVIDENDS VOTED IN ONE DAY THROUGHOUT COUNTRY MAKE VAST SUM—TOTAL NOW $1,600,000,000—TWO OF STANDARD OIL GROUP EACH DECLARE 300 PER CENT DISTRIBUTION.

NEW YORK, December 5.—Stock dividends totaling $211,500,000 were announced to-day by seven large industrial corporations and banks, bringing the total stock dividends declared in the last few months to more than $1,600,000,000. These sums, in virtually all cases, have been provided for out of undistributed surpluses, apparently in anticipation of unfavorable tax legislation in the next Congress.

The Studebaker Corporation increased its capitalization $15,000,000 by declaring a 25 per cent stock dividend. Directors expected that the customary annual 10 per cent dividend would be continued.

$45,000,000 SURPLUS DIVIDED.

The Vacuum Oil Co. distributed $45,000,000 of surplus in the form of a 300 per cent dividend. The William Wrigley, Jr., Co. declared a 10 per cent stock dividend of $1,500,000 to common-share holders.

The Bank of Manhattan Co., one of the oldest in the country, increased its capital from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000 by capitalizing surplus and declaring a 100 per cent stock dividend. The Equitable Trust Co. announced plans to increase its capital from $12,000,000 to $20,000,000, one-half of which would be a 33⅓ per cent stock dividend and the remainder a new issue of stock to which holders of the bank stock might subscribe.

The E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. declared a 50 per cent stock dividend amounting to $20,000,000. The Whitman Mills, of New Bedford, called a stockholders' meeting to consider a stock dividend of 50 per cent by increasing the capitalization from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000.

ANOTHER STANDARD OIL DIVIDEND.

The stockholders of the Standard Oil Co. of California to-day authorized a stock dividend of 100 per cent and increased the capital stock from $115,000,000 to $250,000,000.

The directors of the Standard Oil Co. of Kansas declared a stock dividend of 300 per cent payable December 30 to stockholders of record December 16. The State charter board yesterday authorized the company to increase its capitalization from $2,000,000 to $8,000,000.

[From the Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, Tuesday, December 5, 1922.]

$1,200,000,000 STOCK DIVIDENDS TO DATE—MANY MORE DISTRIBUTIONS AWAIT APPROVAL—STANDARD OIL COMPANIES PAY BULK OF MELONS, WITH SEVERAL YET TO BE HEARD FROM—TABLE GIVES DATA.

Stock dividends totaling more than $1,200,000,000 have been declared since the first of the year, and numerous proposed capital increases are awaiting the approval of stockholders.

Standard Oil companies have accounted for the major portion of the vast total and all of them have not been heard from. The New York, New Jersey, California, Kentucky, and Ohio companies, together with the Vacuum Oil Co. and Atlantic Refining, alone declared stock dividends amounting to $781,324,311. To this will be added the Prairie Pipe Line Co.'s $54,000,000 proposed stock melon and the $36,000,000 distribution of the Prairie Oil & Gas Co.

The following table shows the stock dividends announced by 79 companies, the stock outstanding January 1, 1922, and the par value of the stock melons:

Company.	Stock outstanding Jan. 1, 1922.	Stock dividend, per cent.	Stock dividend, par value.
Allen Consld. Oil	$2,192,095	5	$109,600
Alliance Realty	2,000,000	25	500,000
Am. Bank Note	4,495,700	10	449,570
Am. Gas & Elec	5,604,480	1&1	116,031
Am. L. & Tr	28,077,280	1&1&1	858,000
Am. Mach. Fdy	2,000,000	200	4,000,000
Am. Manuf't'g	8,000,000	10	800,000
Am. Radiator	13,806,225	50	6,903,113
Arundel	4,637,360	6	278,238
Atlantic Refining	5,000,000	900	45,000,000
Bank of N. Y	2,000,000	25	500,000
Beech-Nut P'g	955,400	400	3,821,600
Belding Bros	3,000,000	100	3,000,000
Bigelow-Htfd. C'pt	3,550,000	100	13,550,000
Borne-Scrymser	200,000	400	800,000
Best. Sand & G	[1] 400,000	37½	150,000
B'rr'ghs Add. M	24,750,000	25	6,187,500
Bush Terminal	6,722,200	2½	168,055
Calif. Tel. & Lt	[1] 343,887	36	123,500
Canadian Gen. El	10,800,000	20	2,160,000
Cinn. Un. Stk. Yd	1,531,000	14½	219,000
City Ice & Fuel (Cleveland, O.)	3,600,000	35	1,260,000
Commerc'l Credit (Baltimore)	1,500,000	30	450,000
Com'onw'lth Fin	[2] 59,354	10	.....
Crane	41,290,731	2½	1,032,269
Cumberl'd P. & L	[2] 2,300,000	[2] 10	230,000
Detroit Creamery	3,200,000	50	1,600,000
Du Pont Chem	600,000	[1] 112½	675,000
Du Pont Chem	[1] 2,942,710	[1] 112½	3,310,549
Exchange Buffet	[2] 62,500	300	.....
Fed. Lt. & Trac	[1] 2,500,000	[1] 42	1,050,000
Fidelity & Cas'lty	2,000,000	100	2,000,000
Finance Service	163,370	5	6,170
Gas & Elec. Sec	1,143,561	¾	114,356
General Elec	147,536,814	5	8,609,715
Gibson Art	500,000	25	125,000
Gillette Saf. Raz	23,320,000	5&5	1,428,000
Great Am. Ins	10,000,000	25	2,500,000
Great Nor. Paper	8,272,000	200	16,544,000
Hanover Nat. Bk	3,000,000	66⅔	2,000,000
Hayes Wheel	1,633,320	22	359,000
Hercules Powder	7,150,000	100	7,150,000
Helme, G. W	4,000,000	50	2,000,000
Humphreys Oil	8,577,500	75	6,422,500
Ingersoll-Rand	10,900,035	100	10,900,035
Int. Comb. Eng	[2] 59,000	200	.....
Int. Harvester	93,638,000	2&2	3,782,975
Intertype Corp'n	[2] 20,125	10	.....
Kellogg Switchb'd & Sup	5,500,000	15	825,000
Manhattan Shirt	5,000,000	10 & 2½ & 2½	777,000
Minute Tapioca	200,000	50	100,000
National Biscuit	29,226,000	75	21,920,000
National Sugar	10,000,000	50	5,000,000
North American	[2] 1,533,200	[2] 1	150,232
Ohio Oil	15,000,000	300	45,000,000
Pac. Gas & El	34,004,058	2	680,081
Packard Motor	11,885,100	100	11,885,100
Reo Motor Car	6,937,250	100	6,937,250
Reynolds, R. J	60,000,000	33⅓	20,000,000
Royal Typewriter	[3] 3,771,700	[3] 61.25	2,308,971
Saco-Low'll Shops	3,525,000	50	1,762,500
Schrafft, W. F., & Sons	500,000	300	1,500,000
Scotten, Dillon	2,250,000	33⅓	750,000
South States Oil	2,000,000	8	160,000
Spalding, A. G., & Bros	2,606,900	100	2,606,900
Standard Milling	7,410,142	60	4,446,085
Stand. Oil, Calif	100,971,111	100	100,971,111
Stand. Oil, Ky	6,000,000	33⅓	2,000,000
Stand. Oil, N. J	98,338,300	400	393,353,200
Stand. Oil, N. Y	75,000,000	200	150,000,000
Stand. Steel Car	4,000,000	900	36,000,000
Stand. Undgrd C	5,250,000	20	1,050,000
Texon Oil & Ld	1,904,761	5	95,239
Torrington	3,500,000	100	3,500,000
Union Nat. Gas	9,840,000	75	7,380,000
Union Oil of Calif	50,000,000	80	40,000,000

[1] Preferred. [2] Common. [3] Shares.

Company.	Stock outstanding Jan. 1, 1922.	Stock dividend, per cent.	Stock dividend, par value.
U. S. Guarantee	$205,000	120	$300,000
Un. Royalties	250,000	100	402,690
Vacuum Oil	15,000,000	300	45,000,000
Va. Ir., C. & C	10,000,000	50	5,000,000
Victor Talk'g M	4,999,000	600	29,994,000
Yale & T. Mfg	4,998,774	100	4,998,774
Yellow Cab	500,000	300	1,500,000

Mr. BROOKHART. Great combinations in our country have reached such a position of economic power and such a position of mutual understanding that they seem to be entirely able to charge whatever profit they deem just, and the common people of the United States have no voice in those profits.

Here is the American farmer, with a capital investment of nearly $80,000,000,000. Collectively the American farmer is the big business man of the United States, and yet in the price which he receives for his product he has no voice. He can add in no expense. He can charge no profit. His price is fixed by other agencies of less capital investment, and of a mighty small personnel compared to the 7,000,000 farmers and their families. On the other hand, the American farmer has no voice in the price which he will pay for the industrial products which he must use. That price is also fixed by other agencies beyond his power and beyond his control. There is no other business on this earth that could survive one year or one month under such an economic situation; and it is that great question of giving to the farmer a voice in the marketing of his product, some voice in the credit for the control of that market, which is before the Senate in the determination of this motion.

The other question which I desire to discuss briefly before I conclude relates to the administration of the Federal reserve bank in reference to agriculture.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] said that we had established a Federal reserve bank for the purpose of assisting business; that it was the agency that would help business in a general way; and that a ship subsidy would in some way do for shipping what the Federal reserve bank was doing for business. Apparently, the distinguished Senator omitted the consideration of the biggest business in this country when he referred to the beneficial effects of the Federal reserve bank. He apparently omitted agriculture entirely, because I think it can not be said that the Federal reserve bank has been an agricultural bank in any particular.

As I view that situation, the foundation for all credit, of the whole banking system, is deposits. It is the deposits put in the bank by the common people, the people of the country, upon which the bank is built. Withdraw the deposits and there is no bank. It has no need then for anything but a receiver. The receiver, of course, would wind it up. The first story on top of the deposits is the ordinary bank as it is organized, and that is the first story which I described of the credit structure. A large number of these banks being organized, they are required by law to keep reserves, and they have funds which at times they would like to redeposit in order to get some use of those funds and some return upon them. That redepositing is the reserve business. That is the upper story of the credit structure, all resting upon this same foundation of deposits.

During the war we had big things to finance. They needed to be financed quickly, and it was decided that it would be well to collect these redeposits into one great reservoir under the control of one board in order that these things might be more efficiently handled. I have no objection to that idea, and the Federal reserve bank was established upon it and upon these same deposits. The farmers' deposits were included among those. The farmers' deposits were the biggest item among them. Figuring it out upon the best evidence I could, taking the estimate of my own State as a basis, something like 40 per cent of the deposits of the country are made by the 7,000,000 farmers in the United States, laborers deposit more than 25 per cent, and little and big business the balance. Yet this great structure, built upon those deposits, had no farmer on the board, no laboring man upon the board, and was mainly controlled by those representing the big interests of the United States.

What did they do to the American farmer by their administration? In our State they first looked us over, and decided that we needed inflating. They decided that would be a good thing for us. No; first they established a dead line of credit allotment, I should have said. Under that rule Iowa received an allotment of $36,000,000. One bank in Chicago had $80,000,000, and one bank in New York had $145,000,000, but the whole State of Iowa, ranking fifth in resources among the States of the Union, had the small allotment of but $36,000,000, based upon this arbitrary rule of deposits of member banks. Then, having decided to inflate us, they overloaned us, as they called it, up to $96,000,000 at one time; at the time of which I speak it was $91,000,000.

Then they looked us over again and decided that we needed deflating, and they sent a representative out in the State of Iowa to perform the operation. He came out from the Chicago branch and held meetings around over the State. I attended his meeting at the city of Ottumwa, and I know what was said and done. He said to the assembled farmers, "We have been too good to you out here. We have overloaned you. You are $55,000,000 now above your allotment." That was in the fall of 1920, the corn-husking time. He said, "You will have to sell this corn and reduce these loans, because the time has come when the people who are entitled to this money must have it." Then I stood up and asked him who those folks were who were entitled to that credit and would get it as the farmers were forced to sell their stuff at harvest time and pay the money in. He did not answer that question. I repeated it, and he did not answer it. I never did get an answer from him.

The banks throughout our State, following that direction, notified the farmers that their loans must be paid when they came due, in order to reduce this obligation to the Federal reserve bank. Then started the panic in farm prices, and, as Senators all know, there never was such a panic in the United States. Did they have to call those loans? They did the same thing in California, they did the same thing in Kansas, they did the same thing over all the agricultural portion of the country. At the very time those loans were called the Federal reserve bank had more than a thousand million dollars of unused credit, which it could have loaned to the farmers of the United States instead of calling those loans. That policy perhaps avoided a panic of the banks, but it handed the farmers of the United States the worst panic in the history of agriculture.

I was talking with a distinguished member of the Chamber of Commerce of New York the other evening about that proposition, and he said to me that the deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board was wrong. But he said they did not intend to do that thing; that it went further than they figured. I said, "If they are as inefficient as that, it is the most powerful argument for my theory of turning those fellows out of that board and putting upon it 3 farmers, 2 laboring men, 2 men of little business, and 1 man of big business."

I believe something of that kind must be done in reference to the control of credit throughout the country. The farmers even in my own State deposit enough in the banks for their own credit, but under this banking organization it is taken away from them and is used to back other enterprises. If my estimate of 40 per cent is correct, or anywhere near correct, in 1920, according to the comptroller's report, the farmers deposited more than $4,000,000,000 in all of the national banks of the United States, and at the same time they were allowed $1,998,000,000 for use in agriculture. Therefore it has occurred that the panic in farm prices and the destruction of agriculture, wrought by that panic, have been brought about through the impounding of the farmer's own money and denying him the use of it in his own business. I call that a strike; I call it a credit strike, a money strike. That credit strike of 1920 did the farmers of Iowa and of the United States generally more damage—it did them ten times more damage—than all of the industrial strikes the laboring men have organized in the whole history of the United States.

There is something wrong about that situation. It has brought agriculture to the verge of ruin. The thing we are going to consider now, if this motion carries, is the remedy for that situation. I will not attempt to discuss the merits of the Norris bill, but it is the only measure proposed in Congress which affords a chance for immediate and speedy relief. It is drastic, I will concede. Perhaps in the end it means the ultimate organization of cooperative marketing, which the farmers of the United States are entitled to have; but cooperative marketing, cooperative anything, is a matter of growth, and there would be no immediate relief from a purely cooperative bill, and immediate relief is demanded by the farmers of the United States.

I hope this motion will carry. I hope this question will come before the Senate, and I hope we will no longer be bothered with this little question of saving twenty-five or thirty million dollars a year upon these ships which are being operated by the Government, and which were built for safety in war.

Now a word in reference to the national defense. I believe in national defense. There never was a time my country called that I did not volunteer to serve it. If the occasion should arise again, I would resign from the Senate to serve it again. I believe in all that. Yet why this strange agitation for national defense when those ships now belong to the Government itself, the place they would have to go if they were used for national defense? Yet somebody wants to sell them, and turn them over to somebody else in the interest of national defense. To me that is the most ridiculous proposition which has been advanced upon the floor of the Senate.

It is not national defense; it is moving a long distance away from national defense. The national defense consists in making this Government a more efficient, a more American, a more patriotic Government in its business affairs and its economic affairs, as well as its military affairs.

I desire to inquire of the Senator from Washington in reference to a situation in his own State which was brought to my attention by the Farmers' Union recently. They say that about one-third of the apple crop in that State is being destroyed because it will not bring price enough to pay the freight rates, and because there are no marketing facilities. The Farmers' Union, they told me, are getting ready to dump 6,000 bushels at one time into the Columbia River, and to take a moving picture of those apples as they go into the river. Is there such a situation as that out there?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Six thousand bushels? I would not be surprised if it were 6,000 carloads.

Mr. BROOKHART. They told me there would be 10,000 carloads dumped into the river altogether.

Mr. JONES of Washington. With regard to that, I will say that I do not think the condition is overdrawn. When I was in Wenatchee in the fall there were about 9,000 carloads of apples in the warehouses there, and many of those apples were rather early apples, which need to get to the market very early. It had been impossible, apparently, for them to get cars to carry them off. They should have gotten them to market by about the 1st of December. They were getting about 100 cars a day; they should have had at least three or four hundred cars a day. It looked then as though there would be six or seven thousand carloads of apples lost at that one point. So I am afraid the picture is not overdrawn.

Mr. STANLEY. Are they the same beautiful apples for which we are paying 10 cents apiece here now?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They are.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether it is possible to store those apples, or can they be kept?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is possible to store the apples, but they have not the cold-storage facilities at the point to which I am referring. They have cold-storage facilities for about 700 carloads of apples. They have warehouses for the others but not cold-storage facilities. I would like to suggest right here, in this connection, that those farmers very likely would have relief if we had refrigerator ships which could meet their apples at Seattle, about 150 miles away.

Mr. BROOKHART. I would suggest that we send some of the idle ships around and get them, take them over to New York, and feed the people there.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have not the refrigerator ships. That is the trouble.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, I do not want to get the Senator off the subject, but has he investigated the action of the National Fruit Co., or whatever agency it is that gets western apples, and is preparing to throw them into the sea on one seaboard, and is selling them on another part of the continent at exorbitant prices? It surely does not cost at the rate of 10 cents apiece to ship apples from the State of Washington to the city of Washington by any kind of transportation. Somebody has a trust and a graft in the handling of that fruit.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BROOKHART. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky has touched on the question I was going to ask. What is the price being demanded for those apples by their owners who are about to dump them into the Columbia River?

Mr. BROOKHART. I understand they would be willing to take any price.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Have they been willing to take any price for the apples, or have they demanded a considerable price?

Mr. BROOKHART. I think they have been willing to take any reasonable price.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is a very interesting question. I am not asking it to impugn anybody's motives, but I am very anxious to have the question answered. I would like to know the prices which have been demanded and received for that part of the crop which has been marketed, and since the Senator is in touch with the gentlemen who are supposed to know, I hope he will enlighten us.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, I do not know of my own personal knowledge, but I was informed, when I was out there last fall, that for many of the apples which had already been sold and gotten to the market the farmer had received about 5 cents a box, after the freight was paid, and after the expenses of picking, of boxing, and of packing were paid. Of course, our apples are wrapped in paper, separately, and then packed in the boxes. After all those expenses were deducted, the farmer got only about 5 cents.

I will say to the Senator that these men have not kept their apples there because they have not gotten what they demanded. Their apples must come to the eastern market largely. They send them, I think, to the commission houses and take a chance of having a bill come back for freight rather than having a check come back for the proceeds of the apples.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Who handles the apples at the shipping point?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They have warehousemen who put them in their warehouses, and they have commission men there who sell them or consign them on commission. A good many of the farmers or apple raisers, however, probably ship the apples themselves. They put them in the warehouse and have them shipped out. I really do not know so much about the details of that part of the transaction.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Is there an association of fruit raisers?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; they have associations of fruit raisers, and they handle the fruit through them in many instances.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do not want to be understood as antagonizing the people who have fruits. I am merely trying to get some information.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON. It may be that the difficulty encountered in Washington was what we encountered during the last few months in California. There was a car shortage which was absolutely ruinous to us and our production, particulary with regard to fresh fruits, and the like. It is possible that the same difficulty occurred in the State of Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I stated they were getting only 100 cars a day when they should have had 300 cars a day.

Mr. JOHNSON. We have not had the cars in the West with which to transport our products.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If that is the difficulty, it is so easily met that we need none of us get excited about it. I am as ready as anybody else to help meet it. A condition where railroad companies over long periods of time fail to secure the necessary amount of cars to handle the business of the country is an intolerable condition and points directly to incompetence somewhere. I will not at the present moment say where. It may be we are part of the incompetence.

But I am still interested in knowing whether the apples for which we pay exorbitant figures here are marketed in the East at unreasonable figures and the increased price comes at this end, or whether the price is a result of car shortage or a monopoly exercising a control at the source of supply, or a monopoly exercising a control at the source of distribution, or whether it is the result of all these conditions. While I suppose the Senator is not prepared at this moment to answer, I would like to have these questions answered. If he will permit me further, we have in the last five minutes disclosed abundant reason for Congress giving serious consideration to the whole question.

Mr. BROOKHART. I am prepared at this moment to answer in a general way the question suggested by the Senator from Missouri. As a representative of the National Farmers' Union I attended the investigation conducted by the joint committee of the House and Senate and made the opening statement of the farmers' case in that investigation. In the course of that statement I said to them that out of the dollar which the laboring man paid for products of the farm the farmer gets 38 cents. That statement was somewhat challenged. Then they investigated the proposition. They spent several months and took a large amount of testimony, investigating the matter everywhere.

I will say to the Senator from Missouri that that figure includes all the great average of farm products of every kind.

At the end of that investigation they found and reported that I was wrong. Yes; they found and reported that out of the dollar which the laboring man paid for the products of the farm the farmer gets 37 cents. That situation means that something is intolerable in our marketing distribution in the United States.

A similar situation obtained in Denmark 30 years ago. The farmers then organized their cooperative credits and cooperative banks and cooperative processes. They have 46 cooperative packing plants under their control in that little kingdom at this time. They can outsell the Beef Trust in a competitive market everywhere, because they produce better products. Now, at the end of that development they have reduced the cost of distribution until, instead of 63 cents, as in our country, it is from 25 to 28 cents in their country. The margin ought to be narrower in our country than in theirs, because we produce a larger volume of larger stuff. Our great volume of grain and live stock ought to reduce the cost of distribution below their cost.

I say now, as I indicated somewhat in pointing out the big profits that are being assembled by certain large financial institutions, that it has become a question with the farming business of the cost of distribution over and above all other questions. That question will have direct consideration in the Norris marketing bill, and it will again have full consideration in the rural credits bill when it reaches us from the Committee on Banking and Currency. At any rate, we have reached the time when it seems to me that it is little short of a gross neglect of our duty if we proceed further upon this question of whether or not we shall figure out the $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 saving upon ships when we have this great question, of vital interest to all the millions of Americans, which ought to be solved this winter.

Then there is the Federal land bank, held down by restrictions and limitations until it can not function. The $10,000 loan limit ought to be removed. The other restrictions ought to be taken away. That law ought to be amended at this session and before the 1st of March, when all those loans fall due, so as to relieve the farmers of the country somewhat from the great burden of exorbitant interest that is now put upon them.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. BROOKHART. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not understand that the ship subsidy bill now before the Senate will affect the coastwise trade of the United States in any particular. Does the Senator from Iowa so understand?

Mr. BROOKHART. I do not so understand it.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Of course, the passage of the ship subsidy bill would have no effect whatsoever in regard to the transportation of apples from the State of Washington around to the city of Washington, but I understand that the ship subsidy bill relates wholly to international trade. Much has been suggested in favor of the ship subsidy bill because of its supposed added transportation facilities for farm products. Am I to understand that anyone has suggested that the bill, if enacted into law, would reduce the present freight rates on farm products from this country to any European country?

Mr. BROOKHART. I have offered an amendment to the bill providing for a rebate of 10 per cent of the rates to the farmers. That is the only suggestion I have heard made along that line.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If I understood the Senator from Iowa correctly in his very able address, to which I took great pleasure in listening, the freight rates for the transportation of farm products across the ocean now are considerably less than prior to the war, and no one has suggested, so far as I have been able to learn, that the passage of the bill would tend to reduce present freight rates on farm products in international trade.

Mr. BROOKHART. In talking with members of the Shipping Board, a former member of the Shipping Board said that he believed the rates would surely be increased. They claim they are not getting living rates at this time, so it would not reduce the rates, but is almost sure to increase them.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then the farmer certainly can not be interested in the passage of the ship subsidy bill with the expectation that he would derive any material present profit from the passage of the bill or have any hope of profit from the bill in the near future.

Mr. BROOKHART. No; I think the farmer will pay the added freight.

[At this point Mr. BROOKHART yielded the floor for the day.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Iowa concluded his remarks?

Mr. BROOKHART. I should like to conclude to-morrow if I may do so. There are a few matters that I desire to present at that time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I supposed the Senator from Iowa had concluded. I gave notice the other day that I should ask the Senate to remain in session until half past 5 anyway. How much longer would the Senator desire to-morrow?

Mr. BROOKHART. There are some matters which I desire to present that I have not with me at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that it is a quarter after 5 now, and we have been in session since 11 o'clock this morning. It is not an unreasonable request that the Senator from Iowa makes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I appreciate that. The Senator said he has some papers in his office relating to matters he desires to present. I do not intend to press him unduly, but I think I have been extremely lenient in reference to the bill. Indeed, I have been criticized by some because I have not kept the bill more before the Senate. I am not disposed to press the Senator if he has some papers that are not here, but I do hope that Senators will realize that we are getting to a point where we must insist on the bill being kept before the Senate. Senators who desire to speak I think should be prepared to do so, because we want to press the bill to a conclusion one way or the other as soon as possible. I will consent that the bill may go over and the Senator may conclude to-morrow. A brief executive session is desired this evening.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I was just going to say that I thought it was entirely in order for the Senator from Iowa to suggest that he has material which he proposes to present, but has not with him at this time. It is now a quarter after 5——

Mr. JONES of Washington. I know the Senator has some papers that he wishes to use, and they are not with him. I do not want to press him unduly, but I think I have been extremely lenient in reference to this measure.

Mr. FLETCHER. So far as concerns the suggestion of the Senator from Washington about being lenient is concerned, I think the Senator from Washington has had the bill discussed every minute to-day. No one has delayed it a moment to-day. The speech on the other side of the question consumed somethink like four hours to-day. I do not think the Senator can intimate at all that any one opposed to his view of the measure has taken up any unnecessary time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have not said that. What I am complaining about is that we have not taken enough time on the question; that we have not been keeping the bill before the Senate enough hours during the day.

Mr. FLETCHER. We started at 11 o'clock this morning and the bill has been before the Senate ever since.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood that the Senator from Iowa had yielded the floor and that he will proceed to-morrow. It is understood that he is to have the floor to-morrow morning when the Senate convenes, and I desire to submit a conference report.

Mr. BROOKHART. That course is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 22, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of

the sum proposed insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, and 25.

CHARLES CURTIS,
F. E. WARREN,
H. C. LODGE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
JAMES W. HUSTED,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that the unfinished business may be laid before the Senate so that it may be pending.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Nelson T. Hartson, of Washington, to be solicitor of internal revenue, vice Carl A. Mapes, resigned, effective January 1, 1923.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Albert H. Reutter, of Detroit, Mich., to be appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., to fill an existing vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

John L. Miller to be postmaster at Berry, Ala., in place of J. C. Boone. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

CALIFORNIA.

Lewis P. Hathaway to be postmaster at Ventura, Calif., in place of C. B. McDonell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

FLORIDA.

William A. Parker to be postmaster at Carbur, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

INDIANA.

Lee Herr to be postmaster at Tell City, Ind., in place of Louis Zoecher. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Maud Williams to be postmaster at Lenexa, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

LOUISIANA.

James L. Hopkins to be postmaster at Marion, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

MARYLAND.

James P. Gooch to be postmaster at Brentwood, Md. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Mary W. Tise to be postmaster at Hyattsville, Md., in place of M. W. Tise. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James N. Young to be postmaster at Adams, Mass., in place of J. E. Cadagon, deceased.

MICHIGAN.

Elmer E. Geer to be postmaster at Halfway, Mich. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Everett R. Vitalis to be postmaster at Shafer, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Einar S. Rydberg to be postmaster at Spooner, Minn. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Carl G. Hertig to be postmaster at Buffalo Lake, Minn., in place of E. W. Rebstock, removed.

John S. Stensrud to be postmaster at Canby, Minn., in place of J. S. Stensrud. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Herman C. Rustad to be postmaster at Kerkhoven, Minn., in place of A. T. Archer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MISSISSIPPI.

Neppie R. Lockwood to be postmaster at Crystal Springs, Miss., in place of C. K. Dampeer, resigned.

MISSOURI.

Albert C. Yoder to be postmaster at Rosendale, Mo. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Charles A. Bryant to be postmaster at Richland, Mo., in place of H. C. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Kathrene Patrick to be postmaster at Ericson, Nebr. Office became presidential April 1, 1920.

Elizabeth Rucker to be postmaster at Steele City, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Wilbur B. Alexander to be postmaster at Ansley, Nebr., in place of C. W. Harris, appointee declined.

Joseph Jones to be postmaster at Carroll, Nebr., in place of Gladys Kesterson, resigned.

Sturley T. Stevens to be postmaster at Comstock, Nebr., in place of J. B. Fuller, appointee not commissioned.

Lafayette O. Roblee to be postmaster at Lewellen, Nebr., in place of L. E. Byrd, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles H. Bean to be postmaster at Franklin, N. H., in place of E. S. Avery. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Amos J. Dinsmoor to be postmaster at Laconia, N. H., in place of N. J. Dyer. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

Horace E. Forsyth to be postmaster at Bayhead, N. J., in place of Elbert Wilbert, resigned.

Forman R. Thompson to be postmaster at Matawan, N. J., in place of P. J. Devlin. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Jennie E. Carroll to be postmaster at Cuylerville, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

William D. Carpenter to be postmaster at Hagaman, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Rhoda E. Jackson to be postmaster at Wantagh, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Thomas J. Hamer to be postmaster at Laconn, N. Y., in place of W. W. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expired May 24, 1920.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Allen R. Edwards to be postmaster at Bladenboro, N. C., in place of A. A. Hilburn. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

John G. King to be postmaster at Burlington, N. C., in place of O. F. Crowson. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Clyde G. Mullen to be postmaster at Lincolnton, N. C., in place of J. K. Cline. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

David Smith to be postmaster at Whiteville, N. C., in place of A. E. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Burt E. Stewart to be postmaster at Minot, N. Dak., in place of F. L. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired August 22, 1920.

Ettephina C. W. Winkler to be postmaster at Montpelier, N. Dak., in place of Mamie Peterson, resigned.

OHIO.

Alonzo Keeton to be postmaster at Excello, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Henry H. Harvey to be postmaster at Kenton, Ohio, in place of C. W. Smith, removed.

Gurth W. Repp to be postmaster at Pioneer, Ohio, in place of W. G. Haviland, resigned.

Elsie M. Smith to be postmaster at Sharonville, Ohio, in place of E. M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Lan A. Avenett to be postmaster at Goodwell, Okla. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Harry Andrews to be postmaster at Marland, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Ernest C. Werrell to be postmaster at Depew, Okla., in place of F. C. Knapp, resigned.

Milton M. Bay to be postmaster at Morris, Okla., in place of L. A. Beamer. Incumbent's commission expired September 18, 1922.

OREGON.

Mart Griffin to be postmaster at Umatilla, Oreg. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Samuel H. Bubb to be postmaster at McClure, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

John T. Ritter to be postmaster at Carnegie, Pa., in place of N. F. Barrett, removed.

Joseph L. Roberts to be postmaster at Sharon, Pa., in place of J. T. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

Joseph C. Scowden to be postmaster at Tionesta, Pa., in place of G. G. Gaston, resigned.

Harry V. Gibson to be postmaster at West Middlesex, Pa., in place of W. C. Kemp, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John D. Heidtman to be postmaster at Sumter, S. C., in place of T. S. Doar, removed.

TENNESSEE.

Byrd P. Allison to be postmaster at Gallatin, Tenn., in place of R. W. Caldwell. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1918.

Joseph C. Hale to be postmaster at Winchester, Tenn., in place of Henry Estill. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1922.

TEXAS.

James S. Mewhinney to be postmaster at Buckholts, Tex., in place of J. B. Rector. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lou Gammill to be postmaster at Calvert, Tex., in place of Maxey McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Rebecca White to be postmaster at Carbon, Tex., in place of E. T. Gilbert. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Joseph Wren to be postmaster at Normangee, Tex., in place of Joe Wren. Incumbent's position expired September 5, 1922.

Gustave Natho to be postmaster at Skidmore, Tex., in place of J. J. Jenkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Mary A. Haskell to be postmaster at Stockdale, Tex., in place of J. J. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

John N. Coffman to be postmaster at Edinburg, Va., in place of J. H. Massie. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

William S. Sparrow to be postmaster at Onley, Va., in place of J. W. Kellam, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS.

Clinton O. Richardson to be comptroller of customs in customs collection district No. 13, headquarters, Baltimore, Md.

POSTMASTERS.

NEW YORK.

Harry P. Maxson, Adams Center.
Donald A. Scott, Caledonia.
Howard F. Fleming, Gardiner.
Ralph J. Borden, McGraw.
Walter J. Burke, Mineville.
Maud E. Butterfield, New Berlin.
Helena Swackhamer, Schenevus.
Dexter S. Slack, Speculator.
George O. Leonard, Stamford.

WYOMING.

Harold T. Duffy, Wheatland.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *December 18, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Mr. LONGWORTH as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, Thou hast not promised us joy without affliction, calm without the storm, nor the sun without the cloud. But blessed be Thy holy name, Thou hast vouchsafed unto us sympathy, strength, and unfailing love. O, then, let Thy light be our guide, Thy service our delight, and Thy peace our richest blessing. To-day direct our words that they may do no harm, and may our hearts feel no wrong desires. Let our labors be for our country's good and our acts a help to our fellow men. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

INCOMES FROM SECURITIES.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD to-day the joint resolution that will be considered to-morrow with an amendment which I expect to offer at the proper time, so the House may have the entire matter before it to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I think that is very proper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the way indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 13, after the word "income," strike out the remainder of the section and insert "which the United States has power to tax."
Page 2, line 9, after the word "income," strike out the remainder of the section and insert "which the United States has power to tax."

The joint resolution as amended would read as follows:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'ARTICLE —.

"'SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income ~~derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States or any other State~~ *which the United States has power to tax.*

"'SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States; but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived ~~from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of such State~~ *which the State has power to tax.*'"

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) for the relief of sufferers from fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg., and as it is an emergency matter; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate Joint Resolution 248 to provide for the payment of salaries of Senators appointed to fill vacancies, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

CONSOLIDATION OF STATISTICS, FOREIGN COMMERCE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 276).

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report on the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the statistics of foreign commerce in the Department of Commerce. The parliamentary clerk has the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed under the rule.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I desire also to present a unanimous consent request in connection with it. This was a Senate bill which was passed by the House that made amendments in date made necessary by the time that had elapsed before getting it through the House. The Senate at first disagreed to those amendments. Now, as the conference report will show, the Senate has receded entirely, and I ask unanimous consent that the conference report be read for the purpose of immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa presents a conference report and asks unanimous consent that it be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I think we will have better expedition by following the rule of printing it in the RECORD and have it go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ordered printed under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
KNUTE NELSON,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, submit the following written statement:

The Senate has receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the House.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman withhold that until I ask unanimous consent. I want to ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Winthrop L. Marvin, asking me to place the letter in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. To what does the letter refer?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Marvin thinks I did not fairly represent him in my speech on the ship subsidy bill, and I wish at his request to place the letter in the RECORD and my reply to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following letters:

AMERICAN STEAMSHIP OWNERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York, December 12, 1922.

Hon. RUFUS HARDY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Not until to-day did I learn from your speech of November 25, published December 4, that in that address you had made a reference to me, in connection with an assertion by you that "I do not believe there was a paragraph in this bill that was not framed by the Steamship Owners' Association and sponsored by them," as follows:

"Mr. HARDY of Texas. Let me say right here that Winthrop L. Marvin was introduced before our committee and an article was read written by him in which he claimed most of the credit of having written the bill, and he boasted of his handiwork."

I wish to say that this statement is absolutely without foundation. Before your Merchant Marine Committee, at the public hearings April 27, page 1014, I said:

"I would like to explain to the committee, because in reading the testimony I have noticed here and there a suggestion that I was one of those who drafted the bill; that I had nothing whatever to do with the drafting of the bill that has been laid before you; that I was not consulted with reference to a single line in the bill. I would have been glad to be consulted, possibly; but I was not consulted, and I never saw the bill until it was published in the New York newspapers."

Instead of having "written the bill" and having "claimed most of the credit" of having written the bill, as you assert, it is a matter of public record before your committee that I did not write a line of the measure and did not see it when it was in process of preparation. I was asked to give my opinions, as others supposed to have some technical knowledge were, and did give those opinions. But with the actual framing of the bill I have already declared, and declare again, that I had absolutely no connection whatsoever. That the shipping bill was not dictated by the Steamship Owners' Association is instantly apparent to anyone who compares the bill with the views and recommendations of the association as submitted to your committee April 26 and 27 last in response to its formal invitation. The bill does not include and never has included many of the suggestions that were proposed. It does include and has included many features unsuggested and unheard of by us, and at some points it runs directly contrary to our recommendations.

You have so gravely misrepresented my position that I must ask you to do me the justice of inserting this letter in the RECORD of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,
WINTHROP L. MARVIN,
Vice President and General Manager.

DECEMBER 15, 1922.

Mr. WINTHROP L. MARVIN,
Vice President American Steamship Owners' Association,
11 Broadway, New York.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of December 12 received. I very gladly place that part of it in the RECORD which relates to my speech. I certainly do not wish to do you any injustice by giving you too much or too little credit as to the subsidy bill. The error you complain of in the sentence you quote from my speech was corrected in the colloquy that followed immediately between Messrs. Edmonds, Nelson, and myself. Of course I do not mean that you literally wrote the bill. The whole of the sentence complained of and the colloquy referred to is as follows:

* * * * * * *

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Let me say right here that Winthrop L. Marvin was introduced before our committee and an article was read, written by him, in which he claimed most of the credit of having written the bill, and he boasted of his handiwork.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. Was there not a committee of shipbuilders and ship operators that went before the Shipping Board—I do not know whether it came before your committee or not—and formulated a specific series of demands? And are they not practically all incorporated in the bill?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The gentleman is right, and Winthrop L. Marvin's testimony shows that this bill was gotten up for and by the United States Ship Owners' Association, of which he was the paid representative, with the assistance, I do not doubt, of able men like my friend from Pennsylvania. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. EDMONDS. No steamship owners' association assisted me in framing the bill.

Mr. J. M. NELSON. It is recorded in the Journal of Commerce, and you will find it in the library, that this shipowners' association did meet with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. His name is specifically mentioned, as well as that of the chairman of the other committee, and they discussed these demands with him.

Mr. EDMONDS. That is true.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The real fact is that this is the shipowners' bill.

Mr. EDMONDS. I want to say to the gentleman right now that the 10 per cent limitation was put in by myself. It was never suggested by the shipowners.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. What limitation?

Mr. EDMONDS. The 10 per cent limitation on profits.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That was very kind of you.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Oh, I do not doubt there is some little trimming here and there, some little something that you did not get from them; but ask Winthrop L. Marvin and he will say that substantially all the demands of the shipowners' association are in this bill and that 10 per cent limitation you speak of is one I would be ashamed to father. Why, it requires the Government to subsidize ships up to 10 per cent net profit, and the Esch railroad bill had been damned by the people because it directs the Interstate Commerce Commission to let the railroads earn a 6 per cent profit.

Mr. EDMONDS. There are 15 or 20 sections of this bill written by the subcommittee that aided me in drafting the bill—the subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. We talk to those favoring a measure and get their views and demands and become so permeated with their views and desires that they might just as well be handling the pen as you or me. [Applause.]

* * * * * * * *

That is what I said about the matter in my speech you complain of.

Now, since I am putting your letter in the RECORD and the colloquy also I will comment briefly.

Mr. EDMONDS, of Pennsylvania, claims some credit, I think justly, for the actual framing and writing of the bill and especially for the 10 per cent limitation clause.

This clause is the one providing that when any owner of a subsidized ship makes in any one year exceeding 10 per cent profit one-half of the excess shall be paid back into the ship subsidy or merchant marine fund (not into the United States Treasury) until the entire amount of the subsidy received by that ship in the year is paid into that fund. It seems that if a certain ship costing

$1,000,000 should receive during the year $10,000 in subsidy and that ship should earn during that year $20,000 net profit after allowing for all overhead and interest, depreciation, and repairs, then it would pay back into the subsidy fund $5,000 to be used for the payment of subsidies to other ships. Knowing the ability of great corporations in bookkeeping and in shuffling and shifting of the profit and loss account and capital account I think the whole provision is simply a delusion or fraud, if that is not too harsh a term to use.

In order to determine whether the sentence in my speech which Mr. Marvin complains of really does him any injustice I present the following extracts from the hearings before the committee:

"Mr. DAVIS. You, of course, holding the position you have for the past two or three years, have taken a very considerable interest in the Government merchant marine and Shipping Board affairs?

"Mr. MARVIN. I have.

"Mr. DAVIS. You have kept up with it pretty well and have undertaken to keep your association members advised of that situation? Now it was upon the recommendation of you or your association that Mr. Lasker appointed the three experts, Messrs. Love, Schmull, and Frey, was it not, Mr. Marvin?

"Mr. MARVIN. We favored the appointment of these gentlemen.

"Mr. DAVIS. You were requested to select certain men whom you could recommend, and you did select and recommend those gentlemen and they were appointed?

"Mr. MARVIN. We believed that they were eminently fit for this important post. We recommended their appointment and Chairman Lasker, after his appointment, conferred with the shipping men of New York and of other cities with regard to those technical posts.

"Mr. LISSNER. That is not a fair statement to say that they selected those men, though. I do not think that Mr. Marvin will say that.

"Mr. MARVIN. No; I will not say that, I simply say that we favored their appointment. The choice of these gentlemen was entirely by the Shipping Board.

"Mr. DAVIS. I will ask you if you were not requested to make recommendations of men for those positions?

Mr. MARVIN. Yes, we were asked to designate to the Government gentlemen of experience and capacity in the shipping business for these important positions.

"Mr. DAVIS. And thereupon you did designate and recommend those three gentlemen?

"Mr. MARVIN. These three gentlemen were among those whom we named to the Government as worthy of these responsibilities. Other names were considered.

"Mr. DAVIS. Did you recommend any other names or were you requested to?

"Mr. MARVIN. We recommended other gentlemen also as worthy of consideration by the Government.

"Mr. DAVIS. You, of course, have been called into consultation frequently by Chairman Lasker and others connected with the Shipping Board, have you not?

"Mr. MARVIN. As occasion required, not frequently.

"Mr. DAVIS. You were on the committee, as has been shown, that got together the data and details for the compilation of the studies and the preparation of the bill?

"Mr. MARVIN. Yes, sir.

"Mr. DAVIS. Now you wrote an article that was published in April, 1922, number of Marine Engineering, under the title of 'The merchant marine bill of 1922 analyzed. One of the experts who assisted the Shipping Board in framing the bill outlines its merits. By Winthrop L. Marvin'?

"Mr. MARVIN. Yes, sir. I would like to say on that point, Judge, you have probably sometimes observed the poetic license indulged in by the writers of headlines. I had nothing to do with the latter part of the statement and I think most of the committee thoroughly understand that.

"Mr. DAVIS. You speak so low that I can not catch your answer.

"Mr. MARVIN. I had nothing to do with the framing of the bill as I have already stated to the committee, perhaps quite unnecessarily, because I think the committee generally understands that I had nothing to do with the framing of the bill.

"Mr. DAVIS. Not being a lawyer, you were not called upon to aid in drafting the bill.

"Mr. MARVIN. No.

"Mr. DAVIS. However you did discuss with them in the discussions that were held by the committee with regard to the policies to be embodied in the bill, did you not?

"Mr. MARVIN. The committee was appointed for the purpose—and I hoped fulfilled the purpose—of gathering data in the way of information and of making suggestions as to the best methods of upbuilding the American merchant marine.

"Mr. DAVIS. And you did discuss with them the provisions which were ultimately embodied in the bill, did you not?

"Mr. MARVIN. I discussed with my fellow committeeman; yes, surely.

"Mr. DAVIS. And you gentlemen in that discussion discussed the various aids, direct and indirect, which you thought should be embodied in the bill?

"Mr. MARVIN. We went over the whole field, so far as that was humanly possible.

"Mr. DAVIS. And then did you make a general recommendation as to what should be embodied in the bill?

"Mr. MARVIN. There was an agreement among the committee as to certain policies, certain ideas, general lines to be followed in the building up of the merchant marine. That was the duty for which we were appointed.

"Mr. DAVIS. Now, in this article appears the following, in part:

"'A second important amendment of the Jones Act is provided in the new bill by the specific naming of the sum of $125,000,000 as a construction fund which may be availed of either for the building of vessels of the best and most efficient type, equipped with the most modern, the most efficient, and the most economical machinery and commercial appliances, or in the equipment of vessels already built with machinery and commercial appliances of the type and kind mentioned. Under this provision it is anticipated that powerful aid will be given to the construction of fast liners, in which we are so notably deficient, and to the construction or equipment of motor ships. This is a fair interpretation of the purpose in the minds of the authors of the present measure. Very liberal are the limitations that no loans shall be for a greater sum than two-thirds of the cost of the vessel to be constructed or of the value of the vessel when thus equipped, nor shall any loan be made at a rate of interest less than 2 per cent per annum.'

* * * * * * *

"Mr. DAVIS. In the same article, and referring to the deduction from the taxes of the freight money paid by shippers shipping in American bottoms, you state, 'This is an ingenious new departure intended to serve the purpose of a part of the preferential duties of the original Jones Act, but as a matter of fact it is far more valuable and effective, for it would apply to all merchandise dutiable or free, inward or outward.'

"The provisions of the original Jones Act to which you refer is section 34?

"Mr. MARVIN. Section 34; yes, sir.

"Mr. DAVIS. Which both Presidents felt it inadvisable to enforce?

"Mr. MARVIN. Yes, sir.

* * * * * * *

"Mr. DAVIS. You further state:

"'These elastic features of the compensation portion of the bill, together with the limitation on profits in one of the paragraphs of section 702, are unique in American shipping legislation. A State-aided ship may not realize a net operating profit of more than 10 per cent. This is a legislative experiment that may prove unwise in its results, though it will undoubtedly facilitate the passage of the bill by Congress. Mid-Western Senators and Representatives are frankly recognizing this new bill as "something different," the words "something different" being in quotation marks, and as satisfying their scruples against excessive subsidies. However reluctant the seacoast States may be to recognize this statutory limitation, it may perhaps prove to be the winning of the law.'

"Now, your committee discussed a good deal about what provisions would appeal to the public and aid in winning the bill, did you not?

"Mr. MARVIN. Certainly all practical men, Judge—and I need not say so to you, who are practical men—give great weight to such considerations, and rightly so, as I believe.

"Mr. DAVIS. Then later in the article you say under one of the provisions under section 701:

"'Oil-tank carriers and like craft owned by great producing companies are required to hold open until 10 days before sailing substantially one-third of their cargo capacity for use as common carriers in order to be eligible to the compensation provided. Here, again, a provision is manifestly inserted to smooth the passage of the bill to meet objections certain to be raised by a certain class of lawmakers,' etc."

* * * * * * *

From the foregoing I really invite the reader to draw his own conclusions as to whether the subsidies of the bill was or was not devised by Mr. Marvin or his employers, the American Steamship Owners' Association.

As to the claim in your letter that the bill is at some points directly contrary to your association's recommendations, I can only say that none of you tried to get any changes in the bill, so far as I know. The only change suggested by any of you was that perhaps the basic subsidy ought to be larger. That, I think, is amply met by the provision that the board can double the basic subsidy if they wish to do so. A board so kindly to your association, I think, would not hesitate to double the subsidy "in a proper case." Some of you also may have objected to Mr. EDMONDS's ingenious 10 per cent limitation of profits clause, but I don't think they did. Certainly not seriously. It will never worry them, and may help pass the bill, as you suggested in your article.

Very truly,

RUFUS HARDY.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman withhold that until I can correct the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Focht	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sabath
Anderson	Freeman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.
Ansorge	Frothingham	McPherson	Schall, Minn.
Anthony	Gallivan	Maloney	Shaw, Ill.
Arents	Garrett, Tex.	Mead	Shreve
Blakeney	Gorman	Michaelson	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Gould	Mills	Sinnott
Bond	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Sisson
Bowers	Griffin	Moore, Ill.	Smith, Mich.
Brand	Hammer	Merin	Snyder
Brennan	Henry	Mudd	Stiness
Britten	Herrick	Newton, Minn.	Stoll
Brooks, Ill.	Hicks	Newton, Mo.	Sullivan
Brooks, Pa.	Hill	O'Brien	Sweet
Burke	Himes	Olpp	Tague
Cable	Husted	Osborne	Taylor, Ark.
Campbell, Kans.	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Taylor, N. J.
Campbell, Pa.	Jacoway	Paige	Taylor, Tenn.
Cantrill	James	Park, Ga.	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Jeffers, Ala.	Parker, N. Y.	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Johnson, Miss.	Paul	Tinkham
Classon	Jones, Pa.	Perkins	Tucker
Codd	Kahn, Calif.	Perlman	Vaile
Cole, Ohio	Kendall	Petersen	Vare
Collins	Kennedy	Porter	Vestal
Connolly, Pa.	Kiess	Radcliffe	Voigt
Cullen	Kindred	Rainey, Ala.	Volk
Davis, Minn.	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ill.	Volstead
Deal	Kitchin	Ramseyer	Walters
Dempsey	Kleczka	Reber	Ward, N. Y.
Drane	Knight	Reed, N. Y.	Watson
Drewry	Kreider	Reed, W. Va.	Weaver
Driver	Kunz	Rhodes	Wheeler
Dunbar	Langley	Riddick	Williams, Tex.
Dunn	Layton	Riordan	Williamson
Dyer	Lea, Calif.	Robertson	Wise
Echols	Lee, Ga.	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Edmonds	Lee, N. Y.	Rosenbloom	Woodyard
Fairchild	Luce	Rosedale	Zihlman
Fish	McFadden	Ryan	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and seventy gentlemen have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. On the 12th day of this month the court rendered a decision in the case that is known to the tax commissioners and bankers of the United States as the Hanover case in regard to the tax on shares of stock in national banks. I ask unanimous consent that the decision be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as it is of interest and in general demand by State taxing commissioners and by the national banks of the country. I do not put it in with any view of approving or condemning the decision, but for the reasons I have given so as to be available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to print in 8-point type the decision referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I do not know that I shall, I would like to inquire of the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Banking and Currency as to the status of the House bill which passed the House some time ago to relieve that situation?

Mr. WINGO. That bill is in the Senate. This decision I have just referred to was handed down in New York and is subsequent to the decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called Richmond case. It goes into the question very clearly and cites the authorities and there is quite a demand for the decision. I have only been able to get hold of the decision this morning, as I happened to meet one of the attorneys in the case.

Mr. SNELL. What is the date of that?

Mr. WINGO. December 12, 1922.

Mr. STAFFORD. The decision was printed almost in full in last Thursday's issue of the New York Times. But I have no objection to printing it.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman will appreciate why I want to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am more concerned by the fact that the Senate has not responded to the relief of the States in accordance with the House proposition. I am with the gentleman on that, or on one portion of it.

Mr. WINGO. No; on one question we are not agreed.

Following is the decision referred to:

(Decision.)

DECEMBER 12, 1922.

TAX ON CAPITAL STOCK OF NATIONAL BANKS INVALID.

Opinion reported here because of its collateral bearing on the including of dividends on national-bank stock in gross income for income-tax purposes.

COURT OF APPEALS—PEOPLE EX REL. HANOVER NATIONAL BANK, OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, APPELLANT, *v.* HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE ET AL., RESPONDENTS.

Appeal from order of the appellate division, first department, affirming order of special term dismissing writ to review tax assessment.

Martin Saxe for appellant.

William H. King for respondents.

Charles D. Newton, attorney general (Edward G. Griffin of counsel), for State of New York, intervening.

Pound, J.: Relator, a banking corporation organized under the national banking act of the United States, seeks to review an assessment of its capital stock for taxation for the year 1921 on the ground that taxation thereof by the State is at a greater rate than is assessed on other moneyed capital in the hands of individuals. A national bank is an agency of the National Government. The State has no constitutional power to lay any tax upon it. Its shares of stock are taxable by the State only when and as Congress permits. (McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316; People ex rel. Bridgeport Sav. Bank *v.* Feitner, 191 N. Y. 88, 92; Van Allen *v.* Assessors, 3 Wall. [U. S.] 573.)

Section 5214 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. Comp. St., sec. 9779) imposes upon national banks the obligation to pay to the Treasurer of the United States certain duties "in lieu of all existing taxes," and section 5219 (U. S. Comp. St. sec. 9784; Barnes Fed. Code, sec. 9256) provides that nothing contained in the Federal "national bank act" (13 Stat. 99) shall prevent "all the shares in any association from being included in the valuation of the personal property of the owner or holder of such shares in assessing taxes imposed by authority of the State within which the association is located; but the legislature of each State may determine and direct the manner and place of taxing all the shares of national banking associations located within the State, subject only to the two restrictions—that the taxation shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of such State, and that the shares of any national banking association owned by nonresidents of any State shall be taxed in the city or town where the bank is located, and not elsewhere. Nothing herein shall be construed to exempt the real property of associations from either State, county, or municipal taxes to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed." This section prescribes the full measure of the power of the State to impose taxes upon national banking associations or their shareholders. Any assessment not in conformity therewith is unauthorized and invalid. (First Nat. Bank of Gulfport *v.* Adams, 42 Sup. Ct. 323.)

The tax law of the State of New York (Cons. Laws, C. R. 60, sec. 24, enacted long before any State income tax was imposed, and repealed by chap. 603 of the Laws of 1922) provided: "In assessing the shares of stock of banks or banking associations organized under the authority of this State or the United States the assessment and taxation shall not be at a greater rate than is made or assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of this State." * * *

The tax law also provides for a tax of 1 per cent on the book value of shares of stock in all banks and banking associations (sec. 24b), and that such tax (sec. 24c) "shall be in lieu of all other taxes whatsoever for State, county, or local purposes upon the said shares of stocks, and mortgages, judgments, and other choses in action and personal property held or owned by banks or banking associations the value of which enters into the value of said shares of stock shall also be exempt from all other State, county, or local taxation."

This tax of 1 per cent is a direct tax on the shares of stock, without regard to the amount of income earned thereon, whether such income has been retained as surplus or distributed as dividends.

The personal income tax law (L. 1919, ch. 627; Tax Law, sec. 352), adopted as part of a new program of tax reform, imposes upon every resident of the State of New York an annual tax upon his net income of from 1 to 3 per cent. Such taxes "are in addition to all other taxes imposed by law, except that money on hand or on deposit with or without interest, bonds, notes, and choses in action, and shares of stock in corporations other than banks and banking associations, owned by any individual or constituting a part of a trust or estate subject to the income tax imposed by this article, shall not after July 31, 1919, be included in the valuation of the personal property included in the assessment rolls of the several tax districts, villages, school districts, and special tax districts of the State."

The statute further provides (L. 1920, ch. 647; Tax Law, sec. 4a): "Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter or of any other general, special, or local law, intangible personal property, except shares of stock of banks or banking associations, whether referred to as personal property, capital, capital stock, or otherwise, after June 30, 1920, shall be exempt from taxation locally for State or local purposes. This exemption shall be in addition to all other exemptions of personal property from local taxation, whether based upon the character, ownership, or amount of property. The term 'intagible personal property,' as used in this section, means incorporeal property, including money, deposits in banks, shares of stock, bonds, notes, credits, evidences of an interest in property, and evidences of debt."

Shares of stock in banks and banking associations, both State and national, are thus subject to a 1 per cent valuation tax. Certain other corporations are subject to franchise taxes, but moneyed capital in the hands of individuals is exempt from taxation locally for State or local purposes.

A long line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States defines the business of banking and holds that the words "moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens" includes moneys invested in private banking houses such as J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and others, together with investments of individuals in securities that represent money at interest and other evidences of indebtedness such as normally enter into the business of banking. The National Government permits State taxation only on terms of substantial equality in law and in fact, and entire fairness and friendliness. The tax on national bank shares must not discriminate in favor of moneyed capital entering into competition with the national banks. (Evansville Bank *v.* Britton, 105 U. S. 322; Mercantile Bank *v.* New York, 121 U. S. 138; Aberdeen Bank *v.* Chehalis Co., 166 U. S. 440; Owensboro National Bank *v.* Owensboro, 173 U. S. 664, 676; Amoskeag Savings Bank *v.* Purdy, 231 U. S. 373; Merchants' National Bank of Richmond *v.* City of Rich-

mond, 256 U. S. 635.) The court below has found that the competing capital in the hands of individuals, subject only to the personal property income tax, is very large. "If the principle of substantial equality of taxation under State authority, as between capital so invested and other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens however invested, operates to disturb the peculiar policy of some of the States in respect to revenue derived from taxation, the remedy therefor is with another department of the Government, and does not belong to this court." (Boyer *v.* Boyer, 113 U. S. 689, 703.)

The first question is whether the State of New York discriminates against national bank shares by imposing a tax both on the shares and the dividends, while it imposes a tax on the income only of other competing capital in the hands of private bankers and other individuals. It was held below that if the direct tax and the income tax were both imposed, the discrimination would be clear. The respondent contends, by a process of statutory construction which would exclude by implication the particular from the general, that no income tax is imposed on the dividends of bank stock. The test to be applied is not whether such dividends may lawfully be included in the income of individuals taxed by the State, but whether they are in fact so included. It is urged that the State had no power to tax such income, for the reason that section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States above quoted permits a tax on valuation only, and therefore that it did not tax it. (People ex rel. Alpha P. C. Co. *v.* Knapp, 230 N. Y. 48 [Addenda page 65, herein].) The language of the statute suggests no such punctilious regard for those whose income is derived from dividends on national-bank shares. On the contrary, it plainly includes such dividends in gross income. Gross income includes (tax law, sec. 359) income from dividends. Dividends from stock in bank corporations owned by resident taxpayers are not included in the list of exemptions.

A clear discrimination is made against resident holders of bank shares which are taxed according to their book value, who are also taxed on their income. The shares of bank stock are taxed by one method and the dividends thereon are taxed by another method. Competing moneyed capital in the hands of individuals is exempt from taxation based on valuation and is assessed by one method, according to income only. The provisions of the law are explicit. The discrimination is unfortunately too clear to escape recognition. We can not assume that any exemption of dividends on national bank shares from the provisions of the income tax was in the legislative mind. On the contrary, the report of the special joint committee on taxation and retrenchment submitted to the legislature March 1, 1922, the opinion of the Attorney General (March 31, 1920), and the practice of the income tax bureau indicate that by legislative and administrative construction a personal tax upon dividends on the shares was contemplated and collected.

The amount of such moneyed capital in the State of New York thus exempted from taxation except on income is not inconsiderable. It is relatively of much consequence. In the city of New York in the year 1921 such competing capital was nearly twice the total capital of the State and National banks. The tax on the capital stock of national banks becomes invalid when it appears that it has become discriminatory. No way of escape from such a conclusion is open except by disregarding the rule which requires us to give a plain meaning to plain words plainly used. (U. S. *v.* Goldenburg, 168 U. S. 95, 102; Rodgers *v.* U. S., 185 U. S. 83, 86.) The validity of the tax on dividends from national-bank stock may be considered when it is assailed by a taxpayer in a proceeding in which it becomes necessary to decide that question.

But assuming for the purpose of the discussion only that dividends on national-bank stock are exempt by implication from the income tax or that the tax thereon is invalid and may be disregarded, the tax on bank shares is discriminatory for another reason. The State may, so long as it observes the rule of fairness and good faith, tax national-bank shares by one method while it taxes competing capital by another method, without exact uniformity or equality. (Mercantile Bank *v.* New York, supra; People ex rel. Bridgeport Savings Bank *v.* Feitner, supra.) In doubtful cases the burden may rest on the bank to establish inequality. (Bank of Commerce *v.* Seattle, 166 U. S. 463; First National Bank of Wellington *v.* Chapman, 173 U. S. 205.) Yet the rule laid down for our guidance by the Supreme Court of the United States in substance requires that the shares of the bank shall be taxed only to the same extent that other moneyed capital invested in the State is taxed. (People *v.* Weaver, 100 U. S. 539; Boyer *v.* Boyer, supra.) If the inequality is palpable, the State courts are without discretion. It becomes their duty to declare the right asserted under the Constitution of the United States and the statute enacted by Congress in uniformity therewith and to hold the tax invalid. (Merchants' National Bank *v.* City of Richmond, supra.)

When it appears on the face of the statute that bank shares are taxed on valuation at a flat rate and that the owner of competing moneyed capital relatively material in amount is taxed on income only, the court is powerless to say that equality of taxation has been secured and injustice prevented. We are forced to compare two methods which are wholly unlike. How can equality be established or presumed as the necessary result of the taxing statutes? In a very considerable number of cases the valuation tax must inevitably be the heavier burden. It is fixed and certain. The income tax is variable and dependent on income and amount of income. It is conceivable that when returns on such capital are low, the bank stock would be taxed and the competing capital would be exempt. In no event would equality exist unless the income on competing capital were large beyond the dreams of avarice and the usual returns on investments.

The relator is entitled to the relief asked for. The orders should be reversed and the assessment vacated, with costs in all courts.—(L. S. 359 (1).)

Hiscock, Ch. J., Cardozo, McLaughlin, Crane, and Andrews, JJ., concur. Hogan, J., not voting.

Ordered accordingly.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to prefer a uninamous-consent request. Some months ago there was printed by unanimous consent or by resolution—I do not now recall which—as a House document, a very considerable number, several thousand copies, of what is commonly known as the Wood-Forbes report on the Philippine situation, as they found it. There has been a document prepared in the nature of a response to some phases of that. That matter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some time since, but there has been a revision of the matter as it appeared in the RECORD. It is not desirable to reinsert it in the RECORD. I desire to ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a House document the usual number of copies of this matter, which is in the hands of the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. DE VEYRA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that there be printed as a House document the matter referred to. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would it not be better to send it to the Printing Committee to ascertain the number that should be printed? I am not particular about it, but that would be the orderly procedure.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman desires to take that course, all right. I have not a cost estimate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF FIRE SUFFERERS IN ASTORIA, OREG.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 255 and consider the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 255 and consider it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, let it be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 255) for the relief of sufferers from fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg.

Resolved, etc., That in order to relieve temporarily the suffering and the conditions resulting from the recent fire in the city of Astoria, Oreg., the Secretary of War is authorized and directed, in cooperation with the authorities of the State of Oregon and of the city of Astoria, or otherwise, to issue subsistence and supplies belonging to the Military Establishment to persons in Astoria who are in such needy circumstances and to take such temporary sanitary measures as he may deem necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I could not catch the reading clearly. Does this just provide for the lending of tents and supplies?

Mr. HAWLEY. It provides for furnishing them with such supplies as they have which the destitute citizens of Astoria may be in need of at this time, and for the sanitation measures necessary to relieve a distressing situation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What character of supplies is contemplated?

Mr. HAWLEY. If the gentleman will permit me to make a statement of the general situation, I think that will answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was reserving the right to object, but I will withhold it if the gentleman from Oregon desires to make a statement.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, December 8, 1922, at 2 o'clock in the morning a fire broke out in Astoria, Oreg., and in a few hours had utterly destroyed some 30 blocks of the city. It has done a damage, according to the recent estimates, of some $20,000,000, and it has thrown out of employment and rendered homeless and penniless about 5,000 people. It destroyed the entire business section of the city, according to the information furnished me by the city authorities.

In a telegram signed jointly by Mayor James Bremner, Col. W. S. Gilbert, of the citizens' executive committee, and L. D. Drake, of the chamber of commerce, under date of December 13, they state:

> On Friday morning last the entire business part of the city was totally destroyed by the most devastating fire in the history of the Pacific coast. Streets, water system, sewer system, and fire system in the entire devastated district are totally destroyed. Over 5,000 citizens have suffered loss of their entire property and are without employment or means of subsistence. Business is paralyzed and the city wholly without adequate means either to furnish employment or sustain its citizens who have so suffered.

The fire originated in a building built on piles. A large part of the burned area was built on piling. The streets were paved on piling. The fire spread underneath the piling, underneath the pavements, and spread rapidly in every direction. The resources that the people had who are dependent upon their business or daily labor for a livelihood are gone. All the banks, five in number, all the hotels, restaurants, and apartment houses, some 300 stores and places of business, were burned with their contents. The wires for lighting the city were melted.

The water and sewer mains and laterals in this section of the city are destroyed. The city is built on the side of a hill. Sewers come down through the burned section and the sewage is flooding the burned area from the broken sewerage pipes beneath the ruins of the buildings and streets. This creates a dangerous situation.

The people need supplies of food, although the surrounding country and towns are temporarily supplying them. The weather is very cold for that section, and food, shelter, and other necessities will be required until the city can begin reconstruction and business, plans for which are already being made. They especially need relief from the dangers caused by the destroyed sewerage system.

The Senate joint resolution provides the relief the Government has given in scores of instances where localities have suffered from the destructive activities of the elements. Many millions have been expended for the relief of the sufferers from floods on the Mississippi, Ohio, and other rivers, and from tornadoes in the Middle West; $2,500,000 were made available for the relief of people in San Francisco suffering from the earthquake and fire in 1906; $200,000 for relief in Salem, Mass., when that city was partly destroyed in 1914; $800,000 was sent to Italy for the relief of her citizens in 1908. These are a few of the instances. The situation in Astoria is most distressing and the needs are urgent.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAWLEY. With pleasure.

Mr. GARNER. I notice that the Senate joint resolution originally provided for a $3,000,000 appropriation. As I understand this resolution, it will authorize the War Department to use the funds——

Mr. HAWLEY. Or supplies——

Mr. GARNER. Now in the hands of the War Department for sanitary purposes, and that will enable you to rebuild the sewer system that you speak of. In other words, under the resolution you can spend any amount for supplies and such temporary relief for sanitary conditions; you can use $3,000,000 worth of supplies and engineering material, and you can come to Mr. MADDEN'S committee and ask for $3,000,000 deficiency to make it up. I think there should be some limitation here as to the amount of money that it will cost the Government in order to relieve this situation. The House is entitled to know how much it will cost.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I can not quite agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who has just spoken, in his estimate of the probable cost under this resolution. I agree with him that we ought to have some reasonable assurance that the cost will not be great, but I assume that the War Department would not be justified under a resolution of this character to expend any considerable sum of money. They might expend several hundred thousand dollars. I do not believe they would be justified in spending $1,000,000, much less $3,000,000.

Mr. GARNER. The way to protect that is for the Congress to put in some kind of definition or limitation.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me, within a very short time we hope to have reports from the engineer officers of the War Department who are now on the ground as to what in their opinion it is wise for the Federal Government to do in this particular case, and I think we shall know very soon what the department's estimate is.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. As I recall, the present law authorizes the commandant of a post or the commander of a division to render relief in cases of this kind.

Mr. MONDELL. Temporary relief is what is provided here.

Mr. GARNER. I call attention to the fact that the general law authorizes that to be done at this time without this resolution. The gentleman from Wyoming recalls the fact that a few days ago there was a tremendous fire at New Bern, N. C. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] came to me about the matter, as a new Member, and wanted to know what to do. I told him that I thought the War Department was authorized to let these people have tents and furnish those people who were hungry with food to eat. I understand that the corps commander was doing that very thing; and I venture the assertion that at Astoria they are doing under the law as it now exists all that is temporarily demanded—that is, feeding the people and housing them as far as tents will permit.

Mr. MONDELL. I am inclined to think, as I understand this, that the War Department would not be justified in going much further.

Mr. GARNER. How far have they gone?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina objects.

LAC DU FLAMBEAU BAND OF LAKE SUPERIOR CHIPPEWAS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6428) for the enrollment and allotment of members of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewas, in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARTER. Let the bill be reported.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. The gentleman will recall that on last Monday I called his attention to a proposed amendment in line 4, on page 3 of the bill, giving the Indian council the right to have some voice in the sale of this timber.

Mr. ROACH. I have an amendment that I think will cure the objection which the gentleman has to this bill, by inserting on page 3, line 4, after the word "authorized" the words "by the advice and consent of the Indian council representing the band."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That will meet the objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. CARTER. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri about his amendment that he proposes to offer. There was so much confusion in the House that I did not hear it.

Mr. ROACH. Is the gentleman directing his inquiry to me?

Mr. CARTER. I understand an amendment is to be proposed to the bill which will provide that these Indians when their land is allotted to them may not alienate that land for 25 years without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Is that amendment to be proposed?

Mr. ROACH. Yes; I will state to the gentleman that such an amendment has been prepared and is now held by the gentleman from Wisconsin. While I do not believe it is necessary, as I stated to the House when this bill was up before that the general law covered that, yet in order to make it

absolutely certain that there would be no doubt concerning the matter an amendment has been prepared along that line and will be offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some little acquaintance with this land up in the Lac du Flambeau country—of course, not as much acquaintance with it as my colleague [Mr. A. P. NELSON], who represents that district—but I should like to know why we should create a new roll composed largely of infants, when within 12 or 15 years the last roll was created and the land allotted to those then 21 years of age? This land has a good marketable value, not only for the timber but for summer-resort purposes if sold by these allottees. The northern Wisconsin lake region is becoming much sought after for resort purposes. As a citizen and taxpayer of Wisconsin I am not willing to have these Indians deprived of their lands and have them thrown upon the patrimony of the State. There should be some showing made why there should be a new roll and why it is to the interest of these 450 infants to be now constituted allottees and ultimately thrown upon the charity of the State.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. For the time being I object.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw the demand for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. I trust the gentleman from Wisconsin will not object.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. If I understand, the gentleman from Texas withdraws his demand for the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw it if the gentleman wants to discuss it further.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection.

Mr. ROACH. I wish to state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this is not an attempt to make up a new roll, but to complete and make final the roll of this particular tribe or band of Indians.

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon what does the gentleman base that statement?

Mr. ROACH. The former allotment was made to the adults of this tribe, and it is now proposed by this bill to complete the roll by allotting the remainder of the land to the new-born Indians, born since the former allotment in 1903. It would benefit directly something like 450 Indians, born since the roll was made up, and complete and make final the roll as to this particular tribe of Indians. It would put their affairs in final shape.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me? When the original roll was made up everyone of age in that band of Indians received an allotment.

Mr. ROACH. I believe that is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. And naturally Indians have been born since.

Mr. ROACH. Does not the gentleman think that would be right?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know that they should receive an allotment if the parents received the original allotment.

Mr. ROACH. But they did not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; they did, and the property was well invested and is now valuable by reason of the growing timber that can be sold for the benefit of the entire tribe. Why tie it up by now making allotments to infants. I can see no reason for it.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield to me? On the last unanimous-consent day I objected to this bill for the very reason which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] now objects, to wit, that if this land was allotted to the Indians without any restriction the Indians might dispose of the land and become a charge on the Federal Government, as has been the case in the past.

I insisted that some restriction should be put in the bill as to alienation and exemption from taxation which the bill on its face did not carry. It was claimed that the alienation would fall under the general allotment act, but I am not sure about that. On consultation with the gentleman in charge of the bill I was assured that an amendment would be placed in the bill requiring restrictions from alienation for 25 years and exemption from taxes in the usual customary way of allotment to Indians. This bill is one process of working out the Indian problem, to wit, the Indian is brought in and settled on a reservation and becomes civilized enough to take an allotment. Then the next step is to make the allotment.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are infants, and the purpose is to give them an allotment from this trust fund.

Mr. CARTER. These Indians are principally those who have been born since the other enrollment was made. I think the gentleman from Missouri said most of them, but it is immaterial whether it is most of them or all of them. These Indians when they grow up, if they are not given an allotment, will be left without any means of support. If they did not own the lands to be allotted, if we were allotting lands belonging to the public domain, taking something that did not belong to them, but to some one else, there might be an objection. This is an allotment of lands that belong to the tribe, going only to the enrolled members of the tribe and can not be sold under the amendment which the gentleman will propose for 25 years. Therefore every restriction will be placed around this allotment if the gentleman's proposed amendment is adopted.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the original allotment was made years ago there were 601 Indians on the roll. They had a residuary claim on the rest of the tribal property, and everyone, regardless of the number of such Indians born since, has a claim to that residuum. Now you are proposing to make a new division and we have no assurance that these infants will not be better off with the original allotment—that they will be better off by keeping it in the existing condition than they will by dividing it up in small piecemeal portions.

Mr. CARTER. If it is divided up you start the child out as an individual owner of property and he can not dispose of it for 25 years. There can be no claim growing out of it against the Government for allotting the lands to these new borns. In the Cherokee baby case it was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that Congress had plenary power to do as it saw fit in the division of any undivided tribal property. So there can be no claim against the Government for allotting these lands to these infants.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; there could be no claim against the Government, but we are to consider what is for the welfare of these children. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. A. P. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS MEDAL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2192) authorizing the award of the distinguished service cross or distinguished service medal, provided for in the act of July 9, 1918, to Army officers brevetted for gallantry during the war with Spain, Philippine insurrection, or China relief expedition.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been on the calendar and been through the throes of objections many times. I have not much to add to the objections raised on those occasions. But I would like to know why when Congress in 1918 established a policy as to awards and medals of honor and the distinguished service cross which were to be awarded only to those then in the service of the Army and those in the service subsequently, why we should now seek to extend the provision of that act to those who were not in the service at that time?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can answer the question that the gentleman asked or not. It was my intention to have the Senate bill substituted for the House bill in the consideration of this measure if it should pass objection. As I understand the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], this legislation of 1918, relative to the distinguished service cross, applied to those officers in the Army who distinguished themselves prior to the passage of that act, and should go back.

Mr. STAFFORD. It applies to those who were in the service at that time, even recognizing merit that had been performed in that war or prior thereto, but does not extend the benefits of that act to those who were not in the Army at that time.

Mr. MILLER. The reason that the brevet rank did not pass at the time was that after the close of the war with Spain the Senate, believing that all legislation came to a close at the close of the war, concluded that it acted without jurisdiction, and this is simply a bill to confer on these gentlemen a long-delayed honor to which they are entitled, I believe.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that the intention of this legislation is simply to give to officers who served in the Span-

ish-American War and other wars the recognition provided for officers who served in the World War? The officers of the Spanish-American War, performing the same service, there being no law to grant the medal, can not receive it. This simply allows two men, one entitled to recognition, but one barred by the statute of limitations, one might say, to become eligible for the honor.

Mr. MILLER. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that is quite an accurate statement. At the time of the Spanish-American War the law and regulations provided for certain rewards for gallant and meritorious services and conduct. Later, in the World War we made other provisions, differing widely from those of the Spanish War. We made provisions which we believed were wise and proper and fitted to the conditions and situation then existing and not to the situation existing 20 years before. What is proposed now is that we shall grant the recognition intended to be bestowed upon officers of the World War upon officers of a war 20 years before. It may be that it is wise to do so. It is not very logical. If we do that I know of no reason why we should not go back to the Civil War, to the Indian wars, and to all the wars. The men of the Spanish War received the recognition that they had reason to expect at the time the service was rendered. That recognition was as much of an honor and ought to be as favorably considered as anything that we did later for the soldiers of another war; but it was recognition bestowed in another way, in a different form. Is it logical, after the passing of all these years, to say that the provisions relative to medals and recognition in the World War ought to have been made back in the days of the Spanish War?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. We did not make such provisions, and gentlemen claim now, therefore, that we should go back to the Spanish War and attempt to readjust the situation and give men recognition in a manner not contemplated, not in vogue at the time the service was rendered. I do not think it is a very logical procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

SALE OF MILK, ETC., IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7746) to regulate within the District of Columbia the sale of milk, cream, and certain milk products, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

REGULATING SALARIES OF TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10390) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is a very important measure. It covers 14 pages. I do not know anything about the merits of it. It is said to be a very meritorious measure, but it should not be taken up on unanimous-consent day, and I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, for the reason stated by the gentleman from Indiana, that it is too important a bill to be considered on unanimous-consent day, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

PREVENTION OF VENEREAL DISEASES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11021) for the prevention of venereal diseases in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the reason stated in reference to the previous bill, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the regular order is demanded, and I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

FOREST LANDS IN TAHOE NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6651) to provide for the consolidation of forest lands in the Tahoe National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me we have a good deal of legislation relative to national forests, and unless there can be some very good explanation given as to why this transaction provided for in this bill shall take place I shall be obliged to object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman withhold?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FREE TRANSMISSION OF CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS FOR THE BLIND.

The next business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10496) to provide for the free transmission through the mail of certain publications for the blind.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman withhold that?

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill was previously on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and it has an adverse report from the Postmaster General.

Mr. STEENERSON. It has been modified.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think under those circumstances it should stay on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENUNCIATION OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

The next business in order on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13194) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman interested in this measure kindly explain some reason why this legislation should be adopted?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will be very glad to furnish the information which the gentleman desires. This bill requests an authorization for the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, and is prompted only by the desire to celebrate in a fitting manner a very important national event and international event. There is also to be held in the city of Los Angeles next year a Monroe doctrine centennial exposition. A very unique thing about this bill and the centennial which we propose to hold in Los Angeles is that we do not propose to ask the Government of the United States for one cent of money; that is to say, pecuniary outlay on the part of the Government.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield? The provisions of the bill put this issue entirely in the hands of the local clearing house. That is a unique provision, is it not?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I think not. I believe it has been customary when an exposition or other commemorative events are held in localities and a coin is specifically coined by the Government to commemorate that same event, the locality in which the commemorative event is held is usually permitted to distribute the coin. That is as it should be; that is the only reason for their asking for this, and I hope the gentleman will not object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. The coin is not to commemorate the exposition or fair, or whatever it is down there, but it is to commemorate the enunciation of the Monroe doctrine, which I do not understand took place in Los Angeles.

Mr. LINEBERGER. No; it did not take place in Los Angeles, but I want to say to the gentleman, speaking in a historical sense, I do not think that any portion of the country is more interested in the Monroe doctrine, because it was through the Monroe doctrine that California was annexed.

Ever since the Lewis and Clark expendition, as far back as 1806, England, France, and Russia had cast covetous eyes along the littoral of the north Pacific coast. California was the main attraction, but the Monroe doctrine, proclaimed in 1823, disturbed their plans and kept the European powers at a distance. However, when war was declared between the United States and Mexico, on May 13, 1846, the situation which had been long developing finally crystallized. Commodore John B. Sloat was in command of the Pacific Squadron, consisting of seven vessels and a transport. This fleet was lying in the Harbor of Mazatlan when, on May 17, word reached him that hostilities had begun between Mexico and the United States. But as the report was not official, Sloat contented himself with dispatching a single vessel, the *Cyane*, under Captain Mervin, to join the *Portsmouth* at Monterey, while he remained in the Mexican harbor with the remainder of the fleet. A few weeks later, receiving additional confirmation of the earlier report, he quietly slipped out of Mazatlan and sailed direct to Monterey.

In taking this course Sloat was not only guided by Bancroft's orders of the previous year but also by evidence, apparently genuine, that the British Government planned to check the American occupation of California. Admiral Seymour, commander of the British fleet in the Pacific, whose interest in California was well known, was then cruising in the vicinity of Sloat's command and had shown an unpleasant curiosity in the doings of the American fleet. It was credibly reported that he intended to forestall Sloat's occupation of any California port; and as later evidence showed, only the absence of official orders prevented him from making this attempt.

As it was, however, Sloat found no obstruction in his way at Monterey. His flagship, the *Savannah*, anchored in the harbor on July 2; but he delayed action until the morning of the 7th. The intervening time was occupied in conferences with Larkin, in the preparation of plans and proclamations for the conquest of the Province, and in exchange of official courtesies with the California authorities.

At last, however, stirred by news of Fremont's activities in the north, the fear of Admiral Seymour's arrival, and the urging of his own officers, Sloat decided to act. The occupation of Monterey then became almost a matter of routine. There had been no powder in the fort to salute the American vessels when they sailed into port; all the soldiers—a mere handful—had gone south with Castro; and a Mexican flag had not been seen in the town for three months.

Accordingly, when the formal demand for surrender was refused, because there was no one with authority to grant it, Sloat disembarked some 250 men, who marched unmolested to the customhouse, where they raised the American flag, July 7, 1846. He fired a salute and formally proclaimed California annexed to the United States. Two days later the flag was raised over San Francisco and Sonoma, and on the 11th at Sutter's Fort. In all these proceedings and in the proclamations accompanying them it is worth recording that the American officers sought, according to their instructions, to conciliate the Californians and to treat them with all possible consideration.

Thus the Monroe doctrine kept the European powers from taking action for the acquisition of California for a period of nearly 25 years, and no doubt was the final source of inspiration which caused Commodore Sloat to act in 1846, thereby forestalling the occupation of the territory by the British.

So California has an historical interest in the Monroe doctrine, and in reality owes her place in the great constellation of States to the fact of its existence. Her interest in its present maintenance and future perpetuation is no less now than it was in the past, and it is appropriate, indeed, gentlemen, that this great exposition to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the Monroe doctrine should be held upon the shores of the Pacific in the great State of California, which came under the folds of the American flag because of the foresight and patriotism of the statesman of a century ago who promulgated the doctrine and proclaimed the sentiments of the American people therein enunciated to the world.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman willing to cut section 2 from the bill?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that omission because this exposition is to be held in Los Angeles and preparations are well on their way and that would be the natural place to distribute these coins.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say frankly to the gentleman with section 2 remaining in the bill I shall be obliged to object.

Mr. LINEBERGER. What would the gentleman suggest; from whence could the coin be distributed to better advantage than in Los Angeles?

Mr. CRAMTON. We have a lot of patriotic towns in Michigan that could distribute them if it is necessary to have a town distribute them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand from the gentleman's statement that the people of Los Angeles do not expect to call upon the Government for any funds to assist it in the maintenance of the exposition?

Mr. LINEBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. And that this issue of specially designed 50-cent pieces is virtually for the purpose of raising funds to defray some of the expenses of the exposition?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose of having these coined exclusive in the treasury of the Los Angeles clearing house?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Simply because it is the natural place from which they should be distributed in view of the exposition. It will be an international affair, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year we authorized the issuance of a special coin to assist in the building of a highway in the President's State and those coins were sold at a premium I suppose for the purpose of contributing to the expenses.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that whenever these special things are done, either with respect to stamps or coins, or anything of that kind, eventually there is a very large premium asked for them when they reach the hands of collectors?

Mr. STAFFORD. There will be no question about the number of collectors of these coins.

Mr. TREADWAY. Of what benefit would this be to Los Angeles, or what effect would it have on the Monroe doctrine?

Mr. LINEBERGER. If the gentleman will permit me to answer him, I will say this, that it is to commemorate a national event that we are holding this exposition, and the coining of this coin which will cost the Government nothing—because the exposition pays all expense, is to commemorate the same event, and I think the coins should be distributed from the point where the exposition is to be held.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If they are not going to ask the Federal Government for help—which would be a departure from the usual custom—and if by section 2 they can sell these coins at a premium of 50 cents or a dollar and thereby secure funds to help them out, why should we object? In my opinion that is an entirely proper way for them to finance their entertainment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, it does not occur to me that this is a right way to finance the fair.

Mr. LINEBERGER. It is not financing the fair. It will cost millions. Will the gentleman accept the bill if I move to strike out section 2?

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman suppose the Senate will restore it?

Mr. LINEBERGER. I have no way of telling what the Senate will do in the matter.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will need assurance that section 2 will not be put in.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I shall not, of course, handle the bill in the Senate. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection. He said he would.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will object unless the gentleman can assure us that section 2 will not be restored.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will say frankly to gentlemen on the Senate side that there was objection here, and I shall do my best to cut it out. I hope the gentleman will not renew his objection, so this will not be necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Oh, yes; I will yield to a Senator at any time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Not to a half-baked one. [Laughter.] It seems to me the question is not one of selling a coin at a particular value or at a particular place. The question is whether the United States Government is going to go on from year to year submitting its coinage to this—well—harlotry. It is a question whether the dignity of the Government's coinage is going to be maintained by the Government or be let out to every ballyhoo organization to prop up somebody's fair. I do not mean to be invidious in saying this. I have thought of the same objection heretofore. We have all sorts of expositions, and many have asked for this same thing. It does not apply especially to the exposition of the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER], which is a high-class proposition. But it does seem to me we should call a halt on this business in our postage stamps and in our coins and everything. We are now doing almost everything with these Government agencies but advertise patent medicines. It is time that we should stop it. It is almost like a man renting his barn wall to advertise somebody's paint. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Vermont will not object, holding the views that he does.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. TREADWAY. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, has that bill been on the calendar for a sufficient length of time to qualify it for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that it was put on on Thursday. If it was put on on Friday, it would be too late.

The Clerk is now making a search to ascertain the facts. If objection is made, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] to move to suspend the rules.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then there will be no question about that.

The SPEAKER. There is no question about that. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and that the bill S. 4100 be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended is amended by striking out the words "18 months" in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "30 months."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin demands a second.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the extension of time in which certain claimants for interests in property held by the Alien Property Custodian are required to commence suits in order to protect their rights. The law as originally passed provided that they could have six months from the expiration of the war. About a year ago that time was extended one year, so that it expires January 2 of the coming year. It is now asked by the Department of Justice and by the Alien Property Custodian that the time be extended for one more year.

I think the Members of the House should keep this in mind: This does not deprive anyone of any rights that he now has, but it extends his right to bring suit one year from the 2d day of January, 1923.

The bill has been passed in the Senate and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Members of the House should keep this further point in mind: This does not apply to property held by the Alien Property Custodian that belonged to alien enemies. It applies to other than alien enemies who have a claim against the property which the Alien Property Custodian has. Section 9 of the trading with the enemy act provided that these people might file a claim for the interest which they had in this property held by the Alien Property Custodian, and under certain procedure the President might authorize the Alien Property Custodian to transfer it to persons not alien enemies or allies of alien enemies; but if they did not see fit to follow that procedure clear through, the law gave them six months after the close of the war in which to begin suit or required them to bring suit not later than six months after the close of the war. This bill simply extends the time for another year in which they can begin suit. They can begin suit now, if the time is not extended, and be put and put the Alien Property Custodian and the Government to the expense of defending those suits. If this bill is passed and the time is extended it will simply give them another year before they are obliged to file suits in order to protect their rights.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As a matter of fact the accommodation in this case will be largely to the Government itself, and to the Alien Property Custodian, to make it possible for him to determine these matters in his office and with the available facilities there, rather than in a court after suit has been brought against him?

Mr. MAPES. Of course it will be for the accommodation of the Alien Property Custodian, but it will also save the claimant the expense of bringing the suits.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Certainly. But I mean it is required by the department itself? We are not merely benefiting the claimants?

Mr. MAPES. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan a question for information?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I know of a party in my own State who has lived in Texas 40 years and has grown children and grown grandchildren born and raised in Texas, and whose property was taken away from him by the Alien Property Custodian because he had never taken out his naturalization papers. A case of that kind is not affected by this proposed act, is it? That man is not required to file a suit against the Alien Property Custodian, is he?

Mr. MAPES. Is he an alien enemy under the law?

Mr. BLANTON. Under the law, being formerly a resident of Germany, unnaturalized, but who had lived in this country for 40 years.

Mr. MAPES. If he is an alien enemy or the ally of an alien enemy, this amendment does not affect him at all.

Mr. BLANTON. It does not affect him at all?

Mr. MAPES. It does not apply to that class of people.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Government expect that a man in that kind of a situation shall bring a suit, or is his property to be restored to him some day?

Mr. MAPES. It is hoped that some day his property will be restored to him.

Mr. BLANTON. Without suit?

Mr. MAPES. Without suit, although this amendment has nothing to do with the case at all.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. I understand this amendment will inure to the benefit of a large class of claimants who were held constructively to be alien enemies because they were in territory temporarily occupied by German arms. Under an interpretation of the law by the Alien Property Custodian persons residing in territory temporarily occupied by German or Austrian arms were considered alien enemies while in fact they were not. I understand this amendment will enable this class of claimants to press

their claims, or if necessary to commence actions. Am I correct in that view?

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman that I can not answer his question. Section 9, which this bill proposes to amend, applies only to the class of people mentioned in the first sentence of the section, which is as follows:

That any person not an enemy or the ally of an enemy claiming any interest in any property held by the Alien Property Custodian—

And so forth.

Mr. LONDON. During the war the Alien Property Custodian demanded that all persons who owed any money to residents of territory occupied by German arms should report to the Alien Property Custodian, but in fact those persons were not alien enemies.

Mr. MAPES. I think there might have to be an order finding that they were not alien enemies before this would apply to them and inure to their benefit; but I am not familiar enough with the situation to answer definitely the question the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. STEPHENS. Will this cover cases where property held by the Alien Property Custodian is in dispute, where it is claimed by citizens of this country and yet their claim has not been fully determined?

Mr. MAPES. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to claim the time allotted to me in case anyone wishes to oppose this bill, because I am in favor of it.

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am in hearty accord with the purpose of this bill. I hope it will be a spur to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to consider the bills recommended by the Alien Property Custodian, introduced, I believe, by the chairman of the committee [Mr. WINSLOW] last August, so that consideration of claims may be made by Congress, or authorization may be granted rather to the Alien Property Custodian to pay 95 per cent in number of these claims, but in total valuation a very small percentage of the total claims against the German Government.

If I have read correctly the letter of the Alien Property Custodian addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, this bill has for its purpose not alone relieving these many claimants from taking action in court, which would involve an expense to the Government and necessitate the employment of attorneys, but it is to give time for the status quo to continue, so that Congress may take action upon the bills recommended by the Alien Property Custodian so as to authorize him to give much-needed relief to the many thousands of claimants, large in number, whose claims are small in amount.

Mr. STEPHENS. Does the gentleman refer to a bill that is now in the hands of the committee, which provides that all property up to the value of $10,000 be returned to alien enemies?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the bill that I had specially in mind, and the Alien Property Custodian is strongly in favor of, because it will not destroy any of the equities of our Government if we pay those small amounts, and it will be of great benefit to the small claimants who happen to be alien enemies and happen to have had their property tied up under the trading with the enemy act.

Mr. STEPHENS. Had the gentleman any information as to the probability of that bill being considered or brought before the House for consideration at a very early date?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman should direct his inquiry to some member of the committee to whom the bill has been referred for consideration. I am not advised as to the status of the bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield to me five minutes?

Mr. STAFFORD. We want to hasten the consideration of the bill. I will yield to the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think in the case I mentioned steps ought to be taken at once to return the property to the owner. This is a case where this citizen lived in the country for 40 years. I am not excusing him for not taking out his naturalization papers. But he served on juries; he served on the grand juries of his county time and again. All of his children were born in the State of Texas. He has grandchildren born in Texas now grown up, and because he had not taken out his naturalization papers the Alien Property Custodian took charge of his home and is now holding it. It is four long years since the armistice has been signed and still his home property is being held.

Mr. STEPHENS. The bill I refer to in the hands of the committee will correct that very thing, and that is the reason we wanted it shoved through.

Mr. BLANTON. It ought to be on the calendar and passed under suspension of the rules to-day, because it is time that this property was returned to this old man in his declining years. It is true he came from Germany 40 years ago, but he is an American citizen and a good citizen of the State of Texas. Not one word can be said against his stand during the war.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is quite correct about all that, but there is no reason why he should scold anybody in connection with the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not scolding anyone.

Mr. WINSLOW. The committee has had the matter in hand for a good many months and we have operated back and forth with the Alien Property Custodian time and time again. We have been all ready to bring the matter before the committee a great many times, but about the minute we were ready to take it up somebody, either the Alien Property Custodian or the Department of State or the Department of Justice, would say, "Hold on a bit; we are up against a little sharp point that we had not noticed before." It has been going around and around until now it looks as if we had come to a point where we would have these men settle the final conditions, if they have any, before the committee. I will say now, under the pressure of the moment, to the gentleman that the chairman of the committee purposes to call this up immediately after the holidays and take up the bill to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad of it, because the gentleman from Massachusetts when he wants to get something through gets it through, and he is the last man on earth whom I would undertake to scold. I am glad that the time has come when this bill will be brought out, because I think the home property of such a man as I have alluded to ought to be returned immediately.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, we all have had cases of the kind mentioned by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. A great many of the people of this country who were not advised of their lack of citizenship have served on petit juries and on grand juries and have voted in elections, men who assumed for all purposes that they were citizens of the United States. Their families have grown up here, they were good people in the communities in which they lived, but somehow they had forgotten some incidents connected with their naturalization. For instance, there were many who believed that the first papers authorized them to vote and, in fact, completed their citizenship. In some States until quite recently men were allowed to vote on getting their first papers or the application for citizenship, and were not required to secure a final certificate to enjoy the right of suffrage. All of this resulted in many people living in the country without ascertaining definitely whether they were or were not citizens. When the war came on they were required to produce evidence of citizenship, not only Germans but people born in other countries.

I want to say to those who may not know that there is a law which allows a man under the conditions to be naturalized in six months after he applies for citizenship.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to extend and revise his remarks.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to revise or extend my remarks. I note that a gentleman for whom we have been waiting has entered the Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. In the opinion of the Chair two-thirds having voted in favor therefor the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have as No. 1 on the calendar of motions to discharge committees the bill H. R. 263, amending section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887. I would like to ask if it is not in order for me to call up that

bill at this time in view of the fact that the Unanimous-Consent Calendar has been called and all motions to suspend the rules have been disposed of?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that it is.

Mr. HAYDEN. Notwithstanding the motion of the gentleman from Michigan to go into the Committee of the Whole on the naval appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER. It is a novel question, but at the first blush the Chair thinks the gentleman from Arizona has that right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan made his motion and the Chair was submitting it. No point of order was raised to the privileged character of the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole. Does it not come too late to raise that question whether it is in order to entertain a motion to discharge a committee?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think, as the motion had not been passed upon by the House, that it is too late. There has been no debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Chair was putting the motion.

The SPEAKER. Yes; but the Chair did not know that the gentleman from Arizona was on his feet.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we could not hear. What is the gentleman's request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona makes the point of order that he is entitled to be recognized to move to discharge a committee in a case of the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

Mr. DOWELL. Is that upon the ground that it is privileged?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House—

After the Unanimous-Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday and motions to suspend the rules have been disposed of, it shall be in order to call up any such motion—

That is, a motion to discharge a committee—

which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto.

The Chair will inquire of the gentleman whether this has been upon the calendar for more than seven days?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has been on the calendar for nearly a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the Unanimous-Consent Calendar has not been called; that is, we have not finished calling it. The last bill has not been called.

The SPEAKER. That bill is not in order, it not having been on the calendar for three days. There was a decision rendered on January 16, 1911, to this effect:

A motion to discharge a committee from consideration of a bill under this rule is of higher privilege than a motion to consider an appropriation bill.

The Chair thinks the gentleman from Arizona is entitled to be recognized.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I have a bill upon the Unanimous-Consent Calendar to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] objected. He is now willing to withdraw his objection. I want to know if I can call it up at this time? I ask unanimous consent to return to the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is bad practice, after a bill has been objected to, to revive it again even upon the withdrawal of objection upon the part of the person who objected, because there may have been Members here who would otherwise have interposed an objection. This bill to which the gentleman from California refers retains its place on the calendar. No harm can be done by having it go over for two weeks. It has been the invariable practice when a bill is objected to that it shall not be reconsidered upon that same day.

The SPEAKER. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My impression is that I had been recognized to make a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did recognize the gentleman, but the gentleman from Arizona makes the point of order that he has a motion of higher privilege. The Chair thinks he is correct. Of course, the gentleman's motion must be supported by a majority of the House by tellers. He does not have an absolute right to bring the bill up.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, there is so much confusion; what is the motion?

The SPEAKER. To call up the first motion on the calendar for the discharge of committees.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the rule simply provides that it shall be in order to make such a motion. I do not think that would give us a superior privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair just cited a decision which holds that a motion to discharge a committee from consideration of a bill under this rule is of higher privilege than a motion to consider an appropriation bill. This is a new proposition to the Chair. The rule further provides:

When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers.

Of course, if the House does not want to consider it, it can refuse to consider it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is the motion to discharge the committee and place this bill upon its appropriate calendar?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposed that the gentleman meant to discharge the committee and consider the bill. The gentleman has not stated his motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move, in accordance with paragraph 4 of Rule XXVII, to call up the bill H. R. 263 for consideration at this time.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order. Only one motion is proper at this time, and that is a motion to discharge the committee and place this bill on the appropriate calendar, and that motion must be supported by a majority vote, by tellers, in order to be considered at all. Then the motion must pass this House by a majority of all the votes of the House—not of all the Members present but of the membership of the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arizona would better withdraw his motion.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will frankly say to the gentleman from Wyoming that I have been here 10 years, and I have never seen the calendar of motions to discharge committees brought into action. I want to see what will happen if my motion is considered.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan had already made a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. He had.

Mr. DOWELL. The Speaker could not recognize anyone else while that motion was before the House, could he?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks differently. The Chair supposed the gentleman from Michigan was the only person demanding recognition.

Mr. DOWELL. He was entitled to recognition and received recognition to make his motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman knows that it occurs very often that two or three gentlemen rise and the Chair recognizes one, but if another one states that he has a motion of higher privilege the fact that the Chair had already recognized one Member does not prevent the other being recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was on my feet seeking recognition at that time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arizona to move to take up the bill, to discharge this committee, and consider the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I make the point of order against that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is plainly to be gathered from the rule itself, which is found on page 26 of to-day's calendar. I read from the rule:

After the Unanimous-Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday and motions to suspend the rules have been disposed of, it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto.

Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion fails of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall require for adoption an affirmative vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which

any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, the motion I made was to do with this bill everything that could be done under the rule relating to the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman if he wishes to move that the bill be called up. The Chair does not remember that this has occurred before. It is an entirely novel proposition. The gentleman has the right to call the bill up, and thereupon, in order to have it considered at all, his motion must be seconded by tellers. If a majority of the vote by tellers is against the gentleman, then it has no consideration at all. If, on the other hand, the majority, on tellers, should be in favor of the gentleman's motion then all that it would accomplish would be to put the bill on its appropriate calendar in order that it could be reached when that committee is called, which everyone knows will not happen in this session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the proper motion to call up the bill H. R. 263.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Dyer	Lee, N. Y.	Riordan
Anderson	Echols	Luce	Robertson
Ansorge	Edmonds	Lubring	Rodenberg
Anthony	Fairchild	McClintic	Rosenbloom
Bell	Fish	McCormick	Rossdale
Benham	Free	McFadden	Rucker
Bird	Freeman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Ryan
Blakeney	Frothingham	McSwain	Sabath
Bland, Ind.	Gallivan	Maloney	Sanders, N. Y.
Bond	Goodykoontz	Mead	Schall
Bowers	Gorman	Michaelson	Shaw
Brand	Gould	Millis	Shreve
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Siegel
Brooks, Ill.	Green, Iowa	Moore, Ill.	Sisson
Brooks, Pa.	Griest	Morin	Slemp
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Mott	Smith, Mich.
Burke	Hammer	Mudd	Snyder
Campbell, Pa.	Hays	Nelson, Me.	Stiness
Cantrill	Henry	Nelson, J. M.	Stoll
Carew	Herrick	Newton, Mo.	Sullivan
Chalmers	Hicks	O'Brien	Sweet
Chandler, N. Y.	Husted	O'Connor	Tague
Chandler, Okla.	Hutchinson	Ogden	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Jacoway	Olpp	Taylor, N. J.
Classon	James	Osborne	Ten Eyck
Clouse	Jeffers, Ala.	Overstreet	Tillman
Codd	Johnson, Miss.	Paige	Tinkham
Cole, Ohio	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Tucker
Collins	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Kendall	Paul	Vestal
Copley	Kennedy	Perkins	Voigt
Coughlin	Kindred	Perlman	Volk
Crago	Kirkpatrick	Petersen	Walters
Cullen	Kitchin	Porter	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Kleczka	Pringey	Weaver
Deal	Knight	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kopp	Rainey, Ala.	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Kunz	Rainey, Ill.	Wilson
Drewry	Langley	Ramseyer	Wise
Driver	Larson, Minn.	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Dunbar	Layton	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Dunn	Lee, Ga.	Riddick	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arizona to discharge the committee on the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 263) amending section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from Arizona will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 80, noes 90.

The SPEAKER. The majority of the House not having voted in favor thereof by tellers, the motion fails and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, with Mr. LONGWORTH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13374, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

The Secretary of the Navy may use the unexpended balances on the date of the approval of this act under appropriations heretofore made on account of "Increase of the Navy," together with the sum of $20,000,000, which is hereby appropriated, for the prosecution of work on vessels under construction on such date, the construction of which may be proceeded with under the terms of the treaty providing for the limitation of naval armament, concluded on February 6, 1922, published in Senate Document No. 126 of the second session of the Sixty-seventh Congress; for continuing the conversion of two battle cruisers into aircraft carriers, including their complete equipment of aircraft and aircraft accessories, in accordance with the terms of such treaty; for the settlement of contracts on account of vessels already delivered to the Navy Department; for reimbursement to contractors and subcontractors of carrying charges heretofore and hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Navy to cover additional expenses resulting from the deferring of deliveries or payments under contracts and subcontracts for materials for vessels, the construction of which may be continued under the terms of such treaty; for the procurement of gyro compass equipments for destroyers not already supplied; for the completion of armor, armament, ammunition, and torpedoes for the supply and complement of vessels which may be proceeded with as hereinbefore mentioned; and not more than $10,000,000 of the additional funds herein made available under "Increase of the Navy" shall be applied to objects of expenditure under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Ordnance; and for the installation of fire-control instruments on destroyers not already supplied, and the funds herein made available shall not be used for any other purposes: *Provided*, That in addition to the funds hereinbefore made available for "Increase of the Navy," the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to make transfers during the fiscal year 1924 from the naval supply account fund and the clothing and small-stores fund to the appropriation "Increase of the Navy," of sums aggregating $35,000,000.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: On page 53, line 1, after the word "vessels," insert "authorized or."

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. So it will read "for the prosecution of work on vessels authorized or under construction on such date."

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before beginning I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing some extracts from the report of the Secretary of the Navy of March last, which is the last information I have on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment for the reason that it is a change of law and legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill, and I call the Chair's attention to the fact this would authorize the expenditure of money upon vessels which are now under suspension by reason of the four-power pact. That is in effect an agreement now being considered by nations and which if adopted becomes the law of the land. And this would make available money for the completion of those vessels, the work upon which has been suspended under that four-power pact.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I say in answer to that, in the first place, there is no change of law in proceeding with the construction of vessels authorized by law, and in the second place the four-power pact is expressly excepted in the last part of the same sentence, where it says we are not to construct any vessels which are objected to by the four-power pact. If the gentleman will hear me, he will find that the vessels I am going to speak about are the submarines and light cruisers which are not part of the four-power pact.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman's amendment is subject to the point of order.

What the gentleman desires is to continue work on destroyers that has been suspended?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; my idea, sir, is the completion not only of all the light cruisers which have been authorized but also the work to be done on the six submarines of large size, as well as the three which are already begun, and I want to say a word about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. The word "authorized" would take in the battleships which have been suspended.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. No; because in the act itself it says "vessels under contract authorized or under construction, the construction of which may be proceeded with under the terms of the treaty"; so it is limited to this. I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the amendment is in order. This paragraph is a very broad paragraph, indeed, relating to the increase generally of the Navy. The Chair thinks it may apply to those authorized as well as to the others.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I begin by congratulating the House on the illuminating speech which was made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] on Thursday last, and which is printed in the RECORD, and which I hope every gentleman in the House who is interested in a well-balanced Navy will read.

A navy does not consist of battleships alone. Those battleships are in a fleet, and that fleet needs to have with it not only destroyers, which can not proceed at high speed in a heavy sea, carry only light guns, and which can carry no airplanes, but that fleet needs also the fast light cruiser. We have 10 of them authorized now and under construction. This bill authorizes the completion of seven and the continuance at work at one-third speed on the other three, and those light cruisers will take some time to complete. England has of those light cruisers, according to the report of March last, which I am going to print, as I say, a part of it—England has some 50 or 60—I have not got the exact figures here—and a lot more building. We have only 10 authorized, and we have none on the sea. Mr. Denby closes by saying as to this matter—

If we are to have a fleet fit to fight we must complete our 10 light cruisers at once. Even with those completed our strength in light cruisers will be greatly below the 5-5-3 ratio.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I pass to the other matter, that of the submarines. We have some 80 or 90 submarines, but they are all of the second class. They can go out only a few hundred miles. They have no greater range. They have a speed of from 10 to 15 knots only. They have no speed that will allow them to keep up with a fleet going at 20 or 21 knots. We have authorized, now, nine fleet cruisers, which are twice or three times as big. Three of them are building. Six are only authorized, and this does not allow anything to be done except with the three that are building, and they are not enough.

If you will turn to the hearings, you will find in the testimony of Mr. Roosevelt, on page 742, that he says:

We have no fleet submarines, *V 1*, *2*, and *3* representing our nearest approach to such. These three vessels are large submarines. Their cruising speed will be approximately 20 knots. They can go with the fleet as our other submarines can not. Slowing the work on them—

Under this bill they are to go slow on these—

from the naval aspect is indefensible.

Mr. Chairman, we are intending to do such work in increase of the Navy as will give a balance to the Navy. We need the best submarines and, as we have none now, we ought to complete those three immediately and the $20,000,000 ought to be increased to $25,000,000.

If we have no fast cruisers with 8-inch guns, instead of 3 to 4 inch guns as carried by destroyers, we want those fast cruisers as soon as possible; and the 10 are less than those held by Great Britain or Japan, and we never could expect under the agreement suggested in this bill to get Great Britain to reduce the number of her fast cruisers to 10 or her large submarines to 8. It is absolutely beyond all contemplation, and the fact that that clause exists in the bill is no answer to our statement that we ought now to have these fast, strong, long-range light vessels on the surface and underneath the surface in order to protect the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may have two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the gentleman is perhaps laboring under a misapprehension or misinformation if he understands we have three cruisers authorized on which work has not begun.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I said seven were to be completed under this appropriation, and three were going to be slowed down, because of that, but which are still begun. We ought to have more authorized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the gentleman notice the statement in this morning's press from Japan that regardless of what France or Great Britain or Italy do about the four-power pact Japan is going ahead with the decrease of armament?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Not of these vessels.

I append extracts from the statement of Secretary Denby of March last, made to the Committee on Appropriations as to the need of light cruisers and the larger class of submarines and the condition of our Navy in that regard:

EXTRACTS FROM SECRETARY DENBY'S STATEMENT.

THE FLEET.

Before discussing the different types of naval vessels, I desire to draw a rough picture of a modern fleet as it must be constituted to be effective for cruising on the high seas in time of war.

We will assume that the scouting force, consisting of cruisers, light cruisers, airplane carriers, and destroyers, supported by battle cruisers, has searched for and located the enemy fleet at a distance of perhaps a thousand miles from the base of the battle fleet, and that the battle fleet proceeds to sea to intercept and engage the enemy. The fleet must be disposed in a cruising formation which, with the various screening forces, will cover an area about 300 miles in depth and 80 miles in width.

The most advanced force will constitute an outer screen to guard against surprises and to drive off enemy scouts attempting to gain information. This screen will consist of light cruisers and destroyers with lighter-than-air dirigibles, if available, and airplane carriers. This outer screen extends across the front of the fleet and on each side, where it is normally drawn in somewhat closer to the main body. There will also be cruisers astern of the fleet to drive off enemy vessels attempting to trail.

Between the outer screen and the main body will be an inner screen of battle cruisers and destroyers to detect and drive off enemy vessels which get through the outer screen, and to support the outer screen where necessary.

About 20 miles ahead of the battleships will be several divisions of light cruisers, destroyers, and fleet submarines, whose duty, after deploying into battle formation, will be to protect the head of our formation from torpedo attack and to attack the enemy.

Immediately surrounding each division of battleships and the carriers accompanying them is an antisubmarine screen of destroyers.

Thus it will be seen that a battle fleet is far more than a battleship fleet. True, the battleships are the main fighting strength, but to guard this strength until the battle, and to conserve it during the battle, other types are indispensable.

LIGHT CRUISERS.

The modern light cruiser is a vessel of at least 25 knots' speed, carrying guns of at least 6-inch caliber. Those built vary from 3,500 tons to 7,600 tons and from 25 to 35 knots.

Great Britain has 68 light cruisers built, and in addition has 28 flotilla leaders of over 1,600 tons and over 30 knots—a type intermediate between destroyers and light cruisers, and a type of which we have none in our Navy.

Japan has 8 built, 6 building, and 12 projected, a total of 26. United States has 10 building.

The use of the light cruiser is threefold:

(1) The service of information (scouting). In other words, searching for the enemy fleet, and finding out what he is doing.

(2) Screening—that is, guarding our fleet against surprise and keeping off the enemy scouts.

(3) In battle supporting our destroyers in their torpedo attacks against enemy battleships, and beating off the enemy destroyers attempting to torpedo our battleships.

A military commander should engage the enemy under circumstances favorable to himself and unfavorable to the enemy. He can not decide what to do himself if he is ignorant of where the enemy is and what he is doing. Information must be the foundation of his action; it is a vital necessity.

Since a naval commander must have information, he must have many scouts. A few scouts would be ineffective to cover a large area, such as the western Pacific.

In an Atlantic or Pacific campaign a scout must have large steaming radius, long-range radio, two or more airplanes, speed to evade more powerfully armed ships, and guns to engage ships of equal speed.

Except battle cruisers, the light cruiser is the only type which meets these requirements. Our old cruisers have neither the speed nor the radius of action. Our destroyers have neither the radius, the guns, nor the radio range, and in heavy weather could not make the speed to escape enemy light cruisers. They do not carry airplanes.

SCREENING.

The immense advantage which a surprise confers on any attacking force is well known. A fleet at sea must be surrounded by a screen of vessels to guard against surprise and to prevent enemy scouting vessels obtaining information of our fleet. This duty can be performed in part by destroyers and older cruisers, but enemy light cruisers can avoid old cruisers by their speed and sink destroyers by their guns; only our modern light cruisers can properly combat enemy light cruisers attempting to pierce our screen.

IN BATTLE.

In an action between modern fleets there will be large numbers of destroyers attempting to damage or sink the battleships with torpedoes. Light cruisers support the attack of their own destroyers, break up the attack of the enemy destroyers, and in addition attack

the enemy battleships with their own torpedoes. With only approximately equal battleship forces, a preponderance of light cruisers may well mean the difference between victory and disaster.

The light cruiser has been proved by the acid test of war. At Jutland a light cruiser of each fleet first found the enemy, others warned Beatty in time to save him from the fire of the whole German fleet, and light cruisers repeatedly saved the battleships of each fleet from the torpedoes of destroyers.

Our prospective naval campaigns will not be limited as were those of the World War. They will cover half an ocean. In such campaigns it is not enough to say light cruisers will be doubly important. Without them we would enter any campaign with a nearly insurmountable handicap.

The recent conference gave international approval to a naval policy of the United States by which this Nation maintains at least a naval equality with Great Britain and a ratio of 5 to 3 with Japan.

We may consider the question of light cruisers by studying their use in war or we may accept the opinion of other powers as to their value or we may follow the ratios established by the limitation conference. By any and all of these courses we arrive at but one conclusion:

If we are to have a fleet fit to fight we must complete our 10 light cruisers at once. Even with these completed, our strength in light cruisers will be greatly below the 5–5–3 ratio.

* * * * * * *

LIGHT CRUISERS IN THE BATTLE OF JUTLAND.

There were 26 British and 11 German light cruisers in the Battle of Jutland.

A British light cruiser gave Admiral Jellico the first report of the presence of the German fleet and a German light cruiser made the first report of the British fleet.

Two light-cruiser squadrons formed a screen ahead of the British battle cruisers, and Admiral Beatty reports "their work was of great value."

At 4.15 p. m. a German light cruiser led an attack of 15 German destroyers, sinking a British destroyer and breaking up a counter-attack by British destroyers. A British light-cruiser squadron first reported to Admiral Beatty sighting the German main fleet. This report enabled Beatty to turn in time to avoid the fire of the German battleships. Beatty says "their reports were most valuable."

At 5.36 p. m. a British light cruiser attempting to get information of the German battle line was driven off by four German light cruisers, who in turn fired torpedoes at the British battle cruisers. Nine German torpedoes passed through the battle line, forcing the battle cruisers to maneuver and breaking up their formation at a critical time. At the same time other German light cruisers drove off four British destroyers, sinking one of them, and thus protecting their battle cruisers against torpedo attack.

At 6.30 p. m. the British light-cruiser squadron attacked the German battle cruisers with torpedoes, hitting the *Lutzow*, which was the only German battle cruiser lost.

Between 6.30 and 7.30 p. m. German destroyers, supported by light cruisers, made three torpedo attacks on the British fleet. These attacks saved the German fleet from decisive defeat at this time. These attacks were eventually broken up by two British light-cruiser squadrons.

At 7.58 p. m., two British light cruiser squadrons located the enemy line after it had been lost in the mist and smoke, making it possible thereby to renew the action.

At about the same time five German light cruisers repulsed an attack of British light cruiser squadrons and a flotilla of British destroyers.

A British light cruiser was the last vessel to see the Germans during that action.

At about 10.30 p. m., there was an engagement between four British and five German light cruisers, in which one old light cruiser (German) was sunk by a torpedo.

About 11.30 p. m., German light cruisers repulsed the British destroyer flotilla, which attacked the German battleships. Four German destroyers and one British light cruiser were sunk.

At about 2 a. m. the British destroyer flotilla attacked the German battleships, but, as Admiral Jellico reports, "they were forced to withdraw by the enemy light cruisers."

From the above it will be seen that in the Battle of Jutland, the most important modern naval battle, light cruisers were used—

(a) To find the enemy and report his position and formation;
(b) To repulse day and night destroyer attacks;
(c) To support their own destroyer attacks;
(d) To attack any enemy battleships and battle cruisers with torpedoes;
(e) To attack and drive off enemy light cruisers.

SUBMARINES.

Eighty-four submarines. The uses of submarines are—with the fleet, screening and scouting; assisting in action against the enemy fleet. Acting independently, distant scouting, observation of the enemy ports and coasts, operations against enemy trade, attack of enemy warships; defense of our own coasts and stations; mine laying.

In screening, they are formed around our own fleet to prevent attacks by hostile submarines, or in thick weather or at night by light surface vessels with torpedoes. For these purposes their small amount of surface above water and their underwater listening devices make them able to detect the approach of the enemy before they are themselves discovered, and allow them to either attack the approaching vessel with their torpedoes or warn the heavy ships of what is coming, or both. In the absence of light cruisers, with which we are very poorly provided, this service has to be assigned to the destroyers and submarines.

They are particularly well fitted for scouting for the fleet by the fact that they can see without being seen, and that if they come in contact with a much superior force they can not only protect themselves by submerging but may also inflict serious damage with their torpedoes. They are the only arm we have that can operate unsupported in the presence of superior force. For observation of the enemy in his home waters we have nothing that can compare with them. They can lie off his ports and with periscopes and listening gear keep tabs on his movements and report their information by radio.

They also have a very important part in making our own coasts and our detached stations secure from enemy action. Our fleet is, and will be for years at least, entirely lacking in battle cruisers, while other navies have them. These vessels are strong enough to deal with anything less than a battleship, and fast enough to get away from anything that they do not wish to fight. The knowledge that we have an efficient force of submarines in any given locality will go far to prevent raids by such ships, or to make them costly if undertaken.

A fair allowance of first-line submarines under present conditions would be Manila 20, Hawaii 20, Canal Zone 14, fleet 48. This makes no allowance for distant independent service, but calls for a total of 102 first-line boats. We are asking this year to keep only 84 going. In addition, we expect to keep in reduced commission (with two-third crews) 27 older boats which are fit for coast service and for use in training crews for new vessels.

The 84 first-line submarines are of the O, R, S, and T classes, from 500 to 1,000 tons and from 12 to 15 knots speed. For a properly proportioned fleet we should have boats with at least 21 knots speed for service with the fleet, others with very large steaming radius for scouting and distant service, and some fitted for mine laying. None of these classes are now in service or building except three of the 21-knot type of so-called fleet submarines. They are needed, but are not being asked for this year.

All our submarines are propelled on the surface by Diesel engines, and when submerged by electric motors run from storage batteries. They are filled with a mass of delicate machinery and fittings. The storage battery requires constant attention to keep it from deteriorating and the auxiliaries and fittings can only be kept in good order by being kept in use. It has been our experience that a submarine left idle and without a crew speedily loses a large part of her value. A large part of the machinery of a submarine is highly specialized material—Diesel engines, storage batteries, and air-compressing machinery, which is not familiar to the general service and for which there is not an available reserve of personnel even in civil life. The operation of this special type of vessel and the machinery that runs her is something that requires accurate and special training. This can not be acquired on the spur of the moment even if the vessel and equipment is ready and in perfect condition. If the submarines are ever wanted for actual service, they will be wanted on the first outbreak of trouble, and they can not be ready for such a call unless they are both materially ready and manned with crews familiar with the operation of the material and with the tactics in accordance with which their vessels will be used. Therefore, if the submarines that we have are to be available when they are called for, they must be kept in commission and in operation both for the sake of the material and of the personnel that runs it.

The crew required by even the largest submarine is small compared to any surface vessel, only 4 officers and 34 men in the case of an S-class 900-ton boat. We, therefore, contemplate keeping all our submarines in commission; those that can not be fully manned, with a two-thirds crew.

Our submarines are now distributed as follows:

Fleet submarines—	
Authorized but not appropriated for	6
Building	3
In commission in Atlantic	3
First-line submarines—	
Building	35
In commission—	
Atlantic	14
Pacific	11
Canal Zone	13
Hawaii	10
Manila	10
Second-line submarines—	
In commission—	
Atlantic	15
Pacific	12
Being stripped for sale or scrapping	15
Total built and building—	
Fleet	6
First line	93
Second line	42
	141
To be scrapped (old second-line boats)	15
To be retained	126

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] has offered an amendment which would permit the construction of vessels that have been authorized but not yet begun. The only ships, I think, that answer that description are 12 destroyers, 1 transport, and 6 fleet submarines.

As to the destroyers, of course there is no occasion for building any more than we now have. We have nearly 300 destroyers, a very large excess over the number required.

Mr. BUTLER. How many in commission?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And we have about 200 of them out of commission now but kept in good condition, and they will be useful in case need ever arises. But, of course, Congress does not desire to spend any more money at the present time in constructing ships of that type. The gentleman's amendment would permit the building of the 12 which have been authorized but not begun, and the Navy Department has not asked for any money for their construction.

The same thing is true of the transport. There is no demand by the Navy Department for the transport, and likewise with reference to the fleet submarines.

The gentleman from New Jersey, of course, is very well informed on matters of this sort, and he realizes that the construction of these large fleet submarines is still in the experimental stage.

The three that we are now building are in a sense experimental, and it is not definitely known at this time whether they will be successful when finished, and, of course, it is only the part of wisdom that we finish the three now under con-

struction and then if they are found to be all right the other six can be appropriated for and completed later.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Has the gentleman noticed that in the hearings where the Navy Department state that they have acquiesced in the Budget under protest they likewise say that the slowing down on these three submarines is in their opinion, from a naval aspect, unadvisable and that it will cost more to complete them ultimately?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is right about that. The amount carried by the Budget was $41,000,000 for new construction. The amount carried in this bill for that purpose is $55,000,000. We recognized the force of what Assistant Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt advised the committee, and as the gentleman from New Jersey will see, by increasing this building fund $14,000,000 the work on these three that are under construction may go forward more rapidly.

Mr. OLIVER. And we would destroy the very purpose the gentleman has in mind if we now undertook to put in the bill any blanket authorization for building ships, some of which, though authorized, the Navy does not need. In other words, it might take from the appropriation carried in the bill a large amount for ships not now needed, thus slowing up work on the vessels under construction. If Congress feels disposed to appropriate for new construction, there should be an additional appropriation, rather than a direction to begin new construction with the limited funds carried in the bill for ships now well advanced.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have listened to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] with a great deal of pleasure. The House may recall that in 1915 or 1916 I urged upon my colleague the necessity of building fast battle cruisers, submarines, and submarine chasers instead of large battleships and superdreadnoughts; but the World War was on, and some feared we would be drawn into the struggle, and these fears were well founded, for we were finally drawn into the great World War. The distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], than whom there is no more able Member of this House, led the fight for fast battle cruisers, submarines, and submarine chasers. I want to take this occasion to address the House for just a few moments, because after I made that speech I was severely criticized in my State because I was supposed to be opposed to a Navy, and Florida, extending out into the Gulf about 600 miles, is, as you know, very deeply interested in the Navy.

It is gratifying to me, therefore, to see the House come around to the suggestion that I then offered. As suggested by me at that time, the superdreadnoughts have not even yet been completed, although seven years or more have elapsed. Under the 5-5-3 pact those superdreadnoughts have been cast aside, and the millions of dollars expended on them have been wasted.

It is also gratifying to me, and I am sure it is gratifying to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], to know that Secretary of the Navy Daniels, practically all of the leading admirals of the American Navy, Lloyd-George of England, and the leading powers abroad, and, according to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER], now Secretary Denby are in accord with the attitude that we assumed in 1916.

I sincerely trust that in the future when I undertake in my humble way to make a fight to save some money for the people it will not be misconstrued or misunderstood that I am opposed to anything that is progressive, but simply that I am trying to serve my country as I see my duty. If we had adopted the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] at that time, as I said, millions of dollars would have been saved, we would have had the battle cruisers, submarines, and destroyers that we ought to have and that we must have, and we would have a well-balanced and efficient Navy.

Certainly after the speeches of to-day I will not in the future be misunderstood, at least as far as the Navy is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Page 52, line 24, after the words "sum of" strike out "$20,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000."

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we have now under construction 10 light cruisers. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], in debating that question the other day, when I asked if we would have to have the new cruisers anyhow, said we must, unless by agreement other powers scrapped the cruisers they have in excess of ours; and when we state the number that other powers have there is no sort of reasonable expectation that England will ever scrap down to the number that we have.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I am not quite sure whether the gentleman is under the impression that there are any cruisers that have been authorized by law that are not being built.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have said they are being built, but we are only going to complete 7 of them under this appropriation, and I want the whole 10 completed under it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, they are all going to be completed.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. In time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They are not to be delayed.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. They are not to be completed under this appropriation. This appropriation provides for completing only seven of them and going on with part of the work on the other three.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I think perhaps the gentleman is in error upon that——

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I know I am right.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Because we have increased the appropriation by $14,000,000.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I am talking, however, about the work under this appropriation. I suppose this new appropriation is made along the lines stated by the Assistant Secretary, is it not?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; I think perhaps the testimony that the gentleman has before him was based upon the Budget figure of $41,000,000, which we have increased to $55,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. The Secretary has had his own way about it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Assistant Secretary Roosevelt said at the hearing:

By the third appropriation we expect to proceed at the normal rate on the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga*, proposing to allot to each job the sum of $8,000,000. We expect to complete scout cruisers *4*, *5*, and *6* by allotting the sum of $855,000. We expect to complete scout cruisers *7* and *8* by allotting the sum of $2,857,000. We expect to complete the scout cruisers *9* and *10* by allotting $400,000. We will have to slow down to one-third of normal on scout cruisers *11*, *12*, and *13*, allotting them only the sum of $3,650,000. The normal allotment would be $9,000,000.

That is on page 741. Now, when it comes to submarines, he says they will have to slow down on them, and we certainly need those three submarines, and in order to get those three submarines this appropriation ought to be increased in order to allow us to complete them within the year. That is all I have to say.

Mr. OLIVER. Is the gentleman informed as to what the Navy Department contemplates doing with the $14,000,000 which the bill carries above the Budget estimate? The gentleman is reading from a statement made when the official making the statement was under the impression that the committee would appropriate only $41,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. The committee, after an exhaustive hearing, concluded that it would prove economical in the end to grant an increase in the Budget estimate of $14,000,000, thus insuring the earliest completion of the ships now building.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I did not understand that it covered these vessels. Can the chairman of the committee tell me what they do contemplate doing?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We do not allocate the money to any particular ships; that will be in the discretion of the Navy Department.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The gentleman from Alabama asked me how the Navy Department expected to allocate it. Can the gentleman from Michigan answer?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; I can not. If they did allocate it, they might later on find circumstances required a different allocation.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think they ought to have ample funds, and I move to increase the $20,000,000 to $25,000,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that my reason for asking the question was because I felt the gentleman was under the impression that it had been so allocated as not to accomplish the early completion of the cruisers now building.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not think the committee have allocated it. Unfortunately, they do not allocate it as they did under the old form of bill, so that you can tell what they

are doing. Now the committee says that it does not know where the sum will be allocated. I think the House ought to be informed where they expect it to be allocated; and, at any rate, I want enough to cover the work. Will the gentleman tell me that if all the work under construction were to be completed within the next year that is allowed by the treaty it would be more than the $25,000,000?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; there are 56 vessels now in course of construction, and there will be needed something like $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 more than that now carried in the bill to finish this construction program, which includes the completion of two aircraft carriers.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I move, then, that we have $5,000,000 more. They need it badly.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in harmony with the view of the gentleman from New Jersey, who has just taken his seat, that there should be such orderly and expeditious development of the work of construction in the Navy as will, within a reasonable length of time, give us a completed Navy as now authorized under the treaty, but I believe that all that is abundantly provided for in this bill as reported. As a matter of fact, I think if there could be any proper criticism of the work of this committee—and I certainly have none to suggest—it would be that the committee has been rather liberal in appropriations for the Navy all along the line. We have under the item of construction made available $55,000,000 in addition to certain indefinite sums that still remain of the $45,000,000 appropriation for construction in the bill for the current year. This is in addition to the very considerable amount of material that is available, not only for repairs but some of it at least for new construction work. Take it altogether the appropriation and authorization in this bill, the unexpended balances, the material available for use, I think it would be a fair estimate of the amount available for new construction of the Navy for the next fiscal year to place it at about $65,000,000. Well, it strikes me that is a very goodly sum to spend on the Navy of the United States in piping times of peace and following an international agreement on the limitation of naval armament. I think that is going quite fast enough.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to gentlemen who are going about over the land endeavoring to create the impression in the minds of the people that the Navy is being neglected, that we are not building it up as rapidly as we should or sustaining it as we should, that they at least get their facts straight before they present their alleged arguments to the country as they have been doing through newspaper and magazine articles and in various sundry and divers ways.

The committee very properly placed in this bill as a concluding paragraph a suggestion for the calling of another international conference for the purpose of placing some limitation on naval craft smaller than the great battleships; smaller, lighter, and less expensive than the ships which were limited by the recent international agreement.

If I were to have had the drafting of that paragraph I think I should have drafted it in just a little different form. I do not think that the President needs any urging on the part of Congress to do this thing when it may seem wise, advisable, and practicable to do it. Considering the matter, however, as a mere expression of opinion on the part of Congress that it would be well at the proper time to call such a conference, it is an entirely proper provision.

But if I may make the suggestion, I think that the importance of suggesting to the nations of the earth another meeting grows out of the persistent agitation on the part of men, both here and abroad, who desire enormous expenditures for naval purposes rather than out of any condition existing anywhere on earth absolutely necessitating a further agreement.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. France and Italy have not yet signed the other agreement.

Mr. MONDELL. That is true. I believe, however, they will, but I prefer not to go into a discussion of that particular matter. We will discuss that a little later when it is reached. I am referring to it now only to point a moral and adorn the tale.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been very greatly impressed with the reports that certain gentlemen believe have been received or that certain gentlemen say have been received from foreign parts indicating an intention on the part of foreign governments to go far afield in the development of smaller craft, with a view of at least partly overcoming any handicap that may have been placed upon their governments by the limitations placed on larger ships.

Since any of us can remember this is about the time of year when, according to current report, armies and navies, particularly navies, are being enlarged and extended all over the world. Just about the time when we are considering the naval appropriation bill and for a considerable period prior thereto we hear a great deal about foreign proposals of increase, expansion, and enlargement of naval establishments, and we generally discover later that at least a large part of that increase exists only in the imagination of certain gentlemen who are tremendously interested in great naval expansion. It is unfortunate that we have at one time and another had experience as legislators which leads us to have doubts and reservations relative to the accuracy of information that comes to us in regard to these matters, even through official channels. Those charged with responsibility as administrators under the Government ought to realize how unfortunate it is to have the Nation, and particularly Members of Congress, inclined by their experience to doubt the entire accuracy of information transmitted either officially or unofficially from official sources touching these important matters. I hope the time will come when some one high in the Government will lay down the law to the departments of the Government, and all of them need it, that they should be very careful that any information they give out or statements they make in support of their policies or proposals shall be accurate and based upon facts that can not be denied or successfully disputed. We will have a very much better condition of affairs when that is accomplished. [Applause.]

This bill carries appropriations amounting to $291,000,000, but in addition to that the bill makes available for construction some $35,000,000, so that as presented to us to-day it is not a $291,000,000 naval bill, but a $325,000,000 naval bill.

That, however, does not tell the entire story, because, as I have stated, there are or will be certain appropriations or remnants of appropriations available that can be used for construction during the coming year, and in addition to that the Navy has large surplus supplies on which it is drawing constantly. Reference was made a day or two ago to the fact that there are a large number of Liberty motors available for use, so that our appropriation of $5,000,000 for new aircraft is, in fact, enlarged by the value of the motors now on hand that would be utilized in new airships. There are large reserves in ordnance, in supplies of various sorts, so that putting the matter in a very conservative way—and I should like to be corrected if I am extravagant in my statements by some gentleman of the Naval Committee—the Navy will have available the coming year for its various activities and operations certainly not less than $350,000,000, probably considerably more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that we have not as large a Navy, as sufficient a Navy, as well-rounded a Navy, as some gentlemen think we ought to have, but we certainly ought to have a very goodly Navy, a very sizable Navy, a high-class and efficient Navy, with an expenditure of $350,000,000 of the people's money per annum.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. COCKRAN. Does the gentleman think any Navy is any good that is not the best and the strongest.

Mr. MONDELL. Some time when both the gentlemen from New York and I get into the Senate, where there is no limitation of debate, I shall be very glad to discuss that question with him.

Mr. COCKRAN. That is the first attraction the Senate has had for me.

Mr. LONDON. Is not that navy best which is most suitable for the purposes of the country and the Government?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has stated it accurately.

Mr. LONDON. It is not a question of comparative numerical strength in respect to other navies.

Mr. MONDELL. Not altogether by any means.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman tell us what else it is for?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, I have settled the matter without waiting for the Senate.

Mr. COCKRAN. It is settled in the mind of the gentleman from New York, but I want to see if we can not settle this in

the mind of common sense. For what else is it available or valuable except for the purpose of sustaining the power of the Government that sustains it?

Mr. LONDON. I want to say that the common sense of my colleague is too common for me.

Mr. COCKRAN. Oh, that is disputed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the President very properly called the Conference on the Limitation of Armament in order that we might get away from this never-ending strife for the biggest and most expensive navy. Prior to our entrance into the World War we were spending for the Navy about $140,000,000 annually. We are now spending upward of $350,000,000 annually—considerably over double the amount we then spent. We are trying to economize along all lines. We have denied many perfectly reasonable and legitimate requests for public expenditures. We certainly do not want to economize at the expense of a good Navy, of a sufficient Navy, but I think it would be very well indeed if the gentlemen who are responsible for the Navy would spend a little more of their time seeing how good a Navy they can secure with the very liberal expenditure which the Congress is disposed to make, rather than in urging new avenues, new lines of expenditure. Mind you, I do not blame a naval man, naval experts, for calling the attention of Congress to what in their opinion is essential; if we are to have a perfect Navy, from their standpoint, that is their duty; but it is also the duty of the Congress to take into consideration all of the factors of the case and view the matter, not from the standpoint of the naval expert alone but also from the standpoint of the practical legislator who desires that his country's defense shall be adequate, but must still keep in mind the fact that expenditures for defense should bear some reasonable relation to the total sum which the Nation can afford to appropriate and expend.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes. I will ask the chairman's attention to this amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending now.

Mr. OLIVER. Simply for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read for information.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Can not we have the other amendment disposed of?

Mr. BEGG. Can we have it reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER: Page 54, line 8, after the figures "$335,000,000" insert "any unexpended balances from appropriations made in this bill not authorized to be carried over to the fiscal year 1925 shall constitute a fund available for any new ship construction hereafter authorized by Congress."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment as changing existing law.

Mr. OLIVER. I will ask the gentleman to reserve it.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Would the gentleman like to have it now or hereafter authorized; quite a number are authorized now.

Mr. OLIVER. I purposely put it in so that Congress will have control over it.

Mr. MONDELL. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer was largely suggested by the speech of the gentleman who has just taken his seat, and if he will read the testimony before the subcommittee and the statements made to the House by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] in reference to the pending bill he will understand that this amendment might serve a wise purpose. I am in agreement with the gentleman that the amount carried by this bill, including authority to use reserve supplies, approximates $335,000,000, which amount should prove adequate for the maintenance and operation of an efficient Navy and at the same time provide a reasonable sum for construction. Our people are willing to properly sustain the Navy, and I believe that in normal times it can be done within the limits of the appropriation carried in this bill. The time is now propitious for sane economies to be practiced in the maintenance and operation of the fleet we now have, and certain conditions have been pointed out in the hearings and in the discussion of this bill that suggest that some of the ships of the treaty Navy are in such condition as to need modernizing before they can be considered of real military value, and since no funds have been provided for modernizing them at this time why should such ships be kept in active commission, at great expense, when by putting them in reserve, with a small personnel, the savings thus accomplished would give us a fund sufficient to build some new vessels, which all our naval experts say are urgently needed? Give to the Navy an opportunity of translating into new ships the savings accomplished by keeping in commission only the ships of real military value at present, and they will weigh the relative value of operating ships with little military value until modernized at large expense and the saner policy of putting such ships in reserve until funds are provided for reconditioning the same, and especially if by so doing they are assured a fund with which to build the new types recommended by the General Board as urgent, and which recommendations have the hearty concurrence of the Navy Department. It costs approximately $2,000,000 to keep one of the large capital ships in full commission for one year, and when you remember that at present we confessedly have six, if not more, capital ships that must be modernized before they could be made effective in any war with a foreign power you can well see what the possibilities are for raising a saving fund for the purposes indicated in the amendment I offer.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman's theory is a very ingenious one on which he might believe it would work out, but does the gentleman believe that those in charge of the Naval Establishment would be particularly inclined to economy because of the fact that some savings might sometimes be used for construction when authorized which might never be authorized?

Mr. OLIVER. I will say this to the gentleman: If he will take the time to inquire fully into this whole matter he will learn how insistently our naval advisers are knocking at the door for additional funds to modernize ships now in commission, and to build certain new types, so as to make efficient those we now have, and unquestionably their admonitions must be heeded if we expect to maintain a Navy on the basis and within the limits fixed by the treaty. Give to the Navy in the peace year 1924 an assurance that any savings made will constitute a fund available for new construction, and I think they will find some way to raise that fund. I think I have suggested where large savings may be effected without endangering our country's defense during 1924, and without hurt to the Navy that we now have.

If ships now in commission are of but little military value until modernized, and Congress now fails to give the funds necessary to modernize these ships, why should such ships be kept in full commission if, by putting them in reserve, the Navy is assured of a fund which Congress may later use for new construction or even for modernizing the old ships, if the Navy Department could show that this was the wiser course to follow?

If you are interested in saving, supply, as this amendment seems to do, an incentive and a method where the relative merits of different courses can be considered and determined on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. May I have three minutes more?

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent the gentleman have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, I happen to know that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] and the committee of which he is chairman have given some study to this subject, and doubtless they would be glad to lay before Congress authorizations for modernizing some of the present capital ships and for new construction if they felt there was even a reasonable probability of securing appropriations therefor. The amount carried now for the Navy, amounting as it does to approximately $335,000,000, makes doubtful, if not impossible, any increase, even though the necessity of modernizing the existing fleet and adding new types, as recommended by naval experts, may be shown and strongly urged by the department. Any authorizations made which will involve an appropriation in excess of $335,000,000, I am afraid, will have a long, long sleep before Congress will consent thereto.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I will be glad to.

Mr. BUTLER. If the officers of the Navy would throw aside some of these old tubs that cost us a lot of money, then we would be prepared to offer them something better. But as long as they insist on sailing around and spending money on ships that can not be successfully used we can not do it.

Mr. MONDELL. Why should they use the money?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to take up the time of the gentleman from Alabama. I know what he is aiming at, and I hope he will be successful in reaching it.

Mr. OLIVER. No harm can be done by the adoption of this amendment, and, as stated above, I think it well to hold out as an incentive to those who will have the spending of this $335,000,000 during 1924 the chance and opportunity of translating into a more efficient Navy any savings that can be effected. I have great confidence in and respect for the officers of the Navy and also for the Secretary of the Navy, and I believe they are interested in trying to accomplish savings, especially where it is felt that any savings will be used to make the Navy more efficient.

I am in hearty sympathy with the last paragraph of the bill, and with the knowledge we had of what is now needed to even maintain our Navy on a peace treaty basis, if other naval powers continue the construction of new ships, we felt that it was important to request the President to call a further conference of the naval powers with a view of placing further limitations on naval construction. If it is the desire of Congress to maintain a navy such as that contemplated in the treaty, then this conference must be called and definite action taken to further check construction. If the powers are unwilling to place further limitations on construction, then there is but one thing for Congress to do, and that is to weigh carefully the advice and recommendations of our naval experts with a view of providing funds necessary to keep our Navy on the 5–5–3 basis, as provided for in the treaty. Since the signing of the treaty our country has followed not only its letter but its spirit, and has failed to authorize any new construction whatever.

The amendment as drawn makes the saving fund available for new construction hereafter authorized by Congress, and you will recognize that this is a very proper limitation on the expenditure of the fund, since the bill requests the President to call a conference of the naval powers for the purpose of limiting further construction as to the very types of vessels which the saving fund purposes providing for. I recognize that the amendment is subject to a point of order, but I hope that the gentleman from Wyoming will not insist on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for my colleague on the committee, but I do not follow him in the recommendation he makes as suggested by the amendment. If we assume that the department, through the different bureaus, would make the estimates in any way that he thinks they are capable of being reduced, so that at the end of the fiscal year a fund could be accumulated that could be used for construction purposes, we would need to assume that the estimates made by the several bureaus would themselves be altogether too large, and that the sub-subcommittee and the full committee of the Congress shall have approved, under what you might call inaccurate recommendations by the different bureaus, items for the appropriation bill.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. OLIVER. I stated that I felt that the savings, if effected at all, would be effected out of operations of the fleet, and I gave the reasons why I thought that the Navy Department, if it were assured in advance that the savings thus effected would be used for the purpose of strengthening the Navy, might feel justified in taking what they would otherwise not take, steps looking to economies in the operation of the fleet, so that these economies in the operation of the fleet would be translated into a strengthening of the fleet.

Mr. FRENCH. I think there would be a good deal in the suggestion if the Navy could utilize the appropriations in the fiscal year for which the appropriations were made. But I do not think the general purpose sought by the gentleman would be attained if it were carried over through a series of years. At present any unexpended balance goes back into the Treasury. Under the plan proposed by the gentleman, instead of the unexpended balance going back into the Treasury, it would go into a fund that would be administered independent of the Congress, and under which the Navy Department could supplement the appropriations made by Congress.

It seems to me that the gentleman is probably correct in his logic as to the first year, the first fiscal year as to which the amendment would apply, but beyond that first year it seems to me that the vice of the amendment would be this: It would encourage every bureau chief to make his recommendations generously to the Budget and to the Congress, with the idea that the estimates would be accepted in the largest terms so as to swell the fund, which in succeeding years could be used as a building fund to supplement appropriations made by Congress.

For my part, it seems to me that it is altogether the part of wisdom to retain in the Congress itself, year by year, on the basis of the facts presented by the Navy Department, the authority to make the appropriations for the coming fiscal year, to shape the building program as we go along, and to look forward to a building program definitely under congressional control, rather than to turn this responsible work over to the Navy Department in such large degree, enthusiastic as it always is in the pursuit of a naval program.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman give in an outline the number and character of vessels that the department is keeping in commission at this time?

Mr. FRENCH. That is all set forth in the hearings.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to look at it some time.

Mr. FRENCH. There are 324 vessels now in commission.

Mr. BUTLER. Three hundred and twenty-four?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. It is important for Congress to know that.

Mr. FRENCH. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me make a few other observations pertinent to this paragraph pertaining to the increase of the Navy, and also pertinent to the final paragraph of the bill, having to do with an expression of Congress touching the building program not included in the terms of the limitation of armaments agreement.

No one can read the history of the great countries of the world during the past 25 years without being impressed by the thought that as increased naval programs were entered upon by Great Britain, the United States, Germany, France, Japan, and Italy, the main argument in favor of the increase by any country was the argument that other nations that were potential enemies were themselves making a drive looking to an increase of their navies, in other words rivalry and competition upon the sea. For a more recent lesson, look back to the armament conference of a year ago. The one thought that was in the minds of statesmen who were here at that conference from the several countries represented, was how to protect the interests of the country to which particular delegates were accredited, not measured by what the country needed within itself, but what the country needed with respect to other nations. In other words again, the principle of rivalry, of competition, if you please.

A year ago we worked out a program looking to the limitation of armaments as respects the number of battleships, their size, their tonnage; the number of airplane carriers, their size; the size and number of guns upon the several ships; and other features pertaining to a splendid program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Now, only a year having passed by, we find another program urged in responsible quarters which, as was said by the chairman [Mr. KELLEY of Michigan] when he outlined the general purposes of this bill two or three days ago, would mean not the saving to the people of this country that which we expected would be made possible by the refusal to continue a competitive program of shipbuilding, but, rather, a still greater expenditure through a program applied to craft that are now permissible to be built under the terms of the limitation of armaments agreement—a program that would absorb far more than we will save. I refer to a program of building additional craft, including the swift cruisers upon the one hand and submarines upon the other. What is the argument? It rests upon what other nations may do. If you are going to have submarines, as some nations urge, then you must have the antidote for submarines—swift sailing cruisers—in order to put the submarines of a rival nation out of commission.

For my part, then, I believe we ought to adopt the last paragraph contained in this bill, under which an expression is made of the idea of the Congress, reinforcing the President in his great purpose to bring about the limitation of armaments of the world. And I believe we may be hopeful at this time that there is in the minds of statesmen of other nations a purpose to follow along the lines suggested by the paragraph in this bill. Within the past few days the papers have carried the story of what is going on in South America, how statesmen in Argentina and Chile and Brazil have thought the time has come

when among the nations in their part of the world they may have an agreement limiting armies and limiting the ships belonging to the navies of those respective countries.

Read the discussions in the foreign magazines, carried on by the writers of those great nations that had a share in the last conference a year ago. You will find some propagandists pushing for large navies, looking to see where they can find loopholes in the present agreement. On the other hand, you will find substantial statesmen who are urging that that conference agreement be interpreted in the spirit as well as the letter in which it has been written, to the end that the nations entering into that agreement and all nations shall have a standard of limitation of armament, so that in the years to come we will not be laying upon the backs of the people of the world enormous burdens for the purpose of keeping up competitive navies.

The United States is strong enough and great enough and disinterested enough to lead on in this program for humanity, and I want the world to know that the Congress applauds the President for his great accomplishments for peace, and extends to him our fullest support in more adequate understandings among the nations that will set the standard for military and naval programs.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if I could accept the view expressed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] that his amendment would result in real economies, I should be inclined to withhold the point of order; but I doubt if you can bring about economies in the Navy by saying to the gentlemen of the Navy, "If you will forego poundcake, you may have more candy."

Mr. BUTLER. It will lead in the right direction.

Mr. MONDELL. As a friend of the Navy, I do not want to admit that naval officers are retaining in commission, simply because they have the money that they can use for that purpose, ships that are of no real value in the national defense. I do not think that naval officers should need rewards of merit, suggestions of additional grants to persuade them to do what it is their duty to do, which is to tie up, sell, sink, or scrap vessels that are not useful in the national defense. They ought to do that as a matter of duty, and I should not want to believe that the Secretary of the Navy, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the officers of the Navy, in all of whom I have great confidence, would keep in commission ships that are not necessary. And in order to accept any such amendment as that proposed by the gentleman from Alabama we must take the view that these gentlemen of the Navy do continue to keep in commission ships that are of questionable value from the standpoint of national defense. I do think it would be very well for the Navy and its officers, all of them, to take this matter into consideration, and see if it is not possible to put out of commission a very considerable number of ships that are now being utilized.

And another thing, if I may touch upon a question which is a tender one with some gentlemen of the Congress, I think the Navy might very well consider and definitely pursue a plan under which we shall have less navy on the dry land, particularly fewer naval yards and stations. There is to be found the largest leak in naval expenditures—unnecessary yards, unnecessary stations, yards and stations not needed for the maintenance of an efficient navy, as everyone knows who is informed on the subject.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the amendment is clearly legislation and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation made for the Navy shall be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, including personal services of civilians and of enlisted men of the Navy, except as herein expressly authorized: *Provided*, That there may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time 34 enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. What is the necessity for this provision? Do they not already detail men for this work when necessary and is there any danger that they will detail too many?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In response to the question of the gentleman from Connecticut I will say that the Bureau of Navigation is the only bureau in the Navy in the District of Columbia that has had assigned to it any enlisted men. All the other bureaus are operated by civilian employees. The committee was not in sympathy with the idea of assigning enlisted men to the bureaus in Washington, but the Bureau of Navigation has been made an exception to the rule. This grows out of the fact that since the war this bureau has had a tremendous amount of work, more or less temporary in its character, and we thought it proper that a few enlisted men should be assigned to it temporarily. They have a voluminous correspondence from all the States of the Union with reference to the records of enlisted men during the war. The situation has not reached normal yet, and it seemed better to permit the employment of a few enlisted men than to take on civilian employees permanently. As the work was temporary in its character, we thought it advisable to permit the bureau to use the 34 enlisted men—the number they have there now—until such time as the regular civilian force can handle the business of the bureau.

Mr. TILSON. It seemed to me a wise provision and that there was no occasion for limiting it; that there might be occasions where they might have reason for the use of even a larger number.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The portion of this paragraph coming before the proviso to which the gentleman from Connecticut draws attention provides that enlisted personnel shall not be detailed to the bureaus in Washington.

Mr. TILSON. Has not the department been doing it?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Does not the Secretary of the Navy have authority to detail to the bureau?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; this proviso will allow him to detail 34 men to the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. TILSON. It is only current law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I concede that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. TILSON. If the first part of the paragraph were not here there would be no restrictions.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the proviso was not here the Bureau of Navigation would have to discharge the 34 men. I think it is clearly subject to a point of order; but I hope the point of order will not be made.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and that no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit, for a sum less than it can be purchased or acquired otherwise.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it would be impossible for me to permit the discussion under this bill to come to an end without expressing to the House what is in my heart to say touching the chairman of the subcommittee, Governor KELLEY. I am sure that I convey not only the sentiment of members on this side of the aisle but of the full Committee on Appropriations and the membership of this House, regardless of party, when I say that it is with profound regret that we realize that his services for the time being will come to an end with the conclusion of this session of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY is rounding out now a period of 10 years' service, and during that time has had come into his life the experiences that come to the lives of all the Members of this body, and then some experiences that come to but few Members of the House of Representatives.

During the first year he was here he had the experience of being what you might call under observation from his colleagues. They were looking him over. They were taking his measure, if you please. All Members go through that period. Then Governor KELLEY had the experience, which does not come so generously to our membership, of having it recognized that here was a man who possessed great mental attainments, unflinching courage, remarkable industry, mental integrity, and with it all such a lovable and attractive personality as ingratiated him into the hearts of the Members of this body. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have served here for any length of time realize that the work of the House of Representatives is essentially teamwork—important, essential, yet, after all, teamwork. Look over the record of two years just

gone by and think of the work that has been done, but as you look about over the membership of this House, splendid men and women, as a matter of fact you can find but few names that will attach permanently to the legislation or policies of the Congress. Go further and look back over 20 years' work of the Congresses of the different political parties.

Much legislation has been accomplished; policies have been defined; great and strong men have moved in this Chamber; and yet as you endeavor to recall the names of Members that are attached to policies of government or great pieces of legislation, you must recognize that they are few. The greatest compliment that commonly can be paid the individual Member of this body is that which is paid when it can be said that he was a strong Member of the team.

To Governor KELLEY at once may be paid that compliment. But of him more must be said. During his service here in unusual degree there has come to him that which comes to the rare Member of this Congress—the opportunity through his own force, his own genius, of writing his name upon a great policy of government.

I refer especially to the work of last year. Ten months ago there was given to the world the result of the Limitation of Armament Conference. It represented the splendid idealism of your President. It represented a formula prepared under the leadership of your masterful Secretary of State. And yet after it had been ratified by the members assembled around the conference table 10 months ago, it would have failed in its mighty purpose if it had not been interpreted by the Congress of the United States and by the legislative bodies of other of the world's powers. To Governor KELLEY, more than to any other man, belongs the distinction of interpreting the work of the convention and writing into actuality, into a legislative program, if you please, the principle, the spirit of the Limitation of Armament Conference. [Applause.]

One other word. I am sure I voice the thought of the Members of this body when I say that it is our wish that in the earliest possible time the good people of Michigan may see fit to call upon Governor KELLEY again, to draft him for such position of responsibility where the people of this country and the world may have the full advantage of his wonderful ability and of his genius for statecraft. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of this bill will in large measure complete the active cooperation of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] in the work of the Appropriations Committee, because he is to leave us on the 4th of March next. As chairman of that committee I want to testify to the wonderful genius of this man, to his constant and loyal devotion to the cause of the people, to his hearty cooperation in every phase of the great work with which this committee is charged. He is a wonderful adviser and counsellor, with a wisdom and tolerance seldom embodied in an individual—always placid, always strong, always courageous, never in a state of mind that tolerates bickering, not easily disturbed; a man of great conception and influence and a master of detail, marvelous in his ability to visualize. He has a vision that is nation-wide. He has never spared himself nor has he ever had a personal objective. His work has been a real service—and what splended service he has rendered! The American people owe him a debt of gratitude for his unselfish and patriotic devotion to their cause. We will miss him in the House. The Committee on Appropriations will miss him as a great committeeman. No one will miss him as much as I, because I have leaned on him for his advice and counsel. He has always been true. His integrity of purpose and intellect are unassailable. He knows no hours, he fears no work. He denies no requisition that is made upon him. His mind, his heart, and all of his physical forces are at the command not only of the chairman of his committee but of the House and the American people. God speed him in whatever he may undertake to do in the future. I am sure that wherever he goes or whatever he may do he will deserve the confidence, respect, and esteem not only of the community in which he lives but of the great American public. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States is composed of strong men, picked men. The various constituencies of the Nation send here their strong and virile and forceful characters, men acquainted with public affairs, men who have made their mark at home, men who are qualified for the highest public service. In view of that fact, when a man stands out preeminently here in strength of character, courage, and virility, he is indeed a strong and forceful character. Such a man is PATRICK KELLEY, of Michigan. [Applause.] From the standpoint of my responsibility here I owe him a debt of gratitude. He is not only able and forceful, a man of sane views and sound opinions, but a man who realizes the importance of consultation, of cooperation, of teamwork. In all the important work that he has had charge of here he has not only performed his part splendidly, but he has consulted with his colleagues and those charged with responsibility and carried on his work in cordial agreement and cooperation with them. Through it all he has been a good friend, a pleasant companion, a delightful character, who even in his most forceful and emphatic moments has retained the smile that never comes off, and even in temporary defeat—for sooner or later all men who have responsibility in important matters on this floor meet with at least temporary defeat—he has been, as always, a suave, smiling, genial gentleman. I join with those who have spoken in wishing for our honored colleague long life and abundant success in whatever he may undertake. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on this subcommittee, I desire to add a few words to what has been said about our colleague. I am, of course, in hearty accord with the tributes which have been paid to him by the three gentlemen who have preceded me. I have served with many members on the majority side, and I think I can truthfully say that I have never served with any member who demonstrated greater loyalty to duty than has the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY]. I particularly want to say this, that during the time that I have served with him on this subcommittee never once has it been necessary to take a vote of the subcommittee, never once has there been a partisan decision, never once has there been any suggestion made as to the politics of any member of the committee, but, in accord with recognition of the fact that in the Appropriations Committee there should be no politics, every problem has been solved. Never has there been a time that I did not know that no important provision would be considered without my first being notified of the provision in question. It is a pleasure for a member of the minority to serve with such a gentleman, and I join with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in expressing the hope that whatever he may do, to whatever walk of life he may devote his efforts, success shall attend him. Certainly he will take with him the affection of the Members of this House. I know that with his efficiency, his intellect, his energy, and his ability as an advocate, with which we are all so familiar, in the private walks of life he may work to greater advantage to himself, but if the time shall come when he is again returned to public life, the public will be the gainer, for the public has seldom had a more faithful servant than the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, since coming to Congress I have been on the same committee with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and I know that the Members of the House, irrespective of party, share a sincere and common regret that he, our friend, will not be in the next Congress. We will miss his genial companionship, his sound judgment, and wise counsel. His splendid mind and fine spirit make his personality a very perfect human engine for worth-while accomplishments in every field of human endeavor where he labors. One need but examine the hearings before the Committee on Naval Affairs and before the subcommittee on naval appropriations to know that his official life has been one of great industry, of intelligence well directed, and of real achievements the memory of which will remain with us always as an inspiration and a beckoning to high and helpful public service. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I can not add in language to what has been said by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but I should not feel just right if after the many years of association which it has been my honor to have with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], after years of observation of his labors, I did not voice or try to voice, with all the sincerity which is in me, the profound admiration which I have for the character, the ability, and the intellect of the gentleman from Michigan. The Congress is indebted to him, but above and beyond that the country is indebted to him for the years of faithful, honorable, and efficient service which he has rendered to it. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of Michigan, as his fellow for nearly 10 years on the delegation of that State in this House, as his friend and political associate for a score of years, it naturally is highly gratifying to me to hear recorded in this Chamber to-day such splendid voluntary recognition of the great ability and worthy public services of Hon. PATRICK H. KELLEY. Such praise from men highly honored by great States, North and South, East and West, members of both the great parties, all real leaders upon this floor, given in such generous and unsolicited fashion, is praise indeed. In the busy turmoil of the strife and stress of legislation, serious and busy

men have felt it worth while to stop a moment, turn aside from contest and partisanship to say to a deserving public servant, "Well done."

Hon. BURTON FRENCH, of Idaho, Republican, serving his eighth term; Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, of South Carolina, Democrat, serving his sixth term; and Hon. W. B. OLIVER, of Alabama, Democrat, serving his fourth term, have been coworkers with Mr. KELLEY upon the naval appropriation subcommittee. Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN, of Illinois, Republican, serving his ninth term, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; Hon. FRANK W. MONDELL, of Wyoming, serving his thirteenth term, and chosen leader of the Republican Party in this House; Hon. FINIS J. GARRETT, of Tennessee, serving his ninth term, and leader of the Democratic Party upon this floor; Hon. THOMAS S. BUTLER, of Pennsylvania, Republican, serving his thirteenth term, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Praise from these men is high recognition of duty performed by my colleague with rare ability, industry, and courage.

These traits—ability, industry, and courage—have long been recognized by the people of Michigan as preeminently characteristic of "PAT" KELLEY, as our State universally knows him.

Michigan born, educated at the Michigan State Normal School and the University of Michigan, he has been a conspicuous figure in the public life of that State for a score of years.

In addition to serving on the State board of education, Mr. KELLEY's public service consists of two terms as superintendent of public instruction, two terms as lieutenant governor, one term as Congressman at Large, and four terms as a Member of Congress representing the sixth congressional district of Michigan.

In passing, it must be noted that it was while Mr. KELLEY was superintendent of public instruction that the present excellent compulsory school attendance law was enacted, such enactment being largely due to Mr. KELLEY's personal efforts in this direction.

It was during his encumbency of the office of lieutenant governor, at which time he was the president of the senate, that such important legislation as the railroad 2-cent fare law, the improved direct primary election law, and the law providing for the taxation of telephone, telegraph, and express companies upon an ad valorm basis were enacted.

Never did organized special interests and forces of reactionaryism contest more vigorously or more bitterly progress in legislation than did those elements contest that program. The State senate was evenly divided, 16 with Governor Warner for the program and 16 definitely organized in opposition. KELLEY was the presiding officer and it was then I first learned that his engaging smile and his bit of blarney were but exterior decorations, in no way detracting from the courage with which he held the course his conscience and his judgment dictated. He demonstrated a rigid backbone. Presiding always with fairness, but, sustaining the cause of progress, he made possible the success of the legislative program, and it is interesting to know that he held the admiration and affection of the one 16 equally with the other.

As a Member of Congress he supported the constitutional amendments providing for woman suffrage and national prohibition, and he has been active in reducing naval appropriations to a basis consistent with the needs of the Navy under the treaty adopted by the Conference on Limitation of Armaments. In addition, he has consistently supported all child-labor legislation, the Shepherd-Towner maternity and infant welfare measure, legislation providing for the vocational education and rehabilitation of persons injured in industry, and workman's compensation legislation.

The zeal with which he has performed his legislative duties in Congress has been set forth by some of the most distinguished men in this House with expression of regret that the Nation, for a time at least, loses his services in the national halls of legislation, expressing thus the universal feeling of this House.

His passing from this work is tribute to his courage of conviction, always characteristic. He sought to protect and he succeeded in protecting political standards in the State where he had fought so many a contest before with reaction and selfish private interest. In his defeat there is no sting of failure. A fight he has made for principle is won. Not having put self foremost, his own interest counts with him least.

His friends on both sides of the center aisle of this House may rest assured that Michigan is proud of PATRICK H. KELLEY and will welcome him back, with his smile and his courage and all. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 54, line 22, strike out the words "or other time-measuring device"; and in line 24 strike out the words "or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, we have now in the navy yards of this Government 50,441 civilian employees. Under this provision, especially the words which I seek now to strike out, your Government can not have any kind of system of observation to determine how much work per day these 50,000 employees accomplished or the manner of efficiency in which they accomplish it. Their unions will not permit the Government to check up on them. This Government is the only business in the United States that can not observe its employees while they work. I call attention to the testimony of Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, when he testified before one of your committees, that since Congress had put this kind of a provision in the law that it had been impossible for the department to get more than 67 per cent efficiency. That is the testimony of your former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Why when you have a man construct a wall for you and you are paying him by the day you want to know how many brick he can lay in a day and how he lays them and whether he is efficient or not. There is nothing in private business to keep you from it. If a man goes to paper your house, do you not want to know how much paper he can hang upon the wall and how he puts the paper upon it when you are paying him by the day? If a man is hauling sand, you have a right to know how many yards of sand he can haul and what kind of sand he hauls. If a man is constructing any kind of machinery for you in a private business, there is no business concern in the Nation but which reserves to itself the right to have a foreman upon the job to observe the manner in which the workman conducts himself and the efficiency of his work; but when you came to the Government of the United States with 50,441 civilian employees they say to the Government, "You can not observe our work, you can not observe our men, you can not observe our efficiency. If you put a foreman anywhere around us to observe, he will not get any salary from the Government." Has not the time come for business men in Congress to stop that kind of foolishness?

Mr. STEPHENS. Do not they keep a sort of record for efficiency of all these men—a sort of card record?

Mr. BLANTON. They keep a self-made report record; but whenever you go to observe the movements of men or check up the amount of their work per day or efficiency, the walking delegate comes around and calls attention to this provision in the law which says that the Government can not observe the movements of the men. Now, I am not objecting to this time-watch business. Some men do not like to have a time watch held over them. Let that stay in there. Let us prevent them from having a time watch held over them; but when you prevent the Government, through its foremen and its managers, from observing in some kind of a manner the movements of the men and their production and efficiency, you continue going lower and lower in the maximum of efficiency. Instead of having 67 per cent of efficiency, as you had when Assistant Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt checked it up, you will finally find that the efficiency will go far below 50 per cent. It is natural, it is human nature, for a certain per cent of workmen to shirk when there is no observation of their movements, and I submit that in all fairness to the men themselves we should strike the hamstringing language of this provision out of the bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I hardly think it is necessary to take up the time of this committee in explaining why this language should be left in the bill. It has been debated on three bills for the last eight years that I know of, or since 1914, and this House has never failed to sustain the proposition of having it remain in the bill. It is a part of the prohibition that is put in the bill to prevent the Taylor system from being used in Government factories on this continent. I do not know whether you gentlemen understand what the Taylor system is or not; but I will say this, that the gentleman who originated the idea tried to put it into the privately owned industrial concerns of this country but they have abandoned it. It is not in use in any factory in this country that I know of to-day. Therefore this amendment was necessary to prohibit the use of it in Government-owned factories. It has been held in order and is in order to-day, and those of us who are opposed to the Taylor system are opposed to any entering wedge by which you limit the prohibition. That is about all, and that ought to be an answer in explanation to the House. It is a

prohibition, and this is put in to prohibit the Taylor system in Government factories.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 10, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I have already sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LINEBERGER: Page 55, line 11, after the word "otherwise," strike out all of line 12 and insert "The Congress indorses the limitation of armaments by international agreement and suggests to the President the desirability of entering into further negotiations as soon as he may deem it practicable," so that the paragraph will read:

"The Congress indorses the limitation of armament by international agreement and suggests to the President the desirability of entering into further negotiations as soon as he may deem it practicable with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft."

Mr. LINEBERGER. The word "requested," as it appears in the paragraph, might be misconstrued to indicate that the Congress had to bring to the attention of the President something which he had overlooked.

Now, I think the gentleman from Michigan, whom we are all very sorry to know is leaving this House and who has done truly a great work in the furtherance of this great idea of the limitation of armaments by international agreement, is disposed to accept this amendment because it in no way ignores the great principle for which he stands and for which the House stands, as is shown by the fact that last year in the naval bill, which came up at that time, a provision was inserted which carried within it the same idea that is proposed here, but in what I thought then and think now was couched in unfortunate language, because it "requested" the President to do something in which he was already engaged. So I trust that the gentleman from Michigan will see fit to accept this verbiage as a substitute, and I trust that the House, should a division be demanded in the matter, will vote to substitute the verbiage here presented.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Wherein is there an advantage in the language employed by the gentleman from California over that proposed by the gentleman from Michigan? The latter is known, and will be known henceforth, as "the Kelley amendment."

Mr. LINEBERGER. I consider that the word "requested" carries with it a false implication. It is just as though the gentleman were going from here to the Washington Hotel, and everybody had reasonable knowledge of that fact, and then somebody would run up to him at the Mades Hotel and request him to continue on his journey.

I think the fact that the President has shown to the country and to the world his intense interest in the question of the limitation of armament, and his intense desire to further activities along all legitimate lines in that direction, should preclude that the word "requested" should appear in referring to the President in this matter. It is not necessary under the circumstances.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINEBERGER. Yes.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. I also suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] that the use of the words "as soon as he may deem it practicable" is also very advisable.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him.

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. The paragraph as originally drawn is a straight-out request to the President to do it, without regard to circumstances and conditions. Those of us who know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] know, of course, that he would not want the President to do it regardless of circumstances and conditions.

Mr. LINEBERGER. I will say to the gentleman that, as everybody knows, Italy and France have not yet approved the provisions of the five-pact naval treaty. It is expected that they will, but how can the President comply with the "request" of Congress until they do? Let us be reasonable in the matter, lest the nations who are observing the actions of this body consider us ridiculous.

Mr. COCKRAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER] paid the gentleman from South Carolina a very high compliment which was in no sense exaggerated. I think, indeed, if it erred at all it was on the side of inadequacy. For that speech, besides being of very unusual excellence makes it clear, in my judgment, that some provision of this character is not merely a desirable addition to the pending bill, but it is an absolutely necessary precaution to save civilization from the complete collapse with which it is now threatened. [Applause.]

I do not care much about the language of this paragraph. I am not very hopeful of immediate salutary results from the conference it urges—if one be held. But as an expression of the ardent desire of the American people to cooperate with all nations and peoples in measures which must be taken, and taken soon, if the world is to be delivered from evils the like of which have never yet afflicted the human family, I think the declaration in favor of a conference is the most important action within the capacity of this Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, besides the five minutes allotted to me, I would like to ask a little additional time for the purpose of explaining and vindicating what I have just said. The gentleman from South Carolina has made it painfully clear that the late Disarmament Conference has failed utterly to end competition in armaments among the nations that were parties to it. In the light of that demonstration, the declaration of Mr. Bonar Law in the English House of Commons a few days ago that England can not pay her debt to this country assumes portentous significance. That was an admission of bankruptcy, for inability to pay one debt—and that her largest obligation—impugns her ability to pay other debts. That astounding confession has attracted little attention. And yet the bankruptcy of England, whose credit for 250 years has been the very corner stone of international commerce, must inevitably entail the ruin of prosperity everywhere and imperil the very existence of the human family.

But even worse than Mr. Law's confession of England's bankruptcy is his statement, made at the same time, that at this moment England is paying every year—and apparently will continue to pay for an indefinite time to come—£100,000,000, or $500,000,000, to support the unemployed.

Think of it. One hundred million pounds—$500,000,000—is more than was appropriated for the entire support of this Government the first year that I became a Member of Congress. That enormous sum neither produces nor contributes to produce a penny in commodities or things of value. And it is but the lesser part of this dreadful waste. Every one of these unemployed receives as a dole no more, at the outside, than one-half the value of what he could produce if he were actually engaged in labor. Diminution of production through unemployment amounts at least to a million dollars. So that the net loss to the British people is not $500,000,000. It is, at the very least, $1,500,000,000. This frightful drain on a country already impoverished by the enormous losses suffered in the war can not fail to cause total collapse of its industrial system. And the collapse economically of England will extend far beyond her own territorial limits. It will be the source of calamities worse than those now scourging some countries which a few years ago were the fairest in the world, and which will engulf all countries, including our own, unless means be found to end them.

Is this exaggeration? I wish it were. That it is an accurate statement of conclusions which are irresistible from facts that are undisputed can easily be shown.

When we speak of the money losses suffered by England through unemployment, or of $350,000,000,000 worth of property destroyed in the late war, few of us realize the real meaning of the expressions we are employing. We are very apt to think of these stupendous amounts as though they described mere bundles of bank bills or bags of coins—gold or silver, as the case may be. Now, the only value or importance of money is the commodities for which it may be exchanged. And because we always express the value of these commodities in terms of money it has come to pass that many persons think this

money is itself the value which it merely describes. How grievously erroneous this notion is will be plain if we realize the functions of a single dollar in the ordinary small transactions of life.

With a dollar in my pocket I go out in the morning and buy a dollar's worth of oranges at a fruit stand. The proprietor of that stand with that dollar goes to a shoe store and buys a dollar's worth of shoe laces. The man who sells the shoe laces with that same dollar buys a dollar's worth of note paper at the stationery store, and the man who keeps the stationery store takes that dollar and buys a dollar's worth of neckties at the haberdasher's, and so on. That dollar passes from one hand to another, perhaps sixty or seventy or eighty times in the course of a day, each time effecting exchange of one commodity for another. To speak of all those transactions as trade or commerce, aggregating $60 or $70 or $80 would be entirely correct. But it would be radically wrong to assume that sixty or seventy or eighty separate dollars had been employed to effect it. The one dollar was but the symbol or agency by which each of these different persons obtained what he desired by parting with something he possessed.

The same principle governs the larger transactions of commerce. Trade, whether small or great, whether internal or foreign, is always exchange of commodities. Money is but the wheel by which the exchange is effected.

You hear a great deal these days about stabilizing exchange through international conferences and about restoring the volume of trade through some common action by governments. Mr. Chairman, there is no power in this Government, there is no power in the Government of Germany, there is no power in the Government of England, or in all the governments of the world combined, to stabilize exchange or create trade in the absence of commodities. Before commodities can be exchanged they must first be produced. Exchange of commodities is going on around us every day; and yet because in foreign trade the term "bill of exchange" is applied to the piece of paper which merely attests each particular transaction the minds of men have become oblivious of the fact that it is the commodities themselves that are the basis of every exchange and not the agency by which the exchange is effected.

Let me illustrate. A ships a cargo of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool. He draws a draft on London for the value of it, say, £2,000. He takes that draft to Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co. or to Messrs. Kuhn, Loeb & Co. or some other international bank, and offers it for sale. Under the conditions that prevailed before the war that draft would be bought at the rate of about $4.84 for each pound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman want more time?

Mr. COCKRAN. I should like to have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCKRAN. Now, B, in Philadelphia, owes for a cargo of silk purchased, perhaps, in Lyons. He comes to J. P. Morgan & Co. and buys a draft for $10,000. Here there was an exchange of one cargo of wheat for one cargo of silk. The person who sold the wheat never met or heard of the man who bought the silk. None the less, it was the exchange of those commodities which formed the basis of the bill of exchange issued by Mr. Morgan to the silk merchant and of the check given to the seller of wheat. One balanced the other. Mr. Morgan bought a draft and issued another for the same amount. He has paid out no money of his own. He has simply effected the exchange of these two cargoes of commodities. It might be that the check given to the seller of wheat would be balanced not by a single foreign draft but by two or three aggregating about the same amount. Instead of issuing one bill of exchange to one silk merchant for $10,000, a bill for $5,000 was sold to him, and another for $2,000 to a dry-goods importer for a cargo of cloth, and a third for $3,000 to a dealer in hardware for a cargo of cutlery; but the system would remain the same. It would always be the issue of paper tokens or symbols attesting actual exchanges of commodities. That is all there is to exchange throughout the world.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCKRAN. If you will get me plenty of time.

Mr. BEGG. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement, and I wish to ask him this question: Suppose the man who owned the silk did not want the wheat. There must be something of value in the country on the other side to exchange to the man over here. The gentleman's philosophy would not follow out if the man of one country was through trading or if he ran out of tradable property.

Mr. COCKRAN. I fear I must explain a little further in order to get this matter within the range of the gentleman's concepts.

Mr. BEGG. I will yield to the gentleman all the time he wishes for that purpose.

Mr. COCKRAN. Let me, then, explain to the gentleman. The check or bill which Mr. Morgan gives to each of these men is believed implicitly to be equivalent to gold in value. If there was the slightest doubt about that, it would not be accepted, of course. But the fact remains that it was a mere symbol. There was no gold exchanged. Very little gold enters into these international operations. None except the small amount required in normal times to balance the difference between debts paid abroad and amounts collected by Americans in foreign countries. Before the war commodities were exchanged amounting in value to many hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars without any use of gold beyond a very few millions sent from one side or the other, mainly to settle balances or differences between exports and imports.

Exchange, in the very nature of things, rises or falls according to the movements of commodities, and not, as some gentlemen seem to think, according to the whims or wishes of bankers or the desires of governments. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] I am sure will realize that when the bills of exchange offered to bankers for discount exceed in number the foreign drafts they are asked to issue, rates must go down and vice versa.

If the number of cargoes of wheat and other products, for instance, exported from this country exceed largely the cargoes of commodities purchased abroad, then exchange would go down. In other words, Mr. Morgan would give a little less than $4.84 per pound for each draft he was asked to buy. He would offer $4.83 or $4.82 or $4.81 until desiring to pay debts abroad would be encouraged by these low rates of exchange to purchase drafts on foreign banks, and this would operate to restore the normal rate. But in every case the actual basic transaction would have been the exchange of commodities by producers in this country for commodities produced abroad.

Now, suppose there were no commodities to exchange, then manifestly no bills of exchange could be issued. That was the case after this war broke out, when there were practically no imports into this country. Everything produced in the countries at war was used by their own governments for military purposes. We had abundant commodities to export. The result was that bills in enormous numbers were offered to American bankers, but there were no purchases of drafts on foreign countries. And the rate of exchange went down and down and down, until trade practically stopped. It was only by extensive borrowing of money here by foreign governments and traders that it was reestablished. Foreign countries having no commodities to give us in exchange for those they needed, offered nothing but promises to pay; that is to say, they promised to give us commodities equal in value at some future time.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. COCKRAN. I should lik to very much, but my time is very limited.

Mr. BEGG. Then I will not trouble the gentleman.

Mr. COCKRAN. I am endeavoring to explain these economic terms at this length, because when it is understood that there is no value in money itself, that its only value lies in the commodities that it can obtain, the task of bringing within your realization a full conception of the situation disclosed by Mr. Law's statement and by the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] is very much simplified.

When I am about to build a house, and I borrow $50,000, what do I get? What does my creditor give me? Not $50,000 in coin, not $50,000 in bank bills. Those would be of no use to me except for the fact that with them I can obtain the mortar and the bricks, the lumber and the plaster, besides the aid of bricklayers and mechanics by which the structure that I have planned can be erected. And the money paid in wages to these workers is valuable to them only for the food and clothes and shelter it will obtain. When, therefore, we learn that there was destruction of capital amounting to $350,000,000,000 in the late war we must realize that chairs, and tables, and houses, and machinery, and cattle, clothing, and articles of food equal in value to that stupendous sum, all of them essential to the support of human life, were destroyed. The entire agricultural product of our country this year is valued at $7,500,000,000. The destruction and waste caused by the war just ended was therefore nearly fifty times the total agricultural production of this country during one of the most prosperous agricultural seasons in our history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COCKRAN. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCKRAN. The conditions already produced by this waste and the graver conditions that are impending can be remedied in just one way. No loan from one government to another will suffice.

The world is suffering from destruction of the things on which human prosperity—not to say human existence—depends. How are they to be restored? In one way only, and that is by replacing them with other commodities taken from the earth by the labor of human hands exercised on its bosom. There is but one way by which this can be effected, and that is by taking the weapons of war from the hands of men everywhere and replacing them with the implements of industry. The weapons of destruction can indeed be removed from their hands by treaties between nations. Governments organize armed forces and governments can disband them.

However, I do not believe international conferences to be the most effective method of reaching universal disarmament. I am one who believes that we had it in our power at the close of the war to effect disarmament, complete and universal, by simply declaring to all the world that so long as any nation maintained military establishments by land or sea we would outarm the strongest of them; but if they all consented to disarm, we would disarm with them. But that course was not adopted. A different policy was pursued. We entered into treaties by which we and the other great naval powers agreed not to maintain navies beyond a certain size. Now, surely, it was self-evident that a navy to be good for anything must be able to overcome any other navy.

There can be neither sense nor reason in maintaining a military force for any other purpose. An attempt to avoid recurrence of war by maintaining navies of equal strength is to my mind about as foolish as if two men should agree as a measure of peace between them that each would carry a revolver, but that he would load only half its chambers.

If the nations mean peace they can make peace secure in just one way, and that is by discarding the means of making war. There is no other way.

There is no disarmament worth considering unless it be complete. Partial disarmament means continuous armament. To speak of limiting armaments is to employ contradictory terms. Armaments are essentially and intrinsically competitive. They can have no purpose except to prevail against other military forces.

To appropriate the enormous sum of $325,000,000, as we are doing in this bill to maintain a Navy which we have solemnly bound ourselves by treaty shall never be strong enough to effect the only object of which a navy has ever before been organized by civilized men, is to my mind a course more befitting opera bouffé than enlightened statesmanship. But that is exactly the position this country has assumed. There is no prospect that any different policy will be pursued while the present administration remains in office. The only course now open to the patriotic citizen is to make this policy, which can not be changed, as effective as possible.

Whatever can be obtained by conferences between nations, we should seek to attain. I am, therefore, in favor of the international conference recommended by this measure. It by no means follows, because the last conference has been fruitless to the degree which the gentleman from South Carolina has made so clear, that another conference may not produce better results. Much has happened since then to chasten resentments and to impress upon all who may attend such a gathering much clearer notions of the perils that overhang our civilization. There certainly can be no harm in bringing the nations together, if only to take full account of the appalling conditions prevailing throughout a part of the world and threatening to overspread the whole of it. I do not believe they can engage in such a study without becoming convinced of the truth that unless they disarm they will perish.

I said two years ago on this floor that unless they disarmed they would perish. They did not disarm, and now, by the admission of every one of them, they are actually perishing.

The collapse of Austria, the impending ruin of Germany, together with England's declaration of bankruptcy, all show that the whole fabric of civilization is in imminent peril of destruction. Already the roof has fallen in, and unless the process of disintegration can be checked, the whole structure must soon perish in confusion and disaster.

I believe that this civilization can be saved, but to avert the ruin which threatens it all civilized nations must act together and act quickly. Not merely do I believe this civilization can be saved but it can go to a higher plane than it has ever attained, if we can only succeed in taking the weapons of destruction from the hands of men. If from all this confusion and disaster there should ultimately emerge a world entirely unarmed, where every pair of human hands and every dollar of capital would be employed in productive industry—none diverted to war or preparation for war—the gain to civilization would be greater than that which followed emancipation of the serfs in Russia, or abolition of slavery in this country, or liberation through the great revolution of the land in France from the surviving feudal restrictions which excluded the people from possession of the soil.

This world is as rich to-day as it has ever been in natural resources. In the implements and agencies by which it can be cultivated and its products made available for human use, it is richer, vastly richer, than it has ever been. Yet numbers of people are perishing for lack of food. And the continuously rising cost of living attests with ominous distinctness the steady growth of scarcity throughout the whole world. With all men engaged in industry, and everyone enabled to enjoy in peace all that has been produced by the labor of his hands, the whole aspect of human affairs would undergo a revolution salutary and beneficent beyond our power now to comprehend.

The capital destroyed in the war would not merely be replaced but it would be increased enormously. And remember, when I speak of capital, I speak of it only in the sense that it embodies the three essentials of human existence—food, shelter, and clothing.

If the economic collapse which now seems imminent be not averted, the people of this earth can no longer be fed, nor clothed, nor sheltered. But if by disarmament all men are liberated from military enterprises and enlisted in productive enterprises, all difficulties will be removed, and the pathway opened to abundance greater than the world has ever known.

The first step toward this consummation, let it not be forgotten, is to dissolve armaments. They must be put away if civilization is to survive. It is no longer a question whether nations will maintain armaments or abolish them, but a question whether they will disarm now while some capital is left by which industrial conditions can be restored, or whether they will wait until disarmament is forced upon them by collapse of the whole industrial structure.

I myself am hopeful, aye, confident of the future. I believe men ere long, realizing the actual conditions surrounding them, will turn to industry for their salvation. And when in every country weapons of destruction are discarded, implements of production in the hands of hopeful workmen—the miner's pickax, the farmer's plow, the mechanic's tool, the laborer's implement, striking this earth which its Creator has made so bountiful—will bring forth from its bosom in ever-increasing abundance all the essentials not merely of human existence but of human comfort and prosperity, even as the rod striking the rock in the desert under the inspiration of the Most High brought forth the generous tides that relieved the thirst of His famishing people. The prosperity created by world-wide industry under conditions of peace will be distributed with justice—that is to say, with evenness among all who have contributed to it—and it will be inexhaustible, because justice and peace will be its fountain. [Applause.]

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move as an amendment to strike out the last paragraph in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LOGAN moves to strike out the last paragraph in the bill.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Is that a substitute for my amendment?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers the amendment as a substitute.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am glad to take this opportunity in the discussion of the pending bill to make appropriations for the Navy Department to say a few words in behalf of the Charleston Navy Yard, which on several occasions has been the object of attack, for the purpose of showing that the yard was only established after a most painstaking, careful, and exhaustive examination by an official board composed of some of the most capable and competent officers of the Navy, and that on every occasion since when the yard has been investigated it has been adjudged to be a most important, useful, and valuable asset to the Naval Establishment.

It will be recalled that the Charleston yard was established about 1901, as the result of the report of a board of officers, of which Rear Admiral Frederick Rodgers, United States Navy,

was president. In considering the merits of the location attention was especially invited to a consideration of the following subjects:

(a) The depth and size of the harbor and the character and depth of the navigation from the sea to the harbor and from the latter to the station, if upon a river.

(b) Its defensibility and the character and extent of the defense, if any, now in existence.

(c) The facilities, at or in the immediate vicinity of the location, for furnishing labor, materials, and supplies with promptness and at moderate cost and its ability to supply labor which may be required in large quantities for irregular periods of time.

(d) The suitability of the sites for founding public works, especially dry docks.

(e) The elevation of the lands with respect to grading or filling that may be necessary.

(f) Direct railroad or other lines of communication with commercial centers.

(g) The supply and cost of good water.

(h) The depth and extent of the water frontage.

It will be seen at a glance that the subject which the board was called upon to consider covered quite completely all the elements which enter into the location of a proper site for a navy yard, and was so regarded at the time by those highest in authority in the department. Each of the questions submitted to the board were gone into fully and in detail and as the result the board selected the site where the Charleston yard is now located as a proper one.

In 1905, about four years after the Government had determined to establish the yard and while it was still in course of construction, Admiral F. W. Dickins visited Charleston Harbor in command of the coast defense squadron of the United States fleet. At a dinner given at that time in honor of the new cruiser *Charleston* Admiral Dickins, in the course of a speech delivered by him on that occasion, made the following remarks:

It has been exceedingly fortunate for the squadron that there was such a port as Charleston to select as our headquarters. It has proved to be an ideal place for the work we have in hand. The harbor is a commodious one and the water on the bar will now permit any of our battleships to enter this port. The flagship *Texas* has the distinction of being the first battleship to enter this port. As is well known, there is about 30 feet on the bar at high water.

After entering the harbor 50 battleships with 26 feet draft can be anchored in Charleston Harbor at single anchor, 400 yards apart with a scope of 45 fathoms of chain. Sixty-five battleships with the same draft and with the same scope of chain can be moored in Charleston Harbor 1,000 feet apart. Thirty-five battleships can be moored above the battery.

The new navy yard now under construction at Charleston is about 7 miles up the Cooper River from the battery. Twenty-eight feet can be carried to the yard at high water. The naval reservation has about 1,200 acres and a water front of about 1¼ miles.

The climate of Charleston is a genial one in the winter months, free from prolonged freezing weather, and such a climate that workmen can be employed out doors all the year around. The resources of the city are ample to provide for the personnel of a large number of vessels. All of these conditions would seem to indicate that this place is well worthy of the fostering care of the Government in the interest of a great naval station.

The people are loyal and patriotic, and their courtesies to the officers and men of the squadron have been most hearty and most generous. It is particularly gratifying to know that the uniform of the American bluejacket is held in high esteem and honor by the people of this city, and that the press of the city is most complimentary and sympathetic in all it has to say of the Naval Establishment.

Strategically, the Charleston Navy Yard is nearer our bases in the West Indies than any other yard on the mainland; it is a little nearer the Panama Canal than Galveston and about 10 miles nearer than New Orleans.

Certainly this was very high praise from one well qualified to speak; and since that time the harbor of Charleston has been considerably deepened, and the opinion of the admiral would be even more pertinent now. Again, in addition to the magnificent harbor of Charleston, the city has the advantage of being closely connected up by rail with all the great manufacturing centers of the United States; so, from the standpoint of the constancy of supply, both of labor and material, we might say that there is no place but Charleston south of Norfolk on the entire coast line of the United States—Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific—which offers so favorable a location for a yard.

We take it that the object of a navy yard is to furnish a convenient and economic rendezvous for the ships of all classes of the Navy. If the Charleston Navy Yard were abolished, there would be none such between Norfolk and San Francisco. While we understand that at one time there were those who contended that it was the proper naval policy to have only a few yards and all work concentrated at these, yet we submit that that theory was never sound, being founded upon conditions existing in other countries which had an extremely short coast line as compared with that of the Atlantic seaboard, and that such views have now been entirely abandoned.

Every naval board and every naval officer of standing and experience who has seen the Charleston Navy Yard has been most favorably impressed with it.

In the preliminary report No. 6 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, Document No. 1946, the commission, of which Admiral Helm was chairman, on page 27, paragraph 33, will be found the following:

After weighing all the advantages and disadvantages, including cost, of the various sites between Cape Hatteras and Key West, Fla., the commission is of the opinion that on this coast line Charleston Harbor most nearly meets the physical requirements of the Navy Department for a first-class navy yard.

In the report of Rear Admiral E. A. Anderson, commandant of the yard, dated December 7, 1921, he states as follows:

The Charleston yard is at present the only active navy yard on the Atlantic coast south of Hatteras. The South is lacking in private establishments at which, in need, naval vessels could be docked and repaired, while there are many such private yards north of Hatteras. For this reason it would be more disadvantageous to the safety of the Navy in emergencies to close the Charleston yard than any or all Government yards north of Hatteras.

In 1914 Rear Admiral J. M. Helm, at that time commandant of the yard, wrote as follows about it:

The fact is, as all naval men recognize, that with the opening of the Panama Canal the Charleston Navy Yard becomes an invaluable asset of the Navy. The prime purpose of the canal is to afford a quick means of transferring our battleships from our Atlantic to our Pacific coast. The incomparable superiority of the Charleston Navy Yard lies in the fact that not only is it the nearest yard of first-class equipment to the Panama Canal but it is the only yard south of Norfolk which is impregnable against an attack by sea. Charleston, although under siege throughout two great wars, has never been captured from the water. Its defenses to-day guarantee it against such a fate in future, and make the Charleston Navy Yard, sheltered from storm and protected against any hostile fleet, the great strategic base from which any possible naval warfare of the future is most likely to be conducted.

In 1916 Rear Admiral John R. Edwards had this to say of the yard:

It behooves the thoughtful and progressive officer of the Navy to give immediate, extended, and careful consideration concerning the possibilities of development of the Charleston (S. C.) Naval Station. Whether viewed from an industrial, financial, or strategic standpoint, the progressive, if not the rapid, development of this naval station intimately concerns the efficiency and operation of the fleet.

For military and strategic reasons it appears of paramount importance that there be developed on the Atlantic coast, at some point south of Cape Hatteras, a naval station capable of docking and repairing our largest and most important battleships. The protection of the Isthmian Canal, a project that involves the expenditure of about $400,000,000, combined with the generally existing belief upon the part of naval experts that if the fleet will ever be called upon to engage in battle the contest will take place in the Caribbean makes it a matter of importance to the efficiency of the fleet that there be developed on the mainland of the Atlantic coast (and independent of any outlying naval base) a first-class naval station.

The channel and harbor conditions of the Charleston Navy Yard, together with its industrial possibilities, appear to be measured by some of our naval experts from conditions existing about the period of the close of the Civil War. As evidence of the satisfactory existing character and extent of the channel conditions on the navy yard water front it is only necessary to state that the battleship *Connecticut* about two years ago with packed bunkers and a full supply of ammunition and stores made a complete turn in the channel in front of the navy yard and proceeded to sea without the aid of tugs.

In a report dated October 23, 1916, Rear Admiral B. C. Bryan, at that time commandant of the yard, had this to say:

From Hampton Roads to Key West there is a stretch of coast of approximately 1,000 miles, Charleston being slightly north of the center of this stretch, about 415 miles from Hampton Roads and 588 miles from Key West. In all this coast line Charleston is the only harbor offering facilities for a navy yard with positive assurance of a deep channel from the sea at a reasonable cost of original construction and yearly maintenance and with a protected anchorage ground for a large number of vessels of deep draft.

An idea of the advantage of location may be formed from the following:

Charleston is nearer than Hampton Roads to all Gulf ports by about 350 miles.

It is 200 miles nearer Guantanamo than Norfolk, 270 miles nearer than New Orleans, and 170 miles nearer than Pensacola, and is less than 200 miles farther from Panama than either Pensacola or New Orleans.

Its central position on the long stretch of coast below Cape Hatteras and its comparative proximity to the Gulf, Caribbean, and the isthmian ports makes Charleston a port of strategic importance.

Rear Admiral J. R. Helm, head of a commission on navy yards and naval stations appointed under an act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, in a preliminary report of the commission has this to say of the yard:

The commission is of the opinion that it is necessary, advisable, and desirable to take immediate steps to improve this yard so as to permit full utilization of its docking and repair facilities for work of all kinds within the limits of the capacity of its dry dock and the depth of water which can be maintained, without undue additional expenditure, in the channel approaches from the sea to the navy yard. * * * Viewed as an existing navy yard, with resources and equipment capable of most effective expansion with a reasonable additional expenditure, the most important problem is: How can this yard be most advantageously utilized for naval needs? Its large land area, excellent

dry docks, present shop equipment, extensive adjacent harbor, sheltered location, capability of defense by fortification, mines, and the natural character of the terrain, its accessibility to the sources of supply, and excellent transportation facilities by land and water, renders the problem one of comparatively easy solution. * * * After careful consideration of all data submitted and the conditions previously set forth in this report, the commission recommends as follows concerning the navy yard, Charleston: That it is necessary, advisable, and desirable to improve this navy yard in order to meet the requirements of such portions of the fleet as may be assigned to it for maintenance and repair, including additional facilities as a submarine and destroyer base, and to utilize to the greatest advantage its facilities within the limitations of the capacity of the dry dock and the 30-foot approach channel to the navy yard already provided for by Congress in the last naval appropriation bill.

All these reports show conclusively and beyond dispute the Charleston Navy Yard is ideally located and worthy of the most fostering care on the part of the Navy Department. Not only, however, has the Government looked with kindly eye upon the port of Charleston as the proper place for the establishment of a navy yard, but the Standard Oil Co., recognizing its manifold advantages, has recently established just south of the yard a magnificent refinery costing millions of dollars, and during the war the Government located, several miles above the navy yard, the most splendid and complete terminals, costing upwards of $17,000,000, which will compare favorably with any on the Atlantic or Pacific seaboard.

Of course, from time to time the Charleston navy yard has been attacked just as the navy itself is attacked, but as the navy is essential to the safety of the country, so the Charleston Navy Yard is essential to the Navy.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the vast majority of the committee is in favor of the bill carrying language requesting a further conference on the subject of the limitation of armament. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] was accurate in stating that the only question here is one of language. That question is raised, however, only by the gentleman from California himself, because I know of no one else who objects to the language in the bill.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Oh, I talked the matter over with various Members of the House, and I hope the gentleman will correct himself to the extent of admitting at least that I feel convinced there are others who agree with me in this matter.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I was only expressing my opinion that he alone objects to the language now in the bill.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I decline to yield any more. I ask that the gentleman from California be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I expressed the view, gentlemen of the committee, when interrupted, that the opinion expressed by the gentleman from California was not shared by others. He says not. I accept his statement that there are others who entertain the same opinion, but I reiterate that the views of the great majority of the committee are not in accord with his views. Now, here is the language—the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asked a question at the time as to the difference in the language of the amendment and the language in the bill: "The President is requested to enter into negotiations." That is the language of the bill. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] it is, "the Congress indorses the limitation of armament by international agreement and suggests to the President the desirability of entering into negotiations." When it was shown to me I said I had no objection to it, and it was fully my intention to vote for it, but the gentleman made a speech, and he said that his objection was that the language contained in this bill carried a false implication. When he made that statement I made up my mind I was not going to vote for his amendment, nor do I expect to vote for it. There is no false implication. Why the necessity for changing the language? That is the question the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks. There is no necessity except to placate the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER]. What difference does the language make? When the Borah amendment was considered there was received a letter from the President, and listen to what the President said about it:

> I have said to inquirers, as I am now pleased to say to you, that it is not of particular concern to the administration what form the expression that Congress shall take, though it is most agreeable that Congress shall express itself in favor of securing, if possible, an international agreement upon a program for the limitation of armament.

Again:

> It is wholly desirable to have the expression of a favorable opinion on the part of Congress relating to this world question, and it would seem to me ample if it should be expressed in the broadest and most general terms.

I am vastly more concerned with the favorable attitude of the Congress on this question than I am as to the form of expressing that attitude. You may be sure that the Executive will be ready to give every consideration to such expression as the Members of the two Houses of Congress and themselves disposed to make.

The Borah amendment was then before him and the language was that "the President is requested." There is absolutely nothing to justify the Lineberger amendment except the desire to placate the gentleman from California. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, is there any reason why this should not remain—the Kelley amendment instead of the Lineberger amendment? I know of none. So far as I am concerned it ought to be the Kelley amendment and I hope it will remain the Kelley amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Let it remain the Kelley amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I hope this House will vote down the Lineberger amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it your desire as well as mine to request the President to do this thing?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. BUTLER. Who suggests the desirability of this other language?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Nobody except Mr. LINEBERGER.

Mr. BUTLER. Why do not we ask it plainly? Let it stand as it is.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The position of the President is not so insecure that a request from Congress will harm him. He will not take offense at a respectful request from the representatives of the people.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California, and much prefer the amendment of the committee. In the first place, the gentleman from California in his amendment is in effect contradictory. The gentleman says that the Congress indorses the limitation of armaments by international agreement, and then practically condemns the Washington conference by wanting to call another conference to undo the work, as it were, of the conference which met in Washington a year ago.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I yield briefly, not for an argument, just for a question.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman misstates the intention of the amendment. It is to further negotiate in addition to those which have already taken place.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the gentleman indorses the one already conducted, if it was really effective, there would be no occasion for going further. I want to call the attention, however, of the committee to the fact that even the committee amendment, which I am going to support, probably will be ineffective. We are presented with this situation: The present limitation of armament treaty, though not ratified by all the signatory powers, has been ratified by the United States, and that treaty provides that it shall be in effect until the 31st day of December, 1936. In other words, we have signed that treaty, we have agreed it shall be binding until 1936. The nations have gone ahead with the building of auxiliary fleets under the treaty, and will it not appear that we now go before the world and say we want to back out and start over again after they have expended millions of dollars in building auxiliary ships of below 10,000 tons displacement in agreement with the treaty, under terms to which the United States agreed?

Is there prospect of success now that did not come a year ago? Why, gentlemen of the committee, do you not suppose that Mr. Hughes, the Secretary of State—do you not suppose that he undertook, when the conference was in session, to secure a limitation on the building of warships under 10,000 tons? Do you not suppose he endeavored to place a limit on submarines, destroyers, and other auxiliary craft? Do you not suppose that the President of the United States and our technical advisers undertook in the disarmament conference to secure the limitation of all armaments, large and small—limitation in number as well as size? If they did not, then they were blind to the great importance of the question. If they did not, then their efforts were vain and empty. If they did, if they sought to secure an agreement by the other powers of the world and to secure the limitation as to building ships below 10,000 tons and the limitation of submarines as to number and size, and to secure the limitation of armament below 8 inches in caliber of guns—if they did undertake to do that, then, gentlemen of the House, they failed; and if they failed

a year ago, if the other nations of the world that sat in the Washington conference a year ago were not willing to make an agreement to place a limit upon ships below 10,000 tons, and if they were not willing to limit their armament below 8 inches in caliber of guns, do you suppose they are now more inclined than then to follow a different course?

I am going to surrender whatever doubts I may have as to the success of another such conference and shall support the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] to this bill. But I want to say to you, gentlemen, that the real problem can never be solved merely by treaties of this character which merely seek to limit the size of navies and the caliber of guns.

Wars will never cease until the cause of war is removed; nations will fight so long as there is no forum for the settlement of their quarrels except the battle field; the peoples of the earth will continue to pour out their blood so long as the only final authority among nations is that of the bayonet and the bullet; armies and navies will continue to struggle until the peoples of the world establish an agency to settle international disputes according to law and reason. Taking away battleships, taking away craft above 10,000 tons, only increases the necessity for building more auxiliary ships. The disarmament conference provided that the signatory powers could not build, except within certain limits, ships of above 10,000 tons. Ergo, they must therefore build a great many more under 10,000 tons.

The foreign representatives in the conference knew the terms of this treaty. The American representatives knew the terms of this treaty when they signed it. They knew that the nations of the world could go on building warships, submarines, and auxiliaries below 10,000 tons and increasing their armament below 8 inches in caliber of guns. And, knowing that, they signed it. But, gentlemen, I trust that the President will respond to this request of Congress, and that we shall go on in the endeavor to limit the armaments of the world. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this amendment has been the source of a great deal of discussion here on the floor of the House, I had hoped my amendment would be voted up or down on its merits, but as the distinguished gentlemen from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who is my friend and whom I respect, has seen fit to make this a matter of personal loyalty of the membership to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and made it a question of whether we shall have "the Lineberger amendment" or "the Kelley amendment," I want to say to the House that I have no personal pride of opinion in the matter whatever. I only think I am right, but inasmuch as this is the last naval bill in which the genial gentleman from Michigan will take part, I am going to withdraw my amendment and, without further debate, let it be "the Kelley amendment," and I hope this will please my friend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES]. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Let us vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. LINEBERGER] withdraws his amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LOGAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 54.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, have you considered my amendment to the last paragraph? I will ask the gentleman from Michigan to let us consider this amendment, which comes at the end of the last paragraph.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. What is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. It has not been reported yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. LINTHICUM: Add the following after the period, page 55, line 17: "And it is also requested that he enter into negotiations with the said governments and the governments of other nations, with a view to the United States becoming a party to an international association, whether now existing or hereafter created and by whatever name it may be called, designed to preserve the peace of the world or at least diminish the possibility of war on land and sea, and in that connection to limit the construction of all types and sizes of surface and submarine craft and aircraft."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I make a point of order.

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have not had the opportunity to speak on this.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 54.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object. I am at least entitled to say something on my amendment, whether it is in order or germane or not. I ask the gentleman from Michigan to withhold his request.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland object to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman is given five minutes will he object?

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is all I ask for.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment requesting the President to invite the nations of the world to the consideration of an association of nations and through that association to provide for a decrease of the armaments of all kinds. I can not but believe from the result of the last disarmament conference that little can be accomplished through conferences of that nature. The treaty framed by that conference between the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy has been ratified by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan, but not by France and Italy. It has therefore to this time accomplished but little. It has accomplished so little that when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] was asked what had been the results, he said there had been none. No ships have been scrapped except several worthless ones out of commission. While the treaty provided against the building of battleships and cruisers except according to the 5-5-3 ratio in excess of 10,000 tons, it did not provide any restriction upon the building of those less than 10,000 tons. While it provided for the number of 16-inch guns, it did not provide any limitation on the number of smaller guns, and any nation can manufacture two 8-inch guns in lieu of every 16-inch gun it is prohibited to manufacture. In the turmoil and confusion which prevails among the nations of the world at the present time, scarcely any action in conformity with the treaty has been taken.

To-day we are asked to vote requesting the President to call a disarmament conference for the purpose of limiting the building of ships less than 10,000 tons. While I shall support such a provision in this bill, I must admit that from our experience of the disarmament conference which met on the 12th of November, 1921, there is little prospect of any results from another disarmament conference. To-day the press tells us that the nations are preparing to construct a great fleet of warcraft of the smaller type not restricted by the disarmament treaties. To-day we are faced with the possibility of another race for leadership in naval affairs. Realizing what has taken place, I can not but believe that the only possible way to bring about disarmament is through an association of the great nations of the world, providing against the construction of powerful navies and also against great armies. I care not whether you call it a League of Nations, a league of peace, or an association of nations, but let it be some agreement between the great powers for the prevention of war and for the preservation of peace. The nations of Europe are looking to America to lead; they look to our country, the only solvent and creditor nation of the globe, to lead in that effort to make the last war bring about the permanent peace of the world. The chaotic condition which prevails in Europe and the Near East should certainly stimulate us to quick action to preserve the stability of nations and again establish them upon a permanent footing whereby trade and social intercourse may again bring about the friendship of the various peoples who are now at enmity with one another.

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, in the letter which he and some 30 other prominent citizens signed, recognized the fact that there should be an association of nations, and said they were supporting the Republican ticket because they believed that to be the quickest way to get results, or in similar words.

We have now been under the Republican administration for nearly two years and confusion has become worse confounded. Is it not high time that we should resort to other means to secure stability? Mr. Bonar Law, Prime Minister of England,

has told us that England can not pay her debts. Around England are clustered the financial conditions of Europe. Let this Gibraltar of finance default and it would be nothing short of disaster. France, Germany, and Italy, all practically bankrupt, would doubtless collapse. I believe if my amendment were adopted we could yet save these various countries, and likewise place ourselves in a far better condition than we are to-day. Our great exports, in fact, our entire foreign trade, depends upon the stability of the nations across the water. To bring peace and prosperity to our own people we must not neglect a friendly hand to these great customers of ours. The world looks to America. What is the answer of the present administration? The people of our country look to the present administration for a definite and concrete foreign policy, and when this definite policy is outlined, then and not until then can we take our place in the galaxy of nations to which we are entitled. The press tells us that France has no faith in what is being said on the part of America. How can she have, or how can any other nation, until President Harding and his Secretary of State lay down the policy of America for the guidance of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 54, line 13, with reference to the proviso which was stricken out upon the point of order made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. The entire paragraph was stricken out.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Indiana withdraws his point of order with regard to the paragraph.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to line 9, page 54. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. After the Chair has made a ruling and it has been approved by the committee and the paragraph has been passed, it is not in order to withdraw a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Only by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOWELL. I think not even by unanimous consent, because the record is already made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the House by its unanimous consent can permit the gentleman to withdraw his point of order, which would vacate all the proceedings. Of course, it can not be done except by unanimous consent.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I agreed with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] that this proviso was subject to a point of order, and as the Chair states, of course, that made the whole paragraph subject to a point of order, and it all went out of the bill.

The first part of the paragraph prohibits the employment of enlisted men in the departments in Washington, so if that went out of the bill there would be no limitation whatever on the subject, and the Secretary of the Navy could assign to the bureaus of the departments in Washington as many enlisted men to supplement the civilian force as he saw fit. Of course, the gentleman from Indiana did not want to accomplish that. In the next place, these 34 clerks who are now in the Bureau of Navigation are there in a more or less temporary capacity. If they are thrown out, in all probability in another body the amount of the appropriation for the Bureau of Navigation will be increased so as to permit the employment of 34 more civilian clerks, and they would then in all probability be continued indefinitely. It seemed to the committee that for this one year these 34 enlisted men might well be permitted to remain in the bureau. Therefore, I hope no one will make a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. It was on the assurance that this was not to be permanent law and that no effort would be made for a permanent transfer of enlisted men into the department that I withdrew the point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Do these enlisted men receive the salaries of civilian clerks?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; they receive their enlisted pay, and this is the only case in the departments in Washington where enlisted men are so employed.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman asked that the whole paragraph be reincorporated into the bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the point of order is not made, I will ask to have the whole paragraph reinstated.

Mr. BLANTON. It would require an amendment providing that it be reinserted in the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph to which we have just referred, on page 54, beginning at line 9 and ending with line 16, be restored to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the language be restored to the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. On page 9 of the bill, after line 12, a heading "Recreation for enlisted men," was omitted by the printer. I ask unanimous consent that that heading, "Recreation for enlisted men" may be inserted in the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

[By unanimous consent, Mr. FRENCH, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. LINTHICUM were given leave to revise and extend their remarks on this bill.]

On motion of Mr. KELLEY of Michigan the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONGWORTH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 13374), had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to the final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put the amendments en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a motion to recommit, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 54, line 22, strike out "or other time-measuring device," and in line 24 strike out "or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work."

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 9, noes 103.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present. I think it is an important matter, on which we should have a roll call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order that there is no quorum present. It is evident that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion to recommit be read again before the roll call.

The SPEAKER. That is impossible, because the gentleman from Texas has made the point that there is no quorum present, and the Chair has declared that there is none.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is not necessary. The only thing in order is either a motion to adjourn or a roll call. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members. As many as favor the motion to recommit will, as their names are called, vote "yea," those opposed "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 6, nays 228, answered "present" 2, not voting 194, as follows:

YEAS—6.

Anthony	Hoch	Tincher	Underhill
Blanton	Moores, Ind.		

NAYS—228.

Abernethy	Aswell	Beck	Bixler
Ackerman	Atkeson	Beedy	Bland, Va.
Anderson	Bacharach	Begg	Bowling
Appleby	Bankhead	Bell	Box
Arents	Barbour	Benham	Brennan

Briggs	Funk	Lawrence	Ricketts
Buchanan	Gahn	Lazaro	Roach
Bulwinkle	Garner	Lea, Calif.	Robsion
Burdick	Garrett, Tenn.	Leatherwood	Rogers
Burroughs	Gernerd	Lehlbach	Rose
Butler	Gifford	Linthicum	Sanders, Ind.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilbert	Little	Sanders, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Glynn	Logan	Sandlin
Campbell, Pa.	Goldsborough	London	Scott, Mich.
Cannon	Graham, Ill.	Longworth	Scott, Tenn.
Carter	Green, Iowa	Lowrey	Shelton
Chalmers	Greene, Mass.	Lyon	Sinclair
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	MacArthur	Sinnott
Chindblom	Hadley	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Christopherson	Hawes	McCormick	Snell
Clague	Hawley	McDuffie	Speaks
Cochran	Hayden	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sproul
Cole, Iowa	Hersey	McPherson	Stafford
Collier	Hickey	McSwain	Steagall
Colton	Hill	MacGregor	Stephens
Connally, Tex.	Himes	MacLafferty	Stevenson
Cooper, Ohio	Hogan	Madden	Strong, Kans.
Cooper, Wis.	Hooker	Magee	Strong, Pa.
Cramton	Huddleston	Mapes	Summers, Wash.
Crisp	Hudspeth	Michaelson	Sumners, Tex.
Crowther	Hukriede	Michener	Swank
Curry	Hull	Miller	Swing
Dale	Humphrey, Nebr.	Montoya	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Husted	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Darrow	Ireland	Moore, Va.	Thompson
Davis, Tenn.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Morgan	Thorpe
Denison	Johnson, Ky.	Mudd	Tilson
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Murphy	Timberlake
Dominick	Jones, Tex.	Nelson, Me.	Towner
Dowell	Kearns	Nelson, A. P.	Treadway
Driver	Keller	Nelson, J. M.	Turner
Dupré	Kelley, Mich.	Newton, Minn.	Tyson
Elliott	Kelly, Pa.	Newton, Mo.	Upshaw
Evans	Ketcham	Norton	Vaile
Fairfield	Kincheloe	O'Connor	Volstead
Faust	King	Oliver	Wason
Favrot	Kissel	Parks, Ark.	Watson
Fenn	Kleczka	Patterson, N. J.	White, Kans.
Fields	Kline, Pa.	Purnell	White, Me.
Fish	Knutson	Quin	Williams, Ill.
Fisher	Kopp	Raker	Williamson
Fitzgerald	Kraus	Rankin	Wilson
Fordney	Lampert	Ransley	Wingo
Foster	Lanham	Raybnrn	Woods, Va.
French	Lankford	Reece	Wyant
Fuller	Larsen, Ga.	Reed, W. Va.	Zihlman
Fulmer	Larson, Minn.		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Black	Parker, N. J.

NOT VOTING—104.

Almon	Fairchild	Lubring	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrew, Mass.	Fess	McFadden	Schall
Andrews, Nebr.	Focht	McKenzie	Sears
Ansorge	Frear	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Shaw
Barkley	Free	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shreve
Bird	Freeman	Maloney	Siegel
Blakeney	Frothingham	Mansfield	Sisson
Bland, Ind.	Gallivan	Martin	Slemp
Boies	Garrett, Tex.	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Bond	Gensman	Merritt	Smithwick
Bowers	Goodykoontz	Mills	Snyder
Brand	Gorman	Mondell	Stedman
Britten	Gould	Montague	Steenerson
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Pa.	Moore, Ill.	Stiness
Brooks, Pa.	Griest	Morin	Stoll
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Mott	Sullivan
Browne, Wis.	Hammer	O'Brien	Sweet
Burke	Hardy, Colo.	Ogden	Tague
Burtness	Hardy, Tex.	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Burton	Haugen	Olpp	Taylor, Colo.
Cable	Hays	Osborne	Taylor, N. J.
Campbell, Kans.	Henry	Overstreet	Ten Eyck
Cantrill	Herrick	Paige	Thomas
Carew	Hicks	Park, Ga.	Tillman
Chandler, Okla.	Huck	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Clark, Fla.	Humphreys, Miss.	Patterson, Mo.	Tucker
Clarke, N. Y.	Hutchinson	Paul	Vare
Classon	Jacoway	Perkins	Vestal
Clouse	James	Perlman	Vinson
Codd	Jeffers, Ala.	Petersen	Voigt
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, Miss.	Porter	Volk
Collins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	Walters
Connolly, Pa.	Jones, Pa.	Pringey	Ward, N. Y.
Copley	Kahn	Radcliffe	Ward, N. C.
Coughlin	Kendall	Rainey, Ala.	Weaver
Crago	Kennedy	Rainey, Ill.	Webster
Cullen	Kiess	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Kindred	Reber	Williams, Tex.
Deal	Kirkpatrick	Reed, N. Y.	Winslow
Dempsey	Kitchin	Rhodes	Wise
Doughton	Kline, N. Y.	Riddick	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Knight	Riordan	Woodruff
Drewry	Kreider	Robertson	Woodyard
Dunbar	Kunz	Rodenberg	Wright
Dunn	Langley	Rosenbloom	Wurzbach
Dyer	Layton	Rossdale	Yates
Echols	Lee, Ga.	Rucker	Young
Edmonds	Lee, N. Y.	Ryan	
Ellis	Luce	Sabath	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. Langley with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Brand.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Pou.

Mr. Vestal with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Radcliffe with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Ward of North Carolina.

Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts with Mr. Gallivan.

Mr. Brooks of Illinois with Mr. Sears.

Mr. Luhring with Mr. Jeffers of Alabama.

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Ward of New York with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Voigt with Mr. Vinson.

Mr. Winslow with Mr. Mansfield.

Mr. Dunn with Mr. Barkley.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Black.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Smithwick.

Mr. Porter with Mr. Doughton.

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Oldfield.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Codd with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Taylor of New Jersey with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Paige with Mr. Stedman.

Mr. Wood of Indiana with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Graham of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hardy of Texas.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Griest with Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Free with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Deal.

Mr. Olpp with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Echols with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Focht with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Sisson.

Mr. Gorman with Mr. Hammer.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Kindred.

Miss Robertson with Mr. Lee of Georgia.

Mr. Browne of Wisconsin with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. McFadden with Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi.

Mr. Webster with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Mondell with Mr. Rucker.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Kendall with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Campbell of Kansas with Mr. Garrett of Texas.

Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Johnson of Mississippi.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Rosenbloom with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. Connolly of Pennsylvania with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13481; Rept. 1295) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which, with accompanying papers, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCHANAN reserved all points of order.

CONFERENCE REPORT—STATE AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL (H. REPT. NO. 1296).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED], I present a conference report upon the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 22, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, and 25.

CHARLES CURTIS,
F. E. WARREN,
H. C. LODGE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES W. HUSTED,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Managers on the part of the House.

STATEMENT.

Statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

On No. 3: Inserts the proviso proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of the appropriation for "transportation of diplomatic and consular officers" for transportation on foreign vessels without a certificate from the Secretary of State that there are no American vessels on which such officers and clerks may be transported.

On No. 4: Strikes out the appropriation of $4,200 inserted by the Senate for payment to Leonore M. Sorsby, daughter and only child of William B. Sorsby, late envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Bolivia.

On No. 6: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriates $25,913.50 as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, and eliminates the language, inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate, providing for the detail of an Engineer officer of the Army to act as consulting engineer for the commission.

On No. 9: Appropriates $66,370, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000, as proposed by the House, for payment of expenses in connection with the arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

On No. 10: Appropriates $6,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000, as proposed by the House, for furniture for the Department of Justice.

On No. 11: Appropriates $40,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $45,000, as proposed by the Senate, for miscellaneous items for the Department of Justice.

On Nos. 12 and 17: Transfers the appropriation of $35,000 for printing and binding for the Court of Claims from the general appropriation for printing for the Department of Justice to a separate item for that purpose under the appropriations for that court.

On No. 13: Appropriates $60,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $65,000, as proposed by the Senate, for defending suits in claims against the United States.

On No. 15: Appropriates $200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $230,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the enforcement of antitrust laws.

On No. 16: Inserts the appropriation of $7,500 for the salary of the district judge for Porto Rico and corrects a typographical error in the text of the bill.

On No. 18: Appropriates $2,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,275,000, as proposed by the House, for United States marshals and their deputies.

On No. 20: Appropriates $925,000, instead of $900,000, as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the salaries of United States district attorneys, etc.

On No. 21: Appropriates $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,450,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of clerks of United States courts, etc.

On No. 22: Appropriates $275,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for bailiffs and criers for United States courts.

On No. 23: Appropriates $650,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for miscellaneous expenses of United States courts.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 1: Changing the title of the "counselor for the department" to "Undersecretary of State."

On No. 2: Relating to the appointment of clerks at embassies and legations.

On No. 5: Appropriating one year's salary ($4,500) to the widow of William W. Masterson, late consul to Plymouth, England.

On No. 14: Relating to the use of an automobile for the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

On No. 19: Relating to the transfer of two automobiles to the United States marshal of the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 24 and 25: Relating to the appropriation of $4,000 for the construction of a physician's residence at the Leavenworth (Kans.) Penitentiary.

JAMES W. HUSTED,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS], who has just been called from the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] may extend his remarks upon the naval appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. MCDUFFIE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

Mr. STEENERSON, at the request of Mr. VOLSTEAD, on account of sickness.

Mr. JEFFERS of Alabama, for two days, at the request of Mr. OLIVER, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

837. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, to cover the payment of claims for damages to and loss of private property incident to the training, practice, operation, or maintenance of the Army, $85,692.17 (H. Doc. No. 507); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

838. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimate of appropriation for the Supreme Court of the United States, being an alternate estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, carrying an increase of $600 over the estimates as contained in the Budget for that fiscal year, and a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, in the sum of $300 (H. Doc. No. 508); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

839. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the

Bureau of the Budget, an estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, for the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, $20,000 (H. Doc. No. 509); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

840. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and prior fiscal years, amounting to $67,065.81 (H. Doc. No. 510); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 13459. A bill extending the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission and making available funds appropriated under authority of an act entitled "An act to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, for the purpose of controlling the floods of the Mississippi River from the mouth of the Ohio River to Rock Island, Ill., and for the purpose of controlling the floods of the tributaries of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Ohio River and Rock Island, Ill., including levee protection and bank protection, in so far as said tributaries are affected by the flood waters of the Mississippi River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. House Report 1293. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor. Ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (S. 3048) for the relief of L. D. Riddell and George W. Hardin, trustees of Milligan College, Tennessee, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 13474) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Winnebago, the town of Rockford, and the city of Rockford, in said county, in the State of Illinois, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13475) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to certain persons and certain corporations permits to explore or leases of certain lands that lie south of the medial line of the main channel of the Red River in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 13476) amendatory of and supplemental to an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Co., and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1871, and acts supplemental thereto, approved, respectively, May 2, 1872, March 3, 1873, and June 22, 1874; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN: A bill (H. R. 13477) to create the arbitration commission, United States Shipping Board, and to amend the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 13478) to amend the insurance laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13479) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Pittsfield, Me.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 13480) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Colorado River compact; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BEGG: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 414) authorizing a special committee to consider the readjustment of the laws providing for the retirement and retainer pay of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRENNAN: Resolution (H. Res. 473) directing the Federal fuel distributor to report to the House of Representatives as expeditiously as possible the amount of anthracite coal shipped to foreign countries since September 22, 1922, and the advisability of establishing an embargo on the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 13482) to refund to Clinton G. Edgar income tax erroneously and illegally collected; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 13483) granting a pension to Mary E. Schapley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 13484) granting an increase of pension to John Dudley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13485) granting a pension to Thomas C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13486) granting a pension to Stephen H. Warren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13487) granting an increase of pension to Edward G. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13488) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Brewer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 13489) granting a pension to William R. McCrory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 13490) for the relief of the William J. Oliver Manufacturing Co. and William J. Oliver, of Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 13491) granting a pension to Hannah Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6627. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Ukrainian American Citizens' League of Nations, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring a protest by the United States Government against the atrocities committed by the Polish Government in the Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6628. Also (by request), petition of the political action commission of the Chicago Church Federation, protesting against the passage of the so-called Bursum bill in the Senate; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6629. Also (by request), petition of members of Mizpah Chapter, No. 49, Order of the Eastern Star, Pittsburgh, Pa., and citizens of Pennsylvania, asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6630. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the California Wool Growers' Association, requesting Federal aid in exterminating predatory animals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6631. Also, petition of residents of Sacramento, Calif., opposing excise tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6632. By Mr. FAUST: Petition of 50 citizens of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6633. By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Tennessee, favoring the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6634. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Donald A. Campbell, Esq., Rochester, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Green resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6635. Also, petition of the Northwest Savings Bank, Washington, D. C., protesting against the action of the Comptroller of the Currency permitting the establishment of a branch of the Riggs Bank in northwest Washington; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

6636. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of the Maryland Audit Co., G. Harvey Porter, Wilmer Black, and J. R. Eder, all of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Capper bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6637. Also, petition of Henry P. Bridges, secretary of the Woodmont Rod and Gun Club, favoring passage of the public shooting ground or game refuge bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Saturday, December 16, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

TASKER L. ODDIE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in his seat to-day.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fernald	Lodge	Reed, Mo.
Ball	Fletcher	McCumber	Robinson
Bayard	France	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Shortridge
Brandegee	George	McLean	Simmons
Brookhart	Gerry	McNary	Smith
Broussard	Glass	Moses	Smoot
Bursum	Gooding	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Harreld	New	Stanley
Cameron	Harris	Nicholson	Sutherland
Capper	Harrison	Norbeck	Townsend
Caraway	Heflin	Norris	Trammell
Colt	Hitchcock	Oddie	Underwood
Couzens	Johnson	Overman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Kendrick	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Phipps	Warren
Dial	Ladd	Pittman	Weller
Dillingham	La Follette	Pomerene	
Ernst	Lenroot	Ransdell	

Mr. PHIPPS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], are in attendance at a hearing before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3 to the bill, and agreed to the same; and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and agreed to the same with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3 to the bill and agreed to the same.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Calif., memorializing Congress, pursuant to a vote of the citizens of that city and county, for an amendment of existing law permitting the manufacture and use of light wines and beer for beverage purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CALDER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and vicinity, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by Odessa Local, No. 157, Farmers' Equity and Cooperative Union of America, of Winfield, Kans., protesting against passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of C. Shajerman and 28 others of Bathgate, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of 74 citizens of Griggs and Foster Counties and 166 citizens of Portland and vicinity, in the State of North Dakota, praying for the prompt passage of legislation stabilizing the prices of farm products, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOWARD W. AMBRUSTER ON THE ARSENIC SITUATION.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an article on the calcium arsenate situation that I think will be very interesting to the farmers of the country.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOUNDBROOK, N. J., *December 7, 1922.*

The Hon. JOSEPH FRELINGHUYSEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In view of the recent adoption of the resolution introduced by Senator Smith of South Carolina calling upon the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the present arsenic and calcium arsenate situation in relation to the problem of boll-weevil control, it occurs to me that you might be interested in some articles written by that well-recognized expert on this subject, Howard W. Ambruster.

Mr. Ambruster was the man who designed, built, and operated the largest calcium-arsenate plant in the world. It is located right here in Boundbrook and was owned originally by Mr. Frank Hemingway, whom you may know personally.

It seems to me as a close student of this problem of boll-weevil control that it might be extremely valuable to the cotton growers if these articles were spread on the records of the United States Senate, so that copies might be sent to those who stand to profit most from the information contained therein, namely, the southern cotton growers.

Very truly yours,

PAUL MCMICHAEL.

[Reprinted from November 27, 1922, issue of Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter, 100 William Street, New York.]

WHENCE WILL COME THE ARSENIC?

Arsenic, being wholly a by-product, is, productively speaking, immune from the stimulating influence of demand. The supply is measured solely by the activity of production in the metallurgical field, especially copper, and the price of arsenic would have to rise far, far above even to-day's high level before smelting for the sake of getting the arsenic content of a metallic ore could be looked upon as a profitable undertaking.

Under normal conditions in metallurgy this country produces something like 15,000 tons of arsenic a year. In the years when that output was normal almost the entire quantity found ready consumption. What could be the effect of adding a demand for some 4,000 tons for the manufacture of calcium arsenate? The answer will clarify, but it will not relieve, the situation resulting from the enormous demand for calcium arsenate to combat the cotton-boll weevil. Metallurgical operations are not now normal; they have been subnormal for several years. Need one seek further for evidence that there is a shortage of arsenic? The high price now prevailing has a very substantial raison d'etre.

The cotton planter is faced not by a shortage of calcium arsenate, or a "corner" in that product, but by the stubborn fact that manufacturers of the desired insecticide are extremely hard put to get the raw material to make it out of. There is no lack of firms ready to make calcium arsenate and market it at a reasonable price, and new ones are looking for an opening every day; but to get arsenic—and the arsenate is 40 per cent arsenic—the manufacturer has to bid against the industries which in former years took the greater portion of the available supply, and even then he finds that the smelters have a tendency to take care of their older customers first.

Arsenic can be produced otherwise than as a by-product of smelting. There are several arsenical minerals deposited in different sections of the United States. But no process has as yet been devised for making arsenic from orpiment, realgar, mispickel, and other native minerals at a price which would afford relief from existing market conditions. A few firms are producing arsenic direct, or are about ready to do so, but they will not be able to offer it at a bargain.

Orpiment, practically the most promising arsenical mineral, which contains 50 per cent of arsenic, has been located only in Utah. Realgar, which contains 70 per cent of arsenic, is found in Utah and Washington. Nevada and Washington have deposits of other minerals of good arsenic content. Mispickel (arsenical iron pyrites) is more widely distributed, deposits having been located in 17 States. These minerals offer a potential primary source of calcium arsenate, or of some equally effective compound of arsenic. Their practical application in the boll-weevil fight requires, however, a great deal of development.

There is talk in some of the cotton States of cooperative or State calcium arsenate plants. If we may make a suggestion in this connection it is this: First get the arsenic. Mispickel deposits exist in Georgia, Arizona, North Carolina, and Virginia (to name only the locations convenient to the cotton belt). Perhaps the State universities can be induced to study the problem of turning these deposits to

account in the campaign against the boll weevil. The need justifies a goodly measure of research.

Not so much is heard now as was common talk a few months ago of the possibilities of getting arsenic cheaply from abroad. This material is on the free list of the new tariff law, but importations have not developed any marked proportions. Metallurgy is at as low an ebb in Europe and the Far East as it is in this country. The agricultural peoples of those regions in their intensive practices and because of the large proportion of garden vegetables among their crops need considerable arsenic in the form of Paris green and other compounds. This condition leaves little, if any, to be exported. Even a high price would likely have but a temporary effect in attracting sellers to the American market; the home governments would soon act on the plea of their agricultural peoples and impose restrictions on exports.

Investigation of the calcium arsenate situation has been asked of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The question seems to be a chemico-economic one rather than a matter of monopoly, as is hinted in the request for a probe. The ingenuity which developed the fact that calcium arsenate eradicates the boll weevil has now the bigger task of developing the production of the insecticide.

—

ARSENATE SHORTAGE A SERIOUS REALITY—CALCIUM ARSENATE DEMAND FOR BOLL-WEEVIL CONTROL LEAVES SUPPLY OF RAW AND FINISHED MATERIAL BEHIND.

(By Howard W. Ambruster, calcium arsenate consultant.)

Many contributing factors have brought about a rise in the arsenic market, which buyers among insecticide producers claim is getting top-heavy. From a low mark of between 7 and 8 cents several months ago it advanced at first slowly and more recently by leaps and bounds to 13 cents and over.

The writer has analyzed various phases of the arsenic and insecticide situation from time to time during the past year and has pointed out numerous reasons why arsenic must reach higher price levels. It would seem now that every one of the many facts which could affect demand has been suddenly accentuated.

The arsenic-buying season for next year's requirements of insecticides started in with all stocks of both the raw material and the finished products reduced to the lowest minimum in years by the pressure for late shipments of lead arsenate and Paris green and finally the scramble for calcium arsenate in July. Meanwhile the smelters having shipped all old stocks were still producing less than normal on account of the condition of the metal market.

CALCIUM ARSENATE IN A BOOM.

As reports began to come in about the boll-weevil control this year as conducted by the progressive cotton planter and investigator alike, it became evident that calcium arsenate had, indeed, come into its own. The success of this method of control has definitely proved itself as the main defense of the southern planter against the insect invasion. By contrast was the short crop from those plantations in the infested areas which were not dusted either because the owners were unable to secure supplies or unwilling to use the dust if obtainable.

The result has been a pyramiding of the preseason agitation in the South for contract offers for next year's requirements of calcium arsenate, which agitation started almost before the last cars were shipped South during the summer. Dealers and consumers in the South could not understand why northern manufacturers should have charged a so much higher price late in the season than the figure set before the season opened by one large manufacturer. They did not realize that this earlier price made on the State of Georgia contract was induced by the fact that the manufacturer had carried the stock for two years, and therefore sold it not on the basis of cost plus a legitimate profit but practically as distressed merchandise.

As a matter of fact, the bad judgment displayed by the seller in this instance, while it saved the Georgia planters a large sum of money and permitted them to secure calcium arsenate while the rest of the South begged for it, at the same time cost the seller a large sum, and also caused the rest of the insecticide makers to delay their manufacturing program until late in the season, and thus actually induced the shortage of calcium arsenate last year to such a degree that the balance of the cotton States lost a great deal more than Georgia actually saved.

But with last season's peculiar record a recent experience, the buyers immediately started a campaign for prices for next year, and this important factor in bulling the market price for arsenic itself gradually gathered impetus until finally the pot boiled over when early in November Georgia's State Board of Entomology asked for bids for next year and was unable to obtain any.

FOREIGN SUPPLY NEGLIGIBLE.

Meanwhile the tariff agitation re white arsenic had culminated in the final passage of the tariff bill with this product on the free list. Many consuming buyers had held back on their contract purchases on the fallacious theory that as soon as the tariff was definitely settled the domestic market would be flooded with foreign arsenic and prices would go down immediately. However, the nonexistence of any available foreign surplus beyond that quantity which has come into this country in previous years prevented any response to the new demand from the United States.

The fact that these bidders for foreign arsenic all became active at the same time simply boosted the market up ten or fifteen dollars a ton immediately after the tariff was signed.

In addition to the already existing makers of insecticides a number of new producers have appeared on the scene and many others have been considering the manufacture of calcium arsenate. Inquiries for actual purchases for these accounts have helped along the cry for arsenic, spot and future, and the methods used by some buyers to secure quotations on comparatively small purchases have caused requests for prices on a carload to be multiplied in the New York market to several hundred tons. Instead of buying through one source or bidding quietly, these bidders have gone from one seller to another, including both producers and importers or dealers, and finally to all of the brokers.

In itself constant repetition of requests for prices will bull the market on any product, and when there is an actual shortage the effect is many times multiplied. One strange feature of it has been the way the bidding price level has kept just under the market, but has advanced with the market. In this respect it differs from the market in many chemicals during the war when wise buyers would bid over the market and get their purchases and then sit back and watch the other fellow get caught. In this arsenic situation many of the bidders who still are just under the market are actually offering prices in excess of the figure at which they were apparently willing to buy a few weeks ago.

The increase in the price of cotton has kept in step with the increase in the potential demand for calcium arsenate and the bidding for white arsenic. Granted that the planter always should use calcium arsenate to raise a maximum crop when the boll weevil appears, yet naturally it has been easier for the South to foresee the big demand for this insecticide while cotton is going up than might have been the case should cotton have been going down.

COTTON PLANTERS WAKE UP.

One of the strongest features of the potential demand for calcium arsenate next year is found in the wider distribution of the product in all parts of the South this last season. A large percentage of the planters would not begin to dust their cotton as a result of the most intensive propaganda by county, State or Federal entomologists, newspaper advice or sales efforts of local supply men. These unprogressive planters waited until one of their more up-to-date neighbors successfully used the poison to fight the boll weevil. As the results of the dusting were so uniformly effective this last season many thousands of these doubting Thomases have been converted and are now proclaiming loudly that they, too, are going to buy poison and use it next year.

A remarkable feature of this demand for calcium arsenate so far ahead of the consuming season is the fact that very little additional evidence will be available until next season's "bugs" actually appear. The case for the demand is closed, so to speak, but the real verdict can not be rendered until the first generation of the progeny of the hibernating weevil appears on the scene next year.

That the South wants a tremendous quantity of calcium arsenate is amply sustained by the evidence. There is no doubt also that this poison can not be widely used if it gets too high in price, and it is equally true that the lower the selling price the more actual consumption will finally result. The demand is for more and cheaper white arsenic to produce the commercial poison. Meanwhile the curious phenomenon is observed of the actual buying demand increasing months ahead of the season while the price of arsenic advances with leaps and bounds. This, of course, has pulled the price of the finished product along with it. But the South's real need is for a much greater supply of calcium arsenate at a lower, not a higher, price level than last season.

ARSENIC CORNER A MYTH.

The cry of speculation and an arsenic corner has been raised, but there is no evidence of the latter and the real speculative element is to be found among those consumers of long standing who months ago foresaw at least what their minimum requirements would be but refused to take advantage of the market level at that time. They have simply speculated on the short side of a bull market.

That any one merchandising house or group has effected a corner on arsenic is unbelievable and the smelters actually have been advising newcomers in the industry to stay out, giving as the reason for this advice that they will not have enough arsenic for their regular customers let alone any new ones. That this condition is not confined to the United States is indicated by constant communication with the producers the world over.

The impartial observer is forced to admit that if the smelters were trying to force a situation they would feel that the more new consumers the better, and they would hold out all possible encouragement in order to induce the building of new plants to use arsenic. As a matter of fact, the smelters or by-product producers of arsenic have not had to force the present situation nor can they control it; a logical sequence of events has created it in spite of them and will continue to control its progress despite anything the smelters themselves may do. While here and there a dealer may have accumulated some little tonnage in arsenic futures these parcels exist largely on paper, as they are mainly contracts for shipments obtained through second or third hands from abroad. Until foreign arsenic is actually afloat or stored in this country it can not properly be said to be held for speculative purposes.

DIRECT PRODUCTION STARTED.

The direct production of white arsenic from mispickel ore to supplement the smelter's by-product, which has been predicted by the writer when arsenic should reach present price levels, is an accomplished fact. Among several such ventures contemplated or undertaken, the Toulon Smelting Co. in Nevada has its product on the market and promises expansion if prices continue at higher levels.

It must be remembered, however, that the direct production of arsenic does not mean cheap arsenic and is not going to supply the cotton planter with the low-priced calcium arsenate demanded in such enormous quantities for next season.

The only direct production of arsenic which might result in lower priced calcium arsenate for next season is that controlled by the Salt Lake Insecticide Co., in Utah, whose process is based on a unique deposit of arsenical ore already oxidized by nature, which permits the direct production of arsenates. However, the present tonnage program of this new company is too limited to make even a dent in the demand for calcium arsenate in the South, especially as the alfalfa weevil in the Rocky Mountain States will also require a large quantity of this same insecticide.

It is idle for anyone to contend that arsenic can not go any higher without killing the demand. A higher price will affect demand, but it can not kill it. Arsenic has gone to higher price levels heretofore, and the product has been used for its usual purposes in orchard and crop sprays, weed killers, and glass; and the highest level to which arsenic has been forced in recent years was in the spring of 1920, when the first real excitement about a short supply of calcium arsenate for the South was ever heard. As a matter of fact, a considerable quantity of the calcium arsenate which was sold at a low price to the State of Georgia this last season was made out of the highest priced arsenic sold in 1920. True, it was sold at a loss, but this illustrates the always present speculative nature of the arsenical spray industry as heretofore conducted based as it was principally on a small package business. The calcium arsenate demand on a tonnage basis is changing this largely by creating a dependable demand, and it will be changed altogether when a dependable supply is made available. This must be a supply which will adapt itself to the demand from year to year and month to month.

A cold-blooded analysis of this kind of a situation should convince anyone interested that granting there exists a shortage of a given quantity of arsenic to supply an already developed and potential demand, then some of the users are going to pay very high prices to cover their needs, and other users will not get sufficient to cover their needs.

It is an interesting picture with many phases possible between now and the time the last carload of next season's insecticides moves forward to the consumer's freight station. Meanwhile, the puzzled consumers of both the arsenic itself and of the finished insecticides can not be sure whether the part of wisdom is to plunge into the market and try and cover their maximum estimated requirements, or, in the apt words of Robert Louis Stevenson, to "await events."

[Reprinted from Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering, Vol. 26, No. 25, June 21, 1922.]

CALCIUM ARSENATE FOR BOLL WEEVIL CONTROL AND THE ARSENIC SITUATION—THE INSECT INFESTATION OF THE COTTON FIELDS OF THE SOUTH HAS DEVELOPED A NEW BRANCH OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES, THE GROWTH OF WHICH WILL BE CONTROLLED BY MANY AND CONFLICTING FACTORS, INCLUDING THE AVAILABLE SUPPLY OF THE PRINCIPAL RAW MATERIAL.

(By Howard R. Ambruster.)

The insect pests as a group are said to be the most powerful enemy of mankind to-day, the hazard to humanity being the starvation of the peoples of the earth through reduction of crops. And that part of the chemical industry which is devoted to the production of compounds for the destruction of insect pests is believed by those engaged in it to be the most hazardous of any industry based on applied chemistry from every standpoint. Of the insect pests which have been identified and combated by the combined ingenuity of agriculturists, entomologists, and chemists none has attained more prominence or greater disrepute than the Mexican or cotton boll weevil (*Anthonomus grandis*), which, though it does not attack a food crop, is equally as destructive from an economic standpoint as any insect now known. In the battle for the control of the boll weevil in the cotton States of the Union, after many methods have been tried by Government officials and private investigators, the greatest encouragement that has resulted has been from the use of the compound known as calcium arsenate, $Ca_3(AsO_4)_2$. This product, made by the combination of arsenic acid and lime, is now manufactured in this country by about 15 or 20 of the companies making agricultural insecticides.

IS A SHORTAGE OF WHITE ARSENIC LIKELY?

The probable increase in demand for calcium arsenate for boll-weevil control has brought up the question as to whether the supply of commercial arsenic which is now available in this country and abroad is sufficient for any such quantity of calcium arsenate as some enthusiasts claim will be required annually within the next few years.

There are so many different factors, statistical and otherwise, which must be considered in reaching any conclusions on this subject that the latter are bound to be more or less controversial. But some phases of the situation are sufficiently defined to permit the contention that an acute shortage of arsenic probably will develop should the demand for calcium arsenate reach any sizable proportions. It must be acknowledged also that should the production of arsenic remain stationary, while the demand for calcium arsenate increases, the future program of the entomologists for the use of this spray for the cotton crop will be endangered.

That feature of the situation which is not appreciated by many of those directly interested in the industries affected is the fact that at present the world's available production of arsenic has no relation whatsoever to the market demand for the product. In this respect arsenic is somewhat unique among those products or commodities which may be described as basic raw materials. The white arsenic of commerce, or "arsenic oxide," is more correctly arsenic trioxide, As_2O_3 (also known as arsenious acid and arsenious anhydride). Practically all of this arsenic which is produced to-day is the by-product of the smelters, known first produced in the crude state at the smelters in what are known as bag houses attached to the furnace flues, and in more recent years by the Cottrell process by electrical precipitation of the arsenical or black dust from the smelter fumes.

As the attorney said in advising his client, the latter's case had a "nuisance value" which made it worth while; just so is the arsenic production regarded by metallurgists and smelters. It is a nuisance and has a nuisance value only. It is usually regarded as the most objectionable content of the precious and semiprecious ores, and any ore is selected for its low arsenic content in preference to another ore equally available and valuable but containing a higher percentage of arsenic. It will be conceded generally that if it had not been for the legislation directed against the smelters on account of the damage done by their fumes the use of arsenic as an agricultural spray material would have been seriously retarded from its inception for lack of sufficient supply of the raw material.

METHOD OF MANUFACTURE OF WHITE ARSENIC.

The crude arsenic as it is first collected varies in content all the way from 40 to 90 per cent As_2O_3, though the bulk of it approximates the higher level. To refine it to 99 per cent so that it is marketable as white arsenic the crude must be treated one or more times in volatilizing furnaces, by which process the other ingredients in the original crude product are separated and driven off with the exception of a minimum one-half to 1 per cent of impurities which are found in all commercial white arsenic. The crude product varies greatly in percentage and character of impurities which are at times extremely difficult to reduce, and the smelters therefore sell a certain percentage of their output as off-grade arsenic testing between 90 and 99 per cent.

This off-grade arsenic can be used for a part of the market requirements, but is unsuitable for the most important use, which is the manufacture of arsenic acid, or H_3AsO_4, the first step in the production of the important arsenical insecticides, lead and calcium arsenate.

It should be obvious, therefore, that in case of sudden increase of the demand for arsenic we shall have to look elsewhere than to the smelters, which produce the crude because they can not help themselves and refine it to make it marketable. The selling price has, therefore, no relation to the cost, but reflects in a way an open bidding by the consumers for the given tonnage of arsenic which is available each season.

The real cost of production comprises, first, the transportation of the crude to the refining plant, the revolatilizing cost, which varies according to the number of treatments required, grinding if the product has solidified in the flues, and packaging for the market. If as an accounting policy a part of the actual cost of smelting is allocated to the arsenic by-product as such, a considerable item may be added to the total cost of the refined white arsenic, and as the latter is now a standard market commodity of wide distribution it is of course an entirely logical policy to divide total operating costs among all of the various products of the smelters. But this point should be taken into consideration when considering the actual cost of production in relation to selling price.

The direct production of arsenic from some of the many low-grade iron ores (mispickel or arseno-pyrites) containing a fairly high percentage of arsenic has been commercially attempted many times, but never with sufficient success to insure a stable enterprise. Should the demand increase to such a point as to put the market on a permanent level, about double its present selling price (6 to 7 cents per pound), many of these developments could undoubtedly be firmly established, but any such increase in the selling price of arsenic would seriously affect the cost of manufacture of calcium arsenate as well as all other arsenical spray materials. Calcium arsenate for boll-weevil control must be sold at an even lower figure than it is at present to insure the utmost development of its use and value to the South.

On the other hand, spray materials for all other purposes and likewise all other uses for white arsenic, should necessity demand, can afford to pay increasing prices. This has been demonstrated in the recent past. So while it is a safe conclusion that the direct production of arsenic is a possible development at a higher price level for many other requirements it does not follow that the increased supply thus made available will contribute to the protection of the cotton crop. Aside from the various known methods of direct production of commercial arsenic from mispickel, the only other alternative is the possible development of the production of arsenical compounds for spray requirements direct from an arsenical ore.

USE OF ARSENATE ORE AS SHORT CUT.

A short cut to the final product precludes the process of extracting the arsenic as As_2O_3 and its subsequent oxidation to As_2O_5 and requires an ore in which the arsenic is present in its natural state as an arsenate instead of an arsenite. Deposits of the latter classification are found in many parts of the United States and elsewhere, but there is only one known deposit of the former in any appreciable quantity, and its development, though contemplated for some years, is still in the future as a commercial enterprise. A very considerable saving in final cost would result should it prove to be practicable to produce the commercial arsenical sprays such as calcium and lead arsenate direct from an arsenical ore and without the successive steps of refining white arsenic and converting the arsenic to acid before combining with the lime or lead.

EXTENT OF MARKET.

Of the 16,000 tons of arsenic which it is estimated is now consumed annually in the United States between 80 and 85 per cent is required by the insecticides and related industries such as the manufacture of weed killers and cattle dip. The bulk of the remainder of the total goes to the glass maker and for the manufacture of pharmaceuticals. Of the requirements for insecticides the largest part is converted into arsenic acid in about 25 different plants, mostly located in the East and Middle West. The majority of these are small and operate only a few months in the year. The same intermittent schedule of operation applies to the other plants, about 20 in number, including those which compound spray materials like Paris green direct from the white arsenic and those making weed killer and cattle dip. This irregularity of consumption has always brought the maximum demand within a few months for a basic raw material which is produced normally over the entire 12 months. The effect on the market price is obvious.

The other principal demand for arsenic, for the glass industry, is an all-the-year-round requirement, as is also the limited use of arsenic acid for the production of arsephenimine, or salvarsan, and small requirements such as for rat poisons, preserving hides, and the reduction of metallic arsenic. In times past arsenic was an important raw material for the dye industry, it being used in the production of fuchsine colors, but this method has been abandoned, and the industries enumerated above cover practically all the uses to which arsenic is now put.

Official figures indicate that the present production of by-product arsenic in the United States is at the rate of approximately 12,000 tons annually, and the remainder consumed here comes mainly from Canada and Mexico and from Germany, Japan, and Belgium.

The figures for the world's production of arsenic are exceedingly difficult to compile intelligently, as official statistics are irregular in classifying white arsenic with the crude, with ore content and with red arsenic, and with the metal itself.

From such figures as are available, however, it is evident that the annual production of commercial white arsenic from all world sources is not much in excess of 30,000 tons when the smelters are at normal production, and the total is probably less than that figure during the last two years of restricted metal output.

A large quantity of arsenic was imported into this country in years past from Spain and England, as well as from Germany, but more recently the English supply has been consumed at home or gone elsewhere, and unsettled conditions in Europe since the war have permitted the Japanese producers to make considerable inroads on the importations to America. In addition to the countries named, arsenic is also produced in South Africa, Australia, Greece, Portugal, and France, but in none of these countries is there any surplus for export to the United States.

The demand abroad is fairly stable, and the uses are similar to those in the United States, though a much larger proportion of the total is consumed by the industries other than the agricultural sprays. Of the latter broad classification the use of arsenic for cattle dips is in much greater proportion abroad than in the United States. In South Africa, South America, and Australia, where cattle raising is highly developed, the use of arsenic for dips preceded this use in the United States. All agricultural countries are using insect sprays in a greater degree than ever before, though nowhere to the same extent as the American farmer and fruit grower. The cotton planter abroad has his own weevil problems to help along the consumption of arsenic. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that a normal or steady increase in the world's consumption of arsenic will not keep pace with any possible normal increase in the by-product production of the smelters, and this leaves a margin of only a few thousand tons available at present prices for any abnormal increase in demand which the situation in the South may develop.

LOSS CAUSED BY WEEVIL.

Anything like an exact estimate of the actual loss caused by the boll weevil must be an exceedingly argumentative conclusion, based on unreliable premises. The shiftless planter blames on the weevil everything which he can not unload on the weather and the cotton

traders; the intelligent cotton raiser in boll-weevil districts tries every precaution or remedy recommended by Government and State officials and admits that the weevil is at least largely responsible for the difference between a minimum and a maximum yield per acre. However, there can be no valid objection raised to the statement that the loss to the cotton grower due solely to the destruction by this one pest has already reached a total of hundreds of millions of dollars.

POOR QUALITY OF EARLY PRODUCT.

When the use of calcium arsenate was first advocated a few years ago a number of manufacturers began to produce it. The quality of this first material was so irregular, however, that a great deal of distrust was developed, and this retarded greatly the use of calcium arsenate. In some sections the cotton crop was seriously injured by the high percentage of soluble arsenic. The resulting prejudice is so strong that it is very doubtful if the Government can ever altogether overcome it. In addition to the poor quality of the product, the lack of knowledge of how to apply it also caused considerable damage to the cotton crops. It is perhaps not unnatural that the ignorant negro planters cultivating a few acres of cotton should be slow to learn the proper way to use the insecticide. Chemical manufacturers, however, have not the excuse of ignorance which the poor negro planter has, and it is therefore not unreasonable to expect that they should have known better. The manufacture of calcium arsenate, according to the chemical and physical specifications recommended by Doctor Coad, the Government entomologist, is not a difficult problem, but many producers have found its manufacture tricky and many tons of material have been condemned by Government agents.

PRESENT PRODUCTION AND FUTURE ESTIMATE.

The production of calcium arsenate thus far reached its high point in 1920, when upward of 5,000 tons was manufactured in the United States. Much of this was made too late for the 1920 season, and was carried over for 1921. On account of the condition of the South last year, the use of this spray did not develop as expected, and part of the 1920 production was carried in stock for the second year. In some quarters it is felt that the prospects this season are for an extremely heavy demand. The manufacturers, with last year's disastrous losses in view, have declined to pile up any new accumulation of stock ahead of the selling season, and it is entirely possible that the demand this season will exceed the available supply, though this is not likely, as there are large stocks in the southern warehouses of many companies.

Such manufacturing capacity as the plants now have, if operated continually through the year, would be more than ample for any possible demand at present. In the recent past, however, the erratic market records for the product itself and for white arsenic, the principal raw material, have made it unwise to anticipate the demand before it actually comes about.

It is improbable that this marketing condition will continue to prevail should the demand for calcium increase as expected. But the estimating of just what the possible or probable increase shall be has led some of the producers far astray in the past and will probably continue to do so for years to come. One enthusiast in the early years of the use of calcium arsenate based his calculations on the number of acres planted in cotton in the South and the maximum amount of calcium arsenate which could be used per acre. The result was startling and disastrous to those who were influenced by the figures. There was not enough manufacturing capacity available or enough white arsenic in sight to produce in a long period of years the amount of calcium arsenate which would be consumed in a single season on the basis of this simple calculation. Far below the figures of that brilliant statistician is a conservative estimate for the ultimate consumption of calcium arsenate. When that time will be reached and whether more effective means will be devised in the meantime only a reckless prophet would predict.

PROBLEM OF PRICE.

It would be somewhat desirable to get a rough estimate of just how the price of calcium arsenate affects the extent of its use. Official recommendations from the Department of Agriculture advise the use of about 5 pounds of arsenate of lime per acre and at least four applications during the season if the weevils are actually damaging the crop. Calcium arsenate now sells at from 9 to 12 cents a pound, which represents more than half of the total cost of dusting the cotton. Assuming that we dust four times in a season and use 5 pounds per acre at 10 cents per pound, the poison alone would cost $2. Adding $1.50 for application, the total expense per acre would be between $3 and $3.50. When it is realized that the average yield per acre is a third of a bale and that cotton has been selling for as low as $50 per bale, it is seen that the cost of applying the spray may represent a very considerable percentage of the selling price of the cotton. Dusting with arsenate of lime pays the farmer well if the control is successful and if the yield is a bale per acre or over, as it is in the heart of the Delta Cotton Belt. In the poorer sections, however, the situation is very different, and a planter who can not hope for over a quarter of a bale per acre would really just about as soon have the boll weevil eat his cotton as have his profits go to the manufacturer of calcium arsenate. If the price of arsenate of lime could be cut in half, this would very naturally extend its application to the poorer fields. Likewise, when cotton is selling at a high price, the cotton planter can afford to buy calcium arsenate, when otherwise he could not. It is not a simple problem, but one which involves considerable guesswork as well as experience in the yield of the particular land which the planter is cultivating.

Another handicap to the development of the use of calcium arsenate is the method of marketing the product, which has been both erratic and expensive. The product, being an agricultural spray material, has been handled along similar lines as other insecticides, the sale of which is largely a package proposition. Calcium arsenate is a spray material, but as a marketing proposition for boll-weevil control it must ultimately be sold on a tonnage basis and the margin for sales expense and middleman profit must be reduced to the minimum permitted for fertilizers and similar products. Time will bring about this change in the natural course of events, and the State of Georgia in a way has forced the issue this season by purchasing direct from a manufacturer and distributing to the planter at cost.

The production of calcium arsenate must be classified at present as an "infant industry," but it is evident to any careful investigator of all phases of the situation that a demand for a great many thousand tons will develop in the next few years if the price is low enough.

SUMMARY.

For every hundred pounds of calcium arsenate which is made, approximately 40 pounds of white arsenic is necessary. The supply of white arsenic annually consumed by this product thus far is not large, but it is an appreciable percentage of the total supply, which, it must be remembered, is a relatively stationary quantity. The use of calcium arsenate for the boll weevil will increase, but at a rate which can not be anticipated. It will depend upon the supply of arsenic which is available, upon the price of cotton, upon the yield of cotton per acre, and upon the price of calcium arsenate itself. In addition, other uses of calcium arsenate are increasing from year to year, notably those which have to do with truck-garden produce. Finally, calcium arsenate has been recently recommended as an effective means of preventing the alfalfa weevil from spreading. It is barely possible that this use may eclipse the use of calcium arsenate as a cotton insecticide. Other uses of white arsenic in various insecticides are also increasing, and these uses can easily outbid the cotton market for the available white arsenic. It will be seen, therefore, that many factors enter into the use of calcium arsenate as a cotton insecticide. Besides those already mentioned in this summary, we must refer to such things as the fashions for cotton fabric, the smelting of semiprecious metals, the education of the southern darky, and many others far afield from chemical engineering.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4200) to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Government of China for damages sustained by its nationals as a result of the negligent or unlawful acts of persons connected with the military or naval service of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARAWAY:

A bill (S. 4201) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 4202) to create a national police bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4203) to amend the insurance laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4204) for the relief of the William J. Oliver Manufacturing Co. and William J. Oliver, of Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4205) to transfer to the Secretary of Commerce the powers, duties, and functions of the United States Shipping Board and the assets, properties, funds, and liabilities of the Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4206) making it unlawful to attempt to influence the determination of any proceeding pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any examiner thereof, excepting under the rules and regulations of the commission governing its proceedings in the orderly administration of the interstate commerce law and the acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4207) for the relief of Victor M. Burris; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 259) authorizing the President to abrogate the international agreement embodied in certain Executive orders relating to the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MAILS.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10598) to prevent the use of the United States mails and other agencies of interstate commerce for transporting and for promoting or procuring the sale of securities contrary to the laws of the States, and for other purposes, and providing penalties for the violation thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF NICARAGUAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. LADD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 383), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it has been charged on the floor of the United States Senate and substantiated in great detail by many newspaper reports that United States marines invaded Nicaragua in 1910, killed some 200 citizens of Nicaragua, took forcible possession of the capital of Nicaragua, and set up as nominal President of that country an employee of an American corporation who could not have remained for 48 hours without the backing of American marines; and

Whereas while the United States marines still remained in control of the Nicaraguan capital and United States naval officers virtually dictated the policies of its nominal "President," the United States Government consummated an important treaty with Nicaragua; and

Whereas the officer in charge of the United States military forces in control of Nicaragua admitted under oath before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that 80 per cent of the Nicaraguan people opposed the Government we set up arbitrarily and maintained by force and would have refused to ratify the treaty which was forced upon a nonrepresentative Government under our military domination; and

Whereas it is currently reported that an attempt to enforce the terms of this treaty obtained under these questionable circumstances has created disputes between the United States Government and certain other Central American nations involving territorial grants for a naval base and commercial concessions; and

Whereas the nominal Government of Nicaragua, still under the domination of United States naval forces, refused to abide by the provisions of an arbitral ruling handed down by the International Court of Justice at Cartego, which court was instituted at the request of the United States Government, which also guaranteed to enforce its rulings; and

Whereas it is reported in the public press that with the aid of United States military forces democracy in Nicaragua is under the heel of a very small minority, which have seized political power and exploit the economic resources of the country under the direction of certain New York commercial firms; and

Whereas in support of this claim it is an admitted fact that Diego M. Chamorro is President of Nicaragua; Rosendo Chamorro, Home Secretary; Salvador Chamorro, president of Congress; Gustave A. Arguello, brother-in-law of President Chamorro, Secretary of the Treasury; Augustin Chamorro, Finance Advisor; Miguel Vigil, son-in-law of the President, Secretary to the President; Filadelfo Chamorro, military commander at the capital; Frutos Chamorro, commandant of the principal fortress at the capital; Leandro Chamorro, commandant at Corinto, principal port of Nicaragua; Charles Chamorro, military commander of the northern zone; Dionisio Chamorro, collector of customs; Octavia Chamorro, congressman; Clarence Bergheim, son-in-law of President Chamorro, military surgeon; Augustin Bolanos Chamorro, Nicaraguan consul at New Orleans; Fernando Chamorro, Nicaraguan consul at San Francisco; Pedro J. Chamorro, consul at London; Carlos Chamorro Bernard, diplomatic representative at El Salvador; Emillio Chamorro, Nicaraguan minister to Washington; Octaviano Cesar, brother-in-law of President Chamorro, financial agent; and Diego M. Chamorro, jr., attaché at the Washington Legation; and

Whereas resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the people of Managua (Nicaragua) have publicly accused Dr. Maximo H. Zepeda, delegate to the Central American Peace Conference, now in session in Washington, D. C., of being "a traitor to his country," and "a lawyer of Wall Street bankers against the legitimate interests of his country"; and

Whereas the same mass meeting and other mass meetings and editorials in the Nicaraguan press have demanded the withdrawal of United States marines so that the Nicaraguan people can restore a representative government; and

Whereas it has been publicly charged by a United States Senator through the press that "The Nicaraguan people have been wholly deprived of any semblance of self-government and their national resources are being exploited in shameless fashion by American corporations under the protection of United States marines"; and

Whereas military occupation of Nicaragua, which has now continued for 12 years, has been declared by a United States Senator who is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to be "in contravention of international decency and in opposition to the legal rights and material interests of the Nicaraguan people"; and

Whereas no state of war exists between the United States and Nicaragua which would justify the permanent quartering of our military forces upon the territory of a friendly neighboring nation; and

Whereas the executive department has no constitutional powers to maintain such invasion without the consent of Congress; and

Whereas such permanent occupation conflicts with the traditional policy of the United States and is inimical to the continuance of friendly and harmonious relations with our Central American Republics: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to hold hearings to ascertain the true state of affairs in Nicaragua; the facts concerning our original occupancy of that country; the reasons why United States military forces are still quartered there; the connection between certain New York commercial houses and the Chamorro-clan Government of Nicaragua; and the diplomatic conversations which preceded and followed the so-called Nicaraguan Government's repudiation of the decree of the International Court of Justice in disputed matters which concerned Costa Rica, Salvador, and Honduras, as well as the United States Government; and to this end that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or its subcommittee be empowered to subpœna witnesses and documents which will throw light upon these matters; that the committee be empowered to employ agents, attorneys, stenographers, and to hold hearings in Washington or elsewhere as they may find necessary, and that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall within six months report its findings and recommendations to the Senate or to the President of the Senate for the use of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMERCE AND LABOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives receding from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 3 to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and concurring therein; receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and concurring therein with an amendment as follows: In lines 13 and 14 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the words "or the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator state the nature and effect of the amendment?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The bill as it passed the Senate provided that a certain certification should be made by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor. It refers, however, only to proceedings of the Department of Commerce, so that the amendment strikes out "or the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, at the conclusion of yesterday's session a question was raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] to the effect that the shipping bill would not be of any aid to the coastwise shipping. That is the way I understand it. I would like to inquire of the Senator from Washington if that is correct?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The bill does not affect the coastwise shipping.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I have some information with reference to the apple situation which I desire to place in the RECORD this morning. On the 17th instant I sent the following telegram to the president of the Farmers' Union, Washington State:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 17, 1922.*

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,
President Farmers' Union, Spokane, Wash.:

In the Senate we are trying to substitute consideration of the Norris marketing bill for the ship subsidy bill. Our purpose is to defeat the subsidy and provide immediate relief for marketing of farm products by governmental action. I am also informed you are destroying one-third of your apple crop because price will not pay freight, and that you will dump 10,000 carloads in the Columbia River. Wire me the facts and also your advice as to action upon the subsidy and marketing bills.

SMITH W. BROOKHART.

To that telegram I received this morning the following reply:

SPOKANE, WASH., *December 19.*

Senator SMITH W. BROOKHART,
Washington, D. C.:

You are correctly advised on apples. Same conditions true of potatoes, tomatoes, and other seasonable products. Farmers favor any legislation that will provide immediate relief. All opposed to ship subsidy. Letter follows.

J. Q. ADAMS.

Mr. Adams, as I said, is the president of the Farmers' Union of the State of Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how many members there are in that union?

Mr. BROOKHART. It has a large and active membership in the State. I could not give the exact number, though I know it is a large and active organization. There are over 1,000,000 members in the United States.

Mr. President, it would seem to me that the voice of the people in the far West is just like it is in the Middle West and, for that matter, in the East. I think the common people of the country everywhere are against this special legislation. I hope the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] can hear something in that voice. He himself read some letters at the beginning of the consideration of the bill which were of the same tenor as the telegram I have read. I believe his own State is just like the State of Iowa when its wishes in this matter are thoroughly understood.

At this time I had expected to put into the RECORD certain data in reference to cooperative marketing as the solution for this situation. I have not, however, collected that material completely, and so I shall reserve it until such time as I can have it completed for use on a future occasion. With that statement I will now yield the floor.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], whom I do not now see, had a small matter which he desired to bring up, and I told him I would have no objection if it took no appreciable length of time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the Senator from Rhode Island has submitted the matter to the Senator from Mississippi, who wished to look over it for a little while.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. Mr. President, the pending motion, if it should prevail, would have the effect of displacing the so-called ship subsidy bill and bring immediately for consideration

before the Senate the bill named in the motion. That bill has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has behind it the unanimous report of that committee. The bill is not offered as a remedy to cure all the evils afflicting this country or even those afflicting agriculture.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the Senator state that the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had the unanimous support of the whole committee?

Mr. NORRIS. It had the unanimous support of all Senators who were present, and there were many more present than a quorum, there being only one or two absentees. The bill was ordered reported on a roll call from the committee without a dissenting vote.

Mr. STANLEY. I understand the Senator to assert that every member of the committee favored the bill?

Mr. NORRIS. Probably not.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRELD. I think it would be proper for me to state that at the time the bill was reported out certain members of the committee, including myself, reserved the right to oppose the bill or any part of it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, both the Senators who have just spoken anticipated me, for both of them have made statements that I would have made had I not been interrupted. There were only two Senators, however, who expressed the opinion that they might oppose the bill. Others stated that they would favor certain amendments and one Senator in addition stated that he expected to offer certain amendments to the bill should it be taken up for consideration. I am not trying, either directly or indirectly, to bind any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think, however, that the Senate ought to know that the motion to report the bill with the amendments which we have suggested received the unanimous vote of every member of the committee who was present; and nearly all of the members of the committee were present.

As I have stated, Mr. President, the pending bill is not presented as a remedy for all the evils that affect even agriculture. We do think, however, that it will meet one very important contingency. It is, we must concede to begin with, a remedy that is new. It provides a new method of attempting to regulate trusts and combinations that are dealing in food products. It proposes to do that by setting up a governmental corporation with a capital stock of $100,000,000, to be contributed entirely by the Government of the United States, with the right to issue bonds not exceeding at any one time five times the amount of the paid-in capital, whatever that may be. The corporation proposed to be created by the bill will be handled by a board of directors consisting of three men, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, holding office under a term of eight years; but the first appointments are made one for four years, one for six years, and one for eight years, and thereafter for eight years as vacancies may occur. The corporation will have power (1) to build, buy, lease, and operate elevators and storage warehouses; (2) to buy agricultural products from any person, firm, or corporation, or cooperative organization of producers within the United States, and to sell such products to any person, firm, or corporation, or cooperative organization of consumers within the United States, and to any person, firm, or corporation, or cooperative organization of consumers, or to any government or subdivision of government without the United States; (3) to act as agent of any person, firm, or corporation, or cooperative organization producing or dealing in agricultural products, either in their natural or prepared state, within the United States, in the sale of such products either within or without the United States; and (4) to make advances for the purpose of assisting any person, firm, or corporation, or cooperative organization in financing the sale, or exportation and sale, of such agricultural products, but in no case shall any of the money so advanced be expended without the United States.

There are some provisions of the bill in regard to the net earnings of the corporation. It is provided:

Sec. 11. That the net earnings of the corporation not required for its operation shall be accumulated as a reserve until such time as such reserve amounts to $100,000,000; and thereafter all the net earnings of the corporation not required for the redemption of any of its bonds shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States until such payments equal the amount advanced by the United States for the capital stock of the corporation.

There are also certain other provisions, which ought now probably to be stated, in regard to the taxation. The bonds to be issued by the proposed corporation "shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or by any local taxing authority, except," as follows:

(a) Estate or inheritance taxes, and (b) graduated additional income taxes, commonly known as surtaxes, and excess-profits and war-profits taxes, now or hereafter imposed by the United States, upon the income or profits of individuals, partnerships, corporations, or associations. The interest on an amount of such bonds the principal of which does not exceed in the aggregate $5,000 owned by any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, shall be exempt from the taxes referred to in clause (b).

The franchise of the corporation is not taxable; neither is the surplus, nor its reserve, nor its capital stock; but any real estate owned by it is subject, the same as other real estate, to taxation by the taxing authorities. The provisions in regard to exemption from taxation, as I remember now, are copied verbatim from the War Finance Corporation act, with the exception, perhaps, of one provision which is copied from one of the Liberty loan acts, exempting the income of $5,000 worth of bonds owned by any one person.

Then, Mr. President, there are various provisions in the bill of a criminal nature imposing punishment for violation of the various provisions of the act.

The bill contains one other proposition that I deem of considerable importance. It provides—and this has some relation to the ship subsidy bill that we are seeking to displace—that to this corporation shall be turned over by the Government any ship or ships that it owns, not chartered to any other corporation or not in use, with the provision that this corporation can use such ships as may be necessary in transporting the products it handles from this country to foreign ports without any compensation for the use of those ships except to keep them in repair and pay the expense of operation, and that in case of war, or when the President at any time believes there is danger of war, he shall notify the corporation, and the ships shall be immediately turned back without the payment of any money. This will enable the Government to recuperate its merchant marine without any expense whatever.

As to the intention of the bill, I quote from its terms as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the object and purpose of this act to provide a market for the sale of agricultural products, and to eliminate as far as possible the commissions and charges that are exacted upon agricultural products from the time such products leave the producer until the same reaches the consumer, and to thereby increase the price which the producer receives and decrease the price which the consumer pays.

Mr. President, it will be seen from the brief outline of the bill which I have presented that it seeks to set up a gigantic middleman who shall stand between the producers and the consumers with the object of benefiting both. As I said at the beginning, it is a new remedy; so far as I know nothing of the kind has been attempted in this country in the regulation of trusts and combinations. We have had, Mr. President, the regulation of railroads and trusts and combinations for a great many years; we have paid enough money in the effort to regulate the railroads to buy a large portion of them; and I think every student of the subject must admit that the undertaking has proven to be a failure. We have been regulating trusts and combinations for many years; but to-day we have more trusts and combinations exacting toll for the products of the farm as they travel from the producer to the consumer than ever before in the history of the United States. So we are confronted, I think, with a condition that is abnormal, a condition that so far is unmastered, a condition that everybody admits ought to be changed and remedied; but the laws up to this time, although enacted with the best of intentions, have not brought about the remedy.

The producer is producing at a loss, while the consumer is paying exorbitant prices; the farmer gets too little; the consumer pays too much. As a remedy the bill proposes to set up a corporation, and our idea was to free that corporation of shackles of all kinds and to make it as free within its field as outlined as a natural person would be under existing conditions.

With its capital, with its ability to buy, to store, to loan, and to sell even on time, it seemed to me and it seemed, I think, to those who favored this character of legislation that if we shall pass this kind of an act we will have put into competition with the trusts that are now engaged in various kinds of businesses a gigantic person, with an enormous capital, having for its object justice instead of profit, having for its object the

alleviation of the difficulty that confronts the producer and likewise confronts the consumer.

Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture has not jurisdiction to cover all the evils that exist to-day and that confront agriculture. There is no intention in proposing this bill to interfere in any way with any proposition that may come from the Banking and Currency Committee that will provide for rural credits. I realize that that is an important kind of legislation. I favor it just as much as does anyone else, and we are not offering this bill to take the place of any such legislation. It ought to go hand in hand with it. Those who favor this legislation will be found doing their best to bring about the passage at this session of Congress of proper rural credits legislation. We realize, too, that there is another very important difficulty that confronts all the people of the United States, and that is the freight proposition, the railroad question. The Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction to solve that. After all, Mr. President, a railroad is nothing more nor less than a gigantic middleman. It makes its money, all of it, upon the products as they travel from the producer to the consumer. Of itself, my personal opinion is that it presents the most important single question among the difficulties to-day in our cost of living and in the trouble that now afflicts the producers and agriculturists of this country.

So, Mr. President, I do not want to convey the idea that we are offering this legislation as a cure-all for the difficulties that exist, nor that we are offering it to take the place of any legislation that will bring about cheaper freight rates, or any legislation that will bring about a proper law providing for rural credits; but I want to pause here to call the attention of the Senate to one viewpoint that I think we ought to have in mind on rural credit legislation.

There is such a thing as credit being injurious. However low we fix the rate to the farmer, if we offer to loan him money on the products that he has produced, unless there is reasonable ground to believe that at the maturity of the loan he will be able to sell his product at an advanced price, enough to pay the interest and give him a profit, such a loan is an injury rather than a benefit. The time will come, the time must come, when there must be liquidation. No matter how low the rate of interest, no matter how long the money may be loaned, the loan is going to mature some time; and if the product in the meantime is not enhanced in value and the market conditions are just the same as, or practically no better, than they were when the loan was made, it spells bankruptcy in the end. However low the rate of interest may be, in time it will eat up the product and bring ruin instead of prosperity.

I do not want anyone to get the idea now, because I have said that, that I am opposed to rural credit legislation or that this bill is offered as a remedy on that score. We believe that one of the difficulties in the cost of living, and one of the serious questions presented by the producer on the farm, is that the marketing conditions are so unfavorable. There must be a place to sell the product, and as it travels from the man who produces it to the man who consumes it it must not be eaten up by profits of the middleman.

If we remedied the railroad difficulty, and if we provided proper rural credit facilities for the producer, there would still be the enormous expense connected with the sale of the farmer's products, all of which must be paid by the consumer or lost by the producer. The railroad question is only one of those, as I said awhile ago; and in all the figures that are given about the cost, freight is an important item, but not the only one.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator whether we are taking any steps to improve the transportation facilities in this country?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think so, and I think we ought to; but as we look at it the Agricultural Committee is helpless to do that.

Mr. DIAL. Only yesterday I received a communication stating that one of the largest coal mines in the South was shut down four days last week because it did not have a single car; so it seems to me that we should put some of our energies toward trying to improve the transportation facilities in this country.

Mr. NORRIS. I think so. I think, Mr. President, as I said before, that it is the most important one item; it is the largest item of all, I think, on most commodities—not all of them.

The people of the country do not realize that every dollar charged for freight must be paid by the consumer in the end. They do not realize that every manipulation that has ever taken place from the beginning of railroad history down to the present hour by which water has been converted into gold has been done at the expense of all the people of the United States; that a freight rate is paid upon everything that is transported, in the same way and to the same extent that we pay our taxes to the tax collector. Every particle of water in the railroads, variously estimated to amount to from seven to ten billions of dollars, that has been made of value—and practically all of it has—has been made so by the toiling masses of the American people. We have paid for it just as completely and just as fully as though it were an itemized statement on our tax receipts when we pay our taxes. If the people realized that, if they really understood that after all freight charges are a part of the cost of living, that they are taxation under another guise—as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] said, in reality taxation without representation—they never would stand for the gigantic manipulations that have taken place in the 50 or 75 years in our railroad system.

I was reading the other night a history of the New York Central road, and it is a story that applies to most of the big railroad systems. It showed how in the beginning here was a little road, and here was another little road. After a while they met in the same town and terminated there. The owners of one road and the owners of the other road got together and combined them. That was a good thing, I think. I am not objecting to that. They made it one continuous road. They added the value of this road to the value of that road, and then they added about a third in capital stock that was issued without any consideration whatever. Over here was another little road. Here was another little one. They were put together in the same way, and so on, until, gathered together, they constituted the great system of railroads known as the New York Central; and every time they were put together, without any exception, a whole lot of water was poured into the capital stock, and by the operation of the printing presses the American people were saddled with a debt upon which we have been paying interest ever since. We are not only paying interest on it but by our toil, by our money, by our labor we have turned all that water into gold, not for our benefit, not for our financial advancement, but for the benefit of the fellows who are doing the manipulating.

That would not be so bad if it were not for the fact that after it has been done, after we have toiled, paid rates that made water good, and made it 100 per cent or better on the stock market, we have then been saddled with a freight rate sufficient to bring an income for a reasonable rate upon all that capital stock that we ourselves made by our own toil. So that the people have not only been confronted with capitalization without any value being put in, but after they have done that, after their own money, their own toil and labor have been spent to make it good, they have then been penalized for their own generosity by being compelled through all time to pay a freight rate that would make that kind of business profitable.

Mr. President, the continual pyramiding that has been going on from time to time in this way with our railroad systems has finally reached a climax, and rates have gone so high that, in my judgment, we must either by some means or other reduce freight rates or we must reconstruct our civilization on a new basis, using the railroads of the country as a basis for our operations.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STANLEY. I am very much interested in what the Senator says. Has the Senator any remedy to suggest for the condition of which he speaks?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want to be led into a discussion of that subject.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not want to anticipate the Senator, of course.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not expect to discuss a remedy for the railroad situation. I realize that it is not in the bill that I am trying to get up and therefore I did not intend to discuss it at all; but it has been brought out by a question. The question of the Senator will lead me still further into the side field.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not wish to do that; but, since the Senator has discussed the matter—and I am glad to know that he is interested in it—here is the proposition that disturbs me: It is true that there is no defense for the fantastic financial operations of which many carriers were guilty in years past, resulting in the watering of stocks and the issuing of fictitious securities in vast amounts; but, quoting from memory now, I

think it was in the fiscal year 1920–21 that we carried more freight than in any preceding year, and we collected in excess of $500,000,000 more money for carrying that freight. Yet the earnings of the roads were less than 4 per cent, below 3 per cent, on the capitalization. The operating cost mounted from a little over 60 per cent to nearly 90 per cent of the total cost. So the trouble that confronts us now is not the question of the capitalization of the roads so much as the fact that the cost of operating these systems, even if nothing were paid upon the securities at all, is practically prohibitive in a great many cases.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I said to the Senator before, I do not want to go into that question at much length, because it is not before the Senate. I have some definite ideas about it. I think the capitalization would not be the only question involved in the railroad situation. I do not mean to suggest that. It would be one of the very important things. To my mind, just briefly, without intending to go into a detailed discussion, the capitalization of the railroads must come down. In my judgment, they will and can be managed more efficiently than they are being managed now. Instead of there being a great many railroads they ought to be combined into one system, or at least into a less number of systems. While some road is failing, some other road is making an exorbitant profit.

While the Senator could, no doubt, give illustrations of what he has just said, I can, to counteract that, state that the great Burlington system for years paid to its stockholders dividends running all the way from 8 per cent to 25 per cent; that during that time they accumulated a surplus of $60,000,000; that within the last year or two they have been allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue stock dividends amounting to $60,000,000 on that surplus. Whose surplus was that? Who paid for the surplus? It was paid for out of the cost of living of the American people. Every man who wears a coat or a hat or eats food or rides in an automobile or a horse-drawn carriage has contributed his share to that surplus. During all the time it was accumulating they were making profits that were beyond what they ought to have been allowed to make.

The surplus, instead of being issued in the way of new stock, ought to have been used for the purpose of retiring either stock or bonds, and thus lessening what the people would have to pay in the future instead of increasing it. So in that case the people have paid more freight than they should have paid, amounting on one road to $60,000,000, and now for all time we and posterity have to pay higher freight still, in order to bring an income on that $60,000,000, which in reality was our money in the very beginning.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. At one time I was led to hope, with some degree of probability that the hope was well founded, that the consolidation of railroad systems would remedy this evil, and I voted, with much reluctance, notwithstanding its multiplied iniquities, for the transportation act of 1920, which provided for that very thing. I have since come to the conclusion that the remedy suggested by the Senator and the remedy contained in the transportation act of 1920 is worse than the disease.

As the Senator has pointed out, the trouble with us now is that this very consolidation about which he talks prevents cheap rates anywhere.

The Senator knows of the reckless building of railroads, the financing of all sorts of lines, the practice that existed for so many years of going out and bonding a road for what it was worth, and arranging so that whenever any stock was bought the return was velvet to the fellows who sold it; the bonds paid for the roads. The conversion of stocks into bonds, and the like, has curtailed that evil, and now you have roads recklessly or dishonestly financed, illy located, which can never be operated at a profit at anything like their capitalization, and on the other hand roads which were sanely financed, which were laid along the lines of industrial needs and which make great profits. Whenever you attempt to distribute that profit, and carry these lame ducks, you consume the profit of all. The only way I see to lower freight rates is to enable the roads which can operate at a lower cost to operate in that way, and not to force them to turn over their earnings to some other allied road, or some road artificially consolidated with another, which never was a financial success, and never will be.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, with the latter part of the Senator's statement I most fully agree. I know there are a good many evils in the act the Senator mentions. So many there were that I voted against it when it passed the Senate. I am not doubting but that many, many Senators voted for it with the best of intentions, and they may still think that it was proper. Some, like the Senator from Kentucky, have reached the conclusion that it was a mistake, as I construe his remarks.

I would not combine these railroads and take in what the Senator describes as lame ducks at stock and bond face value. If men get together and build a railroad where there should not be any, and lose money by it, they ought to be in the same predicament I would be in if I go into the manufacturing business where there is no demand for the product I turn out and fail. I would have simply lost out as a business proposition. There is no reason why all the taxpayers of America should make good the mistakes of financiers who build railroads where there should not be any, and those railroads ought not to be permitted to charge rates on their excessive valuations. If they can not maintain themselves on what would be a fair rate, then they ought to fail, as any other business ought to fail under such circumstances. They have made a mistake. There are some roads in that condition, I have no doubt, although I do not claim to be an expert.

I want to say briefly, in passing, because the Senator asked me the question, if I had my way I would meet the railroad question along the same lines I have attempted to meet this question. I would organize a governmental corporation and take over some of the railroads of the country, perhaps not all, but many of them, at what they are worth and operate them for service instead of profit. Railroad transportation is as common as the water we drink. It enters into everything we eat, or wear, or handle, either for necessity of for pleasure. We ought to get the speculation out of the railroads and whatever squeezing process is necessary in order to do that ought to be administered. A corporation operating these railroads along the lines I have suggested would bring every railroad down to a fair, honest system of profit, and would squeeze out the water.

Going back directly to the subject again, I have outlined three difficulties which, in my judgment, confront the farmer and confront the consumer; and, after all, I am just as anxious to protect the rights of the consumer as I am to protect the rights of the producer. I am not aware of having any prejudice or bias in favor of the producer as against the consumer. According to my judgment, if we are perfectly honest and meet the question fairly we will find that what is fair to the producer will be fair to the consumer. I think their interests are identical. The consumer can not afford to want the producer to produce at a loss, because in the end it would mean the ruin of the consumer as well as of the producer. The producer can not expect to produce at an unreasonable profit, because thereby he loses to a great extent his best customer, who is not able to consume so much. So if the producer makes a fair profit the consumer ought to rejoice. If the consumer is not compelled to pay an exorbitant price, the producer ought to rejoice. This bill is intended to protect one as well as the other.

Going, now, to the condition of agriculture, we have heard a great deal about it in the committee, and we have heard a great deal about it here. We have read a great deal about it in the newspapers. Every honest man who has fairly considered the subject or investigated it, without bias and without prejudice, must reach the conclusion that the conditions surrounding and overshadowing the producers of our country are horrible; they are outrageous.

I listened to a description of the condition of agriculture before the committee until I wanted to escape from the committee room. It had the effect of depressing anyone who was listening to it all. It is almost beyond imagination that in our great West, Middle West, and Northwest the producers of the country are brought down almost to a state of poverty. Most of the men who appeared were so-called country bankers, and we had testimony from the bankers of North Dakota, where the farmers produced a crop this year.

The bankers are interested in this matter because the ruination of the producer means the ruin of the country banker. They are in the same boat. If we help the producer and enable him to pay what he owes the country banker, we have helped the banker.

We were confronted with advertisements of tax sales. Newspapers were presented with 9 or 10 pages filled with notices of farms for sale in one county under the tax laws of the State, every one of them mortgaged. As a rule, the personal property was mortgaged, the farmer being unable to pay even the taxes, being unable to pay the interest on his farm mortgage, being unable to pay the note which he owed the local banker, or even the interest on it, and all that after he had produced a crop beyond the normal, a crop which everybody concedes cost him more to produce than he could get for it. The farmer has been confronted with the fact that everything that he has to buy must be bought at prices fixed by trusts and combinations

which made the prices so high that it meant ruin to buy, and it was ruin if he did not buy. That is the condition of the farmer.

We were told that in one county, for instance, 19 men had committed suicide within the last few months. Eighteen of them were farmers who had become insane, living and toiling for years from early morn until late at night. They had some failures a few years before, but they kept on remortgaging until they had mortgaged everything they had, and it was all done with the hope that some time they would produce a crop; and year after year they kept on, and this year they produced a crop, but found that when the crop was produced they were worse off than when they did not produce any. Men were unable to care for their families, seeing their little homes disappear under foreclosure proceedings, becoming insane, and being taken to asylums for the insane. As I said, 18 committed suicide in one county.

What is the remedy? In my judgment, if the farmer's crop thus produced could have reached the consumer without an unreasonable premium being exacted from all kinds of people, including the railroads, he would have made some money; he would have been able to pay some of his debts and he would have kept on farming next year. As it is, he can not do it. Something ought to be done to relieve him. He is brought into that condition through no fault of his own. We have invited men to go west and open up the great prairies of the country and irrigate the lands on the coast and in the intermountain region.

I have here a little notation that I made in conversation with a man who came here from an irrigated section in Nebraska where they raise immense crops. He is a banker there, and he told me just yesterday that in his vicinity one man had produced 20,000 bushels of potatoes. The man made a mistake in raising potatoes this year. He said that if that man had produced sugar beets, while he would not have made much, he would have made something, but he produced 20,000 bushels of potatoes. He did not have money enough to harvest them. He had to borrow some money. The man who was talking with me was one of the officers of the bank in the locality that loaned him $2,000 on his potatoes. They were harvested carefully and stored in a cave, where they are now. He is unable to sell them for a price that will pay anything like the cost of production.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. The potato crop is always uncertain. One year it is a big crop and the next year it is a little crop. The famines in Ireland are attributed to the capriciousness of this crop. Where there is a full crop it will produce more of essential foodstuffs to the acre than any other crop known, and the next year it is liable to be a complete failure. In Germany they have equalized this seasonal change by turning potatoes into alcohol, which is under normal circumstances just as salable a commodity as gasoline.

Does not the Senator think that a sane regulation of the manufacture and sale of alcohol would relieve the farmer very much and find a market for the potatoes? Millions of gallons of that alcohol could be used in coloring everything we use, in driving automobiles, in making automobile tires, in 500 different essential articles, but that business is practically at a standstill on account of the arbitrary, indefensible, and absurd regulations of the Government in controlling the manufacture and sale of alcohol.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me say in answer to the Senator that no legislation would cure all the evils. The market for potatoes, like the market for other products, will go up and down. There is no question about that. Neither is there any question but what the charges for potatoes, as they travel from the man who produces them to the man who consumes them, are many, many times the original cost of the potatoes. What would we have to pay for potatoes in Washington if we bought them now?

Mr. STANLEY. If the Senator will permit me further to interrupt him, the German farmer takes a load of potatoes and hauls it to a near-by distillery. The starch in the potatoes is converted into alcohol there. The other food values in the potatoes are brought right back and fed to his stock. There is no transportation problem except for the alcohol itself. The potatoes grown in this country and referred to by the Senator could be thus converted. Every potato in the United States could be converted to-morrow into salable alcohol and we would have very little transportation to pay if the Government would act with some common sense.

Mr. NORRIS. That might help it to some extent. I am not claiming that it would not. In fact, I think it would help; but it would not be the only remedy. We ought to make it possible for food products in America to travel from producer to consumer without such an exorbitant cost.

One of the men testifying a year or so ago before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was the representative of a cooperative association of fruit raisers in California. They produced various kinds of fruits. He told the committee that they had on hand at one time a vast quantity of some certain kind of fruit—I have forgotten just what it was. He was the manager of that organization; he was the only man in the corporation who was not an actual producer. He was hired and paid a salary to handle the sales of the producing corporation. He said that a year or so before he was testifying he found himself confronted with the fact that of one of the products he had a very large supply in the warehouses. He was not able to sell it. They sold only to wholesalers and jobbers. They would not dare to sell to retailers, and his ordinary customers would not take the product because it was not selling. So he got out some circular letters and sent them to the retail trade, a great many hundred of them, and put a price on the product. Immediately the orders commenced to come in and the product commenced to move. But about that time he commenced to get letters from the jobbers and wholesalers, and he called the attention of the committee to one letter in particular from a jobber, which said:

> We have recently ordered several carloads of some other kind of fruit from you. This is to notify you that that order is canceled and that we will never do any more business with you, because we have learned that you are trying to sell to retailers.

He was asked what he did. He said that he apologized, that he wrote to the wholesalers and the retailers who protested, and said if they would forgive him he would never do it again. He quit that kind of business; he said he had to do it or go out of business altogether. There were several middlemen whose pockets had to be lined at the expense of the producer and the consumer. This man, of course, might have made complaints under the antitrust law, but if he had had any experience in going through our courts—or even if he had not, he probably could see from observation what would happen—he would realize that he would have been out of business long before the suit had traveled its weary way and been finally determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

He said one of the things they produced in large quantities and handled and shipped was a certain kind of grape of exceptionally fine quality. He told us what the fruit producers received for those grapes that year. I think it was a fraction either over or under 2 cents a pound. When he got here to Washington he went down to the market, where even the retailers buy their fruit here, and bought some of the same grapes, some of his own grapes, and he had to pay something over 25 cents a pound. He knew exactly what the freight was. He was an expert. It was a very small portion of the price, although unreasonably high. The balance was taken up in commissions to the middlemen.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator answer a question?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly; if I can do so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Did he buy those grapes on the public market?

Mr. NORRIS. That is my recollection.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The public market and public regulations do not seem to have worked very well.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course they do not work very well. There were too many middlemen between the producer and the man who sold it on the public market.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is true on the public market when one buys direct from the farmer.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; probably that is true.

Mr. STANLEY. It was some time ago that he had the trouble about the grapes?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Several years ago?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Five or six years ago they were selling raisin grapes in Fresno County for 1 cent a pound. After the enactment of certain legislation here a great farm organizer of the West stated that those grapes went up to 30 cents a pound. Grapes went up within six months on the Great Lakes from $10 or $20 a ton to $120 a ton. The difference is this: The home brewer is utilizing the grapes to make beverage alcohol, and we can not utilize potatoes to make industrial alcohol.

Mr. NORRIS. I have a letter on my desk written from Hyannus, a point in the western part of Nebraska, where a man in the general merchandise business bought a carload of apples which were shipped to him from Idaho. The freight on the carload of apples from Idaho to Hyannus, Nebr., was

$508.53. It does not take an expert to tell that there is something wrong with that.

While the producer is laboring under these difficulties and while the consumer is paying exorbitant prices on account of the taxation of the product as it travels from one to the other, what is the condition of big business? How is big business getting along? The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] yesterday put some figures in the RECORD, and I want to call attention to some of them. The first is a quotation from the Wall Street Journal of December 5, 1922. The heading is:

1922 stock dividends—

That means the escaping of taxation—

1922 stock dividends now over $1,000,000,000. Standard Oil Co. declared over three-fourths of this enormous record-breaking figure.

Then it gives a list of many of them, and has this to say:

More stock dividends to come.

They are not through:

There are also proposed capital increases waiting approval of stockholders. For example, Prairie Pipe Line's proposed stock dividend will be $54,000,000 and that of Prairie Oil & Gas $36,000,000. If these and others contemplated go through, they will aggregate $500,000,000, which would bring the year's total above $1,500,000,000.

It is interesting to notice some of the dividends. I shall mention only a few. There was the American Machine Foundry Co., which declared a stock dividend of 200 per cent, amounting to $4,000,000. The Atlantic Refining Co. declared a stock dividend of 900 per cent, amounting to $45,000,000. The Bigelow-Hartford Carpet Co. declared a dividend of 100 per cent, and the Great Northern Paper Co. 200 per cent. The National Biscuit Co. declared a stock dividend of 75 per cent, amounting to $21,920,000. The Standard Oil declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent; the Standard Oil of Kentucky 33⅓ per cent; the Standard Oil of New Jersey 400 per cent, amounting to $393,353,200.

Then here is a news article put in the RECORD by the same Senator from the Baltimore Sun of Wednesday morning, December 6, 1922, in which it was said:

Two hundred and eleven million five hundred thousand dollars given to stockholders. Stock dividends voted in one day throughout the country make vast sum.

It puts the total for 1922 at $1,600,000,000.

Mr. President, I have only touched on these. I have here the information to show while one part of our country, one class of our citizens, are suffering and crying now for help and are in a deplorable condition, there is another class of citizens reeking in wealth and spending their time in issuing stock dividends to avoid taxation, while the poor fellow who is producing food to feed the Nation is compelled to pay if he can pay at all.

None of them are able to avoid it, at least, and are seeing their homes and farms sold to pay taxes, while $1,600,000,000 of stock dividends are issued by another class of citizens to avoid taxation.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HARRELD. I am very much interested in this discussion. There is a question involved in it concerning which I should like to hear from the Senator from Nebraska, and that is this: Every corporation which is organized must take into consideration the possibility of failure. The Senator states that the corporation proposed under the bill is not intended to be organized in order to make profit; that it is to be a go-between, between the producer and the consumer, and necessarily it will not make any special attempt to make profit. There is, therefore, a probability of its failure. I should like to ask the Senator to explain to us what would be the relative position of the Government should the proposed corporation, after a few years, collapse, as other corporations sometimes collapse? Will the Government be morally obligated to liquidate the indebtedness of the corporation? Will that indebtedness become the debt of the United States? Will we be called upon to appropriate money to liquidate its affairs? What will become of the corporation under such a contingency? I should like to hear from the Senator from Nebraska on that point.

Mr. NORRIS. What the Senator suggests might be true, but there would be a difference of opinion as to that. Technically the Government would not be liable, of course, but, having set up the corporation, whether or not the Government would be morally liable would become a question for proper consideration, upon which honest men might disagree.

As a matter of law, there is no implied obligation that the Government is liable for anything in connection with the corporation or anything which is provided in the bill—none whatever—but I must admit that the corporation may fail. I am not offering this proposed legislation as a perfected certainty. I realize that men could be put in charge of the corporation who would make it fail, though I do not assume that would be done. The same suggestion might have been made as to the Finance Corporation when it was designed to provide that money should be loaned to bankers. That corporation might have failed; it might have lost money. The same suggestion might also have been made in connection with the United States Wheat Corporation for which we provided during the war. There was a possibility of its failure, but, as a matter of fact, it made about $50,000,000. I do not understand why this proposed corporation also should not be able to make money. I would not desire them to make big profits.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. Let me proceed for just a moment.

If my theory is correct the proposed corporation would devote a great deal of its energy to working in harmony with great cooperative organizations and would act as their agent. Instead of having many middlemen to handle their products, a cooperative organization of cotton men, we will say, or of wheat men, would combine all their products and turn them over to the corporation, which would handle those products for them on an agreed percentage which would be much lower than that which they would have to pay the middlemen. The corporation would advance them perhaps 75 per cent of the value of the products at the time the contract was made. It would then handle the products, sell them as it could to the best advantage, shipping them to Europe or to other places, and when the transaction was completed would divide the proceeds among the members of such associations. I think that would be one of the main things that would be accomplished by such a corporation. It would also induce consumers to organize. In the city of New York, for instance, a great organization could be formed of the men who consume the food, and they would buy, by the trainload, perhaps, through the instrumentality or agency of the corporation. The corporation would be paid a commission for their work; they would be paid a reasonable fee for carrying on the business. It seems to me that, properly managed, it would be almost sure to make as much money as such a corporation should desire to make. They could themselves regulate that matter. I take it they would not operate at a loss, that they would undertake to make a small profit.

Mr. HARRELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HARRELD. This further thought occurs to me: The bill proposes the establishment of a corporation, and if, as the Senator has stated, there is a possibility that the Government would be morally bound by the obligations of this concern, then it is practically the Government that engages in these purchases and these sales. If that be true, would not the question of the constitutionality of the law be raised?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not believe there would be any question of constitutionality involved in it. This corporation has no governmental function. The corporation is just like any other corporation. It could be sued and could sue; it could buy and sell; it could act as agent; it could loan money. The idea is to make it as perfectly free as an individual, with a free hand and not surrounded by any red tape. So it could act as a person may act, as any other corporation may act. The fact that all of its stock is owned by the Government would show, of course, that the Government owned the capital stock of the corporation, but the Government has given it a right to be sued, to act, and the bill gives it a right to transact all business that an individual may transact. When it was proposed to organize the War Finance Corporation to loan money to banks and trust companies we heard no one question the constitutionality of the procedure. Even if it should operate at a loss, I can see how that would be better than not to operate at all.

We saw the remarkable condition of the Government of the United States spending $20,000,000—I think that was the amount—for Russian relief, the principal part of that sum being used in the purchase of corn, and we saw the price of corn in the United States go up from a point away below the cost of production to the American farmer. If the wheat and cotton and corn which the proposed corporation should buy were absolutely lost and the money paid for it were lost, yet the expenditure would at some time bring about a profit instead of a failure to the man who produced the commodity.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we can not go on as we are going. We can not see one class of our citizens rolling in

wealth, making money and avoiding taxation, when another class are toiling and suffering for the very necessaries of life. I am not a prophet, but many governments have gone to pieces because they have not heeded the voice of caution in time. Carry out that idea to its logical conclusion and ruin must come. We can not build upon the sufferings and pangs of hunger and cold and chill of one-half of our population while aristocracy reeks in wealth and luxury; the foundation will not sustain such a top-heavy burden; it will not stand. We must halt; we must pause, Mr. President, and do something to equalize conditions. If the remedy proposed is not effectual, if the bill needs amendment, let us amend it, but do not stagger and run because it is something new. We are confronted with a new condition, and we need a new remedy. Do not be afraid of it because it has never been tried by this Government before. We have stretched our ingenuity and tried everything that we have known, and we have failed. We must devise new remedies; we must meet abnormal conditions by remedies that will relieve them.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand the Senator from Nebraska, he claims that the spread between the cost of wheat, for instance, at the farm and the cost of wheat when purchased from the mill is too great; that there is too much spread, for instance, between what the farmer receives for his wheat and what the miller obtains for his product. Is that correct?

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is one of the conditions which should be remedied.

Mr. STANLEY. That is one of the conditions which should be remedied. I merely take that as an instance. Is the Senator of the opinion that the Government corporation which his bill proposes to create, with power to buy and sell, will handle wheat at a less cost, or, in other words, that there will be a less spread?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I assume that the proposed corporation or its managers would be men of reason, of judgment, and of ability, and that they will not necessarily undertake to operate in all commodities.

Mr. STANLEY. I am speaking about wheat.

Mr. NORRIS. But they will see where there is something wrong with conditions, and they will operate in that place. When they see that there is something wrong with the cotton situation and middlemen are taking the profits that ought to go to the producer, they will commence to operate with cotton and lessen the burden to the producer.

Mr. STANLEY. I was not speaking about the extent of the proposed corporation's operations; I was referring to one operation to illustrate the character and scope of the activities of the corporation. Taking wheat, for instance, the reason for authorizing this new instrumentality to buy and sell and hold the grain is that there is a loss to the man who eats bread by virtue of too high a price and a loss to the man who produces wheat by virtue of too low a price; in other words, the spread between the producer and the manufacturer of the article is too great. In order to remedy that situation is it proposed that the Government shall take over the functions of the middleman, who, in the case of wheat, is the elevator man?

Mr. NORRIS. The corporation will have the authority to do that.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the Senator expect they will do that?

Mr. NORRIS. I expect they will do so if they find that the spread is so great as to justify such action.

Mr. STANLEY. We are merely assuming that it is.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that it is, the corporation would not act unless they reached the conclusion that there was too great a spread, and then they would buy wheat. Perhaps there would be a cooperative organization of the producers of wheat, of which there are many now, some of them covering two or three States.

Mr. STANLEY. I know that in some States such organizations have taken hold of the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. They would make a contract with the producers and handle their product; there would be no middlemen's profits anywhere; and if they followed out their authority, they would have elevators; they would have warehouses; so that if the grain were not sold immediately it would be stored and sold at seasonable times so as to even up the price.

Mr. STANLEY. Of course, the Government would have to have elevators, because wheat can not be handled without them, as it would be likely to spoil; but in case the Government constructed its own elevators and handled the wheat crop, what would the Senator propose to do with elevators which are privately owned?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I would not interfere with the privately owned elevators unless the corporation created under the bill should buy some of them, as they could buy them, if they agreed on a price; they would have the right to do that; but I do not anticipate that the corporation is going to do all the business either in the wheat line or the cotton line or any other line. They will not be able to handle all the farm products of the country.

Mr. STANLEY. That is what I am trying to get at. Assume that they concluded to remedy the evil in the wheat industry, which is the great staple of the Middle West, and they found it necessary to handle the wheat. In handling the wheat, and handling it successfully, of course every elevator they constructed would put out of business an elevator now constructed.

Mr. NORRIS. No; it would not. Oh, no, Mr. President. I have not any such conception of it. That is not my idea.

Mr. STANLEY. In the event the construction of the Government elevators rendered unprofitable or obsolete or empty a corresponding number of privately owned elevators, what steps, if any, would the Government take to save the owners of those private businesses?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think it would take any. I am not assuming that that condition would happen. I have no desire to put any man out of legitimate business. As I said, this great corporation would only be one, probably the biggest corporation in the business. It ought to be large enough to compete in such a way that it could effectually prevent the charging of enormous commissions as the product travels from the producer to the consumer; but I do not anticipate that it would have a monopoly in any line. There would still be avenues for everybody else to do business if he wanted to, and if he could not do business, of course, he would quit. What happens to the elevator man now if somebody else builds another elevator—the farmers, perhaps? They build lots of them in my country.

Mr. STANLEY. That is all right.

Mr. NORRIS. What happens to the man who owns the other elevator, that has been having its own way about it? He has not gone out of business. He is there yet. He probably does not make the same profit that he made before, but suppose they got the charges down so low that he did go out of business? That happens somewhere every day.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the Senator draw any distinction between the injury that would result from competition between two independent, privately owned concerns and competition that might exist between a concern operated by the Government without profit and a privately owned concern? I readily concede that any loss that one man suffers because he can not compete with another man, both doing an honest and legitimate business, is damnum absque injuria, and that the Government ought not to interfere; but I would draw a distinction between bankruptcy that would result from competition of that kind and bankruptcy that would result from competition with a Government agency of similar kind.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in my judgment we ought not to borrow trouble from sources from which probably no trouble will come. If we have in our country a condition where the producer is being ruined, and the consumer is likewise to a great extent being ruined by enormous prices that he has to pay for the necessaries of life, and we want to remedy it, if this is a remedy—we have tried everything else, and if anybody has a better remedy I should be willing to follow it—why should we hesitate, when all the people on one side or the other of the equation, and perhaps on both, are suffering from the present condition, to alleviate that condition because we fear that in carrying out the plan some man may own an elevator somewhere that will not be profitable afterwards? I hope that will not occur; but if it does, let it occur. We must meet the proposition and we must bring about a remedy, or ruin stares us in the face.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, at that point may I make an inquiry? Then I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. NORRIS. All right.

Mr. STANLEY. I am not contending, of course, that private porperty can not be taken for public use. It can; but hitherto when the Government has taken private property for public use it has provided some means for compensating the owner of that property. I was just inquiring, not in the way of criticism at all, at this time, at least, as to whether any provision had been made for compensation to the owner of private property for any injury directly resulting from the operation of the Government instrumentality?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, this bill does not provide any way for this corporation to condemn property. It has no authority to condemn anybody's property. It is just like any other

corporation. If it does anything that is illegal, and thereby injures another man or another corporation, it is liable for damages just the same as I would be as an individual, or the same as any private corporation would be if it had performed the same act.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not think that one reason why agriculture does not prosper more is on account of unjust laws governing future transactions on exchanges?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know to what law the Senator refers. I think there ought to be a law regulating transactions in futures, especially in all food products.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I should like to see if we can not fix a definite hour at which we may vote on this motion. There are several Senators who have had to go away, but who expect to be back later in the afternoon. There may be others who will have to go; and I ask unanimous consent that a vote may be had upon the motion of the Senator from Nebraska at 4 o'clock to-day.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum here if we are going to take any such step at this time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to see if we can not fix a time for a vote. The Senator can make the point of no quorum, and then we can see.

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURSUM in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lenroot	Ransdell
Bayard	France	Lodge	Reed, Mo.
Borah	George	McCumber	Robinson
Brandegee	Glass	McKellar	Sheppard
Brookhart	Hale	McKinley	Shortridge
Broussard	Harreld	McLean	Simmons
Bursum	Harris	McNary	Smith
Calder	Harrison	New	Smoot
Cameron	Heflin	Nicholson	Spencer
Capper	Hitchcock	Norbeck	Stanley
Caraway	Johnson	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Oddie	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Dial	Keyes	Pepper	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Ernst	Ladd	Pittman	Watson
Fernald	La Follette	Poindexter	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is upon the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. KING. Let the request be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the request.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. That at 4 o'clock p. m. on this day the Senate will proceed without further debate to vote upon the motion made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. KING. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I ask the Senator from Utah whether he will suggest a time when we may vote on this motion?

Mr. KING. I fancy that on account of the importance of the motion it requires further discussion. I think the Senator ought to be willing that those who desire to speak should have full opportunity to do so.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, I can not prevent Senators from having a full opportunity to speak, but I wondered whether the Senator could not suggest a time which would give full opportunity. My desire is to have a definite time fixed for a vote upon the motion.

Mr. KING. It seems to me the Senator should not object to the course which is being pursued, because there is constantly a discussion of the bill which the Senator is championing; its virtues and its vices are being depicted by Senators in the discussion of the pending question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not entering any objection at all. Several Senators, some for the motion and some against it, have expressed to me a hope that a definite time might be fixed so that they would be sure to be present. They would like to know definitely when the motion would be voted upon. There are two or three Senators away this afternoon for a while who said they would be back in an hour or two, and they said they would like to have a definite time fixed. Of course, I can not force it. I am merely asking the Senator to suggest some time at which we might vote.

Mr. KING. Let me suggest to the Senator that he renew his request this afternoon before we adjourn, and I think perhaps a time may be agreed upon.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Has the Senator any objection to making it 6 o'clock to-day, or half past 5?

Mr. KING. For the vote?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; for the vote.

Mr. KING. What I had in mind was that the Senator this afternoon renew his request for unanimous consent to vote at a given time, say some time to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator suggest now some hour to-morrow, if he is not willing to set an hour to-day?

Mr. KING. Speaking only for myself, I suggest 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am perfectly willing to submit that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the Senate vote at 3 o'clock to-morrow on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I see no reason for fixing a time to vote on a motion of this sort. Why not let us proceed in the regular order and when the debate closes take a vote on the motion? We may be ready to vote on it now—I do not know; but I can see no reason for this new custom of agreeing on a definite time to vote.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to suggest that at any time I get recognition I can move to lay the motion on the table. I do not care to use that drastic method. I would prefer to have a time fixed. Otherwise I shall feel disposed to make that motion before a great while.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand there has been objection made to the request for unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. At the same time, I deem it proper to say that my object in casting that vote is to supplant the pending bill and bring before the Senate the subject matter of rural-credits legislation. I do not favor the Norris bill as it is presented to the Senate. It has been demonstrated conclusively, in my opinion, during the course of this debate that the bill now under consideration will not accomplish the purpose which it is designed to accomplish, that it will not restore or maintain an American merchant marine. While the bill presented by the Senator from Nebraska requires amendment in many important particulars, I shall vote to bring that bill before the Senate, in the belief that the Senate will reform the bill so as to make it acceptable to those of us who favor fair rural-credits legislation.

The bill which we know as the Norris bill has received the approval of many practical farmers in various portions of the United States. They are entitled to have their viewpoint considered by the Senate. It would seem to me unjust to them to deny them that opportunity. At the same time, as stated by its author, the bill contemplates a new procedure of very far-reaching importance. It is an experiment.

In so far as the bill proposes to put the United States Government permanently into the business of buying and selling agricultural products, it is objectionable, and I have no hesitancy in saying so. If the United States Government is to enter upon the business of buying and selling agricultural products, the probability is that in the end that procedure will redound to the detriment of those whom the legislation is designed to benefit. It may result in price fixing by Government authority, and this will cause a clash between producers and consumers which likely will destroy the independence of the producers.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator has suggested that one of his reasons for voting to take up the Norris measure at this time is that he has the hope that we may so amend or remodel it that it will meet the situation. I think I ought to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency has several bills under consideration which cover this whole subject. We began hearings a week ago, and we expect to finish those hearings to-morrow, and report out a bill in the near future. I am wondering if it would not be better to

postpone action on the Norris bill until the bill which will be reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency is before the Senate, in order that we may take both measures into consideration and, if possible, cover the subject under one title.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, it is undoubtedly true that the Senate should proceed with caution in the enactment of legislation touching the subject of rural credits, but it should also move promptly in the matter, and if the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency authorizes the report of a bill to-morrow it will be ready for the consideration of the Senate before any action can be anticipated by this body on the subject. The statement of the Senator from Connecticut, instead of being a justification for postponing taking up the subject of rural credits legislation, is, in my judgment, an argument in favor of it.

Mr. McLEAN. The bill will not be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency inside of a week, and I assume that if the Norris bill is put before the Senate it will be voted on in less than a week. I do not know about that, but it would seem to me that no time would be gained by discussing the disputed points which gather around this subject, when the Committee on Banking and Currency may be able to report a bill which will cover the subject and upon which we can all agree.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am not materially concerned with the rivalry which exists between the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think it is fair and proper that all proposals touching this subject which are well considered shall be before the Senate and be considered by the Senate when the matter is to be disposed of. There is not the slightest doubt, however, that if the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the Norris bill with the understanding that it will reform the bill in important particulars, the Committee on Banking and Currency will find it necessary and convenient to bring its proposals before the Senate speedily, in order that we may choose between them and the bill of the Senator from Nebraska, which is reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

We will at least accomplish one result which nearly everyone here seems now to desire. We will for the present get rid of a bill which has been thoroughly discredited, during the course of the debate, as not calculated, in its provisions, to accomplish the restoration of the American merchant marine. It seems to me that the arguments submitted touching the pending bill, the merchant marine subsidy bill, have conclusively shown that the plan proposed in the bill is not fairly calculated to accomplish any wholesome purpose, and, at the same time, that it will cost an enormous sum and put the United States and her present merchant marine in a more disadvantageous position than is now occupied. For that reason I want to get rid of this pending bill and get before the Senate a subject which practically all Senators agree requires consideration.

I have made this statement in order that there might be no misunderstanding concerning my position, and I think I express the viewpoint of a large number of Senators on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I have no desire to interpose any objection to the immediate consideration of any measure intended to bring relief to the agricultural interests of the country. But the Senator knows that there are several bills pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that committee has been hearing not only interested parties from outside but Senators who have already introduced bills covering this subject, and it has seemed to the committee that time would be gained rather than lost if, as the result of our efforts, we could bring about an agreement upon the important points involved in the proposed rural credits legislation.

The purpose of the bill of the Senator from Nebraska, as I understand it, is to improve the marketing facilities now possessed by the farmer for the distribution of his products, and I want to say to the Senator that that is precisely the purpose of the bills pending before our committee. The Committee on Banking and Currency felt it not only was its duty to hear Senators who introduced bills covering this subject before the Senator from Nebraska introduced his bill but it seemed to the committee that that was an exceedingly wise course to follow.

There is no member of the Banking and Currency Committee who is not as anxious as is the Senator from Nebraska to expedite legislation upon the subject.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. McLEAN. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator is referring to bills pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am familiar with some of those bills, but I understand none of those measures traverse the ground that is covered by the bill offered by the Senator from Nebraska. It is true they seek to extend credit to the farmers, but the bill reported by the Senator from Nebraska goes further. If I understand the measures now pending before the Senator's committee, they do not in any manner conflict with the Norris bill.

Mr. McLEAN. They do most seriously conflict, because, while they all seek to accomplish the same general purpose, they do not use the same method that is employed in the bill of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, they extend credit to the farmer upon his giving sufficient security such as is prescribed by the bill, but the measure offered by the Senator from Nebraska goes further than that. He sets up a corporation which may buy and sell grain and acquire elevators and warehouses for the storage of agricultural products, and so forth.

Mr. McLEAN. It seems to me all the more important, if the Committee on Banking and Currency is trying to devise other means to accomplish the purpose than those proposed in the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, that the Senate should wait until our report is out, and the methods proposed by the Senator from Nebraska can be compared with the methods proposed by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Both bills could then be before the Senate at the same time.

No member of the Committee on Banking and Currency assumes ultimate wisdom on the subject. Many of the questions are difficult to answer. We felt that it was wise to hear from Senators who have given the problem long and careful study. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] was chairman of a special commission of agricultural inquiry and his bill attempts to follow largely the recommendations of that commission. It seems to me all important that we should, if possible, try to cover the legislation in one bill and not try to do it by piecemeal.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator before he resumes his seat that I can see no impropriety—indeed, I can see many advantages—in proceeding to a discussion of the Norris bill now? That does not preclude the Banking and Currency Committee from considering the measures now before it and presenting a measure which they think will relieve the situation. But I venture the prediction now—and I make the suggestion without intending in any way to criticize the committee—that any bill which may emanate from the Committee on Banking and Currency will not contain the important and fundamental provisions found in the Norris bill, and that the Norris bill can be easily distinguished from any measure which will be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McLEAN. I assume if we consider the Norris bill it would be voted on at an early date; and if it is voted upon and is passed before our committee's report comes in and the bill is sent to the House, it would hinder rather than hasten legislation upon the subject. There is no question about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator feel confident that his committee will be able to present a bill on the subject to-morrow?

Mr. McLEAN. No; I have already stated that we expect to close the hearings to-morrow.

Mr. SIMMONS. How long after the hearings are closed does the Senator think it will be before a report can be made to the Senate?

Mr. McLEAN. It will probably be a week. That is my opinion. It is an important matter. As the Senator knows, among the Senators who have introduced bills there is a wide difference of opinion as to the best plan to be pursued; and our effort is, if possible, to reconcile those differences and thus avoid long discussions when the bill comes to the Senate. I think the time will be well occupied if in executive session the committee can harmonize the different opinions. This may be impossible.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Connecticut? He thinks it will probably be a week, but suppose it is two weeks, or suppose it is three weeks. We can not tell when the bill will be reported out, but if it should be

reported within a week then the Norris bill, if taken up by the Senate, would be under discussion, and the committee could come in with its bill and propose to amend the Norris bill by offering the committee bill as a substitute. In the meantime we would have had an opportunity thoroughly to consider the Norris bill, and no time would be lost. I believe the program is to recess from Friday until Wednesday next, and therefore if a bill comes out of the committee within a week, there will be no time lost if we go on with the consideration of the Norris bill.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I simply desired to call to the attention of the Senate the situation so far as the legislation now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned. I have no objection to a vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. The sooner we can get a vote on that motion the better, but I think it would be unwise to expect a vote on the Norris bill before the bill prepared by the Committee on Banking and Currency is reported.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it would be impossible, if the committee reports within a week, for us to vote on the Norris bill before that time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I need not say, because it is well known in this Chamber, that I am and have been for many years a champion of legislation in favor of granting adequate credit facilities to the agricultural and live-stock interests of the country. Ever since the hearings began before the Committee on Banking and Currency on the various bills with relation to the subject I have attended their meetings, with the exception of one day, because I was deeply interested in what was going on in the committee and was extremely anxious that a bill should be brought out which would be satisfactory to the friends of the agricultural and live-stock interests.

As the result of what I have heard there I hardly agree with the chairman of the committee. I doubt very seriously whether the committee is going to be in a position to report out a bill within a week or within two weeks. The hearings have now been going on very nearly, if not quite, a week. Sometimes there have been both morning sessions and afternoon sessions the same day. Up to this time the committee has only considered two of the four or five bills which have been introduced with reference to the subject. Two of the bills that have been introduced have had practically no presentation or discussion before the committee up to this time. It may be that the hearings as to the two bills which have not been considered will not be as extensive as the hearings upon the two bills which already have been considered. But in my judgment the two that have not been considered deserve equal consideration with the two which have been discussed. I doubt very much whether it will be found quite expedient or quite fair or just to close the hearings to-morrow, but if they should be closed then, with those four bills before the committee and with the different views that I am led to believe exist among the members of the committee, it will be impossible for the committee to reach any satisfactory conclusion for some time after the hearings shall have been closed.

I am also apprehensive that when the committee shall have concluded its executive sessions it will not be able to bring out a bill that would be satisfactory to the friends of agriculture. Of course, if we should wait until that bill comes out and then move to substitute that bill as the only bill then to be before the Senate, there probably would be motions to substitute for the bill brought out by the committee some of the other bills which have been introduced. I can not very well see how we are going to expedite the discussion by postponing it until after the Banking and Currency Committee reports a bill.

I have taken the precaution to offer as an amendment to the ship subsidy bill a bill prepared by myself providing rural credits for the farmer. I did that because at that time there was no bill on the calendar which I or any other Senator could move to take up and thus displace the ship subsidy bill, and I wanted to create a situation whereby the rural-credits legislation could be brought before the Senate in antagonism to the ship subsidy bill. Of course my purpose was to offer that bill of mine, if there was no other satisfactory bill on the calendar, as a substitute for the ship subsidy bill and thereby make the issue between the two bills, just as the issue is now made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who has moved that the ship subsidy bill be displaced by the bill reported out by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which he is chairman.

We are, therefore, in a position where no vote can be taken under any circumstances upon the ship subsidy bill until we shall have first discussed a proposition for agricultural credits, and we are also in a position where a measure supposed adequately to provide for agricultural credits may be offered as a substitute for the ship subsidy bill, even should the Banking and Currency Committe not act at all.

In view of these conditions, Mr. President, there does not seem to me to be any reason why we should wait for the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency. One of the proposed bills—that introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], the bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], or that introduced by myself—may be offered as a substitute for the shipping bill.

Mr. President, I wish for a moment to make some observations in reference to the bill of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] which he now asks the Senate to take up in displacement of the ship subsidy bill. I am very much in the attitude of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who so interestingly addressed the Senate on the subject on yesterday. I am not in sympathy with either of the two bills. Of course, I am against the ship subsidy bill, and I shall be exceedingly earnest, as I have been from the beginning, in my efforts to bring about its defeat. I think the best interests of the country require that it should be defeated. I believe it proposes a policy which is in conflict with all the sound principles and traditions of the country and upon which we should under no circumstances be justified in entering. On the other hand, I do not think that the bill offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be of any material assistance to the farmer. I do not believe it will help the farmer for the Government to go into the business of buying and selling agricultural products. What the farmer needs is stimulation of the prices of his products, enhancement, if you please, of the value of his products, and the opportunity adequately to finance the production and then the distribution of those products. That is what the farmer needs. I have not found that Government control of prices has resulted in increasing those prices. I think if the Government should become a buyer and a seller of farm products, it would more likely have the tendency of reducing prices than of increasing them. I do not think that is what the farmers need; I do not think that would help the farmers, but I think in the end it would hurt them very much.

However, I am opposed to the policy, not only because I do not believe it promises any relief—certainly no adequate relief—against the conditions with which the farmer now contends, but I am against it because I think fundamentally it is unsound and is a policy upon which our Government should never enter. If the Government should enter upon the policy of buying and selling the products of one industry, no mortal man knows where it will end, and no mortal man can tell what the final result upon our institutions and our system of government will be. In my judgment, it would not only be dangerous legislation but would be utterly ineffective to accomplish the purpose at which it is aimed.

I am not going to commit myself definitely now as to what vote I shall cast upon the question of supplanting the ship subsidy bill with this utterly unsatisfactory so-called farmers' relief bill. If I shall ultimately vote for the motion, Mr. President, it will not be—and I wish that distinctly understood—because I favor the proposed legislation as being either wise or sound legislation or as adequate legislation even tending to give the farmer the relief for which he is now asking and to which he is so obviously entitled; but I shall vote for it, if I do decide to vote for it, simply because it would probably enable us at once, if the motion should prevail, to take up legislation that is of the most urgent character and most necessary to be passed in order to relieve the situation of more than half our population, and would displace legislation the viciousness of which, in my judgment, is probably without a parallel in the legislative history of the United States.

Of course, I know, as every other Senator knows, that if the Norris bill shall be made the unfinished business, the Senate need not necessarily act upon the Norris bill, but that any of the farmers' relief bills which have been introduced may be offered as a substitute or that a composite bill made out of all of them which may be satisfactory to the farming interest as represented in the Senate and as it exists in the country may be offered as an amendment or as a substitute for the Norris bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was interested in what the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN], had to say in reference to what the committee would be likely to bring out as a result of their hearings and conferences which are now being held. I am sorry the Senator has left the Chamber, because I should have liked to have asked him some questions which would possibly have determined my attitude in acting on the

pending motion. There are two questions which I should like to have asked which, in my opinion, are vital: First, how soon may we expect a report from that committee in the form of a bill; and, next, the character and scope of that bill? Taking into consideration the fact that the revenues of the Government, according to the report of the Treasury Department, are running something like $1,500,000,000 or more short, with the tax returns from the several States to support the governments of those States running as much as 50 per cent below the returns even of last year, we are confronted with a question so broad, so fundamental, that it affects not alone an adequate system of credit or financing for the farmer, but one the proper solution of which involves the perpetuity of our commercial and economic life. It is impossible to conceive that this country can continue to conduct its ordinary commercial and industrial affairs with the returns from the very basic industry shrinking to less than one-half of their customary volume and the real estate upon which that industry is founded shrinking to one-fourth of its ordinary market value.

Mr. President, I deplore the fact that the farmers of this country and their interests are looked upon as being rather a negligible consideration unless they become so insistent as to become annoying. Senators and Members of the House and the ordinary business world do not look upon the farmer as a serious factor in our commercial life. Why? The attitude of the bankers toward agricultural paper is notorious. Up to the time of the passage of the Federal reserve act real estate was not allowed to be accepted in a national bank as collateral for a loan. It was only after the passage of that act that we permitted our great financial institutions, as a banking proposition, to recognize the very basis of all prosperity and life in this country. Farm paper was looked upon and was spoken of as a slow and doubtful banking asset. Mark you, when an intimate understanding is had of the attitude of the commercial and banking world the objection to handling farm paper is not so much that it is slow as that it is considered a doubtful risk.

Why should the agricultural securities of this country in the form of farmers' notes be a doubtful security? I challenge the Senate this afternoon to point to a single staple agricultural product as to which the producer has a word to say about the price he is to obtain for it. Point to a single agricultural producer in this country who has a word to say as to the price of the things that he purchases for the production of the commercial asset that he proposes to put upon the market. The very nature of his business is such that he can not organize as other businesses organize.

The woolen manufacturers of this country have a fixed and standardized form of goods that they produce. The manufacturers of those woolen goods can get together and determine the extent to which the market will absorb their production. They can get together and determine the quality of that production, and they can give to that market just the quantity and quality of their particular goods that the market will absorb at the greatest profit to them. If the manufacturer gets an order for the future delivery of a given quantity of goods, he can take it with absolute safety. Why? Because he can determine both the quality and the quantity, and produce it at the given time.

That is true of every form of manufacturing. The farmer, on the other hand, would not dare take a contract for the future delivery of any quantity or any quality of the thing that he might raise. He invests his money in agricultural implements and live stock, and he sets out to produce a crop of wheat. After he has put the seed in the ground, the quantity and quality are beyond his control. He must wait until nature has perfected the product before he can determine what the quantity and the quality will be. Then, what results? He has been 12 months in producing a supply that must be consumed in the subsequent 12 months. He has for 12 months assumed liabilities in producing that product. His liabilities become due when the 12 months' supply is on hand; and he therefore is forced, by virtue of his creditors demanding pay, to put upon the market a 12 months' supply within 30, 60, or 90 days.

That is universally true of agricultural production throughout this country. Therefore the peculiar phase of the problem that we are to meet here is not so much financing him in the production of the crop as financing him in the distribution of that crop over the next 12 months. I submit, Mr. President, that when the farmers of this country have produced the wool and produced the cotton and produced the wheat, and the quantity and the quality are known, and the other fact is also known that that wheat and those other agricultural products are necessary to the world's welfare and must be consumed, there is no better banking collateral in the world than the imperishable, staple agricultural products.

Why, therefore, is it not possible for us to develop a system by which, when the agricultural crops of this country are produced, they can be financed adequately during the period of their distribution? Somebody finances them. Somebody buys them and distributes them. Under our present system and policy the farmer does not, because he is looked upon as being a doubtful risk, and it is said that his paper is long-time paper. I submit here this afternoon that the only long time that is required is from the planting of the crop until the gathering of the crop. From that period on the farmer should have adequate credit for the distribution of his crop. I should like to ask the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, if he were here this afternoon, why it is that we hear from every side "short-time agricultural credits" and different expressions to convey to the minds of the world the temporary makeshift that we propose to hand out to the fundamental business of this country.

I state here this afternoon that it is just as essential for us to have a fixed, adequate system of agricultural finances as it is to have that which now obtains for the commercial world. There are fundamental differences between agricultural banking and commercial banking. It may be, and I for one believe, that the present Federal reserve system could have been so handled, if a different policy had been pursued than the one which has been pursued, as to have met all the necessities that confront agriculture; but a different policy was pursued, credit was denied, and the result is what we see to-day.

It may be possible that we might so amend the Federal reserve act, by mandatory clauses rather than discretionary clauses, as to make it do the work that it was intended to do; but it is essential that at this time and place we shall have a system that will meet the necessities of the agriculturist now and give him hope for a to-morrow. It is an old saying that "Nobody but a fool would be bitten by the same dog twice, providing he knows the dog"; and all those who have come before our committee have expressed their determination not to put themselves again at the mercy of a system that is capable, through any policy that may be adopted by those who have the power, of spelling the farmers' ruin as it was spelled in 1920 and 1921. Before I will vote for giving the preference to any kind of a measure I want to know that that measure is at least susceptible of proper amendment to make it adequate.

Some reference was made here this afternoon to our freight rates. We have talked a great deal about class legislation. I have denied that any legislation looking to the relief of the farmers along the lines of a proper banking system is class legislation. Agriculture is fundamental. It competes with nothing. It is the basis upon which all rests. The other day, when I took occasion on this floor to show that during the period of what was called an unavoidable deflation there had been made by some concerns, or one at least in this country, 16,000 per cent, by another 3,333 per cent, and by another 1,500 per cent—and the papers are full from day to day of what are known as stock dividends—my statement was challenged on the ground of what length of time was consumed in accumulating the 16,000 per cent. The particular corporation to which I have reference had a capital investment of $100,000 and declared a stock dividend of $16,000,000—$160,000 for every $1,000 put in. It does not make any difference if it took 50 years to accumulate it; the farms and the farm homes and the farm organizations of this country have been in existence for more than 50 years, and at the same day and at the same hour that there were published these notorious dividends, declared in the form of stock, a cry went up from East and West and North and South that what the farmers had accumulated in the 50 years, if it took 50 years to make $16,000,000 out of $100,000, was a stock mortgage and a farm mortgage.

I consider this question of not only holding out a hope but giving assurance to agriculture that credit will be adequate, permanent, and without any limitation, a matter of the very greatest importance. I want here and now to enter my protest against any proposal to set aside so many millions for agriculture. Let us fix our system so that the farmer has ready access to all the capital and to all the currency in this country, as business has to-day. Let us give him the same opportunity to borrow, the same opportunity to hypothecate his commodity, peculiarly adapted to the conditions under which he must produce and sell.

Mr. President, I am going to insist in season and out of season on this floor that we shall not say to agriculture, which produces more than 55 per cent of the wealth of this country annually, that we will make some little amendment for the benefit of agriculture, and will set aside some amount of capital, as is proposed in the Lenroot bill, to ameliorate the farmer's condition. My contention is that he is entitled to such

legislation that under all safe business rules he will have the same rights and privileges, under the peculiar conditions under which he produces his wealth, that commerce has in attending to its business, not set aside so much gold, or set aside so many bonds, but to open up to him the entire field of credit, both in this country and abroad, as you have opened it up to commerce.

The legislation we pass should be as comprehensive as that, possibly through a radical amendment of the present Federal reserve act which shall take into account the peculiar conditions under which agricultural wealth is produced and marketed, in which amendment we should put clauses which would insure that the farmer would not be left at the sweet mercy of the whims of those who desire to favor one form of commerce as against another; we should include mandatory clauses providing that if the door is shut in the face of agriculture and farmers are to be hurled into the depths of bankruptcy and ruin, as is now evident, all other business shall share alike with it, as far as the credits are concerned.

Every man knows that the present condition in which agriculture finds itself has come about because credit was denied the farmer. There has been some talk to the effect that the prices of agricultural products had to come down, that they were too high, in spite of the fact that the general level of prices was universally high. Every man in this Chamber knows that when cotton and wheat and cattle had reached the peak the little bootblack who had been getting 5 cents for a shine was getting 15 cents. I mention those extremes to show that the general rise was by virtue of the additional volume, under the quantitative theory of money, the price of everything being raised pari passu; but when the restriction came, what happened? Everything moved along the line of least resistance, and the farmer having the least resistance, he suffered first, last, and was the only one.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, this morning a witness before the Banking and Currency Committee, speaking in behalf of the Norris bill, insisted upon the passage of the Norris bill, and he made the statement that the farmer did not need more credit, that the trouble was that he had had too much credit, and it was for that reason he wanted to have the Norris bill passed. Does that accord with the Senator's opinion?

Mr. SMITH. I think it is not necessary to go into that. There are plenty of people, as Paul said about the Jews, who "have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." I doubt very much if he knew enough about farming to give an intelligent answer about it. I do not know who the witness was, but I know that is absolutely untrue. I know this much: That the wheat of the West and the cotton of the South and the cattle on the plains would not have been sacrificed any more than the securities held in the banks and elsewhere if there had been extended to the farmer adequate credit on that which he had to tide him over that period. But the cry went up, "liquidate," and it went to such an extent that I myself was asked whether the cotton I had for sale was made in 1920 or 1921, and upon inquiry I found that if the cotton had been made in 1920 I could not get a loan, but if it was made in 1921 I could get a loan.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was that true, notwithstanding the quality of the cotton?

Mr. SMITH. The question was as to the time when the cotton was made. It was in accordance with the idea that somebody had determined that the crops should move regardless of whether or not the producer and owner of the crop went bankrupt and committed suicide, as thousands of them did—the crop must move. In other words, you could get a loan if you made the crop in 1921, but you could not get a loan if you made it in 1920, because the latter would be "speculative holdings." To force him to sell and send him into bankruptcy and suicide was legitimate, orderly marketing.

Under the conditions what help did the farmer have? He had no resources. He did not have 16,000 per cent accumulated as a surplus against this evil day. He did not have the 3,333⅓ per cent, the dividend mentioned in the clipping handed me by the Senator from Arkansas. He did not even have the 100 per cent which seems to be so very common. It is said they do not need credit. When you have an accumulated indebtedness of 12 months to produce an article, and it takes you 12 months to produce it as a commercial asset, to liquidate the liabilities of the 12 months previous, and the price is so low that it would take the entire crop to settle, if you did settle, the liabilities incurred in its production.

There is not a manufacturing business in the world but what must have credit to buy its raw material, credit during the manufacturing period, and credit during the distributing period. Hence we find the 30, 60, and 90 day paper to carry them over the ordinary period between the time of purchasing the raw material and the time of making the finished product.

I am fully aware, Mr. President, that there are other problems which enter into this question which make it a very vexed and intricate one. I know that essential to the life of this country is an adequate form of transportation, which is synonymous with the means of distribution. Under the present level of farm products and the present tariff on those commodities the farmer is bankrupt and the consumer is pauperized. I happen to have brought over from my office a statement of some instances of actual bona fide sales from middle Carolina to New York of ordinary foodstuffs, which show just how unequal things are. The first one to which I shall refer was sent to me from the bank of Latta, a little town near the line between North and South Carolina and about 14 hours by through freight out of New York. This man writes me a letter, in which he says:

> I attach some statements for some beans that we shipped to New York for sale some time ago. You will note that after paying express and commissions that two baskets of beans netted us 6 cents and that after paying express and commissions 29 baskets netted us $5.80. It cost us about 15 cents per basket to have these beans picked, and the baskets cost us laid down here in Latta about 17 cents each, and you can thus see that we lost some money on these shipments, besides the labor and fertilizers. I just thought I would call this matter to your attention so that you might know that the producers get it in the neck these days of high freight and express rates. Of course, we sold some beans at a profit as we sold some f. o. b. our station.

I want to read to the Senate the net result. This man got a good price for the beans, as beans go, a dollar a crate, there being about a bushel in a crate. He sold them to be delivered—$1 a crate delivered—and the total amount involved was $2. He sent them by express, and the expressage was $1.74 on the 2 bushels; the commission was 20 cents on the 2 bushels, so he got 6 cents. The express company got $1.74, the commission man got 20 cents, and the man who furnished the land, bought the seeds, furnished the fertilizer, bought the crate, and did everything that was necessary to cause 2 bushels of beans to exist which never existed before got 6 cents.

Mr. CARAWAY. I should like to know how it was they let him get away with so much of it.

Mr. SMITH. I think they overlooked the 6 cents, because I have in my desk, I believe, what I put into the RECORD some time last summer, a statement of the shipment of three carloads of melons to New York in the same train. Each carload of melons brought a fairly good price, as melons were sold, I think something like $130 a car. The freight was $150 to $160 a car, and after paying freight and commission, the shipper had to spend something like $128 for the privilege of giving three carloads of melons to that market. So I suppose they overlooked the 6 cents.

This man seems not to have been satisfied with his 6-cent experience, so he sent 29 bushels by express at another time and he still got $1 a crate. Twenty-nine dollars was the gross. The freight was $20.30, commission $2.90, and he got $5.80. The railroad got $20 for hauling them, a 14-hour haul, the commission man got $2.90 for simply taking them and transmitting them to the ultimate purchaser, and the man who produced them got $5.80.

From another point, Cades, S. C., Mr. T. P. Fulmore writes me a letter. It seems that he started off to do as a great many of the friends of the farmer—those who farm the farmer—say: "Let him diversify, raise his home supplies, and then if he has anything to sell, let it be surplus." This fellow seems to have diversified, and raised artichokes, a form of tuber that is raised for the purpose of making a very delightful pickle. I believe it enters into Mr. Heinz's 57 Varieties. He produced two barrels and got $5 a barrel. The gross was $10. The motto of this house in New York is "Live wires." He shipped the artichokes to them and they got $10 for them. The freight was $7.44 out of the $10, the commission was $1; so the shipper got $1.50.

Mr. CARAWAY. I wonder if he was the gentleman who testified that they did not need any help.

Mr. SMITH. I suspect he was the one the Senator from Ohio said told the committee the farmers did not need credit. He had a market, a fairly good market; $5 a barrel for artichokes delivered in New York seems like a fairly good price, although I do not raise them, but for the shipping space for two barrels he paid $7.44 expressage from his place of business to New York. Mark you, that tariff rate was the result of legislative enactment. You hear men talking about socialism, talking about class legislation. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House, and a like committee of the Senate are responsible for that. They could not have charged any such price had it not been legalized. The charge

was $7.44 for two barrels of artichokes. They brought $5 a barrel in New York, which, as I said, is a fairly good price. Yet to transport them in good shape from a place on the trunk line of the Coast Line, which picks up its make-up of through freight to New York, a distance of less than 24 hours, it cost $7.44 for transporting two barrels of artichokes. Deducting $7.44 from the $10 which the producer received, and $1 for the commission man, left the shipper, to pay for his land, to pay his taxes, to pay the cost incurred in production, the magnificent sum of $1.50. It is the duty of the Congress not so much to make new legislation, but to amend and regulate that which it has done disastrously.

I do not pretend to say, for I do not know, how much of the stock of the railroads is watered, but I want to ask the Senate a question. What is the difference between the railroads of the country issuing fictitious or watered stock and a company declaring stock dividends without an adequate increase of the manufacturing plant? A plant produces a certain amount and makes 100 per cent profit. In place of selling the goods cheaper, they take the 100 per cent on the investment and declare it in stock dividends. That increases the capital stock. There is not another dollar put into the concern. There is no enlargement of the plant. It then simply produces the per cent upon the volume of the stock, but the total amount of earnings upon the real amount invested is just the same as it was before. How much of stock under that guise is being watered now? Who will pay for it?

The other day I called attention to a dispatch in the press with reference to a worsted manufacturing concern making 1,500 per cent. Who pays for it? It is now capitalized. That was declared in stock dividends. Hereafter if they make 10 per cent upon that enlarged capital stock, what is the aggregate return upon the actual initial amount invested? There are other questions just as serious concerning the welfare of the country. It is a man's job that confronts us at this stage of human development and this period of organized society, and you are not going to juggle behind closed doors or with any of the subtleties that have heretofore characterized the business affairs of this country. The exigencies of life and of prosperity demand that we should at least not legalize the whole profit making on the one side and pay no attention to the production of paupers on the other side.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall vote to take up for consideration the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am not in favor of some of the provisions of that bill. I hope to see certain changes made in it. There are other members of the committee who feel as I do about it. We think that it is right and proper to bring the measure before the Senate for immediate consideration for the purpose of amending it and improving it so as to obtain some measure of relief for agriculture. When I vote to take up this bill now for consideration I shall do it for the purpose of trying to bring about legislation that will be helpful to agriculture.

Mr. President, I think that a rural credit bill is the thing that we should take up at the earliest day possible. I believe that a bill giving the farmer the right to borrow money on his staple products will solve the problem. If the farmer is enabled to keep his products off the market when market conditions are bad, prices will be taken care of, because keeping his products off the market will make conditions so that the prices are bound to be above the cost of production and will yield a profit. The farmer must be enabled to hold his product until the price will yield a profit. The merchant is permitted to do that. When the merchant places a stock of goods in his store he does not sell under the cost of production—that is, he does not sell for less than he pays for the goods plus a profit. If anyone goes into a store to make a purchase and offers a price that does not cover the cost of the goods plus a profit, the merchant will not sell the goods. He keeps his goods off the bargain counter, out of the traffic of commerce, until the price will yield a profit; and he is enabled to do that because he has credit at the bank, because the commercial banking system enables him to do that, and it is right and proper that it should. It enables him to handle his business in a businesslike way. That is all we are asking, Mr. President, simply that the farmer be placed upon the same business basis that every other kind of business is placed upon. That is not an unreasonable request. Why should not the farmer be aided by the Government to derive a profit from his business?

Mr. President, I know and you know that if the farmer should go out of business the people would starve. Therefore he is engaged in the most important business in the world; and it seems to me that a Government that will establish a banking system and permit that system to be so manipulated as to serve the whim and caprice of the gamblers of Wall Street, the speculators in various places to get all the money they need or want for speculative purposes, as has been done, ought to be able to devise some plan by which the men who are engaged in an honest industry could have the money necessary to make their business a paying business.

The moment we come in with some measure looking to the relief of the agricultural class, as all must admit is in great distress at this time, somebody is ready to say that it is a Socialist movement and that the Bolshevists are demanding that the thing be done. Mr. President, I have pointed out before and I am going to point out a great many more times that the deflation policy permitted and carried on produced more Bolshevists in this country than anything that has happened here in 50 years. It did more for socialism; it did more to encourage anarchy than anything that has happened.

I recall, as others here do, that when I was talking about deflation and an effort was made by the Wall Street money power to suppress my argument and to keep it out of the newspapers, certain Wall Street representatives would leave the gallery to keep from sending anything whatever to their papers upon the subject, and I remarked at the time that I was not talking to the Wall Street papers, but I was talking to the American people through the 40,000 copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that go out each day and that the people, reading that RECORD day after day, week after week, and month after month, would be heard from at the polls.

The question that I here discussed for weeks and months has become a national issue. It played an important part in the recent campaign in every State in the Union. It is going to play a more important part than that in the campaign of 1924. The American people, if they have the moral stamina that I think they have, if they have the courage that I believe they have, and the memory I have known them to possess, will see to it that every person who had to do with deflation is driven out of public life. Every one of them should be constantly held up to public scorn. They should be condemned every day in the year. The crime of murderous deflation must not be forgotten.

Mr. President, I sat in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the week just passed, where hearings were being held looking toward legislation to aid agriculture, among other things the establishment of a rural credits system. I heard men testify from the West and the Northwest.

I heard them tell of the terrible taking off of farmers in those western counties, 15 in one county, 18 in another, 25 I believe it was in another, and so on. These men, made desperate by deflation, killed themselves. The captains of finance in Wall Street who clip coupons, who make such tremendous profits as those referred to by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the able and faithful friend of the farmer, do not know anything about these conditions and I doubt whether they would care even if they knew.

We have a serious situation in America to-day. Three-fourths of our people are not in easy or comfortable circumstances. While that is true, a certain smaller group of people are making more money than ever before. In other words, one class of our people, and the larger class, is being hard pressed and impoverished and another class is becoming strangely and dangerously rich. We are fast accumulating a menacing population known as the arrogant and idle rich, and that question, unless the situation is changed, is going to become an important one in this Republic some day. Mr. President, the Almighty never intended that all the rich resources of this vast land of ours should be used by a few people to their enrichment and moral degradation and to the hurt and injury of the American masses. If this Government is to live, and it must and shall, for there is enough patriotism in America, enough statesmanship in America, when properly appealed to and utilized, to rescue this Government from the downward grade on which it has been cast. We are going to restore it to the course marked out by the founders of the Republic. We are going to stop Government pets and favorites who win favor with campaign contributions from holding up and robbing the men and women in the common walks of life.

We are going to see to it that those who toil and produce the necessities of life shall enjoy some of the fruits of their labor. On a former occasion I quoted a line of Scripture which fits the situation we are discussing here to-day and it is so appropriate I am going to quote it again: "They shall build houses and inhabit them; thy shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit. They shall not plant and another eat."

Mr. President, that scriptural quotation is good religion and good Americanism. The principle involved in the lines that

I have quoted is the principle that we stand upon and insist upon in our demands for the farmers of America.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. I understand the Banking and Currency Committee have a hearing again in the morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an open letter from Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, with reference to certain statements made in a circular letter from Capper's Weekly, of Topeka, Kans. I have spoken to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] in regard to the matter, and he has no objection to the letter of Mr. Lasker going in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, December 18, 1922.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: There comes to my attention a circular letter from Capper's Weekly, of Topeka, Kans., on whose letterhead your name appears as publisher, stating:

"Capper's Weekly wishes to seek out and make known the actual sentiment of the people on the five great questions following. Will you please indicate your opinion on the secret ballot inclosed? All we are asking is that you will please mark the ballot and mail it at the earliest moment. No name need be signed to the ballot.

"1. Do you favor a ship subsidy? In order to stop $50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags, it is proposed: That the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately $200,000,000, lend one hundred and twenty-five million to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about $750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years. A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment, half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned. President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce."

Whatever may be your position upon the pending ship subsidy bill, I am sure you do not desire the readers of your paper to reach their conclusions upon either inadequate or erroneous statements; and because the statements in the circular of the organ controlled by you are not accurate and are wholly at variance with the facts, I feel it my duty to you, to myself, and to the people we both represent to give you the facts and thus enable you to correct the erroneous impressions your publication has created. You certainly would not wish, and I certainly could not permit, any part of our people to be misled concerning the provisions of the ship subsidy bill, or the facts surrounding it.

The statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington-wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts; your words are taken, practically syllable for syllable, from this partisan minority report.

I challenge one to find where the Shipping Board has ever proposed that the war-built merchant fleet be sold for approximately $200,000,000. What can be realized from the Government fleet depends on changing world conditions as well as changing conditions surrounding the American merchant marine. One of the main purposes of the proposed bill is to create a market that will enable the ships to be sold at all, for, under present conditions of Government operation, the Shipping Board, despite great effort and at what it deemed world prices, has been able to dispose of so little tonnage as to amount to practically nothing at all. The pending bill, it is believed, will create a market that will make possible the sale of the ships so as to realize largely in excess of $200,000,000.

Next, your questionnaire states that it is proposed to "lend $125,000,000 to recondition the ships or build others." If it had been the purpose of those who drafted the questionnaire to submit this feature of the bill even with remote fairness, the questionnaire would have stated that the merchant marine act of 1920, now the law of the land, already provides for a $125,000,000 loan fund for the construction of ships; that the proposed bill makes only slight modifications in the existing law to meet present conditions more successfully.

The statement proceeds to say, "and then pay the owners about $750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years." Whoever connected with your weekly accepted this quotation from the Democratic minority report has, to my mind, willfully or ignorantly put forth a statement that does not remotely come within the facts.

In the original bill as submitted by the Shipping Board to Congress the only direct aid proposed to ships was a subsidy which the Shipping Board has repeatedly averred, in its testimony before the congressional committee, could not under any conditions and at any maximum exceed $30,000,000 annually.

As the bill stands at present, if all privately owned tonnage under the American flag (including that in the coastwise trade that could be used on the deep seas) were, immediately on the passage of the bill, put into ocean service, the total annual subsidy paid would be less than $5,500,000; if, in addition, all the Government-operated fleet at once passed into private hands, the subsidy cost the first year would be less than $15,000,000.

To this the Shipping Board testified repeatedly before the congressional committee, as the printed record, open to all, plainly shows.

If the subsidy ever reached the annual figure of $30,000,000, the Government will have disposed of its fleet, wiped out its annual operating loss of $50,000,000, and, in addition, the country will have several million tons of new ships of much needed types, built in American yards by American labor and flying the American flag—an aid in commerce, for farmer and manufacturer alike, and a protection to the Nation in war.

The statement that the subsidy could possibly reach $75,000,000 a year was originally made by the Democratic minority in the face of repeated evidence that its annual maximum could not exceed $30,000,000, and that in the 10-year period it would average $22,000,000 annually if the bill met with success in the establishment of an ideal American merchant marine.

When, therefore, it was proposed in the Senate committee that the Shipping Board be prohibited from making contracts which in any one year could total over $30,000,000, the Shipping Board accepted this limitation as scotching effectively the malicious misstatements that had been circulated in regard to the possible maximum. It is apparent, therefore, that the statement of a $750,000,000 subsidy cost in 10 years is not within the facts.

The subsidy is the only direct aid proposed, for the postal compensation continued by the bill is only that provided for, long ago under section 4009 of the Revised Statutes and is based on the actual amount of mail carried, i. e., the Government pays for the freight it gives.

In writing you thus I have a thought quite apart from my purpose to appeal for fairness in dealing with a vital American problem; as a Member of the Senate and necessarily a close student of public affairs you share the responsibility with others that true light comes before the people.

You are aware of the restlessness of humankind and the tendency, here as elsewhere in the world, to array class against class. Our hope of the future lies in an understanding of mutuality of interest; and, in order to promote that understanding of mutuality, these problems of Government and the problems of bettering our industrial and commercial conditions depend upon correct presentation of the situation rather than allegations which may excite unfair prejudice.

Very truly yours,

A. D. LASKER, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There is a desire to have an executive session, and, as there is no chance, apparently, of securing a vote on the pending motion to-night, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII.

Alexander Lindsay, jr., to be associate justice of Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

George V. Denny to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 17, Savannah, Ga.

Louis M. Hall to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, St. Louis, Mo.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

To be rear admirals.

Montgomery M. Taylor.
Carl T. Vogelgesang.

To be captains.

Robert L. Berry.
William R. Sayles, jr.
Edwin H. Dodd.
Louis Shane.
John G. Church.
Herbert C. Cocke.

To be commanders.

Leigh M. Stewart.
Francis M. Robinson.
Archibald G. Stirling.
Robert W. Cabaniss.
David A. Scott.
Weyman P. Beehler.
Lemuel M. Stevens.
Joseph S. Evans.
John W. W. Cumming.
Charles A. Dunn.
Horace T. Dyer.
Damon E. Cummings.
Russell S. Crenshaw.
Warren G. Child.
Herbert S. Babbitt.
Bryson Bruce.
Randall Jacobs.
Vaughn V. Woodward.
Richard S. Edwards.
Robert T. S. Lowell.
Clyde R. Robinson.
Irving H. Mayfield.
Philip H. Hammond.
Harvey W. McCormack.
John M. Schelling.
Bert B. Taylor.
William O. Wallace.
William S. Farber.
George M. Ravenscroft.
Alfred W. Atkins.

To be lieutenant commanders.

Ralph E. Sampson.
John R. Peterson, jr.
Joseph McE. Smith.
George J. McMillin.
William H. O'Brien, jr.
Howard F. Kingman.
James A. Saunders.
Alfred E. Montgomery.
Andrew C. Bennett.
Eugene P. A. Simpson.
Oliver W. Bagby.
Lawrence P. Bischoff.

James G. B. Gronier.
William M. Quigley.
Rivers J. Carstarphen.
Calvin H. Cobb.
Lee C. Carey.
Norman Scott.
Conrad Ridgely.
Richard P. Meyers.
Webb C. Hayes.
Howard D. Bode.
Harold E. Snow.
Robert M. Doyle, jr.
Richard H. Booth.
Morton L. Deyo.
Harold T. Bartlett.
Robert M. Hinckley.
Ralph S. Parr.
Charles H. McMorris.
Virgil C. Griffin, jr.
John H. Holt, jr.
William A. Corley.
Benjamin Perlman.
Howard H. Good.
Ernest G. Small.
Carleton H. Wright.
Robertson J. Weeks.
Herman E. Fischer.
Harry G. Patrick.
Donald W. Hamilton.
Herbert G. Gates, jr.
Heister Hoogewerff.
Louis E. Denfeld.
George W. D. Dashiell.
Nathan B. Chase.
George W. La Mountain.

James C. Clark.
James C. Monfort.
Carl G. Gilliland.
Harold Dodd.
Warren A. Shaw.
Robert A. Hall.
Guy C. Hitchcock.
Anton B. Anderson.
Ralph S. Wentworth.
George L. Woodruff.
Mahlon S. Tisdale.
Fred Welden.
Davis De Treville.
Robert S. Haggart.
Raymond E. Kerr.
Philip Van Horn Weems.
George H. Fort.
Lunsford L. Hunter.
Ernest W. Broadbent.
Forrest U. Lake.
Robert R. Thompson.
Elliott Buckmaster.
Nelson W. Hibbs.
Walter S. DeLany.
Emory P. Eldredge.
Clarence Gulbranson.
Wentworth H. Osgood.
Donald F. Patterson.
Alexander W. Loder.
William S. Hogg, jr.
Stephen B. Robinson.
William G. Greenman.
Allen H. Guthrie.
Carroll M. Hall.
Harold H. Little.

To be lieutenants.

Henry B. Broadfoot.
Vaughn Bailey.
Ratcliffe C. Welles.
Arthur Wrightson.
Laurence E. Myers.
John P. Dix.
Robert E. Davenport.
Winfield A. Brooks.
William M. Callaghan.
Harold L. Challenger.
Ralph B. Netting.
William H. Mays.
George M. O'Rear.
Joseph R. Lannom.
George Kirkland.
Lewis H. McDonald.
Marcus C. Miller.
Samuel H. Hurt.
William B. Stork.
John J. Clausey.
Ralph G. Moody.
Frederick Petry.
William F. Schlegel.
Sol Shaw.
Asa Van R. Watson.
Wilmer W. Weber.
Ludwig W. Gunz.
Raymond C. McDuffie.
Henry A. Stuart.
William J. Graham.
Walter B. Buchanan.
Clyde Morrison.
Elmer B. Robinson.
Elijah E. Tompkins.
Doile Greenwell.
Arthur L. Karns.
Marcus L. Kurtz.
John F. W. Gray.
Homer B. Davis.
Edwin Nelson.
Percival W. Busby.
Arthur E. Bartlett.
Carl Hupp.
Stonewall B. Stadtler.
Stephen E. Haddon.
Frank A. Brandecker.
William E. McClendon.
Henry C. Flanagan.
Frank A. Saunders.

Ralph H. Roberts.
Valentine H. Schaeffer.
Eugene L. Kell.
John W. Roper.
William C. Vose.
Harry B. Slocum.
Robert P. Briscoe.
Harry R. Thurber.
James B. Sykes.
Lyle N. Morgan.
Clarence H. Schildhauer.
Cuthbert A. Griffiths.
Franz O. Willenbucher.
Harry M. Jones.
William H. Ferguson
Ernest H. von Heimburg.
Morton T. Seligman.
Douglas A. Powell.
John O. Huse.
Charles J. Palmer.
Arthur P. Thurston.
Logan C. Ramsey.
Scott G. Lamb.
William E. Clayton.
John H. Cassady.
Julian B. Noble.
Henry R. Herbst.
Elmer R. Hill.
Henry D. Baggett.
Bayard H. Colyear.
Ralph W. Hungerford.
Charles B. Hunt.
James D. Lowry, jr.
Albert P. Burleigh.
Eric M. Grimsley.
John B. Griggs, jr.
Charles L. Andrews, jr.
Eliot H. Bryant.
Alonzo B. Alexander.
David S. Crawford.
Charles J. Rend.
Robert L. Boller.
Henry C. Fengar.
Ten Eyck DeWitt Veeder, jr.
Marshall R. Greer.
Philip P. Welch.
Harry A. Rochester.
James J. Hughes.
Carl K. Fink.

Jesse G. McFarland.
William Wakefield.
Richard C. Bartlett.
James D. Barner.
Clyde L. Lewis.
Malcolm F. Schoeffel.
Thomas G. W. Settle.
Ralph A. Ofstie.
Rex L. Hicks.
Herbert M. Scull.
Matthias B. Gardner.
Howard W. Fitch.
Creighton C. Carmine.
Gordon M. Jackson.
Ernest E. Herrmann.
William E. Hilbert.
Hugh W. Olds.
Albert T. Sprague, 3d.
Hobart A. Sailor.
Thomas P. Jeter.
Adolph O. Gieselmann.
David H. Clark.
Jeffrey C. Metzel.
Festus F. Foster.
Russell M. Ihrig.
James J. Graham.
Harold M. Martin.
John L. Reynolds.
John R. Redman.
Ross A. Dierdorff.
Herbert S. Woodman.
George H. Mills.
Desmond J. Sinnott.
John C. William.
Spencer H. Warner.
Dorrance K. Day.
Robert F. MacNally.
Samuel B. Ogden.
Arthur F. Folz.
Charles S. Seely.
Truman E. Ayres.
William E. Phillips.
Raymond G. Deewall.
Earl B. Brix.
Charles M. Johnson.
Henry L. Pitts.
Charles F. Waters.
Edward J. Lysaught.
Percy A. Decker.
Edward B. Peterson.
Charles R. Jeffs.
Joseph S. Ives.
DeForest Ir. Trautman.
Caleb R. Crandall.
Walter E. Andrews.
Raymond E. Farnsworth.

John J. Patterson, 3d.
Walter C. Ansel.
Adrian O. Rule, jr.
Miles P. Duval, jr.
Walther G. Maser.
Elmer R. Runquist.
Walton R. Read.
Daniel McGurl.
William E. Tarbutton.
Stephen K. Hall.
Robert M. Smith, jr.
Robert B. Crichton.
Paul H. Talbot.
James L. Holloway, jr.
Fred W. Beltz.
John B. McDonald, jr.
John G. Crawford.
Paul D. Dingwell.
James G. Atkins.
Frank V. Aler, jr.
Cyril K. Wildman.
Francis H. Gilmer.
Carleton McGauly.
Charles R. Smith.
Giles E. Short.
Dixie Kiefer.
John E. Dingwell.
Norman E. Miller.
Leslie E. Gehres.
Raymond E. Daniels.
Leo L. Waite.
Lawrence S. Tichenor.
Hermann P. Knickerbocker.
Frederick W. Ickes.
Charles F. Grisham.
Howard R. Shaw.
Stuart S. Murray.
Russell S. Barrett.
Gustave H. Bowman.
Leonard C. Parker.
Jack C. Richardson.
Riffel G. Rhoton.
Palmer M. Gunnell.
Perle M. Lund.
Arthur F. Peterson.
Scott E. Peck.
Thomas E. Renaker.
Malcolmn R. Jameson.
Arthur C. Smith.
Harry J. Lang.
William J. Slattery.
Earle P. McKellar.
Grover B. Turner.
Charles A. Kirtley.
James A. Martin.

To be lieutenants (junior grade).

Samuel H. Hurt.
Orrin R. Hewitt.
Thomas Macklin.
George D. Samonski.
Robert G. Greenleaf.
Ernest W. Dobie.
Michael J. Conlon.
William D. Dadd.
Frank Schultz.
David F. Mead.
August Logan.
George W. Waldo.
Norman McL. McDonald.
William T. Shaw.
John P. Millon.
James D. Brown.
Alfred Doucet.
James M. MacDonnell.
Everest A. Whited.
Elery A. Zehner.
George T. Campbell.
Elmer J. McCluen.
Warwick M. Tinsley.
Francis P. Brewer.
John F. Piotrowski.
Ralph A. Scott.
William K. Johnstone.
Emmette F. Gumm.

Arthur D. Murray.
Ralph M. Gerth.
Joseph A. Clark.
Stockard B. Hickey.
Thom H. Williamson.
Benjamin J. Shinn.
George H. Toepfer.
Howard E. Haynes.
Harry A. Wentworth.
Frederick J. Silvernail.
Edward Danielson.
Andrew Simmons.
Ira W. Truitt.
Charles W. Van Horn.
Arthur Brown.
Philip L. Emerson.
John B. McGovern.
Lawrence K. Beaver.
Philip H. Taft.
Charlie S. East.
Thomas J. Eggleston.
John E. Canoose.
Rudolph Oeser.
William M. McDade.
Robert H. Barnes.
John C. Redman.
Ewell K. Jett.
Rudolph P. Bielka.

Clarence H. Fogg.
Frank V. Shepard.
Abram L. Broughton.
Harry F. Gray.
William Klaus.
John F. P. Miller.
Harold F. MacHugh.
Albert R. Colwell.
Loar Mansbach.
Glenn O. Twiss.
William J. Russell.
William P. Turner.
Clarence A. Hawkins.
Alfred R. Bolleau.
William J. Poland.
Thomas Fertner.
Emil H. Petri.
Carter E. Parker.
Harold Bye.
Joe S. Wier.
George H. Turner.
Carl I. Ostrom.
Percy S. Hogarth.
Brady J. Dayton.
John L. Graham.
Floyd J. Nuber.
Charles H. Ross.
Edwin C. Millhouse.
George K. G. Reilly.
Charles R. Will.
Paul G. Wrenn.
Robert K. Madsen, jr.
James S. Warner.
Harold W. Alden.
William M. M. Lobrano.
Arthur W. Peterson.
Alan F. Winslow.
George E. Twining.
Russell D. Bell.
Charles C. Ferrenz.
Henry L. Naff.
James B. Bliss.
Clyde A. Ceggins.
Robert W. Boughter.
Otto F. Johanns.
George E. Kenyon.
John F. Wegforth.
Benton B. Baker.
Frederick L. Farrell.
Clifford B. Schiano.
John A. Paulson.
Albert R. Buehler.
William B. Coleman.
Thomas F. Hayes.
Elder P. Johnson.
Herbert Loewy.
Benjamin C. Purrington.
Robert F. Stockin.
Harold J. Walker.
Florentin P. Wencker.
Arthur H. Small.
Charles D. Hickox.
Ralph W. Bowers.
Malcolm D. MacGregor.
Anton L. Mare.
John D. Murphy.
Le Roy A. Nelson.
Robert E. Permut.
Louis C. De Rochemont.
Harold B. Corwin.
Edward R. J. Griffin.
John A. Pierson.
Emanuel Taylor.
Laurence Bennett.
Harold J. Bellingham.
Albert M. Van Eaton.
John E. Gabrielson.
George C. Weldin.
Sumner C. Cheever.
Albert E. Conlon.
Emmet P. Forrestel.
Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter
George M. Dusinberre.
Clarence J. Ballreich.
William Sinton.
George F. Prestwich.
William R. Dolan.
Maxemillian B. De Leshe.
Thomas O. Brandon.
Roger K. Hodsdon.
Rodney H. Dobson.
Terence W. Greene.
William N. Thornton.
Ernest V. Abrams.
Burton E. Rokes.
Lloyd K. Cleveland.
Donald R. Comstock.
Edgar V. Carrithers.
Dennis B. Boykin.
Martin Nyburg.
William F. Skyles.
Ashton B. Smith.
George Walker.
George L. Bright.
Charles R. Price.
William G. Dow.
Thomas J. Bay.
Harold B. Herty.
Edgar L. Adams.
Samuel S. Fried.
Paul L. Mather.
John P. Curtis.
LaRue C. Lawbaugh.
Warner W. Angerer.
Edward E. Pare.
Richard S. Morse.
William A. P. Martin, jr.
Charles S. Beightler.
Richard Highleyman.
William W. Fife.
Walter H. Roberts.
Herbert Finebaum.
John Perry.
Mead S. Pearson.
Oberlin C. Laird.
Harold R. Parker.
Thomas S. Combs.
Clarence F. Swanson.
Frederick V. Barker.
Lewis Corman.
George P. Kraker.
Edwin F. Conway.
Robert E. Melling.
Horace Burrough, 3d.
Michael D. Dearth.
Kenneth E. Brimmer.
George E. Rosenberry.
Herbert G. Hopwood.
Charles B. Gary.
Henry G. Chalkley, jr.
Carroll L. Tyler.
James B. Donnelly.
Samuel W. Canan.
Robert H. Smith.
John P. Vetter.
John F. Gillon.
Harold C. Fitz.
Rockwell J. Townsend.
Fridthjof W. Londahl.
Russell Keith.
Henry N. Mergen.
Charles C. Hartman.
Olin R. Miner.
Alf O. R. Bergesen.
Lyman S. Perry.
Barnett T. Talbott.
Frank C. L. Dettmann.
Robert P. Erdman.
Carleton C. Champion, jr.
Charles R. Skinner.
Merrill F. Sproul.
George F. Burdick.
Drayton Harrison.
Ellsworth D. McEathron.
Maurice E. Curts.
Allen Hobbs.
William H. Buracker.
John C. Webb.
Eugene F. Burkett.
John E. Shoemaker.
Charles T. Wooten.
Earl R. De Long.
Abel C. J. Sablot.
Mark H. Harrington.
Virgil E. Korns.
Asel B. Kerr.
William E. A. Mullan.
William I. Leahy.
Frank Rorschach, jr.
Allen P. Mullinnix.
George H. Dana.
William B. Goggins.
Kendall S. Reed.
Charles B. Momsen.
Donald T. Whitmer.
Roger Brooks.
Ernest W. Litch.
Morton B. Sterling.
Burton L. Hunter, jr.
Marion E. Crist.
Sam L. LaHache.
Alva J. Spriggs.
John W. Marts, jr.
Donald R. Osborn, jr.
Benton W. Decker.
Morris B. Meyers.
Orin S. Haskell.
William B. Broadhurst.
Maurice E. Hatch.
Benjamin P. Ward.
Edmond P. Speight.
Milton D. Goldsmith.
Raleigh B. Miller.
Robert P. Cunningham.
Charles C. Anderson.
William A. P. Thompson.
Ericson Lewis.
Jesse B. Goode.
James L. Wyatt.
Clarence McM. Head.
Frederick W. Roberts.
John M. Thornton.
Harry D. Power.
William D. Fletcher.
Gordon A. Patterson.
Howard C. Rule, jr.
Austin K. Doyle.
Thomas S. Thorne.
Ralph Humphreys.
George H. Gregory.
Thomas C. Scaffe.
Maurice Montgomery.
Harold R. Brookman.
John B. Lyon.
James H. Doyle.
Neill D. Brantly.
Charles D. Murphey.
Harton I. Booker.
Sumner T. Scott.
George B. Cunningham.
Solomon S. Isquith.
Edwin C. Bain.
Armon D. A. Crawford.
Norman S. Ives.
Bailey Connelly.
Chester A. Swafford.
Gyle D. Conrad.
Clayton S. Isgrig.
John A. McDonnell.
Harold Coldwell.
Benjamin N. Ward.
James H. McKay.
Ferguson B. Bryan.
Frank H. Conant, 2d.
William G. Livingstone.
Frederick R. Buse.
Harley F. Cope.
Hugh P. Kirby.
James D. Haselden, jr.
Jewett P. Moncure.
Wade De Weese.
Amariah B. Cartwright.
Allan D. Blackledge.
Thomas T. Craven.
Clyde W. Smith.
Theodore G. Haff.
Dixwell Ketcham.
William J. Strother, jr.
Cato D. Glover, jr.
Francis B. Stoddert.
Charles M. Huntington.
John W. Higley.
Oliver W. Gaines.
William G. Tomlinson.
Harry H. Hill.
John P. Graff.
Edwin L. Brashears.
Richard C. Wiestling.
James M. Plaskitt.
Harvey Wilson.
Paul W. Steinhagen.
Robert C. Warrack.
Vilas R. Knope.
Douglass P. Johnson.
Francis P. Old.
William H. Wallace.
Norman B. Hopkins.
Melvin H. Bassett.
Charles A. Collins.
Khem W. Palmer.
Justin D. Hartford.
Elmer Kiehl.
Hilyer F. Gearing.
Francis W. Beard.
Jesse G. Johnson.
Joseph J. Rocheforth.
William J. Medusky.
Cecil E. Godkin.
Herbert C. Behner.
Roland E. Krause.
John H. Hykes.
Frederick J. Legere.
Thomas Southall.
Kenneth F. Horne.
Walter C. Haight.
William A. Lynch.
Joseph A. Ouellet.
Myron T. Grubham.
Ira D. Spoonemore.
Alfred G. Scott.
Raymond St. C. Beckel.
Herbert H. Taylor.
Howard W. Bradbury.
Lynn G. Bricker.
James H. Foskett.
Joseph E. Jackson.
Forrest A. Rhoads.
William W. Behrens.
Russell C. Bartman.
Bernhard H. Wolter.
Raymond A. McClellan.
Nullet F. Schneider.
Gordon T. House.
Earl Le R. Sackett.
Edmund T. Wooldridge.
Elwood M. Tillson.
Charles H. Murphy.
Peter F. Hunt.
Raymond D. Sollars.
Stephen C. Dougherty.
Joseph T. Talbert, 2d.
Beverly A. Hartt.
Hugh W. Turney.
Myron A. Baber.
Paul R. Sterling.
Charles L. Hutton.
William F. Moran.
John A. Dillon.
Perley E. Pendleton.
Walton W. Smith.
Charles S. Boarman.
Samuel Gregory.
Frank A. Davis.
Joseph H. Gowan.
Homer N. Wilkinson.

To be ensigns.

William F. Jennings.
Corydon H. Kimball.

To be medical inspector.

Richard A. Warner.

To be surgeons.

Ruskin M. Lhamon.
Clarence W. Ross.
Carleton I. Wood.
Roscoe M. Waterhouse.
William H. Michael.
Talmadge Wilson.

To be passed assistant surgeons.

Francis C. Hertzog.
Deane H. Vance.
Hillard L. Weer.
Jerome Braun.
David B. Peters.

To be assistant surgeons.

Gilbert E. Gayler.
Frank K. Soukup.
Nathaniel C. Rubinsky.
Earl B. Erskine.
James F. Finnegan.

To be passed assistant dental surgeon.

Joseph W. Baker, jr.

To be pay directors.

David V. Chadwick.
David M. Addison.
Victor S. Jackson.

To be pay inspectors.

William N. Hughes.
Harold W. Browning.
Emory D. Stanley.

To be passed assistant paymasters.

Dillon F. Zimmerman.
Alexander Riggin.
Robert G. Robeson.
Frederick Schwab.
Raphael Gering.
Robert J. Monteith.
Fillmore S. C. Layman.
Harold R. Lehmann.
Leon I. Smith.
Myron W. Willard.
Archie A. Antrim.
John H. Gallion.
Harold E. Humphreys.
Hugh A. Phares.
Percy W. McCord.
James E. Brennen.
Tipton F. Woodward.
Mason E. Mitchell.
George P. Smallman.
George E. Duffy.
Chris J. Norstad.
Charles A. Cook.
George L. Thomas.
Samuel L. Bates.
John C. Poshepny.
Gordon S. Bower.
Harry F. Hake.
Harry G. Kinnard.
Percival F. Patten.
William E. McCain.
Grandison J. Tyler.
Theodore M. Stock.
Chester B. Peake.
Stanford G. Chapman.
Hugh J. McManus.
Alexander W. Urquhart.
John J. Carroll.
Howard N. Hill.
Leo V. Flavell.
Cornelius A. Brinkmann.
Albert W. Eldred.
Jacob H. Kyger.
Joseph T. Lareau.
Marvin McCray.
Roy L. Koester.
Clarence E. Kastenbein.
James H. Stevens.
George Scratchley.
Ellsworth F. Sparks.
Charles B. Forrest.
John P. Killeen.
Orville F. Byrd.
Charles H. Gillilan.
Daniel L. McCarthy.
Leon Dancer.
Harry A. Miller.
Joseph W. Cavanaugh.
Harvey R. Dye.
Verny Carroll.
Ervine R. Brown.
Charles Schaaf.
Ray E. Snedaker.
George W. Davis.
William W. Wise.
Guild Bruda.
Don M. Robinson.
Alvin S. Reid.
Robert H. Lenson.
Robert R. Blaisdell.
Edward F. Ney.
Charles A. Cameron.
William G. Conrad.
Karl S. Farnum.
Louis A. Puckett.
James D. G. Wognum.
Charles H. Ritt.
Charles Musil.
Ray W. Byrns.
Walter E. Scott.
Webster Gross.
William R. Calvert.
James M. Thomas.
Edward Mixon.
Julius J. Miffitt.
James E. Hunt.
Leo A. Ketterer.
Nicholas A. Brown.

To be chaplains.

Edmund A. Brodmann.
Le Roy N. Taylor.
Thomas B. Thompson.
John J. Brady.

To be chief boatswains.

William E. Benson.
Fred C. A. Plagemann.
Wildon A. Ott.

To be chief machinist.

John A. Silva.

To be chief pay clerks.

Merle W. Shumate.
Thomas J. Bolan.

To be chief gunner.

Fayette Myers.

To be pay inspector.

John N. Jordan.

MARINE CORPS.

To be captains.

Walter S. Gaspar.
William K. MacNulty.
Alfred Dickerson.
Thomas R. Shearer.
Jacob M. Pearce.
Charles C. Gill.
John F. McVey.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

Clarence J. Carlton, Arcadia.
Charles R. Lee, Clearwater.
Grady W. Bailey, Florence Villa.
Jesse D. Knight, Lake Butler.
Albert L. Lucas, Ocala.
Thomas W. Lundy, Perry.

KANSAS.

Effie M. Brown, Centralia.
Newell R. Kirkham, Lebo.
Elam Shaffstall, Luray.
Caroline Boman, Virgil.

MICHIGAN.

Etta R. DeMotte, Memphis.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Fred H. Ackerman, Bristol.
Edgar A. Noyes, Claremont.
William E. Jones, Winchester.

VIRGINIA.

Ferdinand C. Knight, Alexandria.
William H. Haney, Claremont.
Holdway E. Lane, Gate City.
Philip L. Harrington, Independence.
Augustus R. Morris, Jetersville.
Georgie H. Osborne, Keysville.
Ira D. Baker, Lovettsville.
Glenn H. Wheeler, Marion.
Manley W. Carter, Orange.
Walter C. Franklin, Pamplin.
Charles V. Tucker, Phenix.
Patrick J. Riley, Portsmouth.
Joseph W. Stewart, Richmond.
Edward S. Barnitz, Salem.
Charles G. Rowell, Surry.
Jacob H. Furr, Waynesboro.
Campbell Slemp, Wise.
Charlie R. Fisher, Wytheville.

WISCONSIN.

Robert Luchsinger, Belleville.
Clarence B. Jensen, Cambridge.
Richard J. Hansen, Elcho.
Clara M. Johnson, Ettrick.
John D. Laughlin, Marion.
Marinus Jensen, Mountain.
C. Amelia Knudson, Scandinavia.
Clarence W. Hebard, Sheldon.
Fred J. Hurless, Viola.
Robert C. Bulkley, Whitewater.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *December 19, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

By the memory of the past, blessed heavenly Father, we are encouraged to come to Thee, for Thy goodness and mercy are from everlasting to everlasting. Touched with a feeling of our infirmities, Thou knowest us. Come to us according to our requirements and make our weakness to be our strength. Whatever the exactions and responsibilities of our lives may be, teach us to be patient and long-suffering, anchored in the faith of an all-wise God. Stir the fortunate of our land to a high spirit of charity and to a deep sense of duty, and thus may the poor be blest with comfort and good cheer. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing in 8-point type certain official records and documents furnished me by the Department of Justice relative to the Ricardo Flores Magon case.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

DECEMBER 9, 1922.

Hon. WALTER F. LINEBERGER,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Replying to your inquiry concerning Ricardo Flores Magon, I have to advise you that this subject is a Mexican anarchist who was forced to leave Mexico and come to the United States in 1902. He was the author of the publication Carranza Se Despoja De La Piel De Oveja, a rabid publication advocating the overthrow of government and the substitution of anarchy. Upon his exile from Mexico he came to the United States, where, together with his brother Enrique, he was connected with the publication of Regeneracion at Los Angeles.

In 1918 he was convicted of a violation of section 211 of the Criminal Code, section 3 of title 1, section 3 of title 9 of the espionage act, and section 19 of the act of Congress approved October 6, 1917, commonly known as the trading with the enemy act, for the printing of articles in Regeneracion tending to incite murder or assassination. He was sentenced to a term of 20 years in the penitentiary. Because of several previous convictions of a less anarchistic nature he was given the severe sentence which the court imposed. He had been previously convicted on two occasions and sentenced for short terms. He commenced to serve his term at McNeil Island but, due to the climate, was later transferred to Leavenworth, where he died in November of this year. Together with his brother Enrique, he was the source of considerable trouble both in Mexico and in the United States and was looked upon as one of the most pronounced Mexican anarchists with which this country has had to deal.

Very truly yours, W. J. BURNS, *Director.*

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY IN CHARGE OF PARDONS,
Washington, D. C., November 28, 1922.

(Memorandum for the Attorney General in re Ricardo Flores Magon.)

Magon was convicted in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, at Los Angeles, for publishing in a foreign language an article containing anarchistic propaganda tending to cause insubordination and refusal of duty in the military and naval service and to discourage enlistment, and also of sending such article through the mails without filing an English translation thereof with the postmaster, and of conspiracy to commit such offenses in violation of section 3, title 2, and section 3, title 12, of the act of June 15, 1917, commonly known as the espionage act; section 19 of the act of October 6, 1917, known as the trading with the enemy act; and sections 211 and 36 of the United States Criminal Code.

Magon was found guilty on all six counts of the indictment, with the exception of count 2, to which a demurrer was sustained, and he was sentenced July 19, 1918, to two years' imprisonment on the first count and to pay a fine of $5,000; 20 years on the third count and to pay a fine of $5,000; five years on the fourth count and to pay a fine of $5,000; one day in the county jail on the fifth count; and five years on the sixth count and to pay a fine of $5,000, the whole aggregating a sentence of 20 years and 1 day and a fine of $20,000, to take effect at the expiration of a sentence already imposed, June 22, 1916, against Magon of one year and one day in the McNeil Island penitentiary and a fine of $1,000 for mailing indecent matter tending to incite murder and assassination.

Regarding the fine of $20,000, the court provided that upon the payment of the sum of $5,000—the amount of the fine imposed on the first count—the same should operate in full satisfaction of the fines imposed on counts 3, 4, and 6. The two sentences, therefore, aggregated an imprisonment of 21 years and 1 day and a fine of $6,000.

With regard to the first case, the facts in which show the character and attitude of Magon and his associates to the Government, he was charged, with others, with having signed a manifesto, dated September 23, 1911, of the Mexican Liberal Party, addressed to Mexicans and published in Regeneracion, stating, among other things, that "the Mexican Liberal Party recognizes that the so-called right of property is an iniquitous right, because it compels a great majority of human beings to work and suffer for the satisfaction and ease of a small number of capitalists." (R. Case 1071, p. 51.)

Also that "the Mexican Liberal Party recognizes that authority and the clergy are the mainstay of the iniquity of capital, and therefore the organizing junta of the Mexican Liberal Party has solemnly declared war against authority, war against capital, war against the clergy." (R. 51.)

In an article appearing in the same issue of Regeneracion addressed to "Carrancista soldiers" and signed by Ricardo Flores Magon, Magon urges that they should rebel, turn their arms against their chiefs and officers, and without trembling pulse open fire with their rifles, because they are their enemies and are concerned in having conditions last forever so they can have a life of privilege." (R. 74.)

Magon also advocated the death of capital, of authority, and of clergy of all religions. (R. 75.) He also advocated the expropriation of land, houses, machinery, means of transportation, and merchandise becoming common property without distinction of men or women, race or color, and then urged that if anyone told the soldiers to the contrary, "Spit in his face, and even kill him, because it is necessary; it is absolutely necessary to initiate a revolutionary campaign of house cleaning." (R. 75.) He further stated that "We, the disinherited, must rid ourselves of those who are in our way if we can, by hook or crook, the same as we get rid of a tiger, as we annihilate the rattlesnake, as we crush the tarantula." (R. 76.)

With regard to case No. 1421, in which Magon was sentenced July 19, 1918, to 20 years in the penitentiary and a fine of $5,000, provided that fine was paid, the indictment was based on a manifesto dated March 6, 1918, directed to the members of the Mexican Liberal Party, the anarchists of the whole world, and the Mexican workingmen generally. It was signed by him and Librado Rivera and published in Regeneracion in its issue of March 16, 1918, which manifesto is set out in full in the first count of the indictment.

Among other things, the manifesto recites, in substance, that the death of the old society is close at hand; that everything indicates with force of evidence that the death of the bourgeoise society will come unexpectedly; that the workingman will go on strike, not taking into account that he injures his country's interests, conscious that the country is not his property but the property of the rich.

The manifesto, after making mention of the discontented faces seen on the streets, in saloons, in the theaters, and in the street cars, refers to the discontent in the homes where is "mourned the departure of a son called to the war, or hearts oppressed and eyes moistened when thinking that tomorrow, perhaps even to-day, the boy who is the joy of the hut, the youngster who with his frankness and gentility wraps in splendor the gloomy existence of the parents in senescence will be but by force torn from the bosom of the family to face, gun in hand, another youngster who, like himself, was the enchantment of his home and whom he does not hate and can not hate, for he even does not know him." The manifesto continues with the statement that—

"The flames of discontent revived by the blows of tyranny each time more enraged and cruel in every country and here and there, everywhere, and in all parts, the fists contract, the minds exalt, the hearts beat violently, and where they do not murmur they shout, all sighing for the moment in which the calloused hands during hundreds of centuries of labor, they must drop the fecund tools and grab the rifle, which nervously awaits the caress of the hero. * * * It is the moment preceding the greatest political and social catastrophe the history registers, the insurrection of all people against existing conditions." (R. pp. 12–13.)

The manifesto further recites that—

"It is precise that all of us, all that do not believe in government, all that are convinced that government whichsoever its form may be and whoever may be the head, it is tyranny, because it is not an institution created for the protection of the weak but to support the strong, we place ourselves at the height of circumstances and without fear propagate our holy anarchist ideal, the only just, the only human, the only true." (R. 13–14.)

The third count, which is the count on which a sentence of 20 years was imposed, charged that the manifesto was issued for the purpose, when the United States was at war, of causing and attempting to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States.

For the purpose of showing the intent with which the language found in the manifesto was used, the Government introduced in evidence a speech delivered by Magon on May 27, 1917, and published in the issue of Regeneracion of July 28, 1917, the speech being made in an Italian hall at a meeting organized by the International Workers' Defense League in defense of their comrades Raul Palma and Odilon Luna. In this speech Magon, after reciting the arrest of Palma and Luna, states as follows:

"The words of the anarchist are words of truth and justice. If because this country is engaged in the European carnage our words are obnoxious, they are undoubtedly to the interests of the capitalist class, but not to the interests of the people who are the producers of all wealth. Our words hurt those who take advantage of the European slaughter to fill their coffers. * * *

"Our words hurt all of those who live from the labor of others; our words hurt the parasites, the useless, and noxious beings who suck the blood of the people. The clergyman, the bourgeois, and the ruler; these are the ones who are injured by our words. So much the worse for them, so much the better for us!

"That the country is at war and that is why we can not talk. Bully reason this! It is precisely because the country is engaged in a war for the declaration of which the opinion of each and all of its inhabitants was not taken into account that we must talk, and we must talk high and loud, hurt whom it may, and no matter what the consequence of our words may be. *What interest have we the disinherited in this war?* Are we the wretched going to have more bread for ourselves and for our dear ones? Are we going to be freer? No; we shall be forced, as poor that we are, to shoulder a rifle, and we shall be dragged to the trenches to be torn to pieces by grapeshot so that Rockefeller and Morgan and all the bankers, and all the merchants, and all the bandits who exploit the proletariat may increase their millions and thereby their power. We shall give our blood in the trenches that our masters may debauch in banquets the product of our sacrifice. We shall render our existence in the battle field, and when in the desolated home our dear ones mourn our banishment, and in it reign mourning, weeping, sorrow, and hunger, our hangsmen shall put in their pockets the price of our pain and sacrifice.

"We, the anarchists, can not shut up; we shall not shut up. So long as injustice reigns our voice shall be heard. We are not actuated by caprice but by the sovereign urge of reason which points the way of duty to us, and all injustice, all imposition, all exploitation shall have to stumble over our resistance and our protest." (R. pp. 43–45.)

Other testimony was introduced to show the intent with which the language set out in the manifesto was used. The Government further offered testimony to show that at the time of the publication of the articles above referred to Regeneracion was denied the privilege of the United States mail (R. 38–39); that many of the Army and Navy could be seen upon the streets of Los Angeles where there were also recruiting stations, and that in the territory of the recruiting officers there were a number of men of Mexican extraction who had enlisted in the service (R. 41).

On March 6, 1916, the Postmaster General forwarded to the department a report by a post-office inspector giving a history of the operations of Magon and Rivera as well as other violators of the law.

It is impracticable to go into this in a memorandum. Suffice it to say that Magon was a self-confessed anarchist and a dangerous man to be at liberty in any civilized country.

Now, with regard to Magon's physical condition and his recent death, the department had received repeated reports from the prison physician at Leavenworth concerning the physical condition of this man, and none of them indicated that he was in any serious condition. The chief complaint along that line from friends of the prisoner was that he was going blind. On August 30, 1922, Doctor Yohe reported as follows:

"In compliance with your request for report and remarks as to the physical condition of Ricardo Flores Magon, Register 14596, particularly, his eyesight, Doctor Stuart, our oculist, reports that the man has incipient cataract in both eyes, but that it is not far enough advanced to necessitate or warrant an operation; there is no probability of his becoming permanently blind in the near future, and his vision is twenty one-hundredths in both eyes with proper glasses. The doctor also states it will probable be some years before an operation for cataract will be necessary, but that he is ready to perform operation when indicated, and it is my opinion the doctor is fully competent to do this work.

"Magon has no trouble in getting around without glasses, and with them attends to all his duties in library. His general health is very good; he is in no way failing physically and is standing confinement well."

In a report dated March 20, 1922, Doctor Yohe stated that he had made a complete physical examination of the prisoner and found that he was in good health; that there was no sign of mental disorder; he was standing confinement well, and there was nothing critical or dangerous in his condition and no probability of deleterious effect resulting from confinement during the remainder of his term.

On April 8, 1922, Acting Physician McKee stated that a physical examination of the prisoner that day verified the previous report that there had been no material change; the report was a true statement of the prisoner's condition at that time and there was no evidence whatever of failing health.

Friends of the prisoner, including Mr. Harry Weinberger, an attorney of New York City, insisted that Magon was in a far more dangerous condition than the report indicated and asked permission to have the prisoner examined by an outside disinterested physician of his own selection. To this the department acceded, and Mr. Weinberger selected Dr. S. B. Langworthy, of Leavenworth, Kans., to make the examination. After the department had agreed to this and had written to the warden directing that he permit this prisoner to be examined by Doctor Langworthy, provided the prisoner or his friends defrayed the expense thereof, the department received a further letter from Mr. Weinberger asking that another doctor in Kansas City be substituted in the place of Doctor Langworthy. The Attorney General replied, stating that he had already directed the warden to permit the examination to be made; that he, Weinberger, had given no reason for the change which he desired to have made, and since the department had already acted upon and granted Weinberger's original request, he was not aware of any good or sufficient reason for rescinding the action.

Mr. Weinberger replied to the Attorney General October 11, 1922, stating that he did not feel it necessary to go into his reasons for wishing Doctor Burkhart, of Kansas City, to make the examination; that Burkhart was a doctor of high standing, and the request should be acceded to.

You will recall that you were absent from the city at this time. Weinberger continued to write almost daily, and I held his letters, making no reply, and in the interim Doctor Langworthy, of Leavenworth, having been advised by the warden that the department had consented to the examination, but without any direction to do so, went ahead and examined the prisoner.

Doctor Langworthy's report, which is a lengthy one, completely confirms the diagnosis and views of the prison physician regarding Magon. That report is hereto attached.

Magon died suddenly November 21, 1922, of heart disease. None of the reports of the prison physician, nor does the report of Doctor Langworthy, refer in any respect to the prisoner having heart trouble. Upon being advised of the prisoner's death, the department wired the warden for full information. The warden replied November 22, 1922, as follows:

"Your telegram Ricardo Flores Magon died suddenly of angina pectoris in his cell yesterday morning. Mailed letter informing you of death of Magon with statement from prison physician yesterday afternoon. Prison physician says repeated examination by him and special examination by Doctor Langworthy in his presence did not disclose any evidence of disease of heart. Prison physician says Magon was always given proper medical attention. Shipping Magon's body to-day to his wife in Los Angeles, Calif."

In the article or circular issued by the joint amnesty committee, 233 Maryland Building, this city, marked "Released to-day, a. m. November 27," on which I am asked to submit a memorandum, and which is attached hereto, I note that it is stated that Magon met his death while serving a sentence for *expressions of opinion*. This same claim that Magon was being punished merely for an expression of opinion was also urged in the court of appeals, and that court, in affirming the judgment of the district court, disposed of the contention by saying that "in a very recent case, Mead *v.* United States, 257 Fed. 639, 642, we had occasion to say that free speech in times of war is by no means the same thing as free speech in times of peace; and in a later case the Supreme Court held precisely the same thing in effect." (260 Fed. 811–813.)

When it is considered that the manifesto which was the basis of the indictment brought against Magon and his associates was issued when the United States was at war, with soldiers of the Army and Navy recruits stationed in and around Los Angeles and others being in process of recruiting for both services, it is not difficult to appreciate the far-reaching effect, inimical to the interests of the United States in the successful prosecution of the war into which it had entered, upon the mind of

any wavering one into whose hands such manifesto might have fallen.

While the United States is nowhere specifically mentioned in the manifesto, yet frequent references are made to war, and the discontent in the homes of those mourning the departure of a son called to war is graphically depicted, and in this connection a political and social catastrophe prophesied. Such language, construed in the light of Magon's speech, which was printed in the same issue of Regeneracion, was, as above suggested, well calculated to inspire disloyalty and cripple the United States in its war operations.

The particular issue of the paper in question was intended not only to be mailed into Mexico but to individuals in this country. The manifesto was directed not only to members of the Mexican Party but to the anarchists of the whole world and its workingmen in general. The manifesto calls for "Activity, activity, and more activity." Activity to do what? They say, "Death of the old society is close at hand"; that it is the moment preceding the insurrection of all people against existing conditions, together with the declaration that they do not believe in government. To my mind this is *much more than a mere prediction or expression of opinion.* It is a call inciting the discontented to action—action to destroy the governments of all countries, including the Government of the United States.

It has been demonstrated, it seems to me, beyond all peradventure that these defendants are serving terms for something more than the forecasting of what is to occur in the future and the mere expression of opinions. They were inciting people to action to destroy all governments; and in this connection Magon raises the query, "What interest have we, the disinherited, in the war?" This query he makes at a public meeting, and then attempts to distribute it broadcast through his publication, Regeneracion. *Can there be any question that in his call for action he and his associate Rivera had in mind the disintegration of our Army,* that was still in process of making, and then the ultimate destruction of our form of government? I think not. They must therefore be considered as having violated the laws of our country, which were passed to be observed not only by our own citizens but by these aliens as well.

Respectfully,

JAMES A. FINCH,
Pardon Attorney.

P. S. Magon served a term of 18 months in the Arizona State Prison for conspiring to commit an offense against the United States and was released August 3, 1910. He served 30 days in St. Louis, Mo., for a criminal libel in 1905, also a term in McNeil Island for a violation of the neutrality laws.

Under date of March 6, 1916, the then Postmaster General forwarded to this department the report of a post-office inspector giving a history of the operations of petitioner and Magon, as well as other violators of the law. (Departmental file 180187-1.)

The inspector stated in substance, among other things, that the weekly publication Regeneracion was authorized admission to the second-class mail privilege at Los Angeles, Calif., post office on September 12, 1910, under the act of March 3, 1879; that at the time of its entry it was owned and managed by Anselmo L. Figueroa, but with him in editing and publishing the paper he had Enrique Flores Magon, Ricardo Flores Magon, Librado Rivera, and Antonio de Araujo. He stated, however, that as a result of indictments returned in Los Angeles in 1911 they were all convicted in June, 1912, and sentenced by the United States court to serve 1 year and 11 months in the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., for violating the neutrality act, except Antonio de Araujo, who was never apprehended, but from some point in Spain still contributed his writings to the paper.

The inspector also stated in substance that in 1903 petitioner Magon was arrested by the Mexican Government for inciting the people against it and was imprisoned, and that in 1901 he was again arrested for inciting a revolution in San Luis Potosi, Mexico, and he, together with his brother, Jesus Flores Magon, was imprisoned in Mexico City as leaders of the Liberty Party; that in 1902 petitioner and his brother Enrique were sentenced, to prison for again inciting the people to revolution, and that in the fall of 1902 the Magon brothers came to the United States in the hope of being able to propagate their ideas.

The post-office inspector states that during 1904 the Magon brothers went to San Antonio, Tex., and there published Regeneracion, but being unsuccessful, moved to St. Louis, Mo., in 1905, continuing the publication of the paper in that city, with petitioner Rivera, but after running a short time they were forced from St. Louis to Canada, where they remained until the latter part of 1906; that in the early part of 1907 the Magons, with Rivera, went to San Francisco, and then to Sacramento, Calif., where they established headquarters for the Liberal Party of Mexico; that later in the year they went to Arizona and there set on foot a military expedition against the Government of Mexico, where they were arrested, tried, and sentenced to an aggregate imprisonment of three years in the penitentiary at Yuma and Florence, Ariz., respectively.

The post office inspector states that upon regaining their liberty they, early in August, 1910, went to Los Angeles, and in the following month began to publish Regeneracion under the editorship of Anselmo L. Figueroa, with Enrique and Ricardo Flores Magon, A. L. Villareal and William C. Owen for a time being on the editorial staff, the tone of the paper, if possible, appearing more frankly revolutionary than ever. He says that during the early part of 1911 Enrique Flores Magon, Ricardo Flores Magon, Librado Rivera, with Antonio de Araujo, were in charge of its affairs, the last named having but a short time before been released from the Leavenworth Penitentiary after serving 18 months for violation of the neutrality law while secretary of the liberal party organization.

The inspector states that in February, 1911, these men set on foot through divers means a military expedition against the Government of Mexico by means of which they took control of and operated under their own direction Lower California, Mexico, the principal cities being Mexicali and Tia Juana; that they had an army of 500 men composed of outlaws, anarchists, Socialists, and Industrial Workers of the World, and that after several battles or skirmishes with the Mexican Federal Army they were successful in driving it from Lower California and confiscating all property belonging to Americans to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars.

The inspector states that this condition appears to have existed up to June 14, 1911, when upon a raid by a representative of the Department of Justice a wagonload of documents and other matter was obtained which proved sufficient to convict the five men composing the junta of violating the neutrality law, but after their arrest the Mexican Federal Army drove the rebels, who had been directed by the Magons, out of Lower California.

The inspector states that in the issue of Regeneracion of March 6, 1915, the publishers of the paper declared themselves representatives of the American Liberal Party, advising that the junta was at 2325 Ivanhoe Avenue, Los Angeles, and was formed by five members—Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magon, Antonio de Araujo, Librado Rivera, and Anselmo L. Figueroa, through which junta the army in Lower California received its instructions, and particularly so through Ricardo Flores Magon. He says that the principal generals of the junta were anarchists, socialists, and aliens, and of these quite a number were killed, and that duties were collected and arms and ammunition smuggled into Lower California with the full and complete knowledge of the five men named.

In conclusion the inspector expressed the view that the prime object of the newspaper, the editors of which were professional revolutionists, was for the dissemination of anarchistic utterances and beliefs; to incite people to revolt not only against the Government of Mexico but the authority of the United States; to villify the Chief Executive of the United States, and to incite persons along the southern border of the United States to commit arson, murder, and assassination. For these reasons he was decidedly of the opinion that the permit granting the entry of Regeneracion to the second-class mail privilege on September 12, 1910, should be revoked.

J. A. F.

—

DECEMBER 12, 1922.

(Memorandum in re Ricardo Flores Magon.)

HISTORY.

In 1893 Ricardo Flores Magon was arrested by the Mexican Government for inciting the people against the Government of Mexico and was imprisoned. In 1901 he was again arrested for inciting a revolution in San Luis Potosi, Mexico, and because of which, with Jesus Flores Magon, he was imprisoned in Mexico City as a leader of the Liberal Party. In 1902 Magon, with his brother Enrique, was sentenced to prison in Mexico for inciting the people to revolution.

In the fall of 1902 the Magon brothers came to the United States in the hope of being able to propagate their ideas in greater tranquillity. During 1904 they went to San Antonio, Tex., and there published Regeneracion, but not being successful they moved to St. Louis, Mo., in 1905 and continued the publication of that paper in that city with Librado Rivera. However, in October of that year the Magon brothers were arrested on complaint of the Mexican Government, but the case was dismissed. Following this complaint they again set

up their plant of agitation in St. Louis in 1906, but it was run for only a short time, because they were forced from St. Louis to Canada, where they remained until the latter part of that year, when they returned to Mexico for a short time, then went to El Paso, Tex. During all this time they were inciting the Mexican people, the anarchists, and socialists to revolt against the Government of Mexico.

In the early part of 1907 Ricardo and Enrique Magon, with Rivera, went to San Francisco and then to Sacramento, Calif., and established headquarters for the Liberal Party of Mexico in that city. Later on in that year they went to Arizona and there set on foot a military expedition against the Government of Mexico. Because of this act they were arrested, tried, and sentenced to 18 months in the penitentiary at Yuma, Ariz., then at Florence, Ariz., which aggregated a total sentence of about three years.

Early in August, 1910, these parties, having regained their liberty, came to Los Angeles, and the following month began to publish Regeneracion under the editorship of Anselmo L. Figueroa, with Ricardo and Enrique Magon and, for a time, A. L. Villareal on the editorial staff and William C. Owen as the English editor. Its tone, if possible, appeared even more frankly revolutionary than ever. However, later on John Kenneth Turner, author of Barbarous Mexico, and his wife edited a part of the English section of the paper and directed the policies advocated by the Liberal Party against the Government of Mexico.

During the early part of 1911 Ricardo and his brother Enrique, Librado Rivera, with Antonio de Araujo were in charge of its affairs, the last named, having but a short time before been released from Fort Leavenworth Penitentiary after serving 18 months for violation of the neutrality laws, while secretary of the Liberal Party organization. It seems that in February, 1911, these men set on foot, through divers means, a military expedition against the Government of Mexico, by means of which they took control of and operated under their own direction Lower California, Mexico, the principal cities being Mexicali and Tia Juana. They had an army of 500 men, composed of outlaws, anarchists, socialists, and Industrial Workers of the World. Several battles or skirmishes were had with the Mexican Federal Army, in which they were successful in driving the Federal Army from Lower California. They confiscated all property belonging to Americans to the extent of several hundred thousand dollars.

In the Regeneracion No. 205, issued March 6, 1915, at the bottom of page 4, the publishers of the paper declared themselves representatives of the American Liberal Party and advised that the junta was at No. 2325 Ivanhoe Avenue, Los Angeles, and formed by five members, Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magon, Antonio de Araujo, Librado Rivera, and Anselmo L. Figueroa. As a fact, it was from this junta that the army in Lower California received its instructions and particularly so through Ricardo Flores Magon. The principal generals were anarchists, socialists, and aliens, and of these quite a number were killed. They collected duties, the money from which was turned over to the junta at Los Angeles. Arms and ammunition were smuggled into Lower California, Mexico, through John K. Turner, with full and complete knowledge of the five men named.

This condition appears to have existed up to June 14, 1911, when a raid by representatives of the Department of Justice was made under the direction of the United States attorney at Los Angeles of the junta in Los Angeles, and a wagonload of documents and other matter was obtained which proved sufficient to convict the five men composing the junta of violation of the neutrality laws at Los Angeles, but Araujo escaped and has never been arrested, but is known to be in Spain. After these arrests the Mexican Federal Army drove the rebels, which had been directed by the Magons, out of Lower California, and they were delivered to Fort Rosecrans. Commissions from many of the officers were obtained at that time and held as evidence against the Magons and others, and materially assisted in the evidence produced upon which these men were convicted in the United States court in Los Angeles. Ricardo and Enrique Magon, Anselmo L. Figueroa, and Librado Rivera were convicted and sentenced to serve 1 year and 11 months in the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash.

During the period of incarceration of these men but few issues of the paper Regeneracion were mailed, and this was accomplished through William C. Owen, a naturalized Englishman and avowed anarchist, together with other friends of the prisoners.

After the release from the penitentiary of these individuals, or on October 2, 1915, Anselmo L. Figueroa died, and the paper was then edited by Ricardo and his brother Enrique, and in English by William C. Owen, and by these men the profits from its circulation were received. The publishing of this paper has been carried on at first one place and then another in Los Angeles. The papers were mailed to about 2,500 subscribers weekly.

REVIEW OF THE PAPERS.

An example of the articles appearing in Regeneracion is the following, which was taken from No. 206 of that publication, issued on Saturday, September 25, 1915, contained on page 1, column 2, in the Spanish language, and on page 2, column 3, reading as fo ows:

"Justice and not bullets is what ought to be given to the revolutionists of Texas, and from now on we should demand that those persecutions to innocent Mexicans should cease, and as to the revolutionists we should also demand that they be not executed (shot).

"The ones who should be shot are the 'rangers' and the band of bandits who accompany them in their depredations.

"RICARDO FLORES MAGON."

—

"Enough of reforms! What we hungry people need is entire liberty based on economic independence. Down with the so-called rights of private property, and as long as this evil right continues to exist we shall continue under arms. Enough with mockery! Poor people, whoever speaks to you about Carranzismo, spit in their face and break their jaws.

"Long live land and liberty!

"RICARDO FLORES MAGON."

In the issue of November 6, 1915, No. 211, an article appeared in Spanish, on page 2, column 7, reading as follows:

"So you see, brother Carrancistas, the problem which is going to be solved by the rebels who retain their arms, when Carranza becomes President, is the same problem that you will have to decide, because it affects you in the same manner. Your duty is to help, and for this purpose do not surrender your arms when the tr ops are ordered disbanded. What you should do at such a time, or before, if possible, is to rebel, turn your arms against your chiefs and officers, without trembling pulse open fire with your rifles, because they are your enemies and are concerned in having these conditions last forever so they can have a life of privilege.

"A strong heart, a firm pulse, and steady aim is all you need to exterminate your immediate oppressors.

"If you surrender your arms, you will return to your home in poverty, ready to sell your blood and strength to the rich at their own price.

"You will have accomplished nothing, but in the meantime your chiefs and officers will enjoy in that city all kinds of pleasures and honors and display on their breasts crosses and medals. If you remain in the Carranza army as a permanent soldier, you will be a bad man, an executioner of your brothers of your class, because you will help to serve the rich.

"Honor points to the road you should take; rebel against all governments until you attain the triumph of the principles comprised in the declaration of the 23d of September, 1911, exploited by the 'Mexican Liberal Party,' principles that advocate the death of capital, of authority, and the clergy of all religions.

"Decide to follow this road. Don't be deceived by the specious arguments of alleged wise politicians; these same arguments were used by the enemies of the great French Revolution to prevent the people from obtaining their political liberty. It was the argument of Porfirio Diaz to prevent you from obtaining your liberties; it is also the argument of the Carranza party used to prevent you from obtaining your economic liberty, which is the foundation of all liberties. This means the privilege of earning your living by working for yourself and being independent, and this can only be obtained, understand, by expropriation of land, houses, machinery, means of transportation, and merchandise becoming common property without distinction of men or women, race or color. He who tells you to the contrary spit in his face and even kill him, because it is necessary, it is absolutely necessary to initiate a revolutionary campaign of house cleaning.

"We, the disinherited, must rid ourselves of those who are in our way, if we can, by hook or crook, the same as we get rid of the tiger, as we annihilate the rattlesnake, as we crush the tarantula. Those who tell you that they are not prepared for this or other conquests which benefits you are the ones who have interest in delaying your emancipation so that in the meantime they can live at your expense."

Following this, on December 18, 1915, there was printed, published, and mailed hundreds of copies of "Regeneracion"

under issue No. 217, which contained an article on page 2, column 5, reading as follows:

"Wilson is in connivance with Carranza because the old sharper has promised Wilson that he would favor American capitalists in Mexico. That is, to-day Carranza has promised to deliver the Mexican people, tied hand and feet, to the same repacious American plutocracy that had Diaz enslaved."

The evidence secured relative to the publication and circulation of the various issues of "Regeneracion" was presented to the United States grand jury for the southern district of California, and on February 18, 1916, an indictment was returned charging Ricardo Flores Magon, Enrique Flores Magon, and William C. Owen with violation of section 211, penal code of 1910. Photostat copy of the indictment is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit No. 1."

Ricardo Flores Magon was convicted on the second and third counts as charged in the indictment, and was sentenced to pay a fine of $1,000 and imprisonment in the United States penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., for a term of one year and one day.

In connection with the conviction of Ricardo and his brother Enrique, the following is quoted from an order by Federal Judge Oscar A. Trippet, denying motion in arrest of judgment on September 20, 1916:

"Now, it seems to me that these defendants have got no right to come under the American flag, a flag that is supposed to be the grandest emblem of freedom in all the world, *and they have got no right to come here and do things that may involve this country into war with Mexico. They have got no right to seek the protection of the American flag in order to fight the battles they may have in Mexico.* They have been here now for 16 years, the evidence in this case shows, at all the times in trouble with this Government, violating its laws. They have got no right to do that; they are aliens to this country; they are aliens to our people; I think it would be very much more becoming of them if they would be down there in Mexico with a musket fighting for their rights, as they claim, or fighting for whatever they want to fight for instead of doing things that at the present time indicates may get us into trouble, and God forbid that we may have it."

ACTIVITIES AFTER CONVICTION FOR VIOLATION OF SECTION 211, PENAL CODE, IN MAY, 1916.

Ricardo Flores Magon continued his activities, and in a speech which he delivered on Sunday, May 27, 1917, at a meeting organized by the International Workers' Defense League in defense of Raul Palma and Odilon Luna, he made reference to himself as an anarchist. This speech is quoted in its entirety:

"Comrades: All of you know that on the 6th of this month, and while they spoke to the workers congregated at the Plaza, Raul Palma and Odilon Luna were arrested by some members of the police of this city. Palma and Luna were making use of the right that all human beings have to expose their ideas for their acceptance or rejection. The utmost composure reigned at the meeting and all indicated that the act would end happily and with great benefit from the ideals of human emancipation that the proletarian speakers propounded; but the police, headed by one Rico, took it upon themselves to inject disorder where order reigned and dragged the speakers to jail. Now, the Federal authorities are trying to deport Palma and Luna to Mexico because they are anarchists, so that Carranza may shoot them. For they will not be delivered to Zapata, they will not be delivered to Villa, neither shall they be put in the hands of Cedillo, of Pelaez, of Sibalaume, or of any other rebel; Palma and Luna will be put at the disposal of the cowardly and cunning enemy of the working class; they shall be put in the hands of Venustiano Carranza, the lackey of Wilson and of the bandits of Wall Street. The pretext used for these deportations of members of the proletarian class is that their utterances are injurious to the country owing to the special circumstances in which it finds itself. In reality anarchist doctrines are not injurious to any country, but to the pocketbooks of the vampires who live from the sweat of the workers. The words of the anarchist are words of truth and justice. *If because this country is engaged in the European carnage, our words are obnoxious, they are undoubtedly, to the interests of the capitalist class; but not to the interests of the people who are the producers of all wealth. Our words hurt those who take advantage of the European slaughter to fill their coffers.* Our words hurt the enemies of humanity; our words hurt only those who are interested in the subsistence of the inequality of fortunes; but in what way do our doctrines hurt human beings who waste their existence in the factory and the shop? What injury does the peasant suffer by our words who is obliged to work a land that is not his, and who bent and jaded deposits in the endless furrow, with the seeds that shall produce rich grain for the master, his sweat, his health, and his hopes? How can the words of the anarchist hurt the man or woman who has to work in order to live?

"*Our words hurt all of those who live from the labor of others;* our words hurt the parasites, the useless and noxious beings who suck the blood of the people. *The clergyman, the bourgeois, and the ruler; these are the ones who are injured by our words.* So much the worse for them, so much the better for us!

"*That the country is at war and that is why we can not talk. Bully reason this! It is precisely because the country is engaged in a war for the declaration of which the opinion of each and all of its inhabitants was not taken into account, that we must talk, and we must talk high and loud, hurt whom it may and no matter what the consequence of our words may be. What interest have we, the disinherited, in this war?* Are we the wretched, going to have more bread for ourselves and for our dear ones? Are we going to be freer? *No; we shall be forced,* as poor as that we are, *to shoulder a rifle, and we shall be dragged to the trenches to be torn to pieces by grapeshot, so that Rockefeller and Morgan and all the bankers, and all the merchants, and all the bandits who exploit the proletariat may increase their millions and thereby their power.* We shall give our blood in the trenches that our masters may debauch in banquets the product of our sacrifice. We shall render our existence in the battlefield, and when in the desolated home our dear ones mourn our banishment, and in it reign mourning, weeping, sorrow, and hunger, our hangmen shall put in their pockets the price of our pain and sacrifice.

"*We, the anarchists, can not shut up; we shall not shut up.* So long as injustice reigns, our voice shall be heard. We are not actuated by caprice, but by the sovereign urge of reason which points the way of duty to us, and all injustice, all imposition, all exploitation shall have to stumble over our resistance and our protest.

"Comrades: The order of the day put in force by our tyrants is silence. Do you suffer? Very well, devour your bitterness in silence. Does injustice make you indignant? So much the worse for you, for you shall have to swallow your rage.

"For tyranny, silence is a virtue, and the best citizen, in spite of the blood that humanity has shed in the struggle for liberty, continues to be he who steadfastly observes the black maxim that that, to the shame of this country, continues to embrace the entirety of duties of the oppressed toward the oppressor; to see, hear, and hush.

"In this century of the aeroplane and the Zeppelin, in this epoch of the wireless and the submarine, when God tumbles from the skies at the blast of reason, and human thought reaches with its powerful wings the lofty summit of the anarchist ideal, the old order of see, hear, and hush is an anomaly; it constitutes an outrage which men possessing free minds reject with indignation.

"See, hear, and hush was tolerated in the obscure times of Torquemada and Arbues when humanity knew no other light than the livid flames of the inquisitorial fires; see, hear, and hush was the supreme law, before which the serf of the Middle Ages patiently bowed his head; but that damnable law was buried with the bones of its upholders under the ruins of the Bastile. Why excavate those ruins and extract from its sepulchre and poin the atmosphere with the corpse of a law which culture rejects, which a new conception of human dignity can not tolerate, and which threatens to drag us to a past of shame and humiliation, from which we are redeemed at the price of the blood and sacrifice of our ancestors?

"After the Bastile, after the Commune and privilege and tyranny, in Mexico and in Russia, feel in their throats the choleric hands of the people and from Chapultepec and from Petrograd emerge on their knees the last spawns of the Pharaohs and the caliphs, it is a shame, it is an outrage that the shady emblem of oppression be unfolded to the light of the sun, the black flag of despotism with its shameful inscription of see, hear, and hush.

"To hush, when all invites us to speak; to hush, when we must shout. Go on, you haughty overlords, swallow your order, for we the anarchists are not disposed to obey it; we can not shut up, we will not shut up, and we shall speak, cost what it may.

"To hush, remain with our lips sealed through fear when before our eyes you revel in your feast of hyenas; to hush, *when you are draining millions of proletarian arteries in the fields of Europe to turn* into gold the blood of the humble; to hush, when mourning invades millions of homes, until yesterday smiling and happy; to hush, *when our hearts break to*

pieces before the sobs and tears of the orphans and the widows of the victims sacrificed to your ambition; to hush, when civilization is seriously menaced under the hoofs of allied and Teutonic Prussianism, is the same whip whether it be in the service of democracy or autocracy; to hush, when the progress slowly and painfully attained through centuries and centuries and centuries is at the point of perishing; to hush, so that those above may oppress those below at will, is something that we anarchists can not do, you contemptuous lords. Above your caprice is our right, right which we do not owe to you but to nature which has endowed us with a mind to think; and in the defense of a right—understand it well—we are ready for anything and to face it all, be it the dungeon or the gallows. Do not forget that right, no matter how much you may mutilate it, no matter how much you may crush it, no matter how much you may try to annihilate it; when it is persecuted the most, and when you are proudest of your triumph, it roars its vengeance in dynamite and belches lead from the barricade.

"The spring of every revolt is a violated right; the driving spirit of every insurrection is a wounded right; a persecuted right endangers the revolution. It was not powder that acted in the revolver of Pardinas, it was an outraged right; in the danger of Caserio it was a trampled right that flashed. To crush a right is to throw wide open the doors of rebellion. Press harder, you tyrants, that peoples need the rigors of oppression to remind them that they have the right to be free!"

This speech appeared in Regeneracion under date of July 28, 1917.

In the March 16, 1918, issue of Regeneracion, published by Magon, the following letter was quoted as received from Emma Goldman:

FEBRUARY 6, 1918.

DEAR FAITHFUL FRIENDS: How many have gone the way to Golgotha, and how many will have to go? Only time, the great redeemer of all who are made to suffer for their ideals, can tell. Time hangs heavily on those who cherish great hope, but it moves with surprising swiftness and far beyond our fondest dreams.

Russia stands a glowing proof of that. In 1905 the Tsar's troops drenched the streets of Petrograd and other cities with the blood of the revolutionists. In 1917 the revolutionary troops, more human than those who did the butchery, drove the Tsar out of Russia.

This thought came to my mind when I was being dashed up Fifth in a police patrol automobile to the Pennsylvania Station on Monday, February 5.

The avenue and streets were lined with a curious mob awaiting the parade of the soldiers from Camp Upton. Like the soldiers of the Tsar before 1915 who saw in every revolutionist an enemy to their country, the American soldiers would have greeted me with scorn and jeers and at the command of their Tsar would have taken my life in the ignorant belief that they were saving their country from a dangerous enemy.

Will time do for America what it has done for Russia? *Will her soldiers some day make common cause with her people? Who can say what the future will bring?*

The idealist may not be a prophet, but he nevertheless knows that the future will bring change, and knowing he lives for the future he is giving infinite strength to support the present.

So I, too, dear friend, will be strengthened while in prison by the passionate belief in the future, by the hope that the two years taken out of my life may help to quicken the great events time has in store for the human race. With that as my guided star, confinement, convict's clothes, and the other indignities the guilty conscience of society heaps upon those it dares not face, means no hardship.

You will want to help me while I am in prison, I know. You can do so in various ways. First, take care of my love child, Mother Earth Bulletin. I leave to your sympathetic care. I know that you will look after her tenderly, so that I may find her bigger, stronger, and more worth while when I return from Jefferson. Secondly, spread my Bolsheviki pamphlet in tribute to their great courage and marvelous vision and for the enlightenment of the American people. Thirdly, join the League for the Amnesty of the Political Prisoners. And, finally, write to Berkman and myself. Always address us as Political Prisoners. Always sign your full name.

Good bye, dear friends, but not for long—if the spirit of the Bolsheviki prevails. Long live the Bolsheviki! *May their flames spread over the world and redeem humanity from its bondage!*

Affectionately, EMMA GOLDMAN,
United States Political Prisoner,
Jefferson Prison, Jefferson City, Mo.

(Mother Earth Bulletin, 4 Jones Street, New York City.)

In connection with the Goldman letter, it is interesting to note the following article which appeared in Regeneracion for February 9, 1918, page 1, column 5, entitled, "Goldman and Berkman," and signed with the initials "R. F. M.":

"The appeal of *those two militant comrades* has been declined by the Supreme Court, which decided that the law of the obligatory military service is constitutional. Consequently, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman, who so valiantly fought for the universal peace, will have to fulfill their sentences in the penitentiaries either of Jefferson or Atlanta.

"But the American Government evidently is not taking into the account the universal solidarity of the workmen. It apparently believes that the proletariat will accept with indifference the imprisonment of Emma and Alexander. However, it realized its delusion, because the Russian proletariat has been aroused and is demanding of this Government the liberation not only of those two comrades but also that of Thomas J. Mooney and of other martyrs of San Francisco.

"*The anarchists of Petrograd are attempting to seize the American ambassador, Francis, and retain him as a hostage until our comrades will be freed.*

"This is how the people are beginning to take the defense of its interests into its own hands.

"*This is indicating that within a short time there will be no governments issuing orders above the heads of the people.*

"The sun of anarchism is ascending upon the horizon. Blind are those that do not see it.

"R. F. M."

The above activities, together with a publication of a manifesto signed by Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera on March 6, 1918, resulted in the indictment of these two individuals for violation of section 3 of title 1 and section 3 of title 9 of the act of Congress approved June 15, 1917, and commonly known as the espionage act; section 19 of the act of Congress approved October 6, 1917, commonly known as the trading with the enemy act; and section 211 of the Federal Penal Code of 1910, as amended. The indictment was filed on April 19, 1918, and a photostat copy is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit No. 2."

A photostat copy of the March 16, 1918, issue of Regeneracion, containing the manifesto, which is translated in its entirety in the indictment, is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit No. 3."

On July 24, 1918, Ricardo Flores Magon was sentenced to 2 years and a fine of $5,000 on count No. 1; a fine of $5,000 and 20 years on count No. 3; 5 years and $5,000 on count No. 4; 5 years and $5,000 on count No. 6. It was ordered that a payment of $5,000 would satisfy all fines and, further, that the penitentiary sentence would run concurrently.

Ricardo Flores Magon was delivered to the Federal penitentiary at McNeil Island, Wash., August 25, 1918. Magon requested to be transferred to the Leavenworth Penitentiary in view of his health and the Government complied with his request and he was transferred to that penitentiary on November 3, 1919.

It is very interesting to note the following statements made by Enrique Flores Magon, the brother of Ricardo, during a hearing conducted by Warren E. Long, immigrant inspector, on March 18, 1920, at the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., in connection with deportation proceedings against Enrique Flores Magon:

"Q. (By Immigrant Inspector Long.) Who is the publisher of the Regeneracion?—A. (By Enrique Flores Magon.) I was the editor and publisher.

"Q. And such of the articles that appeared in this paper were written by you?—A. By me and my brother Ricardo.

"Q. What are the aims and purposes of this paper, the Regeneracion?—A. The aims and purposes of this paper are the overthrow of the Government of Mexico and in doing justice to the Mexican people.

"Q. How is this overthrow to be effected?—A. In Mexico it is impossible to come to the polls, for all officialdom is corrupt; therefore, as there is no freedom at all, we had to resort to revolutionary means by armed force. Now, once a revolution is afloat, we have been teaching to the Mexican people not to lay down their arms until everything that has been taken away from them should fall back into their hands.

* * * * * * *

"Q. (By Immigrant Inspector Long.) I will also introduce the record of the hearing accorded Juan Villanueva, and you can examine this entire record, but your attention is particularly called to the testimony on page 3, beginning on page 2, and on page 3, in which Villanueva is asked, "You know, do you not, that Ricardo Flores Magon, who is now in the Federal prison at McNeils Island, Seattle, Wash.; and his wife,

Maria B. Magon; his brother, Enrique Flores Magon; and Tomas Martines, are all anarchists?—A. The whole world knows that they are anarchists."

There has been some contention that Ricardo Flores Magon was not an anarchist. In this connection, I desire to quote the following paragraph from a communication directed to the Department of Justice, dated November 3, 1922, by Harry Weinberger, attorney for Magon:

"By the time this goes through the usual channels of action by the Attorney General and the President, I presume the hearing by the Department of Labor will have been completed. Both Magon and Rivera admit they are anarchists and therefore you can proceed on your report on that basis."

Ricardo Flores Magon died in Leavenworth Penitentiary on November 21, 1922, from angina pectoris.

EXHIBIT I.

In the district court of the United States in and for the southern district of California, southern division.

At a stated term of said court, begun and holden at the city of Los Angeles, county of Los Angeles, within and for the southern division of the southern district of California, on the second Monday of January, A D. 1916.

The grand jurors of the United States of America, chosen, selected, and sworn, within and for the division and district aforesaid, on their oath present—

That Enrique Flores Magon, Ricardo Flores Magon, and William C. Owen, hereinafter in this indictment called defendants, whose full and true names, and the full and true name of each of whom, other than in this indictment stated is unknown to the grand jurors, late of the southern division of the southern district of California, did, on the 18th day of December, A. D. 1915, knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously deposit and cause to be deposited in the post office and the stations thereof at the city of Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, and within the said southern division of said southern district of California, and within the jurisdiction of this honorable court, certain mail matter, to wit, a newspaper published and printed in the said city of Los Angeles and named and called the Regeneracion, which said newspaper did then and there contain certain indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language, and which said newspaper was a publication of an indecent character, and which said indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language was of a character tending to incite in the minds of persons reading the same murder and assassination, and which said substance and language was so printed and published in said Regeneracion in the Spanish language, and was and is in the words following:

Wilson esta en connivencia con Carranza, porque este viejo embaucador ha prometido a aquel favorecer a los capitalistas americanos en Mexico; es decir. Carranza ha prometido a Wilson entregar al pueblo mexicano atado de pies y manos a la misma plutocracia rapaz americana a la que Diaz lo tuvo esclavizado.

Which said language being interpreted and translated into English means and is as follows:

Wilson is in connivance with Carranza, because the old sharper has promised Wilson that he would favor American capitalists in Mexico. That is to say, Carranza has promised to deliver the Mexican people, tied hand and feet, to the same rapacious American plutocracy that had Diaz enslaved.

And said newspaper of said indecent character was so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at said city of Los Angeles, to be transmitted by the post-office establishment to many and divers persons within the United States of America, and within the Republic of Mexico, the names of which divers persons are unknown to the grand jurors, and many copies of said newspaper were so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at one time and as one act to be so distributed by said post-office establishment and delivered, respectively, a copy each, to said many and divers persons.

Contrary to the form of the statutes of the United States in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

SECOND COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, on their oath aforesaid, do further present:

That Enrique Flores Magon, Ricardo Flores Magon, and William C. Owen, hereinafter in this indictment called defendants, whose full and true names, and the full and true name of each of whom, other than in this indictment stated, is unknown to the grand jurors, late of the southern district of California, did, on the 25th day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifteen, knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, deposit and cause to be deposited in the post office and the stations thereof at the city of Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, and within the said southern division of said southern district of California, and within the jurisdiction of this honorable court, certain mail matter, to wit, a newspaper published and printed in the said city of Los Angeles and named and called the Regeneracion, which said newspaper did then and there contain certain indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language, and which said newspaper was a publication of an indecent character, and which said indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language was of a character tending to incite in the minds of persons reading the same murder and assassination, and which said substance and language was so printed and published in said Regeneracion in the Spanish language and was and is in the words following:

"Justicia y no balazos, es lo que lebe darse a los revolucionarios de Texas. Y desde luego, todo debemos exigir que cesen esas persecuciones a Mexicanos inocentes, y, por lo que respecta a los revolucionarios, debemos exigir cambien que no se les fusile.

"Quienes deben ser fusilados sou los 'rangers,' y la turba de bandidos que los acompanan en sus depredaciones."

* * * * * * * *

"¡Hada de reformas! Lo que necesitamos los hambrientos, es la libertad completa, basada en la independencia economica. ¡Adajo el llamado derecho de propriedad privada! Y mientras este derecho inicuo continue en pie, en pie continuemos y con las armas en la mano todos los prolentarios. ¡Basta de burlas! Proletarios: a quien os hable de carrancismo, escupidle el rostro y quebradle los hocicos.

"¡Viva tierra y Libertad!"

Which said language being interpreted and translated into English means and is as follows:

"Justice and not bullets is what ought to be given to the revolutionists of Texas, and from now on we should demand that those persecutions to innocent Mexicans should cease, and as to the revolutionists we should also demand that they be not executed (shot).

"The ones who should be shot are the 'rangers' and the band of bandits who accompany them in their depredations."

* * * * * * * *

"Enough of reforms! What we hungry people need is entire liberty based on economic independence. Down with the so-called rights of private property, and as long as this evil right continues to exist we shall continue under arms. Enough with lockery! Poor people, whoever speaks to you about Carranzismo spit in their face and break their jaws.

"Long live land and liberty!"

And said newspaper of said indecent character was so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at said city of Los Angeles, to be transmitted by the post office establishment to many and divers persons within the United States of America and within the Republic of Mexico, the names of which divers persons are unknown to the grand jurors, and many copies of said newspaper were so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at one time and as one act to be so distributed by said post office establishment and delivered, respectively, a copy each to said many and divers persons.

Contrary to the form of the statutes of the United States in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

THIRD COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, on their oath aforesaid, do further present:

That Enrique Flores Magon, Ricardo Flores Magon, and William C. Owen, hereinafter in this indictment called defendants, whose full and true names, and the full and true name of each of whom, other than in this indictment stated, is unknown to the grand jurors, late of the southern division of the southern district of California, did, on the 6th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1915, knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, deposit and cause to be deposited in the post office and the stations thereof at the city of Los Angeles, in the county of Los Angeles, State of California, and within the said southern division of said southern district of California, and within the jurisdiction of this honorable court, certain mail matter, to wit, a newspaper published and printed in the said city of Los Angeles, and named and called the Regeneracion, which said newspaper did then and there contain certain indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language, and which said newspaper was a publication of an

indecent character, and which said indecent, vile, and filthy substance and language was of a character tending to incite in the minds of persons reading the same murder and assassination, and which said substance and language was so printed and published in said Regeneracion in the Spanish language, and was and is in the words following:

"Ves ques, hermano carrancista, que el problema que tratan de resolver los rebeldes que van a quedar en pie, con las armas en la mano, cuando Carranza sea presidente, es el mismo problema que tienes que resolver tu, porque to afecta de la misma manera que a ellos. Tu debres ayudarlos, y para ello, no entreque las armas cuando se ordene el licenciamiento de tropas carrancistas. Lo que debes hacer en ese momento, o antes si te es posible, es rebelarte, volviendo tu fusil sobre tus jefes y oficiales, sin que te tiemble el pulso al disparles tu arma, porque son tus en emigos, questienen interes en que perduren las instituciones que los capacitan para llevar una vida privilegiada. Un corazon bien puesto, pulso firme y certera punteria, eso es lo unico que necesitas para acabar con tus inmediatos verdugos.

"Sin rindes tu arma, regresaras a tu hogar en la miseria, dispuesto a vender tu fuerza muscular a cualquier burgues por lo que tenga a bien darte. Nada habras ganado, mientras tus jefes y oficiales gozaran en la ciudad de toda clase de placeras, saborearan distinciones y ostentaran cruces y medallas en al pecho. Si te quedas enel ejercito carrancista como soldado permanente, seres un esbirro, un verdugo de tus hermanos de clase, porque serviras para apoyar a los ricos.

"Lashonrades te senala el camino que debes tomar: El de la rebeldia contra todo gobierno hasta alcanzar el triunfo de los principios contenidos en el manifiesto de 23 de septiembre de 1911, expedido por la Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano, principios que abogan por la muerte del Capital, de la autoridad y del Clero de todas las religiones.

"Decidate a seguir este camino. Que no te enganen los sabihondos con la majaderia de que necesitas tal o cual preparacion para emprender una lucha semejante. Esas son argucias de politicos; esos son sofismas propalados y fomentados por tus enemigos, aun cuando ellos se presenten con el caracter de amigos tuyos. Fue el argumento de los enemigos de la gran revolucion Francesa, para impedir que se diera al pueblo la libertad politica; fue el argumento de Porfirio Dias para impedir que se te dieran libertades; es el argumento de los policios carrancistas para que no obtengas la libertad economica, base de todas las libertados, y que no es otra que la facultad de ganarse la vida, por medio del trabajo, sin necesidad de depender de nadie, facultad que se consigue solamente, entiendole bien, solamente, haciendo que la tierra, las casas, la maquinaria, los medios de transportacion y los efectos almacenados, pasen a ser, por medio de la expropiacion, la propiedad coman de todos, hombres y mujeres, sin distincion, de rasa ni color. A quien te diga lo contrario, escupela la cara y aun matalo, pues es necesario, es absolutamente necesario iniciar un severo procedimiento de limpia revolucionaria. Lo que nos estorba a los desheredados, debemos suprimirlo como se queda: Por la buena o por la mala! Como se suprime al tigre, come se aniquila a la vibora de cascabel, como se splasta a la tarantula. Los que te dicen que todavia no estas preparado para tal o cual conquista que te beneficia, son los que tienen interes en que se retarde tu emancipacion, para poder ellos entre tanto vivir a tus expensus."

Which said language being interpreted and translated into English means and is as follows:

"So you see, brother Carrancistas, the problem which is going to be solved by the rebels who retain their arms when Carranza becomes president is the same problem that you will have to decide, because it affects you in the same manner. Your duty is to help, and for this purpose do not surrender your arms when the troops are ordered disbanded. What you should do at such a time, or before, if possible, is to rebel, turn your arms against your chiefs and officers, and without trembling pulse open fire with your rifles, because they are your enemies and are concerned in having these conditions last forever so they can have a life of privilege.

"A strong heart, a firm pulse, and steady aim is all you need to exterminate your immediate oppressors.

"If you surrender your arms, you will return to your home in poverty, ready to sell your blood and strength to the rich at their own price.

"You will have accomplished nothing, but in the meantime your chiefs and officers will enjoy in the city all kinds of pleasures and honors and display on their breasts crosses and medals. If you remain in the Carranza army as a permanent soldier, you will be a bad man, an executioner of your brothers of your class, because you will help to serve the rich.

"Honor points to the road you should take; rebel against all governments until you attain the triumph of the principles comprised in the declaration of the 23d of September, 1911, expedited by the 'Mexican Liberal Party,' principles that advocate the death of capital, of authority, and the clergy of all religions.

"Decide to follow this road. Don't be deceived by the specious arguments of alleged wise politicians; these same arguments were used by the enemies of the great French revolution to prevent the people from obtaining their political liberty. It was the argument of Porfirio Diaz to prevent you from obtaining your liberties; it is also the argument of the Carranza party used to prevent you from obtaining your economic liberty, which is the foundation of all liberties. This means the privilege of earning your living by working for yourself and being independent, and this can only be obtained, understand, by expropriation of land, houses, machinery, means of transportation, and merchandise becoming common property without distinction of men or women, race or color. He who tells you to the contrary spit in his face and even kill him, because it is necessary, it is absolutely necessary to initiate a revoluntionary campaign of house cleaning.

"We, the disinherited, must rid ourselves of those who are in our way, if we can, by hook or crook, the same as we get rid of the tiger, as we annihilate the rattlesnake, as we crush the tarantula. Those who tell you that they are not prepared for this or other conquests which benefit you are the ones who have interest in delaying your emancipation so that in the meantime they can live at your expense."

And said newspaper of said indecent character was so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at said city of Los Angeles, to be transmitted by the post office establishment to many and divers persons within the United States of America and within the Republic of Mexico, the names of which divers persons are unknown to the grand jurors, and many copies of said newspaper were so deposited and caused to be deposited in said United States post office at one time and as one act to be so distributed by said post office establishment and delivered, respectively, a copy each to said many and divers persons.

Contrary to the form of the statutes of the United States in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

_____, _____,

United States Attorney.

_____, _____,

Assistant United States Attorney.

EXHIBIT II.

Service of the within citation is hereby accepted at Los Angeles, Calif., this 2d day of January, 1919.

T. F. GREEN,

Asst. U. S. Attorney for Southern District of California.

(Indorsed: No. 1421—Crim. In the District Court of the United States in and for the Southern District of California, Southern Division. Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, plaintiffs in error, *v.* United States of America, defendant in error. Citation to writ of error. Filed January 2, 1919. Charles N. Williams, clerk. Murray C. White, deputy. J. H. Ryckman, Chaim Shapiro, S. G. Pandit, attorneys for plaintiffs in error. J. H. Ryckman, lawyer, suite 921 Higgins Building, Second and Main Streets, Los Angeles, Calif. 62741.)

In the district court of the United States in and for the southern district of California, southern division.

At a stated term of said court begun and holden at the city of Los Angeles, county of Los Angeles, within the southern division of the southern district of California, on the second Monday of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighteen.

The grand jurors of the United States of America, chosen, selected, and sworn within and for the division and district aforesaid, on their oath present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are, and the full and true names of each is, other than as herein stated, to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit, on or about the 1st day of March, 1918, at the city of Los Angeles, within the State and southern division of the southern district of California, did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully,

and feloniously conspire, combine, confederate, and agree together to violate the laws of the United States of America, to wit, to violate section 3 of Title I and section 3 of Title XII of the act of Congress approved June 15, 1917, and commonly known as the espionage act; section 19 of the act of Congress approved October 6, 1917, commonly known as the trading with the enemy act; and section 211 of the Federal Penal Code of 1910, as amended, which said conspiracy was substantially as follows, to wit: That they, the said Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, would write and cause to be written and published and cause to be published an article containing false reports and false statements which would tend to interfere with the operation and success of the military and naval forces of the United States; promote the success of its enemies; cause and attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States; and would obstruct the recruiting and enlistment service of the United States; and which said article would be printed and caused to be printed, published and caused to be published, and circulated and caused to be circulated in a foreign language, to wit, the Spanish language, without first filing an English translation thereof with the postmaster of the city of Los Angeles, as required by law; and which said article they would publish and cause to be published in a newspaper called Regeneracion; and which said article so published they would deposit and cause to be deposited in the postoffice establishment of the United States for mailing and delivery by means of the said post-office establishment; and defendants intended that the said article would then and there be indecent and contain indecent matter and language.

That in furtherance of said conspiracy, combination, confederation, and agreement, and to accomplish the object thereof, the said Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera did, on or about the 16th day of March, 1918, publish and cause to be published in said newspaper so known as Regeneracion, a certain manifesto, in words and figures as follows, to wit:

MANIFESTO.

La Junta Organizadora del Partido Liberal Mexicano.

A los miembros del partido, a los anarquistas de todo el mundo y a los trabajadores en general.

Companeros:

El reloj de la Historia está próximo a señalar con su aguja inexorable el instante en que ha de producirse la muerte de esta sociedad que agoniza.

La muerte de la vieja sociedad está próxima, no tarda en ocurrir, y sólo podrán negar este hecho, aquellos a quienes interesa que viva, aquellos que se aprovechan de la injusticia en que está basada, aquellos que ven con horror la Revolución Social, porque saben que al día siguiente de ella, tendrán que trabajar codo con codo con sus esclavos de la víspera.

Todo indica, con fuerza de evidencia, que la muerte de la sociedad burguesa no tarda en sobrenir. El ciudadano ve con torva mirada al polizonte, a quien todavía ayer consideraba su protector y su apoyo; el lector asiduo de la prensa burguesa encoje los hombros y deja caer con desprecio la hoja prostituída en que aparecen las declaraciones de los jefes de Esatdo; el trabajador se pone en huelga sin importarle que con su actitud se perjudiquen los patrios intereses; consciente ya de que la patria no es su propiedad, sino la propiedad del rico; en la calle se ven rostros que a las claras delatan la tormenta, interior del descontento, y hay brazos que parece que se agitan para construir la barricada; se murmura en la cantina; se murmura en el teatro; se murmura en el tranvía, y en cada hogar, especialmente en nuestros hogares, en los hogares de los de abajo, se lamenta la partida de un hijo a la guerra o los corazones se oprimen y los ojos se humedecen al pensar que mañana, que tal vez hoy mismo, el mocetón que es la alegría del tugurio, el joven que con su frescura y su gracia envuelve en resplandores de aurora la triste existencia de los padres que los están en su ocaso, será arrancado del seno amoroso de la familia, para ir a enfrentarlo, arma al brazo, con otro joven que es como él e encanto de su hogar, y a quien no odia, y a quien no puede odiar porque ni siquiera le conoce.

Las flamos del descontento se avivan al soplo de la tiranía cada vez más ensoberbecida y cruel en todo país y aquí y allí, allá y acullá y en todas partes, los puños se crispan, las mentes se exaltan, los corazones laten con violencia, y donde no se murmura, se grita, suspirando todos por el momento en que las manos encallecidas en cien siglos de labor, deban dejar caer la herramienta fecunda, para levantar el rifle que espera nerviosa la caricia del héroe.

Compañeros: El momento es solemne; es el momento precursor de la más grandiosa catastrofe política y social que la Historia registra; la insurrección de todos los pueblos contra las condiciones existentes.

Va a ser, seguramente, un impulso ciego de las masas que sufren; va a ser, a no dudarlo, la explosión desordenada de la cólera comprimida apenas por el revólver del esbirro y la horca del verdugo; va a ser el desbordamiento de todas las indignaciones y de todas las amarguras, y va a producirse el caos, el caos propicio al medro de todos los pescadores a río revuelto; caos del que pueden surgir nuevas opresiones y tiranías nuevas, porque en esos casos, regularmente, el charlatán es el leader.

Toca, pues, a nosotros, los conscientes, preparar la mentalidad popular para cuando llegue el momento, ya que no preparar la insurrección, porque la insurrección nace de la tiranía.

Preparar al pueblo no sólo para que espere con serenidad los grandiosos acontecimientos que vislumbramos, sino para que sea capaz de no dejarse arrastrar por los que quieran conducirlo, ahora por camino de flores, a idéntica esclavitud o a tiranía semejante a la que hoy sufrimos.

Para lograr que la rebeldía inconsciente no forje con sus propios brazos la cadena nueva que de nuevo ha de esclavizar al pueblo es preciso que nosotros, todos los que no creemos en gobierno, todos los que estamos convencidos de que gobierno, cualquiera que sea su forma y quienquieraque se encuentre al frente de él, es tiranía, porque no es una institución creada para protejer al débil, sino para amparar al fuerte, nos coloquemos a la altura de las circunstancias y sin temor propaguemos nuestro santo ideal anarquista, el único humano, el único justo, el único verdadero.

No hacerlo, es traicionar a sabiendas las vagas aspiraciones de los pueblos a una libertad sin límites, como no sean los límites naturales, esto es, una libertad que no dañe a la conservación de la especie.

No hacerlo, es dejar manos libres a todos aquellos que quieran aprovechar para fines meramente personales el sacrificio de los humildes.

No hacerlo, es afirmar lo que dicen nuestros contrarios, que está muy lejano el tiempo en que pueda implantarse nuestro ideal.

Actividad, actividad y más acitividad, eso es lo que reclama el momento.

Que cada hombre y cada mujer que amen el ideal anarquista, lo propaguen con tesón, con terquedad, sin hacer aprecio de burlas, sin medir peligros, sin reparar en consecuencias.

Manos a la obra camaradas y el porvenir será para nuestro ideal.

TIERRA Y LIBERTAD.

Dado en Los Angeles, Estado de California, Estados Unidos de América, el día 6 de marzo de 1918.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON,
LIBRADO RIVERA.

[NOTA.—Contestaciones a esta Manifiesto, remítanse a Ricardo Flores Magón, P. O. box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.]

—

A true and correct translation of said manifesto is as follows, to wit:

MANIFESTO—THE ASSEMBLY OF ORGANIZATION OF THE MEXICAN LIBERAL PARTY.

To the members of the party, the anarchists of the whole world, and the workingmen in general.

COMPANIONS: The clock of history will soon point with its hands inexorable the instant producing death to this society already agonizing.

The death of the old society is close at hand; it will not delay much longer, and only those will deny the fact whom its continuation interests; those that profit by the injustice in which it is based; those that see with horror the approach of the revolution, for they know that on the following day they will have to work side by side with their former slaves.

Everything indicates with force of evidence that the death of the bourgeoisie society will come unexpectedly. The citizen with grim gaze looks at the policeman whom only yesterday he considered his protector and support; the assiduous reader of the bourgeoisie press shrugs the shoulders and drops with contempt the prostituted sheet in which appear the declarations of the chiefs of State; the workingman goes on strike, not taking into account that by his action he injures the country's interest, conscious now that the country is not his property but is the property of the rich; in the street are seen faces which clearly show the interior torment of discontent, and there are arms that appear agitated to construct barricades; murmurs in the saloons, in the theaters, in the street cars, in

each home, especially in our homes, in the homes of those below where is mourned the departure of a son called to the war, or hearts oppressed and eyes moistened when thinking that to-morrow, perhaps to-day even, the boy who is the joy of the hut, the youngster who with his frankness and gentility wraps in splendor the gloomy existence of the parents in senescence will be but by force torn from the bosom of the family to face, gun in hand, another youngster who like himself was the enchantment of his home, and whom he does not hate and can not hate, for he even does not know him.

"The flames of discontent revived by the blow of tyranny each time more enraged and cruel in every country and here and there everywhere and in all parts, the fists contract, the minds exalt, the hearts beat violently, and where they do not murmur they shout, all sighing for the moment in which the calloused hands during hundred centuries of labor, they must drop the fecund tools and grab the rifle which nervously awaits the caress of the hero." * * * "It is the moment preceding the greatest political and social catastrophe the history registers, the insurrection of all people against existing conditions."

It will be surely a blind impulse of the masses which suffer, it will be without a doubt, the disorderly explosion of the fury restrained, hardly by the revolver of the bailiff and the gallows of the hangman; it will be the overflow of all the indignation and all the sorrows and will produce the chaos, the chaos favorable to all who fish in turbid waters; chaos from which may sprout new oppressions and new tyrannies for in such cases, regularly, the charlatan is the leader.

It falls to our lot, the intellectual, to prepare the popular mentality until the moment arrives, and while not preparing the insurrection, since insurrection is born of tyranny.

Prepare the people not only to await with serenity the grand events which we see glimmer, but to enable them to see and not let themselves be dragged along by those who want to induce them, now over a flowery road, toward identic slavery and a similar tyranny as to-day we suffer.

To gain that the unconscious rebelliousness may not forge with its own hands a new chain that anew will enslave the people, "it is precise, that all of us, all that do not believe in government, all that are convinced that government whichsoever its form may be and whoever may be the head, it is tyranny, because it is not an institution created for the protection of the weak, but to support the strong, we place ourselves at the height of circumstances and without fear propagate our holy anarchist ideal, the only just, the only human, the only true."

To not do it, is to betray, knowingly, the vague aspirations of the populace to a liberty without limits, unless it be the natural limits; that is, a liberty which does not endanger the conservation of the specie.

To not do it, is giving free hand to all those who desire to benefit merely their own personal ends through the sacrifice of the humble.

To not do it, is to affirm what our antagonists assure, that the time is still far away when our ideals will be adopted.

Activity, activity, and more activity, is the demand of the moment.

Let every man and every woman who loves the anarchist ideal propagate with tenacity, with inflexibility, without heeding sneer, not measuring dangers, and without taking on account the consequences.

Ready for action and the future will be for our ideal. Land and liberty.

Given in Los Angeles, State of California, United States of America, the 6th day of March, 1918.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.
LIBRADO RIVERA.

NOTE: Answers to this manifesto forward to Ricardo Flores Magon, P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif., U. S. A.

Contrary to the form of statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

SECOND COUNT—DEMURRER SUSTAINED AS TO THIS COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are, and that the full and true name of each is, other than as herein stated, to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern division of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit: On or about the 16th day of March, 1918, at Los Angeles, within the State and southern division of the southern district of California, did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously make and convey false statements and reports with the intent to interfere with the operation and success of the military and naval forces of the United States, and to promote the success of its enemies, the United States being then and there at war, by then and there publishing and causing to be published in a certain newspaper known as Regeneracion, published and printed in said city of Los Angeles, Calif., a certain article, which said article and a true and correct translation of said article are set out at length in the first count hereof, at pages 3 to 10, both inclusive, and which said article and the translation thereof are hereby made a part of this second count by reference, with the same force and effect as if set out at length herein; that said article so published as aforesaid, contains the following false statements and false reports, that is to say: "The death of the old society is close at hand and will not delay much longer, and only those will deny the fact whom its continuation interests," defendants meaning to charge thereby that the United States Government was then and there moribund; "the workingman goes on strike not taking in account that by his action he injures the country's interest, conscious now that the country is not his property but is the property of the rich," defendants meaning thereby to state that the workingman had no part or ownership in the United States; "the flames of discontent revived by the blow of tyranny, each time more enraged and cruel in every country and here and there, everywhere and in all parts, the fists contract, the minds exalt, the hearts beat violently, and where they do not murmur, they shout, all sighing for the moment in which the calloused hands during hundred centuries of labor, they must drop the fecund tools and grab the rifle, which nervously awaits the caress of the heroes," defendants meaning thereby to charge that the United States Government is tyrannical and that the citizens are ready to revolt and overthrow their Government; all of which statements and reports defendants then and there well knew to be false and untrue.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

THIRD COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid upon their oaths aforesaid do further present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are, and the full and true name of each is, other than as herein stated to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern division of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit, on or about the 16th day of March, 1918, within the city of Los Angeles, State and southern division of the southern district of California, did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously, when the United States was at war, cause and attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States by then and there publishing and causing to be published in a certain newspaper published and printed in Los Angeles, Calif., known as Regeneracion, a certain article, which said article and a true and correct translation thereof are set out at length in the first count hereof at pages 3 to 10, both inclusive, and which said article and the translation thereof are hereby made a part of this third count by reference, with the same force and effect as if set out at length herein;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

FOURTH COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid upon their oaths aforesaid do further present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are, and the full and true name of each is, other than as herein stated, to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern division of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit, on or about the 16th day of March, 1918, did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously use and attempt to use the United States mails for the transmission of nonmailable matter by then and there depositing and causing to be deposited in the United States post office at Los Angeles, Calif., for mailing and delivery a certain newspaper printed and published at Los Angeles, Calif., known as Regeneracion, which said newspaper was then and there addressed to "Luz Esparza Staples, Guadalupe co Tex.," and which said newspaper then and there contained nonmailable matter, to wit, an article, which said article and a true and correct translation thereof are set out at length in the first count hereof, at pages 3 to 10, both inclusive, and which said article and the translation thereof are hereby made a part of this fourth count by reference, with the same force and effect as if set out at length herein, which said article then and there contained matter advocating and urging treason, insurrection, and

forcible resistance to the laws of the United States, all of which was then and there well known to the said Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera;

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

FIFTH COUNT.

And the grand jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are and the full and true name of each is, other than as herein stated, to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern division of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit, at a time when the United States was at war, on or about the 16th day of March, 1918, did knowingly, willfully, and unlawfully print, publish, and circulate, and cause to be printed, published, and circulated, in a foreign language, to wit, the Spanish language, an editorial respecting the Government of the United States, the present war, the policy of the United States, and the state and conduct of the war; that is to say, the said defendants at the time and place aforesaid did publish a certain article in a newspaper printed and published in Los Angeles, Calif., known as Regeneracion, which said article and a true and correct translation thereof are set out at length in the first count hereof, at pages 3 to 10, both inclusive, and which said article and the translation thereof are hereby made a part of this fifth count by reference with the same force and effect as if set out at length herein, without having first filed with the postmaster at Los Angeles, Calif., in the form of an affidavit, a true and correct and complete translation of the article aforesaid, as required by law.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

SIXTH COUNT.

And the grand jury aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further present:

That Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera, whose full and true names are and the full and true name of each is, other than as herein stated, to the grand jurors unknown, each late of the southern division of the southern district of California, heretofore, to wit, on or about the 16th day of March, 1918, did knowingly, willfully, unlawfully, and feloniously deposit and cause to be deposited in the post office and the stations thereof at the city of Los Angeles, State and southern division of the southern district of California, certain mail matter, to wit, a newspaper published and printed at Los Angeles, Calif., known as Regeneracion, which said newspaper was addressed to "Mrs. S. E. Raybon, 1107 Tampa Street, Tampa, Fla.," and which said newspaper did then and there contain certain indecent substance and language, and which said newspaper was a publication of an indecent character, and which said indecent substance and language was of a character tending to incite in the minds of persons reading the same murder and assassination, and which said substance and language was so printed and published in said Regeneracion in the Spanish language; and said article is, with a true and correct translation thereof, set out at length in the first count hereof, at pages 3 to 10, both inclusive, and which said article and the translation thereof are hereby made a part of this sixth count by reference with the same force and effect as if set out at length herein.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the said United States.

J. R. O'CONNOR,
United States Attorney.
W. F. PALMER,
Assistant United States Attorney.

(Indorsed: Form No. 195. No. 1421—Crim. United States District Court, Southern District of California, Southern Division. The United States of America *v.* Ricardo Flores Magon and Librado Rivera. Indictment. Viol. sec. 37, F. P. C., 1910, conspiracy. Viol. sec. 3, act of June 15, 1917, publishing false statements tending to interfere with success of military and naval forces of United States; causing and attempting to cause insubordination, mutiny, and refusal of duty in military and naval forces of United States. Viol. sec. 3, Title XII, act of June 15, 1917, using mails for transmission of nonmailable matter. Viol. sec. 19, act of Oct. 6, 1917, printing in foreign language matter respecting Government policies, etc., without having filed translation with postmaster. Viol. sec. 211, F. P. C., 1910, mailing indecent matter. A true bill. Meredith P. Snyder, foreman. Filed Apr. 19, 1918. Chas. N. Williams, clerk; by Geo. W. Fenimore, deputy clerk.)

EXHIBIT III.

[From Regeneración, periodico revolucionario.]

(Epoca IV; número 262; subscripción voluntaria; número suelto, 5 cs.; Editor, Ricardo Flores Magón; dirección, P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.)

AL BORDE DEL ABISMO.

La burguesia se encuentra al borde de un abismo, de un abismo ahondado con sus uñas rapaces, de un abismo ahondado todavia más a dentelladas de jabali furioso.

La burguesia se encuentra al borde de un abismo, de un abismo profundo y negro abierto en siglos y siglos de opresión y de crimen.

Y la burguesia resbala hacia ese abismo en un suelo saturado de sangre y de lágrimas, sangre y lágrimas que su crueldad ha hecho derramar.

En vano intenta afirmar su planta en un suelo hostil a la tirania y fija la mirada en el horizonte obscuro con la esperanza de descubrir la mano nervuda que ha de impedir su irremediable caida.

No hay ancla de salvación en perspectiva no hay una brizna de yerba a la cual asirse, no hay un hierro candente al alcance de la mano.

El derrumbamiento es fatal; un soplo airado, que es como el aliento colérico de toda una humanidad que sufre, la empuja a las tinieblas del abismo, del abismo profundo ye negro abierto en siglos y siglos de opresión y de crimen.

Es el soplo inexorable de las masas proletarias cansadas del yugo, ahitas de amargura, rebosantes de odio.

Es el soplo formidable de las obscuras falanjes de la miseria, el aliento calido de los desheredados que se resuelven ya a enarbolar sus andrajos como bandera de reivindicación y de represalia, como estandarte de justicia y de venganza.

La burguesía tiembla bajo un cielo en que se van apagando todos los soles que la brindaban calor y la daban vida: Díaz, desaparecio; Nicolás, se desyaneció en las t nieblas; Huerta, se eclipsó; Kerensky, es un astro errante y sin brillo; Carranza, se opaca; Wilson, pierde su lustre; Menocal, enlodado, chorrea fango; Alfonso, pierde el equilibrio, y para sostenerse siquiera por un instante, comete la estupidez de apoyar el pie en el cuello proletario; Irigoyen, se hunde; Guillermo, condenado por la conciencia humana, bate furiosamente las alas en el lodo como un buitre herido.

Los soles se opacan! Los soles se mueren!

En la noche cerrada, Poincaré parpadea como la luz de una linterna de ventorro, y Eduardo apenas brilla como la luz amarillenta de una cerilla.

Esta gran tragedia bien podría tener por título. La muerte de los Dioses o El Crepúsculo de los Idolos.

Y qué muerte y qué crepósculo tan sin gloria y tan sin brillo!

Ya en el borde del abismo, la burguesía quiere jugar su última carta; no se resigna a morir; no puede renunciar a sus placeres y a sus privilegios sacados del sudor y de las lágrimas del pobre, sin dar las últimas dentelladas y los postreros zarpazos.

Y los zarpazos y las dentalladas se dirigen hoy contra Rusia, fuente de donde manan intrépidas corrientes de rebeldía fecunda, y mañana se dirigirán contra México, fértil admácigo de reivindicaciön proletaria.

Los gobiernos, astros moribundos, se confabulan para desplomarse sobre Rusia, y un sol enorme, el Japón, se precipita a gran priso sobre Siberia, con la esperanza de sofocar con su mole el incendio revolucionario, cuyo calor desentumece los miembros ateridos del proletariado universal.

Al calor de esa lumbre cobran animo los tímidos y los fuertes aspiran a pulmones amplios el ambiente saturado de rebeldía, señalando a las masas medrosas el resplandor que de Rusia se extiende por el orbe entero.

El terreno está abonado para la nueva cosecha: la emancipación proletaria.

El reinado de la burguesía está por terminar.

Nadie la ha matado: se ha suicidado!

Un piadoso puntapié y desaparecerá en las tinieblas de su propia obra.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

—

MANIFIESTO—LA JUNTA ORGANIZADORA DEL PARTIDO LIBERAL MEXICANO—A LOS MIEMBROS DEL PARTIDO, A LOS ANARQUISTAS DE TODO EL MUNDO Y A LOS TRABAJADORES EN GENERAL.

Compañeros: El reloj de la Historia está próximo a señalar con su aguja inexorable el instante en que ha de producirse la muerte de esta sociedad que agoniza.

La muerte de la vieja sociedad está próxima, no tarda en ocurrir, y sólo podrán negar este hecho, aquellos a quienes interesa que viva, aquellos que se aprovechan de la injusticia en que está basada, aquellos que ven con horror la revolución social, porque saben que al día siguiente de ella, tendrán que trabajar codo con codo con sus esclavos de la víspera.

Todo indica, con fuerza de evidencia, que la muerte de la sociedad burguesa no tarda en sobrevenir. El ciudadano ve con torva mirada al polizonte, a quien todavía ayer consideraba su protector y su apoyo; el lector asiduo de la prensa burguesa encoje los hombros y deja caer con desprecio la hoja prostituída en que aparecen las declaraciones de los jefes de Estado; el trabajador se pone en huelga sin importarle que con su actitud se perjudiquen los patrios intereses, consciente ya de que la patria no es su propiedad, sino la propiedad del rico; en la calle se ven rostros que a las claras delatan la tormenta interior del descontento, y hay brazos que parece que se agitan para construir la barricada; se murmura en la cantina; se murmura en el teatro; se murmura en el tranvía, y en cada hogar, especialmente en nuestros hogares, en los hogares de los de abajo, se lamenta la partida de un hijo a la guerra o los corazones se oprimen y los ojos se humedecen al pensar que mañana, que tal vez hoy mismo, el mocetón que es la alegría del tugurio, el joven que con su frescura y su gracia envuelve en resplandores de aurora la triste existencia de los padres que están en su ocaso, será arrancado del seno amoroso de la familia, para ir a entrentarlo, arma al brazo, con otro joven que es como él e encanto de su hogar, y a quien no odia, y a quien no puede odiar porque ni siquiera le conoce.

Las flamas del descontento se avivan al soplo de la tiranía cada vez más ensoberbecida y cruel en todo país, y aquí y allí, allá y acullá y en todas partes, los puños se crispan, las mentes se exaltas, los corazones laten con violencia, y donde no se murmura, se grita, suspirando todos por el momento en que las manos encallecidas en cien siglos de labor, deban dejar caer la herramienta fecunda, para levantar el rifle que espera nervioso la caricia del héroe.

Compañeros: el momento es solemne; es el momento precursor de la más grandiosa catástrofe política y social que la Historia registra: la insurrección de todos los pueblos contra las condiciones existentes.

Va a ser, seguramente, un impulso ciego de las masas que sufren; va a ser, a no dudarlo, la explosión desordenada de la cólera comprimida apenas por el revólver del esbirro y la horca del verdugo; va a ser el desbordamiento de todas las indignaciones y de todas las amarguras, y va a producirse el caos, el caos propicio al medro de todos los pescadores a río revuelto; caos del que pueden surgir nuevas opresiones y tiranías nuevas, porque en esos casos, regularmente, el charlatán es el leader.

Toca, pues, a nosotros, los conscientes, preparar la mentalidad popular para cuando llegue el momento, ya que no preparar las insurrección, porque la insurrección nace de la tiranía.

Preparar al pueblo no sólo para que espere con serenidad los grandiosos acontecimientos que vislumbramos, sino para que sea capaz de no dejarse arrastar por los que quieran conducirlo, ahora por camino de flores, a idéntica esclavitud o a tiranía semejante a la que hoy sufrimos.

Para lograr que la rebeldía inconsciente no forje con sus propios brazos la cadena nueva que de nuevo ha de esclavizar al pueblo, es preciso que nosotros, todos los que no creemos en gobierno, todos los que estamos convencidos de que gobierno, cualquiera que sea su forma y quienquieraque se encuentre al frente de él, es tiranía, porque no es una institución creada para protejer al débil, sino para amparar al fuerte, nos coloquemos a la altura de las circunstancias y sin temor propaguemos nuestro santo ideal anarquista, el único humano, el único justo, el único verdadero.

No hacerlo, es traicionar a sabiendas las vagas aspiraciones de los pueblos a una libertad sin límites, como no sean los límites naturales, esto es, una libertad que no dañe a la conservación de la especie.

No hacerlo, es dejar manos libres a todos aquellos que quieran aprovechar para fines meramente personales el sacrificio de los humildes.

No hacerlo, es afirmar lo que dicen nuestros contrarios, que esta muy lejano el tiempo en que pueda implantarse nuestro ideal.

Actividad, actividad y más actividad, eso es lo que reclama el momento.

Que cada hombre y cada mujer que amen el ideal anarquista, lopropaguen con tesón, con terquedad, sin hacer aprecio de burlas, sin medir peligros, sin reparar en consecuencias.

Manos a la obra camaradas y el porvenir será para nuestro ideal.

TIERRA Y LIBERTAD.

Dado en Los Angeles, Estado de California, Estados Unidos de América, el dia de 6 de Marzo de 1918.

RICARDO FLORES MAGÓN.
LIBRADO RIVERA.

[Nota.—Contestaciones a este Manifiesto, remítanse a Ricardo Flores Magón, P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Cal., U. S. A.]

REGENERACION.

Otra vez ve la luz pública este amado periódico, constando sólo de dos páginas.

Sin dinero y con la precisión gubernamental encima, este periódico, ni puede salir con regularidad, ni puede tener dimensiones mayores para contener abundante material de propaganda.

Pedimos a todos los que reciben este periódico, que procuren hacer entender a las personas con quienes tratan, que es necesario tener en pie hojas como Regeneracion, tan necesarias en este momento de la historia humana.

No pedimos imposibles: si cada trabajador que leé Regeneracion procurase que dos, tres o más de sus amigos o concocidos cooperasen con cualquier cantidad para el sostenimiento de la publicación, este periódico saldría con regularidad.

¿Lo haréis así, hermanos de miseria y aflicciones?

Esperamos vuestra decisión.

R. F. M.

—

Despues que leas Regeneracion mandalo en sobre cerrado a alguno de tus amigos de Mexico.

—

LA REVOLUCION RUSA.

Nikolai Lenine, el leader ruso, es en estos momentos la figura revolucionaria que brillantinás en el caos de las condiciones existentes en todo el mundo, porque se halla al frente de un movimiento que tiene que provocar, quiéranlo o no lo quieran los engreídos con el sistema actual de explotación y de crimen, la gran revolución mundial que ya está llamando a las puertas de todos los pueblos; la gran revolución mundial que operará cambios importantisimos en el modo de convivir de los seres humanos.

Las dimensiones de Regeneracion, reducidas a dos pobres páginas, nos forzan a no traducir todas las declaraciones de Lenine, y lo lamentamos, porque estas declaraciones, así como las del otro leader ruso, Léon Trotzky, arrojan fuerte luz sobre el movimiento, revolucionario ruso. Así, pues, allá va algo de lo que dice Lenine:

"La revolución de Rusia no es una revolución nacional sino que es una revolución mundial.

"Los bolsheviki son los verdaderos internacionalistas. Ellos son los únicos que decean ver extenderse por todo el mundo las ideas de la revolución.

"Los bolsheviki comprendieron deede hace largo tiempo, que la revolución, aunque de carácter politico al principio tiene que llegar a ser económica y social, y que este último carácter de ella nada tiene que ver con diferencias de raza ni fronteras nacionales, y por lo tanto, el futuro de nuestra revolución tiene que ser internacional. La revolución tiene que pasar sobre las fronteras y distinciones de raza, para apiastar las ideas opuestas a ella, porque si queda confinada a un pueblo que adopte principios de paz y de igualdad económica y social, será sofocada por los Estados capitalistas y autoritarios."

En sequida explica Lenine, que esto no quiere decir que los revolutionarios rusos van a llevar la guerra a los Estados capitalistas, puesto que tal cosa equivaldria a negar los principios fundamentales de la revolución, que aboga por la fraternización de todos los pueblos de la Tierra, y continúa de esta manera:

"Es un absurdo pensar que la democracia internationalista rusa pretenda alguna vez hacer la guerra a otros pueblos con el único fin de destruir monarquías extranjeras. Tal guerra estallaria sólo en el caso de que los existentes gobiernos europeos conspiraron, como es posible que lo hagan, para apiastar nuestra revolución con el propósito de impedir que se extienda a sus dominios.

"Nosotros continuaremos propagando nuestros ideales en todos los países, para obtener este resultado: en primer lugar, que la difusión de los ideales antimonárquicos y anticapitalistas, precipite la terminación de la guerra.

"Tal paz sostenida por los pueblos insurreccionados, es el programa más deseable.

"Incitamos también a la revolución a todos los países, porque por su propria naturaleza la revolución rusa no puede permanecer aislada.

"Las naciones deben ser organizadas ya sobre una base capitalista, o bien, sobre una base proletaria y anticapitalista. Los dos sistemas no pueden coexistir. Es imposible para Rusia existir sin bancos capitalistas e industriales, si ella tiene que tratar con países que todavía los tienen.

"Lejos de aislarse Rusia del resto del mundo, debe entrar en más íntimas relaciones con él, y como estas relaciones íntimas tienen que ser en su mayor parte relaciones fundadas en el intercambio de productos, es necesario que todos los países del mundo tengan un idéntico y homogéneo sistema económico.

"Como la revolución rusa nunca restaurará el sistema capitalista, se hace necesario que nosotros luchemos por la difusión de las ideas anticapitalistas en el extranjero."

* * * * * * *

Cuánto alientan las palabras de Lenine. Yano es la fraternidad universal un deseo sentido apenas por unos cuantos emancipados de prejuicios y errores de toda especie. Este deseo va penetrando a la médula de los pueblos; este deseo se hace carne y sangre.

Los sueños de los utopistas se confirman. Los "sensatos" y "cabezas frías" ya no nos llamarán locos a los anarquistas.

Bendita mil veces la carnicería europea que está produciendo tan espléndidos resultados! En tres años y medio de barbarie capitalista, se ha logrado más que lo que se hubiera ganado en cien años con nuestra propaganda de fraternidad y de justicia.

El viejo sistema se derrumba, hermanos de cadenas. Animo!

Que nadie flaquee en este momento en que se necesita que todos los que sufrimos los efectos de un sistema que nos aplasta, tengamos nuestras mentes preparadas para ver con serenidad lo que se acerca: la desaparición de todo lo que nos hace desgraciados: Autoridad, Capital y Clero.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

POR LA JUSTICIA—DISCURSO PRONUNCIADO EN EL LOCAL DEL CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS RACIONALES EL 17 DE FEBRERO DE 1918, EN EL MITIN DE PROTESTA CELEBRADO CONTRA EL ARRESTO DE RAUL PALMA.

COMPAÑEROS: La vieja sociedad, la sociedad injusta y cruel que condena al que trabaja y suda a toda clase de privaciones, y que premia la holganza de unos cuantos con todos los placeres de la vida; esta sociedad corrompida que no puede y que no quiete garantizar a todos los seres humanos el bienestar y la libertad; esta sociedad se desmorona, esta socidad se derrumba, esta sociedad está por desaparecer; pero va moribunda, todavia tiene fuerza para arrancar de nuestras filas, de las filas de los pobres, aquellos valientes que mayores esfuerzos han hecho para derribarla.

Raúl Palma es un trabajador, es un desheredado, es un proletario que comprende que todo ser humano, por el solo hecho de venir a la vida, tiene el derecho de vivir, tiene el derecho de satisfacer todas sus necesidades, y este sencillo principio de justicia social, de justicia humana, lo propagaba sin descanso, en la prensa, en la tribuna, en todas partes, ansioso de ver a sus hermanos de clase libres de cadenas.

Este fué su crimen: abrir los ojos a los trabajadores; este fué su delito: quitar la venda que cubria los ojos a sus hermanos, para hacerles ver el camino de su emancipación.

Por su actividad como propagandista, dos veces había sido arrestado antes de ahora. El hablaba en la Plaza, y sus palabras de verdad y de justicia no fueron del agrado de todos aquellos que quieren que se perpetúe este sistema, que hace posible que los que nada útil hacen gocen a expensas de los que con sus manos y su inteligencia mueven la industria y hacen el progreso. Nuestros amos, los burgueses, no podían vivir tranquilos cuando Palma se encontraba en libertad, porque sabían que este hombre, fuera de las rejas de la prisión, socaba los cimientos de la vieja estrustura social cuyo peso hemos soportado los de abajo por siglos y siglos.

Nuestros amos desean meter las manos en nuestros bolsillos, sin que opongamos los explotados la menor resistencia, y quieren gozar el producto de sus rapiñas, sin que de nuestros labios salga una frase de descontento, una palabro de protesta ni um gemido de angustia. Y todo aquel, que como Palma, inquieta a la burguesia; todo aquel, que como Palma, con sus actos y con sus palabras perturba la digestión de los que tienen satisfecho el estómago, es arrancado de su hogar y puesto en prisión, para escarmiento de los que no estamos contentos con este sistema de la injusticia y de la infamia, sin reflexionar que los que nos sentimos hombres resentimos el ultraje y no estamos dispuestos a volver la otra megilla para que se repita el atentado, sino que estamos listos, sucediere lo que sucediere, y desaparezca quien desaparezca a devolver golpe por golpe, ultrajé por ultraje.

A Raúl Palma se le acusa de haber quitado la vida a un dueño de una tienda y por añadidura polizonte, la noche del 13 de Julio de 1916, con el intento, según la policia, de apropiarse los efectos almacenados en la tienda. La acusación no puede ser más injusta, porque en la época en que se alega que Palma cometió el delito, este joven trabajador se encontraba prestando sus servicios valiosisimos a la causa de los desheredados en los talleres de Regeneracion, en la misma mesa en que yo trabajo, frente a mí, compartiendo mis desvelos y mis afanes por convertir a una humanidad que se arrastra y solloza, débil y doliente, que no tiene fuerza ni para quejarse, que no tiene valor ni para levantar la vista para medir el tamaño de sus opresores, en un conjunto verdaderamente humano apto para la libertad y la justicia.

Que Palma no es el autor del hecho por el cual se le tiene preso, es una verdad que salta a la vista. El no pudo estar al mismo tiempo trabajando codo con codo commigo escribiendo artículos para Regeneracion, y en el lugar en que se dice que occurió la muerte del burgués. Indudablemente que fué otro el autor del homicidio; pero nuestros opresores no quieren buscar al verdadero autor del hecho; no lo necesitan; a quien quieren perder es a Palma, a quien temen y a quien odian.

El verdadero autor del homicidio debe reir satisfecho en estos momentos por haber podido evadir la acción penal, gracias a la malquerencia que los de arriba profesan a Raúl Palma, mientras este joven obrero espera en su calabozo el momento de ser llamado para que el verdugo ponga en su cuello el lazo que ha de arrancarle la vida.

La acusación se basa en un anónimo que tal vez el mismo autor del delito escribió para desembarazarse de toda responsabilidad, y quién sabe si alguno de los interesados en hacer desaparecer a Palma, haya sido el autor de las líneas que han puesto a nuestro hermano en el presidio. Un anónimo es la base de esta feroz persecución. Un anónimo en que se denuncia a Raúl Palma como el autor del homicidio. En ningún país del mundo se persigue a una persona por acusaciones anónimas. La ley, tan opresora y enemiga del débil como es la ley, no concede al anónimo fuerza legal alguna, no porque la ley se interese por eldesvañdo, sino porque el anonimo puede implicar no solamente a una persona de nuestra clase, sino a los de arriba también. Pero en el caso de Palma, todo ha sido diferente. Una mano criminal trazó las líneas del anónimo, y en el acto se puso en juego la policía. No se denunciaba en el anónimo a un individuo apartado de la tremenda lucha que sostenemos los de abajo contra los de arriba, sino a Palma, al agitador obrero, al hombre que nos enseña y nos educa, al joven batallador que no contando todavía veintiún años de edad, tiene sin embargo la experiencia necesaria para decirnos a los que sufrimos la miseria y la opresión, por qué somos desgraciados, por qué nos encontramos abajo, cuando nuestras manos y nuestra inteligencia nos hacen acreedores a gozar de todas las ventajas que nos ofrece la civilización, la civilización que es obra nuestra, la civilización sostendida con nuestros puños y nuestro cerebro, la civilización que no existiera si nos negásemos a regar los campos con nuestro sudor y a desafiar la tisis y la anemia en el taller y en la fábrica. La civilización, hermanos de cadenas, es nuestra obra. No la hace el burgués, no es obra del ministro religioso, el gobernante no la impulsa. La civilización no brota de los palacios de nuestros amos, sino de nuestras manos y de nuestro cerebro. La civilización es hija de nuestro sacrificio en cada detalle de ella encontramos una gota de sudor de nuestros cuerpos fatigados, una lágrima de nuestros ojos y el aliento cansado de toda una humanidad atormentada y doliente.

Palma teñía que ser el blanco de las iras de nuestros verdugos, y por esa razón se encuentra preso. Nuestros opresores no quieren que el trabajador mexicano despierte, porque entonces ya no encontrarían trabajo barato y sus ganancias disminuirían. Ellos quieren vernos siempre sumisos, dispuestos a sopòrtarlo todo, y es por eso por lo que, cuando de la masa proletaria brota un hombre como Raúl Palma, todas las fuerzas de la reacción se ponen en juego para hacerlo desaparecer.

Toca, pues a nosotros, hacer sentir nuestra fuerza, demosstrar que estamos alerta para impedir que los nuestros, los de nuestra clase, los que nos educan sean arrebatados de nuestro seno.

El jurado de Raúl Palma tendrá lugar el 18 de Marzo, y se necesita dinero para su defensa. Si no lo ayudamos, será ahorcado y su muerte pesará sobre nuestras cabezás.

Sí, compañeros, la muerte de Palma será obra nuestra si no hacemos todo lo que se debe hacer por recatarlo de las garras del enemigo. Los que nos oprimen quieren arrancarle la vida; toca a los oprimidos manifestar su descontento y su protesta.

Si los oprimidos no hacemos nada por salvar a los nuestros, bien merecemos ser esclavos.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON.

[From Regeneracion. English section. Published by voluntary subscription. Single copy, 5cs. No. 262. Saturday, March 16, 1918. Send money payable to the editor, Ricardo Flores Magon, P. O. box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.]

"MOTHER EARTH BULLETIN,"
4 Jones Street, New York City.

ON THE WAY TO GOLGOTHA.

FEBRUARY 6, 1918.

DEAR FAITHFUL FRIENDS: How many have gone the way to Golgotha, and how many will yet have to go? Only time, the great redeemer of all who are made to suffer for their ideals,

can tell. Time hangs heavily on those who cherish great hope, but it moves with surprising swiftness and far beyond our fondest dreams.

Russia stands a glowing proof of that. In 1905 the Tsar's troops drenched the streets of Petrograd and other cities with the blood of the revolutionists. In 1917 the revolutionary troops, more human than those who did the butchery, drove the Tsar out of Russia.

This thought came to my mind when I was being dashed up Fifth in a police-patrol automobile to the Pennsylvania Station on Monday, February 5.

The avenue and streets were lined with a curious mob, awaiting the parade of the soldiers from Camp Upton. Like the soldiers of the Tsar before 1915, who saw in every revolutionist an enemy to their country, the American soldiers would have greeted me with scorn and jeers and at the command of their Tsar would have taken my life in the ignorant belief that they were saving their country from a dangerous enemy.

Will time do for America what it has done for Russia? Will her soldiers some day make common cause with her people? Who can say what the future will bring?

The idealist may not be a prophet, but he nevertheless knows that the future will bring change; and knowing he lives for the future, he is giving infinite strength to support the present.

So I, too, dear friend, will be strengthened while in prison by the passionate belief in the future, by the hope that the two years taken out of my life may help to quicken the great events time has in store for the human race. With that as my guiding star, confinement, convict's clothes, and the other indignities the guilty conscience of society heaps upon those it dares not face mean no hardship.

You will want to help me while I am in prison, I know. You can do so in various ways. First, take care of my love child, Mother Earth Bulletin, I leave to your sympathetic care. I know that you will look after her tenderly, so that I may find her bigger, stronger, and more worth while when I return from Jefferson. Secondly, spread my boylsheviki pamphlet in tribute to their great courage and marvelous vision and for the enlightenment of the American people. Thirdly, join the League for the Amnesty of the Political Prisoners. And finally, write to Berkman and myself. Always address us as political prisoners. Always sign your full name.

Good-bye, dear friends, but not for long—if the spirit of the boylsheviki prevails. Long live the boylsheviki! May their flames spread over the world and redeem humanity from its bondage!

Affectionately, EMMA GOLDMAN,
United States Political Prisoner,
Jefferson City, Mo.

—

LEAGUE FOR THE AMNESTY OF POLITICAL PRISONERS.

The purpose of this league is—

1. To educate the public to the fundamental distinction between political offenses and ordinary crime.

2. To work for the recognition in the United States of political prisoners.

3. To crystallize public sentiment in this matter so that it can be made a subject for representation at the general peace conference.

4. To obtain the release of all political offenders through a general amnesty as soon as peace is declared.

The league recognizes as political prisoners those who have been convicted for holding and advocating social and political opinions contrary or believed to be injurious to the country's war activities. The United States, unlike all countries in Europe where amnesty for political prisoners is in common usage, does not differentiate between the political offender and criminal prisoner, and has never granted amnesties for such political prisoners.

—

Address all communications to M. E. Fitzgerald, 32 Union Square, room 708, New York City.

Send all money from now on to Ricardo Flores Magon, P. O. box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.

NUESTRA APELACION.

Por fin, nuestro caso ha sido presentado a la Suprema Corte para su revisión; pero esto no quiere decir que ya se haya reunido la suma necesaria para llevar el litigio hasta su trámite final.

Con algún dinero reunido, se dió el primer paso, el primer paso solamente, y se necesita con urgencia reunir fondos bastantes para todo el pleito, pues de lo contrario, en cualquier momento se nos arrestará y conducirá al presidio, porque ya se sabe que, sin dinero, no puede moverse la justicia burguesa.

Una carta de nuestro abogado Ryckman, fechada el 7 de este mes, nos informa que, si para el 7 de Abril proximo no hemos reunido la cantidad que se necesita, tendremos que ingresar al presidio, pues no se nos quiere esperar más. Nuestros amos tienen prisa de ponernos en el calabozo!

Así, pues, toca a nuestros amigos resolver el asunto. Nuestra libertad o nuestro cautiverio están en sus manos.

R. F. M.

—

AVISO.

Conste una vez más que ya no pertenecen al Grupo Editor de Regeneracion, los compañeros José G. Flores, Rafael R. Gracia, Trinidad Villarreal, Enrique Flores Magón y Teresa Magón.

Toda correspondencia relativa a Regeneracion y a la Junta, Organizadora del Partido Libéral Mexicano, debe ser enviada precisamente a Ricardo Flores Magón, P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.

—

El abnegado luchador anarquista Domingo R. Rosas, que estuvo preso cuatro años en las bastillas texanas con Rangel, Cisneros, Alzalde y demás heroicos camaradas, se encuentra gravemente enfermo y es preciso que los compañeros prueben su solidaridad enviándole algún auxilio pecuniario. Domingo nada pide, pues este joven luchador no quiere que sus hermanos se sacrifiquen por él; pero es preciso ayudarlo para ver si se salva de la muerte este activo propagandista de nuestros ideales.

Los compañeros de Puente, Cal., han iniciado la solidaridad que debe haber para nuestro querido compañero Domingo. Una colecta levantada entre ellos dio el siguiente resultado: Santos Betancur, $1; Felipe Lucio, $1; Antonio Betancur, 65c; Un proletario, 25c; Ramon Tenorio, 25c; Matías Rodríguez, 20c; Francisco Betancur, 50c; y Refugio Solano, $2.

Que los solidarios compañeros de Puente tengan imitadores. Compañeros: a aliviar la situacion de un hermano en desgracia.

Puede enviarse correspondencia y dinero para Domingo, a la siguiente direccion: D. Ramos, Box 781, Uvalde, Texas.

IMPORTANTE.

En lo sucesivo toda correspondencia y dinero para regeneracion deben remitirse a la direccion siguiente:

RICARDO FLORES MAGON,
P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.

—

LAS RAMERAS.

Dentro del bullicio y los placeres, foco de miserias y dolor, allí están las pobres rameras, despreciadas por la sociedad.

Defendiéndolas, se alza la voz del libertario, y grita: ¿Por qué desprecias a la pobre que tú mismo has envilecido? Tú has matado en ella sus mejores sentimientos; tú la engañaste con mentirosas promesas, con falsos halagos. . . y después que cayó, ¿qué hiciste por ella, qué refugio de consolación la brindaste, qué apacible morada de redención la ofreciste?

La arrojaste al insondable abismo del burdel, el hospital y el presidio.

Después huyes de ella como de la peste.

¿Por qué la acusas? . . .

¿Quién es el culpable? ¿Tú o ella? . . .

CLAUDIO SALINAS.

—

El servilismo es pasión tan incurable en el hombre, que aun en el momento de la suprema Libertad, que es el de la Muerte, tiene necesidad de crearse más allá de la tumba, la ficción de un Imperio, y la necesidad de un Amo para tembiar ante él.

VARGAS VILA.

—

LA CANCION DEL FUSIL—EL GRITO DEL BARDO.

Canto al pueblo: no al vencido; al que maldice y espera, forja armas con su amargura y hace de la luz bandera.

Al que estremece las calles en estos días de oprobio, lanzando en ellas, altivo, las grandes bombas de su odio.

Al que es dolor que no llora, porque es pena sublevada, herida al aire que luce con ímpetus de alborada.

No al mentido soberano—¡Rey de ridícula hechura, que adulan los que han de uncirlo al carro de su locura!—

¡Sí al de la huelga, al soberbio del acto heroico, al que lanza al pie de una guillotina el rayo de una esperanza!

ALBERTO GHIRALDO.

—

LA GUERRA Y LOS GRANDES PENSADORES.

El hambre enseñó a los bárbaros el asesinato, les impulsó a la guerra y a las invasiones. Los pueblos civilizados son como los perros de caza. Un instinto corrompido les excita a destruir sin razón ni provecho. La sinrazón de las guerras modernas se

llama interés dinástico, nacionalidades, equilibrio europeo, honor. Este ultimo motivo es tal vez el más extravagante, puesto que no hay un solo pueblo que no se haya manchado con todos los crímenes y todas las vergüenzas imaginables. Ni uno solo que no haya sufrido todas las humillaciones que la suerte puede infligir a una miserable agrupación de hombres. Y si a pesar de todo subsiste todavía un honor en los pueblos, es un extraño medio de defenderlo el consistente en hacer la guerra, es decir, cometer todos los crímenes con los cuales un particular se deshonra: incendio, robo, violación y asesinato.

ANATOLE, FRANCE.

A esta hora, en la cual se forman ligas para enseñar a los individuos a respetar las leyes, despreciando a los que se hallan encargados de asegurar su ejecucion, y a otros a despreciar las leyes para reservar toda su fe para aquellos que las interpretan; en la cual otros tienen la sencillez de creer que podrán hacer que el individuo respete las leyes y a los que las hacen, nosotros nos proponemos sencillamente enseñar a los individuos que deben respetarse, sin leyes, contra las leyes y a pesar de sus parásitos.

Y obrando de este modo, tenemos la conciencia de que hacemos una excelente obra revolucionaria.

Porque cuando haya crecido el número de individuos conscientes de su ser, de su papel en la vida, de su fuerza y su voluntad, habrán acabado los directores y explotadores. (Juan Grave.)

—

GUERRA Y MILITARISMO.

El conquistador hace cónsistir su gloria en quemar casas, matar hombres, o por lo menos, en hurgar los bolsillos para sacar lo que llama tributo, impuesto, empréstito "donación voluntaria," etc., y el historiógrafo hace consistir la suya en registrar todo eso en los anales de la patria, con tantas páginas de elogios, como provincias arruinadas haya. Mientras tanto, el verdugo enrojece el hierro para señalar en el hombro al individuo que hubiese hecho lo mismo enla carretera.

No hay más que el hombre que mate pormatar, destruya por destruir. Jamás semejante inepcia ha entrado en una cabeza animal; si mata, es por hambre o por miedo, pero no por vanidad, jactancia, u ociosidad.

BOUCHER DE PERTHES.

—

Las hormigas tienen ejércitos permanetes, tan numerosos y tan bien organizados como los de nuestras grandes potencias militares.

Y sin embargo, sus finanzas no se encuentran en un estado tan lamentable como el de los Estados humanos, ni sus arrastradores de espada se permiten exceso alguno contra los ciudadanos que los nutren y a quienes están encargados de protejer. No te extrañes de ello, querido lector. A parte de todo, no son sino bestias privadas de razón, guidas únicamente por "el instinto," incapaces, por tanto, de alcanzar la altura de la perfección humana.

LUIS BUCHNER.

—

Si mis soldados empezaran a pensar, ninguno de ellos quedaria en las filas.

Federico II (El grande). Y se vio a los hijos del pueblo levantar los brazos contra el pueblo, degollar a sus hermanos, encadenar a sus padres, y hasta olvidar las entranas que los engendraron.

Cuando se les decia, en nom bre de todo lo que es sagrado, pensad en la angustia, en la atrocidad de lo que se os ordena, respondian; no pensamos, obedecemos.

LAMENNAIS.

—

El héroe verdadero es aquel cuya muerte esta coronada por una idea, no el torpe a quien se ha dicho: "La consigna es de morir para favorecer la venta de los gorros de algodon en un pais lejanos. . . .

JOSEPH PELADAN.

—

FOLLETOS EN VENTA.

Manifiesto de 23de Septiembre de 1911.—Este importante documento debe ser conocido por todos los trabajadores que quieran saber la causa de su pobreza, miserias y desgracias, y la manera de eliminarla. Obrita encuadernada para traerla en el bolsillo como documento de consulta. (Precio, 5cs.)

—

LA BANDERA ROJA, MANANITAS, POR J. O., CON MUSICA.

Esta cancion libertaria, cuyos versos sencillos encierran ideas profundas de elevadas aspiraciones, y cuya musica es facil y agradable, ha hecho furor en Los Angeles y sus alrededoes. (Precio, 5cs.)

LOS VERSOS DEL LIBERAL.

Por Pascual Rodriguez, con musica por J. O.—Resena ligera en verso, de la Revolucion Mexicana. Esta cancion, tanto por la letra como por su bella musica, un valse inspirado, esta llamada a hacer furor y popularizarse. (Precio, 5cs.)

—

Carranza se despoja de la piel de oveja y ensena los colmillos, por Ricardo Flores Magon.—Folleto de mucha importancia para la propaganda, y al que debe darsele la mayor circulacion posible. (Precio, 10cs.)

—

Canto a la accion, 5 cs.—Crimen y Criminales, conferencia dada a los prisioneros de la carcel de Chicago por Clarence S. Darrow. (Precio, 5 centavos.)

—

(Tierra y Libertad—Drama, revolucionario encuatro actos y en prosa—Escrito por Ricardo Flores Magon—Veinticinco centavos—Haganse los pedidos, acompanados de suvalor, a Ricardo Flores Magon, P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Calif.)

ADMINISTRACION—ENTRADAS—DE ENERO 11 AL 4 DE MARZO DE 1918.

Arizona: R. Covarrubias, 12 cents; J. Villanueva, 50 cents; J. Villanueva, $1; M. Perez, $1; H. Cerna, 25 cents; V. Aceves, 50 cents

California: J. A. Gonzalez, 21 cents; Anita Monreal, $1.50; B. Ramos por hermanos Gamboa, $5.50; E. Torres, $3; C. Morales, $1; A. Martinez, 10 cents; C. Perez, $1; M. Juarez, 25 cents; Desiderio, 50 cents; Valentin, 10 cents; H. Leyva, $2; M. J. Morales, $1; A. S. Raleigh, per H. C. Lacefield, $1; C. Balderas, $10; A. D. Gomez, $1; N. Reveles, $1; M. Hill, 25 cents; N. T. Bernal, $2.50; J. Robles, 50 cents; H. Robles, 50 cents; Doctor Fritz, $2.

Colorado: E. N. Aguilar, $2; E. Juarez, $1; E. N. Aguilar, 50 cents.

Cuba: M. Quintero, $1.

Inglaterra: C. Macho y E. Fernandez, $1.70.

Oklahoma: G. M. Soto, 16 cents.

Oklahoma: G. Cervantes envio colecta hecha entre los miembros del Grupo "El Unico," el mismo, $1; J. Lina, 50 cents; E. Luna, 25 cents; A. Luna, 25 cents; A. Rico, 45 cents; C. Zamarripa, 50 cents; J. Diaz, 75 cents; C. F. Rodriguez, 75 cents.

Minneapolis: O. Crooks, $1.

Mexico: M. S. Sotos, $1.

Texas: M. S. Serrano, 50 cents; Modesta Fortuna, 25 cents; F. Pruneda, 20 cents; E. Vara, 10 cents; T. Olivares, $2; P. B. Cedillo, 47 cents; B. Gomez Cura, 80 cents; P. P. Gonzales, $1; J. M. Arjona, $2; M. Fortuna, 50 cents; Pruneda por Vara, 25 cents; F. Flores, $1; A. Soto, $1; C. V. Garcia, $1; M. S. Hernandez, 19 cents; F. Palomarez, por venta de Regeneracion, $2; E. Rivera, 25 cents; F. Palomarez, 50 cents; E. Gonzalez, $2.06; A. Caballero, $2; P. Palacios, $1; F. C. Lozano, $1; M. Vela, 50 cents; J. R. Gonzalez, por M. L. Trevino, 25 cents; L. Trevino, 25 cents; F. Naba, $2; J. M. Gilbert, 80 cents; F. Palomarez, por venta de Regeneracion, $1; S. Canales, $1; F. R. Canales, $1; G. Canales, $1; L. Canales, jr., $1; A. Ramos, $1; A. Jaso, $1; P. Gonzalez, $1; L. Saenz, $1; Faustino Ramos, $1; G. M. Ruiz, $1.50; J. C. Espinosa, $1; D. Arredondo, 21 cents; F. Palomarez por Fernando, Guatimotzin y Ricardo, $1; P. Palacio, 50 cents; J. C. Lozano, 50 cents; A. Sanchez, 50 cents; G. Vazquez, 50 cents; M. S. Serrano, 75 cents; N. S. Orta, 50 cents; total, $91.13.

PARA LA DEFENSA DE RAUL PALMA.

[Entradas del 11 de enero al 7 de Marzo.]

California: Colectado en el Centro de Estudios Racionales por Ricardo Flores Magón, $5.34; Valentín Martínez, $0.50; Luis Martínez, $0.50; Ramón Romo, $0.50; Compañeros Juárez, $1.00; Un compañero, $0.50; Santana Monreal, $0.10; Justa Monreal, $0.10; Tomás S. Gómez, $0.50; Encarnación Núñez, $0.25; Pedro Soto Ramírez, $0.20; Mario Núñez, $0.15; Francisco Sapién, $0.50; Margarito Olivares, $0.25. Colectado por Epigmenio Zavala; el mismo, $5; Pedro Salas, $0.15; G. Ruiz, $0.10; y Pedro Cervantes, $0.10; colectado por Juan Olmos; Francisco G. Moreno, $0.25; Ramón Varela, $0.25; Abraham Vázquez, $0.10; Narcisco Robles, $0.15; y ollar Valles, $0.25; Justo Malonda, $0.25. Colectado por Agustin Sánchez: Zeferino Morales, $0.25; Martina Morales, $0.25; Juan Morales, $0.20; Zeferino Morales, $0.15; Manuela, $0.15; María, $0.10; Mapin, $0.10; y Encarnación, $0.50; Luis Pérez, $0.50; Paz Mesa, $0.50; E. Reyes, $0.10; Candelario Peña, $0.10; Manuel López, $0.25; producto del baile en el Courtell Hall, $15.30. Colectado por N. T. Bernal: El mismo, $2.50; Juan Robles, $0.50; Hilario Robles, $0.50; y Blas Lara, $4. Colectado por Ramón Gamboa, $3.20; Evaristo Torres, $2; Ramón Gamboa, $0.50; Zeferino Lieras, $0.50; F. Mateos, $0.50; J. Domínguez,

$0.50; C. Arredondo, $0.50; D. Gamboa, $0.20; J. Arellano, $0.25; B. Aguilera, $0.25; L. M. Muñiz, $1. Colectado por el mismo, $2.15; P. M. Velasco, $0.50; Luis Vaca, $0.50; Indalecio Flores, $0.25; José L. Moncada, $0.25; Pedro Aragón, $0.25; Manuel Prada, $0.25; Jesús Viramontes, $0.50; Toribio Villaseñor, $0.25; Manuel Hernández, $0.25; Anita Monreal, $0.25; un compañero, $0.25; Jacinto Péres, $2; Siró Nóce, $1; P. Flamarion, $0.50; Ignacio Delgadillo, $1; Gregorio Rodriguez, $0.25; Alvaro Peñez, $0.15; Ascención Martínez, $0.39; colectado en el Central de Estudios Racionales, $4.30; M. Ruben, $2. Colectado por Miguel D. Delgado: El mismo, $0.50; Crisanto Briones, $0.50; y Domingo Floreano, $0.50. Colectado por P. Patiño: El mismo, $0.25; y Jesús Salinas, $0.25. Colectado en el Centro de Estudios Racionales, $4.27. Colectado por J. Olmos: El mismo, $1, V. Mendoza, $0.25; C. Corujedo, $0.50; F. Olmos, $0.50; José Olmos, $1; A. Castillo, $0.50; Camareno, * * * $0.25; A. Perroza, * * *; Seminario, $0.25. Colectado por * * * "Ambulante"; J. U. Rodriguz, $1; Librala Lara, $1; Blas Lara, $3; G. Cal, $0.50; B. Benedetti, $0.50; E. Eraniol, $0.55; T. W. Norton, $0.25; — ————, $0.50; D. Brotin, $0.50; D. Ricci, $0.50; A. Madrigal, $0.50; G. Cantrucci, $0.50; un Obrero, $0.25; Ferdinando, $1; un lavoratore di Fort Bragg, $1; J. Martínez, $0.50; H. Rincón, $0.50; A. Pérez, $1; Ed. García, $1; y un proletario español, $1. Colectado por Isac Robles: El mismo, $1; P. Estrada, $0.50; A. Robledo, $0.25; L. Robledo, $0.50; y M. C. Guerrero, $1. Colectado por B. Ramos, $2. Colectado por el Giupo Regeneración * * * A. Betencur, $1; R. ————, —; — Avila, $0.25; M. Rodríguez, $0.25; un proletario, $0.20; F. Lucio, $2; S. Betancur, $1; F. Betancur, $0.37; R. Soiano, $2; e H. Betancur, $0.15; P. García, $0.50.

Colectado por Ricardo Flores Magón en la casa de Feliciano Macías, $1.16.

Colectado por Anita Monreal, L. Justan, $0.15; Serapio, $0.25; R. Botello, $0.25; H. Muñoz, $0.25; M. Peña, $0.15; Un Anciano, $0.50; colectado por la misma en la Placita, $2.50.

Arizona: Colectado por J. B. Salas: El mismo, $1; S. Mena, $1; E. S. Mena, $1; y M. Salazar, jr., 50 cents. Colectado por H. Ibarra: El mismo, 50 cents; A. Gomez, 25 cents; S. Cuevas, 50 cents; J. Orientia, 10 cents; A. Rincón, 10 cents; A. Aguyo, 15 cents; J. M. Montaño, 25 cents; I. Ortiz, 25 cents; J. Perez, 30 cents; V. Núñez, 30 cents; A. Espinosa, 25 cents; Toribio Cisneros, 25 cents; A. Maldonado, 25 cents; e I. Hernández, 25 cents. Colectado por B. I. Leal: El mismo, $2; I. M. Leal, $2; A. M. Leal, $1; S. Martínez, $1; S. Parra, $1; L. Marquia, 50 cents; L. López, 50 cents; F. Macías, 50 cents; G. de Borboa, 25 cents; M. Verdugo, 25 cents; C. de Mancillas, $1; J. Alanis, 50 cents; B. de Romero, 10 cents; A. Turrey, $1; F. Flores, $1; R. Mendivil, 50 cents; R. D. Durán, 50 cents; E. Carbajal, 50 cents; R. D. Flores, 30 cents; C. Lugo, 25 cents; R. Arviso, 25 cents; R. Chávez, 10 cents; C. C. D. Romandia, 50 cents; R. S. Ruiz, 25 cents; R. Herrera, 25 cents; J. Bernal, 25 cents; S. D. Pompa, 5 cents; C. D. Mendivil, 25 cents; A. Cruz, 25 cents; L. Dominguez, 25 cents; S. Rodríguez, 20 cents; P. López, 25 cents; L. Araujo, 20 cents; G. Torres, 50 cents; familia Pérez, $1.05; C. D. Trujillo, $1; R. Vázquez, $1; G. Acuña, 50 cents; B. Vaca, 50 cents; F. E. Chacón, 50 cents; A. García, 50 cents; A. Plata, 50 cents; M. L. de Leu, 25 cents; C. González, 50 cents; J. R. Gastélum, 50 cents; R. Ruiz, 25 cents; D. López, 25 cents; R. Carrión, 50 cents; M. Castillo, 50 cents; C. Ochoa, 15 cents; P. Angulo, 50 cents; R. D. Quijada, 50 cents; C. Vázquez, 25 cents; C. Zaragoza, 10 cents; A. Méndez, 10 cents; M. Verdugo, 10 cents; J. López, 25 cents; M. Zúñiga, 25 cents; A. Padilla, 25 cents; L. D. Arviso, 10 cents; L. A. Grijalva, 25 cents; R. M. Ruiz, 25 cents; M. M. de Flores, 25 cents; J. C. Velázquez, 20 cents; M. Pedroza, 25 cents; M. de la Rosa, 25 cents; C. Ortiz, 15 cents; I. León, 15 cents; S. Brown, $1; J. Mantrigo, 25 cents; y G. F. Mayne, 25 cents. Colectado por J. Villanueva: El mismo, 50 cents; S. Medina, 50 cents; M. Esparza, 50 cents; A. Medina, 50 cents; M. de Luna, 50 cents; M. Pérez, 50 cents; J. Contreras, 50 cents; F. Acero, 50 cents; C. Mora, 50 cents; M. Lozano, 25 cents; L. Calvillo, 25 cents; E. Ríos, 50 cents; I. García, 25 cents; y S. Ruiz, 20 cents. Colectado por A. Valencia: El mismo, $2; N. Arias, $1; E. y compañeria, $1; G. Montoya, $1; A. Canales, 50 cents; y A. Martínez, 50 cents.

Texas: Colectado por Fernado Palomarez: Jose Aguilar, 25 cents; Teodoro Rodrigues, 50 cents; y Marcelino Delgado, 50 cents; F. Palomarez, $1; P. Alvarez, $1; G. Vazquez, $2; M. S. Serrano, 50 cents; F. Sandoval, 25 cents; A. Luna, 25 cents; F. Pruneda, 25 cents. Colectado por L. Salas: Un nino Anarquista, $1; D. Torres, 50 cents; M. Castilleja, 50 cents; S. Martinez, 50 cents; y M. M. Saiez, 50 cents. Colectado por F. Palomarez: J. C. Quezada, 50 cents; S. Castillo, 25 cents; A. Castillo, 25 cents; C. Castillo, 25 cents; Eusebia Rivera de Castillo, $1; y un Bolsheviki, 25 cents; J. M. Gilberto, 60 cents. Colectado por P. Palacios: El mismo, $1; T. Posada, 25 cents; J. Martinez, 25 cents; A. H. Sanchez, $1; A. S. Gomez, $1; E. Moreno, 50 cents; A. Rosales, 50 cents; T. Rosaces, 50 cents; P. E. Martinez, 50 cents; A. Barrera, 50 cents; F. C. Lozano, $1; A. Saavedra, 50 cents; M. Cedillo, 25 cents; I. Pina, 50 cents; J. Castro, 25 cents; A. Castilleja, 25 cents; F. Castilleja; 25 cents; C. Estrada, 25 cents; P. Estrada, 25 cents; P. R. Martinez, 25 cents; un timido, 25 cents; T. J. Moyers, 25 cents; y M. Vela, 50 cents; G. Jaramillo, 50 cents; J. Castaneda, 25 cents; D. Penez, 50 cents; E. Madigal, 50 cents; C. Taver, 50 cents; J. Estrada, 25 cents.

Washington: F. Louden, $1.

Minnesota: O. Crooks, $2.

Lorado: E. N. Aguilar, $1.

Oklahoma: Colectado por Prazedia Ch. Aguilera: El mismo, $1; P. Sanchez, $1. Total, $193.88.

IMPORTANTE.

Por falta de espacio no publicamos en este número los donativos para la defensa de Ricardo y Enrique Flores Magón, y las cantidades que se nos han remitido para Germinal de Tampico. Por la misma razón no salen en este número los gastos hechos para la defensa de Palma y los correspondientes a la Administración de Regeneración.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its chief clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution (S. J. Res. 258) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 258. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Library.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 13180.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up the conference report on the bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 8, 11, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$12,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "and $35,000 of the $12,100,000 to be available for expenditure

in the District of Columbia in addition to the sums herein and heretofore authorized: *Provided*, That no person shall be paid at a rate in excess of $3,000 per annum and not more than four persons may be paid at a rate of $3,000 per annum each from the said sum of $35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13180) making appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On Nos. 4, 5, and 6, relating to the customs service: Appropriates $12,100,000, instead of $11,950,000, as proposed by the House, and $12,250,000, as proposed by the Senate; makes $350,000 immediately available, instead of $200,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $35,000, instead of $40,000, as proposed by the Senate, available for expenditure in the District of Columbia, with a limitation that no person shall be employed from that sum at a rate in excess of $3,000 per annum and not more than four persons may be employed at $3,000 each per annum.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Strikes out the language, proposed by the Senate, modifying the paragraph in the House bill relative to the utilization of power presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

On No. 9: Appropriates $425,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the suppression of counterfeiting and other crimes, instead of $415,000, as proposed by the House.

On Nos. 10 to 14, inclusive, relating to mints and assay offices: Appropriates $1,200 for an assistant assayer at the Carson City Mint, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates $1,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,500, as proposed by the Senate, for wages of workmen and other employees; appropriates $3,720 for wages of workmen and other employees at the New Orleans Mint, as proposed by the House, instead of $4,900, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $4,300 for the Deadwood assay office, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,200 for an assistant assayer at the Salt Lake City assay office, as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 15: Provides, as proposed by the Senate, that the appropriation for general expenses of public buildings shall be available for freight on the shipment of supplies not usually paid for from other appropriations.

On No. 16: Appropriates $2,900,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,800,000, as proposed by the House, for operating supplies for public buildings.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, and 3, appropriating $7,500 for the Undersecretary of the Treasury.

MARTIN B. MADDEN,
WALTER W. MAGEE,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, as the bill passed the House it carried $115,112,310.37. As it passed the Senate is carried $115,538,190.37, $425,880 more than it carried when it passed the House. The Senate receded from $151,680. The House receded from $274,200. The Senate added for the customs activities $300,000. The House agreed to $150,000. The Senate receded from $150,000. The bill as it passed the House cut out the Deadwood assay office. As it passed both Houses and the conferees it carried $4,300 for the Deadwood assay office. Ten thousand dollars was added to the Secret Service fund in addition to what was provided by the House. Power presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing were substituted for hand presses, and the amendment offered by the Senate and passed by the Senate was receded from by the Senate conferees, so that the bill comes back to the House with the provision as it passed the House. The bill as agreed on carries $115,386,510.37. The estimates were $117,833,768.87, and the bill is $2,447,258.50 less than the estimates. The 1923 appropriation for the Treasury Department amounted to $118,844,828.81. The pending bill carries $115,386,510.37, or $3,458,318.44 less than the current appropriation. Unless there are some questions——

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. What does the gentleman mean by estimates; the Budget estimates?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; $2,447,000 less than the Budget estimates.

Mr. DOWELL. That is the final agreement?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, there are some three amendments not agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. It is really only one——

Mr. DOWELL. How much does that carry?

Mr. MADDEN. That carries $7,500. That would be for the Undersecretary and will come up later. It is not in the report. I move the previous question on the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on amendment No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 8: After the figures "$12,000," insert: "Undersecretary of the Treasury, to be nominated by the President and appointed by him, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $7,500 per annum and shall perform such duties in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury as may be prescribed by the Secretary or by law, and under the provisions of section 177, Revised Statutes, in case of the death, resignation, absence, or sickness of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall perform the duties of the Secretary until a successor is appointed or such absence or sickness shall cease, $7,500."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede and concur on Senate amendment No. 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "In line 2 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word 'Treasury,' insert the word 'hereafter.' In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word 'who,' insert the word 'hereafter.'"

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. It is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to ascertain whether it is or not. Instead of reserving the point of order, I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand it, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois makes this permanent law. Under the appropriation bill it is a mere appropriation for one year. This amendment undertakes to change the permanent law and provides that hereafter this office shall be created. It is the creating of a new office permanently, and under the amendment it becomes permanent law. Therefore it is unwarranted.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no question about it, and it is very essential that it should be permanent.

Mr. DOWELL. However that may be, the amendment changes the entire status of the appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not care to argue the question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not familiar with the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. The amendment simply puts in the word "hereafter."

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that either the language is surplusage or it does make it permanent law.

Mr. MADDEN. It does.

The SPEAKER. In that case it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I withdraw that part of it, Mr. Speaker. I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take up the time of the House, but I do wish to make my own position clear on this amendment.

For two years, I think, we have carried an item in the appropriation bill providing for an Undersecretary of the Treasury. I never favored the change of the title of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to that of Undersecretary of the Treasury, for the reason that I have never understood that there was any real, cogent reason for such a change. I can appreciate the fact that there may be some possible reason for the change of the title of the Assistant Secretary of State to that of Undersecretary of State, because he has to deal and confer with foreign diplomats, and perhaps there is some reason for yielding to a question of sentiment in that department. But I can not understand why it is necessary to change the title of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. I can not see any reason why the title of First Assistant Secretary of the Treasury is not as dignified a title as that of Undersecretary. It is certainly more democratic. It seems to me that we are departing a good deal from the old democratic ideas which have always prevailed in this country when we undertake to follow the ideas of foreign governments in the changing of these titles. For that reason I am opposed to this amendment, and I have always consistently opposed it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 32.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the next amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 15, strike out the figures "$65,760" and insert "$73,260."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 21, after the word "Secretary" insert the word "Undersecretary."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL FOR DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE AND LABOR—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The conference report and accompanying statement were read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures: For all necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, rent outside of the District of Columbia, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, and all other necessary incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, to enable the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce to collect and compile information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufactures, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Public works: For constructing or purchasing and equipping lighthouse tenders and light vessels for the Lighthouse Service as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce not to exceed $240,000, and for establishing and improving aids to navigation and other works as may be specifically approved by the Secretary of Commerce, $473,000; in all, $713,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 3, and 4.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
MARTIN B. MADDEN,
W. B. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
SELDEN P. SPENCER,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

On No. 2, relating to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: Appropriates $50,000, as provided by the Senate, for the collection and compilation of information regarding the disposition and handling of raw materials and manufacture, with an amendment, as proposed by the House, striking out the wording "including expenses of attendance upon conventions."

On No. 5: Appropriates $25,000, as provided by the House, instead of $50,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the compilation of information regarding the restrictions and regulations of trade imposed by foreign countries.

On No. 6, relating to public works under the Bureau of Lighthouses: Strikes out the itemization of the appropriations for public works aggregating $563,000, as passed by the House, and appropriates $713,000 in a lump sum instead of $738,500, as proposed by the Senate.

The committee of conference have not agreed on the following amendments:

On No. 1: Providing that the chief clerk shall be chief executive officer of the department and may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary.

On Nos. 3 and 4: Appropriating $1,500 for the transportation of remains of officers and employees who may die abroad or in transit while in the discharge of their official duties, and appropriating $15,000 for the transportation of families and effects of officers and employees.

MILTON W. SHREVE,
MARTIN B. MADDEN,
W. B. OLIVER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House carried $26,079,101. As it passed the Senate it carried $26,646,101. The Senate added $267,000. The Senate receded from $50,500, on items relating to lighthouses and public works, $25,000; collection of statistics on restrictions of trade imposed by foreign countries, $25,000. The House receded from $216,500, with respect to items for lighthouses and public works, $150,000; statistics of raw materials and manufactures, $50,000; transporting remains of officers and employees, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, $1,500; transporting families and effects of officers and employees, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, $15,000.

The bill as agreed upon carries $26,295,601. It exceeds the 1923 appropriation by $591,908.

The bill as agreed upon, as I have stated, finally carries $26,295,601. The estimates were $25,891,091, so that the bill as finally agreed upon is $404,511 in excess of the estimates. In this connection I wish to say that $300,000 of this was put on by the House as an addition to the $3,000,000 requested in the Budget for the Immigration Service. The Committee on Appropriations recommended $440,000 in addition to the Budget on the maternity item. The law creating the maternity activi-

ties in the Government provided for the expenditure of $1,240,000 a year, while the Budget recommended only $800,000. The committee believed that the law should be enforced, and we recommended the full amount provided by the law.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no question to be asked and no time desired by anyone, I will move the previous question.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman state whether or not the amount appropriated under the maternity bill has been matched by an equal amount already provided for by the different States?

Mr. MADDEN. No; this is for 1924. Of course, they could not match this, because it is not yet available.

Mr. DENISON. Has the committee information that it will be matched?

Mr. MADDEN. All the information we have is to the effect that it will be.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman tell the House how many States have adopted legislation to meet the requirements of the maternity law?

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry to say that I can not tell the gentleman offhand.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: Page 2, line 9, after the word "superintendent" insert "who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the department."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in amendment numbered 1.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 3: Page 10, after line 15, insert: "Transporting remains of officers and employees: For defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce who may die abroad or in transit, while in discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment at their post or at home, $1,500."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in amendment numbered 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 4: Page 10, after line 22, insert: "Transportation of families and effects of officers and employees: To pay the itemized and verified statements of the actual and necessary expenses of transportation and subsistence, under such regulations as the Secretary of Commerce may prescibe, of families and effects of officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under the order of the Secretary of Commerce, but not including any expenses incurred in connection with leave of absence of the officers and employees of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, $15,000: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be paid for transportation on foreign vessels without a certificate from the Secretary of Commerce or the Secretary of Labor that there are no American vessels on which such officers and clerks may be transported."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment. The amendment simply strikes out the words "or the Secretary of Labor," which words should not be in there. The certificate should come from the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves to recede and concur with an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 4 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "In lines 13 and 14 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following words: 'Or the Secretary of Labor.'"

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it the policy of the Government in transporting these employees to places abroad to transport not merely the employees and their families by also their effects free of charge?

Mr. MADDEN. It always has been the policy.

Mr. BLANTON. And there is no limitation whatever placed upon the amount of effects that they may carry? They may carry their whole household furniture?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no. There is a certain limit fixed by regulation.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a limit fixed?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Then this will not open the door?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

The SPEAKER. The question is on receding and concurring with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Departments of State and Justice appropriation bill (H. R. 13232).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York calls up a conference report which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the conference report as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 21, 22, and 23.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, and 18, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon amendments numbered 1, 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, and 25.

JAMES W. HUSTED,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES CURTIS,
F. E. WARREN,
H. C. LODGE,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two House on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

On No. 3: Inserts the proviso proposed by the Senate prohibiting the expenditure of the appropriation for "transportation of diplomatic and consular officers" for transportation on foreign vessels without a certificate from the Secretary of State that there are no American vessels on which such officers and clerks may be transported.

On No. 4: Strikes out the appropriation of $4,200 inserted by the Senate for payment to Leonore M. Sorsby, daughter and only child of William B. Sorsby, late envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Bolivia.

On No. 6: Appropriates $150,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the Senate, for post allowances to diplomatic and consular officers.

On Nos. 7 and 8: Appropriates $25,913.50 as proposed by the House, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the Senate, for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, and eliminates the language, inserted by the House and stricken out by the Senate, providing for the detail of an engineer officer of the Army to act as consulting engineer for the commission.

On No 9: Appropriates $66,370 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House, for payment of expenses in connection with the arbitration of outstanding pecuniary claims between the United States and Great Britain.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

On No. 10: Appropriates $6,500 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $6,000 as proposed by the House, for furniture for the Department of Justice.

On No. 11: Appropriates $40,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $45,000 as proposed by the Senate, for miscellaneous items for the Department of Justice.

On Nos. 12 and 17: Transfers the appropriation of $35,000 for printing and binding for the Court of Claims from the general appropriation for printing for the Department of Justice to a separate item for that purpose under the appropriations for that court.

On No. 13: Appropriates $60,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $65,000, as proposed by the Senate, for defending suits in claims against the United States.

On No. 15: Appropriates $200,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $230,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the enforcement of antitrust laws.

On No. 16: Inserts the appropriation of $7,500 for the salary of the district judge for Porto Rico and corrects a typographical error in the text of the bill.

On No. 18: Appropriates $2,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,275,000, as proposed by the House, for United States marshals and their deputies.

On No. 20: Appropriates $925,000 instead of $900,000, as proposed by the House, and $950,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the salaries of United States district attorneys, etc.

On No. 21: Appropriates $1,400,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $1,450,000, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of clerks of United States courts, etc.

On No. 22: Appropriates $275,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $300,000, as proposed by the Senate, for bailiffs and criers for United States courts.

On No. 23: Appropriates $650,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $700,000, as proposed by the Senate, for miscellaneous expenses of United States courts.

The committee of conference have not agreed upon the following amendments of the Senate:

On No. 1: Changing the title of the "Counselor for the department" to "Undersecretary of State."

On No. 2: Relating to the appointment of clerks at embassies and legations.

On No. 5: Appropriating one year's salary ($4,500) to the widow of William W. Masterson, late consul, Plymouth, England.

On No. 14: Relating to the use of an automobile for the Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

On No. 19: Relating to the transfer of two automobiles to the United States marshal of the District of Columbia.

On Nos. 24 and 25: Relating to the appropriation of $4,000 for the construction of a physician's residence at the Leavenworth (Kans.) Penitentiary.

JAMES W. HUSTED,
ROBERT E. EVANS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the Senate carried $33,488,708. As the bill was reported to the House it carried $33,188,151.50. The House reduction was Mexican Boundary Commission, $4,800. The House addition was International Bureau patents, $1,700, making the net House reduction $3,100. The bill as it passed the House carried $33,185,051.50. There was added by the Senate $303,656.50.

The Senate recessions are as follows: Claim of Leonore M. Sorspy, $4,200. Post allowances, $50,000. Miscellaneous expenditures, Department of Justice, $5,000. Defending suits in claims against the United States, $5,000. Enforcement of antitrust laws, $30,000. Salaries of United States district attorneys, $25,000. Salaries of clerks of courts, $50,000. Salaries of bailiffs and criers, $25,000. Miscellaneous expenses United States courts, $50,000.

One of the Senate recessions amounts really to an addition, and that was for the Mexican Boundary Commission, $5,913.50. So that the net Senate recessions amounted to $238,286.50.

The House recessions were as follows: Arbitration of outstanding claims between the United States and Great Britain, $6,370. Contingent expenses, Department of Justice, $500. Salaries of United States district attorneys, $25,000. Salaries of United States marshals, $25,000, making a total of $56,870.

The House recessions on amendments in disagreement, if the motions of the House managers are adopted, are as follows: Payment to the widow of a consular officer, $4,500; physician's residence Leavenworth Penitentiary, $4,000, making the total House recession $65,370.

The bill as agreed upon carries $33,250,421.50. The bill that passed the House carried $33,185,051.50. So the increase over the House bill amounts to $45,370.

The estimates by the Budget Bureau were $33,703,293.79. The bill as agreed upon carries $33,250,421.50. So that the decrease from the Budget estimate is $452,872,029. The bill as agreed upon carries $33,250,421.50, and the current law is $28,676,921.66, or an increase of $4,573,499.84, and that is due to the payment to Colombia of $5,000,000. The increase over the current law is, as I stated, $4,573,499.84, and the decrease under the current law excluding the payment of Colombia is $426,500.16.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. What are the items in disagreement?

Mr. HUSTED. There are no items really in disagreement, there are certain items we had to bring back under the rule. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1, page 2, line 3, after the figures "$12,000" strike out the words "counselor for the department," and insert "Undersecretary of State."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2, page 6, line 16, after the word "citizens," insert the words "whenever hereafter appointed."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the amendment.

Mr. DOWELL. Reserving the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask what does this amendment refer to?

Mr. HUSTED. It refers to the appointment of clerks at the embassies and legations. The House struck out the words "whenever hereafter appointed," but the Senate put them back on the statement of the Secretary of State that there are five men who have been in the service for a period of 15 years who are useful men and desired by the service. They have been faithful during the entire period, and would be injuriously affected if this was stricken out.

Mr. DOWELL. How many are affected?

Mr. HUSTED. Only five. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to the first amendment. There was so much confusion that I could not hear the action at the desk. I want to offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to vacate the action on the first amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. I offer the following motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUSTED moves that the House recede from its action on amendment No. 1, and agree with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Undersecretary of State and the 'counselor for the department' shall hereafter be designated 'Undersecretary of State.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Page 13, after line 20, insert "For Louise Carroll Masterson, widow of William W. Masterson, late consul to Plymouth, England, $4,500, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died while at his post of duty from illness incurred in the Consular Service."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to recede and concur.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I notice there were two amendments in the Senate bill, on page 13, which seem to be similar. One of them was to pay to Leonore M. Sorsby the sum of $4,500. He was the minister to Bolivia. The other amendment is to pay to Louise Carroll Masterson $4,500. Why the distinction?

Mr. HUSTED. As a matter of fact, they are not similar at all. In the case of Leonore M. Sorsby, the claim is for a daughter, and not for a widow. In the Masterson case, the claim is for the widow of William W. Masterson. It never has been the practice to make any allowance to anyone except the widow. There are numerous precedents for that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the gentleman is simply acting in accordance with the precedents?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Yes.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing therein a letter from the Secretary of State, showing the services of Mr. Masterson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 16, 1922.

The Hon. ARTHUR B. ROUSE,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Having reference to your inquiry in regard to the record of service of Mr. William W. Masterson, an American consul who died at his post of duty, Plymouth, England, on May 10, 1922, I have the honor to inform you that Mr. Masterson was appointed American consul at Aden, Arabia, on February 25, 1895; retired in April, 1898; was reappointed consul at Aden on March 13, 1903; appointed American consul at Batum, Russia, on June 22, 1906; consul at Harput, Turkey, on June 10, 1908; consul at Durban on April 24, 1914; American consul of class 6 by act approved February 5, 1915; appointed consul of class 5 September 14, 1917; consul of class 4 June 4, 1920; assigned as American consul at Plymouth, England on November 19, 1920. Mr. Masterson died at his post, Plymouth, England, on May 10, 1922. His salary at that time was at the rate of $4,500 a year. It should be added that Mrs. Masterson's name is Louise Carroll Masterson.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 31, line 24, after the word "duties" strike out—

"*Provided further*, That the automobile purchased from the appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes for the fiscal year 1923 shall hereafter be under the exclusive control of the Director of the Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in amendment No. 14, with the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUSTED moves that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment of the Senate No. 14 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the language stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That the automobile purchased from the appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes for the fiscal year 1923 shall hereafter be for the exclusive use of the Bureau of Investigation under the control of the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to recede and concur with the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman from New York explained the amendment?

Mr. HUSTED. No; I have not.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman explain that provision?

Mr. HUSTED. Certainly. Objection was made in the Senate that the provision carried in the House placed the control of the automobile under the Director of the Bureau of Investigation and not under the Attorney General. This amendment places the control under the Attorney General instead of under the Director of the Bureau of Investigation, as carried in the House provision.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state to the gentleman that the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] proposed a question to the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from New York answered it.

Mr. DOWELL. But only with reference to explaining what the amendment is.

The SPEAKER. That is debate upon the amendment. The Chair thinks it is very clear. Of course, the rule is well established that a point of order must be made before there is debate. The gentleman from South Carolina had debated it by asking an explanation, and the gentleman from New York was proceeding to give the explanation before the gentleman from Iowa raised his point of order. The Chair does not know whether it is subject to the point of order, but it is too late to make it.

The question is on receding and concurring with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 38, line 16, after the word "subsistence," insert: "*Provided further*, That the Postmaster General or the coordinator of the General Supply Committee is authorized and directed upon the approval of this act, if available, to deliver to the office of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia, without payment therefor, two passenger-carrying motor cycles."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 45, line 10, insert: "For construction of physician's residence, $4,000."

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 24 and 25 be considered together. They relate to the same thing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that amendments 24 and 25 be considered together. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, where is this residence located?

Mr. HUSTED. This is a provision for the construction of a physician's residence at Leavenworth Penitentiary, amounting to only $4,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Has the physician had a residence there heretofore?

Mr. HUSTED. He has not. The physician has at other penitentiaries, however, and it is very much needed here. Of course, the only cost is for materials, as the work is done by the convicts in the penitentiaries.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report amendment No. 25.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 45, line 11, after the word "penitentiary" strike out the figures "$659,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$663,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede from these amendments and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report upon the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, for printing under the rules.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out all of the House amendment after the enacting clause and substitute the following in lieu thereof:

That any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more

during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or whose name is now on the pension roll including those thereon under any act of Congress public or private. Payment to be made in accordance with the pension roll, without further application by the person entitled thereto, and every person who served 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $72 a month.

SEC. 2. That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who has heretofore been or may hereafter be granted a pension under any law, public or private, for service in the Civil War, such widow having been married to such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1915, or who if legally married after said date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with the soldier, sailor, or marine for at least two years and continuing until his death, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month, and an additional pension of $6 a month for each child of the officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability: *Provided further*, That the additional pension herein granted to the widow on account of the child or children of the husband by a former wife shall be paid to her only for such period of her widowhood as she has been, or shall be, charged with the maintenance of such child or children; for any period during which she has not been, or she shall not be, so charged, it shall be granted and paid to the guardian of such child or children: *Provided further*, That a widow or guardian to whom increase of pension has been, or shall hereafter be, granted on account of minor children, shall not be deprived thereof by reason of their being maintained in whole or in part at the expense of a State or the public in any educational institution, or in any institution organized for the care of soldiers' orphans: *Provided further*, That the rate of pension for the widow of any person who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the War of 1812, or for 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be $50 a month: *Provided further*, That all provisions of this section shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted under any law, public or private.

"SEC. 3. That the rate of pension for the former widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or who, having so served for less than 90 days, was discharged for a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, such widow having married the officer or enlisted man prior to June 27, 1915, or if legally married after such date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with such soldier, sailor, or marine for a period of at least two years and continuing until his death, and having remarried, either once or more than once after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce for any cause other than adultery on the part of the wife, shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month: *Provided*, That where a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, a widow or former widow shall not be entitled to pension under this act until the pension to such child or children terminates unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and upon the granting of pension to such widow or former widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other law.

"SEC. 4. That the benefits of this act shall be extended to and shall comprehend and include each and severally the classes of persons enumerated in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of section 4698, Revised Statutes of the United States, who served during the Civil War, and also any person who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, or the acts of January 29, 1897, March 3, 1891, and February 17, 1897, on account of service during the Civil War and the war with Mexico, and the widows and minor children of such persons: *Provided*, That service under this section shall be proven in the manner and form specified in section 2, act of March 4, 1917, and the act of September 1, 1922: *Provided further*, That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension to the soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the acts of July 27, 1892, June 27, 1902, May 30, 1908, or under the act of March 4, 1917, shall be $30 per month, and that the rate of pension to the widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed thereon under said acts shall be $20 per month.

"SEC. 5. That all Army nurses of the Civil War who have been, or who may hereafter be, allowed a pension under existing laws shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month.

"SEC. 6. That all persons now on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $80 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the forearm or any part of the bones of the leg below the tuberosity of the tibia, the rate of pension shall be $75 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or at any point above the elbow or a leg at or at any point above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $85 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is an ankylosis of either the elbow or knee or shoulder or hip joint, the rate of pension shall be $80 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or shall have lost one hand or one foot and in addition thereto shall have lost a portion of the other hand or foot, or shall have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $100 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $90 a month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms or both legs or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $125 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $100 a month; and it is hereby directed that the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be reviewed, upon request of the pensioner, all cases wherein there is an excision or resection of any part of the bones of an arm or leg, shoulder or hip, or any of the joints, or an ankylosis of any of said joints, and shall place the name of the pensioner on the roll at the rates herein provided.

"SEC. 7. That in the adjudication of claims for widows' pensions marriage of the parties and the legality thereof may be established by any competent testimony, and in the absence of direct proof of a ceremonial marriage, satisfactory evidence that the parties lived together as husband and wife and were so recognized by their neighbors and acquaintances until the death of the husband may be held to constitute sufficient proof of marriage; and cohabitation continuously for seven years or more may be accepted in lieu of proof that no impediment existed to the marriage of the parties. A widow, otherwise entitled to pension under this act, may not be barred from being granted such pension for the reason that she failed to live and cohabit with the 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person continuously from the date of the marriage to the date of his death,' unless it be shown that she willfully deserted such 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person,' without good cause; and all provisions of law requiring such continuous cohabitation in any case are hereby repealed, except as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 8. That the pension or increase of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rates herein provided on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law, but who may be entitled to a pension under the provisions of this

act, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check; and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

"SEC. 9. That nothing in this act contained shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as 'The Army and Navy medal of honor roll,' as provided in the act of April 27, 1916, but any increase herein provided for shall be in addition thereto; and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

"SEC. 10. That no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of $10 shall be allowed for such services in other claims thereunder, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall directly or indirectly otherwise contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed, or due, to such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof, shall for each and every such offense be fined not exceeding $500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 11. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines."

And that the House agree to the same.

CHAS. E. FULLER,
JOHN W. LANGLEY,
WM. W. RUCKER,
Managers on part of the House.

H. O. BURSUM,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
T. J. WALSH,
Managers on part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to the widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conference committee:

On account of numerous verbal changes in the phraseology of the House substitute, the conferees have rewritten the entire bill and recommend the adoption of the same as so rewritten. Most of the changes agreed upon are mere changes of phraseology and do not materially change the bill as passed by the House. The rates of pension provided by the original House substitute bill are not changed in any respect, except some slight changes in the rates granted to certain maimed soldiers. The principal change agreed upon is the proviso in section 4, reinserting in the bill the original section 7 of the Senate bill, granting an increase of pension to the veterans of the various Indian wars from $20 per month to $30 per month and to the widows of such veterans from $12 per month to $20 per month. The verbal changes made in the other sections of the bill relate merely to administrative matters and have been inserted in the bill on the recommendation of the officials of the Pension Bureau.

CHAS. E. FULLER,
JOHN W. LANGLEY,
WM. W. RUCKER,
Managers on the part of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Freeman	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Ansorge	Frothingham	Linthicum	Sears
Beedy	Fulmer	Little	Shaw
Black	Gallivan	Longworth	Shreve
Blakeney	Gernerd	Luce	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Gifford	Lubring	Siemp
Brand	Gilbert	McClintic	Smith, Idaho
Britten	Glynn	McFadden	Smith, Mich.
Brooks, Ill.	Goodykoontz	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Gorman	McLaughlin, Pa.	Steenerson
Burdick	Gould	Maloney	Stiness
Burke	Greene, Mass.	Mead	Stoll
Campbell, Kans.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ill.	Strong, Kans.
Cantrill	Griest	Mott	Sullivan
Carew	Griffin	Mudd	Sweet
Chandler, N. Y.	Hammer	Nelson, A. P.	Swing
Chandler, Okla.	Hawes	Newton, Minn.	Tague
Christopherson	Henry	Newton, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Fla.	Herrick	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Clarke, N. Y.	Huck	O'Connor	Taylor, N. J.
Classon	Hutchinson	Osborne	Temple
Codd	Jacoway	Overstreet	Ten Eyck
Cole, Ohio	James	Paige	Tillman
Collins	Jeffers, Ala.	Park, Ga.	Tincher
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, Miss.	Parker, N. Y.	Tinkham
Coughlin	Johnson, S. Dak.	Perlman	Tucker
Cullen	Jones, Pa.	Petersen	Vare
Dale	Kahn	Radcliffe	Vestal
Davis, Minn.	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Ala.	Voigt
Deal	Kennedy	Rainey, Ill.	Volk
Dempsey	Kiess	Ramseyer	Volstead
Drane	Kindred	Reber	Walters
Drewry	Kitchin	Reed, N. Y.	Ward, N. Y.
Dunbar	Kleczka	Riddick	Weaver
Dunn	Knight	Riordan	Wheeler
Dyer	Kreider	Robertson	Williams, Tex.
Echols	Kunz	Rodenberg	Winslow
Edmonds	Langley	Rosadale	Wise
Fairchild	Larson, Minn.	Ryan	Wood, Ind.
Focht	Layton	Sabath	Yates
Free	Lazaro	Sanders, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and sixty-five Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with proceedings under the Calendar Wednesday call to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that proceedings under Calendar Wednesday call be dispensed with to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution from the Committee on Rules which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 467 (Rept. No. 1297).

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; that after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed four hours and be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman from Ohio agree to a division of half an hour on each side, one-half hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio and one-half by myself?

Mr. FESS. Could not the gentleman get along with the amount under the rule—20 minutes to a side?

Mr. POU. I would like to accede to that, but the requests for time exceed the 20 minutes. I can get along with 25 minutes on a side.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the rule be limited to 50 minutes, half of that time to

be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that there be 50 minutes' debate on the rule, half of that time to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it going to be the intention to press for a final vote to-day?

Mr. FESS. I hope that can be done. It means four hours general debate under the rule and I hope to have the previous question ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's request that the previous question be ordered?

Mr. FESS. That is my request.

Mr. GARNER. He did not say that, but that is what he meant.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understood. Without objection the previous question will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution (H. Res. 467), if adopted, simply provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 314 under the general rules of the House and a provision for four hours of general debate. The Rules Committee appreciated the fact that this was a very important matter and should have full and free discussion on the part of Members of the House at this time. We also fully appreciate the fact that there are two sides to this question, but on the general proposition we considered it of enough importance and of enough interest to the people of the whole country that the various States should be given an opportunity to pass judgment upon it. House Joint Resolution 314 simply provides for and makes possible the presentation to the various States of the Union of a constitutional amendment which in general terms provides for the doing away with the issue of both Federal and local tax-exempt securities. The first section of the bill provides that the United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the State, so that the United States can assess taxes against incomes derived from State bonds and different subdivisions and communities in the State. The second provision of the bill provides in turn that the State shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes derived by residents from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States Government. It is necessary to have the two sections of the bill in order to make the general proposition in levying taxes absolutely reciprocal as to the powers conferred upon the State and United States Government, and it seems from that point that the resolution in itself is entirely clear and affects the interests of both the State and Federal Governments in a purely reciprocal manner, and the rights and powers of each are fully protected.

As it is well understood at the present time, under the present Constitution we are permitted to issue tax-exempt securities by the Federal Government, and also by the States and different subdivisions of the States—that is, counties, towns, cities, and so forth—but it absolutely prevents the Federal Government on the one hand levying income taxes on securities issued by the several States or subdivisions, and the States on the other hand from levying an income tax on the securities of the Federal Government. Under these general provisions, we have up to the present time in the vicinity of from fifteen to eighteen billion dollars of tax-exempt securities of various kinds in existence. During the year 1921 there were at least $1,000,000,000 of those tax-exempt securities issued, and there is a growing tendency, on account of the ease by which they are marketed under the present laws, to increase the amount from year to year, for localities to issue more bonds than are absolutely necessary, and eventually to increase the taxes on its citizens.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. KING. Can the gentleman give any information as to how many bonds are issued under the farm loan bank system, the Federal land-bank system?

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman means the total amount?

Mr. KING. The total amount.

Mr. SNELL. I can not; but I understand only about 5 per cent of all the loans taken out by the farmers of the United States come under the farm loan bank system.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. About $82,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. The only opposition, or the principal opposition, is the question of raising the rates on municipal issues. From all previous experience and from all the evidence which was presented before the committee, it seems there is enough of investment funds that come from savings banks, estates, and various other sources that under the law are obliged to invest in these kinds of securities on account of the exceptional security offered, to take up all or any reasonable amount of securities that have been or will be issued by the various communities in the way of municipal bonds, and they will be able to continue to market them at for one-half to 1 per cent less than the rates paid on the highest grade of industrial securities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman from Ohio give me five additional minutes?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SNELL. That evidence was brought out very clearly before the Committee on Ways and Means, and it is absolutely substantiated by the hearings and the people who appeared before the committee; but the chief reason why I as an individual am especially interested in this rule and this resolution is the fact that I believe it will tend to a more reasonable and equitable distribution of the burdens of taxation in this country. If there is any possible law that we can pass or any effort that can be made whereby we can distribute this burden of taxation and place it upon the people who are most able to bear it, I am in favor of that law.

Now, there is absolutely no question, and, so far as I am able to learn, it is an undisputed fact that the people who have the large incomes in the country are the people who are buying and holding these tax-exempt securities. On account of that they are able to get by in paying a very small personal tax. For instance, an individual who has an income of $50,000, all derived from tax-exempt securities, might get by without paying taxes of any kind, even local, or any surtax to the Federal Government, while a neighbor that ran a small business and through individual attention and hard work had an income of $15,000 or $20,000 would have to pay a large Federal income tax in addition to all local taxes. Now, if we can pass or start something on the way of passing that will equalize the levying of taxes and rectify such conditions, I am absolutely for it, and every man in this House should be for it, and I feel that it is of such vital importance to the people of the whole country at this time that we should at least submit this proposition to the people of the various States and give them an opportunity to pass upon this proposition. We can certainly depend upon the States to protect their rights.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. ROSE. I merely wanted to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] made the statement on this floor that there are already $18,000,000,000 tax-exempt bonds held to-day.

Mr. SNELL. Yes; from $15,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000, and I referred to that earlier in my remarks.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What effect would such an amendment have on these securities as to enhancing their value if this constitutional amendment should become operative?

Mr. SNELL. That is a pretty hard question to answer, but I doubt if it would have a very great effect, because between now and the time this amendment would be ratified by the States there would probably be so many more tax-exempt tax securities issued that they would flood the market. I doubt if it will have any great effect.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the gentleman considered the amount of tax-exempt securities that one individual or any one company could hold?

Mr. SNELL. No, sir; I have not. But it may be possible to work out something on that line.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems there should be a reasonable limitation placed on the holding by one company or individual of tax-exempt securities. It might explain the real reason for this legislation, and that is that some very wealthy companies or individuals are at present the owners of an unreasonable amount of tax-exempt securities.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman. I said that, speaking personally from my own standpoint, was my primary reason for favoring the submission of that question to the

people—to get away from the exemptions enjoyed by some people at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. I call the gentleman's attention, in that connection, to the fact that these very securities are now selling in almost every instance at a premium over what they were purchased at.

Mr. SNELL. I am not sure about that.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BACHARACH. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 21 of the hearings, in which the total amount of tax-exempt securities is stated at $10,660,000,000. This statement was made by Mr. McCoy, the Government actuary. The amount of farm loan bonds is stated to be $284,000,000 instead of $800,000,000.

Mr. SNELL. It is impossible to tell the exact amount.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, so far as the issue of bonds by the United States Government is concerned, there is no need for any constitutional amendment, because Congress has the power to refuse at any time to issue any more tax-exempt bonds.

This constitutional amendment proposes to go further than any similar amendment has ever gone before, and to subject to the payment of income tax all bonds issued by the States, by the smaller political divisions, by the counties, and even by the municipalities. It will not, in my opinion, accomplish the purpose hoped for. It will simply transfer the burden to the people who issue the bonds that are put upon the market and who in course of time must redeem them.

The tax-exempt bond that brings 4 per cent will, of course, sell higher upon the market than if it is not tax exempt. Why anybody should want to confer upon the National Government the power of imposing taxes upon the bond issues of the cities and towns and counties I do not know. Yet that is the proposal in this constitutional amendment. Even Alexander Hamilton would turn over in his grave if he could read it. I shall not vote for it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. POU. I would rather not.

Mr. RAKER. Does this include school districts?

Mr. POU. Of course. It also includes irrigation projects. And you gentlemen who are listening to the whisper of this small voice may as well understand that it will also include the Federal farm loan bonds. In my judgment, this is the worst blow ever aimed at the Federal farm loan system. It will subject those bonds to taxation by enemies of the system. The ultimate result will be certain injury and possible paralysis to that great system.

Mr. STEAGALL. And good roads bonds.

Mr. POU. Yes; and good roads bonds. Why, Mr. Speaker, it would paralyze the prosperity of all the agricultural States of this Nation. I come from a State that has been called the "Ohio of the South." I suppose it is intended as a compliment, because we have entered upon a program of great internal development. How are we going to refund our bonds when they come due? Of course, by imposing a higher rate of interest upon all new bond issues. Our people must be taxed to pay the increased rates. So you are adding to the already heavy burden of the agricultural masses. And this amendment, instead of being called an amendment to prevent the issue of tax-exempt bonds, should be termed an amendment to increase the rate of interest upon all bonds hereafter issued and also an amendment to enhance the value of bonds already in existence. Much of the power behind this amendment is the influence of those who already own tax-exempt bonds. The very moment this amendment is ratified there will be an enormous increase in the market value of tax-exempt bonds already issued.

I believe it was said that the Trojans were warned to look out for the Greeks when they came bearing gifts. You gentlemen who contemplate voting for this measure, who represent agricultural constituencies, had better be careful and examine this thing, because it is "loaded."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POU. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. Why did the National Grange, in convention assembled at Wichita, Kans., approve this, and why did the American Farm Bureau Association last year approve it in national convention assembled, as also did the Farm Bureau Association in 1922 again approve it?

Mr. POU. That is a question that I can not answer. Perhaps there was no discussion of the merits of the proposal. But I will say to my friend this: I believe much of the sentiment behind this measure is propaganda; that is to say, sentiment which has been worked up. I do not believe any demand comes directly from the people who must foot the bill.

Many people would be amazed if they were told that the issues of bonds that they vote to put upon the market to build schoolhouses and to build roads and to develop communities are to be subjected to a rate of taxation to be fixed by somebody else, that all such bonds of States, counties, towns, and school districts should be subjected to additional income tax by the United States Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that the Trojans were warned to look out for the Greeks bearing gifts. "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." There is a great deal that is behind this proposition which I suppose will appear in the long four hours' debate granted by the Committee on Rules. Think of submitting such an amendment to our organic law after four hours' debate! Let it not be forgotten that all bonds as a rule find their way to the great commercial centers. Most of the States of the Union will get practically no benefit from the tax that is proposed. North Carolina will get no tax but will pay tribute to other States. Iowa will get very little benefit. Colorado will get very little benefit. The States of the great agricultural West and South will get very little benefit; but New York will reap a harvest. Do not forget that; because, just as water finds its level, so all bonds tend to find the place where there is the best market for them, and the best market will be in the great commercial centers of Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago; Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois will reap a great, rich harvest that is to be taken out of the earnings of all the people of America.

There has never been a greater farce perpetrated on the American people than the attempt to put this thing over. I will not vote for it. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman care to use some more of his time?

Mr. POU. There will be only one more speech on this side.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to myself. That leaves 5 minutes on this side?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution making this joint resolution in order will allow four hours of debate, as has already been stated to the House, and I would like to call the attention of the Members to the merits of the measure, rather than to the rule, because I think there is no opposition to the rule as a rule.

Some time ago I made a computation of what the high surtax does, with the avenue of tax exempts open, and it was rather surprising to most of the Members of the House who read it. When we had the high surtax, 65 per cent, an income of $500,000 could be invested in short-time certificates paying 5½ per cent, which would make $28,750 net income that one of the big income financiers would receive if he invested $500,000 in tax exempts. In that case there is no worry, there is no risk, no possibility of any leaks. He is sure of $28,750.

The money locked up in these tax-exempt securities is unproductive. It is not a source of any revenue to the Government. It does not employ workmen in permanent business. It is simply an avenue for one who has a large income to invest his money, without regard to what it will do for the business of the country. He can do it without any risk whatever.

Now, on the other hand, under the high surtax as it then ranged, if he should put his income of $500,000 into a productive industry employing labor that would produce a product that would be sold from year to year and keep an industry going, he would have to make 22.11 per cent, or $110,550, profit after paying all of the taxes—Federal, State, and municipal—in order to have left the $28,750 net, such as he would have if he put his $500,000 income into tax exempts in the beginning. That means that the man who receives a big income, with that avenue open, will not invest it where the system of taxation, Federal, State, and municipal, operates, because he knows to start with he can not make $110,550 profit on $500,000, and he will put it immediately into tax exempts so as to make sure that he will have that much of a net income and be free from any risk or worry from fear of loss. This open course for escape from the high surtax has been freely entered by the big-income people of the country.

Before the war the tax exempts did not amount to over $3,000,000,000. Two years ago the tax exempts were estimated at $14,000,000,000. You have noticed the various estimates given to-day, ranging as high as $18,000,000,000. Doctor Seligman, of Columbia University, who probably is as good an authority as we have, says that there are about $16,000,000,000

totally exempt and about $14,000,000,000 partially exempt; so that there are something like $30,000,000,000 of our capital that is in the form of capital assets for business that is tax exempt, some of it totally and some of it partially. What does that do? The high surtax which our Government seems to have adopted as a policy, while it has been reduced from 65 per cent to 50 per cent, is still so high that it will cause capital, as a matter of protection, to seek the tax-exempt channel. Now, it strikes me that as a matter of revenue for the Government—for that is the specific thing we have in mind—we must either reduce the high surtax or we must forbid the tax-exempt privilege. It seems that the high surtax has come to be a policy of the Government. Therefore, it appears to me that it would be perfect folly, from the standpoint of revenue, for the Government to keep open the channel into which, as a matter of self-defense, capital enters in order to avoid the payment of these taxes. It is the direct road for the defeat of the very purpose of taxation. There is the loss of revenue to start with. It seems to me that this is justified upon several different grounds. I am persuaded that as a matter of revenue we ought to pass this amendment. It strikes me also that as an incentive to going into productive industry, to invest capital in business, to employ labor, to keep a going concern going, this amendment should be adopted. The tax exempt is an obstacle against productive industry, because it diverts the capital that otherwise would go into the productive industries into unproductive channels; productive, I admit, in the sense that when you build a road you employ labor and capital for the time being while the road is building, but when it is built labor and capital, so far as that construction goes, cease to be employed, while, on the other hand, if you could induce the capital to go into the productive industries, such as transportation or other industrial agencies, you would keep the capital invested and you would continue to employ the labor of the country, which are the best tests of a country's real prosperity.

From that standpoint, in addition to the revenue standpoint, it seems to me that this is of importance. Much of our consideration as a legislative body is given up to the problem of industry. Our material prosperity is determined very largely by the uninterrupted employment of labor in profitable enterprise. We are concerned in keeping open the channels of investment in labor-employing business. If these channels are clogged from whatever reason we endeavor to open them. If European competition tends to close our industries we readily correct it by necessary protective legislation. Here is a situation where capital, always timid, heavily weighted by a high surtax, finds a perfectly easy and complete escape through the channels of exemption from tax burdens. The amount of increase of tax-exempt securities on the one hand and the reduction of numbers of high surtax payers on the other leave nothing further to be said on the general effect of this policy. Again, it is rather a bad condition in our own country when the conviction is on that we are collecting taxes from smaller incomes and keeping open the way for larger incomes to escape taxation. That has a bad social as well as governmental effect.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman see how it is possible for people who are in favor of high surtaxes to be opposed to this legislation?

Mr. FESS. Upon my soul I can not. Those who favor the high surtax, it seems to me, can not be in favor of opening the way for that high surtax to escape payment. It is wholly illogical and the two positions contradictory.

Mr. SNELL. Does not a good deal of the opposition come from those same people?

Mr. FESS. Well, the gentleman knows about that as well as I do.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How can those who favor a reduction of the higher surtaxes be sincere in their advocacy of this measure? [Laughter.]

Mr. FESS. I can do that because I am afraid that my friends like the Socialist from New York are in the majority. It is a choice between two evils and I take the least, especially when the safety of the Government is at stake. I employed what influence I had to reduce the surtax to a point where it could not drive incomes into these channels. Failing that our only recourse is to close up the channels of escape. How a Member can insist upon continuing the course which compels capital to seek refuge and at the same time to refuse to close up the door of escape I can not understand. Surely one who refuses to close the door can not complain if it is entered.

But, as I was about to say, this practice causes the large income holder to seek his escape from tax burdens, while the small man is left to bear them. It is not a sound or wholesome situation socially or governmentally to permit such favor toward the big moneyed man at the expense of the small taxpayer. It produces a bitterness that is reflected in opposition to Government as unfair and inequitable. It breeds disrespect if not open attack upon constituted authority as a protection of the rich as against the rights of the poor.

This unfortunate situation is further aggravated by causing the moneyed class to withdraw its capital from active industry, where it as director is constructively building up the country's prosperity, to place it in unproductive channels, where it ceases to be active, withdraws from business, and joins the idle rich to live off its income. It thus compels a leisure class, and tends to stratify our society into classes, and thus deepen inherent hatred between groups of our population by arraying the mass against the class.

The great virtue of our system of government is the equal opportunity in the rivalry of life, where each stands equal to the other under the law. No such theory can flourish where the idle rich are free from the burdens of tax while the large mass of humanity are in a struggle to live. It is such situation that creates antigovernment sentiment. It is such that promotes anarchistic dogmas and bolshevistic tendencies. It is not enough to denounce the rich for entering the door of escape when the Government opens it wide and then gives the spur to enter it.

It is not treason for a citizen to escape the penalty of a high tax when the Government itself supplies the way of escape. I may prefer to reduce the spur of escape, but since the Congress prefers to keep the tax at the high point, then the only step left, as I see it, is to close up the way of escape, which this resolution proposes to do.

At least I see no grounds for refusal to submit it to the States and give the people the right to say whether they wish to forbid the issuance of tax-exempt securities.

The contention that the amendment will place in the hands of the Federal Government the power to destroy the credit of the States is not well founded.

The resolution specifically forbids discriminatory taxation in favor of or against the States. In other words, if the Government decides to tax State securities, or any issued under the authority of the State, it can not fix the rate beyond what it would fix on Federal securities. In other words, it is forbidden through the channels of the tax power to make a Federal security less burdensome or to be preferred to a State security.

If it is held that the Government may use the tax power to destroy the credit of a State, which, of course, is incredible, this amendment would require the Government to put the Federal securities in the same category.

It must be noted that whatever is done under this amendment will be done by Congress. It is not overlooked that Congress as it is constituted speaks the will of the States. How far would a proposal get that looks to destroying a State's credit in a body that speaks for the States, as is the case in Congress? This contention falls of its own weight.

I have no hesitancy in giving my vote to permitting the people of the States to decide on this issue.

If we decide to continue the high-income tax, then surely we should prevent a practice that looks to the certain breakdown of the system.

I see no better way than that proposed by this amendment.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I stated there would only be one more speech on this side. I would like to have the gentleman agree that there may be an additional speech of one minute.

Mr. FESS. That will be all right.

Mr. POU. I yield one minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when the legislatures come to pass on this question, if they do, the action of the House of Representatives of the United States in submitting it to them in all probability may have some weight with them. I want to call the attention concretely to the proposition that we are allowed one and three twenty-ninths minutes apiece to debate this question.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by the rule which is before the House it is proposed to make in order a resolution

to submit to the several States for their action an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I have no objection to the form of the rule. There perhaps ought to be, there should be, more debate; but as far as the form of the rule is concerned, it is unobjectionable; but I do not believe it is wise or proper that the House should pass upon this matter to-day under the conditions that exist to-day.

A few moments ago we had a roll call in the House, and 266 Members answered to their names. Assuming that there are at least 20 in the city who did not answer and who will be here on the final roll call, it would make a total membership here of 286. Two-thirds of 286 would be approximately 191. So that it may result that an amendment to the fundamental, the organic law of the Republic will be submitted to the several States for ratification by 191 votes, or less, decidedly less, than half the membership of the House. So much for that; the legality of it, of course, is beyond question, but the policy of it deserves our very serious consideration.

The text of the proposed amendment is as follows:

ARTICLE —.

SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States or any State.

SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States; but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under authority of such State.

The gentlemen who have so far spoken in behalf of this proposed amendment have devoted themselves entirely to the economic phase. I appreciate the importance of that. As a general proposition I am opposed to tax-exempt securities, and as a member of the legislature of my State I should be unwilling, except under extraordinary circumstances, to vote for tax-exempt securities. But I do not propose to enter into the economic discussion; that will be presented by others later.

There is a phase much more fundamental, gentlemen of the House, than the economic question. This is a proposition to commingle the powers of the State and the Federal Government in a manner which no amendment ever yet adopted, or ever proposed so far as I know, has attempted to do. It is designed by this amendment, sir, to give to the Federal Government a certain power, and it may amount to a power of life and death, over the credit of the States. [Applause.] On the other hand it is proposed—and herein comes the commingling—to give to the States a certain power which it is possible in the development of human society may reach the point where the States will possess the power of life and death over the credit of the Federal Government. Neither of these conditions is desirable from my standpoint. [Applause.]

I, of course, am a believer in State rights, and I am also a believer in the national rights and powers. [Applause.] I would have each sovereignty's credit independent of the control by taxation of the other sovereignty. Oh, it is insisted that this is reciprocal. I shall undertake to show you that it is not reciprocal in fact. Even with the States as the unit it could not be reciprocal for a long period of years, even approximately; but bear this in mind, gentlemen of the House, the tax-exempt securities, or the great bulk of them, upon which it is designed to give the power of Federal taxation by this amendment are not the bonds and securities of the sovereign States, but are the bonds and securities of the subordinate governments within the State. They are city bonds, county bonds, drainage bonds, school bonds, and all the income upon these bonds of the various subdivisions will be rendered subject to taxation by the Federal Government, but the municipalities can not levy an income tax on the Federal bonds in return.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MILLS. Is it not within the power of the State government to give them authority to levy such an income tax?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is within the realm of possibility that by a change of the constitution of many of the States it might be accomplished, but if that should be done we come then to the proposition that towns and counties would be given a certain control over the credit of this, the greatest Nation on earth. [Applause.]

Oh, this is but another step toward that centralization of power so dangerous to the liberties of the people of the country. Mr. Speaker, I do not proclaim the doctrine of State rights as a sentimental proposition. I am quite willing to forget, for the time being, that that doctrine was sanctified by the blood of heroes spilled in the red welter of war, but let us approach it upon the cold, calm basis of the science of government. The liberties of this people will never be in danger so long as you can keep the powers of government distributed under our dual system, under the checks and balances of the Constitution as it stands, but when you have proceeded again and again and taken these steps until you have finally centralized all your functions and powers of government in a central force, when you have continued to listen and respond affirmatively to the cry coming up from minorities and groups and blocs for legislation and constitutional amendments concerning every possible phase of our local life—the cry of "on to Washington, on to Washington"—you will have created here a central spot at which the future enemies of this country can strike. I do not fear sovietism in this Republic so long as the powers are distributed, but create here once a central power, confer upon this Republic control over the credits of your States, your municipalities, your subdivisions, create here your great central government with all governmental powers, particularly the power of credit, and you create a central point at which sovietism can strike with a single blow, and, God knows, I fear that issue very much.

Oh, we have moved rapidly by legislation, much more rapidly, I fear, than some of us realize. Through these systems of cooperative appropriation, road appropriation, whereby you appropriate so much and give it to a State if a State will give so much, taxing the State anyway, whether it gives or not, and thus coercing it; by the passage of maternity legislation, by the passage of various measures similar in principle, you have gradualy enhanced the powers of the Federal Government, in so far as you can legislatively, and now you come to lay your hands upon the Constitution of the country to bring about a commingling of powers. I may be mistaken, but I repeat the thought that I expressed earlier in my remarks, that never has there been an amendment proposed which in its fundamental aspect went so far as this. Even the prohibition amendment, while it took over police powers, yet maintained the police power of the States in all of its integrity. Here you give the power over credits. What can sovereignty be without full power over its credit? You seek to give the Federal Government power over the credits of your States, and to the States you seek to give power over the credit of the Federal Government.

It will be pointed out before this debate concludes, I apprehend—and I have not the time to go into it now—that it will be years before it can be even reciprocal, as far as that proposition is concerned. Even if it could be so to-morrow, I still oppose it, because I believe in rendering unto the State the things that are the State's and unto the Nation the things that are the Nation's. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very earnest statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I should have been even more impressed by what he said if I thought that it had any real logical relation to the matter now before the House. I doubt if it has. I assume that everyone will vote for this rule. I think that no one is justified in refusing to give the Members of the House an opportunity to express an opinion on so important a matter as that now before the House. It is not necessary, either in this case or in the case of any resolution proposing submission of a constitutional amendment, that we shall be fully and finally convinced as to the wisdom and desirability of the adoption of the amendment before we give our vote on the submission of the matter to the people of the country. It is quite sufficient if we are convinced: First, that there are a large number of people who desire to have the matter submitted; and, second—and this applies particularly to the situation now confronting us—that a condition has arisen under a policy adopted by the Congress, with the approval of the people of the country generally, under which it is very clear that Federal income taxation has ceased to be entirely logical or equitable. In this situation, in my opinion, Congress will be derelict in its duty if it does not give the people of the country an opportunity to say whether or no in their opinion the organic law should be so modified as to make possible the logical development of a policy which we have deliberately entered upon. There is just one class of men who, in my opinion, may be justified in voting against the resolution when it shall be presented to us. That class consists of those who believe that we have altogether too far advanced the size of the contribution demanded in income taxes laid on the large incomes of the country, who believe that we should return to low income surtaxes. If we were to do that, if the income taxes of the

Federal Government were to be reduced to low figures, then there would be little necessity or demand for a modification of the Constitution as is proposed. But of all of the illogical positions that it is possible for any gentleman to take, it is the position held by those in favor of high surtaxes against the passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if there be no objection, I give notice now that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment, if no one else does, to limit the time within which this proposed amendment may be ratified, probably to five or seven years.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Will it be in order now to move to compel attendance by absentees? And if it is in order I shall make such a motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is in order. That is a matter left to the conscience of each Member. The previous question is considered as ordered. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) there were—ayes 118, noes 52.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SNELL. It is too late.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I had already risen to ask recognition.

Mr. LONDON. Then I withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 314, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 314, with Mr. MCARTHUR in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 314, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —.

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States; but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued, after the ratification of this article, by or under authority of such State."

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that I be notified when I have consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], speaking upon the rule very rightfully referred to this measure as extremely important. When, however, he spoke of its being the most far-reaching of any constitutional amendment that anyone had proposed, his memory has failed him for the moment. This resolution has been under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee for nearly a year. It worked upon the form of it for about six months in conjunction with the attorneys of the Treasury. It finally agreed upon the form which, for the first time, places a limit upon the manner in which a given taxable subject may be handled by the Congress. The original income tax amendment, which was the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution, provided that Congress should have power to levy and collect taxes upon incomes from whatever source derived without apportionment among the several States. At that time nearly everyone who read the amendment supposed it would give the National Government complete and sweeping authority over the State, municipality, county, and township issues to tax them as the Federal Government through Congress saw fit, and at any rate, whether it was different from the rate established by the Federal Government, either higher or lower, or establishing among them different classes. Subsequently, rather to the surprise of a great majority of lawyers, the Supreme Court, on passing on the sixteenth amendment, held that the words "from whatever source derived" were not controlling, and that the amendment simply removed the necessity of apportionment of these taxes. As a result the Federal Government lost the power through this amendment to tax State and municipal securities. There is now presented the most important problem that was ever presented to the Congress and the American people.

We have come, gentlemen of the House, to a parting of the ways. This Congress must decide whether our income tax law shall be in fact a real scientific system with some approach to fairness or whether it is to be simply an instrument of oppression upon the people. Under the present operation of the income tax there can be no tax which works more unfairly, more unjustly, and more inequitably than the income tax does, although when the sixteenth amendment was first introduced it was thought that the tax would work more fairly than any other and come more nearly doing justice to those who paid it. The proposition that is presented by this amendment is not only one that affects our Federal revenues, but it affects our business; it affects our social system. Year by year, I might almost say month by month, the great taxable incomes are falling off in number and in amount. Year by year and month by month the number of small incomes that are taxed by this Government in number and amount are steadily increasing. In other words, as we proceed under our present system and the days go by we tax the wealthy man less and the man of modest means more. I have here some tables showing how rapidly taxable incomes of those above $300,000 have decreased and how rapidly the taxable incomes of those below that amount have increased. You can see from the chart in 1916 1,296 incomes of over $300,000 were reported. In 1920 only 395 are reported.

There is not a man in the sound of my voice but knows these incomes are not decreasing in fact. It is the amount that is subject to the Federal tax that is decreasing. These great fortunes, and I am not complaining because they exist, these great fortunes are on the increase instead of on the decrease, but when it comes to paying taxes the amount taxable is steadily decreasing. But how is it with the small taxpayer?

You can see from the chart that the number of all classes that are paying taxes is almost 2,000,000 more in 1920 than even in 1919, showing that the Government is continually reaching out after the small taxpayer and making the man with a small income pay more, and that those with large incomes are investing more and more in tax-exempt securities. I might add also that the amount of tax-exempt securities is constantly increasing. About $1,500,000,000 have been issued this year, while in 1913 the total was only about $450,000.

I know that gentlemen say that the cost is equal, whether we tax these securities or whether we do not, but every tax expert who came before the Ways and Means Committee without exception testified that neither the Government nor the State got any great amount of benefit by reason of this tax exemption. Professor Seligman, Mr. Leffingwell, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and others who had studied the effect of issuing tax-exempt securities, all testified to the same effect. The party who gets the benefit of this tax exemption is not the State nor the Government but the man who buys these securities. And so great is this benefit that day by day, as I have said, everyone knows that the owners of great estates are gradually transferring all of their property into tax-exempt securities. It is easy to find men with incomes of over $100,000 who pay not a single cent to the National Treasury nor to the State, county, or township, while farmers, business men, and others are suffering under the burdensome and oppressive taxes that necessarily prevail to-day.

The gentleman from Tennessee has said that he was not in favor of a strong central government, for that would verge on sovietism. What does he expect will happen if this outrageous injustice is not remedied? I say without any hesitation that this condition of affairs can not long continue in this country; it can not for any great length of time exist half taxed and half free, when those who are the most wealthy pay little or nothing and those who have to bear the burden and the heat of the day must pay out of all proportion to their income or their property.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In just a moment. Under this system you may expect Bolshevism and sovietism to come upon us, for the present system is unendurable. It is such conditions that create Bolshevism and sovietism.

Now I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I wish the gentleman would make it clear that we are not destroying the credit of the States. It is simply taxing the income. If you tax one, you can not tax the other. There is no attack upon the credit of any State.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Under this amendment the securities of a State can not be taxed at a higher rate than the tax upon the Federal securities, and this tax is simply upon income alone. It authorizes no property tax. The whole amendment is reciprocal in its effect. The State has the authority to tax in the same manner and to the same extent the securities of the Federal Government that the Federal Government has to tax the State securities.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. GARNER. I wanted to know whether the gentleman agreed to the premises laid down by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that this proposed amendment did not give to Congress the power to destroy the State's credit?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There can be no possible question about it. It does not give that power. I know what my friend from Texas is coming to. He would say that the day may come when the Federal Government has no securities outstanding, and therefore at that time it may levy such a tax as it sees fit upon the State securities. If that remote and, as it seems to me, utterly impossible contingency should at any time take place, who are they who will sit here in these seats? The Representatives of the various States. The agents of the States who are devoted to their interests. Would the gentleman from Texas vote to destroy the power of his own State to issue securities? Would any gentleman on this floor vote for that? Can you imagine that any sane man would?

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman allow me to answer that question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I will not vote to destroy the State securities; neither would I give the opportunity to anybody else to destroy the State credit.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then the gentleman wants to continue the present iniquity and take chances on the wrong and iniquity of the present system rather than take chances of the agents of the States themselves destroying the credit of the States.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I regret I can not.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I thought the gentleman had some information that the House would like to have. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask him this question: In the gentleman's judgment, if this amendment becomes a part of the Federal Constitution will it in any way interfere with the States in taxing their own securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not in the slightest degree. Each State can now do it, and it can tax the securities of another State.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I know each State can do that now, but the gentleman does not think this amendment would give the Congress the power in any way to interfere with the States taxing their own securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not at all. It certainly would not.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Under this amendment could Congress impose a graduated tax upon the income derived from those State securities? Two per cent on an income of over $1,000 and 3 per cent and higher on an income of $10,000?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It could if it chose impose the same kind of tax upon its own securities. The only provision here is that there shall be absolutely no discrimination in any manner whatsoever against the State securities. So long as privileges and rights and exemptions are kept the same the rate of tax can be progressive.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. What does the gentleman understand to be the right of one State to tax the security of another State at this time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is no question but that they have the right to tax the securities of another State at this time.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I shall reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. GARNER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, please call my attention to the fact when I have occupied as much as 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I regret that the advocates of this proposed constitutional amendment have not given you a more elaborate explanation of the effect which it will have, if adopted. However, I realize, and I think the membership of the House realizes, that there are few in the House that fully understand the far-reaching effect of the proposed amendment. I think I am not out of harmony with the truth when I say that the gentleman [Mr. GREEN of Iowa] who presented the matter a few moments ago, learned and able as he is, is not fully cognizant himself of the effect of the proposed amendment.

There is always a primary purpose in the submission of either a constitutional amendment or a bill before the House of Representatives. However long the bill may be, or however short it may be, so far as its verbiage is concerned, there is a principal purpose in the bill. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] tells you, and I believe he is sincere in his own belief, that the purpose of this proposed amendment is to subject the income from State, county, and municipal bonds to the taxing power of the Federal Government in order that rich people might not escape their fair burden of taxation by virtue of investing their funds in such securities.

I ask you whether or not the record in this case justifies Mr. GREEN in that attitude? I say no. I undertake to say that hearings in this case, propaganda coming from all portions of the United States, the declaration of the President himself to Congress show that the primary purpose of this proposed amendment is to restrict and, if necessary, prohibit the issuance of county, State, and municipal bonds.

Now, why do I say that? I challenge you to read the message of the President on this subject again, because in it you will find this declaration that these bonds ought to be subject to taxation, for the reason that they are absorbing the capital of the Nation, diverting it from active industry; and therefore Congress should restrict it by this method.

Now, will anyone challenge my statement? Does anyone dispute that the President is the highest authority in the advocacy of this amendment that I can give as a witness? I cite his language, where he says in his message of December 6, 1921:

> I think our tax problems, the tendency of wealth to seek nontaxable investment, and the menacing increase of public debt—Federal, State, and municipal—all justify a proposal to change the Constitution so as to end the issue of nontaxable bonds.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. He gives the additional reason that it is necessary in order to check the extravagance of the States and their subdivisions.

Mr. GARNER. Yes. I say there is a paramount, primary purpose in the mind of every man who draws an amendment to the Constitution and submits it, or who draws a bill and submits it to the Congress, and I say that the primary purpose of the men who are back of this amendment—I do not include the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], for I concede their entire good faith—but I say the prime purpose of the men who have been agitating this amendment most and who would have it adopted as a part of the Constitution is to restrict and, if need be, to prohibit almost entirely the issuance of State, county, and municipal bonds.

Now, gentlemen, we had just as well come to the crux of the whole matter, because time is limited. Let me criticize, if I may without being partisan in any way, the Republican organization for limiting the debate on this resolution to four hours. Here we are to call upon the House of Representatives to submit to the sovereign States of the Union an amendment proposing to take away from them their credit or to seriously impair it, with only four hours of general debate to discuss so important and far-reaching a subject.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield to the gentleman; yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is aware that this proposition has been before the Committee on Ways and Means for more than a year, that it has been discussed in that committee and discussed on the floor here, and that it has been under discussion in the public press.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I agree with what the gentleman says, but nevertheless I know that I speak within proper bounds when I say that I have heard 25 Members say they

did not understand the full meaning and effect of this amendment; that they were going to get the hearings and make a more thorough study of the subject. I venture to say that many of these Members who have spoken to me in that vein are sitting on the floor of the House now. This debate should not be rushed to a conclusion within four hours. The House needs more time than that to consider it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This proposed amendment was reported more than six months ago.

Mr. GARNER. Well, there are many bills and resolutions which have been reported from committees. Merely because a bill or resolution has been reported for some time does not alter the case any. It does occur to me that you might have given more general debate on this subject without interfering with or jeopardizing your program of passing certain appropriation bills before the holidays.

I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] if he agreed with the proposition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that he would place in the hands of the Congress the power to destroy the issuance of bonds by States and municipalities if we adopt this amendment. He said he did not; that this proposed amendment would not place in the hands of Congress the power to prohibit the issuance of bonds by States and municipalities. Is that correct?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That statement certainly is not correct, if I understand what you say.

Mr. GARNER. Now we have an issue.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It does not prohibit the issuance of any State bonds.

Mr. GARNER. All right. I will make this proposition to the House: If I can not demonstrate to any five lawyers you may select in the House of Representatives—and you may select them—if I can not demonstrate to them that this places in the hands of the Congress the power to take away from the States and municipalities the right to issue bonds by taking away from the owners of such bonds the interest income by taxation, I will retire from this contest and have nothing more to say about the amendment. Just a moment now and let me see if I can not convince you that if this amendment is ratified the Congress of the United States will have the power to destroy the credit of the States, because it will have the power to take as a tax all the interest that the bondholders receive and put it in the Treasury of the United States. Let us suppose, gentlemen, that to-morrow this amendment was a part of the Constitution of the United States and that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and that he desired to prohibit every State in the Union and every county and every municipality from issuing any more bonds. Suppose that was his purpose and he should report a bill under this constitutional amendment which would say that every dollar of interest on State, municipal, county, and Federal bonds received by any individual upon bonds hereafter issued—because you could not affect those theretofore issued—every dollar received in the way of interest on those bonds should be paid into the Treasury of the United States as a tax. You would not have any more bonds issued, would you? Would that be constitutional?

I can not believe that, if Members of Congress understood that the power contained in this amendment, if adopted, might be used to take away from the States the chance to get any money whatever on their bonds, they would for a moment even consider the possibility of voting for it.

Mr. COCKRAN. Will the gentleman allow me for just a moment?

Mr. GARNER. Just a moment. Now, if Congress should pass a law in which it should provide that hereafter as to any bonds issued by the Federal Government or any State government or its subdivisions, all of the interest received on such bonds should go into the Federal Treasury, would it not have the power to do that under this amendment?

Mr. MILLS. I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman can not answer it, because this amendment gives the United States Congress such power.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman wants an answer, I will answer him now.

Mr. GARNER. I will yield to the gentleman until he answers.

Mr. MILLS. You are given the power to tax, but if the Federal Government exercised that power for the purpose of confiscation it would clearly be extraconstitutional.

Mr. GARNER. Now, gentlemen, we understand we could go up to where it was confiscation. The sale of State and municipal bonds would in all probability be effectually killed long before the point of a confiscation tax was reached within the meaning of the decisions of the courts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was once said, I believe, that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

Mr. GARNER. I believe somebody said that in the Supreme Court a long time ago. Chief Justice Marshall, who did more to interpret and vitalize the Constitution than any man who ever sat upon the Supreme bench, said it.

Mr. STEVENSON. And the very thing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] says would be confiscation was done when Congress taxed out of existence the issues of State banks, when it established the national banks.

Mr. MILLS. That was a special tax and not a general tax.

Mr. GARNER. Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. COCKRAN. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question for the information of the House and myself. If the power which the gentleman describes, and I think in absolutely correct terms, can be employed by the Federal Government with reference to State issues or of municipalities, can it be applied without applying the same rates of taxation to its own issues?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly not. Now the gentleman from New York will please give heed to this phase of the matter, which he probably has not considered. There have been periods of 5 and 10 and 15 years in which the Federal Government did not issue any bonds.

Suppose the Congress of the United States does not issue any bonds for the next five years, but it does desire to stop or restrict the issuance of State or subdivision bonds, and passes a law in which it says that on all bonds in the future issued by Federal, State, or subdivisions there shall be levied a flat 10 per cent tax. That would be enough, would it not?

Mr. COCKRAN. Pretty nearly. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. But suppose we say 50 per cent—make it strong enough for illustration—that any bonds hereafter issued should pay a tax of 50 per cent on the income. The result would be, I think, that all issues of bonds, Federal and subdivisions, would cease. The tax burden would be too heavy for the bond-investing public.

Now, at the end of this five-year period Congress finds that it wants to issue a billion dollars' worth of bonds. Congress meets and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, brings in a bill repealing the tax law. The United States Government then issues its billion dollars' worth of bonds and sells them tax exempt. Congress then, after the bonds are sold and are in the hands of investors, reenacts the law. Where is the State given any right to get along in the world? [Applause.] It is as plain as any human being can make it.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman knows that while it might repeal the law temporarily, the minute it reenacted the law it would apply with full force to the billion dollars' worth of bonds issued by the Federal Government.

Mr. GARNER. Congress passed a shipping bill the other day, and what was one of the principal things which it contained? It was an opportunity to make a contract for 10 years with shipowners which could not be abrogated by any subsequent Congress. If the Government sold its bonds based upon a law exempting them from taxation, how are you going to change it by enacting another statute. It is a contract. Do you think the Congress of the United States would have the power now to subject them to taxation in the hands of the people who own them? Do you believe that? What is the theory of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. This very article in the Constitution would prevent the issuance of tax-free United States Government bonds if the bonds of the States and municipalities were ever taxed.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the Federal bonds issued after the enactment of this amendment are made tax exempt, then the State bonds must be also exempt, and they could not under the amendment do any such thing as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. In all probability all the bonds issued by the Federal Government in the next few years will be renewal of bonds already in existence. Would this amendment give the Federal Government the power to tax the renewal bonds?

Mr. GARNER. The Federal Government has that power now. It has unlimited power to tax the income of its own bonds.

Mr. BARKLEY. But some bonds are now tax free.

Mr. GARNER. If you undertake to refund them, Congress would have the right to make any conditions it wanted to.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Would the States have the right to tax the income on the refunded bonds?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly not under the present law and constitutional limitations.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KING. In view of the fact that nobody outside of a few of the membership of the House can get any time to discuss this matter, I would like to bring out some points in the gentleman's time. What effect will this have on the Federal farm-loan system?

Mr. GARNER. I will try to come to that.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will; and then I want to get on.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman suggests some grave objections to this amendment, and I want to ask him if he has given any consideration to an additional illustration that occurs to me at this time. It is this: We have a surtax now that runs up to 50 per cent. This is in addition to the normal tax of 8 per cent.

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. If we pass a law permitting States to tax income from Federal bonds, the States might also enact surtaxes as high as 50 per cent, and between the two taxes the taxpayer would find all of his income from these securities taken by means of the surtaxes of the State and Federal Governments. That, it seems to me, would destroy the salability of the bonds.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, let me answer everyone who thinks for one moment that the States are gaining anything by this, by saying no. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who introduced the original resolution, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, said that this was a mere sop to the States and had no intention of being any benefit to them. He is the author of it. I gave the President as authority for the principal object of this legislation, and I give you the authority of the author as to what effect it will have upon the States.

The advocates of this amendment talk about it from an economic standpoint. I can demonstrate, and the estimator for the Treasury Department will bear it out, that for every dollar's worth of taxes you get in the way of taxation by virtue of this amendment the interest paid will be four times that tax. The people pay this in the long run, whether the bonds are issued by the Federal Government, the State government, the county, the school district, the road district, the irrigation district, the drainage district, or by whatever other political subdivision. The people pay for it after all. Why do you want to adopt a system by which for every dollar you get into the Treasury of the United States $4 will have to be paid by the public in the form of added interest?

I have that statement from the Secretary of the Treasury—not the figures I have quoted, but I have got the statement from the Secretary of the Treasury that undoubtedly the adoption of this amendment will increase the rate of interest on all bonds—State, county, and municipal. Why, I go further than that and say it will stop the issue. It will so cripple the market for these county and State bonds that you can not sell them, and why? I have an issue, we will say, of a million dollars' worth of bonds from the city of San Antonio, Tex. They are perfectly good, they bear 5 per cent interest, a very high rate, by the way, for those bonds, because I think they have sold them above par drawing only 4½ per cent interest; but I have them at 5 per cent, and I go to Mr. Mills in New York and I say, "I want to sell you these bonds." He replies, "Mr. GARNER, the city of San Antonio is a large city, that security is perfectly good, but there is a provision in the Constitution of the United States which says that the Congress may the day after to-morrow, after I buy these bonds at 5 per cent, take 2½ per cent away from me as income tax and put it in the Treasury. I do not want your bonds." That is quite natural on his part. He is a business man. He is not going to buy something that the Congress of the United States in 24 hours can destroy. Is not that so, Mr. MILLS? Can not the United States destroy that bond for you?

Mr. MILLS. Only by destroying every other security on the market.

Mr. GARNER. Oh, I am just giving illustrations of what might be done if this amendment passes. The power to tax income from State, county, and municipal bonds would be the power to destroy them.

I can go before a joint session of the Legislature of the State of Texas and say, "Gentlemen, here is what Mr. MILLS sent down to you. He wants you to surrender the right of the people over in your district to issue bonds by giving power to the Federal Government to levy whatever taxes it sees fit against them, and what are you going to do about it?" And I have no doubt that they will say, "To the lower regions with such a proposition." They will say that they are not going to give up their right to reclaim the desert lands by a bond issue for irrigation, their right to protect the people of the cities in their health by the issue of bonds for sewerage, and their right to build roads in this country by bond issues.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will yield in a moment, after I have discussed a little further the proposition I am now talking about. The Federal Government is itself encouraging, and I might say promoting, the issuance of road bonds by the several States, because of the large appropriations made by Congress to be spent in cooperation with the States. These appropriations require the States to match the amount dollar for dollar. How can they do it except by bond issues, and yet you gentlemen come to Congress and ask us to surrender the State right to issue those bonds free from the right of the Federal Government to tax them. You Republicans, by bills brought from your committees, have exempted bonds of the United States Government to the amount of nearly $20,000,000,000. Doctor Seligman said that we have thirty billions of bonds in this country exempt to a more or less extent from taxation, and he is correct. Why? Because Congress did it. The law exempted them. You Republicans passed a provision in the last bill in which you carried $125,000 worth of bonds for every man, woman, and child in this country that could own them, as exempt from income tax, and all a rich man has to do is to place $125,000 in the name of each one of the family, and he does not have to pay anything in the way of income tax on a very large amount of bonds, and you Republicans did it, so that I think you are somewhat estopped from coming to the Congress now and complaining about this tremendous issue of tax-exempt bonds.

Who are the people back of the propaganda for this amendment? I have tried to show you that the President said the real reason for it was that it would restrict the issuance of these State and municipal bonds, so that the money could go elsewhere into other kinds of business. I thought to myself, when I heard him read that portion of his message, what is more important to this country than the building of schoolhouses, the construction of good roads, the reclaiming of the desert lands, and the cultivation of the waste places. Thank God money can be invested in that way. These things are conservers of civilization. If they fail, then our boasted civilization sinks into chaos. If you are going to take away the power to issue bonds to do these things, then these things can not be done.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he contends that State and municipal ability to market bonds is dependent upon the tax-exempt privilege?

Mr. GARNER. Not altogether. The extent of the impairment of the ability to market these bonds would depend upon how heavy the rate of Federal taxation. If present extravagance on the part of the Federal Government continues, taxation will increase instead of decrease. While I am not a supporter of this proposed amendment, I am going to offer amendments in perfect good faith, which I think, if adopted, will greatly improve it. My amendments would confine the power of the Federal Government to tax the income from State and municipal securities at no higher rate than income from "any other source." Is not that what you want? Do you not want to subject the income from these bonds to the same tax that you levy against the income from, we will say, Pennsylvania Railroad stocks and bonds? You do not want to do that. I am going to offer an amendment which, if adopted, will make certain that the Federal Government would not have the power to levy a tax which would discriminate against State and municipal bonds in favor of industrial bonds. The amendments which I will offer at the proper time are:

Amendment No. 1. Strike out all after the word "from," line 1, page 2, first section of the bill, and insert "any other purpose."

Amendment No. 2. Strike out all after the word "from," line 8, page 2, and insert "any other source."

I think a great many people in this country, perhaps a majority of them, would like to subject the income on these county, State, and municipal bonds to taxation, if it could be done without impairing their credit. I think that is absolutely true. I want to do that. I would like to do it. I would join with any man who is able to solve the difficulty. I offered to join the gentleman from Iowa, and he said——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER. I ask some gentleman to whom I have agreed to yield time if I may have 10 minutes more.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Take my time.

Mr. GARNER. Thank you. Now, let me say, I can take the inheritance tax law—I see you shake your head—I can take the inheritance tax law and I can put it on the books so that in the course of time the graduation will be the same, and I will get the same amount of money from these securities or maybe more than I will from securities that are subject to Federal income tax.

I might also add in this discussion that the States have already surrendered about all the power they should to the Federal Government.

How far, gentlemen, how far are we going to go in surrendering to the Federal Government the right to control society, finance, and everything else pertaining to the people? If the Federal Government keeps on assuming functions which properly belong to the State government, what is there going to be left for the State to do anyhow, except to duplicate what the Federal Government is doing? There is another point in this matter which I want to emphasize before I conclude my remarks. There is about $11,000,000,000 in round numbers of these State, municipal, and county securities outstanding. Now, gentlemen, do you know what that means? Do you know that the passage of this proposed amendment by the States would increase the value of those outstanding bonds two billions and a half? Perhaps that explains some of the activity for this amendment. It is natural that the owners of these securities would favor an amendment which would increase their wealth by 10 or 15 per cent. It is a natural thing for them to want legislation that will increase it. Then, there is another active group who are urging this amendment. They are the gentlemen who have heretofore been loaning large sums on landed property in this country. Ah, gentlemen, the records of the hearings on this amendment are full of their advocacy of it. They want Congress to discontinue the tax exemption feature as to farm loan bonds. I say that because the men who appeared and represented these loan companies frankly admitted it. They were honest fellows, at least. They said they could not compete with this non-tax money. The situation as to agriculture and live stock we all know has been bad. Why, you find in the present Congress a number of bills having for their object the affording of relief to these important interests. How can you do so? I say the man who has given it one moment's thought knows that you can not help the farmer get cheap money except in one of two ways. You can loan him the Government's credit or you can afford him a system like the farm loan system, wherein his own securities are assembled and sold to the investing public free of Federal, State, and municipal taxes. I much prefer this latter system than the loaning of the Government's credit, because I think it is a much sounder one.

Shall we drive the Government into the business of direct loans to agriculture by removing the tax exemption from Federal farm loan bonds? I am not willing to do so.

I fear that these gentlemen who are clamoring so loudly for the removal of tax exemption from farm loan bonds do not want the system to succeed.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, I know if you ask the people if they want to tax the securities in the hands of the rich people they will say yes. The farmers and the farm unions and the chambers of commerce say they favor this amendment. At least some of them do. But I believe a more thorough study of the proposition and a full realization of all that its adoption might mean will change their conclusions in the question at issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Just one minute more. And, gentlemen, as for me, especially in respect to constitutional amendments which go so far to affect the very fundamentals of our Government, I feel a very keen responsibility. I will vote for what I believe to be for the best interests of the whole people, of posterity, of my children and grandchildren, rather than in accordance with propaganda which is frequently based on imperfect understanding and must surely and certainly give way to better reason and judgment. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had concurred in the amendments of the House to Senate amendment No. 4 to the bill (H. R. 13316) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

TAX-EXEMPT SECURITIES.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I was to have 30 minutes. It is impossible to argue this proposition in 30 minutes, so that I shall ask the Members of the House not to interrupt me, because I prefer to present in a logical way the reasons why I am going to support this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman can not complete his argument in the time given, I will give him more.

Mr. CRISP. I will try to get through. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was at first proposed, I was against it. As the hearings progressed, attending those hearings and listening to the witnesses, I became convinced that it was the greatest economic evil, this matter of tax-exempt securities, that confronted the country, and I believed the welfare of my country demanded that that evil be stopped, and the only way that I know of whereby you can correct the evil is by a constitutional amendment providing that in the future tax-exempt securities can not be issued.

I am proud of our dual system and have reverence for our forefathers who created this great Government, and I do not think the fundamental law should be changed lightly or with every passing whim, but only where the welfare of the country is vitally concerned.

It is with regret that I find myself differing with my party leaders on this subject, but it is not a political question but an economic one. Besides, Mr. Chairman, years ago I decided as long as I was in Congress to be true to my convictions and vote in accordance with them, and I shall do so in this instance. I believe in State rights. I believe our system of government is the greatest one ever devised. But those statesmen of years gone by realized that the world moves. They realized that time would demonstrate the necessity for amendments to the Constitution, and they provided a method in the Constitution itself whereby it could be amended; and since the Government was organized 19 amendments have already been adopted to that sacred instrument, so it is no sacrilege to again amend it.

Now, gentlemen, at the time the Government was formed the tax-exempt privilege was more of a theory than an actual economic condition. It really conferred no special benefit and worked no serious injury, and the tax-exempt privilege did not become of great importance until the country adopted the sixteenth amendment which authorized an income-tax law and Congress had passed a graduated income-tax system. Then it became of vast and vital importance. I believe in a graduated income tax. Economists of every country believe that the fairest of all taxes are graduated income taxes. They believe that men should pay taxes according to their ability to pay. We have an income tax law, both dominant political parties of the country supporting it, and we have provided for high surtaxes. Gentlemen, if you do not stop the issue of tax-free securities you absolutely nullify and destroy your income tax law.

Now, I have always heard the adage, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts," and long before to-day I had thought of that in connection with this constitutional amendment. Unfortunately for me, I am not rich; unfortunately for me, I do not own a bond that will be affected by this legislation. But when I saw a number of able, wealthy gentlemen advocating this amendment I began to look around to see why. It is quite apparent why a man that believes in high surtaxes should favor it, but I was more at a loss to see the reason which actuated those who did not believe in them in supporting it unless, if you wish to attribute an unworthy motive to them, it was because they owned a great number of tax-exempt securities whose values would be increased by the adoption of the amendment. I know many splendid rich men and I prefer to believe they are supporting the amendment for love of country and patriotic reasons and not for selfish, ulterior motives.

But, gentlemen, be that as it may, as I read the testimony and listened to the hearings I became convinced of the absolute necessity for legislation being enacted that would stop the vast fortunes of this country from escaping taxation by being invested in tax-exempt securities, and the one way to do it is by a constitutional amendment.

Gentlemen of the Congress, do you realize the vast amount of tax-free bonds now outstanding and available for investment? According to the testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, there are between 10 and 15 billions of State and

municipal tax-free bonds in existence, and 3 billions of United States bonds totally exempt, making an aggregate of totally tax-exempt securities of from 13 to 18 billions of dollars. In addition, there are outstanding about 18 billions of United States bonds containing certain tax-exempt privileges for the next three years, which swell the total of possibly tax-exempt securities to from 20 to 30 billions of dollars.

These securities afford a complete haven of refuge to wealthy men seeking to escape taxation, and they are undoubtedly availing themselves of the privilege. In his message of December 6, 1921, President Harding said:

I think our tax problems—the tendency of wealth to secure nontaxable investments and the menacing increase of public debt, State, Federal, and municipal—all justify the proposal to change the Constitution so as to end the issue of nontaxable bonds.

Financing the late European war was a Herculean task, but the Democratic administration successfully did it. The man who directed the financing was the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. R. C. Leffingwell, so he qualifies at once as a bond and tax expert. Referring to tax-exempt securities in testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, he said:

Tax exemption is a very grave peril that to-day undermines the very basis of public revenue, and it is a social evil of the first magnitude. It casts the greater part of the tax burden upon earned incomes and gives more or less immunity to unearned incomes. It diverts capital from productive enterprises and housing into wasteful or deferable Government enterprises. * * * I think the combined social and economic objection to the present situation is absolutely controlling. This country has been a land of opportunity, and to-day's rich men got to be rich men when the money they saved was theirs and not the Government's. By virtue of the high surtaxes and the exemptions awarded to the fortunes already existing you are confirming in their monopoly of the country's capital the rich men who got to be rich men before the war, and you are denying to the men who had not gotten there before the war the hope of ever getting there. You have taken away a very important stimulus to effort, and you have created a sense of social wrong that is a very grave problem, because it is a social wrong to take a third of the income "of a man who with his brains made $50,000 last year and had not a penny before, and to take nothing of the income of a man sitting at home or in his club and enjoying an income of $50,000 derived from tax-exempt bonds."

Hon. D. F. Houston and Hon. CARTER GLASS, both Secretaries of the Treasury under President Woodrow Wilson, in their annual reports to Congress called attention to the evils of tax-exempt securities. The present Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Andrew Mellon, testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, said:

Tax-exempt bonds issued by the Nation, States, and municipalities are drying up the sources of industrial capital and placing a premium on extravagance in government—

That tax-exempt securities constitute one of the greatest economic evils the country has ever faced; that—

as long as a large percentage of those most able to pay taxes escape all tax burdens through investment in tax-exempt securities the balance of the population must pay double taxes to raise the revenue needed by the Government.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee will disclose telegrams from 15 governors of the States urging the submission of this amendment; 6 governors opposed the amendment, 7 were noncommittal, and the remaining governors did not communicate with the committee on the subject.

The committee hearings show that the subject of tax-exempt securities has been given careful consideration by various tax associations and tax experts. Many of them appeared before the committee and testified, urging the submission of the amendment, among them the National Tax Association, composed of representatives from every State, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Economic Association, the Investment Bankers' Association, the Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association, associations representing the public-utility business, the New York State tax conference, the People's Reconstruction League, the Ohio Tax Association, representatives of labor organizations, and a large number of business men from the different States of the Union. So far as the committee knows, all prominent authorities on the subject of taxation favor the proposed amendment. This is the only one of the great nations that permits the issuance of tax-exempt securities.

The Dearborn Independent, a newspaper owned by Henry Ford, expressing Mr. Ford's views on this subject, says:

Why should any class of private or corporate property be exempt from taxation? Some one has to pay. Just as the general public had to make up revenue lost in rebates and free passage, so the rest of us are forced to pay a double share to make up for the exempts and delinquents.

The Atlanta Constitution, one of the leading dailies of the South, editorially says on the subject:

There should be no tax-exempt securities. Every dollar should be compelled to contribute its pro rata share toward the support of the Government and the upbuilding of the country. There should be no favoritism as between legitimate investments, so far as the principle of taxation is concerned. So long as there is a bomb-proof, tax-exempt cellar in which capital may hide away from the tax gatherer, the burden of maintaining the Government and of providing adequate public-utility facilities for the masses will not be justly and equitably distributed among the people.

That the wealth of the country is not bearing its just burden of government and is escaping taxation by being invested in these tax-free securities no one who will study the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee or study the statistics from the Treasury Department can for one moment doubt. Money goes where it will make the greatest return to the owner. If I had money I would so invest it, you would so invest it, and the men who have money now do so invest it.

Let me call your attention to some statistics relative to the income tax.

Table showing decline of taxable incomes over $300,000.

	Number of returns.		Net income.	
	All classes.	Incomes over $300,000.	All classes.	Incomes over $300,000.
1916	437,036	1,296	$6,298,577,620	$992,972,986
1917	3,472,890	1,015	13,652,383,207	731,372,153
1918	4,425,114	627	15,924,639,355	401,107,898
1919	5,332,760	679	19,859,491,448	440,011,589
1920	7,259,944	169	23,735,629,183	

You will observe from the table that, in 1916, 1,296 persons returned an income of over $300,000 each, while in 1920 the number paying a tax on such incomes dropped to 169 persons. To-day, I have no doubt, the number is much less than 169.

The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the year 1920 shows that 1,900,000 more persons made income-tax returns that year than made them in 1919; that the aggregate income reported was approximately $4,000,000,000 more than it was in 1919; and yet, notwithstanding that there were 1,900,000 more persons making returns and the taxable income was $4,000,000,000 more, the Government lacked $194,000,000 of collecting as much tax from incomes in 1920 as it collected the year before, 1919. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, there was $1,300,000,000 less collected from incomes and from corporation taxes than was collected the year before. Congress repealed the excess-profits tax, and the greatest estimate we have heard as to the amount it would produce was $450,000,000. If you subtract that from the $1,300,000,000 left, it will leave a falling off from income taxes of $947,000,000 in the last taxable year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. With small incomes paying more all the time.

Mr. CRISP. I stated that there were 1,900,000 more income-tax payers than the year before. Now, gentlemen, how can you account for that? There is only one way to account for it. The great wealth of the country is going into tax-exempt securities and avoiding taxation.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. No; I ask the Members kindly not to interrupt me for the reason I gave.

Doctor Adams, tax expert for the United States Treasury Department, states that a man with a very large income will receive more from a 5½ tax-exempt security than he will from an investment paying 24 per cent; that a rich man with an income of a million a year, if he buys a farm mortgage or stock paying 6 per cent, will net only 1 per cent a year, whereas a tax-exempt security will net 5½. The president of the American Railway Electric Association is quoted as saying, "No man with an income of above $10,000 can afford to buy an 8 per cent taxable security; he will net more by purchasing a tax-exempt bond paying 5 per cent."

The following quotation is from Collier's:

The banker, Jacob H. Schiff, left an estate valued at nearly $35,000,000. The net taxable income from the whole of it worked out at scarcely 1½ per cent per year. The bulk of his estate was in tax-exempt bonds, because the surtaxes on other investments would have left him a lower rate of return than did the bonds. Schiff was a business man. Tax schedules did not tax him, but only forced his money out of business uses into governmental uses. He had to invest his money not with those who build up industry but with those who spend the proceeds of State, city, and national bond issues. The information contained in such wills as that of Jacob H. Schiff is disquieting to those who want to "make the rich pay all the taxes."

Our colleague from New York [Mr. MILLS], who is a very able man and a financier, testifying before the Ways and Means Committee, said:

Now, the reason why the rich man prefers the tax-exempt bond at 8½ per cent at 97 is that it yields him a very large income, equivalent to a 12 per cent taxable security, and yet he pays less than par for it.

The late railroad magnate, James J. Hill, left a large fortune invested in taxable securities, which netted his widow an income of $365,000 a year. The trustee of the estate sold these

taxable securities and invested the proceeds in tax-free securities and thereby increased the income of the widow to $730,000 a year, thus practically doubling the income. This is not an isolated case, but there are thousands like it.

Julius S. Bache, a New York multimillionaire, states:

The rich escape taxation now, as they have an asylum in tax-exempt bonds.

Charles M. Schwab, multimillionaire steel manufacturer, is quoted as saying he could withdraw from active industry, invest his capital in tax-exempt securities, and net four times as much as he now receives.

If you will investigate the statistics available, you can not escape the conclusion that the men with large fortunes are doing just what you and I would do—investing their money where it yields them the greatest return, and they get the greatest return by withdrawing it from industry and investing it in tax-exempt securities.

Gentlemen, Mr. McCoy, the actuary of the Treasury Department, testifying before the Committee on Ways and Means, estimated that the Government probably lost directly about $120,000,000 on account of not being able to collect a tax on the incomes derived from these tax-exempt securities; but he said that was not all that the Government lost. Men with large fortunes can invest a part of their money in these tax-exempt securities, and if half of their income is yielded from these tax-exempt securities and the other half from taxable securities, making the total income, say, $300,000, if half of it is from nontaxable securities, when the man comes to pay surtaxes he is paying surtaxes on the bracket of $150,000 instead of the $300,000 bracket, when his income, as a matter of fact, is $300,000. The Government is losing many thousands of dollars indirectly in that way in addition to the millions lost directly from not being permitted to tax incomes derived from tax-exempt bonds.

Professor Seligman, of Columbia University, estimates the direct loss of revenue to the Government from tax-exempt bonds at approximately 250 million a year. I believe a study of income-tax statistics will demonstrate that the loss far exceeds this amount.

The proposed amendment does not attempt to tax or affect in any way the bonds now issued, for Congress can not pass any retroactive law. Neither does the amendment propose to tax the ad valorem or market value of bonds to be issued in the future. It only proposes to tax the interest as a part of a man's income derived from bonds issued after this amendment is ratified by the States and becomes a part of the Constitution.

But, gentlemen, to me not only is the loss of money by the Government a reason why this amendment should be adopted but there are other reasons. Tax-exempt securities stagnate business. They put a premium on idleness. They withdraw money from the necessary industrial and business channels of the country. In my judgment they make people pay more for the necessities of life and really add indirectly to the high cost of living. Why do I say that? The railroads must have money for betterments and development. They go into the market and compete with tax-exempt securities. The man with money to loan is going to loan it where it pays him the most. He gets more from a 5 per cent tax-free municipal bond than he does from a 10 or 12 per cent taxable loan if he is a man of large fortune. Therefore, if the railroads get the money necessary for their development they must pay a high rate of interest, which tends to keep up high freight and passenger rates. High freight and passenger rates is one of the great evils of the day. It prevents the farmer from receiving a fair price for his products, and it forces the city man to pay a high price for what he buys.

Let me read you what Mr. Hoover, our present Secretary of Commerce, had to say. Mr. Hoover is a man of world-wide reputation. He says:

Surplus capital is pouring by the hundreds of millions monthly into tax-free securities and foreign loans, and yet our railroads are unable to finance the most moderate of construction programs.

What applies to the railroads applies to other lines of industry. There appeared before the Ways and Means Committee representatives of the various real estate boards throughout the country. I remember the president of the board from Detroit said that there was a shortage of 25,000 to 30,000 homes in Detroit alone; that they could not build them because they had to pay 20 to 25 per cent for money when they used to get it for 10 and 12 per cent; that they could not get it because men with capital were investing their money in tax-free securities that netted them the most. It has been known always, almost a matter of common repute in the United States, that the Astors never sold any real estate, that they held their real estate in New York City.

I understand that within the last few years, since the income tax has been in operation, the Astors have sold $40,000,000 worth of real estate, and are still selling as fast as they can, because after paying taxes, insurance, and high income-tax rates it did not pay them to keep it; they would net more by selling the real estate and investing the proceeds in tax-free securities.

Gentlemen of the Congress, you will find that the public-service corporations, according to testimony of representatives who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, are charging the consumers of gas, electricity, and water higher rates because they have to pay higher interest rates for the necessary money to operate their business. They testified before the committee that when they went into the market before the tax-exempt securities became so valuable to the rich they could get money at a reasonable rate and they sold gas and electricity and water to the consumer cheaper, but now they have to charge the consumers more because they have to pay more for the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CRISP. I thank the gentleman. Now, we are all much interested in the farmers. According to the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, there are about $8,000,000,000 of farm mortgages out in the United States. According to these hearings, only about 5 per cent of that amount was obtained through Government agency or the rural credit land banks. You who are sincerely solicitous for the farmer think well of this—95 per cent of the loans outstanding, owed by the farmers, is money belonging to private individuals, mostly men of large means. Five per cent tax-free securities will net the investor more than a 7 or 8 per cent farm mortgage. What is the result? The farmers are finding it difficult to borrow money, and when their loans mature—and they are maturing all the time—if they can not finance a renewal, it means sales of homes and farms on the sheriff's block. A witness testified before the Senate committee that a few years ago there was a gentleman that had $7,000,000 invested in farm mortgages. Now he has 95 per cent of that $7,000,000 withdrawn from the farm mortgages and has invested it in tax-free securities.

There is a gentleman who resides in my home town, Mr. Ellis, who for years has done an extensive business in loaning money on first mortgages on land. He has sold many million dollars of farm-mortgage notes in the East and the West and different parts of the United States. He was in my office a few days ago and stated that he had just returned from Chicago; that in years past he had sold many thousand dollars' worth of these mortgages to the estate of Marshall Field; that he went to see the trustee of the estate the other day and wanted to sell him more mortgages and the trustee said, "No; we will not take any more mortgages; we are collecting those we own as fast as we can and investing the money in tax-free securities, because it nets us more."

There is a grave social evil of tax-free securities, and that is that it builds up an idle class of rich men who toil not, men who give employment to no one, men who contribute nothing to society, men who are drones. They withdraw their capital from business, they do nothing for society or the Government. They flaunt their wealth in the faces of the laboring people; they spend lavishly, living in luxury and ease, and the only work they do is to clip their coupons from tax-exempt bonds. Do you wonder that men and women who labor for daily bread become dissatisfied with the Government which permits this injustice?

Now, let me call your attention to a few things. A man who works or is in business and earns an income of $10,000 must pay a tax to the Government of $520. A man who has an income of $10,000 from tax-free bonds pays no tax to the Government. A man who has $20,000 income from business pays $1,720 tax. A man who has $20,000 from tax-free bonds pays nothing. The man who has an income of $50,000, which he has earned, pays $8,640, while the man who clips his coupons from the tax-free bonds pays nothing. A man who has $300,000 from his business pays $144,000 in taxes, and the man who inherits bonds and has a net income of $300,000 pays nothing. Do you think that is good for the body politic? Does not that tend to breed anarchy and discontent and contempt for the Government that permits it? How long, O Lord, how long will this be continued. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, I do not blame the rich. If I were rich, I would do it. The law invites it, and therefore there is nothing dishonorable in doing it. What I blame is the lawmakers and the law that continues to permit that policy to be pursued. [Applause.] That is the way I feel about it. But I must hasten along for my time is short, and I do not intend to ask that it

be extended, for many other gentlemen desire to speak and the time for debate is limited. I have already had more than my share of the time. There are two objections, and only two that I have been able to find against this constitutional amendment. One is that it will increase the value of bonds already outstanding. The testimony before the Ways and Means Committee was that there are ten or fifteen billion municipal bonds outstanding, and, of course, this will increase their value. But you know it will be absolutely necessary some time to stop this practice or you will dry up your source of revenue for the Federal Government, and if the Federal Government can not collect money from the wealth of the land through an income tax, as sure as the night follows the day Congress will have to levy consumption taxes, sales taxes, excise taxes, and other vicious annoying taxes, for the Government must have revenue. Therefore "I would rather bear the ills we have than to fly to others we know not of." I prefer to stop it now when we have only ten or fifteen billions, rather than to wait a few years when there will be from twenty to thirty billions outstanding, which will have to be increased in value. According to the best information available, there were 1,300,000,000 tax-exempt bonds issued this year (1922). If you do not prevent this growing evil by a constitutional amendment, each year the amount issued will increase and keep on piling up. So if you do not do it now, when you do stop their issue—which at some time you will be compelled to do—there will be many more bonds out than are out now whose value will have to be increased.

The other and only objection I can find is that it might possibly, and probably will, make the State and municipalities pay a little more interest on the money borrowed. Mr. Leffingwell, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who really managed the finances of the Treasury Department during the war, testified that temporarily it might increase the value one-half per cent, but ultimately when things became adjusted he did not think it would increase the rate of interest on State and municipal bonds. Professor Seligman, of Columbia University, who is an authority on taxation, expressed the same opinion. Secretary Mellon testified it would increase the rate, but did not express a definite opinion as to how much. I admit the rate will be slightly increased, but in my judgment the benefits to the local taxpayers who pay the interest on municipals will far outweigh the evil caused by the slight increase in tax rate.

Gentlemen of Congress, we read in Blackstone there are two things that fix the rate of interest—the scarcity or worth of money and the certainty of its being returned. State and municipal bonds have always brought a premium and have sold cheaper than the highest class industrials, because the security was safer, and there was more certainty of its being repaid. If this amendment is ratified and no other tax-exempt bonds can be issued, State and municipal bonds will still be more desirable, and will bring a better price and sell at a lower rate of interest than the best industrial and railroad bonds will sell for, just as they did before the tax-exempt privilege became of so great a value. Do you know that the tax-exempt privilege of bonds is not of so much value to the borrower as it is to the lender of the money or purchaser of the bonds? It is not for the benefit of the poor so much as it is an unconscionable benefit and advantage to the rich man. Take a man with an income of under six or eight thousand a year, and a tax-exempt 5 per cent bond is worth to him but par.

Take a man with an income of two to three hundred thousand dollars a year, and a 5 per cent tax-exempt bond is worth to him 140. They are the class who are getting the benefit from the tax-exempt privilege. Canada does not permit any tax-exempt securities to be issued. Canada is having no trouble in selling her bonds, and the Canadian bonds, State and municipal, sell for from 1 to 1½ per cent cheaper than the highest industrial bonds. That will be true here, in my judgment, and this amendment does not interfere with the sovereignty of either the United States or of the several States. It puts them on an exact equality, and it was the intention of the committee to put them on an exact equality. I was on the subcommittee that drafted this amendment. As far as I am concerned, I have no pride of opinion as to the wording of the amendment. I am willing myself, although I can not speak for anyone else, to accept amendments that safeguard it; for what I desire and what I want to submit to the States is a constitutional amendment providing that after its ratification no more tax-free State or municipal bonds and no more tax-free United States bonds shall be issued. [Applause.]

If we stop the future issuance of tax-exempt securities, those now in existence in the course of a few years will be paid off or renewed, and wealth will then have no place to hide to escape taxation. I regret that the amendment, if adopted, may to a small extent enhance the market value of bonds now issued, and deplore that it may slightly increase the rate of interest on State and municipal bonds that may be issued and sold after the ratification of the amendment; but the benefits to be derived from stopping the further issuance of tax-free securities so far outweigh these objections that the objections become negligible by comparison. For the reasons given in this speech, I feel that the economic evil of tax-free securities is so great that it is my duty as a national legislator to at least vote to submit the matter to the respective States for their consideration. Our action is not final. If this resolution is passed we simply submit the question to the States for their judgment. If they do not approve of the amendment they will reject it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH].

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] to a statement which he made, to the effect that there was no testimony to show that municipal bonds, if they were taxed, would cost the purchaser more money. Mr. McCoy, the actuary of the Treasury Department, makes this statement on page 21 of the hearings:

> There is little doubt that under these conditions the future investor in our now tax-exempt securities would demand that they pay a higher rate of interest or be sold at a discount sufficient to at least meet the tax.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, I stated that the testimony was that it would increase it one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. BACHARACH. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to Secretary Mellon's statement, which reads as follows—and I think the gentleman from Georgia interrogated him:

> The CHAIRMAN. If we adopt this constitutional amendment and make municipal bonds subject to taxation, are we not going to add additional burdens upon the people in taxes?
> Secretary MELLON. I should say not, in the long run.
> Mr. FREAR. Does not this question arise there, Mr. Secretary, that there is an assumption that the 3½ per cent tax-free security of the Government can be put out at par? Is that true?
> Secretary MELLON. Probably.
> Mr. FREAR. That is true to-day, that the Government can issue 3½ per cent tax-free securities?
> Secretary MELLON. Perhaps. Now, to sell a security at par that is not tax free the Government would have to pay a rate of interest to-day of more than 4 per cent, of course.
> Mr. CRISP. More than what?
> Secretary MELLON. More than 4 per cent. I suppose it would depend upon the length of time they would have to run, but it would be somewhere from 4¼ to perhaps 5 per cent, depending on the length of time they would run.

Mr. GARNER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Congress recognized that three-quarters of 1 per cent and 1 per cent interest is the difference, by differentiating securities to be sold at the same time, one taxed and one not taxed.

Mr. BACHARACH. Yes. What I have read indicates that it would cost 1 to 1½ per cent more.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this resolution because I believe that it will not be effectual in reducing the amount of tax-free securities. If the provisions of this resolution could be made retroactive, or if it were possible to enact legislation in this respect which could become effective immediately without the necessity of an amendment to the Constitution, which requires the approval of two-thirds of the States of the Union, there would probably be some merit in it.

The Secretary of the Treasury, at the hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on January 16 last, contended that the total amount of tax-exempt securities of State, county, and minor political subdivisions is $8,142,000,000, and of this amount he contends that 56 per cent is held by insurance companies, banks, and trust companies, which are required by law to retain certain reserves.

It should be further noted that the figures given by Mr. Mellon as to the total indebtedness of States and municipalities is the gross indebtedness; in other words, no allowance is made for sinking funds of the various States and municipalities through which they gradually take up these securities whenever they are put upon the market at attractive prices; and the money held in such sinking funds amounts to fully one-third of the total indebtedness mentioned by the Secretary.

As we all know, savings banks are conducted without profit to anyone excepting the depositors, and naturally the more money these institutions earn, the more interest the depositors receive.

Of course, the highest class of securities that one could own are United States Government securities; the next are the securities of States, counties, and municipalities, which are solvent and financially sound and strong.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McFADDEN], the author of a similar resolution, who appeared before the committee, stated that the effect of this legislation would be to increase the price of bonds. This statement is absolutely correct, and the final ratification of this resolution by the required number of States making it a law would mean that thereafter States, counties, and municipalities would have to sell their bonds either at a higher rate of interest than they now carry or they would not bring the same premium they are bringing in the open market to-day.

The consequence of such a condition would mean that the individual would have to pay a higher proportion of State taxes and a higher proportion of municipal taxes, and I believe the increase in State and municipal taxes would be considerably more than would be gained by any decrease in Federal taxes brought about by the adoption of this resolution.

It is also evident if, as a result of this legislation, the higher grade of securities would sell at a higher figure, those securities which are not considered as good from an investment standpoint as State and municipal bonds, would naturally sell at a still higher figure.

In other words, in our section of the country an individual can now borrow money on mortgage at the rate of 6 per cent, but it is my belief that this legislation would result in his having to pay more than 6 per cent for a mortgage on his home and in addition to that he would have to pay increased State and municipal taxes.

Before the provisions of this resolution can become a law the proposed amendment to the Constitution must be ratified by 36 States. So far as my knowledge goes I have no information that the governing bodies of any State are in favor of this legislation, and in my opinion it will be a long time before the State legislatures of a sufficient number of States ratify the amendment to put it in full force and effect.

In the meantime, fearing the possible ratification of the amendment, there is no question in my mind but what every State and political subdivision thereof which had not already issued its full quota of bonds would authorize bond issues for every conceivable sort of public improvement, without any consideration of the real need for such improvements, because these bonds would sell at a very attractive premium. Such bonds would be issued for as long a term as it would be possible to issue them, running from 50 to 100 years. It would be the forerunner of an era of local governmental extravagance, I fear, the consequence of which we can not foresee at this time.

Further, I am of the opinion that at the time this legislation was first suggested there was more merit to it than there is at the present time, for this reason: Then there was a great business depression and stagnation, and capital was afraid to invest its money in industrial undertakings. To-day business conditions are much improved, and I am one of those who do not believe that because a man has wealth he will try to put all his money in tax-free securities.

I think you will find the business people of this country, if we in Congress will only permit them to go on in their normal way, without the constant fear that we are going to change our tax laws, will place their money in enterprises where not alone will their capital be used but where their own energy and business ability may find a field of usefulness.

With the gradual reduction of our bonded indebtedness in the course of a few years there is no doubt in my mind that the present surtax rate can be reduced, making Federal taxation less burdensome to industry.

Now, so far as the State of New Jersey is concerned, it is one of the States that has not issued any bonds up to the present time. We voted a $40,000,000 bond issue last year, and these 5 per cent bonds when offered for sale will probably sell at 115, 118, or 120. Pennsylvania State bonds were recently offered for sale, as I saw in last week's paper, at 117, and they are 5 per cent bonds, tax free. Of course, the reason that they are selling at that high price is because they have a time limit of about 20 to 25 years to run, and in consequence they have a greater value than if they had a shorter term to run. Personally, I am always anxious to support legislation that comes from the dominant party of the Ways and Means Committee, but this is one matter in which I feel that the individual is entitled to express his own mind; this I have done; and I am not only expressing my own opinion but I have taken the matter up——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARNER. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. BACHARACH. I just want to call attention to the fact that I have consulted with the responsible heads of the Government of the State of New Jersey as to the effect of this legislation upon my State. Our budget commission is composed of the governor, who is a Democrat, and the State comptroller and State treasurer, both of whom are Republicans, and all three men, individually and collectively, feel that it would be a bad proposition for the people of the State of New Jersey to tax State and municipal securities; and I feel myself that not only would it be bad for the people of the State of New Jersey but I do not believe we are going to effect anything at all for the benefit of the whole people by the adoption of this resolution. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask how the time stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 1 hour and 15 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas 68 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I shall be very brief. I shall vote for this bill. A majority of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means favors the report. The Treasury Department recommends the bill. Frankly permit me to say I have my doubts about the wisdom of a law such as this bill proposes, but I feel that if my vote against the bill would result in loss of opportunity to the people of the various States to register their approval or disapproval of this measure I would not do my duty here by so voting, and therefore I shall vote for it. I do want to call the attention of the House to the reason why I doubt the merits of the measure. Last evening I read in the Evening Star quotations of closing prices of Government bonds in the market yesterday at 1.30 p. m. I notice that the 3½ per cent bonds outstanding, which are tax free, were selling for $100.70 on a par value of $100. Mind you, they carry a rate of interest at 3½ per cent. The Liberty 4¼ per cent bonds sold at $98.84, or $1.86 below that price, notwithstanding the fact that the rate of interest on these Liberty bonds is three-fourths of 1 per cent higher. Second Liberty 4¼ per cent bonds sold at $98.12, or $2.58 a hundred less than the tax-free bonds. Third Liberty, $98.90, or $1.80 less. Fourth Liberty, 4¼ per cent, $2.26 below the 3½ per cent tax-free bonds. Victory loan of 4¾ per cent, due in 1923, on or before the 20th of May next, were selling for 32 cents below the tax-free bonds. And the United States bonds, 4¼ per cent, due in 1952, recent issue, 98 cents below the tax-free bonds. The point I want to make is this: There are now outstanding about $15,000,000,000 of State and municipal bonds tax free. If the law is so changed that taxes must be paid on the income from those bonds, then the taxpayers must pay the difference in the rate of interest at which these bonds will sell.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the position of the gentleman from Michigan, it is that this proposed amendment is economically unsound; but he does not want to take the responsibility of not submitting it to the States?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas, my opinion is that the reason why these higher interest-bearing Government bonds sell on the market for a less price than the 3½ per cent bonds is because of their taxable feature.

Mr. GARNER. Let me ask this question, if I may.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me complete one sentence here. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that there are in round numbers now $20,000,000,000 of Government bonds, the incomes from which are subject to taxation.

One-fourth of 1 per cent on $20,000,000,000 of bonds is $50,000,000 a year. Three-fourths of 1 per cent, or the difference between a 3½ per cent bond and a 4¼ per cent bond, is $150,000,000 per year taxes that the people of the country are called upon to pay into the Treasury of the United States as interest. What for? To be paid out by the Secretary of the Treasury to the bondholders.

Now the point is, how much of that $150,000,000 will the Treasury of the United States get back in taxes from the bondholders? That is the point. I called upon the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, when those bonds were first authorized, and pointed out to him that in my opinion the taxable bonds must bear a higher rate of interest in order to carry a value of par in the market, and I called his attention to the fact that where three-fourths of 1 per cent on $20,000,000,000 would cost the taxpayers an additional $150,000,000, the average taxpayer was paying but 11 per cent of his income in taxes to the Federal Government.

That is not a fair comparison as to the amount of taxes paid by the bondholder, because the man that holds Government

bonds undoubtedly is a heavier taxpayer than the average taxpayer. But let us go to the extreme and say that if you tax the people three-fourths of 1 per cent, a higher rate of interest because of the taxable feature of that bond, the taxpayers must pay $150,000,000 a year into the Treasury of the United States, and if under the law we take a much larger per cent of the bondholder's income you will not get back the additional sum imposed upon the taxpayers.

Now, I may be wrong in my calculation, but in substance I think I am right.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Treasury Department officials who testified before us, as the gentleman will remember, said that if all the Government issues had been made tax exempt it would have made very little difference.

Mr. FORDNEY. I am inclined to say to my good friend that that is a matter of opinion. It may be that they are right and that I am wrong. But I am giving you what seems to me a sound reason as to why a tax-free bond will sell at par at a lower rate of interest than a taxable bond, and that the Treasury will not get all of the money paid by the taxpayer in interest because of the taxable feature in that bond.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. As a matter of fact, out of the $150,000,000 that the taxpayers are now paying we are only getting back 22½ per cent.

Mr. FORDNEY. The Treasury is getting back only one-fourth of the taxpayers' income. The law never intended that we should take all of the taxpayers' income. If you do not take it all, the bondholder gets some of the money paid by the taxpayer, and the Government gets the balance.

Now, I was willing to submit the question of prohibition to the country. Why? Because I felt that the people of the country should have the right to express themselves on the question, and that if by my vote I prevented them from expressing themselves at the polls I would not be doing my duty. I feel that same way about this matter. I am willing that the States should pass upon the question as to whether we shall have such securities taxed, whether municipal, State, or otherwise.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman agree to submit to the States the question of the recall and referendum?

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, such a proposition is Bolshevism, and I would not vote for it. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman speaks of relieving himself of responsibility by allowing the people to vote on it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I desire to extend my remarks by inserting a letter written to me by Judge W. M. Cain, of Nebraska. It dwells chiefly upon our primary election laws, and, in my opinion, it is a very able document. I heartily concur in its sentiments. I would like to have it inserted in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the document indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

FREMONT, NEBR.

Hon. J. W. FORDNEY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

In a recent issue of an eastern paper with a large circulation there appeared two editorials, one headed "The direct primary" and the other "No compromise with Bolshevism," and it appears to me that these two editorials are wholly inconsistent and utterly irreconcilable with each other.

In the first of these editorials the writer advocates the retention of the direct primary, which in the isolated instances where it functions at all effectively its results represent rather the uninformed emotions of the people than their intelligent and sober judgment. In the second editorial the writer depicts the dangers of Bolshevism, which, whether it exists in Russia or in America, is government by emotion instead of government by judgment.

The fundamental defect in the direct primary is that it proceeds upon the false assumption that this Nation is a pure democracy, while the fact is that it is a Republic, in which the people are governed, not by themselves directly, but by representatives duly chosen by them. It appears that the writer of the editorial has been carried away by William Jennings Bryan's perpetual cry of "Let the people rule," and has lost sight of the fact that it was never intended in this country that the people should rule directly, but only by their representatives, who have an opportunity to inform themselves, and then only within the limits laid down by the Federal Constitution and the constitutions of the several States.

The inconsistency of the two editorials lies in the fact that one deplores Bolshevism and the other advocates the very method and means by which Bolshevism can be made effective in the United States.

The trouble with us right now is that there is too much room for fakers and claquers and agitators to influence government in all its three branches. This idea has even influenced the courts to make constitutional restrictions more elastic or to disregard them entirely. If carried out, this can only lead to anarchy and communism. It is time to call a halt.

Here in Nebraska our experience with the direct primary has been intensely disgusting. Candidates are chosen almost by guess or accident. Our primary was held three weeks ago, and I have before me the primary ballot. There were three Democratic, six Republican, and two Progressive candidates for United States Senator. For governor, there were four Democratic, four Republican, and two Progressive candidates. For State treasurer there were five Democratic, five Republican, and one Progressive candidate. For attorney general there were five Democratic, five Republican, and one Progressive candidate. For Congressman, there were two Democratic, three Republican, and four Progressive candidates. For the nonpolitical office of State superintendent of public instruction there were six candidates.

It is wholly impossible that any considerable number of the people could know about nine-tenths of these candidates except from their own fulsome eulogies of themselves printed in the press. Most candidates chosen were minority candidates. The loudest advertiser stands the best chance. The defects of the primary system are also—and necessarily, of course—reflected in the character and competency of our public officials. They are substantially, with few exceptions, very noticeably below the character of our public officials under the convention system, where a body of men who are well acquainted in their respective localities meet in convention and nominate their best men for the various offices.

The direct primary in Nebraska has been a direct loss of excellence in the service of public officials. There is a livery-stable keeper in western Nebraska who has twice been on the ballot as candidate for the President of the United States, and he received about one-third as many votes as either the Democratic or Republican candidates for President. Though those who know him classify him as mentally and morally subnormal, yet he got thousands and thousands of votes in Nebraska.

Nor is the injury to the public service all. It is necessary for every candidate to advertise his supposed qualifications in the newspapers, and this at great expense. I positively know that it has taken and still takes at least $25,000 to conduct a candidacy for United States Senator for Nebraska. Candidates for governor have often spent from $10,000 to $20,000. Candidates for Congress, I judge, about midway between. I know of two candidates for judge of our supreme court, one of whom spent $8,000 and one $9,000. No one on earth benefited from this except the newspapers. A candidate for State office here in Nebraska told us the other day that he had received requests from 100 Nebraska newspapers, each wanting $40 for running his advertising matter. This expense is too much of a mortgage on the future of the official.

Wherever the people have been more closely connected with the Government and could make their direct impulses immediately effective the result has been far from satisfactory. Just now the chief issue in Nebraska is taxation, and all the candidates indiscriminately pledged the reduction of taxes. Analysis of the situation, however, shows that about 80 per cent of the people's taxes have been levied upon themselves by themselves. The chief items of taxation here have been for schools and roads, and the people have gone in strong for fads on the former and are building many expensive roads on the latter. We have, of course, here in Nebraska innumerable boards, bureaus, commissions, and inspectors traveling over the State and impertinently interrogating decent citizens of this State. We have pure food and drug inspectors, and the food is no better and the drugs no purer than they were a quarter of a century ago, before this madness began. We have three State fish hatcheries, with innumerable fishing and hunting license inspectors, and I undertake to say that outside of the hatcheries and a few lakes or ponds newly replenished with fish from the hatcheries there is not a half dozen more fish in this State than there would have been if we had never had any fish hatcheries. We have a bureau of animal industry, whose methods of testing cattle for tuberculosis conflict with those of the Federal Government, so that it is possible for animals to be condemned as tubercular under our State law and pass the tuberculin test of the stockyard where the Federal method is employed.

We had a blue sky department in our State government to guard the people from buying worthless securities, and that department has been vocal and in active operation at least since 1916, and in 1918 and 1919 tens of millions of dollars of worthless corporate stocks were unloaded on the people of this State, each corporation having a permit from the blue sky department to sell its worthless stock. Our State capitol is crowded and jammed with scores of stenographers who write hundreds of letters that nobody reads and are just as well off for not reading them. This is all the fruit of the people's uninformed and fanatical ruling of themselves.

I am a firm believer in the intelligent, deliberate, and dispassionate judgment of the American people, but I fear and abhor their uninformed emotional impulses translated into government. Before the people "pass a law" which deprives me of my liberty or property or my rights as a citizen I want the machinery to be so fixed that they will do it intelligently and deliberately, for I know if this is required that the people will not do it.

The direct primary is a menace to our institutions and to that governmental tranquillity so vitally necessary for the prosperity and happiness of all the people. If one is opposed to Bolshevism, it logically and necessarily follows that he is likewise opposed to the direct primary.

Yours very respectfully,

W. M. CAIN.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACGREGOR].

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I have long felt that one of the causes of ptomaine poisoning from which the body politic is suffering is tax-free securities. We must get them out of our system before we can hope to restore a healthy condition.

Tax-free securities are bad because—

1. They shift the burden of taxation from the backs of the rich to those of the poor.

2. They discourage enterprise, create nonemployment, hinder reduction of transportation rates, cause higher living costs, and create unrest among our people.

3. They encourage extravagance in municipal expenditures with a consequent increase of taxation.

It is estimated that there now exist a minimum of $30,000,000,000 of tax-free securities in the United States. Upon the basis of a national wealth of three hundred billion they represent one-tenth of the whole. The output is increasing at the rate of two billion per year. It would seem to follow that the proportion of taxes to be paid by wealth would decrease while the burden grows greater upon the man of moderate income.

Self-preservation is nature's first law. This is particularly so with wealth. It is human nature that a man will not invest his wealth in commerce or business and pay a large share of his income into the Public Treasury through taxes when he can invest his fortune in tax-free securities, live in idleness, take no chances, and pay no part of the cost of running the Government.

The situation is strikingly presented in connection with the estate of the great New York banker, Jacob H. Schiff. He left an estate of nearly thirty-five million. The net taxable income of securities left by him was about 1¼ per cent per year. The bulk of his estate was in tax-exempt securities, because the surtaxes upon other investments would have left him a lower return than did the tax-exempt bonds.

Charles M. Schwab says that he could retire from active business, reinvest his money in tax-exempt securities, and treble his income.

The financial manager of the widow of James J. Hill says that he changed her holdings from taxable securities to tax-exempt and increased her income from $365,000 to $730,000.

It is not fair to the ordinary business or salaried man that he should labor and use his talents diligently to secure a good income with the prospect before him that the larger his income for the year the greater his income tax, when the man with the accumulated fortune can sit by with folded hands, rendering no service to the country, and enjoy his income tax free.

It is apparent that when there is such a large field for the investment of large fortunes in tax-free securities that there should be difficulty in obtaining money for the carrying on of the business of the country. It will be argued that if municipalities could not issue tax-free bonds, that then they could not get necessary funds without payment of a higher rate of interest, which eventually the taxpayer would have to pay, and thus the difference is equalized. But that argument is not sound, because, independent of the fact that the low rate of interest has caused extravagance which has led to greater taxation for public purposes, business has had to pay a much higher rate of interest to secure money in competition with tax-free securities, which is reflected in enhanced costs to the people.

This fact is quite vital also in connection with our transportation problem, which is perhaps the most important one that is confronting us at the present time. If we could solve the proposition of reduction of freight rates, we would solve most of the troubles that are confronting our country. The railroads of the country can not get money essential for betterments except by the payment of a very high rate of interest. This is reflected in the freight rates, and thus all of the people of the country suffer—the producer and the consumer—so that the wealth of the country can enjoy this special privilege.

It is essential for the welfare of the country that capital should be invested in enterprises that give employment and produce more capital. Municipal improvements are essential, but not to the point of paralyzing industry.

Judge Lovett, chairman of the Union Pacific Railroad, puts the situation very tersely:

> The processes of common sense seems to be reserved in our basis of taxation. Instead of a premium upon industry and enterprise by a lower tax upon earned than invested income, just the opposite is the law. A salary or a profit made by personal effort is taxed the maximum rate under the provisions for surtaxes, while capital escapes the tax altogether by being invested in municipal securities. The result is not only a sense of injustice suffered and discouragement in the individual relying upon his own efforts but an orgy of recklessness and extravagance in municipal expenditures unparalleled in history to supply bonds for tax-exempt investment of capital. These huge sums are not only going into tax-exempt securities, shifting the burden of taxation to industry, but are being withdrawn from investment in industrial enterprises of all sorts that employ labor and in the building of homes for housing the people.

The argument will be made by some that the abolition of tax-free bonds will take away from the farmer the benefits of the Federal farm loan system. The president of the American Farm Bureau Federation says:

> Tax-exempt bonds are rapidly increasing, and unless soon checked will more than equal the values of all farm properties in the United States, including lands, buildings, live stock, and machinery. These tax-exempt bonds are property. Being tax exempt, they throw additional taxation burdens upon other classes of property. When the amount of tax-exempt bonds equals the value of the farm lands of the Nation, it means that every acre of farm land will be carrying approximately a double taxation.
>
> The farmer is certainly as much entitled to tax-exempt securities as anyone else, but if all tax exemptions could be done away with and the farmer's bonds placed on equal basis with other bonds, he would be the gainer and not a loser.

Senator CAPPER's Weekly says:

> These untaxed billions penalize the farmer with a heavier tax upon his land.

Mr. MacKenzie, a tax expert of the Farm Bureau Federation, says:

> Some farmers fear to have the issuance of tax-free securities stopped for fear it would raise the interest rate on Federal farm loans. This is quite likely to happen, to a small degree at least. But the total amount of farm-loan bonds outstanding is only a little over half a billion—only a small fraction of the total value of tax-free securities. The small gain that comes to the farmer from lower interest on Federal farm loans is much more than offset by his having to pay his tax and the other fellow's, too.

It is estimated that the total amount of mortgages upon farm properties in the United States is in excess of $8,000,000,000. The amount loaned through the Federal Farm Loan Board is $500,000,000. The burden created by $30,000,000,000 of tax-exempt securities much more than offsets the benefits of the exemption to the farmers as a whole.

A curb must be placed upon municipal extravagance. The mounting costs of State and municipal governments is appalling. In 1912 about $400,000,000 of State and municipal securities were placed upon the market. In 1921 there were $1,305,868,916. It is estimated that 1922 will show at least two billion.

The people groan under the burden of taxation. The orgy of extravagance of Federal, State, and municipal governments must cease. The old adage, "Come easy, go easy," applies to governments. Cheap money tends to easy spending. Capital needed for industry to create employment must not be diverted. Capital needed to the end that transportation rates may be reduced, with a consequent reduction of living costs and the bringing of a greater degree of prosperity to the farmer, must not be induced to be withdrawn or withheld. Great wealth must not be given a special privilege.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in answer to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. FORDNEY], who has just given figures to the House as to the loss suffered by the Government, I would like to call to your attention the testimony of the Treasury Department, on page 23 of the hearings, in which they took the very figures that the gentleman has just presented to the House and pointed out that in calculating the loss to the Government he had only estimated the tax on three-fourths of 1 per cent interest on the $20,000,000,000, or $150,000,000, whereas, as a matter of fact, if the securities had not been exempt the Government would have collected the tax on the full amount of the interest paid, namely, $700,000,000. So that instead of showing a loss, as the gentleman from Michigan does, even taking his figures, there would be a net gain of over $62,000,000 if the tax exemption were denied.

Mr. FORDNEY. I may be in error in my judgment about the matter and for that reason I am going to vote for the resolution and give to the people the benefit of the doubt and let them decide on it.

Mr. MILLS. I want to begin by answering some objections that were raised by my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who on these occasions always favors me by addressing his remarks to me. The gentleman from Texas says we are threatening the credit of the States. Now, the only way you can threaten the credit of the State is by giving the Federal Government the right to levy a discriminatory tax, and that is the very thing we are not giving to the Federal Government. It must be obvious to every man in this room that if there are no taxes whatsoever imposed on the income from securities, then all securities, whether municipal, State, Federal, industrial, or public utility, are on the same basis. If, now, you impose a uniform tax of 10 per cent on all securities, including municipal and State, they would still be on the same basis and the credit of the State in nowise impaired. You might conceivably threaten the credit of the State if a discriminatory tax were levied against State securities, but that clearly is not contemplated by the proposed amendment. What we are doing in effect is to put the States back precisely where they were prior to 1916. We are simply taking away from them the bonus which has come

to them by reason of excessive war taxation, an advantage never contemplated, much less guaranteed, by the Constitution.

You talk about destroying the credit of the States! Let me point out to my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that when the Federal Government issues $20,000,000,000 worth of Federal securities, exempt from State taxes, it is effectually destroying the credit of the States by narrowing to a dangerous extent the base available for the levying of State taxes, and that if we compare the advantage to be derived from tax-exempt securities by the Federal Government and the State governments, respectively, the advantage lies very clearly with the Federal Government. State securities and the securities of municipalities and other subdivisions will amount, in the case of individual States, at best to but a few hundred million dollars. But there are $20,000,000,000 worth of tax-exempt Federal securities available to the citizens of the individual States, by means of which they may seek refuge from all State taxation. If that is not destructive of State credit by impairing the tax base itself, I do not know what it is.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I should prefer not to yield until I finish, because I have only 20 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. All right.

Mr. MILLS. Now, the other proposition is that there are desirable public improvements, schoolhouses, roads, and such things, and that if you permit the Federal Government to put the State and municipal securities on the same basis with all other securities, the State will not be able to market the securities to finance them. That is what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] says. As a matter of fact, long before we ever had this bonus created by high income taxes you were able to market your securities. You were able to bring your million dollars worth of bonds of your city of San Antonio to New York and you were able to sell them, and you were able to sell them at a rate which ran anywhere from twenty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent to sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent over the best railroad securities sold in the New York market. You were able, during the years from 1904 to 1916, to sell them at an advantage over the best public utilities securities sold in the market at a rate which averaged from one-half of 1 per cent to over 1.25 per cent.

Mr. GARNER. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but I should like to ask him just one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman as to this: I hope you will tax them so they will be on a parity with railroad securities. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman, Why are you not willing to do that?

Mr. MILLS. I am willing to put them on the same advantageous basis they always enjoyed before this bonus came to them, and that, as I have just shown the gentleman, and as I will demonstrate by the tables which I will put in the RECORD, was a very substantial benefit. You will find that since the war, when we adopted high income taxation, that advantage increased somewhat, but nothing like as much as I expected to find. This table shows that from 1900 to 1904 municipal bonds enjoyed an advantage anywhere from fifty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent to sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent over railroad bonds, whilst from 1905 to 1908 they enjoyed an advantage of approximately 1 per cent over the best public-utility bonds. Since 1916 the advantage enjoyed over railroad bonds has been on the average only seventy-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent, which is a pretty small increase, and on the average the advantage over public-utility bonds has been 1.37 per cent. So that after all this talk the privilege enjoyed by the State and municipalities can be measured by a small fraction of 1 per cent.

Whatever other fears you may cherish, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that there is not the slightest question but that, even if we adopt this amendment, you will be able to sell your Texas securities in the New York market with a favorable margin of one-half of 1 per cent interest over the best railroad or public-utilities securities. In other words, you will have the same advantage which you enjoyed for over 40 years prior to 1916.

But if the disadvantage to the State be measured in terms of a fraction of 1 per cent, what are the disadvantages to the Nation resulting from this system that has grown up? Tax-exempt securities, gentlemen, are absolutely indefensible, whether you study them from the standpoint of the fiscal needs of government or from the economic or social standpoint. Let us consider the fiscal one first.

The Treasury estimates that there are $11,000,000,000 of wholly tax-exempt securities outstanding, and that they are being issued at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year. There are, in addition, some $20,000,000,000 of partially exempt United States securities, partially exempt because they are totally exempt only as to the normal tax, in so far as the surtaxes are concerned, being limited both as to the amount to be held by one individual and as to time, the exemption having only some three and one-half years to run. If we assume that this $10,000,000,000, more or less, of wholly exempt securities and the $20,000,000,000, more or less, of partially exempt securities are held in the following percentages by the following classes, I can give you an estimate of what it is costing the Government.

Assuming that 37 per cent of these securities are held by corporations, that 23 per cent are held by people who pay no income tax, and the balance by people whose average rate of income tax is 35 per cent, tax-exempt securities are to-day costing the United States Government $242,000,000 a year. Mr. McCoy says $120,000,000, which is low. Professor Seligman says $300,000,000, which is high, in my judgment. Mr. McCoy limits his estimate to the $11,000,000,000 of wholly tax-exempt securities. Moreover, he estimates the loss in the corporate income tax at but $35,000,000, whereas the returns of the Internal Revenue Bureau, published since his estimate, show the loss in corporate income tax can not be less than $60,000,000 a year. For my part, I am confident that $240,000,000, more or less, is what the tax-exempt securities are costing the Government to-day.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman state whether that is growing or becoming less?

Mr. MILLS. As to that, of course, the amount will be diminishing in the course of three and a half years, when the number of partially exempt securities disappear. But, on the other hand, the wholly exempt securities are increasing at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year, so it will not be many years before the United States Government will find itself again in the position of losing through tax-exempt securities one quarter of a billion dollars a year.

Theoretically this loss should be offset by the lower rate of interest which the Government has to pay by reason of the tax-exempt privilege granted the investor, but this, under our system of government and taxation, is only true to a very limited extent. Thus the Federal Government derives no benefit whatsoever in so far as State and municipal securities are concerned. In the second place, even with respect to its own securities, it is unable to capitalize the reduced taxes, first, because the rate is uncertain; and, second, because it is progressive. There is no question but that, if we had a flat, uniform, and reasonably permanent tax, tax-exempt securities would command a price in the open market which, as compared with the price of taxable securities, would be higher in proportion to the exact extent represented by the tax-exemption privilege; that is to say, they would sell at a price high enough so that the net yield of the bonds would be equal to the net yield of the taxable bond after the payment of the tax. The Government would, of course, get the benefit of the increased value. But with the progressive rate we have a very different situation. Let us assume that a man with an income of $10,000 bought in 1920 a 5 per cent taxable bond which yielded him a net return of 4.58. Had he bought a tax-exempt bond and paid 105.17, it would have yielded him 4.58 net. In other words, he was equally well off whether he bought either a taxable or a nontaxable security at that price. But assuming that the nontaxable security was selling at 106, then he was obviously better off if he bought a taxable security. This meant that under the 1918 revenue act the $10,000 man dropped out of the tax-exempt security market at 106. Applying the same line of reasoning to the other income classes, you will find the $20,000 man dropping out at a somewhat higher figure, and so on down the line. The million-dollar man could have afforded to pay 143.80 for the nontaxable as compared with the taxable 5 per cent bond. As a matter of fact, he obtained the nontaxable bond at a much lower figure by reason of the fact that the other income classes dropped out long before the bond had reached a price where it would be still profitable for the million-dollar man to buy it. The result is that the men with the large incomes obtain a much greater reduction in their taxes than the Government can hope to make up by a lower interest rate on the securities which it issues.

If you estimate the gain in interest charges at one-half of 1 per cent on the $1,500,000,000 still outstanding first Liberty bonds, the saving is $11,000,000 a year. Add one-half of 1 per cent on the $20,000,000,000 of partially exempt securities, and you have an additional $100,000,000. We are losing $250,000,000

and getting back at most $111,000,000, making a net loss of $140,000,000 a year to-day and one that is constantly increasing.

Now, turn to the economic aspect. Is there any need again to point out to the House how excessively high surtax rates sin against the fundamentals of a sound tax system in that they are becoming increasingly unproductive; that they encourage evasion and are too great a burden on industry, initiative, and thrift? Whether you believe it or not, there is not the slightest doubt but that high progressive surtax rates coupled with tax-exempt securities will destroy the progressive income tax, which is the fairest tax ever devised by man, and will in the course of a few years make as big a farce of progressive income taxation as the personal property tax on intangible property is in every State in the Union that tries to enforce it at general property rates.

Can there be anything more fantastic than the Government of the United States solemnly declaring its purpose to take 58 per cent of a man's income and then providing the means whereby he will not pay any tax at all? [Applause.] What is the sense of talking about the rich tax dodgers when the United States Government considerately provides isles of safety on which men of wealth can find complete security from State and Federal taxes?

Furthermore, mark you, and mark you well, the privilege is reserved for men who have accumulated their money and are living on its interest. The doctor, the lawyer, the professional man, the man in active business pays his 10, 20, 30, or 40 per cent of income to the United States Government. He pays 40 per cent to the United States from income that he is making in his prime to support his family, to insure himself a comfortable old age, and to give his children a start in life, while his neighbor, the man with accumulated wealth invested in tax-exempt securities, contributes nothing to the support of government. Gentlemen, how long do you suppose such a system of taxation can endure in any enlightened country?

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I prefer to wait until I am through. Is there any need again to point out to you that you are driving liquid capital needed for production into unproductive channels? You have been repeatedly reminded of this, but let me give you one illustration that came to my attention within the last 10 days. A man I know had half a million dollars of bonds of an industrial corporation paying 5 per cent and selling at 85. By selling the bonds, taking a loss of 15 points, and investing in New York City 4½ bonds due in 1971 at 106 that man would make in the course of the life of the bonds $226,000. If instead of buying New York City bonds due in 1971 he bought farm-loan bonds callable in 1932, that were last week selling on a 4.40 basis, he would in the course of the next nine years net a profit of $26,000. Is he a tax dodger? Is he unpatriotic? Is he blamable if he takes his money from the industrial corporation and puts it in tax-exempt securities, loaning it to the farmers of the West and making incidentally one-quarter of a million dollars? Gentlemen, multiply that instance by thousands and you will get an adequate picture of what is going on in the country to-day.

It is not a question of wanting to deny to the municipalities and States the money that they need for public improvements. They have always been able to get that money and will continue to do so. What we want to do is to deprive them of this artificial stimulant that was produced by the war, so that municipalities will not spend their money simply because they think tax exemption makes it cheap. I want to have every proposition for a public improvement decided upon its merits, to go back to 1916, to a normal state of affairs when no tax-exemption needle was demanded to stimulate public expenditure.

Mr. GARNER. But the gentleman does complain about diverting capital to that nonproductive industry.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARNER. Therefore, you ought to stop it.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly not; but you ought to take away the artificial stimulus, and that is where the gentleman and I differ. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. I take it that what the gentleman from New York wants is to prevent cities running races with each other to see how many obligations they can charge up against the taxpayers by the issue of bonds.

Mr. MILLS. In order to get a fictitious advantage.

Mr. GARNER. That is just one more instance of where they are not willing to trust the people.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if we turn to the social question, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has pointed out, we have something that is even more serious. Say what you like about the great American fortunes, they have been accumulated by men of vision, of extraordinary energy and initiative, who in the course of a busy lifetime made very distinct contributions to the development of their country. Their rewards may have been excessive, but what man will care to deny that the Rockefellers, the Fords, the Carnegies, the Harrimans have greatly promoted our economic and industrial development?

The outstanding characteristic of the rich men in this country is that they are or were in active business. They spend comparatively little on their personal needs. They reinvest the money that they do not spend, or they have up to date, in the very enterprises which under their guidance and leadership were constantly developing, employing thousands of workmen, and adding steadily to the economic prosperity of the country by adding to its creative wealth. What are you doing through these tax-exempt securities, backed by a high—a very high—progressive income-tax rate? You are not only drying up this investment fund but you are drying up this fund of initiative, of energy, of business ability. [Applause.] You are driving these men out of active business, because you are depriving them of the great incentive to remain in active business—not only the incentive of building up a great, successful concern, but of the tangible evidence of success. You are creating, in other words, through this system, which came by accident, a class of idle rich and, what is worse, gentlemen, you are creating a class of idle rich that are not contributing their share to the support of government. Can there be from the standpoint of the preservation of the social order in this country a worse spot in the body politic? Is there anything more likely, if history means anything, to engender class hatred and prejudice, and is there anything more likely or more rapidly to bring into general contempt a government which not only permits such a situation but one which has actually, actively created it?

My friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who is a very clear-headed gentleman, who analyzes measures as clearly as anyone I know, who can as quickly lay his finger on the weak spots, has from my standpoint, based on the observation of almost two years, the one weakness of always looking for hidden motives instead of being willing to rest his case upon the powerful arguments which he is so well able to present. I want to say to the gentleman that he need not go any further if he wants to find the motives of the men who are supporting this measure. The motive is that no man who believes in his country and its system of government, who believes in equal opportunities, in equality before the law, who believes that people should contribute to the support of the Government in accordance with their ability to pay, can defend for a single minute, whether it be in the name of State rights or whatever it may be, the iniquitous system which I have had the privilege of describing to you gentlemen this afternoon, a system which if allowed to continue will threaten the structure of the Government itself. [Applause.]

Average annual yield of railroad, public utility, and municipal bonds, showing disparities between the yield on (1) municipal and railroad, and (2) public utility and municipal.

Year.	Average yield on municipal bonds.	Average yield on railroad bonds.	Average yield on public utility bonds.	Disparity, municipal and railroad.	Disparity, municipal and public utility.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1870	7.15	7.40	.....	0.25	.....
1871	6.80	7.40	.....	.60	.....
1872	6.75	6.85	.....	.10	.....
1873	6.70	7.10	.....	.40	.....
1874	6.90	7.15	.....	.25	.....
1875	6.45	6.55	.....	.10	.....
1876	6.10	6.00	.....	[1].10	.....
1877	5.80	5.90	.....	.10	.....
1878	5.65	5.75	.....	.10	.....
1879	5.65	5.75	.....	.10	.....
1880	5.35	5.30	.....	[1].05	.....
1881	4.80	5.00	.....	.20	.....
1882	4.85	4.95	.....	.10	.....
1883	4.75	4.95	.....	.20	.....
1884	4.65	4.80	.....	.15	.....
1885	4.65	4.75	.....	.10	.....
1886	4.05	4.30	.....	.25	.....
1887	3.90	4.25	.....	.35	.....
1888	3.95	4.30	.....	.35	.....
1889	3.95	4.15	.....	.20	.....
1890	3.75	4.20	.....	.45	.....
1891	4.30	4.40	.....	.10	.....
1892	4.20	4.35	.....	.15	.....
1893	4.15	4.30	.....	.15	.....

[1] Yield on municipal bonds is higher than on railroad bonds. All others, yield on municipal bonds is less.

Average annual yield of railroad, public utility, and municipal bonds, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Average yield on municipal bonds.	Average yield on railroad bonds.	Average yield on public utility bonds.	Disparity, municipal and railroad.	Disparity, municipal and public utility.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1894	4.15	4.35	.....	0.20	.....
1895	3.70	4.10	.....	.40	.....
1896	3.60	4.15	.....	.55	.....
1897	3.65	3.95	.....	.30	.....
1898	.....	3.95	.....	.....	.....
1899	3.15	3.65	.....	.50	.....
1900	3.10	3.75	.....	.65	.....
1901	3.10	3.70	.....	.60	.....
1902	3.20	3.70	.....	.50	.....
1903	3.25	3.80	.....	.55	[1]
1904	3.45	3.80	4.50	.35	1.05
1905	3.45	3.70	4.40	.25	.95
1906	3.50	3.80	4.45	.30	.95
1907	3.70	4.00	4.55	.30	.85
1908	4.20	4.05	5.20	[1].15	1.00
1909	3.55	3.95	4.65	.10	.80
1910	3.85	4.00	4.60	.15	.75
1911	4.00	4.03	4.70	.05	.70
1912	4.09	4.06	4.70	.05	.70
1913	4.15	4.20	4.65	.05	.50
1914	4.25	4.40	4.90	.15	.65
1915	4.15	4.45	4.90	.30	.75
1916	4.00	4.20	4.85	.20	.85
1917	3.85	4.10	4.75	.25	.90
1918	4.35	4.95	5.75	.40	1.20
1919	4.40	5.20	5.70	.80	1.30
1920	4.45	5.35	6.15	.90	1.70
1921	5.35	5.80	7.45	.45	2.10
1922	4.20	5.25	5.55	1.05	1.35

[1] Yield on municipal bonds is higher than on railroad bonds. All others, yield on municipal bonds is less.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO].

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, it is naturally with a feeling of timidity that I take a stand to-day different from that of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury and the many men who have studied this subject, and who are perhaps much more familiar with it than I am. I believe that in the Secretary of the Treasury we have a man who has shown his capacity and ability and whose administration of that great office will go down in history as something wonderful; but I am not willing to surrender my idea as to the rights of local self-governing bodies, States, counties, and cities, for the opinion of any man, no matter how expert in financial matters he may be.

There are two phases of this question, as I look at it. The constitutional phase first, and that is to be divided into two parts. First, there is the demand of the Government to have the right to tax municipal and State bonds, and in exchange, in order to get that approved by the several States, give the States the right to tax Federal bonds which we issue. I am not in favor of either of these propositions. I am a believer in a strong, central, Federal Government, but when I say that I mean that I am in favor of a strong Federal Government along the line of our national defense, in our Army and in our Navy, and in our dealing with foreign powers. I want to reserve just a little of self-government to the counties, towns, and States if I can, and not have the Federal Government reach out its hands into every locality in this land and demand additional taxes on everything in sight. [Applause.]

Looking at this question from the standpoint of one who has seen something of the benefits of these tax-exempt securities, I look at it in this way, and I differ fundamentally and radically from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who contend that these men who buy these tax-free securities are tax dodgers and are not paying taxes. They are all paying their taxes. They paid it right at the source without cost and expense of collection when they made their contract for that low rate of interest. They paid a fixed rate, and they know what that rate is to be, and they were willing to sacrifice the additional interest in order to get something upon which they could depend, and to know what they could be called upon to pay. Years ago I heard a distinguished lecturer at Princeton, who was afterwards President of the United States, say that in many cases "certain injustice is better than uncertain justice." I have come since then, as I have had to deal sometimes with the tax bureau, to believe more or less in that doctrine.

If we know what we have to meet we will adjust our business accordingly, but we should not attempt to amend the Constitution of the United States every time some temporary situation annoys us. Let us not fool ourselves about who pays the taxes. The consuming public pays the taxes. They seek their level. They all go back to what we eat and wear and consume, and the reason the man of moderate means pays more than his proportionate share of all the taxes is because he must live, he must have clothing, he must exist just the same as the man who has millions, and when we hear men stand up and say that the man who takes the low interest-bearing security and lets that local community have the benefit of that low interest rate is not paying tax I say you are mistaken. Every county and every city is limited in the amount of these bonds they can issue by their State constitution or legislative enactment, and they are not going beyond that limit; and when a community of live, energetic people are willing to vote to put a mortgage on their homes in order to make public improvements, improve their streets, provide proper sewerage, provide schools, and so forth, I do not think we ought to sit here and try to trade something and force something upon the people and compel them to abandon these improvements and take away advantages they have heretofore possessed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how the time stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has 39 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas 63 minutes remaining.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is not that a mistake? He had only 68 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. My attention was diverted and I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I thought I was considerably ahead.

Mr. GARNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER]. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could have more time. This is a large question. I do not agree with the sentiment expressed here that we have a right to turn the decision of that question over to the States. The Constitution says that we may do this when two-thirds of each House of Congress deem an amendment necessary, but we must first deem it necessary. We have seen what it means to give such amendments to the States. Oddly enough, if a State assents it can not withdraw its assent, but if the State disagrees it can withdraw its disagreement. That is not a fair way to take a vote.

The taxation of Government bonds is a question that is as old as the Constitution, or at least as 1795, when Mr. Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, made his report on the public credit. He held that the credit of the United States was of so much importance that it should not tax its own bonds or the income thereof. More than that, he contended that those bonds, unlike other property, should not even be the subject of sequestration in the hands of an enemy in time of war and that our credit should be sacred. We have seen what that decision meant to the United States. I ask unanimous consent to print what he had to say on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the matter indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE POWER TO ISSUE THEM IS NECESSARY TO SOVEREIGNTY.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say on the two branches of this matter that I am not willing to take away the essential power of the United States Government, the sovereign power of borrowing money, subject to no tax by any other person or government in the United States. I am also not ready to take that power from the several States. I am not ready to take it from the United States and to allow the great State of New York, whose citizens own millions and perhaps billions of Government bonds, to tax these bonds in the hands of their residents and perhaps subject them to the tax which the State levies on investments, a tax which is sometimes up to 2 or 3 per cent of the par value thereof. Such a tax would be lawful under this amendment.

EXPERIENCE CONFIRMS OUR CONSTANT POLICY.

In time of war we must borrow, and in time of peace we want to reduce interest. I agree with the great first Secretary of the Treasury that we will pay more in increased interest than we will get from the taxes. His policy enabled us to reduce interest. I remember at the outbreak of the Civil War that we issued bonds at 6 per cent which we could redeem in five years; we refunded them at 5 per cent, refunded them again at 4 per cent, and refunded those at 3 per cent and some at 2 per cent with the circulation privilege, and we paid over 2½ per cent less than the interest we are paying now. I believe that the Government of the United States ought to hold its bonds sacred. I do not understand why the Government taxes the interest and income received on its bonds when they

are sold abroad. We want credit. Perhaps, and it is quite possible, we may have to make remittances abroad when other countries get on their feet again and perhaps become more prosperous than ourselves. In that case we will not want to send cash; we will want to send bonds, and those bonds will have to be absolute bonds, paying what they promise to pay. The great first Secretary said we had no right to take back what we promised to pay in the shape of a tax. [Applause.]

[Under the leave to extend his remarks Mr. PARKER of New Jersey submitted the following:]

THE SURTAX AND NOT TAX-FREE BONDS DRIVES CAPITAL OUT OF BUSINESS.

While it is true that capital is being driven out of business, this is not because of the existence of nontaxable municipal bonds, but because of the surtax on the income from business investments, a surtax often of over 50 per cent, which makes business unprofitable to the rich man.

Capital so driven out of business can always find other investments; if not in municipal bonds, then in unproductive but promising speculations, in lands and mines and abroad.

THE TAX OPPRESSES THE SMALL BONDHOLDER AND HAMPERS THE GOVERNMENT.

This surtax on Government bonds prevented the rich from owning them, and for this reason the small patriotic subscribers were forced to sell their holdings at a loss. Even now that surtax hampers the United States in negotiating new loans except at nearly double the interest that should be paid. Our United States securities should be sacred and untaxed, whether by the United States or the State.

I add as part of my remarks the words of Alexander Hamilton in his report of 1795 on the public credit, wherein he condemns the very suggestion of taxing the public debt. His statement is as follows:

ALEXANDER HAMILTON, 1795.

"The Secretary of the Treasury has reserved for the conclusion of this report, a proposition which appears to him of great importance to the public credit, and which, after some preliminary observations, will be offered to consideration. It relates to the right of taxing the public funds, and to that of sequestering them in time of war.

"A proposition on either of those points would have been deemed superfluous, had there never been discussions asserting a right to do the one and the other, and even the expediency of exercising that right. The negative of both the pretensions, from the habit of regarding it as incapable of being disputed, had acquired, in the mind of the Secretary, so much the force of an axiom as to have precluded even the mention of the subject in the plan which he originally submitted, for funding the public debt. He should otherwise have thought it an indispensable duty to suggest, as a matter of primary consequence to the system of credit contemplated in the plan, the express renunciation of those pretensions; for they are (as he believes) not only unwarranted by principle or usage, but subversive of the sound maxims of public credit. A persuasion that this would always be a truth granted in the councils of the United States, is his apology for the omission.

"Even now, he should think it useless to depart from his silence on the point, had not the discussions alluded to, created some alarm in places where all the circumstances are not well understood, which it is the interest of the country to dispel. The confidence justly to be reposed in the collective wisdom of this Government, forbids the supposition, by one acquainted with its Constitution, that the security of the creditor can need, in this particular, a further sanction. It is presumed to be impossible, that any final act can ever give so deep a wound to the national interest and character, as to derogate from a principle which may be placed among the most sacred in the administration of a government.

"Is there a right in the Government to tax its own funds?

"The pretense of this right is deduced from the general right of the legislative power to make all the property of the State contributory to its exigencies.

"But this right is obviously liable to be restricted, by the engagements of the Government. It can not be justly exercised in contravention of them. They must form an exception. It will not be denied, that the general right in question, could; and would be abridged, by an express promise not to tax the funds. This promise, indeed, has not been given in terms; but it has been given in substance. When an individual lends money to the State, the State stipulates to repay him the principal lent, with a certain interest, or to pay a certain interest, indefinitely, till the principal is reimbursed; or it stipulates something equivalent, in another form. In our case, the stipulation is in the second form.

"To tax the funds, is manifestly either to take, or to keep back, a portion of the principal or interest, stipulated to be paid.

"To do this, on whatever pretext, is not to do what is expressly promised; it is not to pay that precise principal, or that precise interest, which has been engaged to be paid. It is, therefore, to violate the promise given to the lender.

"But, is not the stipulation to the lender, with a tacit reservation of the general right of the legislature to raise contributions on the property of the State?

"This can not be supposed—because it involves two contradictory things; an obligation to do, and a right not to do. An obligation to pay a certain sum, and a right to retain it in the shape of a tax.

"It is against the rules, both of law and reason, to admit, by implication, in the construction of a contract, a principle which goes in destruction of it.

"The Government, by such a construction, would be made to say to the lender: 'I want a sum of money, for a national purpose, which all the citizens ought to contribute proportionately, but it will be more convenient to them, and to me, to borrow the money of you. If you will lend it, I promise you faithfully, to allow you a certain rate of interest, while I keep the money, and to reimburse the principal within a determinate period, except so much of the one and the other, as I may think fit to withhold, in the shape of a tax.'

"Is such a construction either natural or rational? Does it not, in fact, nullify the promise by the reservation of a right not to perform it?

"Is it to be presumed, without being expressed, that such can be the understanding of a lender, when he parts with his money to a government?

"The contrary is so much the more presumable, that nothing short of an express reservation can support the pretension—to tax the fund.

"It may be replied that the creditor might be willing to rely upon the equity of the Government, not to abuse its right by exacting from him excessive contributions.

"This, if true, does not obviate the difficulty of supposing the coexistence of an obligation and a right, destructive the one of the other, in interpreting the sense of a contract, when nothing of the kind is said.

"It is possible that a creditor might be willing so to contract; yet it is still necessary, in order to determine that he has done it, to find some provisions or expressions in the contract indicating the intention to render what is stipulated compatible with what is reserved. But it is not probable that an individual would be willing to lend upon such terms. He would justly apprehend, that in great emergencies, a right, having no limit but the opinion of the party possessed of the power, would be abused, and that the convenience of laying hold of a fund already prepared and at hand, supported by a claim of right, would be a temptation to abuse, not easy to be resisted. However well disposed to contribute, in common with his fellow citizens, on all the ordinary objects of property or income, he would be unwilling to subject himself to a special burden in the peculiar character of creditor of the State. He would prefer to employ his money in other ways, even to lend it to private persons, where it might be more likely to escape the hand of the fiscal power.

"Let the question be tried by another analysis.

"Public debt can scarcely, in legal phrase, be defined either property in possession or in action. It is evidently not the first, till it is reduced to possession by payment. To be the second, would suppose a legal power to compel payment by suit. Does such a power exist? The true definition of public debt is a property subsisting in the faith of the Government. Its essence is promise. Its definite value depends upon the reliance that the promise will be definitely fulfilled. Can the Government rightfully tax its promises? Can it put its faith under contribution? Where or what is the value of the debt, if such a right exist?

"Suppose the Government to contract with an individual to convey to him a hundred acres of land, upon the condition of paying a hundred dollars. When he came to pay the $100 and demand his title, could the Government require of him to pay $50 more as a tax upon the land, before it would consent to give him the title? Who would not pronounce this to be a breach of contract, a fraud, which nothing could disguise?

"This case is parallel with that under examination, with circumstances that fortify the right of the lending creditor.

"The Government agrees with him, that, for $100, which he delivers to the Government, it will deliver to him, at the end of each year, $6. Here the $6 to be delivered answer to the land to be conveyed, with this stronger ground of right, that the consideration for them has actually been given and received.

Yet when the creditor comes to demand his $6 he is told that he can not have them except with the reservation of $1 as a tax upon the $6, or that he can not have them, except upon the condition of returning $1 as that tax. What is this but to say, that his title to the money in this case, as to the land in the other, must depend upon his paying or allowing a further consideration for it not contemplated in the contract? Can there be a doubt that this, also, would be a breach of contract—a fraud?

"The true rule of every case of property, founded on contract with the Government, is this: It must first be reduced into possession, and then it will become subject, in common with other similar property, to the right of the Government to raise contributions upon it. It may be said that the Government may fulfill this principle by paying the interest with one hand and taking back the amount of the tax with the other. But to this the answer is, that, to comply truly with the rule, the tax must be upon all the money of the community, not upon the particular portion of it which is paid to the public creditors; and it ought, besides, to be so regulated as not to include a lien of the tax upon the fund. The creditor should be not otherwise acted upon than as every other possessor of money, and consequently, the money he received from the public, can then only be a fit subject of taxation, when it is entirely separated and thrown, undistinguished, into the common mass. A different practice would amount to an evasion of the principle contended for and to oppression. A rent or annuity liable before it passes, or in the act of passing, or at the moment of passing from one proprietor to another to a deduction or drawback, at the pleasure of the party from whom it is to pass, is an imaginary thing, destitute both of shape and substance.

"When a government enters into contract with an individual it deposes, as to the matter of the contract, its constitutional authority, and exchanges the character of legislator for that of a moral agent with the same rights and obligations as an individual. Its promises may be justly considered as excepted out of its power to legislate, unless in aid of them. It is in theory impossible to reconcile the two ideas of a promise which obliges with a power to make a law which can vary the effect of it. This is the great principle that governs the question and abridges the general right of the Government to lay taxes, excepting out of it a species of property which subsists only in its promise.

"There are persons who, admitting the general rule, conceive a distinction to exist between a tax upon the funds, which must be paid at all events, and a tax upon alienations of them, which will only be paid when they are transferred from one to another. The latter they think justifiable, because it is in the option of the creditor to avoid the tax, by avoiding the alienation. But the difference between the two cases is only a difference in the degree of violation.

"The stock in its creation is made transferable. This quality constitutes a material part of its value, and the existence of it is a part of the contract with the Government, which has undertaken itself to conduct the operation of transferring by its own officers, and consequently at its own expense. It is as completely a breach of contract to derogate from this quality, in diminution of the value of stock, by encumbering the transfer with a charge or tax, as it is to take back in the same shape a portion of the principal or interest. It is obvious, too, that this may be carried so far as essentially to destroy the transferable capacity. But what is a tax upon transfers, other than the faculty of taking away from the actual proprietor of stock a portion of his principal, whenever his interests or his necessities demand a transfer, in derogation from the full enjoyment of the right to transfer and from the express promise of the Government to pay to him or his alienee? For it is upon the seller, not upon the buyer, that such a tax will fall. And where is the substantial difference, on the ground of contract, between this and a direct tax upon the fund itself? The value of it is as certainly impaired by the one as by the other.

"But shall the proprietor of money in the funds, then, be exempt from his proportion of the burdens which other citizens bear?

"This will not be the consequence of the principle. As a consumer, of which his income is the instrument, he will pay his proportion of the taxes on consumption. As a holder of any other species of property procured by that income or otherwise which is liable to a tax, he must also contribute his proportion.

"But without undue refinement, the lender of money to the public may be affirmed to have paid his tax when he lends his money.

"Relying upon the engagement of the Government, express or implied, that he will receive what is promised him without defalcation, he is content with a less interest than he would take if subject to any such defalcation, and especially if it was to be arbitrary as to its extent. In this lower rate of interest he may be truly said to pay his tax, or to purchase an exemption from it.

"Here, also, we find what is decisive on the point of expediency.

"If the Government had a right to tax its funds, the exercise of that right would cost much more than it was worth. The money lender would exact exorbitant premiums, not only as an indemnification for the use which the Government might probably make of its right, and which, in practice, would be likely to be qualified by some regard to equality of contribution but as an equivalent for insurance against the risk or possibility of a more extensive use. Hence the Government would be likely to pay much more in premiums upon its loans, than it would draw back in taxes; and the former being supposed but equal to the latter, there would be no advantage in exercising the right.

"But it will be, perhaps, more safe to affirm that there would be no borrowing at all upon such terms. The first precedent of a tax upon the funds might be expected to compel the Government to an express renunciation of the right in every future loan. Solid capitalists would not be much inclined to adventure their money upon so precarious a footing as is implied in a power of taxing their credits.

"These reflections lead readily to an estimate of the impressions which would be produced by the example of an imposition on the funds. Regarded either as a positive breach of contract, or as a deviation from the sound maxims of credit, the effect upon it would be nearly equally fatal. Whatever might be excused to a time of revolution, to a defect of means, or to some extraordinary peculiarity of situation, no excuse would be admitted for a deliberate departure from principles—at a time, too, of national prosperity, in a flourishing state of the finances—after the foundations of a regular system had been laid. The departure would argue an incorrectness, an instability, or a depravity of views calculated to give a lasting shock to public credit.

"The United States must henceforth tread with the most cautious steps.

"A renunciation of the right in future might not speedily heal the wound which an example of its exercise had given. Durable suspicions might fasten on to the wisdom of the integrity of the Government, which might occasion to it no inconsiderable loss and embarrassment, before a course of contrary experience would obliterate them.

"The right of a Government to sequester or confiscate property, in its funds in time of war, involves considerations analogous to those which regard the right of taxing them. Whether the foreigner be himself the original lender, or the proprietor of stock in its constitution transferable without discrimination, he stands upon equal ground with the citizen. He has an equal claim upon the faith of the Government.

"In the second case: as the substitute of the original lender, the promise made attaches immediately upon him. Indeed, the certificates which issue upon every transfer, and which may be called the public bonds, designate him as the creditor and expressly invest him with the correspondent rights.

"To sequester or confiscate the stock is as effectually a breach of the contract to pay as to absorb it by a tax. It is to annihilate the promise under the sanction of which the foreigner became a proprietor.

"But does not the general right of war, to seize and confiscate enemy property, extend to the property of the citizens of one nation in the funds of another—the two nations being at war with each other?

"Resorting to principle as the guide, this question may, on solid grounds, be answered in the negative.

"The right to seize and confiscate individual property in national wars, excludes all those cases where the individual derives his title from the enemy sovereign or nation; for the right to property always implies the right to be protected and secured in the enjoyment of that property; and a nation, by the very act of permitting the citizen of a foreign country to acquire property within its territory, whether to lands, funds, or to any other thing, tacitly engages to give protection and security to that property, and to allow him as full enjoyment of it as any other proprietor: an engagement which no state of things between the two nations can justly or reasonably affect. Though politically right, that, in wars between nations, the property of private persons, which depend on the laws of their own country, or on circumstances foreign to the nation with which their own is at war, should be subject to seizure and confiscation by the enemy nation, yet it is both politically and morally wrong that this should extend to property acquired

under the faith of the Government, and the laws of that enemy nation.

"When the Government enters into a contract with the citizen of a foreign country it considers him as an individual in a state of nature, and contracts with him as such. It does not contract with him as the member of another society.

"The contracts, therefore, with him can not be affected by his political relations to that society. War, whatever right it may give over his other property, can give none over that which he derives from those contracts. The character in which they are made with him, the faith pledged to him personally virtually exempt it.

"This principle, which seems critically correct, would exempt as well the income as the capital of the property. It protects the use as effectually as the thing. What, in fact, is property but a fiction without the beneficial use of it? In many cases, indeed, the income or annuity is the property itself. And though general usage may control the principle, it can only be as far as the usage clearly goes. It must not be extended by analogy.

"Some of the most approved publicists admitting the principle, qualify it with regard to the income of lands, which they say may be sequestered 'to hinder the remittance of it to the enemy's country.'

"But the same authority affirms that a state at war 'does not so much as touch the sums which it owes to the enemy. Everywhere, in case of a war, funds credited to the public are exempt from confiscation and seizure.' These expressions clearly exclude sequestration as well as confiscation.

"The former, no less than the latter, would be inconsistent with the declarations that a state at war does not so much as touch the sums which it owes to the enemy, and that funds credited to the public are exempt from seizure. And on full inquiry, it is believed that the suggestion thus understood is founded in fact.

"Usage, then, however it may deviate in other particulars in respect to public funds, concurs with principle in pronouncing that they can not rightfully be sequestered in time of war.

"The usages of war still savor too much of the ferocious maxims of the times when war was the chief occupation of man. Enlightened reason would never have pronounced that the persons or property of foreigners, found in a country at the breaking out of a war between that country and his own, were liable to any of the rigors which a state of war authorized against the persons and goods of an enemy. It would have decreed to them an inviolable sanctuary in the faith of those permissions and those laws by which themselves and their property had come under the jurisdiction where they were found. It would have rejected the treachery of converting the indulgences, and even rights of a previous state of amity, into snares for innocent individuals.

"Happily, however, the practice of latter times has left several of those maxims little more than points of obsolete doctrine. They still retain their rank in theory; but usage has introduced so many qualifications as nearly to destroy their operation.

"This appears from the acknowledgment of writers, from the barrenness of modern history in examples of the application of those doctrines, from the opinions known to be generally current in Europe, and from a variety of articles which are constant formulas in the treaties of the present century.

"The United States are in every way interested in the mitigation of the rigor of the ancient maxims of war. They can not better demonstrate their wisdom than by their moderation in this respect. Particularly interested in maintaining in their greatest purity and energy the principles of credit, they can not too strictly adhere to all the relaxations of those maxims which favor the rights of creditors. No temporary advantage can compensate for the evils of a different course of conduct.

"Credit, public and private, is of the greatest consequence to every country. Of this it might be emphatically called the invigorating principle. No well-informed man can cast a retrospective eye over the progress of the United States from their infancy to the present period without being convinced that they owe, in a great degree, to the fostering influence of credit their present mature growth. This credit abroad was the trunk of our mercantile credit, from which issued ramifications that nourished all the parts of domestic labor and industry. The bills of credit emitted from time to time by the different local governments, which passed current as money, cooperated with that resource. Their united force, quickening the energies and bringing into action the capacities for improvement of a new country, was highly instrumental in accelerating its growth.

"Credit, too, animated and supported by the general zeal, had a great share in accomplishing, without such violent expedients as generating universal distress would have endangered the issue, that Revolution of which we are so justly proud, and to which we are so greatly indebted.

"Credit likewise may no doubt claim a principal agency in that increase of national and individual welfare since the establishment of the present Government, which is so generally felt and acknowledged though the true causes of it are not as generally understood. It is the constant auxiliary of almost every public operation; has been an indispensable one in those measures by which our frontiers have been defended; and it would not be difficult to demonstrate that in a recent and delicate instance, it has materially contributed to the safety of the State.

"There can be no time, no state of things, in which credit is not essential to a nation, especially as long as nations in general continue to use it as a resource in war. It is impossible for a country to contend on equal terms or to be secure against the enterprises of other nations, without being able equally with them to avail itself of this important resource; and to a young country with moderate pecuniary capital, and not a very various industry, it is still more necessary than to countries more advanced in both. A truth not less weighty for being obvious and frequently noticed.

"Public credit has been well defined to be, 'a faculty to borrow at pleasure considerable sums on moderate terms; the art of distribution over a succession of years the extraordinary efforts found indispensable in one; a means of accelerating the prompt employment of all the abilities of a nation, and even of disposing of a part of the overplus of others.'

"This just and ingenious definition, condenses to a point the principal arguments in favor of public credit and displays its immense importance.

"Let any man consult the actual course of our pecuniary operations, and let him then say whether credit be not eminently useful. Let him imagine the expense of a single campaign in a war with a great European power, and let him then pronounce whether credit would not be indispensable. Let him decide whether it would be practicable at all to raise the necessary sum by taxes within the year, and let him judge what would be the degree of distress and oppression, which the attempt would occasion to the community. He can not but conclude that war without credit would be more than a great calamity—would be ruin.

"But credit is not only one of the main pillars of the public safety, it is among the principal engines of useful enterprise and internal improvement. As a substitute for capital it is little less useful than gold or silver in agriculture, in commerce, in the manufacturing and mechanic arts.

"The proof of this needs no labored deduction. It is matter of daily experience in the most familiar pursuits. One man wishes to take up and cultivate a piece of land; he purchases upon credit, and in time pays the purchase money out of the produce of the soil improved by his labor. Another sets up in trade; in the credit founded upon a fair character, he seeks and often finds the means of becoming at length a wealthy merchant. A third commenced business as a manufacturer or mechanic, with skill but without money. It is by credit that he is enabled to procure the tools, the materials, and even the subsistence of which he stands in need until his industry has supplied him with capital, and even then he derives from an established and increased credit the means of extending his undertakings.

"Among the circumstances which recommend credit, and indicate its importance in the whole system of internal exertion and amelioration it is impossible to pass unnoticed its unquestionable tendency to moderate the rate of interest—a circumstance of infinite value in all the operations of labor and industry.

"If the individual capital of this country has become more adequate to its exigencies than formerly, it is because individuals have found new resources in the public credit, in the funds to which that has given value and activity. Let public credit be prostrated, and the deficiency will be greater than before. Public and private credit are closely allied if not inseparable. There is perhaps no example of the one being in a flourishing where the other was in a bad state. A shock to public credit would therefore not only take away the additional means which it has furnished, but, by the derangements, disorders, distrusts, and false principles, which it would engender and disseminate, would diminish the antecedent resources of private credit.

"The United States possess an immense mass of improvable matter: the development of it, continually making, may be said to enlarge the field of improvement as it progresses; and, though the active capital of the country has no doubt con-

siderably increased, it is probable that it does not bear at present a much greater proportion to the objects of employment than it has done at any former period. Credit, upon this hypothesis, of every kind is nearly as necessary to us now as it ever was. But at least it may be affirmed with absolute certainty that to a country so situated, credit is peculiarly useful and important.

"If the United States observe with delicate caution the maxims of credit as well toward foreigners as their own citizens in connection with the general principles of an upright, stable, and systematic administration, the strong attractions which they present to foreign capital, will be likely to insure them the command of as much as they may want, in addition to their own, for every species of internal amelioration.

"Can it be doubted, that they would derive from this in a course of time, advantages incomparably greater than any, however tempting, that could partially result from a disregard of those maxims, or from the exercise of a questionable right which should even appear to derogate from them?

"Credit is an entire thing; every part of it has the nicest sympathy with every other part; wound one limb, and the whole tree shrinks and decays.

"The security of each creditor is inseparable from the security of all creditors. The boundary between foreigner and citizen, would not be deemed a sufficient barrier against extending the precedent of an invasion of the rights of the former to the latter. The most judicious and cautious would be most apt to reason thus, and would only look for stronger shades of apparent necessity or expediency to govern the extension. And, in affairs of credit, the opinion of the judicious and cautious may be expected to prevail. Hence the Government by sequestering the property of foreign citizens in the public funds at the commencement of a war, would impair at least, if not destroy, that credit which is the best resource in war.

"It is in vain to attempt to disparage credit by objecting to its abuses. What is there not liable to abuse or misuse? The precious metals, those great springs of labor and industry, are also the ministers of extravagance, luxury, and corruption. Commerce, the nurse of agriculture and manufactures, if overdriven, leads to bankruptcy and distress. A fertile soil, the principal source of human comfort, not unfrequently begets indolence and effeminacy. Even liberty itself, degenerating into licentiousness, produces a frightful complication of ills, and works its own destruction.

"It is wisdom, in every case to cherish whatever is useful, and guard against its abuse. It will be the truest policy of the United States, to give all possible energy to public credit, by a firm adherence to its strictest maxims; and yet to avoid the ills of an excessive employment of it, by true economy and system in the public expenditures, by steadily cultivating peace, and by using sincere, efficient, and persevering endeavors to diminish present debts, prevent the accumulation of new, and secure the discharge, within a reasonable period, of such as it may be at any time matter of necessity to contract. It will be wise to cultivate and foster private credit, by an exemplary observance of the principles of public credit, and to guard against the misuse of the former, by a speedy and vigorous administration of justice and by taking away every temptation to run in debt, founded in the hope of evading the just claims of creditors.

"As an honorable evidence of this disposition, and with a view of quieting the alarms which have been excited, and to silence forever a question which can never be agitated without serious inconvenience, the Secretary of the Treasury, in the last place, respectfully submits:

"That there be an express renunciation, by law, of all pretension of right to tax the public funds, or to sequester at any time, or on any pretext the property which foreign citizens may hold herein.

"This will be particularly essential to the success of the plan for converting the foreign into domestic debt; as the present contracts for the Amsterdam and Antwerp debt contain an equivalent stipulation, and there is no prospect that the creditors would consent to a change, but upon the condition of a like stipulation.

"In the commencement of this report it was the intention to submit some propositions for the improvement of the several branches of the public revenue, but it is deemed advisable to reserve this part of the subject for a future communication.

"All which is respectfully submitted.

"ALEXANDER HAMILTON,
"*Secretary of the Treasury.*"

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a little more time.

Mr. GARNER. I am sorry, but I have more requests. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, this resolution in effect seeks to create a double form of taxation. The Federal Government is to be given the power to impose an income tax upon the interest paid by cities, counties, or municipalities or other subdivisions upon bonds issued for public improvements, provided at the same time the Federal Government imposes a like income tax upon the interest of its own securities. With the hope of inducing the States to ratify such an amendment, the States in turn are given the power to impose an income tax upon the interest of Federal bonds held by residents, provided the same rate of income tax is at the same time imposed upon the interest of the State, county, or municipal bonds.

This tax is not retroactive. State legislatures, in my opinion, will guard with jealous right the power of their political subdivisions to issue bonds for public improvements.

Our form of Government is based on the proposition that local affairs should be managed by home authorities and general affairs by central authority. To permit the Federal Government to impose a tax upon the interest of bonds issued by a city is a tax upon the exercise of the power of that city to improve its streets or to erect schoolhouses.

The argument is advanced by those favoring this resolution that cities are extravagant in the sale of bonds for public improvements and that by this check this extravagance will cease. For myself, I prefer to trust local authority rather than Congress on the question of what public improvements should be made in my home city. These bonds are generally issued by vote of the people and the State of Ohio, at least, imposes a tax limitation upon the amount of bond indebtedness. It should be recalled, on account of the war, that for several years there were very few public improvements. Schools became crowded; streets and roads were out of repair; few public buildings were erected. If the people in their particular communities desire they should be permitted to progress to prosperity by improvement and they should not be hindered by a Federal tax imposed at the will of Congress. Tax-exempt bonds are easier to market at lower rate of interest, thus saving at once part of the initial cost of construction.

The fault of our present taxing system does not lie with my home city or county, or yours, but rather with Congress. Everyone should contribute to the support of his Government in proper proportion. The rich should not escape through tax-exempt securities, but neither should the small property owner be penalized or punished through this resolution by increasing his local taxes. The tax-exempt securities in the hands of the wealthy are an evil—but the remedy proposed is worse than the disease. Pass this resolution and tax-exempt securities will flood the market, issued lest there be ratification. Bonds coming due after ratification that must be funded would have to be reissued at a higher rate of interest, increasing the local debt. Bonds issued after ratification will bear higher rate of interest. This higher rate falls on the small home and farm owner in the cities and counties throughout the country. Abolish tax-exempt securities and you increase at once the value of outstanding bonds, so that "the rich become richer and the poor become poorer." You can not stop the issuance of bonds for public improvements by repealing tax-exempt securities. Necessary local improvements will always continue.

The issue of such securities will not be checked, because history shows that municipal and county bonds have been, are now, and always will be easier to market and at a lower rate of interest than railroad, industrial, and public utility bonds. The ratification of this amendment will impose a tax upon Federal farm-loan bonds, these issues being substantially the only new bonds of the Federal Government at the present time.

Those advocating this measure should recall that the resolution was introduced in a period of depression. Prosperity has now returned and with it will come increased Federal taxes, so that the need for finances will not be so urgent. The year 1923 will be better and more prosperous than 1922. Capital, in my opinion, will be available for all industry. Besides schoolhouses, improved streets, roads, irrigation districts and the like, are just as beneficial and just as productive as the construction of a new industry.

Let Congress unite to save more and waste less. Cut Federal expenditures to the limit and balance our Budget. Reduce the burden of taxation rather than impose additional taxes. For the last complete fiscal year there was a reduction of about one billion in gross debt; a balanced Budget and successful refunding operation which have reduced the yearly maturing debt to manageable proportions. These facts indicate that Uncle Sam is not in such dire need for cash that he must seek, through constitutional amendment, to impose taxes on our States. Whenever a right to impose a tax exists it is a

right which in itself never acknowledges limitation. It may be carried to any extent. The power to tax is the power to destroy. A tax war between States and Federal Government is not probable but would be possible if the amendment should be ratified. Let us permit the States of our great Union to maintain their financial independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks made earlier in the day by including the text of the proposed constitutional amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by including the text of the proposed constitutional amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. BACHARACH. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, I was told that there was no time to spare, and I had dismissed the idea of saying anything at this time. However, I will take advantage of the generosity of the gentleman in charge of the opposition [Mr. GARNER] to express two or three thoughts in connection with this subject.

Personally I regard the frequency with which, whenever any difficulty arises, resort is had to an act of the legislature in a State or an act of Congress, or when it can not be reached otherwise, through an amendment to the Constitution. Already irreverent hands are laid upon that sacred document with the thought of amending it in various ways; and I know of no amendment that has been offered to that instrument which will be more pernicious than the amendment which is here proposed, and which we now have under discussion.

It is an invasion of the fundamental distinction founded by the fathers of the Republic when this Government was created. It is an effort to rob each State of one element of its sovereignty.

The offer is made here of an exchange—"reciprocal," say the friends of this measure. What is there "reciprocal" about these two sections? On one side the Government of the United States gains everything. On the other side the State loses infinitely more than the Government of the United States gains.

This right of a sovereign State to control the issue of its securities, to regulate its taxes, is a fundamental right and one necessary to its very existence. [Applause.] If you invade that right, you destroy the sovereignty of the State.

Gentlemen, if we are going to do this, let us obliterate all State lines and make of this a strong central Government. "Oh," they say, "we want to check these municipal departments from issuing freely, too freely perhaps, these securities." What? Transfer to another and a foreign jurisdiction the right to say what shall be issued for a local improvement? Who is there that can better be trusted than the people in the different localities? Home rule there is an essential element of safety and security.

There is no argument in the statement that this is a refuge for the rich. As my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAGO] said, if a rich man wants to pay the penalty at the beginning and invest money in bonds that are tax free, with a very limited income, let him do it. But they say "You are diverting this money from the industries of the States." The money must come from some source and must be used. What for? Why, in maintaining the government, managing and developing the institutions and the developments and improvements of the community. And what better use could the money be put to than that?

Another argument that has been advanced here is that only the rich seek this avenue to escape taxation. I am sure if men will be honest with themselves they will recollect and recognize that there are thousands and thousands of people with small incomes whose money is invested in Government bonds and in State securities. The savings banks and other kindred institutions invest in them. Why should they not have the refuge of an investment for their little savings which they have accumulated and desire to have free from tax, if they are content to take the lesser income?

I submit that the credit of every State will be injured and impaired by this amendment to the Constitution. You are going to rob the State of its power through its municipal subdivisions to borrow money. You will make it probably impossible for them to realize on their bond issues. A necessity will arise in a community that is not blessed with a great credit like the United States Government, and it will wish to raise money by bonds for the purpose of some little necessary improvement in its midst, and when faced by this possible double taxation of income the State will be powerless to carry out its purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this resolution provides, first, for the taxation by the United States of incomes derived from securities issued by or under the authority of the State; and, second, for the taxation by the State of incomes derived from securities issued by the United States.

The second provision, in my opinion, is far more objectionable than the first, and I doubt if any persons who advocated the passing of a constitutional amendment preventing a State from issuing tax-exempt securities ever dreamed that Congress would favor an amendment preventing itself from issuing securities the value of which would be materially depreciated, and yet such would be the effect of this proposed amendment if the State can tax the income from the bonds.

When Congress was given power by the Constitution "to borrow money on the credit of the United States," was it intended that the credit should be taken away or impaired by the State by making less valuable the securities given for the money received? I can not believe that such was the case.

The amount of outstanding tax-free securities, as stated by Joseph S. McCoy, Government actuary, and by Secretary Mellon, page 17 of the hearings, "on January 1, 1922, was $10,660,000,000, and of this amount $5,000,000,000 is held by corporations, such as insurance companies, surety and bonding companies, banks and trust companies, which are required to maintain certain reserves." But neither Mr. McCoy nor Secretary Mellon nor anyone else has ever stated that the balance or any specified part of the tax-free securities are held by those seeking to avoid the payment of an income tax of any kind. On the other hand, it is well known that by far the greater portion is held by guardians and trustees for the benefit of widows and orphans and by elderly people, who are satisfied with a small income of which they can not be deprived.

The mere fact that there has been a decrease in the amount of the surtax is no proof that more money of the rich has gone into tax-exempt securities. It is well known that there are other ways of avoiding the payment of income taxes. It is but natural that when the war was still on that a person should feel that he ought to contribute liberally, but with the war ended the old habit of avoiding taxes would again be resorted to and incomes reduced accordingly. This, with the change in rates, would account for the falling off of incomes without charging it to investments in tax-exempt securities. If such was not the case, is it not probable that an actuary would estimate the amount instead of leaving us without any information on the subject?

What is the real reason for this demand for this constitutional amendment at this time? Certainly Secretary Mellon did not demand it, for on pages 24 and 25 of the hearings he makes four positive suggestions as to what he advises to be done: First, repeal the excess-profit tax, and then follow four other recommendations, and finally, before closing his fifth recommendation, he says:

> I suggest for the consideration of Congress that it may be advisable to take action by statute or by constitutional amendment where necessary to restrict further issue of tax-exempt securities.

This is far from recommending a constitutional amendment, especially one that will enable each State to place a different tax on the income of bonds issued by the United States. It seems to me that the real reason for this proposed amendment is found in the statement of Philip H. Gadsden, on page 36 of the hearings, when he says:

As this committee probably knows, the three associations which I represent comprise in their membership practically all the gas, electric railway, electric light, and power companies of the United States. Those companies have an aggregate investment of over $10,000,000,000.

And on page 41 he concludes his evidence by stating that a municipal bond sells so that the difference in the actual investment rate is from 2½ to 3 per cent. He says:

The cities are going to demand that these facilities be increased, and what will be the result of these demands? The public utilities are going to say we can not find this money because you are competing with us and getting the money cheaper. The reply will be, "Well, if you can not do it, we can," don't you see? "We will take you over and operate you," and the municipality can secure its money for 5 per cent as against the 8 per cent that the utilities have to pay, and you are going to cause a municipalization of the public utilities whether you like it or not, because under the present economic conditions there is no other answer to it. If the city can own its own gas plants and street car lines, they can operate them on money which they can get at 5 per cent, when it is necessary for the public utilities to pay 8 per cent more, so they can not compete with the city.

This seems to be the sole reason why some at least are interested in obtaining this amendment; in fact, if there was any doubt in the matter it is removed by the report of the committee itself, which, in speaking of the issuing of tax-exempt securities, says:

It also operates as an inducement to every municipality to have all kinds of public utilities owned and controlled by the municipality itself, thereby escaping its proper share of Federal and State taxation. In 1921 over a billion dollars was issued of tax-exempt securities, and the amount in existence is constantly increasing. It is obvious that this condition of affairs makes it difficult for public utilities privately conducted to maintain their financial condition, for just in proportion as the money can be obtained cheaper on bonds that are tax exempt the rate becomes higher on those which are subject to levy.

This is certainly a bold statement. Do the members of the committee believe that a municipality should be required to pay more to a private corporation than it would cost the municipality to own and operate its own plants, should the taxpayer be mulcted for the benefit of contractors? This is certainly a new doctrine that is sought to be promulgated.

I doubt if there is a State in the Union in which there are not municipalities that own either their electric light, waterworks, or railway plants, many of which are selling their products or carrying their passengers far below what is asked by privately owned plants in the same municipality. I know that such is the case with the municipal electric plant at Cleveland. I doubt if there is a city in the Union in which either electricity or water is furnished at as low a cost, and both are furnished by the city. While the electric railways are not owned by the city, the city has a contract by which it virtually controls the rate of fare, which is regulated by the increase or decrease of the so-called interest fund, and no city has a lower rate of fare or better service or better equipment. And yet the admitted purpose of one, at least, of the principal witnesses and the committee itself is to prevent municipalities from issuing bonds to engage in any municipal enterprise.

It is said that investments in municipal and State securities prevent capital from being employed in industries that give employment to labor and in mining and oil industries. What can be of more interest to the laboring man and our citizens generally than good schools, plenty of water and light, and transportation to his place of employment at a reasonable rate, not by paying 8 cents for a mile ride, as is required in this city? Every citizen demands a competent police and fire department to protect his life and property, and numerous other improvements which a municipality should itself provide.

But, as stated, this resolution should be defeated, especially for the reason that it provides that a State can tax the income from United States bonds. I am opposed to the United States surrendering any part of its sovereignty to any State in the Union, to its permitting any State to impair its credit. The United States bond to-day is the best security in this or any other country. It is as good in one State as in another and in any country in the world. Why was it that the first issues of Liberty bonds were subscribed for by persons in every walk of life? Every person who urged their sale made special mention of the fact that they were tax free and as good as gold and could never be impaired. At present an emergency does not exist and an immediate sale of bonds is not necessary, but let trouble arise as in 1914, and then who would say that the United States should not have the right to put upon the market a bond the interest from which can not be decreased by any State in the Union and which will be as good the day it is payable as it is the day issued, no matter how distant that day may be, and that the interest thereon shall not be subject to decrease by any law in the land.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Iowa go ahead?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Texas should use as much of his time as we have used of ours.

Mr. GARNER. It is nearly 5 o'clock. Suppose we quit. Gentlemen have gone away with the understanding that we were going to quit at 5 o'clock. I think it is a good time to quit. If you were going to try to finish to-night, it would be a different matter: but if you are not going to finish to-night, why keep the membership later to-night than at any other time?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. How does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCARTHUR). The gentleman from Iowa has 39 minutes and the gentleman from Texas has 43 minutes.

Mr. GARNER. I will even up the time by yielding five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] is recognized for five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment has emanated from the wrong source to get my support. [Applause and laughter.] The very same crowd that have humbugged the people of the United States for the last 40 years are sponsoring and propagandizing this amendment, and sending out statements to the patent outside of weekly and farm newspapers, and putting the same thing in labor papers. They are absolutely endeavoring by false information to win the favor of the farm organizations and labor unions for the purpose of fooling them, and through this method get these organizations to write their Representatives in Congress. The people of the United States ought to know what is going on. It sounds good to say, "We want to grab by the nape of the neck the big rich man who owns these securities and make him pay taxes." Listen! The men who are sponsoring this proposition do not mean to pay any more taxes into the Treasury of the United States than they are paying now. They mean to make the poor farmer, whose house is on the hillside; the poor people in the workshop and in the factory, who must vote school bonds in order to have a decent school building for their children, and road bonds in order to have a good gravel road to haul their produce to town—they mean to make that poor man and his wife and children pay a higher rate of taxation on the bonds that must be sold for these improvements. They further mean, when it becomes necessary, to prevent the town and the city from having the necessary school buildings, to prevent them from having a municipally-owned electric-light plant, a municipally-owned gas plant, a municipally-owned electric railway system, a municipally-owned sewerage system.

That is a part of the propaganda. It means, as the President not only implied but said in his message the other day, to put the railroad bonds, the Bethlehem Steel bonds, the bonds of the great and powerful corporations and trusts in a class over the good-roads improvement bonds, drainage bonds, and municipal bonds, bonds that are for the poor people of the country. That is the effort of the powerful, rich, monopolistic corporations of this country at the expense of the poor men and people of the United States. [Applause.] Men, do not deceive yourselves in this matter to-day, do not put faith in any of this propaganda which has gone out from this iniquitous Wall Street source, ramifying through the subdivisions of the United States for the purpose of fooling Members of Congress and getting them to vote to fasten this iniquity around the necks of the poor people of this Republic. They have in past times been successful in this propaganda, and they may be successful to-day, but at the other end of this Capitol, where they will pass on this question, the folks back home can be informed by that time, and if it runs the gantlet and gets back to these people I hope there will be patriots enough in the United States Senate who believe in upholding the hands of the people against the power of the rich to kill this iniquitous proposition. [Applause.] It is the intent and purpose of this amendment to ultimately raise the interest rate on the farm loan bonds. That crowd has endeavored in every possible way to prevent the farm-loan banks from functioning properly, and now they think they will slip up on the farmer and fool him into the net of this constitutional amendment, and after it is adopted Congress can tax all farm-loan bonds and, of course, make the farmer pay higher rates of interest. The private mortgage companies are doing all they can to get this amendment adopted. Do not you know they are after higher rates of interest? They want to force the Government farm loan bank bonds to bear a higher rate of interest. Let us stand by the farmer and kill this amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCARTHUR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 314, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORTON, Mr. VARE, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, and Mr. SWING were granted leave to extend in the RECORD their remarks on this resolution.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, after consideration of the merits of House Joint Resolution 314, being considered by this House, I am forced to announce my opposition to the measure, which provides as follows:

That the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States:

"SECTION 1. The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of any State, but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

"SEC. 2. Each State shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived by its residents from securities issued after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States, without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of such States."

I am firmly convinced that this proposed constitutional amendment should be defeated in the House for the following reasons:

First. That it is an infringement upon the rights of the various States.

Second. That it has a tendency toward reducing or weakening the credit of the various States and their subdivisions.

Third. Taxation of State, municipal, county, and school bonds would increase the interest rates paid on such securities and thereby increase the local burden of the people of every community in the country.

Fourth. Public development will be retarded and enterprising communities will be taxed unjustly for public improvements.

Fifth. That the contention made on the floor that practically all of this class of securities are held by the rich is not altogether based on facts. Municipal securities on several occasions have been sold over the counter in Philadelphia, and the thrifty wage earner has been, on the whole, the largest purchaser.

It is fundamentally wrong to place any greater burden on the erection of schoolhouses, on the construction of new highways, and the prosecution of other State and municipal undertakings. These activities should be encouraged as other activities of progress are encouraged, and public enterprise should be fostered and protected the same as private industry.

In Pennsylvania a great road-building program has been formulated. It is perhaps the greatest road-building program in the United States. As a Pennsylvanian, I do not propose to cast my vote here in Congress for a proposal which in any way will hamper this program.

The city of Philadelphia is about to proceed with the issuance of bonds for transportation subways and elevated railroads, sewage disposal, construction of many large public buildings. As a Philadelphian, I am unwilling to support any legislation which in my opinion would be a handicap to this great development.

I regret that I can not accept at this instance the views of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, for whom I have the highest regard, and who I believe will go down in history as one of the greatest men who ever sat as Secretary of the Treasury. It seems to me further, however, that the people of the country are tired of having the tax laws changed each year so that experts must be employed by the average business man in order to present a reasonably correct report of his earnings or losses. Changes in the tax laws by legislation or constitutional amendment, as well as the ever-changing regulations, are bad.

For these reasons, which are based primarily on my earnest desire to see the various communities in Pennsylvania and other States of the Union progress, I am unable to support this measure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey, for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. STEDMAN, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. LINEBERGER, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SEARS, for 15 days, on account of business.

To Mr. BRAND (at the request of Mr. CRISP), indefinitely, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS ON JOINT RESOLUTION.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on House Joint Resolution 314.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the resolution under consideration. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Speaker, nearly everyone has come to accept as fundamental the axiom that taxes should be levied and paid according to ability to pay. This is based upon the almost universal conception that he who has been richly endowed should give in proportionate amount for the social good. It is also based on the theory that he who has the greatest possessions enjoys the largest measure of protection from the Government and, therefore, as a matter of equity should contribute in like measure toward its support.

From time immemorial the burdens of government have fallen the most heavily upon the poor. They have not only fought its battles in time of war but as an aftermath have been compelled to rebuild the waste places and pay the heavy obligations incurred. It is only in recent years that any real headway has been made in securing anything even approaching a fair distribution of the tax burden. We have yet a long way to travel before that much-desired goal shall be reached. The issuance of tax-exempt securities is not in the line of progress. It is a retreat, a reversal of the stride forward represented by the adoption of the income-tax amendment to the Federal Constitution. This amendment is one of the outstanding achievements of the Roosevelt administration, and marks the greatest single step forward yet made by this Nation in its attempt to work out a rational and just system of taxation. Now, however, we have largely nullified the primary purpose of the amendment by creating a class of superrich who pay no taxes on their vast incomes from tax-free Federal, State, and municipal securities.

SALES TAX CONDEMNED.

The shortening of our revenues thus occasioned has given rise to advocacy of the sales tax. This agitation is further augmented by the heavy taxes on business income made necessary by these exemptions. To levy a sales tax is to lay still heavier burdens upon the poor. The argument that a sales tax is a fair tax because it equitably distributes the burden according to consumption is so manifestly absurd as hardly to be worth passing notice, and yet in the plausible form in which it is put forward by its advocates it has deceived many. The amount which a man and his family must consume in order to live in ordinary comfort has little relation to his ability to buy. More often it is the poor who have the large families. Their needs for subsistence are correspondingly great. Most generally their entire income is spent for the bare necessaries of life, and yet there are plenty of those of affluence who are willing to still further lighten their own burden by saddling a tax upon everything that a man must eat, wear, or use for shelter. Not only is a sales tax contrary to the principles first enunciated, but is well calculated to drive the country into sovietism. Its advocates may as well save their breath and the large sums they are spending for propaganda. Their theory will never be accepted by the American people. Equality of opportunity is the highest tenet of a just government. This can never be approached until there is an equitable system of taxation that distributes the burden according to ability to pay.

TAX-EXEMPT BONDS DO NOT MATERIALLY DECREASE INTEREST RATES.

The issuance of tax-free securities on the assumption that the Government thereby is enabled to get money at an appreciably lower rate of interest, resulting in a corresponding saving to the public, is another of those plausible suggestions that has often deceived, but which will not bear analysis. The report of the Comptroller of the Currency shows that on June 30, 1921, individual deposits in all reporting banks in the United States

and island possessions amounted to the stupendous sum of $35,459,155,000. This amount has been greatly increased the past year and, according to the best available information, there is now an untapped total of about $40,000,000,000. Most of these savings belong to people of comparatively small means, who would be only too glad to invest their funds in Federal, State, and municipal bonds were these not immediately grabbed up by the rich. For those whose income falls within the lower brackets it matters little whether the bonds are tax free or not, and, in my judgment, the removal of this feature would not materially increase the interest burden to the public. On the other hand, we are now sustaining huge losses in revenue, as, for all practical purposes, the bonds are so distributed with reference to the income of those holding them as to be tax exempt.

HEAVY LOSS OF REVENUE SUSTAINED.

There are now at least $10,000,000,000 of tax-exempt securities that have been issued by the States and their subdivisions, including school and drainage districts. This does not take into account the vast sums tied up in tax certificates, county warrants, and the like. In addition to these, there are $5,560,453,600 of the first Liberty and Victory bonds, which, together with the Federal farm-loan bonds of about $500,000,000, make up the $16,000,000,000 which I gave as my estimate of tax-exempt securities in addressing the House some time ago. There are in addition to these, however, the second, third, and fourth Liberty issues, aggregating $13,272,546,850, which are partially exempt.

According to the figures submitted by Prof. Edward B. A. Seligman upon the hearings on the resolution now under consideration, it is possible for any one man to hold as much as $160,000 worth of these securities in such proportions as to make the income from this amount totally exempt from any kind of taxes. And, as a matter of fact, these intermediate issues are now so distributed that the income from them is practically tax-exempt in the hands of those who own them. It is clear, therefore, that we have just about thirty billion of tax-free securities in this country. The loss in revenue from this vast sum has been estimated all the way from $150,000,000 to $400,000,000. It is safe to say it is $200,000,000 annually. In the hands of the present owners the loss is more probably in the neighborhood of $300,000,000.

Just as an illustration of how this works out, let me read an excerpt from the Detroit Free Press which I clipped last summer:

A probate court fight among the heirs of James J. Hill and Mrs. Hill has been on of late in St. Paul. The row has been over the appointment of an administrator for Mrs. Hill's estate of $12,000,000. But that is only incidental here. The significant point of public interest is that Louis W. Hill, former business adviser for Mrs. Hill, testified that, beginning in 1916 and continuing until 1919, he disposed of heavily taxed securities held by his principal, substituting therefor tax-free holdings, and in this way increased her annual income from $365,000 to $730,000 a year; that is, he doubled net returns.

Here is a concrete example of the working of the tax-exempt bond evil anybody can understand at a glance. In a single instance, in the case of a personal fortune which is surpassed by several in Michigan which have been similarly invested, a little shrewd readjustment has withdrawn $365,000 annually from the reach of the taxgatherers.

EXEMPTION DESTROYS CREDITS FOR PRODUCTIVE INDUSTRY.

Nor is the loss in revenue the only serious consequence of the existence of this huge sum of tax-exempt securities. Mr. Kingman N. Robins, president of the Farm Mortgage Bankers' Association of America, tells us that "there is a sort of general principle apparently among investors now who have incomes of $30,000 or more that they will not buy anything but tax-exempt securities." The result of this is that the larger incomes are artificially diverted from productive industry. It is this diversion in large measure that has been responsible for the business stagnation and unemployment from which we have suffered until recently. It is not that there has been any lack of money, but everywhere there has been a failure of credits for private enterprise. While business and industry have suffered, the farmers have fared even worse. Since 1919 they have found it impossible to secure adequate funds to carry on their ordinary business operations. Not only were they the chief losers from the indefensible policy of rapid deflation but they were robbed of every defensive weapon because of inability to secure necessary funds so as to enable them to market their products in an orderly manner. Strike down the exemptions and the bonds would soon find their way into the hands of the small investor whose savings are insufficient to enable him to engage in business or invest in mortgages. This would release billions for business credits and industry from which the returns would be larger.

The solution of our Federal tax problem is not to be found in an effort to save a few dollars in interest by the issuance of tax-free securities, which saving is paid manyfold in heavier taxes upon those engaged in productive industry, but in requiring everybody to pay in the same proportion, no matter what the source of his income. Only through this policy and the practice of the most rigid economy can we relieve the burden now resting on business and the earnings of individual effort. The lightening of the tax load upon productive enterprises and the earnings derived from individual effort will result in stimulated activity and the creation of new tax values, which in their turn will aid in reducing the rate of taxation which is now causing so much hardship and discontent.

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS.

But if the economic aspects of the question are important, the political aspect is even more so. From the days of Moses we have been warned against the oppression of the poor. And from that day to this the economically weak have struggled to free themselves from the heavy burdens imposed by the economically strong. To permit a privileged class is bad enough, but to create one—particularly of the superrich—by exempting them from taxation is supreme folly. Such a class is inimical to the fundamental concepts of human society and runs counter to the principles laid down in the Declaration of Independence. While all men are not born free and equal in the sense that they are equally endowed, they should be born free and equal so far as equality of opportunity is concerned. This fundamental can never be realized by a system which fosters the accumulation of untold wealth in the hands of the relatively few, and more especially is this true where these are permitted to escape the burdens of government.

The issuance of tax-free securities is wrong in principle and any seeming advantage that may be gained is lost many times over by the added burdens placed upon the backs of those engaged in productive toil and industry. When government becomes so burdensome to the average man that he begins to mentally weigh the advantages it offers against the burdens it imposes, it is high time that we not only seek means to lessen the load but that we take particular pains to see that it is equitably distributed.

To permit men of great wealth and large income to practically escape all taxation is a social and political wrong. It is the occasion of much unrest and agitation against the rich and ultimately will give rise to serious political convulsions that may become revolutionary in character. If we are to avoid confiscation and repudiation we must so order our system of government that the causes which give rise to them shall be either removed or suppressed.

The fundamental principles that underlie successful self-government have been known for generations, but their practical application to the new conditions that are constantly arising is the test of statesmanship. Greed, avarice, and self-interest will always wield their mighty forces for advantage against the interests of the great mass of our people. These forces must be combated and held in check; the gates of opportunity for the humblest must be kept open, and a substantial equality be maintained among our citizens, if we are to avoid the pitfalls that ultimately lead to the destruction of free government.

The rapid increase of our tax-free securities and the corresponding increase of those of great wealth who pay no taxes have already grown into a national menace. The grumbling discontent of those who are left to carry the added burdens is daily growing in volume. The proposed constitutional amendment now under consideration will serve as the basis for remedial legislation and should therefore receive the sanction of this body. What the States may do in the way of approval or disapproval does not immediately concern us. Our duty is to do that which seems imperative in order that the abuse may come to an end. I am confident that the States will approve when their people shall have had time for reflection and study.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 20, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

841. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation regarding the Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system transferring money from and to Alaska and between points within Alaska; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

842. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting papers relating to the claim, in the amount of £378.5.0, presented by Leopold Walford (London), Limited, for reimbursement of stevedoring charges, billed to the firm by the Army Transport Service, arising incident to the discharge of cargoes, consigned to the American Expeditionary Forces, from the steamship *Weimar*, at St. Nazaire, France, in May and June, 1919; to the Committee on War Claims.

843. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the purpose of the aiding in the development of the science of aeronautics in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

844. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation which provides that the transportation of civilian employees and of materials incident to the performance of public work in the War Department be charged to the appropriation for the department for which said work was done; to the Committee on Appropriations.

845. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing that any unexpended balances of the appropriation for "Clothing and equipment" for the Army for the fiscal year 1922 shall be available for the payment of obligations arising under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1922, and the necessary transfer of appropriations shall be made accordingly; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4031. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4032. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 5, township 30 north, and section 32, township 31 north, range 13 east, of the third principal meridian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4033. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Illinois, department of public works and buildings, division of highways, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Kankakee River, in the county of Kankakee, State of Illinois, between section 6, township 30 north, and section 31, township 31 north, range 12 east, of the third principal meridian; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13195. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State highway commission of Missouri, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, in the State of Missouri; with amendments (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 13492) to assist by loans disabled veterans of the World War in becoming established on self-sustaining farm homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 13493) to authorize the State road department of the State of Florida to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Escambia River, near Ferry Pass, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 13494) to prevent discrimination in prices, to provide for publicity of prices, and to protect good will; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 13495) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Two Rivers, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13496) supplemental to the trading with the enemy act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ACKERMAN: A bill (H. R. 13497) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Boonton, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GENSMAN: A bill (H. R. 13498) to enroll certain persons, if entitled, with the Choctaw Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13499) to extend the time for obtaining certificates of disability from the Veterans' Bureau until August 9, 1926; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13500) granting a pension to Theodosia B. Kemble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13501) granting a pension to Milligan Comstock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION: A bill (H. R. 13502) granting a pension to Laura Hendrickson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 13503) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Doyle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 13504) granting a pension to Ludwig Zugner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 13505) granting an increase of pension to Brother Buis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 13506) authorizing and directing the bestowal of a medal of honor upon William Henry Schmidt; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13507) granting a pension to Adaline Donaldson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6638. By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Petition of Ukrainian Orthodox Holy Trinity Church, of Trenton, N. J., protesting against the barbaric outrages committed recently again by the Polish Government upon the Ukrainian population; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6639. Also, petition of the League of American Citizens of Ukrainian Extraction, of Trenton, N. J., protesting against the barbaric outrages committed recently again by the Polish Government upon the Ukrainian population; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6640. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of New York Post, Society of American Military Engineers, New York City, N. Y., favoring a minimum strength of the United States Army at not less than 150,000 enlisted men and that the officer strength of the Army should be restored to not less than 15,000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6641. Also, petition of American Ethnological Society (Inc.), New York City, N. Y., condemning Senate bill 3855, known as the Bursum Indian land bill; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6642. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 21 residents of California, protesting against discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6643. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of Ukrainian residents of Yorkville, Ohio, protesting against treatment of their people by Polish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6644. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of Hall Hardware Co. and other residents of Minnesota, petitioning the Congress to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms and ammunition, as contained in section 900, paragraph 7, internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6645. Also petition of J. C. Famechon and other residents of Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning Congress to abolish discriminatory tax on small arms and ammunition, as contained in section 900, paragraph 7, internal revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6646. By Mr. PATTERSON of New Jersey: Petition of 20 citizens of New Jersey, asking for the removal of the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6647. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Freeport, Pa., and petition of citizens of Indiana, Pa., protesting against the tax on ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6648. By Mr. THOMPSON: Petition to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Saturday, December 16, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	McKellar	Sheppard
Ball	Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Simmons
Bayard	George	McNary	Smith
Brandegee	Gooding	Moses	Smoot
Brookhart	Harreld	Nelson	Spencer
Bursum	Harris	New	Sterling
Calder	Harrison	Nicholson	Sutherland
Cameron	Heflin	Norbeck	Townsend
Capper	Hitchcock	Norris	Underwood
Caraway	Johnson	Oddie	Wadsworth
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Culberson	Kellogg	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Kendrick	Pepper	Warren
Curtis	King	Pittman	Watson
Dial	Ladd	Ransdell	Williams
Dillingham	La Follette	Reed, Mo.	
Ernst	Lodge	Reed, Pa.	
Fernald	McCumber	Robinson	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent, due to illness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 19, 24, and 25 to the bill, and had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 14 and concurred therein each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8996) to amend paragraph 440, section 5211, act June 3, 1864.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7912) to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5349) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels.

The message further announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of Lizzie Askell.

PETITIONS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented resolutions adopted by the directors of the Lonoke National Farm Loan Association, of Lonoke, Ark., favoring the prompt adoption of an amendment to the Federal farm loan act providing for increase of the loan limit from $10,000 to $25,000, so that every actual farmer operating a standard farm unit may enjoy the benefits of the cooperative farm loan system, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Wellington (Kans.) Commercial Club, favoring the enactment of legislation providing a 1-cent drop-letter postage rate in cities, towns, and on rural routes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KENDRICK presented a resolution adopted by the Cheyenne (Wyo.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3244) to authorize the transfer of surplus books from the Navy Department to the Interior Department (Rept. No. 954); and

A bill (S. 4137) to authorize the transfer of certain vessels from the Navy to the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 955).

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 4029) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Co., and to aid in the construction of its road, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1871, and acts supplemental thereto, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 956) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4208) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 4209) for the relief of Adelaide S. Fish; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4210) for the relief of Stephenson & Bills; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 4211) for the examination and survey of the Intracoastal Canal from the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans, La., to Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4212) to amend pargraph 11 of section 1001 of an act entitled "An act to reduce and equalize taxation, to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved November 23, 1921; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 4213) relating to sales and contracts to sell in interstate and foreign commerce; and

A bill (S. 4214) to make valid and enforceable written provisions or agreements for arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts, maritime transactions or commerce among the States or Territories or with foreign nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 4215) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4216) authorizing the sale of real property no longer required for military purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4217) to provide for the pay and allowances of certain officers of the Regular Army nominated to but not confirmed in higher grades; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 260) to provide for the deepening of Astoria Harbor, Oreg., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 384), which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Whereas a shortage of labor now exists in the industries of agriculture and metalliferous mining;

Whereas under the existing percentage system for the admission of immigrants there are now being admitted into this country immigrants unsuited to employment in the fields of labor in which such shortage exists, thereby failing to relieve such shortage and increasing unemployment in other fields of labor; and

Whereas there exist many difficulties in the administration of the present immigration laws which may be avoided by suitable legislation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the Senate appoint a select committee to consist of three members of the Senate who are members of the Committee on Immigration, to investigate immigration problems in the United States, particularly with a view to relieving labor shortage in the United States by selecting, as the immigrants admissible under the present percentage system of admission, those who are best suited for employment in the fields of industry in which any shortage of labor exists and with a view to remedying the existing difficulties in the administration of the immigration laws. The committee shall make a final report to the Senate not later than January 1, 1924. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places, to make such expenditures, and to employ such stenographic and clerical assistants, as it deems necessary. The committee is further authorized to send for persons and

papers, to administer oaths, and to take testimony. The committee may, under the signature of the chairman, issue subpœnas for such purposes. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. ROBINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PAYMENT OF RECLAMATION CHARGES.

Mr. KENDRICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4187) to extend the time for payment of charges due on reclamation projects, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADVANCED RETIRED RANK FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS.

Mr. LODGE submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7864) providing for sundry matters affecting the naval establishment, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, it seems to me that neither the friends of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska nor its opponents could lose anything by fixing a definite time to vote upon it. It would, I know, accommodate many Senators who have other things to do if they knew when the motion would be voted upon, so they would not have to stay here under the uncertainty of its coming up at any moment. I know that the mover of the motion is perfectly willing to vote to-day or to-morrow, although he would prefer, I think, to vote to-morrow, and I would have no objection to fixing a time to-morrow. So I ask unanimous consent that we vote on the motion to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington, and suggest also to the Senator from Nebraska, why could we not agree to vote on the motion, say, the day following the report from the Committee on Banking and Currency? The chairman of that committee stated yesterday that in all probability they would make their report the first of next week, as I understood him. We could in that case vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska about Tuesday or Wednesday. The motion is still pending. The speeches are now directed with respect to the agricultural credits bill and also the ship subsidy, and it would not disarrange anything. I make that suggestion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The only question about that which occurs to me right now is that there might be a desire to take up the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee. It is very likely that bill could be taken up without motion, by unanimous consent, or if it should require a motion then it could not be substituted for the other measure; we would be put in the position of having to vote squarely on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska one way or the other. If that motion should be defeated, of course we could take up the bill reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, or if the Senate should vote to take up the bill of the Senator from Nebraska, probably an effort would be made to substitute for it the other bill. Otherwise I would have no objection, so far as I am concerned; but that, it occurs to me, would be rather an embarrassing situation.

Mr. HARRISON. May I say in answer to the suggestion that it seems to me if the Committee on Banking and Currency would make its report, all opposition to bringing up this question would give way, and you could substitute the Banking and Currency measure if you had the votes, the same as you could substitute it by voting to take it up, and it would save that much time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No motion could be made to amend the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HARRISON. No; but if his motion prevailed and a majority voted for substituting the other bill, it could be done in that way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is true.

Mr. HARRISON. The question would be whether the bill of the Senator from Nebraska or the Banking and Currency bill was to be considered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The whole proposition would be up, whether his bill was here or whether the other bill was here, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I am personally concerned I would rather vote to-day than to-morrow. I would not like to vote to-morrow because one Senator who is now in the Chamber will not be here to-morrow. Perhaps he can change his arrangements so that it would not make any difference.

I think I ought to state to the Senator from Washington, and likewise to the Senate, because I want to be frank about it, that if the motion now pending, which I have made, shall fail, I intend to follow it as soon as I can get the floor with another motion to take up Order of Business No. 918, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 253) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I realize that if my motion fails there will not be any possibility of taking up any legislation affecting agricultural conditions until the Banking and Currency Committee reports. In the meantime the joint resolution, to which, so far as I know, there is no objection—there may be some opposition, and there may be Senators who will propose to offer amendments to it—will not have an opportunity to be considered until after the question of farm credits is disposed of. Between the action of the Senate, if it should refuse to take up the bill that I have suggested in the motion, and the time the Banking and Currency Committee reports we will probably have time to dispose of the joint resolution. If that joint resolution is to be passed in this Congress it ought to be passed soon in order to give the House an opportunity to act upon it.

The joint resolution has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, one effect of which would be to eliminate the short session of Congress. It also provides for the beginning of the terms of service of Members of the Senate and of the House on the 1st day of January in each year after they shall have been elected. It further provides for the elimination of the Electoral College and the beginning of the presidential term on the third Monday of January following the election.

I feel that there is quite a deep interest in the country in the joint resolution; but if it should be passed in the short time remaining before the adjournment of the present Congress, which will expire on the 4th of next March, it would not bring about any effective result, for the House of Representatives would hardly have opportunity to act upon the joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Nebraska has a perfect right to make a motion to take up any measure that he desires, and I merely suggested that we vote to-morrow. As the Senator knows, in my conversation with him on yesterday I gained the impression that he had no objection to voting to-day, but that he would prefer that the vote be taken to-morrow.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator got a wrong impression. I desire to ask the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] if he is going to be able to be present to-morrow?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I have no choice; it does not make any difference to me.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator, perhaps, would just as lief vote to-day as to vote to-morrow?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] would not present that request. I think we are proceeding in an orderly way and without waste of time. I think we shall reach a vote in due course perhaps as quickly as, and it may be more quickly than, we should if we set a time for voting. There is one objection for setting a time to take a vote on a motion like this, and that is that nearly all Senators absent themselves from the Senate until the time for voting arrives; that there are very few here to listen to the debate and the discussion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion, I desire to say that I do not think that would be the case as to the pending motion, because we could go on considering the bill, and if the time should arrive when

it was likely that the debate would run out, we could vote upon amendments to the bill; so it is not like the ordinary case of fixing a time to vote on the final passage of a bill. If we shall fix the time when the vote is taken on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska, then of course we shall proceed with the consideration of amendments to the bill if there should be no further debate upon the measure; so, I take it, that Senators would feel just as much obligation to be here as they otherwise would.

Mr. NORRIS. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I should like to suggest to the Senator, though I may be wrong about it, that my idea is that so long as this motion is pending it would be improper to vote upon any amendment to the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I myself think that would be so. The motion would be the pending question, I take it, and I think it would not be in order to consider anything else.

Mr. NORRIS. It would not be in order to vote on any other question.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that we vote to-day at 3 o'clock on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FLETCHER. I object.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I make that request simply for the convenience of Senators, for it would be no convenience to me at all. It will not hasten or delay the passage of the pending measure in any way.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, as I have stated, that we are proceeding without the waste of any time and should gain nothing by entering into an agreement to vote on the pending motion. I think that we shall reach a vote on it in due course and in an orderly way, and also without very much lapse of time. I do not like the idea of fixing a time for a vote for the reason which I have stated, that it means that Senators will be absent until the time for voting arrives; that they will not be here to listen to the discussion in the meantime. Fixing a time for a vote does not mean that another measure may be taken up or that a vote on amendments may be taken in the meantime, because the motion is the pending question and is the only question that may be considered until it shall have been voted upon. I think the Senator from Washington is in error in his statement in regard to that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in making my request I thought I was accommodating Senators who on yesterday urged the necessity of getting promptly at legislation for the benefit of the farmer. It was urged, I know, by several Senators in the discussion yesterday that they were very anxious to consider legislation for the benefit of the farmer, and I thought the earlier we could get a vote on the pending motion, if it were carried, of course, the sooner we would reach a consideration of that question.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we vote to-day at 4 o'clock on the motion.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington is anxious to consider farm legislation, if that is really his purpose, as is indicated by what he has just stated, it would be very easily accomplished by the Senator simply withdrawing his bill and letting us go on with the Norris bill, for he has that power.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Missouri did not, of course, intentionally misrepresent my position, but he did not correctly state it. I suggested that several Senators on yesterday expressed a desire to take up the consideration of legislation for the benefit of the farmer and that I thought agreeing to my request would aid that end. However, Mr. President, I made my request really for the convenience of the Senators, and that is all. If Senators do not desire to give the consent which I have asked, it will not disturb me in the least.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the request for unanimous consent which has been preferred by the Senator from Washington.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock this day, being the calendar day of Wednesday, December 20, 1922, the Senate shall proceed to vote without further debate upon the motion of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4050, a bill to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

TRANSFER OF LANDS IN FULTON COUNTY, GA.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the privilege of reporting from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys two measures which are pressing for action. I first report from that committee, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 12174) to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary, and I submit a report (No. 952) thereon.

I may say the bill authorizes the Attorney General to quitclaim to Fulton County a strip of land 5 feet in width at the rear of the United States penitentiary in Georgia. McDonough Road is the principal thoroughfare in Fulton County, and in order to make it conform in width from one end to the other the 5 feet are asked for from the Government to be added to the roadway. The officials of the penitentiary report that the widening of the road would be a great advantage by facilitating the passage of incoming and outgoing vehicles from the penitentiary. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I shall not object if the bill does not lead to discussion.

Mr. SMOOT. If it shall lead to any discussion whatever I will withdraw it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not think what I wish to suggest will lead to discussion to exceed more than a minute or two; but the question arises in my mind why does this bill provide that the Attorney General shall make the conveyance? That is not the usual way of conveying land owned by the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is the usual method wherever the land is built upon and used and is not a portion of the public domain. The lands in question in this case were originally purchased by the Government.

Mr. NORRIS. The act of Congress would make the title good, of course. The Congress could authorize the Senator from Utah, or anybody else, to make the conveyance; I realize that; but there ought to be a uniformity in legislation of this kind.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that the uniform practice has been that the Attorney General has made such conveyances wherever the land has been originally purchased by the Government and does not constitute a portion of the public land. I think that the bill in this instance is in conformity with the general rule.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it occurred to me as a member of the committee that it is quite appropriate in this instance, inasmuch as the penitentiary is under the supervision of the Department of Justice, that the head of that department should make the conveyance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to convey, by quitclaim, to the county of Fulton, in the State of Georgia, for use as a public road, and for no other purpose, all the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to all that strip of land, 5 feet in width, off the northerly and northeasterly sides, along the McDonough Road frontage of United States penitentiary farm No. 1, in said county, between the easterly line of Sawtell Avenue and the westerly line of Forrest Road: *Provided, however*, That the county of Fulton shall not have the right to sell or convey the said premises, nor to use the same for any other purpose whatever than as herein provided, and in the event the premises shall cease to be used for a public road and cease to be cared for and maintained as are other public roads in said county, the right, title, and interest hereby authorized to be conveyed shall thereupon immediately revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That the conveyance herein authorized shall not be made until and unless a strip of land 5 feet wide is dedicated by the property owners on the opposite side of McDonough Road: *Provided further*, That the county of Fulton shall bear the cost of replacing the existing curb in front of the residence of the warden along said McDonough Road as widened.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the report of the committee, accompanying the bill, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 952) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12174) to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary, having

considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass without amendment.

The purpose of this bill is fully explained in House Report No. 1261, as follows:

[House Report No. 1261, Sixty-seventh Congress, third session.]

WIDEN M'DONOUGH ROAD IN FRONT OF THE UNITED STATES PENITENTIARY, FULTON COUNTY, GA.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 12174:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12174) to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary, having duly considered the same, hereby make report of it to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

This bill was introduced by the chairman of your committee pursuant to a letter addressed to him by the Attorney General of the United States, which is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN W. LANGLEY,
Chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LANGLEY: The department is advised that the board of county commissioners of Fulton County, Ga., has undertaken to widen, by 10 feet, and otherwise to improve McDonough Road, one of the public streets of said county, under a plan which contemplates the dedication by abutting owners of the necessary land on each side thereof. As McDonough Road extends along the northerly and northeasterly sides of penitentiary farm No. 1, the county authorities have requested the United States to dedicate for that purpose a strip of land 5 feet in width, beginning on the easterly line of Sawtell Avenue and extending, of that width, along the southerly and southwesterly sides of McDonough Road to the westerly line of Forrest Road.

The superintendent of prisons and the warden of the penitentiary are of the opinion that to widen McDonough Road as aforesaid will result not only in better facilities of egress and ingress but will otherwise improve the Government's property, and they recommend that the dedication be made.

I see no objection to the proposed improvement, but am of opinion that the conveyance should be made only after the requisite authority has been secured from Congress.

I have therefore prepared the inclosed bill, with certain provisions and restrictions which I think adequate and proper, and am transmitting the same with the request that it have consideration by your committee with a view to its passage.

Respectfully,
H. M. DAUGHERTY,
Attorney General.

The following statement of Hon. Clint W. Hager, Federal district attorney of the northern district of Georgia, setting forth the need for immediate action on this bill, is made a part of this report:

"McDonough Road, which is the street running along the front of the penitentiary, is at the present time completely torn up and impassable along the entire front of the penitentiary property, rendering it impossible to either get in or out of the penitentiary with wagons or trucks. McDonough Road is a very narrow street and is entirely inadequate for the traffic since the Atlanta Penitentiary was located on it. The county commissioners of Fulton County have agreed to widen McDonough Road and have secured donations of land from the abutting property owners, so that the street may be widened approximately 10 feet. The county commissioners propose to widen the street along the penitentiary without cost to the Government provided an act of Congress is passed authorizing the Attorney General to convey a strip of land 5 feet in width to Fulton County for the purposes above set forth. It is imperative that quick action be taken in this matter by reason of the fact that if the work is delayed a few weeks and cold weather sets in, it will be impossible to make concrete, and in its present condition the penitentiary is isolated, with no means of ingress or egress. The commissioners are now completing the work on either side of the penitentiary property, and if they finish without completing the road in front of the penitentiary it will be a great loss to the Government."

McDonough Road extends along the penitentiary property a distance of 6,600 feet, and unless this bill is passed at once the road will be turned over to the county with this gap in it, and it will be necessary for the Government to do the work at its own expense.

Your committee recommends immediate and favorable action.

HOMESTEAD PRIVILEGES TO AMERICANS SERVING IN ALLIED ARMIES.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I also report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War, and I submit a report (No. 953) thereon.

I am advised, Mr. President, by the Secretary of the Interior that there are a number of cases pending now before the department, and he would like, if possible, to have the House joint resolution passed so that those cases may be acted upon and settled. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. I understood that some time ago—immediately after the close of the war, I think it was, and during the last administration—there was a law passed giving priority in homestead entries to veterans of the World War. Is not that so?

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, why is it necessary to enlarge that right by this joint resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. The joint resolution which I have reported merely affects American citizens who served during the war with the armies of our allies. All of the boys who served in the Army of the United States have that privilege, and the joint resolution simply extends it to American citizens who fought in the armies of the allies.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For instance, American boys who went into the Canadian army.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what the joint resolution is designed to cover.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I shall not object to the consideration of the joint resolution if it does not lead to further discussion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the act of Congress of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry, be, and the same are hereby, extended to apply to those citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War, and who were honorably discharged, upon their resumption of citizenship in the United States, provided the service with the allied armies shall be similar to the service with the Army of the United States for which recognition is granted in the act and resolution herein referred to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMOOT. In connection with the joint resolution, I ask that the report of the committee accompanying it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 953) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to whom was referred the bill (H. J. Res. 180) extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass without amendment.

The purpose of this bill is fully explained in House Report No. 678, as follows:

[House Report No. 678. Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE DURING WORLD WAR.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following report to accompany House Joint Resolution 180:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 180) extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, and of Public Resolution No. 29, having had the same under consideration, report the same back to the House with the following amendment and recommend that as amended the bill do pass:

Amend page 2, line 1, by inserting after the word "War" the words "and who were honorably discharged" and a comma.

In recommending the passage of the measure the committee recites that before the United States became involved in the World War numerous American young men volunteered for service in the armies of France, Great Britain, notably Canada, and possibly other of the allied nations. Again, after the United States had entered the World War, other Americans who could not meet the high physical standards required for entrance into the service of the United States entered the armies of the Allies.

These soldiers gave service in the common cause in which the United States was engaged, similar to the service rendered by the American soldiers.

Following the World War, by act of Congress, citizenship was restored to all such Americans who had forfeited their citizenship by taking the oath of allegiance to a foreign country.

There seems to be every reason why the provisions of the acts referred to in this bill, applicable to those who were in the naval and military forces of the United States during the World War, should apply equally to those other citizens of the United States who saw service with the armies of the Allies and whose citizenship has been restored to them.

There is herein attached letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior to Hon. N. J. SINNOTT, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, indorsing the resolution.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, August 9, 1921.

Hon. *N. J. SINNOTT,*
Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have your request of July 29, 1921, for report on House Joint Resolution 180, which proposes to extend the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries and of

Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preference right of entry in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War.

It is believed that the legislation proposed is meritorious, and I therefore recommend that the resolution be enacted.

Respectfully,

E. C. FINNEY, *Acting Secretary.*

CIVIL WAR PENSIONS.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, some time ago the Senate passed Senate bill 3275 increasing the rate of pension allowed to Civil War veterans and the widows of such veterans. That bill passed the House with certain amendments. A conference was ordered between the two Houses on the disagreeing votes thereon. As a member of the committee of conference, I desire at this time to submit the conference report and ask unanimous consent that it be taken up immediately for consideration.

Mr. President, we are now in that season of the year when good will and good cheer should prevail all over the land, and I feel that it would be a splendid expression of gratitude on the part of the people of this country to the veterans of the Civil War now to consummate and complete this proposed legislation so that it may be passed in time to permit the signature of the President and may become a law as a Christmas present to the children of Lincoln of 1861.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether the conference report has been made to the House and acted upon there?

Mr. BURSUM. It originated in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Who asked for the conference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it should go to the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the House granted the conference.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the report should be submitted to the House first if they granted the conference. We asked for a conference. In that case the other side granted it, and it goes to them first.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it goes to the House first.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to clear up this matter. He is advised that there are no papers here from the House, and, as he now understands, the conference report is not in a position to be acted upon by the Senate until some measure is received from the House of Representatives.

Mr. BURSUM. My understanding was that the Senate had asked for this conference.

Mr. SMOOT. But the House granted the conference. Therefore the report must go to the House first.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, it seems to me that of course the papers should properly go to the House that has not asked the conference, and there the papers should stay until the conferees report; but that is not the question involved. I understand that the papers are on the desk of the Senate; and if the original papers are on the desk of the Senate and the Senator from New Mexico got hold of them there is no reason why the Senate can not act on the matter. It does not make any difference how he got hold of them.

I know that a good many years ago, in reference to a tariff bill that I reported to the House in a past administration, somebody raised the question that the Senate was entitled to the papers; but I had them, and I moved the adoption of the report, and the bill went to the President. Of course, if there is any real objection to the pension bill, that may be another matter; but if there is not any objection to the pension bill the papers are here, and there is no question that the Senate can act on the matter if it wants to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the motion of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BURSUM. The motion is to agree to the conference report.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the original bill as it passed is among the papers, then the statement of the Senator from Alabama is correct; but if the original bill as it passed Congress is not in those papers we have no right to it at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the Senator thoroughly; but the Senator from New Mexico said that the original papers were on the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair endeavored to state that the papers were not in the Senate, nor has the Senate been notified of any action on the part of the House. The original bill is not in the Senate and not on the desk.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That makes a different state of the case. The Senator from New Mexico stated that he had the original papers.

RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the rural credits committee of the Conference of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations, held in Washington last week. There were present at that conference representatives of about 1,000,000 members of cooperative marketing associations, and this report embodies their ideas as to rural credits legislation. It is very brief.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The report is as follows:

REPORT OF THE RURAL CREDITS COMMITTEE ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS IN WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 15, 1922.

The committee on rural credits of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations has made a survey of the subject of farmers' credits and the legislation proposed on such rural credits.

Your committee recommends as follows:

1. That this national council announces as a general policy that the primary reliance of the farmer for credits for production or for marketing should be upon the local banker, and that under normal conditions the local banker is likely to meet the greater part of such needs.

2. That the Federal reserve system should be modified so as to meet the special requirements of farm credits and to permit the financing of farmers and farmers' cooperative marketing associations conveniently and efficiently through normal banking channels.

That such modification involves primarily the extension of the maturity of agricultural paper to a maximum limit of nine months, with the fixing of cooperative marketing for loans on such agricultural paper to any one cooperative marketing association to be fixed as 50 per cent of the capital and surplus of banks, members of the Federal reserve system, subject to the State laws wherever applicable; and that encouragement and inducement be made to have more State banks exercise the privilege of membership in the Federal reserve system.

3. That the maximum basis of loans from farm loan banks be raised from $10,000 to $25,000.

4. That adequate opportunity be presented for the creation of agricultural credit corporations with sufficient minimum capital to purchase or discount ordinary agricultural paper, with a maximum maturity paper of nine months and live-stock paper with a maturity of not more than three years; with rediscount corporations adequately capitalized to purchase such paper from agricultural credit corporations, with the privilege of rediscounting any such paper with its indorsement, through Federal reserve system.

5. That a farm credits department in the Federal land banks be set up in each of the land banks, with a capital of $5,000,000, making a total of $60,000,000 capitalized, against which credits may be issued to the extent of approximately $600,000,000; and that these farm credits departments of the Federal farm banks be authorized to discount or purchase agricultural paper in a broad sense and to make loans or advance directly to cooperative marketing associations and agricultural cooperative credit organizations.

6. That the right of the Federal land banks to purchase production credits shall be limited to production credits where the note of the individual is indorsed by the cooperative credit association or is secured by a chattel mortgage on implements or animals, or both, and indorsed by the local banks, or where the note or draft itself is made by a cooperative credit association of producers; and that any Federal land bank may exercise any of the powers herein granted in any section or district of the United States.

We further recommend that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate be requested to consider these suggestions and to combine them if possible into a rural credits act, to be introduced in such way as the committee may deem advisable.

The council announces as its policy that the cooperative marketing associations do not ask anything from the Federal Government except that legislation be enacted to permit farmers and farmers' organizations to have the same access to the Federal credits system, adapted to its needs, that all industries now possess, and to make provision for unforeseen emergencies by setting up a last reserve in such a manner as is above suggested in the farm credits department of the farm land banks.

* * * * * * *

THE MUSCLE SHOALS PLANT.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, a few days ago my friend, the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], took occasion to point out in the Senate what to him appeared to be injustices in the Ford proposal, in part to purchase and in part to lease Muscle Shoals, and he made some observations with regard to the attitude of those who differed with him on the proposal he has offered to the Senate and the country. To allow these charges to go unanswered, and as sponsor for the Ford offer, leaves me before the country, to say the least, in a compromising position. I, therefore, Mr. President, propose to present some phases of the other side of this great picture in which the large majority of our people are deeply interested.

Mr. President, there is apparently a great division of opinion as to the proper disposition of the great power project at Muscle Shoals, and in this division of opinion and the resultant inaction I fear that we are faced with the serious possibility of the plant either being scrapped or left in an uncompleted and haphazard manner as a serious liability of the Government. In this divergence of views there are some very meritorious ideas that are worthy of profound analysis, and such an analysis can be made without the slightest reflection upon the motives of anyone. There is honesty and integrity that has stood the test of years, and such honesty and integrity as has been most intelligent in most of its endeavors;

but, Mr. President, honesty and integrity is not always infallible in its application. Human mental processes will not always allow us to reach the same conclusion, even with the same statement of facts, because individual logic is different. And when there is a different understanding as to fundamental facts, it is quite reasonable to expect that there will be different conclusions as to the proper action to take.

There can be but little doubt, Mr. President, that if it had not been for the offer of Henry Ford, Muscle Shoals would be on its way to the scrap heap to-day; indeed, it would probably already have been there—save such portions as were desired by particular interests, and which they would probably have acquired for a song. Furthermore, it is doubtful if very much would have been said about the scrapping, but by common consent it would have been agreed that it was a great failure and a great blunder—chargeable to war cost—and it would have made its way to destruction, just as have so many other things that have come in the pathway of special privilege.

There is another thing, Mr. President, that we must bear in mind, and that is Mr. Ford was requested to make a bid for this property, and he did so upon the invitation of the Government. He has made his offer and has simply requested that we accept it or reject it; if there has been pro-Ford-offer propaganda, it has sprung from the American people, who know what they want in the way of the disposition of this plant. The burden is not upon Henry Ford to show that his proposition is the best thing for the country, but the burden is upon the Ford opponents to produce a better proposition. Mr. Ford's attitude is above reproach. He complied with the request of his Government and made an offer; that offer certainly resulted in saving Muscle Shoals from the scrap heap. Suddenly other men decided there was some value to the proposition; now Mr. Ford's position is simply "accept my offer or reject it," the responsibility is upon us. It would come with very poor grace for anyone to rise upon this floor and propagate the insinuation that Henry Ford is trying to graft something from the Government. I hope and believe that it will not be done.

FACTS VERSUS FICTION.

Mr. President, since the burden must be upon the opponents of the Ford offer to produce a better proposition, I first wish to direct attention to what is believed by some to be a solution of the problem, before I specifically answer some of the objections that have been made to the Ford offer.

My good friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], is advocating a proposition about which he said (page 178, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, December 7, 1922), "If the Senator will devote his energies and his eloquence to getting the Ford people to support the bill I have tried to get through, we will help the Alabama farmer ten thousand times more than the Ford proposition, if carried out, would help him. We will furnish him fertilizer at a price which does not include even an 8 per cent profit." I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the Senator believes every word of what he has said, and that his faith in his proposition is very much larger than the size of a mustard seed, but his belief is not conclusive evidence that he is right in his conclusions. He might have faith sufficient to remove mountains and still be wrong in his ideas as to the disposition of Muscle Shoals. Should, under his plan, the manufacture of fertilizer be successful and should that fertilizer be sold to the farmer at cost, Henry Ford might, even then—at a profit of 8 per cent—produce it and sell it to the farmer very much cheaper. There is no argument in that part of his statement. As to his statement that his proposition "will help the Alabama farmer ten thousand times more than the Ford proposition," I think I will be able to show in pointing out some features of his bill that he has tremendously overestimated the possibilities of farmer aid provided for in this proposed measure. In fact, I seriously doubt if the Senator really understands the possibilities, yea, the probabilities, of his bill.

In studying it I think I understand just what the Senator would like to accomplish; but his bill strikes me as being only a preamble to something more gigantic and, when beyond his control, something that would probably prove frightful in its consequences. What the Senator would like to accomplish and what his bill proposes are two separate and distinct things. The Senator believes that under his bill there will be a great development at Muscle Shoals, great reservoir dams built, vast endeavors in research. It is a glorious picture that he paints when he waxes eloquent on this subject, and he waxes eloquent because he believes that his bill will accomplish all these things. But, Mr. President, I make this expression of belief: If Senate bill 3420, as introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, should be passed and become a law, just the opposite of all these desirable things enumerated by the Senator would happen. If there was any special interest that wanted Muscle Shoals, such as the Alabama Power Co., for instance, I do not see how they could draw a more subtle measure, such as would stand a chance of being slipped by the people of this country, than the Norris bill. I am sure that the Senator from Nebraska has never taken this viewpoint of the matter, but I am going to try to point out to the Senate some of the provisions of his bill.

WHAT THE NORRIS BILL PROPOSES.

The caption of the bill is—

To provide for the manufacture of explosives for the use of the Army and Navy, to provide for the manufacture of fertilizer for agricultural purposes, to incorporate the Federal Chemical Corporation, and for other purposes.

The first section of the bill clearly authorizes and directs the Secretary of War "to cause surveys to be made" above the dams on the Tennessee River and its tributaries "for the purpose of locating storage reservoirs." However, there is no appropriation provided for this work, and there must be further legislation if the surveys are made. The section further provides—

if a suitable site or sites can be found upon such investigation where practical storage reservoirs can be obtained at reasonable cost, the Secretary is directed to take the necessary steps to secure such sites and to build the necessary dams for the impounding of water therein.

The defect in this is that the decision is left entirely with the Secretary of War as to whether or not suitable sites are found, and if they "can be obtained at reasonable cost." Therefore, it is left to the Secretary of War to decide whether or not there are suitable sites and if the cost at which they can be obtained is reasonable. What more authority could he desire, should he want to delay action, than to have such decisions left entirely within his power? Does anyone suppose that under these times of "normalcy" that the enormous business interests of this country that are in conflict with Muscle Shoals development would be challenged and antagonized by the selection of sites and the development of dams for the purpose of the Government going into competition with large private capital? Would the present administration go contrary in this matter to its avowed policy of taking the Government out of business? Does the Senator contemplate a delay of at least two years in this matter until the present administration passes into history and then take his chances with another administration that would probably prove just as positive in the same kind of policy? In addition to that, suppose the Secretary of War should select such sites, and suppose he should find that he could purchase such sites at "reasonable cost," then before he can buy them he will have to come to Congress for an appropriation. Indeed, this is splendid machinery to create all the delay that any interest who might desire the scrapping of Muscle Shoals could desire. In so far as this bill providing a means that will result in the development of the upper reaches of the Tennessee River and its tributaries and establishing these desirable reservoirs is concerned, we might as well discard the idea as merely a pleasant pipe dream.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LADD. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to ask the Senator, if the proposition that this survey be made by the War Department is not proper, if it ought to be done in some other way, whether he would make a suggestion as to where the power should be placed rather than in the Secretary of War? Let me state to the Senator that I put it in the hands of the Secretary of War because the Secretary of War has the men, and the War Department has always been the instrumentality by which such surveys have been made. I would be very glad indeed if the Senator could suggest a better place to put it. I would be glad, if the bill was before us, to accept an amendment from the Senator from North Dakota or any other Senator lodging the power in better hands. Would the Senator be willing to put it in the hands of the corporation which it is proposed to set up?

Mr. LADD. No; I will perhaps show, as I go on further, the reason why I would not be willing to put it in the hands of the corporation.

Mr. NORRIS. I am referring to the survey. Assuming that we pass the bill, and the corporation provided for in the bill is set up, would the Senator rather put the power in the hands of the corporation than in the hands of the Secretary of War?

Mr. LADD. No; but I would want some control over it.

Mr. NORRIS. Where would the Senator put it? The Senator will admit, will he not, that this survey and the building of these reservoirs on the Tennessee for storage purposes are

absolutely necessary if we are to get the maximum amount of electrical energy out of the Tennessee River?

Mr. LADD. There is no question there. What I maintain is that the machinery is so cumbersome, the time required would be so long, the delays would be just what the opposition would desire in order to prevent action. Before the survey can be made there must be appropriations, and after the survey is made there must then be further appropriations and money raised from some source with which to purchase those sites.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator must admit that provision of the machinery for bringing about the building of the storage reservoirs, if they are to be built, is just as important as the completion, for instance, of Dam No. 2 or Dam No. 3, particularly Dam No. 2. They could go on just the same, and it would necessarily have to be delayed long enough to make the surveys. If there is any other way to do it more quickly I want to say to the Senator that I would be delighted to have him suggest it and I would be glad to adopt it.

Mr. LADD. I think, if the Senator will allow me to go on, I will point out some of those things before I am through.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. LADD. It does not require very much experience in the National Legislature to know that there is frequently a difference of opinion between those who recommend appropriations and the Congress that grants such appropriations. Considering the various interests concerned about what happens to Muscle Shoals, and the difficulty that this Congress has had with that very proposition during the past two years, it is not an unreasonable conjecture that young men would blossom into the grave during the process of its long-drawn-out development, should it be developed by the Government and for the Government at all.

Mr. NORRIS. May I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. LADD. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Either now, or at some other time in the course of his remarks, I wish the Senator would point out to the Senate and to the country where in the Ford proposal there is any proposition to survey the river and to build storage reservoirs, which everybody admits are necessary to the full and maximum enjoyment of the water power there. Has the Ford proposition in it anywhere anything which would bind the Ford corporation to do anything of that kind, or have they even suggested such a contingency?

Mr. LADD. I will deal with those subjects somewhat later.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. LADD. In so far as the bill relates to the development of such reservoirs, it sounds like only a preamble to what might be desired.

FEDERAL CHEMICAL CORPORATION.

In sections 4 and 5 are found provisions for the chartering of "The Federal Chemical Corporation," and all of the powers of this so-called corporation are set forth. These two sections are very important, Mr. President. They are as follows:

SEC. 4. That there is hereby incorporated and created a corporation by the name, style, and title of "The Federal Chemical Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the corporation). Said corporation shall have perpetual succession and shall have power—

(1) To adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(2) To sue and be sued, and to complain and to defend in any court of law and equity within the United States;

(3) To make and enforce such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act;

(4) To appoint and fix the compensation of such employees, attorneys, and agents as are necessary for the transaction of the business of the corporation, to define their duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalties thereof; but in no case shall any such employee receive a salary in excess of $12,000 per annum;

(5) To prescribe, amend, and repeal by-laws not inconsistent with this act for the conduct of its business; and

(6) To exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon it by this act and such additional powers as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That the business of said corporation shall be transacted by a board of directors (hereinafter called the board), consisting of three persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of said board shall hold their offices during good behavior and shall receive a salary of $7,500 per year, payable monthly: *Provided*, That any member of said board may be removed from office at any time by a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate. No member of said board shall during his continuance in office be engaged in any other business, but shall give his entire time to the business of said corporation. Said board shall select one of its members as president. It shall select a treasurer and as many assistant treasurers as it deems proper, and such treasurer and assistant treasurers may be corporations or banking institutions and shall give such security for the safe-keeping of the moneys of said corporation as the board may require. In the appointment of officials and the selection of employees for said corporation and in the promotion of any such employees or officials no political test or qualifications shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. The board shall give publicity to any request, coming from any source, asking for any favor in behalf of any person or the promotion of any employee. Any member of said board who permits the use of political or partisan influence in the selection of any employee, or in the promotion of any such employee of said corporation, or who gives any consideration to political considerations in the official action of said board, or who, knowing that such political influence has been or is attempted, does not give publicity to the same, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $1,000 or be imprisoned not to exceed six months, or both such fine and imprisonment, and the conviction of any member of said board of the offense herein defined shall have the effect of removing such member from office.

Mr. President, I want to observe right here that the attempt to build up a merchant marine by means of a private corporation under governmental control was practically the same character of machinery as that proposed in this bill. That attempt, although started in good faith, resulted in failure, waste, extravagance, and the greatest scandals in the history of our Government. Even now we are faced with the colossal task of scrapping, junking, subsidizing, and a general untangling of business mismanagement that is so bad as to stagger the imagination and so rotten that it almost becomes necessary for us to put on gas masks as we approach the task. We have no assurance that we will not be faced with a very much greater problem in untangling the complications that will certainly result should Senate bill 3420 become a law.

Mr. NORRIS. In drawing the provisions which the Senator has just read, I was moved by a desire to make this corporation entirely independent of partisan or political control, as much as human ingenuity could make it so. Of course, I understand that the Senator is opposed to the Government operating anything. He is opposed to the Government operating anything either through the instrumentality of a corporation or otherwise, and I concede he has a right to that opinion; but I would like to ask the Senator again if he can point out any amendment which would improve the measure or avoid the dangers he says exist, which I do not believe exist. I would be glad to have him do it. I do not claim to have the last word in the construction of an act providing for a corporation. I welcome any criticism tending to improve it, and even though the Senator is opposed to Government operation of anything, I wish he would take the viewpoint of one who believes that there are some things the Government ought to do and, taking that viewpoint, assist to the extent of his great ability in suggesting amendments which would avoid the pitfalls he says are certain to overtake the corporation.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, if the Norris bill comes before the Senate I shall offer some amendments and suggestions, in the first place; in the second place, I want to correct the statement of the Senator that I am opposed to Government operation and ownership. Just the opposite to that; I am in favor of Government ownership and operation of certain industries, and especially those which may be considered as public utilities, but I am not in favor of such operation unless I am convinced that it is going to be for the best interests of all the people of the country.

Mr. NORRIS. I assumed from other things he has said about this proposition that the Senator was opposed to Government operation, because the bill I have reported, the one setting up this corporation, provides one method of Government operation. I am not criticizing the Senator because he is opposed to it. He has a perfect right to be opposed to the Government operation at Muscle Shoals, of course, and to be in favor of Government operation of public utilities. But does not the Senator favor Government control of any kind of the use of electricity which is generated from our navigable streams?

Mr. LADD. I certainly am, and if the Senator will wait until I am through I think he will find that I pointed out some of the reasons.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is in favor of that, I would like to have him explain why he is favorable to the Ford offer, which proposes that the Government shall turn over to the Ford corporation, without any regulation, all of the surplus energy which will be generated at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. LADD. I can not agree with the Senator that such is done; but I prefer to discuss the matter along this line, and take up those other matters on another occasion.

WHICH, A COMMISSION OR A CORPORATION?

Let us notice for a moment the character of this proposed corporation.

First, does this bill actually create a corporation? There is some doubt in my mind as to whether this is a corporation or is simply a commission. We will take it for granted, however, that it is a corporation. If it is, there is no limit upon its capital, and should it become necessary to have capital in order to begin its operations, then that capital must be obtained by appropriation of Congress or the corporation must rely upon its own resources in order to obtain money. If capital is to be supplied by an appropriation of Congress, then there is a still further delay, and there is no assurance to the Ameri-

can people as to what amounts will be required. Indeed, it is entirely probable that each succeeding Congress will be besieged with requests for additional appropriations. It is safe to assume that there can be no activity in the way of manufacturing fertilizer unless the corporation is at least supplied with sufficient capital for operating expenses. But suppose the corporation should not wait upon Congress for an appropriation, but depends entirely upon its own resources, and the directors should decide that it was necessary to borrow money for operating expenses. Under paragraph (3) of section 4 the corporation has the power "to make and enforce such contracts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." Under this authority the corporation could borrow money and secure it by mortgage upon any property that was in its possession, and the first step would be made toward turning it over to private control, or else pave the way for burdensome appropriations in order for Congress to save the situation.

ALABAMA POWER CO. AND GORGAS.

It may be contended that funds would be provided by that portion of section 6 which reads, "Said corporation is authorized to negotiate with the Alabama Power Co. for the purpose of settling the difficulties existing between the Government of the United States and the said power company by virtue of the joint ownership of the power plant at Gorgas, Ala.; and it is authorized to sell the interest of the Government of the United States in said plant to the said Alabama Power Co., and to use the money received therefor in the operation of its business as hereinbefore described." But there is nothing in the act which prescribes just what that settlement would be, and the red tape of negotiation for settlement might be strung out over a period of years, most especially should the Alabama Power Co. decide that it would be desirable to delay and hamper the corporation as long as possible. And I might observe in this connection, Mr. President, that it is doubtful if the Alabama Power Co. itself could have drawn a provision that would have been more pleasing to them than this provision which assures them the ownership of the Gorgas plant. It makes it impossible for the directors to dispose of the interest of the Government to anyone else, and serves notice to the Alabama Power Co. that they will have no competition but can negotiate as long as they please and finally, no doubt, settle on their own terms; and that would be most especially true should the corporation experience some period wherein it was short of funds and would be willing to make considerable sacrifice in order to obtain money.

Mr. President, this bill either provides for a private corporation or a simple commission or it provides nothing. If it is a private corporation—and it must be, since it is to be granted a legal entity and the right to sue and be sued, and to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal, make and enforce contracts, and the other rights of a corporation—then there are some very serious aspects of its powers that should be carefully considered.

In the first place, "said corporation shall have perpetual succession." The bill reserves to Congress no rights to alter, amend, or repeal, and once it is organized and contractual relations established, Congress can not in any way alter or change the law or the powers granted under it, because all the powers granted in the act become part of the contracts entered into by it. On the other hand, if it is not such a private corporation, and Congress has the right to change the law, then the whole act is nothing but a scrap of paper, because any succeeding Congress may change it. It is well established that no Congress has the power to bind any succeeding Congress.

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT CONTROL.

The fact that the corporation is supposed to be controlled by the Government does not affect the legal position of the corporation. This situation again parallels the situation in the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The Supreme Court held (October term, 1921) in the case of Sloan Shipyards Corporation et al., appellants, v. United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation and the United States of America, that—

The United States took all the stock, but that did not affect the legal position of the company.

Indeed, there is another point to consider: This corporation being a private corporation, could it compete with other concerns to the extent that it was injurious to their business, and would it not be brought under the restrictions of the Sherman Act, the Federal Trade Commission acts, and other regulatory measures? If so, then all of the wonderful possibilities that the Senator claims for it as an aid to the farmer begin to fade into insignificance. Indeed, it can not be a private corporation for one purpose and at the same time be a Government commission for another purpose. It must be one or the other; it can not blow hot and cold.

IS IT A PRIVATE CORPORATION?

This corporation being a private corporation can very easily get around the provision that attempts to limit the salary of any employee to $12,000 per annum. Congress may provide that in its charter, but since it is a private corporation and the employees are not under the direction of Congress, there is nothing to prevent the payment of fees and commissions in addition to the salary. Of course, if the salaries were to be paid by appropriations of Congress, then Congress could direct the expenditure of its appropriation. But it is contemplated that this corporation will receive great funds from sources other than Congress.

Now, let us consider for a moment another grave provision in this bill, and that is that the business of the corporation—

shall be transacted by a board of directors consisting of three persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of said board shall hold their office during good behavior and shall receive a salary of $7,500 per year, payable monthly: *Provided*, That any member of said board may be removed from office at any time by a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

What the Senator has attempted to do here may be commendable, but he has actually done nothing other than to provide that the President shall appoint these directors by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that they shall hold their office during good behavior. Notwithstanding the fact that the Senator attempts to reserve to Congress the right to remove these directors by a concurrent resolution, he has not done so. The President has the right of appointment here and he alone will be the judge of "good behavior," and if the President decides that they shall come out or stay in his word alone is final. The only way that Congress can remove one of them is by the constitutional method of impeachment or by abolishing the office, and since the bill does not reserve the right to alter, amend, or appeal, then Congress can not abolish the job. This whole question has been thoroughly thrashed out and settled. The question arose during the first administration of President Cleveland and the whole matter is set forth at length in Senate Report No. 135 of the Forty-ninth Congress, first session. So the Senator simply places these three directors in the same category of all other presidential appointees, and, notwithstanding the fact that he has provided a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment, for the use of political influence in the selecting of officers and employees of the corporation, yet these directors will not come within that provision, and they will be subject to the pleasure of each succeeding administration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LADD. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator contend that a new President coming could remove one of those directors?

Mr. LADD. He alone has the authority.

Mr. NORRIS. He would not have authority to remove them any more than he has authority to remove an appointee of the Supreme Court. Does the Senator contend that the President, for instance, President Harding, could remove a member of the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. LADD. I am not referring to that; I am referring to what took place under the Cleveland administration and a similar power under the bill here.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, the Senator must be in error about it. The President would not have any authority to remove one of those men, and the only reason the Senator gives why he would have the authority is because he has the appointing power. He would not have any more authority to remove one of them than he would have to remove a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Does the Senator seriously contend that by concurrent resolution the proposed directors could not be removed?

Mr. LADD. I say there is some grave doubt about it.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think there is a particle of doubt, but if there is, and if the appointment plan is not right, if the Senator has a better way, I would be very glad to follow it. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill never even came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so an opportunity was had for anybody to suggest an amendment. The Senator himself was one of the members, and the other Ford supporters helped him to prevent even the consideration of those propositions by the committee and voted to prevent it from having any opportunity to amend it or even to discuss it. I would like to have the Senator assist us in a constructive way. If there is something wrong with it, or if there is anything that can be offered to improve it—and I have no doubt

the Senator could indicate many places where it ought to be improved—I would go with him whole-heartedly and endeavor to improve it in every respect.

Mr. LADD. That is just why I am trying to point out at this time some of the defects, as I consider them, in the bill. It was only because the Senator made the remark he did a few days ago in the course of his observations that I am led to make the statement I am now making.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator, it seems to me, is inconsistent in pointing them out now when he and the other Ford men prevented the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from doing just what I say I would like to have done by constructive statesmen like the Senator—to suggest amendments and improve the measure.

Mr. LADD. And those who are opposed to the Ford offer prevented action also on the other side equally well.

Mr. NORRIS. What action?

Mr. LADD. Favorable action for consideration of the Ford offer.

Mr. NORRIS. The majority of the committee was against accepting the Ford proposition. The majority of the committee, composed of all the Ford men and a few members of the committee who were probably opposed to either proposition, went with the Senator and the other Ford men and prevented the improvement of the bill that ought to be made if the Senator's criticism is right.

POLITICAL MAKESHIFTS.

Mr. LADD. But even in the question he raises about the use of political influence, what is to be the definition of "political or partisan influence"? Who is to determine these things? Is it to be done by a court and jury? Mr. President, the whole idea is simply visionary. We will never accomplish anything in the way of reform by such makeshift measures.

May I direct the attention of the Senate to this thought: Since these directors are to come in the class of other political presidential appointees, who for one moment doubts that they will be subjected to the same pressure of the same old interests? Mr. President, this bill would simply result in a financial juggernaut, a collossus that would crush the whole project. Instead of proving a salvation to the farmer it would prove a curse. I know that the Senator has conscientiously given a great deal of time and thought to this subject, and that there is no man in the Senate who has the interests of the people more at heart, but he has evidently taken some very bad advice in this matter.

WOULD PROTECT BIG BUSINESS.

To this private corporation, with this loose organization, with practically no governmental regulation, is to be granted all of these great properties and without consideration. Mr. President, if there were designing big interests who wanted to "trick" the American people out of all this property, they could not desire a better measure than this bill to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator tell just how the big interests would get it? How would they get it away from this corporation?

Mr. LADD. I shall have to object to further interruption at this time and must confine myself to a full discussion of the matter in my own way.

To accept this means of settling the Muscle Shoals matter means to accept a proposition that will either terminate in scrapping the entire project, or eventually turning it over to some special interests for practically nothing. Under this arrangement, Mr. President, like the Shipping Board, it will be made to show losses if it is actually making money. It will soon be held up to the American people as a dismal failure, a white albatross around our necks, a thing to be gotten rid of in some manner—to be "wished" off on some private parties if they are willing to assume the burdens. The farmer's dream of cheap fertilizer will vaporize into the heavens. It is not a pleasant thing to say it, but it is a fact that we must face.

That the administration does not indorse Government ownership or operation of public utilities is clearly evident from statements set forth in President Harding's address before Congress when he said, speaking of the railroads:

> Government operation does not afford the cure. It was Government operation which brought us to the very state of things against which we now rebel, and we are still liquidating the costs of that supreme folly.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator if he meant what he said awhile ago that he did not want to be interrupted further. Of course, the Senator has a right to object to interruption, and without complaint I shall accept his suggestion. If he objects I shall not ask any questions, but I would like to ask on the proposition he has just mentioned——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LADD. I yield for a question only.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator agree with the President of the United States on what he has just read from the President's message?

Mr. LADD. I do not.

Mr. NORRIS. Then on the Muscle Shoals proposition the Senator does agree with the President, who is opposed to my bill, as is the Senator. Is that true?

Mr. LADD. That is not entirely true.

Mr. NORRIS. How true is it? How much truth is there in it? The President has said that he is opposed to my bill, and I think he is, and the Senator from North Dakota is opposed to it. Does the Senator agree with the President?

Mr. LADD. As I shall state further on in my remarks, when there is presented a bill providing Government ownership or otherwise that is more favorable to the people, in my judgment, than the Ford offer, I shall drop the Ford offer and take up the new proposition within 20 minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish the Senator would prepare such a bill. I would like to go with him on it, or modify mine so it will meet that contingency.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, if one but studies governmental operation and control of our railroads, of the magnificent fleet of ships owned by the United States, and other activities, one can not escape being convinced that there is no intention on the part of certain great interests in permitting Government ownership to succeed even in handling or operating public utilities in the interest of all the people, but it may be done for the benefit of certain groups. For New York to build a great State-owned elevator to handle grain, to promote foreign export, to insure a needed food supply for New York City, and for the special benefit of the middlemen and speculators is lauded as good business and a great achievement. That there should be built a great grain elevator and magnificent cotton warehouses by Louisiana to promote foreign export through New Orleans by the middlemen and speculators is again acclaimed as a great achievement and proper use of governmental funds, but when the producers of my own State propose to erect an elevator to be used for the benefit of the producers in that great basic industry, agriculture, now prostrate because of unfair discrimination on the part of the Government, the manipulation of middlemen and grain speculators with protection of a four to five decision by courts to overthrow the lower courts, the building of such an elevator by the State is nation-wide acclaimed as paternalism, the putting of Government into business, as interfering with the sacred rights of privilege who already have gained control of the insurance companies, banks, mills, railroads, and mines, and who are now seeking to control the land, and by the policy adopted through credit control are fast accomplishing their purpose. Those who advocate such a policy for State warehouses are branded as socialists and dangerous citizens, and at times mob rule encouraged and protected by self-appointed representatives of special privilege which marks a forward step in evolution of government by and for the people. We are now at the fork of the road; which way shall we proceed?

The Senator from Nebraska stated in his speech in the Senate on December 7 (p. 175, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) that—

> When the farmers of America understand the iniquity of this Ford proposition they will rise en masse and condemn it, and they will condemn any man who stands for it.

May I but caution the Senator, Mr. President, that Haman hung on his own gibbet.

The Senator seems to be afraid of corporations, yet he does not seem to realize that he proposes to create a private corporation that will have infinitely more of power than the one proposed by Mr. Ford, and infinitely less of control, supervision, and regulation than the one proposed by Mr. Ford. To my mind, Mr. President, the proposition does not harmonize in the least with the wonderful fight the Senator has made during a long period of years in behalf of the people.

Perhaps we are all prone to overlook faults in our own creation, but it seems to me that the Senator does not apply the same rules of analysis to his own proposition that he insists upon applying to the Ford proposal. Both are private corporations, and there is the distinction that the Ford corporation will have less of power and equally as much, if not more, of regulation under the general laws than will have the proposed Norris corporation. I know of nothing that will exempt the Ford corporation from the operation of the Federal Trade Commission acts, the Sherman Act, and other regulatory measures.

AMOUNT OF FERTILIZERS USED.

Mr. President, during the years from 1913 to 1920, inclusive, the average annual amount of fertilizer used in the United States was 6,543,435 tons (House hearings on Muscle Shoals propositions, p. 96).

I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to paragraph 15 of the Ford offer, which is as follows:

Since the manufacture, sale, and distribution of commercial fertilizers to farmers and other users thereof constitutes one of the principal considerations of this offer, the company expressly agrees that, continuously throughout the lease period, except as it may be prevented by reconstruction of the plant itself, or by war, strikes, accidents, fires, or other causes beyond its control, it will manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers, mixed at nitrate plant No. 2, or its equivalent, or at such other plant or plants adjacent or near thereto as it may construct, using the most economical source of power available. The annual production of these fertilizers shall have a nitrogen content of at least 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, which is the present annual capacity of nitrate plant No. 2. If during the lease period said nitrate plant No. 2 is destroyed or damaged from any cause, the company agrees to restore such plant, within a reasonable time, to its former capacity, and further agrees:

(a) To determine by research whether by means of electric furnace methods and industrial chemistry there may be produced, on a commercial scale, fertilizer compounds of higher grade and at lower prices than farmers and other users of commercial fertilizers have in the past been able to obtain, and to determine whether in a broad way the application of electricity and industrial chemistry may accomplish for the agricultural industry of the country what they have economically accomplished for other industries, and if so found and determined, to reasonably employ such improved methods.

(b) To maintain nitrate plant No. 2 in its present state of readiness, or its equivalent, for immediate operation in the manufacture of materials necessary in time of war for the production of explosives.

This language seems to be plain enough for anyone to understand that the company is bound "continuously throughout the lease period" to "manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers, mixed or unmixed, and with or without filler, according to demand." We will discuss Mr. Ford's personal liability a little later on.

Also, "the annual production of these fertilizers shall have a nitrogen content of at least 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen." There seems to be some contention over this point, Mr. President, and some of the opponents of the Ford offer seek consolation in the fact that his obligation to manufacture fertilizer is limited to that amount. There had to be a minimum, and the only reasonable minimum to take was the annual capacity of nitrate plant No. 2, which was the only plant that was running successfully. The fact that Mr. Ford has agreed upon a minimum does not mean at all that he will not produce more. But suppose that he should not produce but the minimum amount, what then?

FORD WOULD MAKE A FOURTH OF ALL FERTILIZERS USED.

How much of commercial fertilizer would that be? I quote from page 367 of the House hearings:

Mr. Ford agrees in his offer "to operate nitrate plant No. 2 at the approximate present annual capacity of its machinery and equipment in the production of nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers (said capacity being equal to approximately 110,000 tons of ammonium nitrate per annum) throughout the lease period," etc.

He therefore agrees to make nitrogen commercial fertilizers and other kinds of commercial fertilizers requiring for their nitrogen content an amount of nitrogen equal to the amount of nitrogen contained in 110,000 tons of ammonium nitrate. Since ammonium nitrate is 35 per cent nitrogen, 110,000 tons of ammonium nitrate contains 38,500 tons of nitrogen. This is sufficient nitrogen to make—

Ammonium sulphate (24 per cent nitrogen), 160,000 tons; sodium (Chilean) nitrate (16 per cent nitrogen), 240,000 tons; 2-8-2 commercial fertilizer (2 per cent nitrogen), 1,925,000 tons.

It should not be understood, however, that Mr. Ford intends to make any of these, for it is his expressed purpose to produce a more concentrated plant food than any of the above forms.

If Mr. Ford should succeed in producing a more concentrated plant food, and can save the farmers in the weight of fertilizer shipments, he will cut down a great deal of the fertilizer expense in freight. It will be seen by these figures, however, that under the proposition to which Mr. Ford is obligated he will produce a minimum of nearly 2,000,000 tons of 2-8-2 commercial fertilizer, or about one-fourth of the amount required for American use. If the theory that the price obtained for our 10 per cent surplus in farm commodities governs the price we obtain for the entire crop means anything, then it should be equally true that the price Mr. Ford will make for his amount of fertilizers, equaling about 25 per cent of what we need for national consumption, should equally affect the price for all the fertilizer sold in the United States. If the theory holds good in one instance, it should hold good in the other.

REDUCE THE COST OF FERTILIZERS.

Even the opponents of the Ford offer seem to think that Mr. Ford will reduce the cost of fertilizer. It is not necessary to assume that he will cut the price in two. That would be very desirable, but suppose he should only reduce the price by $5 per ton, that alone would mean a saving to the American farmer of approximately $35,000,000 in a single year. It is granted that none of us expect Mr. Ford to live 100 years, but should he only live for 10 years more and should effect such a saving for the farmer each year—which estimate of saving is not at all unreasonable, but I think it rather conservative—then during those 10 years he would have saved for the American farmer an amount approximating $350,000,000—a sum far in excess of the cost to the Government of the entire project. Naturally, Mr. President, these great savings to the American farmer will be chipped off from the unreasonable profits that the Fertilizer Trust would realize out of the American farmer, and we may expect them to set up a great howl. To turn this proposition over to Henry Ford will be one of the greatest investments the Government could make in behalf of the American farmer.

GUARANTEE TO MAKE FERTILIZERS.

Mr. President, I think there can be no doubt that Mr. Ford has obligated himself to produce a complete fertilizer. The language of paragraph 15, which I have just quoted, clearly obligates him to manufacture it either "mixed or unmixed, and with or without filler, according to demand." I do not see how he could employ any language more definite than that. Then his representative, Mr. Mayo, in his explanations of the Ford offer before the House committee (House hearings, p. 253) declared that he will make a complete fertilizer. I quote as follows:

Mr. MORIN. In the form produced at nitrate plant No. 2, it is not a fertilizer, but is a fertilizer compound; is not that true?
Mr. MAYO. He intends to produce a complete fertilizer.
Mr. MORIN. He intends to produce a complete fertilizer?
Mr. MAYO. Yes, sir.
Mr. MORIN. Would it be sold in this form to the farmer?
Mr. MAYO. Yes, sir.
Mr. MORIN. Could the farmer use it in this form without the addition of the other essential ingredients?
Mr. MAYO. He will be able to use the completed product as it will be furnished from that plant.
Mr. MORIN. As it will be furnished to him?
Mr. MAYO. Yes, sir.
Mr. MORIN. It will not be necessary, then, for the farmer to mix it with the other ingredients in order to market this product through the fertilizer mixers now existing?
Mr. MAYO. Not further than perhaps mixing it with dry earth or sand or something he has right at hand.

Mr. President, it may be contended that Mr. Ford is not obligated by this testimony. It does not make any essential difference whether he is or not. The essential fact is that he is obligated by the terms of his office to "manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers, mixed or unmixed, and with or without filler, according to demand." This testimony, however, is important in that such intention is emphasized and clarified by his personal representative.

In order to produce mixed complete fertilizers, Mr. President, Mr. Ford would have to manufacture or purchase phosphoric acid and potash. Phosphates are abundant near by, and it has been pointed out by Mr. Mayo (p. 281, House hearings) that the necessary ingredients of fertilizer can be obtained within a radius of 100 miles of the plants; also, Mr. Theodore Swann, president of the Federal Phosphorus Co., of Birmingham, Ala., has shown (House hearings, pp. 432 to 434) how the phosphate rock can be smelted in an electric furnace and phosphoric acid collected for use in the fertilizer industry, and that such a method will reduce the present costs of fertilizer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator long enough to say that there are inexhaustible beds of phosphate rock in southern Tennessee within 100 miles of Muscle Shoals?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt there along the same line——

Mr. LADD. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not suppose it will be contended that there is not anybody except Mr. Ford who can utilize that great quantity of phosphate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; but my contention is that in view of his success in the past in handling machines, if he makes the same kind of success in manufacturing or getting together fertilizers that he made in automobiles he will make it a great success.

Mr. NORRIS. That ought to go to show, and I think does, that anybody—the corporation provided for in this bill that is being condemned, if it is set up, which goes a great deal further than that, or Mr. Ford, or anyone else—will be able to utilize that product, and ought to utilize it, and that it ought to cheapen fertilizer, no matter who does it.

Mr. McKELLAR. We hope so.

Mr. LADD. All of this can be done at Muscle Shoals; and Mr. Ford contemplates experiments along that line, as indicated by section (a) of paragraph 15 of his proposal.

PROFITS LIMITED, HOW?

Mr. President, paragraph 16 of the Ford offer provides the manner of appointment of a board of nine members for the purpose of seeing that fertilizer is manufactured at a profit not to exceed 8 per cent. Here are some of the powers of that board:

The said board shall determine what has been the cost of manufacture and sale of fertilizer products and the price which has been

charged therefor, and, if necessary for the purpose of limiting the annual profit to 8 per cent as aforesaid, shall regulate the price at which said fertilizer may be sold by the company. For these purposes said board shall have access to the books and records of the company at any reasonable time. In order that such fertilizer products may be fairly distributed and economically purchased by farmers and other users thereof, the said board shall determine the equitable territorial distribution of the same and may, in its discretion, make reasonable regulation for the sale of all or a portion of such products by the company to farmers, their agencies, or organizations.

Mr. President, the Government could not devise any method that would better protect the farmers of the Nation in the fertilizer that is to be manufactured at Muscle Shoals than in this method. No man could make a fairer or better proposition than this. I do not see how it can be subjected to misinterpretation. Now, how are the members of this board appointed? The board is to consist of nine voting members and a representative of the Bureau of Markets, who will serve in an advisory capacity. Of these nine voting members only two are to be designated by the company, and the other seven are to be selected by the President of the United States from a list proposed by various representative farm organizations, and the President is to then send these seven selections in to the Senate for confirmation.

WHO WILL DUPLICATE FORD'S OFFER?

It is small wonder, Mr. President, that of all the big interests affected by Muscle Shoals none of them have made the Government a proposition that in any way approached the Ford offer. It was simply too staggering for them. Mr. Ford has offered the Government so much more than any of these big interests who are primarily affected are willing to offer that all they can do is to rear back on their haunches, spout their high-priced wisdom, and protest against the acceptance of the Ford offer. Ah, Mr. President, Henry Ford has been too much for them; he does not play the game according to Hoyle. They know he will succeed, and they know his success at Muscle Shoals means more for the farmer and less for them. All they can do is criticize. If his offer is not the best thing for the people of the United States, why do not some of them propose something that is better? As I have before stated, the burden is not upon Henry Ford to show that his offer is the best thing for the country, but the burden is upon the Ford opponents to produce something better. There has been only one proposition that I have heard anyone contend with any seriousness was better than the Ford offer, and that is the proposition embraced in the bill of the Senator from Nebraska. I think I have very effectually shown, Mr. President, that his measure falls far short—indeed, would be very dangerous.

HOW FERTILIZER MEN VIEW IT.

In fact, Mr. President, I was very much struck by the line of argument employed by the Senator from Nebraska against the Ford offer. It reminds me very much of the objections raised by Mr. Charles H. MacDowell, president of the National Fertilizer Association and president of Armour Fertilizer Works—one of the packer concerns—and other big connections, when he stated that the fertilizer manufacturers were opposed to the Ford offer. He said (House hearings, p. 523):

Mr. HULL. Why are they opposed to the Government accepting the Ford proposition?

Mr. MACDOWELL. * * * One reason is a public-policy reason, where they think it is questionable public policy to provide facilities and overfacilities at a water power for one man to monopolize for 100 years. They do not think that it is wise public policy to give one man the power to say to a community what kind of industry shall be located in that particular section of the country. * * *

Imagine such benevolent attitude in packer and fertilizer trust councils, if you can.

There has been much objection raised to the 100-year feature of the Ford proposition. One cry is that Henry Ford can not be expected to live for another 100 years, and that his liability ceases upon the formation of his proposed company. In the first place, Mr. President, contemplating the vast expenditure of money that Mr. Ford will have to make in order to carry out his plans of development, he would not be justified in making such a tremendous outlay of money unless he had a longer period than 50 years. Furthermore, Mr. Ford proposes to back up this proposition with his entire wealth. What further evidence of good faith could he give? The very fact that he does not expect to live for another 100 years is evidence of the fact that he is not in this proposition for the purpose of making money. If it offered such tremendous advantages for money-making, you may rest assured that the great capitalistic interests of this country would very soon be in the field with a better offer to the Government. Everyone knows that Henry Ford is in this matter for the purpose of helping the American people; that is why his opposition is so fierce and denunciatory.

FORD'S GUARANTY.

The Senator from Nebraska said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 7, 1922, p. 175) in referring to Henry Ford:

He is going to organize a corporation with a capital stock of $10,000,000. It is that corporation and not Henry Ford with which the Government deals. He binds himself, his heirs and executors, to what he has agreed to do in the contract, and that is to organize that corporation. When he organizes it with a capital of $10,000,000 he has complied with his proposition. He is not liable any further.

I must confess that I can not, however hard I try, construe the language in the Ford offer to mean what the Senator from Nebraska has interpreted it to be. In the first place, Mr. Ford is to organize a corporation "with a capital stock of $10,000,000 or more, of which at least $10,000,000 shall be paid in in cash," and it is to be controlled by himself. (Par. 1.)

In the next place, and this is what seems to most concern some of the Ford opponents, Mr. Ford has not "complied with his proposition" when he organizes the company. His liability does not cease there, but his estate—his heirs, representatives, and assigns—is obligated to the terms of his proposhi throughout the lease period. Let me direct the attention of the Senate to the language employed in paragraph 20 of the Ford proposal:

Upon acceptance the promises, undertakings, and obligations shall be binding upon the United States, and jointly and severally upon the undersigned, his heirs, representatives, and assigns, and the company, its successors and assigns.

I do not see how more definite language could be employed. This language plainly obligates the estate of Henry Ford just so long as the contract is in existence. It could not let him out upon the organization of the company, as asserted by the Senator from Nebraska; the language expressly states that Ford, his heirs, representatives, and assigns are "jointly and severally" bound. To whom else could the words "jointly and severally" apply? It could not apply to that period of time before the organization of the company, because the company will not have had any legal existence prior to its organization. There would have been no person, no legal entity, with whom he could have been "jointly and severally" obligated. No other construction can be placed upon the language than that Henry Ford and his estate is obligated to the terms of the contract just so long as the lease is in existence. Should Ford not be a man of sufficient business judgment to provide for this liability to the satisfaction of the Government in his will, then his whole estate will be held in abeyance until a proper adjustment is made; unless, of course, the Government should sleep on its rights. Mr. President, the Senator's argument falls.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROOKHART in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LADD. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has correctly quoted me when I gave my construction of the contract. I have so often heard the assertion made that the Senator has made now, and I have so often had other people criticize me for making the assertion that the Senator has just quoted, that I have looked into it as carefully as I am capable of examining any instrument; and while I have perfect respect for the Senator's opinion, I am just as confident that my construction is right as I am that I stand here on the floor of the Senate.

The proposition of Ford is, toward the end of it, which the Senator has read, that the signers are bound, and they bind their heirs and assigns. To what does it bind them? To comply with the conditions of the offer. In the offer the only thing that Henry Ford is bound by is that he will organize that corporation; and my contention is that when he has organized it in accordance with the offer he is relieved from personal liability.

I have never advocated that as any great objection to Ford's proposition. Personally, I do not think it is much of an objection. I would not expect Henry Ford to bind his heirs and assigns. If the Senator's construction is right, let me tell him what would follow as a matter of law. It would follow that if, after that contract was made and had been in force for 10 years, Henry Ford should die, his entire estate, every piece of real estate and property that he owns anywhere on earth, would be held in abeyance for 90 years, until the expiration of that entire contract. Do you suppose Ford wants to make that kind of a contract?

I will say frankly to the Senator that I do not think the Government is in danger of losing any money on this proposition, so that I think it is quite immaterial from my viewpoint; but

I do insist that any lawyer who will examine that contract and give the Senator an opinion will agree with me that when Henry Ford organizes the corporation with the paid-in capital required he has complied with the part of that contract that he is personally obligated to perform. Personally, as to what will happen down there, I do not care, because, according to my theory, he is going to get something and his corporation is going to get something that will be so big and so profitable that I do not expect that there will ever be any danger but that the Government could recover in case the contract was violated as it went over the 100 years, because the corporation would be sufficient security.

I will say to the Senator that I do not offer that now, and I never have offered it, as any particular objection to the plan. I have mentioned it because so many people have said, "Why, Ford has bound himself and his estate that he will do so-and-so with fertilizer," when he has not done anything of the kind, if my viewpoint is right. It is the corporation that has done it. He has complied fully with his contract when he has organized it, and if he is a sane man we could not expect him to and he certainly would not bind his estate over a period of a hundred years, much of which must elapse after he is dead, and prevent the settlement of his estate.

Mr. LADD. The Senator may be right or wrong. I am a layman. I am not a lawyer.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that I do not offer it as anything of importance.

Mr. LADD. Two lawyers have told me that my interpretation is correct, but I will make no contention on that particular point.

Mr. President, under his proposal Mr. Ford will lease from the Government—

> Dam No. 2, its power house, and all of its hydroelectric and operating appurtenances, except the locks, together with all lands and buildings owned or to be acquired by the United States connected with or adjacent to either end of said dam. (Par. 3 of Ford offer.)

According to the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the Henry Ford Muscle Shoals offer, dated February 1, 1922—

> The total expenditures on Dam No. 2 have been $16,251,038.14 (p. 3). This dam will be leased by Mr. Ford and will remain the property of the Government. Mr. Ford's company will "pay to the United States during the period of the lease of Dam No. 2, $35,000 annually in installments quarterly in advance for repairs, maintenance, and operation of Dam No. 2, its gates and locks." (Par. 4 of the Ford offer.)
>
> At all times during the period of the lease of Dam No. 2 the company will furnish to the United States, free of charge, to be delivered at any point on the lock grounds designated by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, electric power to an amount necessary for the operation of the locks, but not in excess of 200 horsepower. (Par. 5 of the Ford offer.)

The same conditions apply to Dam No. 3, and the company will pay $20,000 annually, in installments, quarterly in advance, for repairs, maintenance, and operation, and will furnish free power for the operation of the locks. (Pars. 7, 8, and 9 of the Ford offer.) This is yet to be constructed.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Ford offer, which I will insert in the RECORD, set forth the property to be purchased by Mr. Ford. It is difficult to get any accurate estimate of the actual expenditure of the Government on these properties, as they are so interwoven with the properties that will be retained by the Government that it is hard to say with any certainty just what exact portion of the expense went for the property to be leased and just what exact portion went for the property to be purchased. The Secretary of War in his letter transmitting the Ford offer, dated February 1, 1922, gives quite a discussion of this matter.

It seems to be pretty generally admitted, however, that the relative cost of these properties is not fundamental. The other principles involved are the things about which the country is interested. The supreme question is, What is the best thing to do with this property? In what manner will the American people get the most out of it? To date there seems to have been nothing that offers in any way as much as does the Ford offer. I think I have illustrated how the savings Henry Ford could effect in fertilizer alone would soon more than pay for all of the property. These unreasonable profits in fertilizer, which are after all an indirect subsidy, have already cost the American farmer many times the cost of all the Muscle Shoals property.

As I have before stated, the only plant that has been successful in the manufacture of nitrates at Muscle Shoals has been plant No. 2, the cyanamid process. The Haber process at plant No. 1 was not successful, but it is entirely probable that by a reinstallation of machinery there plant No. 1 will be made ready for the manufacture of fertilizers also. However, Mr. Ford is not compelled to follow either the Haber or the cyanamid processes; he may have a method of his own and one that will prove superior to either of the others. We all acknowledge his genius along the lines of development. If he installs his own method and is enabled to produce cheaper than the present processes then there is that very great possibility that the cost of fertilizer will be cut in two, notwithstanding the fact that there are those who now hoot at the idea. Regardless of the hooting, however, Mr. Ford's representative, Mr. Mayo, expressed the belief that Mr. Ford could produce fertilizer so that "it will not cost more than half." (House hearings, p. 284.) He also stated that Mr. Ford hoped to start producing within a year. (House hearings, p. 257.) I think I have shown that under the Norris plan it is doubtful if there would be any real activity within two years, if then.

The Senator is apparently honestly concerned over the granting of anything that might be a monopoly to a private corporation. In looking over the record, Mr. President, I was astonished to find that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was one of the two Republicans that voted for the greatest private monopoly that has ever been granted by any legislative body—that was when he voted for the Federal reserve act, which gave to private banking institutions a complete monopoly over the issuance and control of the money and credits in this great Nation.

Mr. NORRIS. I plead guilty to that charge, and I am not sorry that I voted as I did. I plead guilty to it, and am willing to stay guilty. I did vote for the Federal reserve act, and I think it will result in good if it is administered properly. But the Senator is condemning me now, in his argument on the Ford question, because I voted for the Federal reserve act. I hope he will apply that argument to the Senator from Alabama, and the other Ford supporters in the Senate, and see where he comes out. If I am to be condemned on the Ford proposition because I voted for the Federal reserve act, just let the Senator apply that argument to his colleagues who were in the Senate at that time, and you are aching now to give Ford this great monopoly, and see where he comes out.

Mr. LADD. There has never before been seen such a monopoly. The farmers of this country know the curse that it has proved to them. Since the Federal reserve act was passed in 1914 the farm indebtedness in the United States has increased over 25 per cent, and the farmers are less able to pay off a debt to-day than they were in 1914. Oh, yes; the farmers of this country know what drastic deflation meant to them, when there was wrung from their toil and labor five billions of dollars in value out of a single crop. Oh, yes; the farmers of this great land who have witnessed the foreclosure on their property and the loss of a life's savings know what that has meant to them. I earnestly hope that the Senator will not be deceived about this great Muscle Shoals measure that so vitally affects the farmer.

Mr. President, if we are to save this great project for the people of this land the only plan that has been offered us that promises any hopes of doing it is the Ford offer. Let not the Members of this body be deceived. If we are to do our duty by the great farming interests of this country we must support the Ford offer until such time, if that ever be, that a better proposition for the people is offered us. When that time comes I will most gladly support it. This is not the time to be victimized by "jokers."

Mr. President, I expect in the near future from another angle to present a different view of this great problem and with special reference to the use of fertilizers indicate the direct importance in relation to a successful agriculture and to point out how vital it is that cheap fertilizers be furnished our farmers if we hope to continue to develop our own food supply, to meet the needs of the people of our country even for the present century.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I want to ask him another question. I interrupted the Senator at the beginning of his remarks and asked him to point out where it was in the Ford offer that Mr. Ford proposed to build reservoir dams and storage dams up the Tennessee River, and he said he would take that up later. He has not taken it up, and before he yields the floor I would like to have him read from the Ford offer anything that directly or indirectly binds either Ford or Ford's corporation to build reservoir dams or storage dams up the Tennessee River.

Mr. LADD. Mr. President, when I said I would take that up later, I did not mean to-day. I expect to speak several times on this proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to ask the Senator another question before he takes his seat. Is there anything in the Ford offer which provides for such storage and reservoir dams?

Mr. LADD. So far as I am aware, there is not anything that binds them; on the other hand——

Mr. NORRIS. Is there anything that does not bind them?

Mr. LADD. Just wait until I am through. On the other hand, he can not develop the industries which he proposes to develop down there, utilize the water power, and get the maximum primary power without so developing it.

Mr. NORRIS. What are those industries? There is nothing in the Ford offer to the effect that he is going to develop any industry. If the Senator's statement is accurate, the Senator has some private information which is not in the contract.

Mr. LADD. I said that if he develops any great industry down there, not any particular industry.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator can not point out where Ford has made, either directly or indirectly, any proposition that he will ever build a storage dam, or even make a survey to see whether the water can be stored up on the Tennessee River to equalize the flow over the dams that are in question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to the contribution of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD] with reference to this important question. I do not intend to take up the time of the Senate to debate the question now. I wish the Senate had been afforded an opportunity to vote directly on Mr. Ford's offer. I do not think it has been fair to Mr. Ford or to the people of the country in that a direct vote has not been taken on Mr. Ford's offer.

It must be borne in mind that the question of the utilization of the Muscle Shoals Dam now rests with the party in power. Two years ago the Senate passed a bill providing that that dam should be operated by the Government, and that proposition was rejected in the other House by the party in power. Then, realizing that something had to be done and that millions should not be wasted by allowing that water to go over the dam with no utilization made of it, the Secretary of War proposed that the matter should be open for those people in the United States who desired to make bids on it. That did not come from the Congress, it did not come from Mr. Ford, it did not come from the men who are supporting Mr. Ford's offer, but it came from the administration itself, and bids were called for from those who would come and finish the dam and operate the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals.

Not on his own initiative, but in compliance with that request of the Government, Mr. Ford made a proposal. The Secretary of War might have rejected it then if he had wanted to do so, and that would have been the end of it so far as Mr. Ford was concerned, because he could not have gone any further; but the Secretary of War submitted the matter to the Congress.

Congress has no right to amend or alter Mr. Ford's proposition. It is his proposition. Congress is entitled to do only one thing about it—accept it or reject it.

Of course, the proposal Mr. Ford has made has cost him some money. He had to have engineers in order to make his estimates; he had to know what he was going to do; and he made a proposal to the Government, which has been submitted and which has been lying before the Senate for more than a year.

I am in favor of accepting it. Other gentlemen may be in favor of rejecting it and think that some other plan is better, but I do not think that under these circumstances the Senate of the United States has a right to ignore the offer; and that is the situation in which the matter rests to-day.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to add just a word to what my colleague has said regarding the timely and very able address of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD].

He has shown the necessity of accepting the Ford offer. He has shown how advantageous it would be to the farmers of America. He has shown that Ford has undertaken to take up a project which had been junked upon the recommendation of the committee on the part of the House of Representatives which visited Muscle Shoals some time ago. He has shown that the Ford offer is now pending, and that Mr. Ford is entitled to have his offer acted upon.

He has made it plain that Henry Ford should not be criticized for offering to do something with Muscle Shoals, because when he found it it had been abandoned, the work had been stopped, the Government property was deteriorating; and when Ford brought the matter back to public attention he rendered a great service to the whole country, whether he ever gets the project or not.

He has pointed out that the Government, by accepting Ford's offer, can do more good with that project for more people than could be done through any other utilization of it. He has shifted the burden to those who support makeshift legislation, to those who stand behind stalking-horses, which are simply being used for the purpose of preventing an acceptance of Ford's offer.

There are a good many people in this country who are opposed to Ford's offer who would lend encouragement to those who favor the Norris or some other bill, who really would not want to see the Norris bill ever become a law; but when they have a proposition like that pending, they get behind it for the purpose of defeating something which is about to be accepted, and then, when that project is out of the way, they turn their guns upon the other proposition and proceed to shoot it out of the way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to say that I have received letters from men in Tennessee saying that large numbers of the speeches of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] are being circulated in Tennessee and neighboring States. Of course, I am sure that they are not being circulated by the junior Senator from Nebraska, but they are being circulated by the interests, those particular companies to whose interest it would be to keep Mr. Ford out of this property.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is correct, I think. I was about to say that when these interests succeed in getting the Ford offer rejected and in then defeating the project which they pretended to support while the Ford offer was pending, they will wait a little while and go to the Government and say, "There is Muscle Shoals idle. It ought to be taken and disposed of in some way; and while it is not worth very much, we would pay you something for it." They would do that in the hope of getting it for nothing. They would strangely influence some engineer to go down and make an inspection of it, and come back and report that it ought to be disposed of, and that a certain figure would be reasonable. The Government in the past has been beaten out of millions of dollars in just that way. This is one project that is not going to be disposed of in that fashion.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Alabama Power Co. is using Plant No. 2 now in just the way the Senator has pointed out. It does not have to wait for the future; it is being done right now. They are renting the plant at a nominal figure and using it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understand that is true. I have no objection to Plant No. 2 being used by the Alabama Power Co. while the matter is pending. Of course, I would rather it would be used and the Government get a little something for it than to have it stand idle. But the aim and end of those who are opposing the Ford offer is to defeat the Ford offer and then to put the Norris bill to sleep, and then come to the Government and get the project at Muscle Shoals for a song. I repeat they are not going to do that with this project. The Government has been imposed on many times in the past in that way, but the people are getting wise to it.

Now, with reference to the suggestion of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that the speech of the Senator from Nebraska has been broadly circulated, I raised that question in the presence of the Senator from Nebraska the other day, and said that it was being circulated by the thousands and that I did not know who was circulating it, but that the Senator knew. The Senator was sitting here, and he did not say who was circulating it. The Senator from Tennessee suggested that probably some of the interested parties are circulating it. That appears to be the situation. I know something about a situation of that sort. The Federal reserve banks, under the direction of the governor of the Federal Reserve Board, sent out 140,000 copies of a speech against my position on deflation. That cost them between $7,000 and $10,000. When outside interests that are being favored by a policy of a governmental institution will circulate the speech of a Senator in that way, it is unfair to the Senator who has made a speech attacking the proposition, because he is not supposed to be able to circulate his speeches on such a large scale, and it does raise a very nice question as to who is circulating this speech attacking the Ford offer.

Mr. President, I merely rose to compliment the Senator from North Dakota upon the splendid presentation he has made to the Senate and the country regarding the Ford offer. He has offered a statesmanlike solution of the problem. I repeat, in conclusion, that he was right when he said that the Ford offer will do things that will bless and benefit more people than in any other way in which Muscle Shoals could be disposed of.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit several amendments to the pending bill, and in order to save printing them separately I have arranged them as one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Glass	McLean	Reed, Pa.
Brandegee	Harris	McNary	Sheppard
Brookhart	Harrison	Moses	Shortridge
Broussard	Heflin	Nelson	Simmons
Bursum	Johnson	New	Smith
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Smoot
Cameron	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Spencer
Capper	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Caraway	Kendrick	Oddie	Sutherland
Culberson	King	Overman	Townsend
Curtis	Ladd	Page	Trammell
Dial	La Follette	Pepper	Underwood
Dillingham	Lenroot	Pittman	Wadsworth
Ernst	Lodge	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	McKellar	Ransdell	Warren
George	McKinley	Reed, Mo.	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Sixty-four Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to present a unanimous-consent request. I understand we are going to adjourn from Friday until Tuesday. If the program of the Banking and Currency Committee is carried out as stated by the chairman of that committee on the floor yesterday, they will probably make their report the first of next week. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the Norris motion at not later than 4 o'clock on Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to have it understood, if the request is agreed to, that the Senate will go right on considering the shipping bill. I think it has a right to do it, and to dispose of any amendments to the bill until the bill is displaced, if the motion of the Senator from Nebraska should prevail.

Mr. HARRISON. Do I understand the Senator to say that if a majority of the Senate should vote to take up the Norris bill he would then want to lay aside that bill or any substitute that might be proposed for it and proceed with the ship subsidy bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; the Senator misunderstands me. It was suggested this morning that we could not take up amendments to the shipping bill until the motion of the Senator from Nebraska had been disposed of. This morning when I asked unanimous consent that we fix a time to vote on the Norris motion I suggested that if we did fix a time we could go on dealing with amendments to the shipping bill in the meantime. I think we have a perfect right to do that. I think it is entirely in order. I believe we have a right to consider and dispose of amendments to the shipping bill until it is displaced, if it ever should be, and I wanted to have that clearly understood. I have no objection to fixing a time to vote on the Norris motion, even next Wednesday, but I want the Senate to understand that we are not going to sit still in the meantime, but we are going to proceed with the consideration of the shipping bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought perhaps there would be an appropriation bill brought before the Senate to-morrow or the next day, which would take up some of the time of the Senate, and in the meanwhile there would probably be discussion of the Norris motion or the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. As long as there is discussion or any other business coming before the Senate, that is all right; but if discussion runs out and there is an opportunity to vote on an amendment to the shipping bill, I expect to have the Senate do that. Let me ask the Senator a question. The Senator did not understand that if his request were granted that would halt all proceedings on the shipping bill, did he?

Mr. HARRISON. I thought, perhaps, we should go ahead and discuss the ship subsidy bill and also discuss the agricultural relief measure, which is known as the Norris bill, as well as other bills.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood that that probably would be so, but I did not wish to be foreclosed, if debate stopped, from voting upon amendments to the shipping bill.

Mr. HARRISON. The amendments are so important that I imagine there will be a good deal of discussion on them, but the motion to set aside the ship subsidy bill and to take up the agricultural relief bill is more important than are the amendments, I imagine.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think that is very true.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If the vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is to be deferred for a week and is then fixed for a particular hour, in order that Senators may know when to be here and when the motion is to be voted on, would it not be wise to include in the unanimous-consent agreement the statement that any other motion made between now and that time that the Senate proceed to the consideration of another measure should not be in order? In other words, there is a motion pending, made by the Senator from Nebraska, to proceed to the consideration of the agricultural relief bill, if that be its name. If we should agree by unanimous consent to vote on the pending motion at a particular hour it would not follow that the Senator would be precluded from rising in his place to-morrow and moving to proceed to the consideration of some other bill, which would leave the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] in exactly as bad a position, so far as deciding the real merits of the question at issue is concerned, as that in which he is left by the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. I think the Senator will understand what I mean.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; but the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has stated that that committee will not be able to report out the rural credits bill until the first part of next week.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand; but suppose we agree to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska on next Wednesday, a week from now, which motion, if agreed to, would displace the ship subsidy bill, and suppose that to-morrow the Senator from Mississippi should arise and move to proceed to the consideration of some other important measure and a vote should be taken on that motion.

Senators wish to be here when the vote is taken on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska or on any motion to displace the pending measure. That is the object of Senators. Those who are in favor of the shipping bill do not wish it displaced, while those who are in favor of some other measure wish to displace the shipping bill, and it is immaterial to them whether it shall be done by the prevalence of the motion of the Senator from Nebraska or that of any other Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Connecticut is not stating our position in its entirety.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, no.

Mr. HARRISON. Some of us are in favor of the agricultural credits legislation, and believe it is a great deal more important than is the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, there may be several bills presented for the relief of agriculture. My point is that the reason for fixing a time for voting on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is in order that Senators may be here when it is decided whether the Senate will continue to hold the ship subsidy bill before the Senate or not.

Mr. HARRISON. What change would the Senator from Connecticut suggest in the request for unanimous consent?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was simply asking the Senator if we are to have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska on next Wednesday at a particular hour that it be coupled with a unanimous-consent agreement that pending the arrival of that time no other motion shall be in order to displace the shipping bill.

Mr. HARRISON. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into, then no amendment may be offered to the shipping bill until after next Wednesday at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, yes; it may be.

Mr. SMOOT. No; because the motion will be the pending question. We may discuss the bill until next Wednesday, and we may vote upon the motion at 4 o'clock next Wednesday, but if any Senator should desire to offer an amendment to the bill in the meantime it would be out of order, because there is a motion pending.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, while I do not agree with the position of the Senator from Utah in that respect, I am not going to get into any controversy over that. I object to the request.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, of course we are very sorry that we can not reach a unanimous-consent agreement on this question. I thought that, perhaps, the Senator from Washington would be the last Senator to object to entering into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the motion. I based that supposition on an item which I read in a newspaper this morning, not stating specifically that the Senator from Washington, who is in charge of the pending legislation, had charged

the Democrats with filibustering but hinting in that direction. I presume he was laying a predicate upon which to make that charge later on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that there is nothing that I said to anybody that could be construed as suggesting that the Democrats were filibustering, and if any statement of that kind was made in the newspapers it was made without any foundation whatever.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear that, because it was so stated in the official organ of the Republican Party published in Washington. I refer to the Washington Post.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator will not charge to me what may be published in any "official organ" of any administration.

Mr. HARRISON. I am very glad to hear that statement. I knew that the Senator knew that it could not be charged that there was any filibuster against the ship subsidy bill, because the Congress has only been in session for some 10 days, and during that time there has been more speed displayed in passing appropriation bills, I dare say, than has been evidenced in the history of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think—and if I am not correct I ask the Senator from Utah to correct me, as he is a member of the powerful Appropriations Committee—we have passed through the Senate at this early stage, during the short session of Congress, three great appropriation bills which ordinarily take months to pass. We have shown so much cooperation, such a spirit of speeding up legislation, that those three great appropriation bills already are out of the way and much wholesome discussion has been had on the floor touching the ship subsidy and agricultural relief bills.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know the figures carried in those three great appropriation bills, but they approximate $180,000,000. The Senator from Washington, being one of the members of that committee, I wish he would tell me what was the sum total of those three appropriation bills which we have passed through the Senate at this early stage of the session?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I rose to say that I indorse heartily what the Senator from Mississippi has said; there is no issue between him and me about that question at all; and I was going to express the hope that we might continue the speed referred to by him by voting right away on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Answering the Senator's question, I will say that the bill for the Department of Commerce carried, in round numbers, $25,000,000. As to the other two appropriation bills, I am not a member of the subcommittee which considered them, and I do not remember their totals.

Mr. HARRISON. I presume the sum total would be more than $175,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I confirm absolutely what the Senator has said, that there has been no filibuster developed on the pending bill on the Democratic side at all; but, with reference to that measure, we have had the heartiest cooperation of the other side, as we have had on the appropriation bills; and I had hoped that cooperation might be continued so that we might be able to get a vote in a very short time on the pending motion.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure we are going to have that high degree of cooperation to the end. I hope the consideration of the appropriation bills will be speeded up. No doubt there will be another appropriation bill reported out to-morrow, if the Committee on Appropriations shows its usual degree of energy; and if it is reported out, no doubt we can also pass that measure quickly.

The discussion which has proceeded has been wholesome, Mr. President, because it has given to the country a picture of what is presented here as to whether this Congress wants to take up agricultural credit legislation for the farmers or whether it wants to take up a ship subsidy measure for the benefit of the Shipping Trust. The issue is clear; it is well defined. Of course, there are those who are in sympathy with the idea of affording the shipping interests some relief, because, perhaps, those interests did not charge sufficient freight rates during previous years, and perhaps their profit was not great enough, so that it is necessary that immediate legislation be passed to take care of them; and that in the face of the fact that the pending ship subsidy bill was submitted to Congress some eight months ago. As I recall, the Lasker plan was given to the committee about 10 months——

Mr. SMOOT rose.

Mr. HARRISON. And, may I ask the Senator from Utah—inasmuch as he is on his feet, and he can give me the answer—in view of the fact that Mr. Lasker presented this plan 8 or 10 months ago and the bill was introduced that long ago, why so much speed is insisted upon now upon the part of the Senator from Utah and other leaders on his side to force the passage of the ship subsidy bill immediately following the election when his party was repudiated?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not rise to discuss that question, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the question which I should like to have answered.

Mr. SMOOT. I can answer the Senator by saying that, so far as I am concerned—and I speak for no one except myself—I am in favor of the shipping bill. I know that it can not pass unless it is kept before the Senate continuously; and I may say to the Senator that I do not know whether it can be passed even in that way; but by pursuing that course is the only way, probably, in which it can be passed. If I had the bill in charge—which I have not—I would keep it before the Senate, just as the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is undertaking to do, if I could.

Mr. HARRISON. There is not any fault to be found in that respect.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to ask the Senator, however, whether he favors the so-called Norris agricultural bill?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will abide his time in patience, I am going to analyze the Norris bill and express myself fully about it, as I am on other pending agricultural measures. I am not in favor of that bill, I will say to the Senator, but I am in favor of the farmers of the country having a day in court, and I am not in favor of the Shipping Trust having a monopoly all the time of the few days that the present Congress is to remain in session.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no difference between the Senator and me on that question at all.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear the Senator say that; we have a convert.

Mr. SMOOT. But I am opposed to the Norris bill just as strongly as is the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator from Mississippi permit me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think I will make a statement that may bring some consolation to the Senator from Mississippi. I want to keep the shipping bill before the Senate just as much as possible. I think there is ample time at the present session to pass that measure and also rural credit legislation. The Senator and I have disagreed and do disagree as to the shipping legislation; he may be right and I may be wrong; but I am just as sincere in my view, I think, as is the Senator in his view. I think I am just as anxious also for legislation for the farmer as is the Senator from Mississippi; and I am going to say to the Senator right now that as soon as the rural credit legislation shall come before the Senate the shipping bill will be laid aside for the consideration of the rural credit measure. So the farmers will be taken care of; and, if we have the cooperation which the Senator has indicated we will have, that legislation ought to be passed in three or four days or a week; and then we will resume the consideration of the shipping bill.

Mr. HARRISON. That was exactly why I made the request for unanimous consent. Relying on the statement of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that his committee would report out next Tuesday a rural credit measure, I thought if a majority of the Senate would agree to substitute that measure for the Norris bill there would be no question raised and we would all join hands. If amendments are needed, then we can provide them and make such changes as are necessary. The Senator, however, objected to my request; so we must proceed in this lopsided kind of a way.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator understands, of course, why I objected. The Senator knows that I would be very glad to vote right now on the Norris motion; but there seemed to be a controversy, if I agreed to what the Senator from Mississippi suggested, whether that would stop all proceedings on the shipping bill and we would have a week wasted. I am not willing to be put in that position. I should be perfectly willing to agree to the Senator's proposition if then, as I think we have a right to do, we could go on considering the shipping bill, or any other matter that might be brought up, so far as that is concerned; but if there is going to be a long controversy over a question of procedure I thought we could save time by just going along, and if the vote upon the Norris proposition is kept off until next Tuesday or Wednesday, very well; we are no worse off then than we would be if we should make the agreement.

Mr. HARRISON. I must say that I have a little selfish interest in making the unanimous-consent request. I want to help, so far as I can, the other side of the Chamber out of a very difficult and boggy hole. Here is what some of the Senator's own party say about this proposition. Here we are discussing whether we ought to pass a ship subsidy bill or an agricultural credits bill. I asked the Senator from Utah a question while he was on his feet, but, unlike his ordinary deportment, he evaded it; he did not answer it; so I will ask the question and read from the RECORD an answer.

Here is what a distinguished member of the Republican Party said in a speech on the floor of the House about the ship subsidy proposition and the policy of passing it during this Congress, when the American people have repudiated practically all Senators and Representatives who even hinted that they were for a ship subsidy bill. I do not know whether or not my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], expressed himself in his State as to whether he was for this ship subsidy bill. If he, as a part of the leadership of this body, would come back so soon after the election and try to force through here a bill that taxes the American people anywhere from $700,000,000 to $875,000,000, I imagine that the Senator did not press it in his State in Utah, because he was in every hamlet and on the stump from one end of Utah to the other appealing to the people of Utah to send here a colleague to grace the other side of the Chamber.

If he made that statement to the people of Utah and took them into his confidence, then they repudiated that statement; and if he did not mention it to the people out there he was not quite frank and open with them, because he knew that the President was going to call this extra session of Congress and try to force this bill at this session through the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I never heard it mentioned in the campaign.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator should have taken them into his confidence. He should have given them his views on this question.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator thinks so.

Mr. HARRISON. Was the Senator afraid that the vote for the Democratic candidate might have been larger if he had taken them into his confidence?

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all. There is not a voter in the State of Utah who does not know where the Senator from Utah stands upon the ship subsidy bill or any other question.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator did not tell them on the stump that he was for it.

Mr. SMOOT. It was not a question in the campaign.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator think that if the President was going to force it through here in so short a time following the election, those Republicans as well as Democrats who ran in that election should have been candid with the people and told them how they stood on it, so that the American people might have passed on it?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question but that the people of Utah knew where the Senator from Utah stood.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator said he did not take them into his confidence.

Mr. SMOOT. No; it was not a question in the campaign at all.

Mr. HARRISON. But they did not know until after the election that the Senator was for it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes, they did, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. It will be hard on the Senator the next time he comes up, then.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to take my chances on that. I have not asked anybody to make any excuse for any position that I have ever taken in the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, what applies to the Senator applies to other Senators; but this colloquy is not personal. It just shows that you are trying to put over something here when you failed to take the people into your confidence before the election; and it shows that this matter should wait until the new Congress comes in, and let the proposition be handled by those Senators and Representatives who are fresh from the people. That so objectionable a piece of legislation should be foisted upon them by a repudiated and defeated Congress——

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. I am prompted to ask the Senator a question. In what State or States, or in what congressional districts, was the ship subsidy bill an issue during the recent campaign?

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that I am going to read here in a moment the testimony of some witnesses from the Senator's own party to show that a great many of the members of the House Merchant Marine Committee who voted to report out the bill were defeated and left at home. I will say further to the Senator that I do not know just how many States some of us spoke in. I spoke in a good many, and I never made a single speech in which I did not denounce the ship subsidy bill, and I dare say that the Senator never indorsed the ship subsidy bill in any speech that he made in that campaign. If Senators and representatives of the Senators failed to take a position on this question in the campaign, knowing that it would come up, then they deserve the condemnation of their constituents.

Mr. STERLING. That may be; but the fact that the Senator from Mississippi denounced it does not necessarily show that it was an issue in that State in that campaign.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, Mr. President, that is the great trouble about the Republican Party. They repudiate promises; they betray the trust reposed in them, and they do not take the American people into their confidence as they should. The statement of the Senator from South Dakota and the statement of the Senator from Utah bear me out in that assertion.

Here is what a distinguished Republican Congressman said in talking about this procedure on the floor of the House:

My friends, I am a Republican—

He was proud of that, ordinarily. I imagine he was sorry at this time.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a minute?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was the gentleman bragging or confessing?

Mr. HARRISON. He was confessing, and very properly so. I read further from him—

and I have seen all I wish to see of a Democratic administration. I should like to see the good old ship of state steered by Republicans. But when as now my party leaders—and I believe many of them against their own best judgment—steer the ship of state in a wrongful course, when my heart and convictions and conscience rebel against some such legislative measure, as this subsidy bill before us now, then, as frequently in the past, I can not go with them. I must resort for a time to a lifeboat or a plank. Self-preservation is the first law of life. You watch Republicans jump for the planks. You watch the Republican whip jump.

He was not talking about the Republican whip here. He was speaking of the Republican whip of the House.

Further, he says:

You watch the chairman of the conference jump. You watch many a Republican save himself before we get through with this bill.

That was pretty good advice.

I have had to go through this experience very often. I happen to be one of the older Members of this House. I remember when these subsidy bills were up before, when Hanna and Gallinger had started them, and when "Uncle Joe," in his prime and vigor, backed by leaders like Payne and Dalzell, together with my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], were pushing this subsidy privilege.

And he said they defeated it by a vote of 172 to 175. Then he said:

Let me say to my good Republican associates here—

And he was talking about you, just the same as his Republican associates over in the House—

Let me say to my good Republican associates here who would vote right, the rank and file of the Republicans are out on the farms and in the factories. They are not these leaders nor these shipowners.

Listen to this wise sage:

If we are going to hold our party, we have got to go to the masses and not look to the ship profiteers. Every man knows it. If you will look out and see the angry waves of discontent, you know that I am speaking the truth.

That speech was made by a Republican, and I am glad we are getting some more Senators in here so that they can hear it. I wish every Republican seat were now occupied, because I want to save you from your own iniquities.

Have you read the election returns?

You know that is an interesting question that he propounded to you.

Did you see the men elected who ran on antiship subsidy platforms? I ran on one. It was a platform denouncing this bill, and I won overwhelmingly. Those who did favor it went down to defeat. Have you noticed the fatalities? Thirty-five per cent of the vacancies on the Republican side of this Merchant Marine Committee!

Thirty-five per cent went down in that catastrophe.

They prepared this bill; I presume they told their constituents all about their arduous labors for a subsidized merchant marine. Five out of fourteen defeated.

I have not looked over the figures to see how many of the Commerce Committee of the Senate went down in defeat. I know that a pretty large percentage of the Republican members of the Finance Committee were defeated because they reported out and advocated the tariff bill and the revenue measure.

That is not all. That is one distinguished Republican that I read from. Here is another:

Let me say before I go further that I believe that Pennsylvania, the old Keystone State, would have failed to return my good friend—

Talking about Mr. EDMONDS—

of whom I think so much, if this proposal had occurred before election—

This is a Republican speaking—

because we lost New York, we lost Maryland, we lost New Jersey, we lost so many States of the country, just due to bills of this character, and this is worse than anything I have ever seen in all my experience here as a Member.

He could have gone further. He could have said, "We lost Delaware"; he could have said, "We lost Rhode Island"; he could have said, "We lost Senator Moses's State of New Hampshire"; he could have said, "We lost Ohio; we lost Michigan"; he could have said, "We lost Indiana"; he could have said, "We lost Kansas, the Republican whip's State"; he could have said, "We lost Colorado"; he could have said, "We lost the leader of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, FRANK MONDELL"; and the people of Wyoming reelected that splendid Senator, the former governor of that State, to the Senate. He could have said, "We lost Montana; we lost Nebraska; we lost Oregon; we lost Washington; we lost Nevada; we lost Arizona; we lost New Mexico; we lost Oklahoma." Oh, well, they lost about everything in that election; and yet, because of that fact, the President comes here and tells the Republican leadership to drive through this infamous measure that will add to the burdens of the American taxpayer before the new Congress can come into control.

I do not blame you for looking sad. I do not blame you because your morale is broken. I do not blame you for your lines being divided. It is a sad picture you present to us who are your friends, and God knows how you look to the American people.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Mississippi said he did not know what the effect had been on the Committee on Commerce of the Senate. There were only two Senators on the Republican side of the Commerce Committee who were up for reelection, and neither of them will be with us in the next Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. See there! Yet you persist in driving this legislative monstrosity through the Senate, neglecting the farmers of the country, and there was talk yesterday about filing a motion to table the Norris motion to proceed with the consideration of a bill for agricultural relief. You want to go so far even as to shut off discussion of the matter, strangle debate, close our mouths.

But I have not finished reading all that this distinguished Republican Congressman said. I want to proceed further. He said:

I realize that you are putting these hundreds of millions of dollars into the pockets of a few favored monopolies and that you could not go before the country for a moment with your proposition, and you dare not let it go for three months until the new Congress meets.

That is what is in the heart of some Republican. Yet you are trying to drive through this Congress this bill in a kind of strangle-hold fashion. Said this Republican:

You know it and so do I, and I do not believe it will stand the ghost of a chance of getting through the Senate.

I hope he is right.

But I do not want my good friends here, on the Republican side, whom I have tried to persuade to stay in the straight and narrow path in the past—I do not want them to fall down at this time, because I want them, all of them, to be here two years from now.

They will not be there if they vote for such propositions as this. He said further:

Why was the bill not brought up before election?

I put the same question to my friend the Senator from Utah while he was on his feet and he has not answered me yet, and to show that it is a fair question a Republican Congressman puts the same question to him and puts it to other Republican Senators. He said:

It is an indictment of the whole proposition to try to jam it through this expiring Congress when a certainty exists it would be overwhelmingly defeated if presented four months hence to the new Congress coming fresh from the people.

There is the indictment. A few years ago, when the Senate considered for quite a while—and certainly most carefully—the Jones bill, we thought that would surely result in the maintenance of our merchant marine. At that time we believed that the distinguished Senator from Washington, now in charge of this bill, had evolved a plan and constructed a bill which would make the merchant marine a success in the future. That is why we supported the Jones bill; and at that time, sitting in the Chamber, was a very distinguished Republican. Those were his views. He sealed the fact by a vote for the bill, and that distinguished Republican is now none other than the President of the United States, who admits, by coming to the Congress and pressing forward this legislation, that he was not so wise, that he was mistaken, when, two years or more ago, he championed the Jones bill and voted for it and helped to enact it into law.

What changes have come about that should change the situation? One is that we have Lasker as the head of the Shipping Board, the wise man of shipping, who knows everything about advertising but before he took charge of this board knew nothing about shipping.

I notice he has taken my good friend from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] to taw because the junior Senator from Kansas saw fit to write some editorials in his papers out in the Middle West against the ship subsidy bill and told the truth about it, namely, that it would allow the Shipping Board to lend to these men and these interests, be they the Standard Oil, the United Fruit Co., or the Steel Corporation, money to buy these ships at low interest rates. He said it would enable the board to lend to them $125,000,000 at 2 per cent interest. Simply because the Senator from Kansas said that this would cost the Government approximately $750,000,000 for the next 10 years Lasker has a nightmare, goes into the press, and gives out a statement criticizing the Senator from Kansas, saying, "Oh, the information he got is from Democratic sources and therefore it can not be correct."

Lasker himself said in the testimony that it would cost the Government $52,000,000 a year in subsidies to operate this proposition. He admits and the Senator from Washington admits that it will enable the board to lend $125,000,000 at a low rate of interest to the men who purchase the ships, and in his testimony before the committee Lasker stated that the merchant marine was worthless, that you could not get anything for it, that although it cost three billion dollars or more they would hardly be able to get $200,000,000 for it. Yet he takes the Senator from Kansas to task. The Senator from Kansas is performing a great service to the American people in exposing the iniquities of this bill; and I dare say that, big and powerful and influential as Lasker is, he can not browbeat the distinguished Senator from Kansas and cause him to close his mouth or cease his writing in condemnation of this nefarious measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In that connection I call attention to the fact that this bill sets apart 10 per cent of all the customs duties, which, according to the statements made by those in charge of the recently passed tariff bill, will amount to $45,000,000 a year, and, in addition, the tonnage dues, amounting to $4,000,000 a year, making $49,000,000 which they actually set apart to pay these subsidies.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator will have to concede that the Commerce Committee has recommended an amendment to this bill limiting the amount which can be spent in any year as compensation for these ships to $30,000,000. It is plain language. Senators may argue as they see fit, but that is what the committee recommends.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not what the House passed, and, of course, it can be stricken out very easily in conference. What you do is to set apart $49,000,000 of the people's money to pay this subsidy.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, the Senator from Washington recognizes the fact that I was merely answering Lasker's statement in condemning my friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. When some Republican goes out to condemn another Republican, it looks as if no Republican dares open his mouth in defense of the other Republican. So I have found that about half of my time on the floor is spent in defending Republicans.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington certainly does not mean to say that $30,000,000 is all that might be expended under this bill. That amendment has been offered merely to provide some people a life line to climb down

on. There is no amendment providing that a contract shall be declared void if the expense runs to $50,000,000, if they simply thought it would not be more than $30,000,000.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to be mistaken about this measure, and I do not want to take up the time of the Senate unnecessarily. I do not want the Senator from Washington to think, when I propound a question to him, that I am just trying to consume time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That never entered my mind.

Mr. HARRISON. I am trying to get information. I say that because I am going to ask the Senator some questions now. As I understand it, the Standard Oil Co., with its tankers, or any ships they may own, will come under the provisions of this bill, just the same as any person who might buy ships from the Shipping Board or might operate ships.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The companies operating ships for the carrying of their own products get no subsidy, according to the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. HARRISON. I want the Senator to explain to me one thing, briefly, if he will. The original bill, the one presented by Lasker, which the President asked the Congress to pass, and which was submitted to the House of Representatives, did it not include the provision for pay to the Standard Oil Co. if it had tankers?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It did.

Mr. HARRISON. Or the United States Steel Corporation if it operated ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It did.

Mr. HARRISON. Or the United Fruit Co. if it operated ships?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It did.

Mr. HARRISON. They would not only get the advantages of the indirect subsidy, but would get the direct subsidy, would they not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were put on the basis of any person owning ships.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Standard Oil Co. was bringing some oil from Mexico to New York in its own tankers, the ships loaded exclusively with its own products, under the original draft of the bill what benefit would they receive? In other words, I would like to have the Senator illustrate the difference between the original bill and the bill as it is before the Senate, so far as the Standard Oil Co. in bringing its own products in its own tankers from Mexico to New York is concerned.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not seek to conceal anything with reference to this.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator never does conceal facts with reference to a measure of which he is in charge.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is just as the Senator has suggested; under the original bill, as it was first introduced, Standard Oil ships, or United Fruit Co. ships, in fact, all ships under the American flag, would be on the same basis. The House excluded from the benefits of the subsidy features of the bill ships carrying products of the owners of those ships.

Mr. HARRISON. What position was taken by the committee of which the Senator is chairman?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We did not interfere with that provision of the House.

Mr. HARRISON. The committee did not accept Lasker's proposal, in other words, to that extent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; we did not. We went further, and in that part of the bill authorizing a loan fund of $125,000,000 we inserted an amendment providing that none of that money should be loaned to companies for the construction of ships to carry their own products.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the committee raise the rate of interest, or was it raised in the House, from 2 per cent to 4½ or 4¾ per cent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That was raised in the House.

Mr. HARRISON. The original draft carried only 2 per cent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It provided not less than 2 per cent.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the Senator. I did not know why the chairman of the Shipping Board, an expert in advertising, wanted to give all those favors to the Standard Oil Co., the United Fruit Co., or the Steel Corporation. This may sound hard to some of you, but we are trying to let everything out and keep no secret. Far be it from me to suggest that Mr. Lasker's recommendation was because in the recent campaign Mr. Rockefeller—a poor fellow, of course, who needs the sympathy of everybody—in the last report filed by the chairman of the Republican National Campaign Committee was shown to be one of the largest contributors to the Republican Party, having given $25,000. His son, John D., jr., was quite lavish in his donation. I think he gave $25,000. Of course that was the amount the chairman stated that these gentlemen had given. He did not say how much more they had given that was not shown in the report. Consequently we must accept the statement that only $50,000 was given by father and son Rockefeller to the Republican campaign fund in the last election. And here Mr. Lasker, head of the Shipping Board, writes a bill, in frequent conference with the President, which receives the indorsement of the President, which is sought to be passed through the Congress under whip and spur of Executive influence, that gives to the Standard Oil Co. greater privileges than would be enjoyed by any other person and few other corporations under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Inasmuch as the bill as it was then written and reported out in the House contained this benefit to them, does not the Senator think the Republican Party ought to pay back their campaign contributions if they are going to amend the bill and cut out those benefits?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; they should be fair with them, because the Rockefellers, John D., jr., and John D., sr., had every reason to believe when they made the donation of $50,000 that they were going to be taken care of.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CALDER. I wish simply to correct the Senator in regard to the elder Rockefeller. In testimony submitted to the Committee on Manufactures recently, it was called to my attention this morning that it had been stated that the elder Rockefeller is not now a stockholder in the Standard Oil Co. So that he ought not to get his money back.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator believe that?

Mr. CALDER. The statement was made by the president of the company, and he is a truthful man. He said that the younger Rockefeller was a large stockholder and the elder Rockefeller was not a stockholder, and I believe that the gentleman who made the statement told the truth.

Mr. HARRISON. Does the Senator believe that John D., sr., has no interest in the Standard Oil Co.?

Mr. CALDER. I repeat merely what the president of the company said.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not mean financial interest alone. I mean sympathy for the poor little thing.

Mr. CALDER. I repeat that the gentleman testified that young Rockefeller was a large stockholder, but his father had no interest in the company. I believe that is true, because the man who stated it is a truthful man.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator does not believe that it is fair, after John D., jr.—I will leave out John D., sr.—the man who owns the largest interest in the Standard Oil Co., gave this $25,000, and the House had passed this liberal provision that would treat him fairly, indeed, that now the Senate, through the Senator from New York and his friends, should go back on any promise made?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator again is misstating the fact; unwittingly, I am sure.

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. CALDER. The House did not pass the bill with a provision in it to take care of the Standard Oil Co.

Mr. HARRISON. The House committee reported it out containing that provision.

Mr. CALDER. The House refused to keep that provision in the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I know the Senator does not want to be technical.

Mr. CALDER. But the point I want to make is——

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. CALDER. The point I make is that Mr. Rockefeller, sr., at least, is not entitled to have his money back if, as the Senator intimates, he may have contributed, because the Standard Oil Co. was being taken care of in the shipping bill.

Mr. HARRISON. I have eliminated John D., sr.; I am talking about John D., jr., now.

Mr. CALDER. I am quite sure that John D. Rockefeller, jr., who is a great philanthropist and is also a good Republican, contributed his part of the fund with no expectation of any help or assistance from anybody. He is too high type of man for that, and the Senator ought to know it.

Mr. HARRISON. He is a constituent of the Senator?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; he lives in my State, and is a very distinguished citizen, a splendid man, a very high-minded Christian gentleman, and when he contributes to the funds of the Republican Party he contributes like he does to many other good purposes, for the good of the country.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not think that favoritism by legislation should be shown to John D. Rockefeller, jr., does he?

Mr. CALDER. Of course not.

Mr. HARRISON. Merely because he has these exceptional qualities?

Mr. CALDER. Of course not.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator was not in sympathy with what the House committee did when it reported out the bill containing that special provision?

Mr. CALDER. Of course not. I am entirely in sympathy with that provision of the bill which eliminates from any benefits all companies which carry their own goods exclusively.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator, then, was not in sympathy with Lasker's suggestion that it should be done?

Mr. CALDER. I do not know who made the suggestion or if he prepared the bill. I am not in sympathy with that particular provision.

Mr. HARRISON. If the President indorsed it, the Senator is then out of sympathy with the President on that proposition?

Mr. CALDER. I doubt very much if the President knew it would affect that particular interest. I am sure that he did not know it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Surely he read the bill before he recommended it to the Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. The best excuse the Senator can offer is ignorance on the subject, and we will all accept that excuse.

Mr. CALDER. Oh, no; I do not offer that reason at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Did the gentleman who appeared before the committee this morning say when John D., sr., got out of the Standard Oil Co?

Mr. CALDER. I was not present at the committee meeting. I was informed by a Senator who was present, and a newspaper carried the story. His testimony was given about a week ago.

Mr. HARRISON. But he did not say when John D., sr., got out?

Mr. CALDER. I did not see that statement made.

Mr. HARRISON. He may have gotten out after he learned that the Committee on Commerce had repudiated what the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had endeavored to do for him—in other words, had taken away from him the favoring provisions that had been granted to him or his company in the original draft and by the action of the House committee?

Mr. CALDER. My recollection is that the statement was made that he had had no interest in the company for the past two years.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from New York, with the permission of the Senator having the floor, if he means to state that John D. Rockefeller, sr., has no interest either in the Standard Oil Co. or any of its multitude of subsidiary organizations?

Mr. CALDER. I simply repeated the statement made by the president of the Standard Oil Co. before the Committee on Manufactures. In that statement it was set forth that for the past two years—I think I am correct in the time—the elder Rockefeller had had no financial interest in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the parent organization, has a multitude of subsidiary organizations, and that the parent organization now is of less consequence than many of the children which have sprung from it.

Mr. CALDER. My information is that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey is by far the most important, the most wealthy, and the most influential of them all.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, the parent company, owns the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana and a multitude of other companies, pipe-line companies, prospecting companies, and other organizations engaged in the development of the oil industry. Does the Senator mean to state that John D. Rockefeller, sr., is not interested in any of those great organizations?

Mr. CALDER. Of course, I have no knowledge of that. I have no knowledge of the ramifications of Mr. Rockefeller's interests. I simply repeated the statement made by the president of the company before the Senate Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator will discover that Mr. Rockefeller's holdings in oil companies—I do not care by what name they may be labeled—exceed $350,000,000, according to the par value of the stock.

Mr. HARRISON. As I understand the Senator from New York, he had some friend who appeared before the committee who said that John D., sr., had no interest in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Mississippi is putting words in my mouth. I did not say I had a friend who appeared before the committee. I said that the president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey had appeared before the committee and made the statement.

Mr. HARRISON. He made the statement that John D., sr., had no interest in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; but that his son, John D., jr., was a large stockholder.

Mr. HARRISON. And, of course, we assume and the Senator, I imagine, assumes that John D. Rockefeller, sr., still has a holding in the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio, and the many other subsidiary companies?

Mr. CALDER. I assume nothing of the sort. I know nothing about it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not know? The only assurance he has is that some person has stated before a committee that John D., sr., has no interest now in the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Mr. CALDER. No. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HARRISON. The Standard Oil Co. of Ohio or of Indiana or of some other State may have tankers and operate tankers in the trade. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey is not the only Standard Oil Co. that owns and operates tankers carrying their product to and fro over the seas, is it?

Mr. CALDER. I am not sure of that, of course, but I am under the impression, from information I have obtained from time to time, that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey are by far the largest owners of oil tankers. I have not exact information, but that is the information that comes to me in a general way. There may be other oil companies that own tankers.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, what I thought when the Senator first rose was that he had some information that John D., sr., did not give the $25,000 contribution which the Republican chairman reported in his statement; but the Senator, of course, I imagine, will agree that the chairman of the Republican committee would tell the truth about it, or about anything, and that that was all right.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I understood the Senator from New York correctly, he said that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey had been operating most of the tankers. I presume that was suggested to him because they recently declared a 400 per cent stock dividend, and that might also suggest to him that they were the owners of the ships.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, coming back to the proposition that the ship subsidy bill should await the new Congress recently elected by the people, I want to read what the Republican campaign textbook, in the Republican platform, said with respect to the merchant marine. At no place in it does it hint or suggest subsidy. On the contrary it indorses the Jones Act which was passed here by a Republican Congress to maintain the merchant marine and to which the President of the United States gave his earnest support and for which he voted and which carried no subsidy. Here is what the platform said:

> We indorse the sound legislation recently enacted by the Republican Congress that will insure the promotion and maintenance of the American merchant marine.

There is an indorsement of the Jones Act. The American people in that election had a right to rely on the fact that you were through with legislation affecting the merchant marine, and they had no thought that you would come here and want to place additional taxes on the American people to the extent of $875,000,000 to give to the Shipping Trust. Yet that is what is sought in the pending bill.

Mr. President, getting back to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to take up the agricultural credits legislation and sidetrack, so to speak, the ship subsidy bill, presenting an issue to this body whether the Shipping Trust needs our help more and to a greater extent than the farmers of the country, I want to refresh the memories of Senators that a year and a half or more ago this body and the House of Representatives passed a joint resolution providing for an agricultural inquiry and a commission was appointed to look into agricultural conditions, in an endeavor to solve the problem, and to make their recommendations touching legislation and otherwise, that might

promote the interests of the agricultural classes. That commission worked faithfully for months. It made many suggestions. It made, in my opinion, many wise recommendations.

Up until this good hour, although those recommendations were made six or eight months ago, this Congress has dilly-dallied with the tariff and dillydallied with revenue legislation and talked about the ship subsidy and the antilynching bill and the Liberian loan until we have wasted the time, and we have passed none of the legislation that might have benefited the farmers of the country. And yet when the proposal is made and the sentiment of the country is crystallized for agricultural credits legislation we have it thrown at us that there is a filibuster on. Filibuster! Why? Because we are trying to point out to you that the next Congress is the Congress to take up and solve the ship subsidy question, and that this Congress is the one to take up agricultural credits legislation and enact it speedily, so that if relief is to come to the farmers of the country it may be given to them at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, in the summary of the recommendations of the Joint Commission of Agricultural Inquiry we find the following:

(1) That the Federal Government affirmatively legalize the cooperative combination of farmers for the purpose of marketing, grading, sorting, processing, or distributing their products.

* * * * * * *

(3) That there should be a warehousing system which will provide a uniform liability on the part of the warehousemen and in which the moral and financial hazards are fully insured.

* * * * * * *

(4) The commission believes that an immediate reduction of freight rates on farm products is absolutely necessary to a renewal of normal agricultural operations and prosperity, and recommends prompt action by the railroads and constituted public authority to that end.

Is there anything that is burdening the farmers of the Middle West and the far western sections more than the high freight rates which are charged by railroads? Is it not a question of such moment and importance that this Congress should turn its attention to it and let the ship subsidy bill, which will cost the American people so much, slide away until the next Congress begins its session? Which does the American people believe more important—subsidy legislation or a reduction of freight rates by the railroads, especially on agricultural products? Which legislation would be more welcome to the farmers of the West and South? To ask the question is to answer it; and yet this Congress, under its wise leadership, allows itself to waste precious moments in talking about subsidizing the Shipping Trust and permits the farmers of the great Middle West, of the South, and every other part of the country to continue to pay high and unreasonable freight rates in order that they may ship their products from the farm to the consumer.

The commission made other recommendations. It recommended furthermore—

(5) That there should be an extension of the statistical divisions of the Department of Agriculture, particularly along the line of procurement of live-stock statistics.

I hope that the Agricultural Department is working toward that end; but I do not know.

(6) That provision should be made by Congress for agricultural attachés in the principal foreign countries producing and consuming agricultural products.

We passed a bill the other day carrying an appropriation of over $100,000 for consular agents and commercial attachés in foreign countries to study trade conditions, to study commerce, and to report back to the Department of Commerce. We have recommended that agricultural attachés should be appointed in those countries in order that they might study agricultural conditions there and report them back and let the farmers learn by first-hand information the condition of crops and of markets throughout those countries and throughout the world.

The commission also recommends—

(7) The development by trade associations and by State and Federal sanction of more accurate, uniform, and practical grades of agricultural products and standards of containers for the same.

Nothing has been done along that line.

(8) That adequate Federal appropriations should be made for the promotion of better book and record keeping of the cost of production of farm products on the basis of the farm-plant unit as a basis for the development of more efficient methods of farm management.

It is to be hoped that in the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill at this session some of these recommendations, at least, will be taken up and acted upon, and that some law may be enacted to carry out the recommendations of this commission.

(10) More adequate wholesale terminal facilities, particularly for handling perishables at primary markets, and a more thorough organization of the agencies and facilities of distribution of the large consuming centers of the country.

(11) The development of better roads to local markets, joint facilities at terminals connecting rail, water, and motor transport systems, and more adequate facilities at shipping points, with a view to reducing the cost of marketing and distribution.

(12) That greater effort be directed to the improvement of community life.

Here is a recommendation which is more important than all the others; one that cries out from every farm home throughout the country; one to which no Senator can turn a deaf ear. It is:

(2) That the farmer's requirements for credit corresponding to his turnover and having maturity of from six months to three years, which will enable payment to be made from the proceeds of the farm, be met by an adaptation of the present banking system of the country which will enable it to furnish credit of this character. It is expected that a concrete proposal to carry out this recommendation will be made in part 2 of this report.

That was one of the recommendations which the commission, after weeks and months of earnest work and endeavor, unanimously agreed upon; that the agricultural credit system as to-day constituted does not meet the demands nor the needs of the farmers of the country. So we drafted a bill to cover the matter. That bill did not meet my ideas in every particular; I suppose it met the ideas of no member of the commission in every particular; but we agreed to it because it was the best plan upon which all parties to the commission could agree. I am for that bill, with amendments, until a better plan can be suggested by some one else. But after the commission, following weeks of labor, recommended this important legislation for the farmers, who are to-day more distressed than ever before in their history, we are confronted by a situation which is most glaringly and correctly illustrated by one statement made by the expert of the commission. He was a splendid expert; I dare say that if we had combed the whole country we could not have procured one more faithful to the trust imposed than Doctor King. He found and the commission found, according to all the statistics they gathered, that—

Measured in terms of purchasing power, the farmer's dollar in 1920 was worth only 89 cents.

We might consider the purchasing power at that time of the banker's dollar, the purchasing power of the dollar of the owners of the great steamship lines of the country, the purchasing power of the United Fruit Co., of the United States Steel Corporation, of the Standard Oil Co., of commercial houses, mercantile establishments, and manufacturing plants, and find that the purchasing power of their dollar at that time was much greater than that of the farmer; in fact, was so much greater that it could hardly be compared to the purchasing power of 89 cents on the dollar, as shown for the farmer in that year.

In May, 1921, the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar—which amounted to 89 cents in 1920—had depreciated until it was only 77 cents; and during the months since then the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar has gone still lower, as my good friend the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] will attest, because at the time when the purchasing power of the farmer's dollar was but 77 cents his corn was selling at a higher price than that for which it sold a few months ago or for which it sells to-day. The same statement applies to wheat and other commodities which he raises. Why, sirs, the average income received by a farmer for his labor in 1909 was only $311. In 1918 it was $1,278, and in 1920 it was only $219, and to-day in many sections it is less. The average income of a person in every other business or trade is greatly in excess of the farmer. In many sections of the country distress, discontent, and unhappiness are staring the American farmer in the face; privation and starvation hover over many an humble American farm home. The farmer is suffering because of high railroad rates, lack of marketing facilities, and an inadequate and ancient credit system which does not respond to his needs; yet we sit here as representatives of the American people and try to press through Congress a ship subsidy bill that will add to their burdens instead of relieving them in the slightest degree.

Although, Mr. President, I realize these facts, yet when I suggest that a time be fixed to vote on a motion to give to the farmer a day, so to speak, in court, a day when his case may be presented, a day when his case may be called on the calendar, a day when we may get away for a short time from the consideration of a ship subsidy measure and consider the wants and needs of the American farmer, I have hurled at me the insinuation that I am in part helping in a filibuster. Ah, my friends, this question presents the issue of whether the shipping interests in this country can utilize and monopolize the time of the Senate or whether we will be fair in a small degree at least to the agricultural interests of the country and say to them, "We are going to give you a few days so that we may consider some legislation for your benefit."

I am going to vote for the motion submitted by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I shall not vote for that motion because I favor the Norris bill; I am not in favor of the Norris bill; but I am in favor of the farmers having a day here in order that Senators may agree upon an agricultural credit bill and upon other legislation for his benefit and relief, and the best way is by adopting this motion. I know that if we procrastinate, as we sometimes do on this side and as the Republican majority always does on their side, we will never get anywhere to relieve the distressed conditions of agriculture as they are presented to us to-day.

I said I was not for the Norris bill. I have shown my opposition to it already. I happen to be a member of the Agricultural Committee, and I was one Senator in that committee—and I am not divulging any secrets when I say it—who made two motions and called for a record vote trying to eliminate the two objectionable features of the bill as I saw them. I am not for my Government going into the junk-shop business—no! I am not for my Government purchasing and operating and holding elevators and warehouses—no! I filed a motion, and on the roll call I voted to eliminate that provision from the bill, and I am not for the other provision. I am not for section 2 of the Norris bill, which seeks to buy agricultural products from any person. I do not want to see my Government go into the mercantile business. I do not want to see it go out and as among and between farmers compete in the purchase of their products. I am against the Government selling such products to any person within the United States or to any person or to any government or subdivision of government without the United States. To me those provisions are not only socialistic but they are bolshevistic, and I shall vote against them in the consideration of this bill; and if they are not eliminated, and the vote comes on the passage of the bill, I shall vote against the bill. But I voted to report it out, reserving the right to offer amendments and vote as I saw fit on the floor of the Senate. I did it because I knew it was the only way for us to agree on a measure as a substitute that would guarantee some relief.

I know, however, what is going to happen, and you know what is going to happen. We can not fool ourselves. Unless the adherents of ship subsidy legislation continue to occupy the time of the Senate to the exclusion of the consideration of an agricultural credits bill, we will take up the Norris bill for consideration. It will be discussed. Every line of it, every suggestion in it, will receive arguments for it and against it, and in the end we will agree upon a substitute for the Norris bill that will meet the needs, at least in part, of the agricultural interests of the country in the form of an agricultural credits bill.

I hope that when we shall have begun the consideration of the bill we can agree upon the bill that was recommended by the Joint Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, that was known as the Lenroot bill and that is known in the House as the Anderson bill, and which received the indorsement—of course, with reservations to improve it—of the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry. I want to see that bill substituted, with some amendments to it. I want to see the amount of $1,000,000 that is to be appropriated to each of the 12 Federal land banks increased in amount to $10,000,000 for each one, making possible a capitalization of $120,000,000, with power vested in the bank to issue bonds and obligate itself to the amount of $1,200,000,000.

Is that giving the farmers a little mess of pottage? Is that a piece of popgun legislation, when you present an opportunity to the farmers of the country to borrow $1,200,000,000, provided they can meet the terms of the bill? They are modern. They are well drawn. It will render great benefit to the agricultural class, who need the credit; and I want to see that bill amended further so that it will compel the Federal Farm Loan Bureau, which is to control this credit, to establish in every agricultural or live-stock State where it has no offices now a branch office or an agency. I want to carry the plan to the farmers, and I want to see it amended—although I know without hope of success—so that the institution need not go through the banks to loan the money to the farmers or go directly to the associations. I would have it read that this concern can loan the money directly to the farmer if he can produce the security, freeing him from the interest charges imposed by the banks or the necessity of organization in an association in order to obtain the credit.

That proposition has been tried out in this body on an amendment that I offered a year ago, I believe, when we were considering the amendment to the War Finance Corporation bill. It has been tried out in the committees. I know that I am but a part of a small minority on that proposition, and so I am willing to take the very next best thing, which, I think, is incorporated in what is known as the Lenroot-Anderson bill. We can get together on that proposition, and I hope that the Banking and Currency Committee of this body will not take up too much time, although the matter should be carefully considered; that they will eventually report out that bill, with such amendments as they think are wise, so that we can all get together on it or some other proposition that may be better and sounder, offer it as a substitute for the Norris bill, and pass it, so that we can at least say to the farmers, "We have redeemed in part the pledges and promises we made to you."

I would not stop there. That is not all. If I should write the policy of agricultural credit legislation at this time, I would incorporate in it a provision such as is embodied in the Norris bill, such as is embodied in the Norbeck bill, such as has been suggested in other pieces of legislation here, that the life of the War Finance Corporation shall be extended another year or more, or that some corporation shall be created as its successor, and it can loan money to interests in other countries to buy our surplus agricultural products here, provided the money is spent in this country and provided those interests put up adequate security before they borrow. That is what will help in this country.

When I look at you I remember how you have isolated America, how you have destroyed to our farmers as well as manufacturers the markets of foreign countries, how you have dammed up the stream of commerce so that agricultural products, of which we had a surplus in prior years and of which we have a surplus now, can not flow, and consequently a surplus hoarded here drives down the price of the farmers' products. If it had not been for that policy, if you had shown a little more wisdom, if you had not halted in your steps so much, if you had not been fearful of certain men in the Republican Party who would cry out, "Foreign entanglements!" we would have gone over there to try to help—yes; to try to help Germany in the reparations imposed upon her, to help Poland, to help other countries, through our counsel and our advice and our influence, to be rehabilitated; to help their industries start up anew and to restore prosperity to those countries, because when we do that we open up markets for our agricultural products and insure to America prosperity not only on farm, in factory, but to all our people.

Then, too, you have added to the farmer's burden by trying to build a tariff wall around this country, so that we can not trade with other countries, thinking we could just live here among ourselves and eat up or use our own products, destroy our exports, and diminish our balance of trade; and it is all felt in reduced prices to the American farmer.

Why, I saw my friend from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] and my friend from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] exhibit on the floor of this body a little doll, made, no doubt, by some little German girl. It took her, perhaps, days and even months to make that little toy. She thought, perhaps, that by her efforts she could gladden some little heart in America at Christmastide. She thought, perhaps, she could sell it for enough to buy her a little Christmas present, or a little Christmas toy; yet I heard the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Indiana say that a tariff wall should be constructed so high as to prevent that little German girl from making and selling here that little, simple toy to gladden the heart of a little American girl!

That is your policy; that is your record in this body and in the other body. I appeal to you, let us join hands and vote for the motion to take up the Norris bill, not especially because we are for the Norris bill but because it presents a foundation on which we can construct some agricultural credits legislation that will give immediate relief, if necessary, to the great farming classes of the country.

Oh, you need not worry; you will not lose the support of the great Shipping Trust of the country. You will not lose the support and the future campaign contributions of Rockefeller, even though John D., sr., has gone out of business in New Jersey. You will not lose the support of the United States Steel Corporation and the United Fruit Co. Let them wait a little while. Let the farmers have a day in court. Let us deal fairly with them. Let us meet the conditions as they arise. Let us stop making this charge of filibustering. Let us discuss these matters in an open way, and try to arrive at a quick conclusion.

When I cast my vote for this motion I am not fearful of the finger of scorn being pointed at me on the ground that I am for the socialistic doctrine of the Government buying and operating elevators and warehouses and buying and selling agricultural products. I am merely voting for it to open up the opportunity so that we can get together here and frame legislation to take care of this agricultural situation.

I want to see on this program, also, the Federal reserve law amended so that agricultural paper can be discounted for a longer time than is given to it under the present law. I want to see it extended to nine months, so that the paper which can be discounted can carry some benefit to the farmers of the country.

Mr. President, I have said about all I desire to say. I hope we can speed along. I hope that we can pass the appropriation bills and that we can all get together.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Mississippi has very kindly yielded to me that I may give notice that to-morrow, at the convening of the Senate, I shall address the Senate on the shipping bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not like to interrupt the Senator from Mississippi, but I desire to have action on two amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate to the State and Justice Departments appropriation bill. There will be no debate over it.

Mr. HARRISON. Very well. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I shall not take any time to answer in detail the statements made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], but I desire to refer to one in particular at this time, because I think perhaps the country ought to know facts about the statement made by the Senator in relation to the imports and exports of our Government.

From the speech of the Senator from Mississippi we were led to believe that no imports of any amount were coming into this country and that the tariff law had dried up all sources of exportations, and that our export trade had been virtually destroyed.

What are the facts? Only this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial which read as follows:

> The overseas trade statistics, made public on Monday by the Department of Commerce, contain the gratifying intelligence that exports in November reached the highest point of the current year. The total value of the commodities sent abroad was $383,000,000, which is $12,000,000 more than the figure for October, $90,000,000 more than that for November, 1921, and $138,000,000 more than that for November, 1913. It is evident that in this important department of trade the trend is steadily upward. A large volume of exports generally denotes national prosperity, and in the present instance that is undoubtedly its meaning.

That does not look as if our exports are declining to a minimum. That does not look as if in the near future there will be no outlet at all for the products of the farm or the products of the factory; $383,000,000 worth of goods were exported during the month of November.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Would the Senator mind placing in the RECORD in this connection a statement of the exports and imports, by months, for the past 36 months?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not that information here, but I will be glad to insert it if I can secure it by to-morrow.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. SMOOT. For the last three years?

Mr. HARRISON. For the last 36 months, by months.

Mr. SMOOT. That would take it into the war period, and that, of course, would be of little value.

Mr. HARRISON. Thirty-six months would take it into the war period?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is three years.

Mr. HARRISON. That does not take us back to the war period.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that right after the war the business of this country was even greater than it was the year before.

Mr. HARRISON. Then let the Senator take it for the last 24 months.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to put it in for the last 24 months.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator always watches those things. The exports have gone down constantly in the last 24 months, have they not?

Mr. SMOOT. In some months they did, and in some months they did not.

Mr. HARRISON. In most of the months they went down; gradually declined.

Mr. SMOOT. Not since the passage of the tariff bill, however, and it was the claim of the Senator that because of the passage of the tariff bill, that "iniquitous measure," as he designated it, our imports had decreased, and our exports had gone down to almost a minimum.

Mr. HARRISON. They have been so very, very small during the Republican administration that they amounted to practically nothing.

Mr. SMOOT. In the month of November of this year, 1922, our exports were $138,000,000 more than they were in November, 1913, when the Democratic Party was in power, when there was no war, and just before the breaking out of the war in Europe.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator read what they were in 1916?

Mr. SMOOT. I have not the figures here as to that, but I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly willing to put into the RECORD a statement of our exports for every month and every year since 1913, if it will do any good.

Mr. HARRISON. I think it will do a lot of good.

Mr. SMOOT. In that connection I want to say that there is no question but that during the war period we exported everything that could possibly be gathered together. There is no need comparing those years with ordinary times, when there is no war. But I am citing last month's figures, a time when the Senator from Mississippi wants the people of this country to understand there was a stagnation in all our exports, and I call attention to the fact that they were $138,000,000 more in November, 1922, than in November, 1913, the month of November before the declaration of war in 1914. I only hope, as an American citizen, that our exports will continue to grow, and I see no reason why they should not, at least if European countries can get upon their feet again.

Mr. President, that $138,000,000 increase was notwithstanding the fact that the purchasing power of the people in Europe has been brought so low that in some countries the people can not even get food enough to eat. Yet, with all that, our exports, as I have stated, are $138,000,000 more for the month of November of 1922 than they were for the month of November, 1913.

Again, I think the figures will show that for the last three months our exports have been more than in any other three months outside of the war period. There is no one on either side of the Chamber who is not interested in legislation that would help the agriculturists of this country. I have no doubt but that the recommendations of President Harding in his last message, wherein he calls specific attention to the need for legislation by Congress, which the Senator from Mississippi has stated he is in favor of, will be carried out, and, as far as I am personally concerned, I want them carried out just as soon as it is possible to do it. The Senator from Mississippi can not denounce the Norris bill in any stronger terms than I do. He does not denounce its principles any more than I do. It is wrong in principle. I have not the least fear of its ever passing this body.

I simply rose to put into the RECORD at this time a statement of our exports. I am also happy to say that our imports have increased. The Senator from North Carolina knows that my estimate of the amount we would receive per annum after the passage of the tariff bill was $400,000,000 at the most. From what has occurred since the passage of the bill I think it will be more than $400,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does the Senator estimate the import duties will produce?

Mr. SMOOT. If our import duties continue on the same basis that they have since the passage of the bill, I will say to the Senator that I think the revenue will be about $450,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the amount I quoted to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I heard the Senator this afternoon state that he thought there would be 10 per cent of $450,000,000, and I say frankly now if the increase continues as it has in the last few months there is no doubt but what the sum realized from the importation of goods into this country will amount to $450,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I had in view the Senator's statement when I made the suggestion.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was boasting of our export trade for last month as compared with the same month of 1913. The fact that the foreign countries are buying from us, as export figures indicate, contradicts the gloomy statement made recently by the Republican ambassador to Great Britain. Just at the time when the cotton crop is moving to market, and knowing that Great Britain is one of the greatest consumers of the raw cotton of America, and that the farmer is trying to get a price that will yield a profit, this Republican ambassador gives out a statement that Europe is about to fail financially and that conditions can not go on much longer as they are now going.

I submit that the figures which have been called to our attention by the Senator from Utah flatly contradict the state-

ment given out by the ambassador to Great Britain, Mr. Harvey. There are a great many people here who believe that he made the statement for the purpose of injuriously affecting the cotton market and the wheat market of the United States. It did seriously affect both. All sorts of things are resorted to in order to affect the markets here to aid the speculator in robbing the farmers of the United States.

This same man Harvey, who made the statement just referred to, not long ago rose on a solemn occasion in London and expressed serious doubt as to whether a woman has a soul. This man is representing a Christian nation——

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; misrepresenting it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Misrepresenting it, as my friend from Arkansas suggests. I submit that, acting as ambassador of the greatest Government on the globe, he cast a reflection upon every woman in the United States and in the world. Paul said to Timothy—

> The faith that is within thee was first in thy grandmother, Lois, and then in thy mother, Eunice.

Woman has been and is to-day the keeper of the faith.

If there is one or the other who has not a soul, it must be George Harvey and not the American woman. If I had been President of these United States when this ambassador made that speech in London, I would have recalled him by cable.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why not dismiss him and leave him there, and not bring him back?

Mr. HEFLIN. I agree that that would have been better. I would have employed whatever method would have humiliated and punished him most. The President of the United States owed it to the Christian Nation which he represents to call that man away as representative of our country to Great Britain. But this man who misrepresents our country, strange to say, has not been removed. He has done half a dozen things that have warranted his removal, but it is strange that certain influences here seem to get a man of this type in position and hold him there and it is impossible to get him out. It is strange indeed.

This man gave out the statement to which I referred, that Europe was just about on the edge of financial collapse, when it is not so. When Europe can buy more stuff from us and pay for it in the month just passed in 1922 than she could prior to the war it presents a situation that flatly contradicts the statement of George Harvey. His statement, in my judgment, was made for the purpose of affecting the grain market and the cotton market in the United States. I have seen letters to the effect that his statement broke the cotton market several dollars a bale. That means a good deal on a crop of nine or ten million bales. That means a great deal to the farmers who are struggling and are in dire distress to-day. But this man is permitted to get away with that sort of thing.

While Harvey stands in London telling us of the deplorable financial situation in Europe, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], one of the leaders on the other side of the Chamber, stands here and boasts of the purchasing power of Europe and how it has increased, how it has grown by leaps and bounds until to-day they are buying a great deal more, nearly $200,000,000 in one month, more than they did prior to the war, before its terrible devastation struck and cursed that country.

I submit that these are very remarkable contradictions. Either George Harvey is mistaken or the Senator from Utah is mistaken. I am satisfied the Senator from Utah is not mistaken, because I am sure he has given the figures correctly.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah complains that we are delaying the passage of the ship subsidy bill. I want to call attention to what happened in connection with the tariff bill—the most obnoxious and oppressive tariff bill ever written. It was kept hanging here for one year, and it was held back by the Republican Party and was not permitted to be put on the statute books until it was too late for the American people to know the evil effects of it before the election.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator ought to be fair. I have never before stated on the floor of the Senate, during all of the discussions, that the Democratic Party held that bill back until just before election so the American people would not get the benefit of it. I am surprised to hear the Senator from Alabama now make the statement that the Republican Party held it back. The Senator knows that the Republican Party would have passed it months and months before it was finally passed. The Senator from Alabama was one among the Senators on his side of the Chamber who prevented its passage. If we had had that bill in operation six months before election, every argument that was made by Democratic speakers in the campaign would have been swept away from under the feet of my Democratic friends, because it would have demonstrated then, just as it is demonstrated to-day, what we said would take place.

I do not like to have the Senator say that it was the Republican Party that held it up until just before election. If anything could have defeated the party on account of the passage of the legislation, that very thing would have defeated it, because the Senator knows the result of a change of tariff law, when it has not had time to demonstrate its——

Mr. HEFLIN. Time to get in its awful work?

Mr. SMOOT. When it has not had time to demonstrate what it will accomplish, no matter whether we call it good or evil. Let it demonstrate itself. Of course, all sorts of charges could be made against it and it may be called anything. The sponsors of the bill could only say, "We do not believe it;" but if it had demonstrated itself as it is doing to-day and as it will do in the future, all we would have to do would be to point to the results, just as I have pointed to them this afternoon.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to have this confession from the Senator from Utah. It is a fact that they wanted to pass the bill the first week they brought it in here without discussing it. Senator SIMMONS insisted that its provisions be discussed. I remember that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] got up and asked that the first item be explained. He asked why that rate was fixed and why that item was put in the bill. The very intelligent and frank answer made was that it was put in there for the same reason that all the other items were put in there. That was the amazing and only information that was given on the subject. We commenced then to take up the bill, item by item, and call the attention of the American people to what was going to happen through that legislation. Some of the Republican newspapers commenced to arraign Republican Senators who sponsored the measure, and it was the exposures made by the Democratic Party in this body that got out to the people that turned the Republican majorities into Democratic majorities and changed the political complexion of both bodies in the recent election.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator can say that and claim it, but that does not necessarily prove it. I do not know which Senator we are to believe—the Democratic Senator who just preceded the Senator from Alabama or the Senator who is now addressing us. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] said it was the shipping bill that did it. In the House discussions I notice there were other things said to have brought it about. Now, we are told by the Senator from Alabama that it was the tariff bill that brought it about.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am just referring to one of the things on which you have filibustered, or rather on which you have taken a great deal of time. That is the reason why I am commenting on that. I am showing that you had it under consideration for more than a year, and you will probably have the ship subsidy bill under consideration for more than two years. You do not think so, but you may.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know how long it will take. It all depends upon whether the filibuster develops or not. I know just as well as I know I am standing upon this floor now that a filibuster can stop the passage of the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the Senator think a filibuster that would defeat it would be justified?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I do not. That is a difference of opinion between the Senator and myself. I will admit frankly that four days were taken in the discussion of the tariff bill to settle the question of the rate on vinegar. I know that, and the Senator remembers it very well. I was not deceived as to why it took four days to pass the one item of vinegar. It was for the very purpose of holding up the passage of the bill until just before election.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the Senator will not consume the time of the Senate in discussing one item now, especially when the subject matter is so sour a thing as is vinegar. [Laughter.] We want to get along with business, and the Senator wants to take up my time discussing vinegar.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator said if the tariff bill could have been passed six months earlier and could have gone to the country the situation would have been different; that it would have worked miracles. Mr. President, I sincerely believe if it had been passed six months earlier, and we could have had the same discussion up to that time which we had before the bill was passed, there would not have been enough Republicans left on the other side to count. Look how it trimmed the Republicans out in the other House. Republican editors when they read the able speeches of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and of

other Senators who discussed the tariff question, turned right around and said, "This thing ought to be defeated." I submit to the Senator from Utah and to the Senate and to the country when Democrats with a few grains of truth and a few flashes of light can so convince a Republican, can so enlighten him that he changes his position completely and fights the thing which he formerly supported, that is "going some"; yet we saw that happen right here in this country.

I am not going to make a speech. I merely wish to comment briefly upon an article which appears in the Washington Post this morning in reference to the leadership on the other side of the Chamber. It reads:

Senator JONES made a faint gesture in the direction of the only drastic step which the Republican leadership can take to put a stop to the wasting of time now going on in the Senate. This would be by making a motion to lay the Norris motion on the table. Such a motion is not debatable.

That is a gruesome confession to be made by the Republicans who talked to the newspaper man; that we are wasting time when we stand here and demand legislation for the farmers of America. Those farmers are part and parcel of this Government; they contribute to its support, to its strength, and its glory; they are patriotic people. Their boys went to the World War and fought under the flag. Some of them died and others of them came back, having been wounded in the cause of their country; but when we stand here and undertake to plead for legislation, not giving special privilege to the farmer but legislation that will put him on the same business basis as other classes of people, this article refers to our efforts as a waste of time.

Here is another paragraph to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate:

What the leadership is afraid of is that even if the Norris motion were tabled or defeated, the discussion on farm relief would go on just the same.

* * * * * * *

It is now clear the Norris motion can not prevail, but the tactics being employed to defeat the administration's program might easily throw the final test over into the new year, thus still further jeopardizing the chances of the subsidy bill.

Oh, Mr. President, that presents an awful picture to my mind. Here is a newspaper supporting the administration, the mouthpiece of the Republican side, criticizing those of us over here who demand legislation in the interest of agriculture that is very much needed by the farmers of the country. That newspaper states that we are continuing the discussion and we might continue it over into the new year. On the other side, it is suggested that that would jeopardize the President's program and would defeat the President's measure, which is aid for the shipping trust of the United States. I call the attention of the Republican Party here assembled and the country over and the attention of the people of the Republic at large to the fact that the Republicans are striving, with whip and spur, to force through a subsidy measure in the interest of the shipping trust, but are holding back all legislation looking to the benefit and relief of millions of people in the agricultural sections of the country.

Mr. President, I have been sitting in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry listening to the hearings and participating in them. I wish every man and woman in the country could have heard farmers and country bankers from the West testify, for their testimony was of such a character as to bring tears to the eyes of anyone who really had a heart. I heard those farmers testify that their land was mortgaged. I asked "And how did you get money or credit then?" They said, "We got it on our cattle, our horses and mules." I asked, "After you had mortgaged your stock, how did you get it then?" They replied, "We mortgaged our growing crops."

That is the condition which confronts us in the agricultural regions of the land. The farm lands are mortgaged; the rooftree that shelters the family is plastered over with mortgages; the live stock about the premises are covered over with mortgages; the crop which is growing in the fields is covered with a mortgage. That is the class of people who come to Congress and ask us to create a rural credits system that will enable them to break the chains of the bondage that binds them; yet this newspaper says that the fear on the part of the Republican leaders is that the Democrats will continue this discussion of relief for the farmers over into the new year and that the danger is that we shall defeat the President's pet scheme of a ship subsidy bill.

Oh, Mr. President, one can not serve two masters. A man must either be for God or mammon. He has got to choose in this Chamber whether he will be for the ship subsidy, with all its iniquities, or will be for the farmers of the country, their wives and their children who are clamoring and crying out for fair treatment at the hands of Congress.

I wonder why it is that the special interests can always get the ear of the Republican Party? Why is it that they are so powerful that they can get the President to come to Congress and deliver a message specifically naming a certain measure and urge immediate action? When the Republican leaders refer to other measures they do so in glittering generalities; they merely say, "We ought to have some sort of a rural credits system"—just shooting at the moon, and with little bird shot at that. However, when it comes to a ship subsidy they get a big Winchester with a steel bullet and they shoot right at the spot, and there is no time lost then; they go right to the issue.

Mr. President, in another place in this article it is said that—

This week's filibuster has already cost them $400,000.

Think of that, Mr. President! Whoever it is who is writing these inspired articles is employing new tactics against us. He states that we are costing the Government $400,000—doing what? Demanding of a stubborn Republican majority legislation in the interest of the agricultural classes of the United States. Are we wasting time? Is that a waste of time? Mr. President, time spent in demanding justice for the agricultural class is time well spent; and when we can not secure action by coaxing and appealing to the other side, if we can employ tactics which will force action to give relief to the farmers before the shipping trust is served, I say we are performing a patriotic duty; it is not a waste of time, but is time well spent.

I quote another statement from the article in the Washington Post:

The statement by Chairman JONES late in the evening that he had received information which led to more optimistic conclusions was most reassuring.

I wonder what sort of information that was; I wonder who gave such information.

What this information concerned was not disclosed.

Oh, Mr. President, how mysterious the workings of the ship-subsidy crowd! They are receiving information, but we do not know whence it came. It did not come over any particular wire running into this Chamber, I presume, but probably it came by wireless from somewhere out yonder. However, it is stated that the chairman of the committee did not disclose the character of the information he received. The article continues:

What this information concerned was not disclosed. It indicated the terrific Progressive counterattack of the last few days had failed and that the administration forces had been strengthened.

I want to know who it is that has gone back on the people; I want to know who it is that is ready to sheathe his sword; I want to know who it is that is ready to crawl and truckle to those who stand beyond the walls of this Capitol and demand that the ship subsidy bill be driven through? Who is it that is giving information that those who are opposed to ship subsidy are weakening? Where are they? Where is a single one of them who stood out against this thing who has now gone around and whispered to somebody somewhere in some mysterious fashion that he is about ready to go with the other side?

No, Mr. President, the ship subsidy bill ought not to be here at all; it ought to be considered, if it is to be considered at all, by the Congress which is coming in on the 4th of next March. Lame ducks ought not to settle this question.

Now, I desire to draw a picture of a defeated candidate repudiated at the polls. I may say first, however, that the people voted against some of them because they were not clear as to whether they were against the ship subsidy bill or not, and I dare say there is not a Republican who was elected at the recent election who would have stood up before his constituency three days before the election and told them if re-elected he would vote for the ship subsidy bill. Why should we act in that way with the rights and interests of the American people? They are entitled to be taken into our confidence.

Referring to the picture of the lame ducks, Mr. President, there he is at home submitting his case to the people. They say, "No; we do not indorse your record; we do not want to keep you there any longer." So they defeat him; he is repudiated by them, by the sovereign power of his district or State. Then he comes back to Washington, although his term ends on the 4th of March. The White House looms in the distance, and the President stands beckoning and smiling; the lame duck goes "laming" on up in that direction and the President whispers to him, "I will take thee into my bosom. You have been beaten at the polls, repudiated by your people; but you still have a vote, and I have an official plum tree."

Mr. President, of course I do not charge that the President would do a thing like that, but I am just wondering if he did; whether that fellow—remembering back yonder the expressed judgment of the people—hearing this beckoning call and seeing this winsome smile, with this tree full of plums just ready to

shake and fall, would not think how nice it would be to sit up under it and pick out a nice, luscious, ripe plum and ask the President to knock it loose and let it fall into his tender care and keeping. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, in the House there were sixty-odd Members who had been defeated, and they put over this ship subsidy bill. But for their votes it would have been defeated in the House. Nobody can deny that. This is a serious thing we are talking about here to-day—the undertaking to give away, for a song, ships that cost this Government in cold coin $3,000,000,000—three thousand million dollars. We have a man at the head of the Shipping Board, a Mr. Lasker, who told the world that we could not sell the ships, and that there was no market for them, and threw off on them in various ways, and then said: "What will you give me for them?" Did you ever see a discreet, intelligent, worthy agent do anything like that? Then he comes along and says: "Now, we can only get about $200,000,000 for this three thousand million dollars' worth of ships, a fleet of the finest steel merchant ships that sail the sea. It is proposed to give them to the ship trust for $200,000,000, and loan them money at 2 per cent, and give them out of the pockets of the people a subsidy of $52,000,000 a year."

Mr. President, I am going to make a prediction now. The man who votes for this bill will be defeated two years from now if he is a candidate at that time. The people are not going to stand for this sort of a steal. I do not know how to characterize it in any other way. Anybody that would recommend the selling of this Government's property that cost three thousand million dollars for two hundred million dollars has something wrong with him. He ought to have his head examined, or his heart, one or the other, and maybe both. There is something wrong somewhere.

What would you do, as an individual, if you owned those ships and general business conditions were bad, as they say they are now? Why, you would say, "I will just throw my arms around them and sit quietly down and hold them until times get better." Why should the Government of the United States have this action taken by the administration that stood on every housetop in the Nation saying that it was going to take the Government out of business and put business into Government? This is business with a vengeance, is it not—selling three thousand million dollars' worth of ships for two hundred millions? And then, if you have not money enough for their upkeep, why, bow and smile to them and say, "We are going to make a special exception in your case. We are going to let you have money out of the Public Treasury at 2 per cent. We do not show that consideration to anybody else under the sun. You are a trust. You are going to get the benefit of these ships that the Government has built. We are going to make special pets of you and give you a subsidy of $52,000,000 a year, and on top of that we are going to loan you money at 2 per cent." There is no man living who can defend such a deal before the American people.

You can talk about wasting time all you please. You can talk about a filibuster. Some of you two years from now, after the election is past, will wish that this filibuster had lasted beyond your terms, so that you would not have had to go on record. I remember, when the Newberry case was up, standing here myself in nine different speeches upon the subject, and I warned my friends on the other side that when they voted to give Newberry a seat they were voting to give up their own seats; and the people trimmed every one but one of them, I believe, that voted for him.

Mr. President, I make the prediction again that Senators who vote for this ship subsidy will be defeated. That is the only way the people can get agents out of here that serve other interests and not their interests. They have a right to get them out. They ought to get them out. Whose Government is it, as I frequently ask? It is the Government of the people; and if Congress undertakes to ram something like this down the throats of the people, and does it with a lot of lame ducks, it adds to the outrageous aspects of the case, and it ought not to be tolerated.

Mr. President, there are some of us here who are interested in legislation for the farmer. We simply want a fair deal given to the farmers of the country. We want a rural credits system established that is suitable to the farmer's business, and we intend to see that that is done. I, for one, am not in favor of sidetracking for one hour legislation looking to the interest of the farmer and the relief of the farmer to consider any bill in favor of the special interests of America, especially such a measure as this ship subsidy bill. There ought not to be a man in this Chamber who would urge its consideration over these measures looking to the relief of the farmers of the country. As I have shown, the farmers' land is mortgaged; their homes are mortgaged; their cattle and horses and mules are mortgaged; their crops are mortgaged; all that they have is tied up; they are in a state of bondage, and we are undertaking to stretch forth the healing hand to give to them deliverance.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate closes its business to-day it recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I have such high regard for the honesty and for the zeal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that I regret to oppose almost any legislation that he proposes; but, Mr. President, to my mind the bill involved in the pending motion is so revolutionary and is so much out of order, there is so much to be condemned in it, that I could not think for one moment of supporting the bill. It is paternalism run mad, and I never could bring myself to vote for any bill that would put the Government deeper into business. In fact, I wish that the Government were out of all kinds of business that it is in. We have had a sad experience in the past by reason of the Government dipping into business, and this bill goes much further than we did, even in war times. It is thoroughly unconstitutional. It is thoroughly out of keeping with the times. Therefore I could not even vote to lay aside temporarily the shipping bill and take up the Norris bill, notwithstanding I confess that I have a good deal of difficulty in deciding which one is the more objectionable. I am almost in the position of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. However, I will not do as he did, and fail to vote. I will stand my ground, and vote for the lesser evil, I hope, with a view of having them both defeated.

Mr. President, I presume that there is but little divergence of opinion in the Senate about trying to enact some legislation beneficial to the agricultural interests of our country. I am certainly heartily in favor of passing a proper bill at the earliest possible moment. I am deeply concerned in agriculture, and certainly for the last several years the producers have not received anything like they should have received. In my part of the country, in addition to financial troubles, we have had the pest of the boll weevil, which has infected pretty much the whole cotton-growing country; and my State, particularly this year, has suffered more in proportion than any other State in the Union. Where year before last we raised in that State about 1,600,000 bales of cotton, last year we made a little less than 800,000 bales, and this year we will not raise over 500,000 or 530,000 bales; so that is a great slump. Our sister State of Georgia is about in the same condition. The situation in North Carolina is not quite so bad, but the boll weevil is going in that direction, and no doubt next year will have enveloped the whole cotton area. Therefore we should do something to aid the farmers in a proper way.

I am not one of those who believe that all ills can be cured by loaning people money. In fact, I am not much in sympathy with the propaganda of the times, encouraging people to get deeper in debt. My training has been to borrow as little as possible. It is not so hard to borrow, but the time for payment is the time when we encounter great difficulty. However, there are times when people of all occupations should be accommodated by credit in the proper way for a reasonable time at the lowest possible interest. I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will expedite their deliberations and will soon report a bill, and if we can not agree upon it at once we can soon whip it into shape, and I hope it will be passed in a few days.

In the meantime, I do not think that any efforts should be spared to expose the iniquities of the shipping bill. I am a member of the Committee on Commerce, and I confess with some humiliation that my education in regard to ships is limited. I have had very little experience along that line, but with the desire to become better posted, I attended most diligently the meetings of our committee, held some time ago, with Mr. Lasker before us, and those meetings extended to late hours at night; so that at physical inconvenience I attended those meetings in order to get better posted and to see if I could aid in any way in solving the problem of disposing of the Government's ships.

We find that the Government has this large tonnage on hand, built during the war, and built at enormous cost. I am not one to complain about that, however, and to find fault. It was necessary to build them at the time, regardless of cost, and there was no one to blame. It was thought to be necessary. I am only sorry that there was so much profiteering in their construction.

However that may be, that should be counted as a cost of the war, and we should now make the best disposition possible of those ships. I hesitated a good deal about supporting the American merchant marine act of 1920, but I was young on the committee, had been on it only a short time, and that was thought the best solution of the problem at that time. I have watched the disposition of those ships since that time.

This is a large problem which we have to dispose of. It is one which requires the very best thought in the country, and I was in hopes that the Government would be able to dispose of those ships at a reasonable per cent of the cost, at least; but it seems that for the last few years the demand for shipping has declined greatly, and those ships, which were built at a cost of something like $200 a ton, could not be disposed of for more than $30 a ton, even the steel ships. That was a great disappointment to the taxpayers of this country.

I confess I have been greatly disturbed as to the best disposition we could make of the ships. I am very much interested in the subject, and I attended the hearings to which I have already referred with a great deal of interest and an open mind, to see if I could get some information; but I must say that I was greatly disappointed at those hearings, and I had reluctantly to come to the conclusion that a proper effort had not been made to dispose of the ships.

I am opposed to Government ownership of railroads, ships, or any other so-called public utility, and I would take great delight in seeing those ships disposed of to private owners at the earliest possible moment, so that the Government could retire completely from the shipping business, but I am totally at variance with the methods which have been pursued by the Shipping Board. I do not like to say harsh things against people; I prefer to think well of everybody. I know most of the members of that board, or a great many of them, at least, very pleasantly, and I was in hopes they would make a success of the operation and disposition of the ships, but after listening to Mr. Lasker—who, I am sorry to say, in my opinion is about the whole show, he having been selected apparently for a purpose, which he has about performed—I was surprised to find that the efforts of this board had not been to make money by operating our ships. In fact, if they had tried to make a failure they could not have succeeded better than they have, notwithstanding the tonnage of the world is no larger than it was just preceding the war. Yet we have something like a thousand steel ships tied up.

When Congress donated $20,000,000 to buy corn for the Russians, it was publicly stated that the ships of the Shipping Board were not in condition to convey that corn across the ocean. At that time I made some remarks on the subject and criticized the board, stating that that was a very poor advertisement in a campaign to sell the ships when we had over 900 tied up, decrepit, lame, and halt, ships which could not carry the grain we were donating to relieve the suffering in Russia. A few days after that public talk we were notified in the Senate that they could carry the grain across. I guess that woke them up. That is a demonstration of the incompetency of that board, and of their methods of advertising our ships.

To my great astonishment Mr. Lasker said—and I do not want to misquote him—that if there were cargoes to be had, and if there were individual shippers who would take those cargoes, he would not allow the Government ships to come in competition with them. In other words, they did not go after business, but tied the ships up, and would not let them get business. He further stated, to my astonishment, that he was spending a large part of his time in trying to organize companies to buy those ships from this board.

I do not like to criticize the administration, notwithstanding I am not a member of the majority party; it is our Government, Mr. President, and I like to accord to all Government agencies the thought that they are doing the very best they can. But after listening to Mr. Lasker for a long time on different evenings, and seeing the performance of his experts, I reluctantly arrived at the conclusion that his effort was to belittle the ships, instead of trying to give them their proper standing in the world. It seemed that his main thought was to cast reflections upon the former administration on account of the cost of the ships and the mistakes they had made. It may be true that ships did cost too much, and I think they did, and it may be true that there were too many built; but the former administration were not trying to build ships for the sake of building them; they were building them for the purpose of winning the war. It seemed to give Mr. Lasker great satisfaction to cast all the slurs he could about mistakes which had been made. I have never thought it was very profitable to go back and complain about the past, or find fault with somebody. It seems to me the way to build up a country, particularly with the taxpayers' money, is to try to avoid duplicating the mistakes which have been made in the past.

So I am not surprised at the financial failure of the Shipping Board. It seems that Mr. Lasker had no experience with ships; in fact, he admitted so, and made light of his own knowledge. He hardly would have known a ship from a two-horse wagon, said he had no experience with shipping, and that he took the position reluctantly. My understanding about it is that he is an advertising agent, and I think he has advertised the inefficiency of our ships most liberally.

It seems to me a peculiar thing to hire a man to sell something, and then for him to go out and malign it, and blackguard it, and belittle it. That is about the best course he could take to give them away. If I had a kicking mule, I would not advertise that he was a kicking mule. I might reluctantly have to answer the question if I were asked, but I would not tell that he was a balking mule, and that sort of thing, all at one time. I would not misrepresent him but I would not want to magnify his faults. It seems to me they have done that in the case of these ships.

The board seems to be incompetent to run the ships, and they had to go out and hire some men at salaries of $35,000 a year each. I am one who believes that a laborer is worthy of his hire, and I do not blame a man for asking as much as he wants for his services, and if the other man is willing to pay that is his lookout; but it seemed to me that, with the great number of people in the shipping business in the United States, men who were experts in operating ships could have been employed at much lower salaries than that. When we think about the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States being not more than half of what one of these men is getting, and when a hard-working Senator comes here and works day and night, with all the vicissitudes of being reelected, and draws only about one-fourth of that salary, it seems that the Shipping Board are trying to find a way to dispose of money instead of trying to save it. So no one need be surprised at the result. In fact, it would have been most remarkable if that board, operating about 400 steel ships, I believe, with something like a thousand tied up, could have made ends meet.

I am firmly of the opinion that the right way to dispose of those ships would have been to put them in active business and to have competed with the ships of this country and the ships of the world, and wherever there were cargoes to have sent after them, and tried to help build up new routes, and tried to let the people who owned ships know that the Government was in the business and that the Government could operate ships. Then those private owners would have gone in and bought a large number of those ships at reasonable prices.

Now we have to dispose of them in some way. I would dislike very much to see the Government in the shipping business permanently. But there are worse things than that. If we could not get rid of them at a reasonable price, and if we could not get rid of them without paying people big bonuses and subsidies to operate them hereafter, I would favor the Government operating them itself until shipping in the world becomes more normal. Then possibly we could dispose of them.

I do not think that it is commendable for a legislator or anyone else to "knock" a plan unless he has something better to propose. The slight degree of success I have attained in the world has not been by knocking down the other fellow's propositions or destroying something, but it has been by trying to construct and build up. It is much more agreeable to me to take that course than it is the course of "knocking." So we either have to pass the subsidy bill, it seems, or do something that is better. If I had it in my power, the line of action I would pursue would be to see if we could not get Congress to take a sane view of the situation. This is a serious matter. The taxpayers of the country have something like $3,000,000,000 invested in these ships. Considering the distressing times, the scarcity of funds, the shortness of crops, and the great distress that is in the country, the rising cost of living and the increasing taxes, we should do something to see if we can not put the people of the country in a better condition.

So it seems to me that it is a good time now for Congress just sanely to take a new stock of our situation and of our laws and of what we are going to do in the future. World conditions have changed in the last few years. We are now a creditor Nation instead of a debtor Nation. Therefore, we have to look to different ways of doing business. The time has arrived when we might have to adopt revolutionary laws. In fact, I think we should take a new start and revise our conditions generally. Every Member of Congress should approach these subjects in a calm, honest, fair way, with a view to the best interests of the taxpayers of the country. The mere fact that a measure has been introduced by one side or

the other or is advocated by one side or the other, should not justify other people in opposing it. They ought to advocate something of real merit, of real constructive quality, something that would help our people permanently. If we do not do that, we are going to encourage the voters of the country to become more discouraged and more demoralized than ever before. I am glad that I live in a conservative section of the country. Our section has a greater proportion of original citizens and of pure-blooded Americans than any section of the country. I noticed the other day what the Vice President had to say with respect to that, that we were the balance wheel of the whole country; that we were the conservative element of the country. It is time that we get that principle inculcated all over the United States.

It pains me to hear Senators make speeches like they sometimes do here. I noticed the other day that the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], for whom I have great respect and in whom I have great confidence, admitted that we could not pass any railroad legislation at this session of Congress. Whatever is for the good of the people ought to be passed at any time, and nothing could be done that would help out more than to revise our railroad legislation. It ought to condemn and damn any man forever who stands in the way of constructive legislation. Yet we are told that we can not at this session enact any railroad legislation. I do not care whether this session ends the 4th of March or whether it ends the 1st of February, we ought to sit down and get together and pass laws that would help the country, without even a week's debate. If we do not do it we are bringing about our own destruction.

Now, in the matter of the shipping bill, while I feel that I am not an expert at all, yet I have studied the subject somewhat, and I would suggest that we take a comprehensive view of all the laws on shipping and see what are injurious and what are beneficial. If there is anything injurious, we ought to be men enough to repeal it even if it might make us unpopular with certain people in the country. I am told that there is a good deal in the seamen's act that militates against the successful operation of our ships. Instead of trying to wink at a proposition or trying to evade it, we ought to meet it and every proposition squarely. We ought to be men enough to legislate for the people as a whole in the country and for no class and no section. If I had it in my power I would repeal, before 6 o'clock to-night, every law that gives special privileges to any class of people in the country.

I received the other day a copy of American Industries, a magazine published in this country, from which it appears that they have submitted the ship subsidy question to a large number of prominent business men throughout the United States. It seems to be almost the unanimous conclusion of a great number of the big business men who replied to the questionnaires that there is something wrong with the shipping laws of the country. We ought to know what is the matter. If we do not know, we ought to get experts to tell us. We ought to study what is right and what is wrong in those laws.

In the first place, I will state that the whole shipping bill, to my mind, is on the wrong basis. It is a kind of hothouse proposition. We may just as well get rid of the idea that the Government can make people rich by taking from one class and giving to another class. The bill is wrong at the bottom and it is wrong at the top. It starts out with a subsidy on the theory that here is an infant industry, "sucking the bottle," and we have to support it. That is a wrong proposition. What we need is that the people of the country go to work. Any enterprise that needs special nursing and special hothouse attention is not worthy of help.

On the other hand, we put in the bill a provision that if a man makes over a very small per cent that surplus is to be taken away from him and put in the Treasury. That is a wrong proposition. That is against the principles that have made this country great. We should not expect people to invest their money in an enterprise, to develop the resources of the country, whether it be in the field or in the mine or in the factory or on the sea or anywhere else, asking the owner of capital to take all the hazards of the business, when he has worked a little bit harder than somebody else and taken care of his money and invested it, and then have the Government come along and say, "I will take all that you earn above a very small percentage." That is a wrong principle. We never would have built up this country if we had had any such principle prevailing. It is wrong in business. It is wrong in every way.

I know something in a personal way of water-power companies, for instance. After a man takes all the chance of developing, all the risk that he runs by combating the elements and all the uncertainties of the business and the customers, it is wrong, then, for the Government to come along and say, "If you were exceedingly fortunate one year, if you sat up all night and worked hard and lived scantily, so that you made more than a certain little per cent, we are going to take it away from you." We will not be able to get people to go into enterprises of that sort if we adopt that principle. I do not wonder that people will not buy ships under those circumstances.

I can not understand how it is expected that we should give a subsidy with these ships. They are practically given to the operators. They have the oceans to run upon, with no tracks to lay, no grass to cut, no weeds to keep down, and with very little expense of operation. Why they can not make money I do not understand. If we can not compete with the ships of the other nations of the world, it is time that we learn how to do it.

As to the seamen's act, to which I have referred, I notice in the magazine, American Industries, an editorial on page 6, in which, speaking of what we will have to do to make a merchant marine, it said:

> Restrictive labor laws must be repealed; without their repeal no intelligent shipping company will take over Government ships at any price commensurate with this present cost in the expectation of making them profitable or of maintaining an efficient and loyal organization.

On page 7, in an article by Mr. Frederick J. Koster, it is said that—

> In many ways foreign ships can be operated much more economically than American ships, primarily because wages and living conditions of foreign ships' officers and crews are very much lower. It is generally accepted as an axiom that where the overhead of an American manufacturer is higher than his foreign competitor, the former must either sell his goods at less or must sell better goods to offset the difference, or else go out of the foreign-trade business.

I was interested the other day in hearing the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] read from the opinion of Robert Dollar. Robert Dollar is a shipping man, and must be a man of great experience, who knows what he is talking about. On page 20 of the same magazine he said:

> As Congress will not change or modify the laws that drove the American merchant marine off the ocean before the late European war, I am in favor of a subsidy. I claim, however, that if our laws and regulations were the same as our competitors', we would not require any assistance from our Government. This applies only to cargo ships engaged in the foreign trade. No foreign government gives subsidy or aid to their cargo steamers, and they are able to operate successfully; for this reason I say that under the same conditions American shipowners could successfully operate American ships.
>
> It may surprise your readers to know that until my company put three American 10,000-ton cargo steamers in the foreign trade of the Pacific Ocean, running from the Pacific coast ports to the Orient and around the world, there was not one privately owned American steamer engaged in this great Pacific Ocean trade. All the American ships engaged in this trade were owned by the Shipping Board.
>
> I write on the question of subsidies without any bias, as, with the restrictions proposed in the subsidy bill, I could not take advantage of it.

So it seems he could not take advantage of it even if it has become a law. Mr. Dollar continues:

> A sharp distinction must be made, however, between cargo and fast mail steamers. They can not and are not operated by any nationality unless either subsidized or paid a large compensation for carrying the mails. Every nation assists their fast mail steamers in one way or another, and as all American steamers cost 20 to 30 per cent more to operate than those of other nationalities, it goes without saying that it would be impossible for them to compete without being subsidized.
>
> The "seamen's act," or "La Follette bill," as it is called, was so vicious and bad that several sections of it have never been enforced. The latest legislation is the joker put on the tail end of the tariff bill, which provides that all repairs made to American ships in foreign countries shall pay 50 per cent duty. As American prices are more than 50 per cent higher, it goes without saying that American ships are penalized 50 per cent over and above what their competitors have to pay. I only mention these two bills, as they are the very latest. There are many more, but too numerous for this article.

I have the kindliest feeling in the world for people who work; I want them to realize everything they possibly can from their labor, all that it is worth, and all they can reasonably get, whatever is fair and honest and equitable; they ought to be paid good wages and be encouraged to work harder; but if there is anything in our laws which would restrict the operation of our ships, we ought to repeal it. Therefore, Mr. President, what I would undertake to do would be to amend existing law.

Our shipping is encumbered in its operation by the tariff. I hope it will soon be demonstrated that we will have to amend the tariff act in some respects so that we may encourage our shipping. Then, I would encourage railroad connection with the ships; I would aid in that way.

Then I would turn the Lasker propaganda for the sale of our ships into a propaganda to induce the people of the United States to patronize our ships. I am ashamed to note that Government employees—even officials of the United States—when they are compelled to go abroad on business of the Gov-

ernment frequently travel in ships of other nations. That should not be the case; and prevention of that is one thing in this bill that I must say deserves a little commendation, although it is about the only good thing in the bill. I am glad, however, that it has some good in it.

Mr. President, I understand an executive session is desired. I have not quite finished my remarks.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Would the Senator like to conclude his remarks to-night?

Mr. DIAL. No; I have no objection to deferring them until to-morrow.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With a view of determining my own conduct, because I have a slight notion of making a short speech of from three and one-half to five hours—I am not certain which—I should like to inquire of the manager of the bill whether it is contemplated to adjourn very soon or whether it is contemplated to hold a night session?

Mr. JONES of Washington. We do not contemplate a night session to-night, unless the Senator desires to proceed to-night.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; then I will postpone my infliction. I do not desire any particular time for the infliction, because I shall not enjoy it myself, and I shall not take any pleasure in the suffering of the Senate; but I thought that if it were necessary I would impose the infliction to-night, and if it were not necessary I would do so at some time hereafter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. We will not require the Senator to do that to-night.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; then I am perfectly satisfied.

CREDENTIALS OF SENATOR KING.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a certificate of the Governor of Utah certifying to the election of WILLIAM H. KING as a Senator from the State of Utah for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF UTAH,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, A. D. 1922, WILLIAM H. KING was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Utah a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1923.

Witness: His excellency, Gov. Charles R. Mabey, and the great seal of the State of Utah hereto affixed at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 29th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.] CHAS R. MABEY.

By the governor:

H. E. CROCKETT, *Secretary of State.*

REPORTS ON RUSSIAN RELIEF (S. DOC. NO. 277).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers and documents, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress for the relief of the distressed and starving people of Russia, approved December 22, 1921, I transmit herewith reports from the American Relief Administration, the United States Grain Corporation as fiscal agent for the Purchasing Commission for Russian Relief, and the comptroller of the American Relief Administration, which organizations were designated to carry out the provisions of the said act.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 20, 1922.*

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTORS OF CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of law governing the choice of directors on the part of the Senate, the Chair hereby appoints the Senator from Michigan, Mr. COUZENS, as a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. DILLINGHAM, as a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, both for the term of a single Congress, beginning March 4, 1923.

CLAIMS SETTLED BY THE SHIPPING BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 278).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report of the United States Shipping Board and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, made pursuant to law, of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement from October 16, 1921, to October 15, 1922, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REINTERMENT OF SOLDIER DEAD.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Quartermaster General of the Army, transmitting a list of American soldier dead returned from overseas, consisting of the remains of six enlisted men to be reinterred in the Arlington National Cemetery December 28, 1922, at 2.30 p. m., which was ordered to lie on the table for the information of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives receding from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 5, 19, 24, and 25 to the bill (H. R. 13282) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and concurring therein; receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 and concurring therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Undersecretary of State and the 'counselor for the department' shall hereafter be designated 'Undersecretary of State'"; receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 14 and concurring therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the automobile purchased from the appropriation for detection and prosecution of crimes for the fiscal year 1923 shall hereafter be for the exclusive use of the Bureau of Investigation under the control of the Attorney General."

Mr. CARAWAY. I would like to ask the Senator from Kansas a question. Last year, when the Attorney General got his $500,000, he promised us he was going to have the jails so full of profiteers that their legs would be sticking out of the windows. I see that another $500,000 is asked for. Has he made any report of that first $500,000?

Mr. CURTIS. The first $500,000 resulted in the examination of 472 cases by the board, and recommendations for prosecution in over 240 cases. Settlements have been made in two cases, the Government getting back $1,100,000, and in two others checks have been received, one for $250,000 and another for $170,000, in these two cases, and settlement in two or three other cases which will run the amount up to about $1,700,000.

Mr. CARAWAY. Who has been indicted?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know who have been. I am not acquainted with the facts.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF ALIENS UNDER BOND.

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Immigration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That aliens who entered the United States before March 7, 1922, in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, and were temporarily admitted under bond, may, if otherwise admissible, and if not subject to deportation for other causes, be permitted by the Secretary of Labor to remain in the United States without regard to the provisions of such act of May 19, 1921. In the case of any alien so permitted to remain the bond shall be canceled.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator if it will lead to any discussion.

Mr. COLT. It will not. If it does, I will have it go to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, December 21, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Nominations received by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

MEMBERS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Charles C. McChord, of Kentucky, for a term of seven years, expiring December 31, 1929. (A reappointment.)

Joseph B. Eastman, of Massachusetts, for a term of seven years, expiring December 31, 1929. (A reappointment.)

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Stephen B. Davis, of New Mexico, to be solicitor of the Department of Commerce, vice William E. Lamb, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Adam C. Cliffe, of Illinois, to be United States district judge, northern district of Illinois. (An additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922.)

Frederic P. Schoonmaker, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge, western district of Pennsylvania. (An additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin A. Olson, of Illinois, to be United States attorney, northern district of Illinois, vice Charles F. Clyne, whose term has expired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

William A. Dollison, of Colorado, to be United States marshal for the district of Colorado, vice Samuel J. Burris, resigned, effective January 1, 1923.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Harry Louis Bloomberg, of New York, to be aid with relative rank of ensign in the Navy, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, vice Frederick E. Joekel, promoted.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

John M. Stapleton to be postmaster at Foley, Ala., in place of L. E. Wolbrink. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

ARKANSAS.

Hiram S. Irwin to be postmaster at Clarendon, Ark., in place of J. F. Hurst. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CALIFORNIA.

James F. Trout to be postmaster at Avalon, Calif., in place of J. F. Trout. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George T. Fissell to be postmaster at Davis, Calif., in place of G. T. Fissell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

John V. Van Eaton to be postmaster at El Segundo, Calif., in place of N. M. Ellis, resigned.

George F. Bartley to be postmaster at Escondido, Calif., in place of C. W. Corey. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

George H. Gischel to be postmaster at Tracy, Calif., in place of W. T. Tschierschky. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

COLORADO.

Joseph A. Measures to be postmaster at Grand Junction, Colo., in place of R. C. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

FLORIDA.

Edgar D. Hogan to be postmaster at Loughman, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Harold J. Engel to be postmaster at New Valparaiso, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Frank M. Meaders to be postmaster at Dahlonega, Ga., in place of F. M. Meaders. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

John E. Puett to be postmaster at Cumming, Ga., in place of A. G. Hockenhull. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Harry J. Glover to be postmaster at Albion, Ill., in place of Frank Howey. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Thomas Turigliatto to be postmaster at Benld, Ill., in place of P. S. McPherson. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

INDIANA.

Rex Hannum to be postmaster at Worthington, Ind., in place of W. H. Beaty. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Robert B. Beadles to be postmaster at Fulton, Ky., in place of J. R. Graham. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1922.

William E. Jones to be postmaster at Princeton, Ky., in place of F. K. Wylis. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Elizabeth M. Benere to be postmaster at West Acton, Mass., in place of James Kinsley. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

MICHIGAN.

Christine Anderson to be postmaster at Holton, Mich., in place of Herbert O'Connor, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

Edwin Mattson to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Minn., in place of E. H. Mangskau. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MISSOURI.

Eldridge G. Hoff to be postmaster at Stockton, Mo., in place of F. L. Church. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MONTANA.

Harly J. Stephenson to be postmaster at Belgrade, Mont., in place of F. M. Byrne. Incumbent's commissioned expired September 13, 1922.

Hermon Y. Gard to be postmaster at Brady, Mont., in place of L. C. Woolson. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Edward E. Ely to be postmaster at Milford, Nebr., in place of M. E. Lindeman, deceased.

Elmer G. Watkins to be postmaster at Orleans, Nebr., in place of Robert Dunlay. Incumbent's commission expired October 3, 1922.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George L. Crockett to be postmaster at Whitefield, N. H., in place of B. C. Garland. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

Dorothy H. Miller to be postmaster at Essex Fells, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

George W. Earl to be postmaster at Tabor, N. J. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Thomas F. Zettlemoyer to be postmaster at Sewaren, N. J. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Olin D. Beers to be postmaster at Freehold, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

Marguerite A. Scruton to be postmaster at Oswegatchie, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Lewis E. Fredenburg to be p stmaster at Afton, N. Y., in place of Daniel Grant. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Jacob A. Phillips to be postmaster at Cleveland, N. Dak., in place of J. A. Phillips. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1922.

OHIO.

James Azallion to be postmaster at Laferty, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1921.

Hosea M. Thompson to be postmaster at Ostrander, Ohio. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Albert W. Griswold to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ohio, in place of T. B. Richey. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Ida M. Mingle to be postmaster at Birmingham, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Frederick M. Adam to be postmaster at Temple, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1920.

Horace W. Wickersham to be postmaster at Thompsontown, Pa., in place of O. W. Kaegel. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

George W. Correy to be postmaster at Milton, Pa., in place of Edward Weidenhamer, resigned.

Paul C. Rupp to be postmaster at Pitcairn, Pa., in place of M. D. Salyards. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

PORTO RICO.

John L. Gay to be postmaster at San Juan, P. R., in place of R. A. Rivera, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mortimer R. Sams to be postmaster at Jonesville, S. C., in place of R. W. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Frank D. Beste to be postmaster at Corsica, S. Dak., in place of F. B. Boyle. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Charles K. Metcalf to be postmaster at National Sanatorium, Tenn. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Joseph M. Dudney to be postmaster at Gainesboro, Tenn., in place of F. L. Tardy. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1922.

TEXAS.

John L. Dillon to be postmaster at Leonard, Tex., in place of A. L. Melton. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Arthur A. McNeil to be postmaster at Moody, Tex., in place of W. H. McCurdy. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

William Tays to be postmaster at New Braunfels, Tex., in place of J. E. Abrahams. Incumbent's commission expired April 6, 1922.

James M. Campbell to be postmaster at Strawn, Tex., in place of C. E. Maxwell. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

UTAH.

Walter O. Lundgreen to be postmaster at Monroe, Utah, in place of O. C. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expired September 26, 1922.

VIRGINIA.

Haynie S. Robertson to be postmaster at Blackstone, Va., in place of J. M. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Edwin L. Toone to be postmaster at Boydton, Va., in place of E. L. Toone. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

Charles R. Whitmore to be postmaster at Broadway, Va., in place of S. M. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

WASHINGTON.

William R. Cox to be postmaster at Pasco, Wash., in place of A. A. Barnes. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

Blanch Lyon to be postmaster at East Ellsworth, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

WYOMING.

Hubert S. Ladd to be postmaster at Hudson, Wyo. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 20 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

John C. Rose to be circuit judge, fourth circuit.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Edward Perry Morton to be aid.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Frank F. Crowe, Montevallo.

GEORGIA.

Luther W. Vickery, Lavonia.
Clifton O. Lloyd, Lindale.
Andrew H. Staples, Metter.
George H. Broome, Pavo.

INDIANA.

Fred Austin, Birdseye.
Oliver A. Potter, Geneva.
Louis T. Heerman, Syracuse.
Lee Herr, Tell City.

KANSAS.

Maud Williams, Lenexa.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Henry L. Pierce, Barre.
Lucius E. Estey, Brookfield.
Charles J. Dacey, Conway.
Horace W. Collamore, East Bridgewater.
Henry L. Ripley, Edgartown.
Thomas J. Murray, Prides Crossing.
William C. Temple, Rutland.
Douglas H. Knowlton, South Hamilton.
George A. Wilder, Townsend.
Walter C. Ring, Woronoco.

MICHIGAN.

Elmer E. Geer, Halfway.

MISSISSIPPI.

Neppie R. Lockwood, Crystal Springs.

MISSOURI.

Benonia F. Hardin, Albany.
Robert W. Raines, Glasgow.
Catherine A. McSwiney, Normandy.

NEW MEXICO.

Maud W. Lenfesty, Aztec.
Augustin F. Sisneros, Espanola.
James A. Shipley, Silver City.

OKLAHOMA.

Ward Guffy, Cleveland.
Clarence S. Brigham, Cushing.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Effie P. Corts, Karns City.
William H. Lowry, Ligonier.
Lena E. Gould, McClellandtown.

RHODE ISLAND.

May B. Lamb, Greenville.
Bertha M. Brayton, Hope.

TENNESSEE.

Charles H. Bewley, Greeneville.
Alfred M. Agee, Lafollette.
Joseph R. Mitchell, Mascot.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 20, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy revelations are so merciful and gracious that we are unequal to the task of definition, but read our hearts and accept their offerings. The Lord bestow upon our country blessings of peace, plenty, and prosperity. Make these days for all the gladdest days in all the year, and may we have the spirit of Him who sees what others see and feels what others feel. Oh, may a great wave of good will sweep over our land and let the converting, controlling, and restoring Spirit of God come to the world and make it new and fresh and clean. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented a conference report upon the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican wars, and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, for printing under the rule. I find that there is a mistake in the printed report, and I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report printed in the RECORD of yesterday, and to resubmit the corrected report and have it printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the first report will be withdrawn, and the gentleman submits a new report to be printed under the rule.

There was no objection.

SCRAPPING OF NAVAL VESSELS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the reply of the Secretary of the Navy to House Resolution 457, in respect to compliance with the agreement reached upon the scrapping of naval vessels.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein the statement of the Secretary of the Navy referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

(No. 188.)

REQUESTING THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, IF NOT INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE PUBLIC INTEREST, TO COMMUNICATE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FULL INFORMATION TOUCHING THE NUMBER OF VESSELS OF WAR THAT HAVE BEEN SCRAPPED OR DISPOSED OF BY THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER POWERS WHO WERE PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT SINCE THE ADJOURNMENT OF THAT CONFERENCE.

(H. Res. 457.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 14, 1922.

MY DEAR MR. BUTLER: Referring to information requested in House Resolution 457 of December 1, 1922, requesting the Secretary of the Navy, if not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the House of Representatives full information touching the number of vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of by the United States and other powers who were participants in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament since the adjournment of that conference, and including vessels of war, whether defined by any treaty signed at that conference or not, I am sending you such information as I possess for transmittal to the House of Representatives. The information follows:

UNITED STATES.

Ships required to be scrapped under terms of treaty:

The *Maine* and *Missouri* have been sold and are being broken up by the purchaser.

All completed battleships required to be scrapped are out of commission except the *Connecticut*, which will soon be placed out of commission.

The *Delaware* and *North Dakota* are not required to be scrapped until the *Colorado* and *West Virginia* are completed.

No steps have been taken to comply with Article III, part 2 (b) of the treaty in the case of the *Oregon* and *Illinois*.

Work has been suspended on vessels under construction.

SHIPS NOT DEFINED BY THE TREATY.

Since February 6, 1922, the following ships have been sold or otherwise disposed of: One destroyer, 2 monitors, 1 dynamite gun vessel, 25 submarines, 1 gunboat.

The above list does not include vessels stricken from the Navy list since February 6, 1922, but not yet sold.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Ships required to be scrapped under terms of the treaty:

Broken up: *St. Vincent*, battleship; *Indefatigable*, battle cruiser; *Temeraire*, battleship.

Sold (to be broken up or rendered unfit for warlike purposes under terms of treaty): *Bellerophon*, battleship; *Commonwealth*, battleship; *Hercules*, battleship; *Dreadnought*, battleship; *Indomitable*, battle cruiser; *Neptune*, battleship; *Collingwood*, battleship

Sold (not yet completely dismantled): *Superb*, battleship.

Ready for sale (mutilations completed at dockyard): *Orion*, battleship; *New Zealand*, battle cruiser.

Being prepared for sale (mutilations being carried out at dockyards), with estimated date of completion of mutilations: *Monarch*, battleship, October 14, 1922; *Conqueror*, battleship, November, 1922; *Princess Royal*, battle cruiser, November, 1922; *Agincourt*, battleship, November, 1922; *Erin*, battleship, December, 1922; *Lion*, battle cruiser, end of December, 1922.

The status of the *Colossus* and *Agamemnon* is unknown, except that the *Agamemnon* is being used as a target ship.

The Australian Government has decided to scrap the battle cruiser *Australia*.

Following ships have been sunk: One cruiser, 1 destroyer, 1 submarine.

Following ships not affected by the treaty have been sold since February 6, 1922: Two cruisers, 4 light cruisers, 6 destroyers, 2 torpedo boats, 24 submarines.

This does not include ships on the disposal list but not sold.

JAPAN.

Ships required to be scrapped under terms of treaty:

Certain preliminary work of removal of guns and turrets, and in some cases removal of armor and engines, is being done on the battleships *Hizen*, *Ikoma*, *Ibuki*, *Mikasa*, *Kashima*, *Katori*, and *Kurama*.

The battleships *Satsuma*, *Aki*, and *Settsu* have been placed in the fourth reserve.

Work has been suspended on the battleships *Kaga* and *Tosa* and the battle cruisers *Amagi*, *Akagi*, *Atago*, and *Takao*. No work had been done on the last two except to lay the keels. Work on the machinery of the battle cruisers *Amagi* and *Akagi* is proceeding with the evident intention of completing these ships as aircraft carriers as permitted under the treaty

The Japanese ministry of marine has stated that while work preliminary to scrapping will be done the hulls will not be broken up or sunk until the treaties have been ratified by all the powers.

SHIPS NOT DEFINED BY TREATY.

The following were removed from the effective list on March 29, 1922: One battleship, 1 mine layer, 3 coast defense ships, 1 cruiser, 1 gunboat, 9 small destroyers, 5 submarines, 13 torpedo boats.

Of the above only the battleship is definitely known to have been disposed of.

The following has been wrecked: One light cruiser.

FRANCE.

Ships required to be scrapped under terms of the treaty: France is not required to scrap any completed ships. One of the ships she was permitted to retain, the *France*, has been wrecked. France had five battleships under construction at the beginning of the war that have not been completed. It is proposed to complete one of these, the *Bearn*, as an aircraft carrier. Under the treaty another could be completed to replace the *France*. No steps, so far as known, have been taken to dispose of these ships.

SHIPS NOT DEFINED BY TREATY.

Since February 6, 1922, the following have been disposed of: One battleship, 2 armored cruisers, 2 light cruisers, second line, and 9 torpedo boats.

ITALY.

Ships required to be scrapped under terms of treaty:

Italy is not required to scrap any completed ships under the treaty.

The battleship *Caracciolo*, under construction, has been disposed of, and the contracts for the battleships *Colombo*, *Colonna*, and *Morosini* annulled.

The battleship *Leonardi da Vinci*, which Italy may retain under the treaty and which was salvaged after sinking, will not be reconstructed.

SHIPS NOT DEFINED BY THE TREATY.

Italy has not disposed of any vessels of war since the adjournment of the conference.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN DENBY.

Hon. THOMAS S. BUTLER,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives.

[H. Res. 457, Sixty-seventh Congress, third session.]

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to communicate to the House of Representatives full information touching the number of vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of, by the United States and other powers who were participants in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, since the adjournment of that conference, and including vessels of war whether defined by any treaty at that conference or not.

[House Rept. No. 1266, Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session.]

The Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives, to whom was referred the resolution requesting certain information from the Navy Department regarding the number of vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of by the United States and other powers, who were participants in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, since the adjournment of that conference, having had the same under consideration, report the resolution favorably without amendment and recommend that it do pass.

The resolution meets with the approval of the Navy Department, as shown by the following letter from the Secretary of the Navy, which is made a part of this report:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 6, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Replying to the committee's letter of December 4, inclosing H. Res. 457 re vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of by the United States and other powers who were participants in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, I have the honor to inform you as follows:

This department has no objection to the passage of the resolution in question. While full information touching the number of vessels of war that have been scrapped or disposed of by the United States is completely available, the information regarding other powers who were participants in the Conference on the Limitation of Armament will be as nearly accurate as it is possible to be ascertained by the Office of Naval Intelligence.

The compilation of information called for by the resolution will be immediately undertaken and forwarded to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives as soon as completed, if possible by Friday, December 8, 1922.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN DENBY,
Secretary of the Navy.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 7912) to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7912) to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
PARK TRAMMELL,
F. R. GOODING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7912) to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the Senate numbered 1 defines that the word "employee" shall include enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The amendment numbered 2 makes the settlement of claims retroactive to April 6, 1917.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

DAMAGES ARISING FROM COLLISIONS WITH NAVAL VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 5349) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels and move the adoption of the same.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5349) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
PARK TRAMMELL,
F. R. GOODING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5349) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment changes the amount from $1,000 to $3,000.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman in a word give some explanation as to the effect of the Senate amendment to which the House conferees have agreed?

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is to increase from $1,000 to $3,000 the amount which the Navy Department can settle for or allow suit on in damages resulting from collisions with naval vessels.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the Senate amendment was originally $5,000 and the House provision $1,000. The conferees have agreed upon $3,000 as the maximum amount on which the Navy Department may settle in case of collision where they are at fault?

Mr. UNDERHILL. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

LIZZIE ASKELI—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of Lizzie Askeli, and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of Lizzie Askeli, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
H. B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
PARK TRAMMELL,
F. R. GOODING,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3034) for the relief of Lizzie Askeli submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The amount is reduced from $5,000 to $2,500.

G. W. EDMONDS,
JAMES P. GLYNN,
H. B. STEAGALL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

REPORT OF CONDITION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8996) to amend paragraph 440, section 5211, act of June 3, 1864, with Senate amendments thereto, and move to agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up from the Speaker's table a House bill with Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

JANE ROME.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 472 (Rept. No. 1303).

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Jane Rome, widow of John Rome, late an employee of the House of Representatives on the soldiers' roll, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as said employee, and an additional amount, not exceeding $250, to defray the expenses of the funeral of said John Rome.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, John Rome was the oldest employee on the soldiers' roll of the House, having served continuously from the 1st of August, 1878, until November 6 of this year. This is the usual resolution, and I move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on the matter of procedure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] called up the resolution submitting a constitutional amendment touching tax-exempt securities yesterday, it was with the understanding that the matter would be disposed of during the day. It was not possible to so dispose of it, and I do not believe we are justified in giving further time to the subject at this time, and thus delay the program of the appropriation bills. Having talked the matter over with gentlemen interested, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] will this morning ask for recognition to call up the Agricultural appropriation bill. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that we hope to dispose of the Agricultural appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the Post Office appropriation bill before the new year.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman did not confer with me about dispensing with further consideration at this time of the constitutional amendment, but it is satisfactory.

Mr. MONDELL. I felt confident it would be, Mr. Speaker. I do, however, apologize, because I ordinarily do confer with the gentleman from Tennessee. He is always kindly disposed.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. GARNER. Can the gentleman tell us about when the resolution will be called up, if at all?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, my present thought is that it would probably be called up about the second week in January, providing that in the meantime the gentleman from Texas prints his speech of yesterday in order that we may know what his arguments are before we take the resolution up again. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GARNER. I want to say, if the gentleman will permit, if the withholding of the speech will withhold the consideration of the resolution, I shall withhold it.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, we are all anxious and pining to know what the gentleman's arguments were. Unfortunately, I was unable to be present in the Chamber when his speech was delivered, and I am anxious to read his arguments.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say to the gentleman if the calling up of this resolution is conditioned on printing the speech in the RECORD, it will not be called up the balance of this Congress, and I doubt if it will be.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman desire further time in which to change his speech before inserting it in the RECORD?

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13481), the Agricultural appropriation bill; and, pending that, I should like to have some agreement with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] in regard to general debate. How much time does the gentleman from Texas want on that side?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire, so far as requests have been filed with me, an hour and a half.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the Agricultural appropriation bill be limited to three hours, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] and the other by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that general debate on the Agricultural bill be limited to three hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] and one-half by himself. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish the Chair would notify me when I have used 20 minutes, if I use that much.

Mr. Chairman, the total annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year amounted to $46,929,173. Of this amount $10,000,000 was appropriated for road construction. The amount recommended in this bill is $68,781,553, and of this amount $29,300,000 is appropriated for road construction. That resulted in the following situation with respect to the regular estimates. Eliminating the appropriation for the construction of roads under authorizations previously made by Congress the pending bill carries appropriations amounting to $442,940 in excess of the estimates made by the Bureau of the Budget. It carries $440,620 less than the current appropriation bill. That situation results largely from the policy adopted by the committee with respect to a small number of items under which work has been and is being carried on by the Agricultural Department toward a very definite end. For example, since about 1918 the Department of Agriculture has been engaged in the program of eradicating the barberry bush as a means of stopping epidemics of black rust which affects not only wheat but a large number of other grain crops. Last year we increased the amount of appropriation from approximately $150,000 to $350,000. The Budget Bureau reduced the amount from $350,000 to $200,000 in the current estimates. The committee felt that, inasmuch as this work was proceeding toward the definite end of the eradication of the barberry and hence of black rust, and in view of the fact that appropriations in aggregate to accomplish the work will depend somewhat upon the length of time that it takes to complete the job, it would be real economy to place it on a basis of the appropriation of last year. It is estimated that with an appropriation of $200,000 it will take six and a half years to complete the work with a total appropriation of $1,375,000. At the rate of $350,000 a year it will take two and a half years with an approximate expenditure of $1,025,000, while at $500,000 it will take approximately a year and a half with an appropriation of $900,000 in the aggregate. The committee felt therefore it would be real economy to continue the appropriations on the basis of the current fiscal year. We did not feel justified in increasing the amount beyond the amount carried in the current appropriation bill. And in that same way the committee restored the item for the eradication of cattle ticks to the figure of this year which was reduced in the Budget estimate by $160,000.

In that work the Bureau of Animal Industry has now eradicated the cattle tick from about 70 per cent of the territory originally infested. That work is proceeding along the line of a definite program of eradicating the tick altogether from this country. There will be no economy whatever, in the view of the committee, in reducing the appropriation for this purpose, because of the longer time it will take to complete the job, and the possibility, and perhaps the probability, of reinfestations of territory already cleaned, which are always a menace so long as the cattle tick remains in the country at all.

Much the same policy was followed in the case of the appropriations for the soil survey and for farmers' cooperative demonstrations.

The bill carries provision for the completion of the program of reorganization of the department, which was begun last year. The work of the Department of Agriculture falls into substantially three classes—research, regulation, and extension. Last year we created in this bill a director of research and a director of regulatory work, and under these two directors the work of research and the work of regulation have been coordinated. We complete that reorganization this year by creating a director of extension. Under this director the work which is of the character of extension work will all be concentrated. This will result in taking from the Division of Publications the office of exhibits and the office of motion pictures and making these offices a part of the extension service. The office of home economics is taken out of the States Relations Service and made a separate bureau under the title of Bureau of Home Economics.

I want to refer to just one other matter, and then I shall be through, unless some one wants to ask me questions about some items in the bill. That is the appropriation for road construction. Under the act of November 9, 1921, Congress authorized an appropriation of $65,000,000 this year for the construction of roads. The pending bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to allot the full amount of the authorization of $65,000,000 to the States and to enter into contractual obligations with the States for the highway construction contemplated under that authorization. The bill, however, does not carry a total appropriation of $65,000,000. It carries an appropriation of $29,300,000, that being the sum which it is estimated will be withdrawn from the Treasury during the next fiscal year on account of this authorization.

Gentlemen will understand, of course, that there is a lag of from 6 to 18 months between the time when the sums authorized to be expended by Congress are allotted to the States and the time when the withdrawal of the sums from the Treasury becomes necessary. Consequently, it is not necessary now to provide an appropriation of the total $65,000,000 authorized under this act for the fiscal year.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Looking at the hearings, on page 374, it would seem that the statement of the gentleman is not consistent with the statement made by Mr. MacDonald, of the

Highway Bureau. The latter appears to think that it is necessary to make a larger appropriation in order to meet the needs of the States in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand the statement I made. I dealt only with the authorization of $65,000,000 for the next fiscal year. I did not deal at all either with the allotment which had been made under prior authorizations or the authorization of $50,000,000 for this fiscal year. It will be necessary unquestionably to make an additional appropriation to cover the obligations which will be incurred and which will mature in the next fiscal year under the authorization of 1923. That is what Mr. MacDonald referred to in his statement. He makes the statement that it will be necessary to make an appropriation of $50,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Of course the gentleman is more familiar with the matter than I. I have only seen the report of the hearings within the last few minutes. But in making his statement these are the concluding words of Mr. MacDonald:

> This program, however, will not enable the States to proceed on so extensive a road-building program as they have been carrying during the last three fiscal years.
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. Even with the $30,000,000 appropriated?
>
> Mr. MACDONALD. With the entire $65,000,000 appropriated there would not be a sufficient amount to pay the States the sums that we paid them during the past fiscal year. That is, there is no question but what a number of States, proceeding as in the past, will need to draw their proportion of the entire $65,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is unquestionably true, but that arises primarily not from the fact that the appropriations have not been made, but on account of the fact that the authorizations contained in the act of November, 1921, were relatively less than the appropriations that we had previously made.

This is the situation that arises also: It has been the custom of the Bureau of Public Roads, under a decision made by the solicitor or by the comptroller—I do not now recall which—to segregate the sums allotted to each State, so that instead of having one sum out of which payments could be made to meet any maturing obligation we had 48 accounts, and if one State's program of road construction advanced more rapidly than others it exhausted its allotment of the fund before other States exhausted theirs. In consequence they have always had a very large balance in the roads fund, although some of the States have actually been confronted with the slowing up of their program because their particular allotment had been exhausted.

Now, I think that can be reached, and I understand it will be reached in a deficiency bill soon to be reported by a provision which makes all of the sums appropriated under all of the acts available as one fund, so that the States which are progressing on their road program can withdraw the total amount alloted to them up to the current period without reference to what may be done by other States which are lagging behind in their programs.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As I understand, the last road act authorized the appropriation of $65,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. For the year 1924.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Do I understand that $65,000,000 will be actually available for expenditure by the States during the year 1924?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; the allotments of that sum will be made and the Government will enter into contractual obligations with the States for the full amount. Now, only a portion of those obligations will mature, so as to require actual withdrawals from the Treasury during the next fiscal year. So we are only providing in this bill for the amount which will mature and require actual withdrawals during the fiscal year; but any State that wants to go ahead with its program up to the amount of its allotment during the fiscal year will be entirely able to do that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the chairman anticipate that it will be necessary to make actual appropriations during the fiscal year 1923-24 larger than the amount carried in this bill? If so, will that be done by a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think a deficiency appropriation will have to be made to cover withdrawals which will take place as a result of the authorizations for the current fiscal year. The $29,300,000 which we are appropriating here will, I think, cover all withdrawals which will result from the authorization of $65,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But if authorizations should be made for the full amount of $65,000,000 there will be no question that ample provision will be made to take care of it out of the Federal Treasury when the allotments become due?

Mr. ANDERSON. No question whatever.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman kindly state the reason why we have changed from 48 State funds to one?

Mr. ANDERSON. The reason is this: With 48 State funds there is always a large sum in the Treasury which remains idle, because the programs of the States do not progress at the same rate. The idea was to put them all in one fund, both to minimize the amount of bookkeeping necessary and to avoid keeping in the Treasury a considerable balance from year to year which was not used.

Mr. LAZARO. And then, too, it punishes the States that are a little slow in coming forward, does it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it will not do that at all, because as soon as a State comes forward the money will be there for it.

Mr. LAZARO. Provided we appropriate enough as we go forward.

Mr. ANDERSON. We will do that.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman explain the appropriation of $3,000,000 for forest roads and trails, and will the gentleman state why that appropriation is made $3,000,000 instead of $6,500,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly in the same situation, as I understand it. We undertake to cover here only the actual withdrawals of funds which will arise during the fiscal year under the authorizations, without in any way interfering with the right of the States to the total amount of the authorization.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. On page 79 of the bill is an appropriation of $103,600 to carry into effect the provisions of the grain futures act. On page 505 of the hearings the chairman of the committee [Mr. ANDERSON] asked if that act were yet in force. The statement was made that it was inoperative just now. I should like to ask the chairman will that act become operative before a decision has been handed down by the Supreme Court? Is that what is holding it up?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what is holding it up.

Mr. HILL. And this appropriation is for the administrative end of it, but it will not become effective until the constitutionality of the act is decided.

Mr. ANDERSON. My recollection is that during the current year they are using a small amount of the appropriation simply on the administrative end pending the decision as to the constitutionality of the act. That will continue to be the situation until the constitutionality of the act is determined.

Mr. HILL. It is not contemplated then to put the full administrative machinery into effect until the constitutionality of the act is decided?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. HILL. Does this appropriation include any expenditures for testing the constitutionality of the act or for the legal enforcement of the penalties and that sort of thing?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LOWREY. What is the policy set forth in this bill in regard to agricultural extension work through the agricultural colleges? Is it enlarged or diminished or not changed?

Mr. ANDERSON. We continue the appropriation upon exactly the same basis as that for the current fiscal year, neither increasing nor diminishing the amount. The Bureau of the Budget recommended reducing the appropriation by $50,000, but we did not agree to that reduction.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Does the gentleman feel that the amount of $3,000,000 carried in the appropriation bill will permit construction work to proceed as outlined in the various national forest programs?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so. That is as near as the Office of Public Roads and the rest of us could get at the probable withdrawals. If the amount should be larger than that under the authorizations it will be taken care of promptly in deficiency appropriations.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. It will not need any curtailment, then?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not at all. It is not contemplated at all.

Mr. ARENTZ. The people of the West, of course, are very much interested in this appropriation and in the program of road building that has been placed before the heads of the proper departments. I understand the gentleman to say it is his opinion that this will not be curtailed, but that the program will be carried out, and if not the money will be still available?

Mr. ANDERSON. The plan is to go ahead with the program on the basis of the total authorization of $6,500,000. We withdraw from the Treasury only the amount which will probably be required for the next fiscal year. However, if additional amounts should be required the obligations will have been created and they can be taken care of as deficiencies.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. The bill contains an item of $200,000 to provide means for the control and prevention of the spread of the European corn borer?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman make a brief statement as to the success with which the department is meeting in that work, or as to the spread of the pest?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are three major infestations, one in the territory around Boston, one in eastern New York, and one in northern Ohio and southern Michigan and western New York around Lake Erie. It has not been possible to prevent the spread of the corn borer in the Massachusetts and New England area owing to the fact that it infests all sorts of hollow-stemmed plants. It gets into the weeds alongside the garden plots and it has been impossible to eradicate it except by burning with gas flame or with chemicals of some sort. It has not been possible to control it entirely in the New England area, and probably will not be. In the area around Lake Erie there has been a very small spread of the insect in the United States but a considerable spread northeastward into Canada. The infestation is very light, indeed. The probabilities are that it will be held in control in that territory for many years to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has occupied 20 minutes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. There was authorized in the last Post Office appropriation bill for good roads an appropriation of $50,000,000 for 1923 and $65,000,000 for 1924. If I understand in looking over the bill, you make no appropriation of any part of the $50,000,000 for 1923?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we will have to take care of that by a deficiency.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. MacDonald, the head of the good roads improvement, insists that it is very important that this work should go on.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I can give the gentleman assurance that a deficiency bill will be brought in in a few days covering the withdrawals under the $50,000,000 authorization.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Does the gentleman differ with Mr. McDonald that it is needed immediately?

Mr. ANDERSON. His statement was predicated upon the continuance of the present policy of allotting the appropriations to the States as 48 separate funds.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The gentleman says that he will bring in this appropriation in a deficiency bill as needed, but I can not understand how Mr. MacDonald, the head of the road department, can close up the various contracts with the States when he does not know whether the money will be available when the money is really needed.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Congress of the United States authorizes Mr. MacDonald to enter into a contract with the several States, the Congress of the United States will make the appropriation.

Mr. KINCHELOE. But you are not doing it in this bill. Suppose we adjourn on March 4 and contracts are made during the summer and we do not meet until December?

Mr. ANDERSON. We will not adjourn on the 4th of March without taking care of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 80 there is appropriated for forest roads and trails under provisions of section 23 of the Federal highway act $3,000,000. How did the committee arrive at that $3,000,000 necessary for the purpose during the next fiscal year?

Mr. ANDERSON. The committee took the word of the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads for the amount of the withdrawals.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was unable to find anything in the hearings as to that, and I supposed it was merely an arbitrary guess on the part of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think not.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman thinks that not more than $3,000,000 will be withdrawn?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, we can not be absolutely accurate, but on the basis of what we know have been the requirements this amount would seem to be sufficient; but if it is not, it will certainly run until next December, when a deficiency can be brought in.

Mr. HAYDEN. The proviso gives the Secretary the right to enter into contractual obligations of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost of the project?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will, although I have consumed the time I had allotted to myself and am now speaking in the time of other gentlemen.

Mr. McKENZIE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question about the corn-borer appropriation. As I understand it, it is quite prevalent in Canada. The gentleman has stated the different localities on our northern border where it is prevalent. It is my understanding that in that locality this particular pest only lives one generation.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true in northern Michigan and Ohio, but it is not true in New England.

Mr. McKENZIE. If it gets into the Corn Belt of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa there will be two generations, and it will be absolutely impossible to control it, and therefore it is the purpose, as I understand, of the committee to make every effort to hold this pest in the locality where it is now.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the policy of the committee to give them every dollar they said was necessary to put into effect every measure for the control of this pest.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the chairman state what, if any, active cooperation there is between the Federal authorities and the State as regards the eradication and control of the corn borer.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not give the gentleman offhand the amount actually appropriated by the States. If the gentleman will remember, last year a proviso was agreed to that made $75,000 of the appropriation contingent on the subscription of an equal amount by the States.

Mr. TREADWAY. That does not appear in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it does.

Mr. TREADWAY. Does the item of $200,000 depend on the cooperation of the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; not the full sum, but $75,000 of it does.

Mr. TREADWAY. Just one other reference along that same line. To what extent does the department feel that the spread is under any fair amount of control, particularly in Massachusetts or in New England?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has not been possible to control completely the spread of the insect in New England, and probably will not be.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I realize, of course, that the gentleman's committee is an appropriating committee and not a legislative committee. But what has the committee done with regard to effecting a better marketing system? I notice, with regard to the radio distribution of market news, there are only five cities that broadcast this radio information—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Chicago. The gentleman is very much interested in enlarging that, is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no restriction upon the number of cities which can take advantage of the broadcasting of market news. I think the gentleman probably has reference to the leased-wire service rather than to the radio service.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am referring to page 442 of the hearings. The farmers in my country say that they want one thing particularly from Congress, and that is a better marketing system. I know the gentleman is considered to be one of the best friends that agriculture has in the House. What is being done, constructively, to effect a better marketing system?

Mr. ANDERSON. We are carrying a very considerably increased appropriation in this bill for work along marketing lines, through appropriations for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which has direct charge of that work—a larger increase than in any other bureau in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. And eventually the whole country will get the benefit of this radio broadcasting system?

Mr. ANDERSON. I see no reason why not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In reference to the item of enforcement of the food and drug act, which is increased from $671,401 to $704,401, I notice that on page 202 of the hearings the statement was made that we now have less than 40 inspectors where we formerly had a staff of 51 inspectors. Is the increase of $33,000 provided for the purpose of putting back the 51 inspectors they formerly had?

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course the $33,000 would not put back 51 inspectors.

Mr. HILL. But it would put back the difference, would it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; the idea is to restore the item to its previous basis.

Mr. HILL. The testimony was that the enforcement of the drug act was more difficult than formerly.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is.

Mr. HILL. And they wanted the same number that they formerly had, and this puts it back to 51?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. That is the expectation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am not in full accord with my associates on the Appropriation Committee. Usually we are harmonious upon this subcommittee and generally I can see no reason why men who are sincere and intelligent can not agree on any proposition for the interest of our common country. Such has been my course whenever and wherever it is possible to cooperate with my colleagues. I can say that so far as I am concerned no partisan action has ever divided the committee. But I find myself not in accord with its action in respect to the cooperative fund for the construction of public roads throughout the Nation, and I have been requested by some of my colleagues to state the facts, that the House may understand clearly the actual condition that exists. The proposal in this bill to remedy those conditions and to suggest what is left to be remedied or corrected hereafter which is an urgent and indispensable duty.

The Post Office appropriation bill last year authorized three sums for the construction of public roads. The first was the sum of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923. This bill before us does not carry one cent in fulfillment of that authorization.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The last appropriation did not, as I understand.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That was not an appropriation. It was merely an authorization in the Post Office bill, and no legislation of any character has been passed making available one cent of the $50,000,000, and this bill fails to do so. The second authorization in the Post Office appropriation bill last year was the sum of $65,000,000 authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924. This bill carries an appropriation of $29,300,000 of the $65,000,000 for the next fiscal year. To save my soul I can not appreciate the reason for skipping the authorization of 1923 and appropriated under the authorization of 1924.

This same act, the Post Office appropriation act, last year authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion among the several States the $50,000,000. Forty-eight million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the $50,000,000 has been apportioned to the respective States by the Secretary in accordance with the good roads act. More than $16,000,000 of the $50,000,000 has been actually obligated to the States, and when I say "obligated" I mean actually contracted to the States, upon projects submitted by them for the improvement of their public roads. Yet we carry not one cent of appropriation in this bill to fulfill those obligations by the Federal Government to the State governments. It would have been far better had this bill carried the appropriation of $50,000,000 authorized for the fiscal year 1923 and not carried one cent for the fiscal year 1924. We should merely have confirmed the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to apportion and obligate the appropriation of $65,000,000 for the fiscal year 1924.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. If we continue this policy, what will happen to the States that have contracted with parties to build roads?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I was advised yesterday over the phone by the Bureau of Good Roads that they expected some of these obligations to fall due and payment to be demanded within a few weeks; and practically every month until next December, or until we pass the next appropriation bill, some of these obligations will fall due, and the States will have to wait for the money, and the Federal Government will have failed to fulfill its obligations.

Mr. LAZARO. Will not that stop road building?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; the Secretary of Agriculture has been authorized by Congress in the same act to apportion this money and enter into contract.

Mr. LAZARO. But will not those obligations fall due and the Federal Government be unprepared to pay, and will not that discourage the States in building the roads?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It might have a discouraging influence upon some States and retard them from entering into these obligations. It might be used in some counties throughout the States in bond elections in States, where in a special instance a certain State has completed its contract and where the Federal Government has not fulfilled its contract.

It might be used by politicians to that effect; I do not know. The plan I advocate is that whenever and wherever this Government gives its plighted word in an act of Congress to perform certain obligations to a State, it ought to be ready to perform that obligation according to the letter of the law and the latter of the agreement.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. What practical objection could there be to carrying the $50,000,000 appropriation for the current fiscal year on this bill rather than postponing it for the uncertain enactment of some deficiency bill in the future?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The only objection I have heard is that the various States do not use promptly their proportion of the allotment of this $50,000,000, and therefore some of it will remain unused but segregated in the Treasury.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But it will be in the Treasury.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It will be in the Treasury and will not be lost, of course; but it may remain there one year or it may remain there two years or it may remain there for three years under the good roads act.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I hope the gentleman will propose an amendment increasing the appropriation of $50,000,000 so as to cover the item which Congress authorized for the current fiscal year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am informed this morning by one of my colleagues on this committee that the deficiency committee was going to take care of any obligation under this $50,000,000 authorization. Maybe they can and maybe they can not. In order to do so they will have to carry legislation upon an appropriation bill. They can not do it without running the risk of the good roads fund losing a portion of this $50,000,000 by Congress losing the authority to appropriate it. Let us analyze it for a minute.

This Post Office act authorized an appropriation of $50,000,000 for the year 1923, and if you permit that year to elapse before we make that appropriation then we have lost authority to appropriate under that act. The only way the $50,000,000 authorization under the act can be preserved beyond the fiscal year is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to contract it during the fiscal year, and in order to do so in a deficiency bill we will have to carry legislation to that effect which is contrary to the rules of the House. Secondly, you can not always contract promptly. Many of the States are not ready to contract within the year. They have to hold elections for the issuance of bonds, and sometimes an election is defeated and another is ordered; and many of the States delay a long time, and the attorneys of the legal department have to approve the bonds, and before they can be sold many of the States have difficulty in selling and are thus tied up. Some States take one year, some take two years, and some take three years before they get ready to assume the obligation. Suppose a portion of this money is not obligated during the fiscal year at all? I do not care what the character of legislation, the deficiency bill must carry an authorization for the Secretary to obligate it. Suppose as a matter of fact it does not obligate a portion of it. Then Congress loses its power to appropriate the money and the good roads funds loses the portion of it that is unobligated. How much is obligated now? It has been stated that in six months only $16,000,000 have been obligated, and it is reasonable to suppose that in the next six months we would obligate no more than $16,000,000 even if we had the authority. Therefore, if we do not make this appropriation and depend upon some deficiency bill to make it, the good roads fund and the good roads movement stand in imminent danger of losing all that portion of its unobligated funds at the expiration of this fiscal year ending June 30 next.

Now, then, gentlemen, let me discuss another feature, the necessity for the appropriation of this $50,000,000. Does the

necessity exist? Where do we go to get the information? We can only go to the good roads department and to those States that have entered into obligations and which will soon demand payment. Now, let me read you a few lines from the testimony of Mr. MacDonald, chief of that bureau. Speaking of the $50,000,000, he says:

Contractual obligations of the sort referred to in the preceding paragraph have already been entered into with many of the States, and with the exhaustion of the appropriated funds apportioned to these States there will be no funds to pay vouchers rendered by them on account of construction work done under the terms of these contractual obligations.

Then a little later on, now mind you, the mutual obligations of one State can not be paid out of the portion that has been allotted another State. The Comptroller General has so held and the department recognizes that ruling.

We need an immediate appropriation for all the States of the $50,000,000 authorized for 1923.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me read this statement. Here is the conclusion of Mr. MacDonald:

Our conclusions, as stated above, are that there should be an immediate appropriation of the $50,000,000 authorized for 1923, an immediate authorization to apportion the $65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1924, and an immediate appropriation of $30,000,000 from the $65,000,000 authorization, to be followed by an appropriation of the balance of the authorization by January 1, 1924.

That is the statement of Mr. MacDonald, in a prepared statement delivered to the subcommittee, showing that we will need an appropriation of $50,000,000 for 1923, $30,000,000 appropriation for 1924, and an appropriation of the balance of $65,000,000 for 1924 by January 1, 1924.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is it the only reason that the gentleman has ever heard for not appropriating the total of $50,000,000 for 1923—that there might remain at the end of the fiscal year an unexpended balance to some of the States that had not been taken advantage of?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is absolutely the only reason.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is there not an additional reason on the part of those opposing this? Heretofore we have always appropriated for the whole year.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; you have always appropriated for the whole year.

Mr. KINCHELOE. What reason do they who are opposing the $50,000,000 give for skipping that for 1923 and appropriating $29,000,000 for 1924?

Mr. BUCHANAN. You know they want to make the appropriations come within the amounts fixed by the Budget.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Roads or no roads?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; roads or no roads, or anything else. Now, that is about all on that question. I have tried to state to you the plain and simple facts; and if we pass this bill in its present condition, without the amendment, we shall have to depend upon the deficiency committee not only to bring in an appropriation to cover a matter that is not a deficiency—because it has not yet matured—and perhaps depend on that committee to bring in legislation to preserve the balance of that appropriation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. As I understand, then, the States that have made contracts for the building of roads will be taken care of under this bill, while those States like Texas, for example, that have not made contracts, will not be taken care of?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir; no State, whether it has made contracts or not, will be taken care of under the $50,000,000 authorization for 1923. There is not one iota of money in the Treasury or in this bill that will meet the obligations under the authorization of 1923.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I am glad my colleague has explained that, because some of my colleagues on this side had the impression that the States that had made contracts will be taken care of, but that those States that had not made contracts will not be taken care of.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They will, we presume, be taken care of ultimately, but there is no provision in this bill, nor in any other statute, to take care of them; and if they are taken care of it must be by legislation.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. KING. Was there any evidence before the Budget Bureau or any evidence taken by the Budget Bureau to show the situation?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not know as to that.

Mr. KING. You do not know of any evidence being taken by them or any inquiry being made by them?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No. All I know is that the Secretary of Agriculture sent to the Budget Bureau a message recommending and requesting that this $50,000,000 for 1923 be included in the estimate, as well as the $65,000,000 under the estimate for 1924.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. What will be done now under the bill unless the amendment of the gentleman is adopted?

Mr. BUCHANAN. What will happen will be that obligations maturing will have to be taken care of by deficiency bills.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman understand that Congress will not be in session after March 4?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes. I think one of the greatest curses that could afflict the American people would be an extra session of Congress. The country needs a rest. It needs to find out what the laws are that are now on the statute books, and it needs a rest from the disturbing conditions that now exist and from the discussion of many false nostrums that are urged as a remedy for imaginary evils that are now suffered by the people. That is why I am pressing this measure, to help to avoid the necessity of an extra session. We should not leave one item in any appropriation bill unattended to, that could be used as an excuse for calling an extra session.

Mr. BRIGGS. Unless the appropriation is made to meet this situation, either the road building will have to stop or we will have to have a special session to meet the deficiency?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I think the road building will go on, but I think the States would have to wait for the money after the money is due.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman does not approve of that?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The States can only raise their money by bond issues. Suppose they have not sufficient funds to take care of this matter. Then would not the road building stop?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The contracts would have to stop. Now, so much, gentlemen, for the road proposition. All this situation, this condition, in the road matter is absolutely brought about by the Budget Bureau, and it seems to be the desire of Members of Congress and of the Committee on Appropriations to pass bills within the limit of the amount fixed by the Budget, and not to exceed the Budget in the totals carried by the bills. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the recommendations of the Budget as recommendations, but as recommendations only.

I believe in economy, but I believe in intelligent economy. There are two kinds of economists in this House, and there are two kinds of economists in the country. One is the intelligent economist; the other is the "damn-fool economist." [Laughter.] The intelligent economist cuts an appropriation where the results obtained from that appropriation do not justify the expenditure. The intelligent economist will not hesitate to increase an appropriation where the results obtained from that appropriation will redound to the benefit of the American people, and will be large enough to justify the expenditure. Such is my position.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it not true that there is a car shortage in the country now and freight rates are prohibitive? Would it be good economy to stop the building of good roads?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not think so. I believe it would be the reverse.

Now, to illustrate: We had the people from the Agricultural Department before our committee. What did we find? We found that in the estimates, before they were passed by the Budget Bureau, large sums were asked for, and that those sums were cut. Regardless of whether it was justifiable or not, they were cut. What else do we find? We find that to stamp out the "black-stem rust" in wheat $350,000 was estimated. That sum was estimated to stamp out that injurious fungus. It was a large appropriation. They cut it to $200,000 or $150,000. The Budget Committee cut it, though the Department of Agriculture had conducted an extensive campaign in the 13 States which raised spring wheat.

What the department did has aroused the sentiment of the people of those States and convinced them that black-stem rust could be stamped out by the extermination of the barberry bush. They have State organizations, and never in the history of this country has public sentiment been in a better condition to secure the eradication of black-stem rust than it is to-day. Yet the Bureau of the Budget cut the appropriation $150,000, which would cripple the work and allow the fungus or insect, or whatever it is, to breed and increase and spread. I was a member of the subcommittee which considered this matter. The stamping out of black-stem rust does not concern my State. Wheat is grown in my section of the country, but

in that southern climate there are many perennial grasses, upon which the black-stem rust can feed, and for that reason we have no hope of its eradication. None of the eradication work has been done down there, but I did not hesitate one minute to make a motion to override the Budget and to increase the amount back to $350,000. And I stand here willing to vote $500,000, if necessary, because by expending that amount now when the hour is timely and while the iron is hot we can completely eradicate it—a fact which has been conclusively demonstrated.

Again, for the stamping out of the cattle tick there was another large appropriation. The Budget Bureau cut that appropriation. The Budget Bureau cut that appropriation largely at a time when the same conditions exist which are favorable to the destruction of the cattle tick as those which existed with reference to destroying the black rust of wheat. We increased that appropriation.

The same condition applied to rodents and animals that injuriously affect agriculture and live stock. We increased that appropriation. Therefore, gentlemen, I say I have absolutely no respect for the intelligence of the Bureau of the Budget on propositions like this. I am forced to believe that for some reason they are not acquainted with the agricultural affairs of this Nation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUDSPETH. In view of the great importance of stamping out the cattle tick, and in view of the fact that it is estimated by competent men that in stamping it out in Texas the value of all clean cattle is increased from $3 to $5 per head, does the gentleman think his committee has appropriated a sufficient amount for the carrying on of that important work?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is the same appropriation that we had last year. We put it back to that. I would not object to increasing it further, because the department is well organized with an effective force; and if you can act promptly and stamp out these things, it is an economy to do it, because by allowing these pests to continue from year to year you permit them to multiply and increase. Therefore I believe in taking effective measures promptly.

Let me tell you something. Of all the activities of the Agricultural Department, I care not what branch you may select, the branch that deals with injurious insects and animals and other pests that affect and destroy agricultural production is the most important in the whole department, and we should not make stinted and miserly appropriations to destroy those pests that inflict such great damage upon the yearly production of our agriculture. I will not hesitate to support all appropriations that the department can economically expend in its fight against these pests.

I have here in my hand a statement covering the past 14 years of the activities of the Agricultural Department in its fight against insects and other pests that are committing ravages upon the agricultural production of the Nation. It is astounding to see the damage that has been inflicted upon the American people through the ravages of these pests. We have made considerable appropriations to fight them, and every appropriation to conduct that fight has redounded to our benefit far more than the amount of the appropriations. So long as I am on this Agricultural Committee I am going to continue to fight for liberal appropriations to stamp out these pests, of whatever character and description, and in whatever section of the country they may be found. [Applause.]

Mr. JONES of Texas. I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I notice on page 65 of the bill that provision is made for the maintenance of the department which handles the collection, publishing, and distributing of market information by wire and otherwise. I observe that the amount carried for that purpose has been reduced below the amount of last year's appropriation. Does the gentleman think this amount is sufficient to provide for the proper distribution of this market information that has been so much in demand throughout the country?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We think so. The radio is in its infancy, and being tested out. There is no doubt in my mind that it will be a success. We think the amount appropriated is sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There was provision made last year, and then the amount was increased a little later, to provide for the dissemination of market information by wire or otherwise throughout the eastern part of the United States, and to practically all of the States east of the Mississippi River.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We are getting it in Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They increased it a little and have carried it to one or two points beyond, and there seems to be quite a demand for it. As I understand they can distribute this information by radio at less than they can by wire. Is it so arranged that they can distribute it all over the country by radio or just to certain sections?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They can distribute it all over the country by radio wherever you find a radio station that will take it. Of course, the Federal Government does not own the radio stations in Texas.

Mr. JONES of Texas. According to the hearings they have established stations for that purpose at Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Chicago.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They did not establish the station at Austin. They use the station there to transmit the information.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Those are not the only stations that they can use?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; there is no limitation on the stations that can be used, and if the gentleman will take it up with the Secretary of Agriculture I have no doubt he can make arrangements to have the service extended.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I wondered if the appropriation was sufficient to enable that to be done.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not know. We can not anticipate every imaginable demand to be made for the establishment of new radio stations or any other new establishment. Perhaps if the gentleman had taken it up with the Secretary of Agriculture before the estimates came in, he might have included that in his estimates. I do not know.

Mr. JONES of Texas. There is very great demand for it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the gentleman that while there appears to be a reduction in this item there is an actual increase, owing to the fact that a considerable amount, $18,000, has been transferred to another item. That is the statutory roll. So that while there is an apparent decrease there is really an increase.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is that sum to be paid for the officers who do this work?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. This is where we carried certain clerical employees. These employees have been transferred to the statutory roll so that that amount can be used for other purposes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask if this appropriation provides for all the services that are now being maintained?

Mr. ANDERSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; it does. But these important matters are not so serious as some that frown upon our individual prosperity and menace our governmental life. These various and vicious pests, which are so troublesome to our agriculture, must be controlled or exterminated; for their activity means suffering and their scourge is the plague of dire distress.

Our food crops, by which we live, and the apparel by which we are kept in healthful comfort and working condition depend upon successful agriculture. And our richest soils are in vain if their products are subject to the ravages of these devastating insect drives.

Of course, the sections more interested in the food cereals, essential to our living, have their singular experiences; and their crops are subject to the peculiar parasites that prey upon field and crib, and the growing plant life and the harvested grain are alike subjected to the destruction of their voracious hunger.

Of these trials the great wheat-growing sections have their day, and at times their wails monopolize the columns of our news journals. The black-stem rust destroyed 200,000,000 bushels of wheat in one year. Our sympathies go out to the grain grower wherever adversity depletes his purse or whenever his dependent loved ones are cramped by remorseless failure and he can not provide the comforts and necessities of life.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that these field vermin, which have been scientifically classified under the sonorous term of entomology, and luxuriate on the life blood of trade and commerce, have no friend in the human race. And what means are needed for the protection and salvage of our living interest would be generously forthcoming if every legislator were posted by an intimate knowledge of the facts.

Let an intelligent observer behold the splendid spectacle of great fields of wheat or corn as they roll in billows of golden glory, ripening under the alchemy of the harvest sunshine, or

standing in serried ranks of living green, aflame with banners of silk and tassel! When he sees that scene of matchless beauty and promise stripped of its hope and dead and shriveled by the remorseless sweep of the tempest or the scourage of devouring swarms he is ready and anxious to come to the rescue of the grain grower by any means in his power.

Or, Mr. Chairman, the vision of what has been so common in our fields of the South is equally appalling in the realm of king cotton. That uncrowned monarch, so often the theme of the gifted pen, wields the scepter of command wherever the human body must be clothed, wherever fashion holds sway and knows the potential dominion of the fleecy staple.

No more consummate tragedy is enacted than in the periodic disaster of the cotton industry. When the planting crisis is past and the critical "chopping out" process has presented the stand of tender plants, the grower contemplates the prospects in hope and in fear, for great expectations may be realized and great disasters may befall. The torrent and the lurking leaf worm has often blasted the young stem and leaf and driven to distraction the anxious cotton planter who knows the furtive genius of the crawling enemy; and his heart quakes as he remembers the storm cloud and the sudden descent of the resistless cyclone.

I think there can be nothing more attractive to the agriculturist than the maturing and developing field of luxuriant cotton. The rich dark green of its foliage over an abounding acreage is indeed an emerald sea; and when its "squares" burst into snow white and change, in turn, to blooming red flowers and the swelling boll opens its casket to reveal its tuft of immaculate fleecy fiber, it presents a unique and variegated beauty, characteristic of no other bush or plant.

And when, on some fine day, as he inspects the developing crop and sniffs an aromatic odor his heart sinks, for he recognizes the telltale scent of ruin. In the interval of a single day his luxuriant field may be swept of every leaf, for the caterpillar in countless myriads is no laggard, and its ravages leave no verdant bud or leaf. The instant duty and only recourse are the arsenical supply and application, discovered after years of trial and experiment to be the fulfillment of his dreams and the realization of his successful weapon of defense.

Again at another time as the same picture of apparent prosperity delights his soul, he sees nor smells a warning; not a sign of danger is apparent as he looks over his splendid prospects, but something is lacking. On looking closely he finds in all that field of a thousand acres, more or less, that not a single fully developed square or incipient boll can be found. Then he knows that the deadliest enemy of the maturing cotton has done and is doing its fatal work. The Mexican boll weevil, the most deadly and destructive pest known to the cotton field and its most indestructible enemy, has stung and blasted every swelling and immature cotton square and boll, and the loss of the crop is complete.

It is not correct to think that the American people and our economic forces have been oblivious or designedly neglectful in resisting these ruinous encroachments upon the products of our soil. The proper indictment is that our efforts have been feeble; our fighting strength has been inadequate and crippled because of insufficient appropriation. Let us look into this for a moment.

We have the figures covering the fiscal years 1910 to 1923, inclusive, "showing the appropriations for fighting insects and diseases affecting plants and animals available to the Agricultural Department." These amounts can easily be quoted in detail, but a summary serves our purpose and saves time.

SUMMARY.

Appropriations available to Department of Agriculture for fighting insects and diseases affecting plants and animals during the 14-year period, 1910-1923.

(1) BY YEARS.

Fiscal year.	For research.	For service and regulatory work, including eradication.	Total.
1910	$403,280	$1,150,000	$1,553,280
1911	403,885	1,148,000	1,551,885
1912	457,325	1,102,540	1,559,865
1913	521,475	1,155,840	1,677,315
1914	588,275	1,940,000	2,528,275
1915	724,415	3,930,520	4,654,935
1916	743,100	4,236,580	4,979,680
1917	901,710	3,446,590	5,348,300
1918	1,025,340	4,124,330	5,149,670
1919	1,101,310	4,703,300	5,804,610
1920	1,262,070	6,235,003	7,588,073
1921	1,325,380	6,651,518	6,976,898
1922	1,465,200	6,833,590	7,898,790
1923	1,501,205	6,938,910	8,440,115
Total for 14-year period	12,514,870	52,101,821	64,616,691

SUMMARY—Continued.

Appropriations available to Department of Agriculture for fighting insects and diseases affecting plants and animals, etc.—Continued.

(2) BY BUREAUS AND YEARS.

Fiscal year.	For research.	For service and regulatory work, including eradication.	Total.
Bureau of Animal Industry:			
1910	$109,000	$850,000	$959,000
1911	108,000	848,000	956,000
1912	78,680	817,700	896,380
1913	78,680	825,000	903,680
1914	78,680	1,579,000	1,657,680
1915	77,360	3,500,520	3,577,880
1916	85,940	3,756,580	3,842,520
1917	173,020	2,790,180	2,963,200
1918	166,660	2,714,880	2,881,540
1919	171,620	3,226,302	3,397,922
1920	170,180	4,426,205	4,596,385
1921	150,920	3,556,920	3,707,840
1922	150,920	4,313,920	4,464,840
1923	156,520	4,602,720	4,759,240
Total, 14-year period	1,756,180	37,807,927	39,564,107
Bureau of Plant Industry:			
1910	105,880		105,880
1911	102,985		102,985
1912	136,695		136,695
1913	140,045		140,045
1914	154,345		154,345
1915	231,685		231,685
1916	241,790		241,790
1917	307,040	270,000	577,040
1918	377,330	730,000	1,107,330
1919	400,590	630,448	1,031,038
1920	479,270	567,048	1,046,318
1921	472,670	471,088	943,758
1922	488,150	326,920	815,070
1923	508,555	830,000	1,338,555
Total, 14-year period	4,147,030	3,825,504	7,972,534
Bureau of Entomology:			
1910	188,400	300,000	488,400
1911	192,900	300,000	492,900
1912	241,950	294,840	536,790
1913	302,750	305,840	608,590
1914	355,250	321,000	676,250
1915	415,370	330,000	745,370
1916	415,370	330,000	745,370
1917	421,650	325,050	746,700
1918	478,250	325,050	803,300
1919	504,100	323,250	827,350
1920	678,620	573,250	1,251,870
1921	683,790	894,200	1,577,990
1922	808,130	814,200	1,602,330
1923	818,130	819,200	1,637,330
Total, 14-year period	6,507,660	6,245,880	12,753,540
Forest Service:			
1922		130,000	130,000
Bureau of Biological Survey:			
1921	13,000		13,000
1922	13,000		13,000
1923	13,000		13,000
Total, 3-year period	39,000		39,000
Federal Horticultural Board:			
1913		25,000	25,000
1914		40,000	40,000
1915		100,000	100,000
1916		150,000	150,000
1917		61,360	61,360
1918		354,500	354,500
1919	25,000	523,300	548,300
1920	25,000	668,500	693,500
1921	5,000	729,310	734,310
1922	5,000	753,550	758,550
1923	5,000	686,990	691,990
Total, 11-year period	65,000	4,092,510	4,157,510

(3) BY BUREAUS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR 14-YEAR PERIOD, 1910-1923.

Bureau of Animal Industry:			
Inspection and quarantine		$7,676,642	$7,676,642
Tuberculosis eradication	$76,000	9,281,840	9,356,840
Eradication of cattle ticks		6,920,900	6,920,900
Animal disease investigations	1,462,880		1,462,880
Hog cholera	218,300	2,451,425	2,669,725
Control of viruses, serums, etc.		1,381,320	1,381,320
Dourine eradication		695,800	695,800
Foot-and-mouth disease		9,400,000	9,400,000
Bureau of Plant Industry:			
Plant-disease investigations	694,670		694,670
Fruit diseases	852,695		852,695
Disease of forest and shade trees	836,610		836,610
Cotton, truck, and forage-crop diseases	834,680		834,680
Cereal diseases	966,705	944,400	1,911,105
Tobacco diseases	41,670		41,670
Pine blister rust control		1,435,344	1,435,344
Eradication of citrus canker		1,445,760	1,445,760

SUMMARY—Continued.

Appropriations available to Department of Agriculture for fighting insects and diseases affecting plants and animals, etc.—Continued.

(3) BY BUREAUS AND APPROPRIATIONS FOR 14-YEAR PERIOD, 1910–1923—CON.

Fiscal year.	For research.	For service and regulatory work, including eradication.	Total.
Bureau of Entomology:			
Deciduous fruit insects	$1,252,320		$1,252,320
Cereal and forage insects	1,502,700		1,502,700
Southern field-crop insects	1,149,920		1,149,920
Forest insects	640,030		640,030
Truck-crop and stored-product insects	832,840		832,840
Tropical and subtropical plant insects	336,800	$57,600	394,400
Mediterranean fruit fly	106,400	160,400	266,800
Miscellaneous insects (including insects affecting man and domestic animals)	661,650		661,650
Preventing spread of moths		4,782,880	4,782,880
European corn borer		1,125,000	1,125,000
Mexican bean beetle	25,000	100,000	125,000
Insect infestations, forest and other public lands in Oregon and California		20,000	20,000
Federal Horticultural Board:			
Enforcement of plant quarantine act		721,570	721,570
Domestic potato quarantine		150,000	150,000
Potato wart extermination		135,900	135,900
Eradication of date scale		28,000	28,000
Pink bollworm of cotton	65,000	3,057,040	3,122,040
Forest Service:			
Insect infestations, Oregon and California		130,000	130,000
Bureau of Biological Survey:			
Diseases of reindeer	39,000		39,000
Grand total, 14-year period	12,514,870	52,101,821	64,616,691

(4) BY BUREAUS FOR 14-YEAR PERIOD, 1910–1923.

Bureau of Animal Industry	$1,756,180	$37,807,927	$39,564,107
Bureau of Plant Industry	4,147,030	3,825,504	7,972,534
Forest Service		130,000	130,000
Bureau of Biological Survey	39,000		39,000
Bureau of Entomology	6,507,660	6,245,880	12,753,540
Federal Horticultural Board	65,000	4,092,510	4,157,510
Total	12,514,870	52,101,821	64,616,691

These appropriations and disbursements of governmental expenses are solely for operations against the predatory insects that destroy so largely our agricultural wealth. They are not extravagant in truth when we weigh and measure our great Commonwealth and realize how infinite and various is our resourceful country. It dawns on our consciousness that for such a stupendous task as a successful war with our countless infinitesimal and aggressive foe, against which we are pitted for God and humanity, our provided equipment has been illiberal and even contemptible.

The billions and billions of wealth we enjoy by the agricultural pursuits of our people constitute a class—aye, a veritable guild—consecrated and entitled to the worship of mankind. As a people we should give precedence to what might be appropriately favored as the one class for which legislation can not be invidious, for it is the class on which humanity has depended, and which supplies our living necessities, and it is assuredly the class to which we are indebted always and to the limit. The pagans of antiquity were by every count and consideration justified in their ascription of divinity to Ceres, their goddess of husbandry.

Mr. Chairman, our people should be commended for the most drastic warfare we have been able to wage against these predatory enemies of our agricultural products. The swarms that infest our crops, and which are as noisome and injurious as the plagues of Egypt, are by no means an insignificant barrier to progressive life, but are a menace to life itself.

If we could obliterate them, the grain and textile producers of our race would gratefully erect a monument in honor of our achievement. It would be a wonderful blessing to the planting and hungry world. And yet these creeping myriads but follow their instinctive law of existence, and beyond the demands of hunger they ask nothing. Their depredations, however ravaging and deplorable, are the visitations of a periodic scourge which we may successfully resist and finally defeat.

But the sectional and partisan game of politics seems to be based on an unfathomable spirit of lurking malice, selfishness in design and ruthless in application. This animus to which I allude is born and lives in the atmosphere of the most malignant of our human exhalations. It thrives on the unholy schemes of expediency. It is easily traced. An individual trained in profit and loss until obsessed by the venom of selfish greed is irresistibly the tool of personal passion and, by partisan bias, political expediency is easily confounded and confused with political principle. It is the motive thought of every agent with an "ax to grind."

That these insinuations and accusations are true, there is undeniably abundant evidence, by common repute and by the testimony of fact.

On Saturday, December 16th instant, a notable exposure of disgraceful conditions was aired on the Senate floor by Senator SMITH, of South Carolina, as he pointed out the outrageous discrimination by which agriculture is compelled to suffer at the hands of political partisanship.

In that disclosure the discussion centered around the quotation from President Harding's message before Congress, in which the President took occasion to stress the deplorable condition of the farming interest throughout the country and recommended remedial legislation. How monstrous the fact that in behalf of the class that feeds and clothes us remedial legislation is deemed necessary. Since then the Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings looking for some way to return to normalcy. But normalcy seems a mythical term except as it applies by comparison favorably to other industries than that of the planter and stock raiser. It was shown in the discussion that the Committee on Agriculture was visited by representative men of affairs, who had knowledge of the terrible calamity which fell upon our agricultural interests without warning, when the price of farm products and cattle raising went down to a point that meant bankruptcy.

These allegations and denunciations were justified by excerpts from the administration newspapers and reports, and from cited instances showing that the manufacturing and speculative operators had profited by incredible per cents and dividends, while the toilers on farm and ranch were unable to realize the cost of production in the markets of the country.

To substantiate the above statement, I will cite only a few of many instances wherein the manufacturing industries are reaping an enormous profit at the expense of the American consumer and the agricultural interests of our Nation. Wanskuck Co., manufacturers of worsted, recently voted to distribute among themselves a 1,500 per cent stock dividend. The New York Manufacturing Co. of Minnesota, which makes cotton cloth, doubled their capitalization and declared a 100 per cent stock dividend. The Oakdale (R. I.) Worsted Co., after increasing its capital stock from $60,000 to $540,000, declared an 800 per cent stock dividend. The Merrimac Woolen Co. increased its capital stock from $750,000 to $1,000,000 and, in addition, declared a large dividend. The New Bedford Cotton Mills Corporation declared a stock dividend of 200 per cent. The textile manufacturers of Fall River, Mass., declared dividend for the year 1922 amounting on an average to 9,324 per cent. There are other instances in which the great industrial corporations have declared dividends as high as 3,000 per cent. Something is radically wrong with any government whose institutions and laws are so framed that the great industrial manufacturing corporations can realize such immense profit, while the foundation, the agricultural interest of the Nation, which sustains the entire superstructure, is continuously threatened with bankruptcy and ruin.

Our great problem is to make a correct diagnosis of the evil and correct that evil, even though it takes major surgery in order to completely restore the patient.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary.

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On December 16, 1922:

H. R. 540. An act for the relief of Bradley Sykes;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of William Malone; and

H. R. 1862. An act for the relief of Leroy Fisher.

On December 18, 1922:

H. R. 8062. An act amending subdivision (5) of section 302 of the war risk insurance act.

On December 19, 1922:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 32 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in the limited time at my disposal it is very difficult to say very much on any subject that should receive much study from Members, as the House will appreciate. In yesterday's RECORD, in the speech by Senator BROOKHART, appear a number of statements on stock dividends that I commend to the reading of Members of the House. I will attach some data to my remarks as well. A few days ago the National City Bank of New York defended what they called social wealth, with the understanding that the stock dividends that were turned over for the purpose of conducting the business of a concern was "social wealth," and that the people of the country who created the "social wealth" ought to be satisfied with its present whereabouts, notwithstanding the income tax laws we have failed to reach a large part of the social wealth when it is placed in stock dividends.

I have only the time to read briefly from a statement of the National City Bank of New York which was placed by the bank on the desk of every Congressman. This is very high authority, and as the bank speaks from a standpoint not ordinarily taken by the average legislator I believe it should be answered, to show the position we are obliged to take when legislating.

Under the pressure of time, I am going to read only briefly from the statement sent out by the bank. This statement, in the form of a circular, was issued by the National City Bank of New York City for December, 1922, and sent to every Congressman and to banks generally. It contains a carefully prepared defense of the $775,000,000 ten-year net profits, or 77½ per cent annual net profits, of Standard Oil of New Jersey, and concludes with the statement:

> The wealth employed in industry is social wealth no matter who owns it. * * * The soviet revolutionists of Russia had a theory that leadership in industry counted for nothing. * * * The soviet leaders have modified their policies very materially in the past year as the result of practical experience. * * * The same old doctrines, however, are widespread in the United States, and the clamor for increased taxation of wealth is largely by people who favor it as a means of distributing the accumulation of wealth that exists. * * * The country will not be safe from such proposals until the fundamental fallacy that runs through all of them is generally understood.

The bank justifies a $775,000,000 net profit in 10 years on the capitalization of Standard Oil of New Jersey, or 77½ per cent annual net profit on $100,000,000, and excuses a 900 per cent surplus of Standard Vacuum Oil and others of like character, including a 16,000 per cent stock dividend of the Brown-Sharpe Manufacturing Co., of Rhode Island, that increases its stock through profits from $100,000 to $16,000,000, freed from present taxes.

THE BANK AND STANDARD OIL.

First, it should be noted, the National City Bank is reported to control Standard Oil's activities. It stretches out its hands all over the universe, reaching to the islands of the sea, far distant Africa, and the Central American and South American Republics, while its great power is recognized by the world. It says in this statement in effect that the accumulation by one man in a lifetime, through Standard Oil manipulations, of wealth reaching, according to estimates, over $2,000,000,000 on an original capital of a sixpence is "social wealth no matter who owns it." That is to say, it is immaterial whether Mr. Rockefeller as one man owns the money or whether it is possessed by the people generally who were squeezed out of that sum. It contends the same is equally true of thousands of our multimillionaires who began wealth on a shoestring, all of whom are comprehended in the National City Bank's unique defense of "social wealth."

THE BANK'S OFFICERS AS WITNESSES.

When witnesses voluntarily take the stand, it is customary to inquire as to their general views, particularly if they assume to speak for other parties or for their country which they fear may become impregnated with sovietism. Among such witnesses we note James Stillman, a recent president of the National City Bank, who belied his name with an unenviable notoriety gained while spending the patrimony of his dad. He is a standing justification for a stiff inheritance tax, because the "social wealth" he inherited was of doubtful value to himself or to the public generally. In fact, a relationship may occur to some minds between the cognomen Stillman and Standpatter that is found in the modern vernacular.

Mr. Frank Vanderlip, a former vice president of the National City Bank, in assuming to speak for this country, for France and England, and for the universe generally, stated in a Senate hearing (Sixty-sixth Congress):

> There is a distinct feeling in France and England that it would be a just thing for us to forego asking the repayment of the large amount of money ($10,000,000,000) we have loaned.

With this statement the National City Bank officers seem to be unanimously agreed, a suggested reason being that foreign holdings held by its customers would thereby be enhanced in value, leaving a tax burden of $23,000,000,000 for the American taxpayer to pay with no offset or liquidation by foreign debts.

It is understood that Mr. George E. Roberts, vice president of the bank, is sponsor for the National City Bank tax views. With all due respect to his large wealth and his opinion against taxation of Standard Oil's profits, it may be proper to recall that when Mr. Roberts was before the National Institute of Science he, too, was favorable to the cancellation of the $10,000,000,000 of foreign debts, that would be left for American taxpayers to pay, and in a burst of Christian fervor he declared, among other things:

> Apparently a good many people are beginning to think that, perhaps, this country will do well to forgive its debtors and take advantage of whatever benefits are implied in the Lord's Prayer, etc.

Those who pay their legal taxes and see men of large wealth charged by Secretary Mellon with tax dodging due to investments in tax-free securities may quote some biblical terms not found in the Lord's Prayer when responding to Mr. Roberts's proposal to forgive $10,000,000,000 to foreign debtors.

THE BANK'S POLICY IN BUSINESS.

Let it also be remembered the National City Bank was recently chosen to be the fiscal agent for Liberia, in far-away Africa, and that this bank was selected to handle $5,000,000 of American taxpayers' money to be paid to holders of defaulting Liberian bonds. Approximately $1,500,000 was to be paid out of the Federal Treasury for depreciated bonds thus made payable at par, and $3,500,000 for exploiting Liberia with the money of American taxpayers. The proposal was defeated during the present session after it had passed the House by a close vote.

The National City Bank's taxing viewpoint may be gathered from its government of Haiti, aided by American marines as collectors for the bank's loans. Its reputation as a tax collector abroad extends to preventing a vote on the Haitian constitution and a confiscation of officers' salaries to meet its own holdings. So, too, the National City Bank has abundant reason to quote Russia as a horrible example, for the bank is reported to be a large holder of Russian bonds reaching many millions of dollars, which the soviet government refuses to recognize or pay, and their repudiation to-day is alleged to prevent recognition of that government by our own.

Other illustrations could be offered of its viewpoint when speaking authoritatively on the subject of Standard Oil, which it represents, but these would seem to suffice. Financially the National City Bank is considered the American Gibraltar, and if Congress permitted its branch banks to reach out in this country as abroad the National City doubtless would be as numerously represented as the proverbial canine has active inhabitants. Officials of smaller banks speak with bated breath of the huge New York bank that assumes to lead in finance, business, and supervision of politics, and when it comes to quoting the Lord's Prayer for the forgiveness of foreign debtors, other than its own, they find in it a model of interested disinterestedness.

It may be conceded that the National City Bank is a fair representative of the big business viewpoint of profiteering, exploitation, and accumulation of "social wealth" at public expense. Contributors who furnish the profits, surpluses, and "social wealth" are not much in evidence, but are entitled to consideration from those who make the laws and for whom we equally speak, and I am addressing you to that end.

ANOTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE.

A page from the human side of the ledger of last year is offered. In 1921, when one of the 33 subsidiary Standard Oil companies (New Jersey) was extracting upward of $77,000,000 net profits, or 77 per cent, from oil consumers of the land, the farmers of my own State, one of the most prosperous States in the country, suffered a loss in gross income over the year 1920 of $160,000,000, or of more than 33 per cent compared with the preceding year. The official figures for 1921 are $306,708,000, and for 1920, $480,800,000, which, however, tells only half the

story, because in 1921 the purchasing power of the dollar was only 50 per cent pre-war prices with which to meet the necessities of upward of 2,000,000 men, women, and children of the State who are dependent upon their products of the farm.

Standard Oil's profits of 77½ per cent annually taken from 10,000,000 farmers and other consumers of the country are placed in the pockets of a comparatively small handful of stockholders. The bank contends this is "social wealth, no matter who owns it." The 10,000,000 farmers averaged less than $500 annual income for themselves and families in 1921, with 54 per cent increased cost of necessities over 1913, or less than one-half of the pre-war purchasing power. They have helped put an additional $2,000,000,000 into a comparatively few pockets through excess profits held out from corporate earnings as surplus aside from cash dividends, taxes, and all other charges, and as the big fish swallow the little ones, the number of stockholders will be reduced eventually to a few great interests.

Apart from these extortionate profits we now learn that the $2,000,000,000 of surplus is carefully tucked away in stock dividends and will avoid individual income taxes, which if collected under the law and not avoided would probably reach a half billion dollars contributed toward the support of Government from these excess profits. I have placed the facts before you in the Mellon correspondence, and these facts elicit a public protest that will not be affected by cries of sovietism, even by such powerful combinations as the National City Bank and the equally powerful Standard Oil system, which it represents.

HARSH TERMS BY TAX DODGERS.

Harsh terms are hurled at the heads of those who protest against extortion, profiteering, and tax dodging by men of large wealth or against the recognized power of those who are popularly understood to form "the invisible government" in this country. Protestants are termed radicals, reds, socialists, soviets, and other opprobrious names when they ask why big business does not obey the law and pay its just taxes. Secretary Mellon in his 1922 report, page 16, speaks specifically of tax evasions or tax dodging by large wealth in these words:

> Investors who would normally put their surplus funds into productive enterprise are driven * * * into investment in tax-exempt securities with the result that the Federal Government loses the revenue * * * and funds badly needed for productive purposes are directed into unproductive and frequently wasteful expenditure.

Secretary Mellon estimates $10,000,000,000 of this money has gone into tax-free securities in order to dodge taxes. The amount is double that sum, according to Doctor Seligman, and within three months upward of $2,000,000,000 more of "social wealth" has gone into stock dividends that will also dodge individual surtaxes.

JUSTICES DESCRIBE TAX DODGING.

Of "social wealth" one of the ablest members of the United States Supreme Court, in protesting against the MaComber decision, reported by one majority of the court, said:

> If stock dividends representing profits are held exempt from taxation under the sixteenth amendment, the owners of the most successful businesses in America will, as facts in this case (Standard Oil) illustrate, be able to escape taxation on a large part of what is actually their income.

That has come to pass, over the protest of the country that voted for the sixteenth amendment, of the Congress that passed the income tax law, and of four protesting judges of the court, who were outvoted by the other five members, and Secretary Mellon refuses to impose any tax penalties under the law.

After impaling tax dodgers, Mr. Mellon asks Congress to remove incentives for dodging by reducing the tax dodgers' taxes by one-half. No one charges Mellon with being a soviet or a Socialist because he threw the spot light on unprecedented tax dodging. Those terms go only with men who would see the law enforced, even if it affects the fortunes of Mr. Mellon himself. Some really sensible people believe that, instead of radicals, reds, and soviets, the country is in more danger from the rabid cult than from the radical; from the blacks, who, figuratively, fly the skull and crossbones of law's defiance, rather than from European reds; from self-constituted money sovereigns, or what Clemenceau terms our "money imperialism," rather than from soviets.

It does no good to call names. It gets nowhere. It frightens nobody but small children whether the tom-tom is drummed by the National City Bank or other great influences, while those in glass houses may find stone throwing a hurtful exercise. Men who are intelligent mortals—and most men are—do not lose their poise excepting during war or under stress of great excitement. In other words, the 100,000,000 people of this country who do the governing figuratively under the Constitution will not be seriously alarmed over the hundred thousand or more who shout imprecations to distract attention from their tax dodging, and who are credited with being the invisible government, with far-reaching influence over our business and political affairs to-day.

PROFITEERING WITH NECESSITIES.

The spirit of profiteering evidenced by oil, steel, cutlery, and all the huge melon-cutting concerns recently disclosed was never more universal or more cruel and unconscionable than it is to-day. Food, fuel, clothing, and, in fact, all necessities of life have caused consumers to contribute to the growth of human greed.

A 16,000 PER CENT MELON.

Let me say in this connection that it was recently disclosed that one cutlery company in Rhode Island increased its capital stock from $100,000 to $16,000,000, or 16,000 per cent. Now, that must have come, apart from cash dividends, through additional profits which they have not distributed during that time. That is a melon of some size that the consumers of the land have grown for the stockholders cutting.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I will, certainly.

Mr. GARNER. I want to ask the gentleman if, in addition to the present statute which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate these matters and ascertain if they are not collectible under the present statute, if there is not another way to get at these people in the future? With reference to the particular case that the gentleman from Wisconsin has just mentioned, if you levied a very high stock tax and discriminating so that it would apply to stock dividends of the last two years, is it not possible to get some of that money?

Mr. FREAR. I have had that plan with some others in mind, but it seems to me that the safer plan if we can secure action by Congress would be to tax the undistributed profits, because by that means after you have made full allowance for corporation reasonable profits the earnings which ought to be allowed, the rest ought to pay a just tax. There ought to be a way to reach it, but of course we can not reach it now under the stock-dividend decision of the Supreme Court, although the Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to impose penalties of 25 per cent where the surplus is not necessary for the business.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. BRIGGS. In spite of the fact that the accumulations may be far above those necessary for the conduct of the business, no action can be taken without the certificate to that effect.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman probably knows that I have had a controversy with the Secretary of the Treasury—and, by the way, it has been in good spirit—to the effect that he ought to impose the penalty. I am not discussing that here, because I have already discussed it before in the House. It seems to me that that would be the way to reach it at present, and the penalty tax ought to be imposed. But in the absence of that penalty there ought to be some way to reach it, especially by law.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does not the gentleman think, then, that that provision ought to come out of the law and leave it a question of fact whether there is an unlawful accumulation?

Mr. FREAR. It is absolutely impossible to frame any law that has not a certain discretionary power, and I am frank to say that I do not care to have discretionary power left with any official. Every man should be treated equally under the statute and the stronger we can make the law the better for those who believe it ought not to be evaded.

STANDARD OIL'S SOCIAL WEALTH.

Standard Oil makes public confession through the National City Bank that during peace and during war, for the last 10 years, one of its 33 subsidiaries has accumulated enormous net profits and profits on profits averaging 77½ per cent annually. These huge profits have been rolled up for stockholders represented by the National City Bank who find their profits translated into stock dividends to escape personal taxes due to a court decision that turned on the "guess" of 1 justice out of 9 in the MaComber case, while a kind-hearted Secretary of the Treasury who started the "melon cutting" now protects oil profits from penalties or surtaxes.

Mr. Roberts and other officers of the National City Bank, by an ingenious method of reasoning, after admitting the facts substantially as stated, now discover there has been added to our "social wealth" the profits and tax-exempt stock dividends pocketed by their customers. In other words, a "social wealth" that serves to fatten the prize porker largely goes to a quadruped that stands with four feet in the trough.

Those who protest against this National City Bank and Standard Oil method of reasoning are now reminded that Soviet Russia is a result of protests against the powers that be,

to which the fellow who is pinched may respond, "Well, see what happened to the Czar and his followers, and to the National City Bank's Russian bonds." No sensible man finds any hope in either the reign of Trotsky or Lenin or of a drifting Czar who left behind a drifting Russia. Men who ignorantly shout about sovietism or socialism frequently do not know the fundamental principles governing their own America, and that may be a grievous error of several prominent bank officials.

THE PEOPLE ARE PATRIOTIC.

The people of this country are law abiding and love their Government and its institutions. Outside of New York City, which is the rendezvous for Old World immigrants, not 1 per cent of our people are in sympathy with sovietism. Not 1 per cent of the people of America would accept that form of government. Neither would 1 per cent quietly accept a czarlike government that seeks to rule with a rod of iron and blisters and bleeds the other 99 per cent under a plea that such money wrung from the helpless masses is "social wealth." The unprejudiced legislator seeking to avoid future possibilities reflected alike in Russia, Rome, and other governmental mistakes would steer clear of the rocks now and hereafter.

It is useless to discuss tax problems with men who believe their wealth should be exempted from tax laws, or that laws only are for the farmers, the socialists, labor, and for those who have little but pay much proportionately. When wealth serves notice on Congress and on the country it is superior to law, and when defeated at the polls or in legislative halls it gives its ultimatum what it will not pay and we can take it or leave it, then we may well ask who makes such announcements and such demands.

LAWS SHOULD BE ENFORCED.

Critics generally who from self-interest denounce Congress or measures designed to carry out the will of the people are losing their power to inspire terror over the lawmaking branch of the Government. The Government will be stronger, not weaker, when officers fearlessly enforce the law, when men, great and small, obey the law, and when courts do not usurp the functions of Congress or subvert the will of the people as expressed in constitutional amendments and substantive law.

I have no further comment to offer on "social wealth" that fears "sovietism." This does not seem to be a fair argument with those of us who are just as much in earnest, just as anxious for the welfare of the country as the National City Bank. The average Member is anxious to do what he can for the country at large and acts from right public motives, I believe. As was well stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] yesterday, most of us are comparatively poor men, but if we were rich men we would probably adopt the same plea that the men of wealth do to-day. We would invest in tax-free securities because no man cares to pay taxes if to be avoided legally; but having passed laws in which surtaxes are provided whereby the man best able to pay shall pay, Congress should enforce the law and meet evasions with curative legislation. Men of large means now escape through investments in tax-free securities, in stock dividends, but the little fellow who has a small income—some 1,900,000 more in 1921—as the gentleman from Georgia said yesterday, the little fellow has to pay his full share of the tax. He can not escape. He can not argue the question with the Treasury Department, he has no way of making investments in these stock dividends or tax-free securities. That is the situation, and although there may be no chance for immediate action now we ought to meet the bank's argument and later seek means of reaching this vast accumulation of "social wealth" which has been exacted from the people in addition to cash dividends and reasonable profits.

A FEW STOCK DIVIDENDS.

No complete list of stock dividends can be furnished, but a few cases that have been published in the press are attached hereto with memoranda that may be of interest. Bearing in mind that these stock dividends represent accumulations of surplus saved out of net profits, after deducting all expenses, including taxes, cash dividends, sometimes enormous salaries, and other items, it gives a bird's-eye view of some earnings, with accent on the word "some."

Because industry was "suffering" Congress repealed the excess-profits tax. The corporation tax of 12½ per cent instead of 40 per cent imposed under the excess-profits tax after deducting 8 per cent net profits explains why the excess-profits tax was objectionable. In like manner the stock dividend, by avoiding individual surtaxes, prevents any considerable paring of the enormous melons, a few of which are found in the following items.

SURPLUSES TO DIVIDE.

The following press copy is self-explanatory:

Although no definite explanation has yet been offered to account for the sudden rush of the Standard Oil companies to split up their big surpluses through the payment of huge stock dividends, belief is growing on the Street that such action is being taken to forestall some new Government financing plan, not yet disclosed to the general public, to impose a heavy tax on such surplus funds. It will be recalled that the Gulf Oil Co., which had a surplus of $112,000,000, was the first of the larger oil corporations to split up its shares this year. Gulf Oil gave 12 new shares for 1 old share, and charged par value of its stock from $100 to $25. Gulf Oil is understood to be controlled by the Mellon family, of Pittsburgh. Following close on Gulf Oil's action comes Standard Oil of California's 100 per cent stock dividend and Standard Oil of New York's 200 per cent payment.

Expectation now is that not only will Standard Oil of New Jersey and other Standard Oil units fall in line but that distributions of like character will be made by scores of big industrial and, possibly, railroad corporations whose surplus accounts bulk into the millions. If such turns out to be the case the Street will be flooded with new stock certificates, and we may fairly expect to see such public interest in the stock market as has never before been witnessed.

Six Standard Oil companies, which have not yet acted on stock dividends or surplus distributions so far this year, had a combined surplus at the close of 1921 amounting to over $1,000,000,000. They include:

Standard Oil of New Jersey	$594,000,000
Standard Oil of Indiana	143,000,000
Prairie Oil & Gas	86,000,000
Ohio Oil Co.	72,000,000
Vacuum Oil Co	62,000,000
Atlantic Refining Co	61,000,000

United States Steel is the leader of the general industrial group, with a profit and loss surplus at the close of 1921 amounting to $508,000,000, or next to the Standard Oil of New Jersey among the corporations whose securities are listed on the stock exchange. Following comes American Telephone & Telegraph, which at the end of 1921 had a surplus fund in excess of $108,000,000. General Motors, Texas Co., Swift & Co., Anaconda, General Electric, and Corn Products have surplus funds running to $45,000,000 or better.

A partial list of industrial corporations with surpluses of $20,000,000 or more includes:

	Surplus, 1921.
United States Steel	$508,000,000
American Telephone & Telegraph	108,000,000
General Motors	83,000,000
Texas Co	83,000,000
Swift & Co	72,000,000
General Electric	70,000,000
Anaconda Copper	67,000,000
Corn Products Co	45,000,000
Westinghouse Electric	42,000,000
Utah Copper	38,000,000
American Car & Foundry	36,000,000
United Fruit	35,000,000
American Woolen	31,000,000
Pittsburgh Coal	30,000,000
Mexican Petroleum	25,000,000
Pan American Petroleum	25,000,000
American Locomotive Co	25,000,000
American Can Co	24,000,000
International Harvester	23,000,000
National Biscuit	22,000,000
Woolworth	22,000,000
Pullman Co	20,000,000
National Lead Co	20,000,000
American Smelting & Refining	20,000,000

Among the rails Southern Pacific had surplus of $283,000,000; Northern Pacific, $183,000,000; Union Pacific, $150,000,000; Atchison, $198,000,000; and New York Central, $100,000,000. A score of others had surpluses ranging from $35,000,000 to $90,000,000.

[From the New York World, December 6, 1922.]

BILLION DIVIDENDS IN STOCKS LAID TO SURPLUS TAX FEAR—PERLEY MORSE ALSO EXPLAINS THAT CORPORATIONS MAY THUS HOPE TO DISARM CRITICISM—POINTS OUT SHAREHOLDERS RECEIVE NO MORE VALUE—SWITCH MERELY MADE FROM SURPLUS TO CAPITAL—LIST OF 79 THAT CUT MELONS THIS YEAR.

Since the first of the year $1,000,000,000 in stock dividends have been declared by 70 corporations. Such a record-breaking figure for stock dividends naturally has led to considerable public interest. What does the phenomenon mean? What is the reason for it?

Does a stock dividend of 200 shares added to 200 shares of 5 per cent stock already owned by a shareholder mean that the holder is the fortunate possessor of 400 shares of 5 per cent stock, or 400 shares of 2½ per cent stock?

ADVANCES TWO REASONS.

The Standard Oil companies alone accounted for $781,324,311 of the immense total of stock dividends. The question of the explanation of the unprecedented performance was of such interest that the World yesterday sought the opinion of a recognized expert on financial matters. Perley Morse, head of Perley Morse & Co., public accountants, declared it to be his opinion that the corporations scent a surplus tax. He gave as a second cause the pressure of public opinion. This is Mr. Morse's analysis of the situation:

A FEW MELONS PRIOR TO DECEMBER 6.

These reasons speak for themselves.

"In my opinion, the reason why a great many of the large corporations are issuing stock dividends is because they expect sooner or later a tax upon their surplus; further, because they are liable to obtain less criticism from the public by paying smaller dividends upon a larger capital than larger dividends upon a smaller capital.

* * * * * * *

ONE POSSIBLE ADVANTAGE.

"The only possible advantage a shareholder gets by receiving a stock dividend is in cases where the old dividend is kept up upon the increased number of shares. If the company pays a reduced dividend on the increased number of shares equal to the dividend paid upon the old number of shares, the income to the stockholder is no different.

"The Standard Oil Co. excited a lot of criticism before and since its famous dissolution into numerous companies on account of the enormous dividends it paid upon its small capitalization, and it would not have done so if it had increased its capitalization to an extent that represented the value of its assets; while the United States Steel, when it was organized, was capitalized up to the full value of its assets and paid a much smaller dividend on its capital; hence excited less criticism."

CORPORATIONS AND DIVIDENDS.

Here are the corporations that have declared stock dividends, with the amount of their outstanding stock and the value of the dividend:

Company.	Stock outstanding Jan. 1, 1922.	Stock dividend, par value.
Allen Consol. Oil	$2,192,095	$109,600
Alliance Realty	2,000,000	500,000
Am. Bank Note	4,495,700	449,570
Am. Gas & Elec	5,604,480	116,031
Am. Lt. & Trac	28,077,280	838,000
Am. Mach. Fdy	2,000,000	4,000,000
Am. Manufacturing	8,000,000	800,000
Am. Radiator	13,806,225	6,903,113
Arundel	4,637,360	278,238
Atlantic Refining	5,000,000	45,000,000
Bank of N. Y	2,000,000	500,000
Beech-Nut P'g	955,400	3,821,600
Belding Bros	3,000,000	3,000,000
Bigelow-Hfld. Carpet	13,550,000	13,550,000
Borne-Scrymser	200,000	800,000
Bost. Sand. & G. (pf.)	400,000	150,000
Burroughs Add. M	24,750,000	6,187,500
Bush Terminal	6,722,200	168,055
Cal. Tel. & Lt. (pf.)	343,887	123,500
Canada Gen. El	10,800,000	2,160,000
Cin. Un. Stk. Yd	1,531,000	219,000
City Ice & Fuel (Cleve., O.)	3,600,000	1,200,000
Commercial Credit (Baltimore)	1,500,000	450,000
C'mm'n'h Fin. (shs.)	59,354	
Crane	41,200,731	1,032,200
Cumberl'd P. & L. (pf.)	2,300,000	230,000
Detroit Creamery	3,200,000	1,600,000
Du Pont Chem	600,000	675,000
Du Pont Chem. (pf.)	2,942,710	3,310,549
Exchange Buffet (shs.)	62,500	
Fed. Lt. & Trac. (pf.)	2,500,000	1,050,000
Fidelity and Casualty	2,000,000	2,000,000
Finance Service	163,370	6,170
Gas & Elec. Sec	1,143,561	114,356
General Elec	147,536,814	8,009,715
Gibson Art	300,000	125,000
Gillette Safety Razor	23,320,000	1,428,000
Great Amer. Ins	10,000,000	2,500,000
Great North. Paper	8,272,000	16,544,000
Hanover Nat. Bank	3,000,000	2,000,000
Hayes Wheel	1,633,320	359,000
Hercules Powder	7,150,000	7,150,000
Helme, G. W	4,000,000	2,000,000
Humphreys Oil	8,577,500	6,422,500
Ingersoll-Rand	10,900,035	10,900,035
Int. Comb. Eng. (shs.)	80,000	
Int. Harvester	93,638,000	3,782,975
Intertype Corp. (shs.)	20,125	
Kellogg Switchboard & Supply	5,500,000	825,000
Manhattan Shirt	5,000,000	777,000
Minute Tapioca	200,000	100,000
National Biscuit	20,226,000	21,920,000
National Sugar	10,000,000	5,000,000
North-Am. (com.)	15,033,200	150,282
Ohio Oil	15,000,000	45,000,000
Pacific Gas & E	34,004,056	980,081
Packard Motor	11,885,100	11,885,100
Reo Motor Car	6,937,150	6,937,250
Reynolds, R. J	10,000,000	3,333,333
Reynolds, R. J. (pf.)	50,000,000	16,666,666
Royal Typewriter (pf.)	3,771,700	2,308,971
Saco-Low'll Shops	3,525,000	1,762,500
Schrafft, W. F., & Sons	500,000	1,500,000
Scotten, Dillon	2,250,000	750,000
South States Oil	2,000,000	160,000
Spalding, A. G., & Bros	2,606,900	2,606,900
Standard Milling	7,410,142	4,446,085
Stand. Oil, Calif	100,971,111	100,971,111
Stand. Oil, Ky	6,000,000	2,000,000
Stand. Oil, N. J	98,338,300	395,353,200
Stand. Oil, N. Y	75,000,000	150,000,000
Stand. Steel Car	4,000,000	36,000,000
Stand. Undgrd. C	5,250,000	1,050,000
Texon Oil & Ld	1,904,761	95,239
Torrington	3,500,000	3,500,000
Union Nat. Gas	9,840,000	7,380,000
Union Oil of Calif	50,000,000	40,000,000
U. S. Guarantee	205,000	200,000
Un. Royalties	250,000	402,690
Vacuum Oil	15,000,000	45,000,000
Va. Ir. C. & C	10,000,000	5,000,000
Victor Talking M	4,599,000	20,994,000
Yale & T. Mfg	4,998,774	4,998,774
Yellow Cab	500,000	1,500,000
Total par value of stock dividends		1,007,705,033

BENEFITS AVERAGE INVESTOR.

The splitting up of shares into smaller units through stock dividends places within reach of the average investor many stocks that formerly were looked upon as investments for the richest men only. Employees of the Standard Oil concern who have bought these shares during the past 15 years have seen some of them jump 1,000 per cent in value. Some of the stocks of other companies outside of the leading oil concerns have made an equally good showing.

Less than two decades ago the Standard Oil properties represented an investment of several hundred millions. To-day its properties and working capital are estimated at several billions. When the Standard Oil of New Jersey was dissolved, the $100,000,000 capitalization was selling for about $400,000,000. The stock dividends declared by the Standard Oil companies in the last 11 months have a par value about double that.

OTHERS THAT MAY "CUT MELONS."

To-day many corporations would be warranted in declaring stock dividends and it is expected that within the next year they will do so. The possibilities include United States Steel, Baldwin Locomotive, American Locomotive, American Car & Foundry, National Lead, General Electric, and United Fruit.

A GREAT, JUICY MELON.

Cutlery was an item boosted in the last tariff bill to the limit. Apparently there was a reason, if the following enormous melon of 16,000 per cent is any standard of profits:

PAY STOCK DIVIDEND OF 16,000 PER CENT—BROWN & SHARPE, OF PROVIDENCE, FILE NOTICE OF NEW DISBURSEMENT—BIG INCREASE BY WANSKUCK—WORSTED MILLS TO DISTRIBUTE 1,500 PER CENT—PAN AMERICAN TO PAY 20 PER CENT.

BOSTON, Dec. 15 (by the Associated Press).—Another batch of increased capitalizations, with consequent stock dividends, brought further Christmas distributions representing many millions of dollars to stockholders in New England corporations to-day. To the large sums already diverted from surplus and other companies there were added several actions of recapitalization and disbursement that ran into many hundreds per cent.

The Browne & Sharpe Manufacturing Co., of Providence, making machine tools, filed with the secretary of state notice that its capital stock had been increased from $100,000 to $16,000,000. A stock dividend of 16,000 per cent was voted to dispose of the new stock.

WILL DISTRIBUTE 1,500 PER CENT.

Stockholders of the Wanskuck Co., manufacturers of worsted, voted at Providence to-day to increase the capital stock from $500,000 to $8,000,000. They voted also to distribute among themselves the new stock as a 1,500 per cent stock dividend.

The York Manufacturing Co., of Saco, Me., making cotton cloths, by action of the directors, proposed to the stockholders a doubling of the $1,800,000 capitalization with a 100 per cent stock dividend.

The Oakdale (R. I.) Worsted Co., after increasing its stock from $60,000 to $540,000, distributed the difference in the form of an 800 per cent stock dividend.

The Merrimac Woolen Co. increased its capital stock from $750,000 to $1,000,000 and provided for a stock dividend from capital and surplus, the exact amount of which was not announced.

The New Bedford Cotton Mills Corporation declared a stock dividend of 200 per cent, increasing its capital from $850,000 to $1,050,000 to make it possible.

—

20 PER CENT BY PAN AMERICAN.

NEW YORK, December 15.—E. L. Doheny, president of the Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co., announced to-day a 20 per cent stock dividend, payable in class B stock to holders of the common stock. Mr. Doheny said that the surplus of the company, after acquiring 90 per cent of the Mexican Petroleum Co., was more than $30,000,000 and that $12,000,000 of the surplus would be capitalized by the increase in stock.

—

PARKE, DAVIS & CO. TO DISBURSE 100 PER CENT.

DETROIT, December 15.—A stock dividend of 100 per cent, payable December 28, to stockholders of record December 18, was declared to-day by the board of directors of Parke, Davis & Co., drug manufacturers. Capital stock of the concern was increased from slightly less than $12,000,000 to $25,000,000, leaving slightly more than $1,000,000 for the stock in the treasury.

In addition to the stock dividend, the directors declared a cash dividend of $2 a share, amounting to 8 per cent, payable January 2 to stockholders of record December 18.

—

100 PER CENT BY SIMMONS CO.

KENOSHA, WIS., December 15.—The board of directors of Simmons Co. in Kenosha to-day declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent to be distributed among the stockholders of the common stock of the company. The new stock is to be issued immediately to stockholders of record November 30.

THIRTY DAYS' PROFITS REPORTED EXCEEDS GOVERNMENT DEBT PRIOR TO 1914.

Over a billion dollars distributed by Santa Claus gathered in from the rich and poor alike. All to escape any surtax, because of the Supreme Court stock-dividend decision in the MaComber case, 252 United States, decided 5 to 4 (see Mellon correspondence).

STOCK DIVIDEND TOTAL IS LARGE—RECORD DISTRIBUTION IN LAST 30 DAYS EXCEEDS UNITED STATES DEBT IN 1914.

This autumn will figure in the annals of finance as the period in which the distribution of stock dividends reached proportions never before known, not even in the days of large dividends by the Standard Oils before the war. In the last 30 days no less than 41 stock dividends and special distributions have been declared, the aggregate total of such dividends having been $1,119,000,000, or more than the total public debt of the United States in 1914.

The campaign of stock dividends has its basis chiefly in the desire of big corporations to split up their shares so that the market price can be scaled down within the reach of the small investor. Various other reasons have been assigned for the numerous dividends, among these reasons being the desire to capitalize surpluses and put them beyond the reach of the tax collector.

Still another reason for the special payments and stock dividends is cited in the newly inserted provision of the 1921 income tax law which makes it possible for large holders of stocks to liquidate their holdings under what is known as the capital-investment tax. The section of the stock law covering this point makes it possible for large holders of securities, which were owned for a period of two years or more, to liquidate their holdings, and under the capital-investment clause pay a

straight tax of 12½ per cent on the profit from the sale of such securities in place of the regular surtaxes.

Regarding the many increases and resumption of cash payments, together with the payment of extra cash dividends, this is a clear reflection of the improvement noted in the business world since the beginning of the year and forecasts what these companies will show in earnings when the annual reports for 1922 are made public during the early part of 1923.

Some of the more important stock dividends declared by industrial corporations, banks, and trust companies within the last few weeks appear in the following table:

Stock dividends declared.

(000 omitted.)

Company.	Per cent.	Par value distributed.
Standard Oil of New Jersey	400	$395,517
Standard Oil of New York	200	150,000
Standard Oil of California	100	100,971
Magnolia Petroleum	50	58,675
New York Transit Co.	80	[1] 4,000
Standard Oil of Kansas	300	6,000
Standard Oil of Kentucky	33⅓	2,000
Solar Refining	100	2,000
Borne Scrymser	400	800
Buckeye Pipe Line	25	[1] 5,000
Indiana Pipe Line	20	[1] 2,000
Ohio Oil	300	45,000
Vacuum	300	45,000
National Biscuit	75	22,927
Manhattan Shirt	20	1,000
National Fuel Gas	100	18,500
National Sugar	50	5,000
U. S. Gypsum	10	991
Great Northern Paper	200	16,800
Lawyers Mortgage	25	1,500
Ingersoll Rand	100	15,000
National Liberty Ins	50	500
Globe and Rutgers Ins	700	3,000
Babcock & Wilcox	33⅓	5,000
Great Amn Insurance	25	2,500
Lawyers Title & Trust	50	2,000
Bank of Manhattan	100	5,000
May Department Stores	30	6,000
Hanover National Bank	66⅔	2,000
Public National Bank	16⅔	500
Pan American Pete	25	17,500
Scoville Mfg	200	10,000
Singer Mfg. Co	33⅓	30,000
Timken Det. Axle	150	4,467
Union Natural Gas	75	7,500
Yale & Towne Mfg	100	5,000
American Steel Foundry	18	3,600
Hercules Power	100	10,000
Victor Talking Machine	600	30,000
American Machine & Foundry	200	4,000
Gulf Oil Corp	200	[2] 72,290

[1] Paid in cash.

[2] Not announced as a stock dividend, but distributed to stockholders under a plan of readjustment of capital.

$1,200,000,000 IN MELONS.

Here are a few present and prospective melons that are self-explanatory:

MORE BIG FIRMS ORDER DIVIDENDS—FIFTY-FOUR CORPORATIONS HAVE NOW VOTED STOCK OR CASH PAYMENTS WITHIN MONTH.

(By the Associated Press.)

NEW YORK, November 21.—Four more large corporations to-day were added to the list of about 50 which within the last 30 days have declared extra stock and increased cash dividends approximating $1,200,000,000.

The Packard Motor Car Co. has declared a common-stock dividend of 100 per cent, payable December 9.

The R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. declared a 33⅓ per cent stock dividend on common and common B stock, payable in common B stock December 2 to stock of record December 1.

The Southwest Pennsylvania Pipe Lines declared a quarterly dividend of $4, payable December 30 to stock of record December 15. The dividend makes a total of $7 for the year, an increase of $1 over last year.

The Alliance Realty Co. declared a stock dividend of 2% per cent, payable December 5 to stock of record that date, and announced that stock so issued would participate in all cash dividends effective as of November 20. The company also declared the regular quarterly cash dividend of 2 per cent, payable January 10 to stock of record December 28.

—

ANOTHER BIG MELON.

BALTIMORE, November 21.—The Mortgage Guarantee Co., of Baltimore, has declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent, payable December 15 to share owners of record December 12. Stockholders also will receive the right to subscribe to 1,000 shares of stock (par value $100) at $150 a share in the ratio of one share for each two shares held. The shareholders will be asked to vote an increase in the stock from $200,000 to $500,000 on November 27.

—

NEW ENGLAND FIRM ACTS.

BOSTON, November 21.—A special meeting of stockholders of the New England Spring Bed Co. has been called for December 4 to authorize an increase of its preferred stock from $500,000 to $2,500,000 and of its common stock from $500,000 to $2,500,000.

The Reed, Prentice Co., of Boston, has filed a certificate with the commissioner of corporations showing an increase in its common stock from 7,500 shares of $100 par value to 16,000 shares of no par value.

COAL NOT CORN PROFITS.

In recording profits it is well to remember that the farmers are not dividing these juicy melons. They are created by the farmers and other consumers, but the farmers are not cutting melons to-day brought about by raising wheat, corn, potatoes, or apples. They only help to grow melons that are not found in the farmer's field.

Here is a good side light on coal. Coal is a necessity, and it is a timely subject with the temperature hovering around and below zero in the Northwest to-day:

An investigation of bituminous coal mining profits by the Federal Trade Commission disclosed an average of 15 per cent net income upon investment for the four years 1916 to 1920. The high figure of 29 per cent was set in 1917. Over the six-year period 1916 to 1921 the average net income upon investment is computed at 14.5 per cent. Profits in the anthracite industry are even higher, net income for the seven years 1912 to 1918 averaging 21.3 per cent on capital stock on the basis of returns by leading producers. Results in the four following years were even more impressive, including 1922, when the formidable storage supplies were completely distributed at top prices which more than offset the cost of the strike.

In comparison the return on £160,000,000 invested in the British coal mining industry is estimated below 9 per cent. This low figure is all the more surprising considering the close concentration of the mining companies into comparatively few and strong hands. In August, 1921, there were reported 1,160 companies operating 2,576 mines, but about half of these companies do not count. Around 98 per cent of the entire output is credited to 51 per cent of the companies.

EXPLAINS HOW MELONS GROW—LIKE THE SNOWBALL.

Speaking of coal, it is noted that melons grow like a snowball, and the consumers furnish the material apart from cash dividends and other regular corporate expenses.

SEE NO REASON FOR NEW STOCK ISSUES—RUSH TO DECLARE DIVIDENDS OF SURPLUS SAID TO BE BASED ON MERE SHADOW—TRADE EXPANSION CONTINUES—TEXTILE AND AUTO INDUSTRIES ARE MAKING RECORDS—LOADINGS SHOW PROGRESS.

(By Tracy J. Sutliff.)

NEW YORK, December 3.—The last week has been curiously lacking in economic developments of great significance. The stock market has moved within the narrow limits established by its professional character; the bond market has done much the same. Commodities have fluctuated over rather a wide range, particularly wheat, and foreign-exchange rates have moved in a fashion which before the war would have been epochal, but which now, due to tremendous speculation in foreign currencies, is regarded as more or less normal.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the last week was the manner in which the rush to declare stock dividends by almost every company that has a sizable surplus broadened. Some weeks ago the Gulf Oil Corporation declared a 200 per cent stock dividend. This was followed by other large surplus distributions by some of the Standard Oil companies and then the smaller concerns fell into line.

GROWS LIKE SNOWBALL.

Like a huge snowball this tendency has grown both in size and in velocity until now it amounts almost to hysteria. With a few exceptions, notable among which are the United States Steel Corporation and the larger railroads, a majority of the biggest industrial concerns in the country having large surplus accounts have taken the initial steps looking to the distribution of at least a portion of this surplus through the medium of capitalisation.

In seeking a sound and substantial reason for this new condition, one meets only the single explanation of taxes. On all sides are heard stories of proposed revision of the Federal statutes which would place an impost on large corporate surpluses, but from official sources there has been a surprising reticence. Members of Congress have risen to demand of the Treasury Department why companies should be allowed to make these huge distributions which now amount to considerably more than $1,000,000,000 in stock, and the Treasury officials have patiently answered that the law as it stands to-day is sufficiently broad to permit taxations against a huge surplus account when it is shown that that surplus is unreasonable.

STARTED BY GULF OIL.

It is intimated by a Treasury official that the present helter-skelter method of surplus distribution reflects only the hysterical reaction of timid capital frightened perhaps by a shadow. When the Gulf Oil Corporation decided to pay a big stock dividend the shadow first made its appearance. Everyone knew that this company was more or less under the control of the Mellon interests. Everybody knew also that Andrew W. Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury and they took it for granted that he "knew something." Next came the Standard Oil interests, and when they declared a series of large stock dividends the suspicion became a conviction. Thereafter a large number of companies that had piled up surpluses which were materially out of line with their capital accounts followed suit.

As a matter of fact it is quite unlikely that the Government has in mind any plan for the taxing of surplus accounts. It is reasonable to assume that if such legislation does develop it will be because the corporations have drawn attention to themselves through their hasty action. Except in rare instances stockholders have not benefited by this violent rush to pay stock dividends. They have only been given, in the form of stock certificates, what was already theirs in the shape of surplus. Of course, a few companies have placed their increased capital stock on a dividend basis which nets stockholders a larger return in dollars and cents, and to that extent have the stockholders benefited. In more cases, however, the new dividends have been fixed at a rate which changes but slightly or not at all the aggregate disbursements of the corporations.

LITTLE CHANGE IN BUSINESS.

So far as business is concerned the last week has shown little in the way of change. Steel mills are still averaging from 75 to 80 per cent of capacity and the textile and automobile industries are making records. Bank clearings show the same tendency toward expansion as compared with a year ago and car loadings and car shortage suggest the same high rate of progress as has been apparent for several weeks. Money has been in freer supply due to the let-up in requirements of

the interior, but this is not especially important at this time because money has not been what might be called scarce this year.

Railroad earnings for the month of October which came to hand during the last week were not good, but all who have followed developments in the railroad industry and who have analyzed the situation carefully were expecting nothing else. So there was no great element of surprise there. Some of the carriers wrote off their entire strike losses in the month of September, but a far greater number preferred to extend these charges over the last four months of the year, and for this reason it is not unlikely that the monthly statements from now until the end of 1922 will be more or less disappointing. (Copyright, 1922, by Sun-Herald Corporation.)

MORE MELONS.

Here are a few melons, watermelons, and other varieties grown by the public for the melon cutters and gatherers. They were picked out incidentally because they attracted attention. All were ripe for picking:

MAY CUT 40 PER CENT MELON.

NEW YORK, December 1.—The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Coal Co. to-day called a special meeting of stockholders for December 18 to act on a proposal to declare a 40 per cent stock dividend. The present capitalization of the company is $10,000,000.

—

VICTOR VOTES $5 DIVIDEND.

CAMDEN, N. J., December 1.—The Victor Talking Machine Co. to-day announced a dividend of $5 per share on its new issue of common stock.

The last dividend of the company was paid in October and amounted to $10 a share. The old capitalization was $5,000,000 and the new one is $35,000,000.

—

WHITIN MACHINE TO PAY 1,400 PER CENT DIVIDEND, A RECORD.

NEW YORK, December 18.—(By U. N.)—The Whitin Machine Works, of New England, is about to pay a dividend of 1,400 per cent to its stockholders.

An increase in stock from $600,000 to $9,000,000 had been authorized.

This is the biggest dividend yet declared by big corporations for the ostensible purpose of evading a tax on accumulated and undistributed earnings.

—

FOUR HUNDRED PER CENT "MELON"—PARK HILL CO. JOINS STOCK-DIVIDEND RANKS.

FITCHBURG, MASS., November 20.—The Park Hill Manufacturing Co. to-day announced a stock dividend of 400 per cent. This action was explained as intended to adjust a balance between a low stock capitalization and a heavy capital investment. The company's mills here manufacture ginghams.

—

WALL STREET GOSSIP.

"Standard Oil has absolute control of industrial alcohol," is the statement of one close to the latter company's management. He declares that recent trading in the stock has originated with interests connected with 26 Broadway. Those usually familiar with Standard Oil affairs, in discussing the matter, point out that Standard Oil always had quite a little to say in industrial alcohol. Now that they have found that its products can be used advantageously, they naturally want more of a voice in the management. The company's sales are said to be running at the highest figure attained since the war boom. The financial position is said to be sufficiently strong to take care of the growing business. With continued improvement, it is expected that before long alcohol will join the growing list of companies resuming dividends.

UNENDING PROCESSION OF STANDARD OIL MELONS.

The "unending procession" of Standard Oil melons is marching on. The Atlantic Standard Oil cut only 900 per cent. Of course, that looks rather large to the farmer who is scratching to make ends meet, but he helped grow the melon, if that is any consolation:

Atlantic Refining, which has just declared a 900 per cent stock dividend, is expected to go on a dividend basis of $1 per share for all the new stock. This would mean annual dividends of $40 per share on the equivalent of one share of the present stock, on which the rate has been $20 per year. While this new dividend rate has not been actually declared, it is reported that officials of the company anticipate such an increase. This is decidedly interesting in view of the fact that all of the Standard Oil companies which have declared stock dividends so far have been reticent on the subject of dividends, or, if anything has been said, the only inference that could be drawn has favored a continuation of the old dividend rate. The position of Atlantic Refining as the largest earner in the Standard group favors the larger disbursement.

—

THIS IS ANOTHER PICTURE OF THE SAME MELON.

[From the Financial Review, December 2.]

MORE S. O. "MELONS" PICKED FOR PUBLIC—EXTRA JUICY ONE OF 900 PER CENT.

The unending procession of Standard Oil stock dividends was enlivened by a "whopper" declaration of 900 per cent by Atlantic Refining Co., the largest "melon" cut by any member of the "trust" group this year. Standard of Indiana, which holds the distinction of having disbursed the largest stock dividend ever paid—2,900 per cent, in 1912—also entered the list, this time with a 100 per cent stock dividend declaration.

In the case of Atlantic Refining, no special meeting of stockholders to increase capital is necessary, as only $5,000,000 is outstanding from $50,000,000 authorized. Distribution will be made December 20 or as soon as possible thereafter. Larger cash dividends upon the new shares are also rumored.

Stockholders of Standard Oil of Indiana are called to a special meeting December 27 to increase the authorized capital from $140,000,000 to $250,000,000. The proposed stock dividend will be paid to holders of record December 28. This will be the third large stock dividend for Indiana Standard, the initial disbursement having been 2,900 per cent, in 1912, and the second payment 150 per cent, in 1920, when par value was also reduced from $100 to $25. At the beginning of 1922 there was outstanding $107,360,455 capital stock, which will now be brought up to $214,720,910.

Share owners of Ohio Oil Co., Standard's big operating representative in the Northwest, have authorized increasing capital from $15,000,000 to $60,000,000. The additional stock will be distributed as a 300 per cent stock dividend December 30 to owners of record December 1. Directors have also posted the usual quarterly dividend of $3 in cash, payable on the same dates.

Here comes the "manufacturer" that collects in the melons, from 100 to 16,000 per cent. He professes to fear that the tax-gatherer may limit his profits. He signals "Danger ahead."

[From the Manufacturer (semimonthly edition), published by the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, November 25, 1922.]

"DANGER AHEAD."

With the installation in office of the new Congress there will be in existence a situation filled with constant danger to the conservative element and policies of the Nation. It will be the embodiment of the drift that has been going on in certain sections of the country, whose object is to "liberalize" legislation. There will be attempts to promote a line of legislative enactments utterly at variance with the ideas of those people who do not wish government to be something paternalistic. The conservative interests of the country can none too soon inquire what they purpose to do about it.

* * * * * * *

There will be projects of which our farm-loan enterprise is only a beginning, further cheapening the rates of interest for loans on agricultural products and widening the field to which this advantage may apply. There must be faced plans to have public ownership and operation of storage warehouses and grain elevators, such as was tried out in North Dakota. There will be attempts to have Government ownership of the railroads, the telephone, and the telegraph. Business surplus will be heavily taxed, stock dividends will be penalized, and an end put to tax-exempt securities, if the busy radical leaders can have their way.

Who is to pay for all of this if the program goes through? The well-to-do people of the East, through income and inheritance taxes. The greatest war in all history saddled upon the American people a measure of taxation, including that of city, State, and Nation, wholly without precedent. The war has been over for years. Yet the prospect is now for higher taxes rather than lower. But it was only some 15 years ago that a Federal income tax was proposed for this country, to be greeted with a tremendous storm of opposition by a Nation free at that time from such a levy on business and industry. We have gone far since then along the tax road, from the day not far back when the Federal Government supported itself from customs and internal revenues.

One of the facts of American life is that government is the most expensive agency known to man for the conduct of business. * * *

GULF OIL'S PROFITS.

Gulf Oil that recently carried a 200 per cent melon is again in the limelight. It acquired undue prominence because of Secretary of the Treasury Mellon's share of the melon that began the fatal procession. Its significance occurs from the fact that Secretary Mellon can not impose the 25 per cent penalty on accumulations of surplus reaching, in one case I have quoted, to 16,000 per cent, because his own company, Gulf Oil, started the melon cutting. All this has been discussed in the Mellon correspondence but it was not then known that other dividends were to be issued on the heels of the melon carving of Secretary Mellon's company:

[From the New York World, December 20.]

STOCK DIVIDENDS IN MORE STOCKINGS—HUMBLE AND GULF OIL COMPANIES REMEMBERED BY SANTA—IN OTHER LINES.

Directors of the Humble Oil & Refining Co. have declared a 75 per cent stock dividend and also ordered that the present capital stock of $100 a share par value be changed to $25 par. This will give each holder of the present $100 stock seven shares at a lower par value.

The action of the directors increases the capital stock from $25,000,000 to $43,750,000. The company has also declared the regular quarterly dividend of $2 on the old stock of $25,000,000, payable January 1. Stock declaration is payable December 30. It is stated that the dividend on the new stock will be at the rate of $1.20 a share a year. The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey is the largest stockholder in the company. At last reports the company was credited with holding about 70 per cent of the Humble Co. stock.

Directors of the Gulf Oil Corporation, which is controlled by the Mellon interests, met in Pittsburgh and declared a quarterly dividend of 37½ cents on the new $25 par stock, payable January 2 to stock of record December 20. This rate is equivalent to $18 a year on the old stock, which paid $6 yearly.

A meeting of the preferred and common stock holders of the Saco-Lowell Shops has been called for December 28 to increase the capital stock of the company by authorizing $2,643,800 par value new second preferred stock. It is understood that the entire amount of the stock will be disbursed to the common-stock holders as a 50 per cent stock dividend.

STERLING PRODUCTS IN LINE.

The Sterling Products Corporation has increased its dividend from 75 cents quarterly to $1 quarterly, and the stockholders will receive the increase February 1 next. It will be paid to stock of record January 12.

The banks are showing up well in the general prosperity. Among those that will gladden the stockholders' Christmas is the Nassau National. It has just declared its regular 3 per cent quarterly dividend and also an extra of the same amount, both of which are payable January 2 to stock of record December 28.

Chicago Railway Equipment Co. yesterday declared the regular quarterly dividend of $2 and a stock dividend of 50 per cent, both payable December 30 to stock of record December 19.

The United Engineering & Foundry Co. has declared a stock dividend of 50 per cent on the common, payable December 30 to holders of record December 23.

Falling off in the trade of the shipping companies caused the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. yesterday to cut its quarterly dividend

to 25 cents a share, as against 87½ cents, which the company paid in the preceding quarter. The dividend just declared is payable January 2 to stock of record December 20.

MINING COMPANY INCREASE.

Stockholders of the Tamarack & Custer Consolidated Mining Co. have voted to increase the capital from $2,000,000 to $5,000,000, and the directors have declared a stock dividend of 100 per cent, payable December 30 to stock of record December 28.

To permit payment January 2 of a 100 per cent stock dividend to holders of record December 30, the stockholders of the Worcester Salt Co. yesterday voted to increase the capital from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000, the increase being provided by the transfer of $1,000,000 from the surplus and undivided profits to capital account.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Coal Co., which has just declared a 40 per cent stock dividend, will pay it to owners of record December 18. The action of the stockholders increases the capital $4,613,490, or to $16,147,215. Stock has $50 par and has paid 10 per cent annually since organization in 1909, in addition to frequent extra cash dividends, aggregating 265 per cent, between 1913 and 1920. This is the first stock declaration. The authorized capital is $20,000,000.

Standard Oil issues.

	Bid.	Asked.
Anglo-American Oil Co. (Ltd.)	17⅛	17⅜
Atlantic Refining Co., new	112	116
Atlantic Refining Co., preferred	117	119
Borne-Scrymser Co	118	123
Buckeye Pipe Line Co	85	87
Chesebrough Manufacturing Co. consolidated	210	225
Chesebrough Manufacturing Co. consolidated preferred	112	115
Continental Oil Co	149	151
Crescent Pipe Line Co	43	45
Cumberland Pipe Line Co	162	166
Eureka Pipe Line Co	96	98
Galena-Signal Oil Co. preferred new	104	107
Galena-Signal Oil Co. preferred old	108	110
Galena-Signal Oil Co. common	56	58
Humble Oil & Ref. Co. $25 par when issued	33	35
Illinois Pipe Line Co	158	162
Imperial Oil, Ltd	113	115
Indiana Pipe Line Co	89	91
International Petroleum Co., Ltd	20⅛	20⅜
Magnolia Petroleum Co	160	164
National Transit Co	26	26¼
New York Transit Co	129	132
Northern Pipe Line Co	100	102
Ohio Oil Co. new	70	74
Penn-Mex Fuel Co	16	19
Prairie Oil & Gas Co. new	205	210
Prairie Pipe Line Co	313	315
Solar Refining Co	355	365
Southern Pipe Line Co	100	103
South Penn Oil Co	158	162
South West Penn Pipe Lines	64	67
Standard Oil of Calif. $25 par new	56⅜	57⅛
Standard Oil of Indiana $25 par	114¼	115
Standard Oil of Kansas $25 par new	42	42½
Standard Oil of Ky. $25 par new	70	73
Standard Oil of Nebraska	185	195
Standard Oil of N. J. $25 par when issued	38⅜	39⅛
Standard Oil of N. J. preferred	116½	117½
Standard Oil of N. Y. $25 par value when issued	45⅞	46⅛
Standard Oil of Ohio new	260	270
Standard Oil of Ohio preferred	117	119
Swan & Finch Co	24	28
Union Tank Car Co	130	135
Union Tank Car Co. preferred	108	110
Vacuum Oil new $25 par when issued	40	40½
Washington Oil Co	24	27
MISCELLANEOUS OIL COMPANIES.		
Atlantic Lobos Oil Co. common	6	6½
Atlantic Lobos Oil Co. preferred	20	30
British American Oil Co., Ltd	35	37
Gulf Oil Corporation $25 par	49⅜	50
Merritt Oil Corp	6⅛	6⅜
Mountain Producers Corp	16⅞	17⅛
Mutual Oil Co	11	11½
Salt Creek Consolidated Oil Co	10	16
Salt Creek Producers Assoc	20⅛	20½
Sapulpa Refining Co	2½	3
Western States Oil & Land Co	20	85

STANDARD OIL'S LIST.

From the press we learn of Standard Oil's private preserves, which include well-grown melons, properly preserved:

[From the New York Times, November 22.]

STANDARD OILS PAID $881,960,684 IN 1922—TOTAL DISTRIBUTION SINCE DISSOLUTION OF OLD NEW JERSEY COMPANY IS $2,389,693,252—PRESENT YEAR SETS RECORD—EXCEEDS ANY PREVIOUS TWELVE-MONTH PERIOD BOTH IN CASH AND STOCK DIVIDENDS—MORE PAYMENTS EXPECTED—EXTRA DIVIDENDS IN MONEY AND SHARES ARE LOOKED FOR FROM SEVERAL PIPE LINES.

The various companies comprising the so-called Standard Oil group have distributed to stockholders during the current year a total of $881,960,684, either in the form of cash dividends, "rights," or stock dividends. In the 10 years, 1912 to 1921, inclusive, a total of $1,507,032,568 was distributed in the same forms, making a total of $2,389,593,252 since the dissolution of the old Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey in 1911. The cash dividends distributed this year, amounting to $128,856,373, establish a new high record for any year in the history of the independent operation of the various units of the old company, while the stock dividend distributions this year also establish a high record.

A recapitulation of the total for 1922 and the previous decade follows:

Total cash dividends.	Total par value stock dividends.	Total par of rights.
1922—$128,856,373	$751,104,311	$2,000,000
1912-1921 inclusive—$924,855,968	288,200,000	294,576,600
Total for 11 years, 1912-1922 inclusive—$1,053,712,341.	1,039,304,311	296,576,600

Prior to 1922 the largest total in any year in cash dividends was $115,736,700 for 1920, which was nearly duplicated in 1921.

The record of cash and stock dividends declared by the various companies since January 1, 1922, up to the present time, as compiled by Jenks, Gwynne & Co., is as follows:

Name.	Total cash.	Total par value in stock.
Anglo-Amer. Oil	$1,980,000	
Atlantic Refin., com	1,000,000	
Atlantic Refin., pf	1,400,000	
Borne-Scrymser	70,000	$500,000
Buckeye Pipe Line	7,000,000	
Chesebrough Mfg., com	210,000	
Chesebrough Mfg., pf	70,000	
Cumberland Pipe Line	150,000	
Eureka Pipe Line	400,000	
Galena Sig. Oil, com	160,000	
Galena S. O., old pf	160,000	
Galena S. O., new pf	320,000	
Illinois Pipe Line	2,800,000	
Indiana Pipe Line	3,000,000	
National Transit	1,080,000	
New York Transit	4,800,000	
Northern Pipe Line	400,000	
Ohio Oil	5,400,000	45,000,000
Prairie Oil & Gas	4,140,000	
Prairie Pipe Line	4,820,000	
Solar Refining	300,000	2,000,000
Southern Pipe Line	800,000	
S. W. Pa. Pipe Line	245,000	
South Penn Oil	1,200,000	
S. O. of California	[1] 16,165,378	[1] 100,971,000
S. O. of Indiana	[1] 17,175,673	
S. O. of Kansas	300,000	6,000,000
S. O. of Kentucky	1,260,000	2,000,000
S. O. of Nebraska	600,000	
S. O. of N. J., com	[1] 19,676,660	[1] 393,333,200
S. O. of N. J., pf	[1] 13,573,662	
S. O. of New York	12,000,000	150,000,000
S. O. of Ohio, com	1,120,000	7,000,000
S. O. of Ohio, pf	490,000	
Union Tank Car, com	840,000	
Union Tank Car, pf	840,000	
Vacuum Oil	2,400,000	45,000,000
Total	128,856,373	751,104,311

[1] The outstanding amount of each of these stocks has been slightly increased since Dec. 31, 1921, but as the exact amount is not known yet, total payments are calculated on the Dec. 31, 1921, capitalization.

In addition to the companies mentioned above which have declared large stock dividends, similar action is expected by other units before the end of the year, while some of the pipe-line companies are expected to declare extra cash dividends. Those companies which are expected to declare stock dividends include the Atlantic Refining Co., Standard of Indiana, Prairie Oil & Gas, Prairie Pipe Line.

The Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey leads the list in both cash and stock dividend distributions. In the payments from 1912 to 1922, inclusive, this company disbursed a total of $216,344,436 in cash on the common stock, $37,599,278 on the preferred, or a total of $253,943,714, which is approximately one-fourth of the cash dividends distributed by all companies. Its subscription rights (to preferred stock) total $196,766,600, or about two-thirds of all rights given by these companies in the 11 years. Its stock dividend of $393,333,200 par value is about a third of the total par value of stock dividends by the entire group.

FEARS OF TAXATION.

The following is not of special moment excepting it explains why the vast crop of melons were cut after they were ripe. It would be cruel on the part of the new Congress to do anything that would disturb the melons or melon cutters, and Congress rarely does cruel things. It allows tax-free securities, or, rather, the Supreme Court allows all kinds of escape from the income tax, and that is law to-day:

STOCK DIVIDEND LAID TO FUTURE TAX FEARS—DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUSES DUE TO POSSIBLE DRASTIC ACTS BY NEW CONGRESS.

NEW YORK, December 4.—With stock dividend declarations announced by leading Standard Oil companies and other prominent industrial corporations during the last few months amounting to approximately $1,500,000,000, the question as to what is the purpose of this flood of stock distributions continues to attract more attention as one announcement of such a dividend follows another. That the question of taxes is back of the entire movement, says the New York Times, is the belief which dominates in the financial district, but as already pointed out there is also the desire on the part of the officials of companies whose stocks have been selling higher to bring down quotations to a level which would appeal more to the general investing public, and also the desire of these officials to bring capital more in line with the investment in the business rather than continue to pile it up in surplus accounts. These latter reasons, however, are considered of minor importance so that all arguments are based upon the question of taxes.

In regard to taxation, the provisions of the present law are well known. These are not believed to be the cause for the recent flood of stock dividend announcements. What the officials fear, according to opinion, is the possibility of drastic revision in the tax laws when the new Congress meets for regular session. Before this takes place, however, it is expected that agitation will be brought about to have the entire question of the taxability of stock dividends presented to the Supreme Court for review.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

[By unanimous consent Mr. FREAR was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I should perhaps ask the pardon of the House for taking up the amount of time assigned to me out of the time allotted for the discussion of this important bill, and I am going to do my very best to get through in less than 30 minutes and yield back some of the time to the gentleman in control of the time.

This is the annual appropriation bill dealing with the great industry of agriculture. During the past two years the people of the Nation apparently have come to appreciate the importance of agriculture, not only as the source of their food and clothing but as the source of business, as the root of our entire industrial plant in a most definite sense. During the first of the period of readjustment following the war, when the strain, the pressure, came against the interrelated industries of the country, we broke at the point held by agriculture because there was no economic strength there. When agriculture lost its purchasing power the factories were closed, and idle men walked the streets of the great cities of this country. I believe we have reached the point where definite results of universal benefit may be expected. We now have all sorts of blocs—we have the farm bloc in the Senate and the farm bloc in the House, and everybody is trying to do something for the farmer. When the President appeared before the House and Senate in joint session the other day he made certain observations and recommendations, and I ask the Clerk to read from that address the paragraphs which I have marked.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

There are necessary studies of great problems which Congress might well initiate. The wide spread between production costs and prices which consumers pay concerns every citizen of the Republic. It contributes very largely to the unrest in agriculture and must stand sponsor for much against which we inveigh in that familiar term—the high cost of living.

No one doubts the excess is traceable to the levy of the middleman, but it would be unfair to charge him with all responsibility before we appraise what is exacted of him by our modernly complex life. We have attacked the problem on one side by the promotion of cooperative marketing, and we might well inquire into the benefits of cooperative buying. Admittedly the consumer is much to blame himself, because of his prodigal expenditure and his exaction of service, but Government might well serve to point the way of narrowing the spread of price, especially between the production of food and its consumption.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is in no spirit of criticism that I direct attention to that part of the President's message, and direct attention to the fact that some time ago you authorized that this identical study be made. You created a Commission on Agricultural Inquiry, of which Mr. ANDERSON, the gentleman in charge of this bill, was the chairman. That commission made a concrete recommendation to the country after nine months of exhaustive study, and I ask the Clerk to read that.

The Clerk read as follows:

With the better organization and standardization of farm production, the organization of farmers' cooperative associations, the evolution of grades more accurately reflecting the qualities of farm products in relation to use, the establishment of concentration warehouses at points within the areas of production, issuing receipts or certificates which clearly indicate such grades and guarantee the physical protection and quality of product, it should be possible to develop a system of commodity exchanges through which these commodities may be sold and under which such products will move directly from areas of production to points of use under prior sale without the necessity of previous inspection and with the assurance of delivery of a product by grade conforming to the user's or consumer's requirements.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss as briefly as I can those recommendations.

My observation during my period of service in Congress is that we talk too much, too generally, investigate too much, study too much, and do not undertake to apply to a given situation the knowledge which we acquire. Let us see what the concrete suggestions are.

Of course, we require in this country a system of long-time agricultural credits. Everybody recognizes that, and a bill has been introduced looking to that end. In this connection, may I say that we have made a fundamental mistake in dealing with the extension of agricultural credits in taking the position that paper secured by agricultural commodities being held by producers ought not to be regarded as eligible for rediscount through the Federal reserve system. It is nobody's business when the farmer sells his commodity. He raises it and it is his, and as long as he tenders a good sound basis for credit he ought to be the judge of when it is to be sold. If he is permitted to hold it, instead of the speculator, the consumer will not have to pay a speculator's profit. That is not merely to the interest of the agricultural producer. I make the further suggestion that we are rapidly moving toward a condition in this country with regard to the volume of agricultural production when there will not be sufficient surplus carried over from the years of high production to make sure a sufficient surplus in the lean years. The difference in the price of the same commodity from year to year is too great. It is of the highest importance that somewhere we find, and find soon, in the economic structure of this country a reservoir where we can hold over from the years of high production to supplement the yield of the years of low production.

There is too much uncertainty as to when the bugs or the droughts will come. The manufacturer can speed up to meet any emergency demand. With a given amount of equipment and material he can calculate with certainty almost as to his future output. Farmers can not do that. The farmer who helps to carry over from a bountiful harvest helps to guard the people against hunger, or at least ruinous prices when the lean years come.

If we make it possible for the farmer, when the volume is excessive and the price is low, to carry this surplus himself, then there will be something for the people in the city to eat when the bugs and the drought comes, and we will not have this spread of price which we now have, which ruins farmers when the yield is good and makes the cost of living too heavy a burden in the lean years.

I ask nothing for the farmer which is not in accord with the highest public interest. We have reached the point where that interest demands a definite, comprehensive, constructive policy for agriculture. Much of this demand for radical legislation comes as a penalty for inexcusable delay. In addition to a proper credit system, not one cut to fit the necessities of the manufacturer or of the merchant, but of the farmer, we must find a way to shorten the route of physical movement of agricultural products, and in some way we must reduce the number of intervening profits.

In some way we must reduce the physical waste of these commodities after they have been harvested. These are the definite concrete propositions which challenge us now as a people. Those are the things which enter so largely into what we call the high cost of living. They cause the farmer to get too little and compel the consumer to pay too much. How are we going to do it? How can it be done? There is but one way to do it, and I submit with all deference to gentlemen who might differ—I do not believe they differ—we must make it possible to deal with agricultural commodities on paper. In addition to credits we must evolve a better method of sales and distribution of agricultural products than the shipping of those commodities from the farms to the concentration centers to find a market. If we are to effect the greatest good, they must move from the place of first concentration to the points of use by the shortest railroad and steamboat line. In order to do that they must move under prior sale or with an assurance of use at destination equivalent to that. There is no other way to do it. The time has come when we must stop running around in a circle. If I may be permitted to speak the certainty which I feel, this is the only route that we may travel with a warranted hope of success. It is the first essential, gentlemen, that agricultural commodities be standardized with regard to requirement for use, and the quicker we learn the better.

You never can take these so-called produce exchanges that are privately owned, merchant controlled, where gambling transactions are admittedly carried on, and build upon them as a foundation a real market for agricultural commodities. [Applause.] During the 10 years almost of my service I have seen the Congress legislating, legislating, trying to compel this service from privately owned institutions which say they can not function in that regard. The fact that we have been trying to compel them to render this service is an evidence of our belief that it is needed. They do not want to, can not, and we know if forced to the effort would desire to fail, and yet we continue to try to have them perform this public function. I offer no apology for this statement. From times most remote the establishment and regulation of public market facilities has been recognized as government's chief duty with regard to com-

merce. That duty discharged in adjustment with modern economic conditions and trade necessities, not the buying and selling for the people, but the creation of the possibility of general trade contact, and the necessity for many of our regulatory laws would disappear, democracy in business opportunity would be established, and the laws of commerce which God has made would have a chance to operate. I make this general observation as a preface to the statement that it is at the marketing end where the chief difficulty of agriculture lies, and there the chief duty of the Government is. Unreasonable demands upon the Government come largely from the failure of the Government to do what it ought to do at the time it ought to be done.

Let us forget about these so-called produce exchanges. They never can function directly in the economic sale and distribution of farm products. These products are capable of being dealt in on paper, of being bought and sold for shipment to any point of consumption in the world while they are still at the points of first concentration. It is difficult, of course. Everything worth while is difficult. But we have reached the point where we must tackle the job. First, these commodities must be graded according to requirement for use, as distinguished from requirement for future board transactions. Each considerable quantity possessing distinctive characteristics determinative of the use to which it is best adapted must have a separate grade classification. If we will get away from the limitations imposed by the future boards, it can be worked out.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Is it not true the Secretary of Agriculture is just now through its department carrying on an investigation of the standardizing of tobacco, for instance, and——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; much work, and what I say is not in criticism of the Department of Agriculture. What I am trying to do is to get before us a picture of the structure of economic strength which we must build for agriculture. It was brought out in the hearings of the Commission on Agricultural Inquiry that nobody who wants to use cotton or grain can depend upon the purchase of those commodities through any of the so-called exchanges. Why? Because they have in mind a particular sort of finished product which requires for production a particular sort of raw material, which they can not depend upon getting when they purchase through the exchanges or when they purchase by grade, due largely to improper and incomplete grade classifications, which in turn is to a degree due to the influence of future board requirements. With these commodities properly standardized, and when they are stored in the warehouses where they are physically and morally protected, and the warehouse issues a certificate that indicates the exact quantity and quality of the commodity, and that warehouse receipt has behind it financial responsibility that guarantee both physical protection of the commodity and integrity of the whole transaction, then you create a universal potential commercial status for that commodity while it is still at the point of first concentration. In other words, the commodity can stay where it is while you send that which represents it into the market to be sold.

Proper standardization, proper system of warehousing, and then the third thing that is necessary, namely, the place where that certificate, representing the actual commodity stored in the warehouse, physically and morally protected, can be offered for sale, some place, not a little obscure place hidden in a department, but some place, figuratively speaking, which stands on the hilltop of commerce where everybody who has a commodity for sale can offer it by its descriptive grade and everybody who wants to buy can buy, not necessarily in person but by telegraph or through an agent on the ground. That is a mere detail. This would create the possibility of universal trade contract between people who have commodities for sale and people who want to buy.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. In a moment. That would make possible for cotton in a warehouse in Waxahachie, in my district, properly classified, properly certificated, properly protected, and properly guaranteed—it would make it possible for that cotton while remaining there to be placed in trade with China, Liverpool, Bremen, Havre, or wherever cotton is used. Then when it is sold it could move from Waxahachie by the shortest physical line to the point of use with the minimum number of intervening profits and charges.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. McKENZIE. I just wish to ask the gentleman from Texas, who is an expert on these matters, if he does not believe, as an alternative to the proposition that he has just now laid down concerning the warehousing of all these products, that if the suggestion of the President of the United States, made recently, were followed by Congress and credit could be extended to the farmers of the country on their products, such as wheat and cotton, would it not be better to have the farmer build his own granary or his own warehouse for storing his wheat or his cotton if he had the credit and he could hold it there himself and avoid one of the things we are now cursed with, and that is the lack of transportation occasioned by all of the farmers in a certain section wishing to take advantage of the market at the same time?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have the same object in view, and I thought I had made myself clear. I agree with the President as to the necessity of having long-time agricultural credits. I agree thoroughly with the President that we must get rid of what we call "crop-moving periods." It taxes unnecessarily the financial institutions of the country and the transportation facilities of the country. It is a foolish thing. But the point I make is, in addition to long-time credit, is that it is highly essential that these commodities move under prior sale from the point of first concentration to the point of use by the shortest physical line. I want to make it possible for the farmer to hold his stuff until the market condition is ripe for sale, and then when he, with a group of other farmers selling in cooperation, wants to sell they have a chance in trade contact with the general markets of the country and of the world. I do not believe it is possible for an individual farmer not acting in cooperation with his neighbors, even if he has got credit or if acting with them to accomplish what is desired, unless there be the chance to reach the general market before the products are shipped for sale. We must not be mistaken or confused about the value of credit. Credit is valuable, but credit means interest and a sale at some time to pay the principal and interest. A better marketing system will be as badly needed when the sale is made as if no credit had been extended. They are both needed. That is the point. It takes all of what I have enumerated, if I may use the figure, to span the difficulty. Credit for orderly marketing, but the broadest possible market in which to sell.

I would not have in mind the idea that immediately after the harvest the farmers would send all the commodities they contemplated selling into a public warehouse; but I do believe that you must be able to put somewhere behind these commodities such assurance of financial responsibility as that a stranger, a man who has never seen the commodity, who has no knowledge of the financial responsibility of the owner or of his integrity, would have full confidence to buy the commodity. In other words, to do with regard to agricultural commodities what we have done with regard to rural credits. Under our farm land bank system a farm is appraised and put under mortgage, and a man in New England buys that mortgage on a Texas farm, we will say, which he has never seen. He does not know whether the man who owns it is a thief or not; he does not care. He has confidence in the intervening agency of inspection and guaranty. The difficulty with regard to sale of agricultural commodities is almost identical with the difficulty with regard to the sale of rural credits.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not want to divert the gentleman from his argument, but he said that one difficulty about our deliberations on these matters was that we talked a great deal and did not get down to concrete action. Now, as to the classification of commodities and the warehousing of commodities, does the gentleman think that should be done by private enterprise and cooperation, or should there be a quasi authority or an absolute authority over these agricultural functions? What is the gentleman's thought on that?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have thought very much of that. I do not advocate Government building warehouses. The gentleman's question touches the only point where there is any reason or excuse for making an additional study. In my judgment it is a matter of ascertaining in the general coordination of the national and State departments of agriculture the distribution of governmental assistance and supervision. The total of that in turn will depend upon how much of that which is required to be done can be left to cooperative effort and private agencies. The first thing, however, is for us to agree as to what ought to be done. The Department of Agriculture of the Nation, the departments of agriculture of the several States, with no great readjustment can, if agreed to be necessary, provide the Government's share of aid, and the cooperative organizations of the farmers I believe can supply the rest. That is the only study yet to be made. I do not know, but I do have this in mind, the thought that the Department of Agriculture of the Nation, created by the Gov-

ernment and its people to help deal with the big problems of agriculture, ought to feel, and I hope it does feel, the same degree of responsibility and duty in helping agriculture to deal with the big problems of sale and distribution that it feels when it renders service with reference to the problems of production and preservation of soil fertility. The fact is, gentlemen, practically speaking, if you help agriculture to deal with the sale and distribution end of its business, the point where the nerve center of agriculture is now located, if you help the farmer get a fair share of what the consumer pays for his commodity, the question of production and preservation of soil fertility will pretty largely take care of themselves. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Does not the gentleman believe that if we could get money on longer terms or at a lower rate of interest and then take advantage of the national warehouse law that we have and of the cooperative marketing law, we could get along fairly well?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I believe we could get along fairly well and very nicely. But I do insist, my good friend, that we need the things that I have enumerated. We need the credit which the gentleman has spoken of. We need the warehouse system that he has spoken of. We need the proper standardization of these commodities by which they can be given a universal trade status while at the point of first concentration; and then when we have the agricultural product ready for sale we need a place that sustains relatively the same position with regard to the commodity that a jockey yard bears to the fellow who has a horse to swap. I do not want to stop short of the manifest destination. This grading is to prepare for sale by grade. This warehousing is to protect physically and provide a guaranty of correct grading. This credit is to make orderly marketing possible. Then the next thing obviously is the market place; otherwise we have it all dressed up with nowhere to go. The market is the objective. Let us provide the possibilities of trade contact.

In the little country towns in my country we used to have a place near the courthouse square where on first Mondays every man knew who had a horse to swap that he could find other people of similar disposition, and by assembling there it saved a great deal of time and expense and trouble in the horse swapping that the country did. I want to create that which in the sale of farm products by grade will be to such sales what the jockey yard was to horse swappers, except that that which represents the commodity would be sent to market, and when the commodity moves it would not be to market but to the place where it would be consumed.

Mr. LAZARO. Let us see if I have this thing right now. Under the national warehouse law the farmers of your country, for instance, could build a bonded warehouse, could they not?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Every bale of cotton in this bonded warehouse would be weighed and graded by a Government agent, who would be neither a buyer nor a seller. Is not that true?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Then with a receipt issued by that bonded warehouse, all it would need would be someone willing to loan money on long time at a low rate of interest, and a man could borrow money on his warehouse receipt.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If the gentleman will excuse me, I should like to proceed in the order which I have in mind.

Mr. LAZARO. I should like to get the gentleman's views on this national warehouse proposition.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have tried to make myself clear on it. In my judgment, it is going to take all four of the things I have enumerated to put agricultural commodities in trading contact with the market so as to reduce to a minimum the intervening profits, reduce physical waste, and make it possible for the farmer to get a larger share of the dollar that the consumer pays than he now gets. That is the thought I have in mind. Each of the things which I have enumerated sustains a natural relationship to the others. They are parts of the whole. They fit into each other. Each is, in the nature of things, dependent upon all the others for its proper functioning. To illustrate, agricultural commodities properly standardized, physically and morally protected in a warehouse and in general trade contact with the markets all the time through a real produce exchange, would constitute the best and safest possible basis for the rural credit system we have been talking about. Such commodities, in the event of their distress due to the financial necessities of their owners and your market conditions, would have a chance to be reached by the speculative energy of the country, which now is absorbed by chalk-mark transactions on future boards.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know how much time I have remaining. I had 30 minutes to begin with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 28 minutes. He has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Is the gentleman prepared to state how he would apply his idea to the live-stock industry? I am very much interested in that.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will try to state it very briefly. I can not speak as an expert, as the gentleman can in regard to live stock, but I have been out on the ranches a good deal. I believe if we had a proper system of standardization of live stock the gentleman from Kansas could go into a herd of 1,000 white-faced cattle and separate them into five different bunches of more uniformity than any expert cotton grader can separate 1,000 bales of cotton into five lots. That is my idea.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. The gentleman compliments me too highly.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think it can be done. I have talked with a great many ranchmen who seem to think it can be done. If it can be done, then that is the end of it. If practical, this is true if you had a market herd graded, you could list that market herd by grades and thereby put it in trading contact with every packing house while the herd was still on the range. When it was moved it would be moved to the point of purchase for slaughter with no uncertainty as to price, and you would not be at the disadvantage at which you now are, after you have shipped your stock into the cattle pens, where they have to be maintained at a high cost, and are subject to shrinkage, and you are almost at the mercy of the men who want to buy. You do not have a fair trade opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD of North Carolina. When the gentleman extends his remarks I ask him to elaborate them by stating his machinery for selling and for reaching the market, after the product is stored.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I will be glad to do so if I can find time to extend. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with a great deal of what our friend from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has just said, particularly as to our manner of doing business here, perhaps too much talking and too little accomplishment. I do not know that there is any way of correcting that condition. I have no suggestion to offer as to the method of procedure, but I think the illustration that some of us saw last week in one of the well-known weeklies is quite apropos. It was a take-off on our manner of doing business here, the politeness that we show in debate, and so forth. It was supposed to be a debate on a resolution to send for a physician for some one who had been injured. The debate and the politeness among the Members and the parliamentary procedure ran on so long that eventually the injured person died. So an amendment was offered to send for the coroner instead of for a doctor, and even that was objected to. I use that as an illustration for a condition which is developing very rapidly to-day in New England. The coldest part of our winter is coming on. We suffer severely from low temperature, particularly in the section of New England where I live. I have been in correspondence with some of my friends at home during the last few days, and I find that the fuel situation there is very critical indeed. I do not know who or what is to blame, beyond the strike conditions of last summer, with which we are all familiar. The President came before us and asked to have a fact-finding commission appointed, and we have a fuel director here in Washington for the Federal Government. We have one in Massachusetts for the State, and I think other States have the same. But the fact remains, my friends, that we do not get coal. I do not pretend I can offer any cure for that condition. The people expect we should and want us to do so. I stand ready in any way possible to cooperate with my colleagues to bring about a better condition of fuel supply for New England. Of course, the average citizen has some rather indistinct and vague ideas as to our powers here. I try frequently to convince them that we are not all

powerful, and that we can not do the impossible. Perhaps it is beyond human power to remedy the fuel situation in New England which exists to-day. I am only making this statement with a hope that if there is any progress being made or any process under consideration to remove the serious condition that confronts our section of the country during the next few weeks and months it may be drawn to the attention of the proper officials. Our people for warmth burn anthracite coal, and to be supplied with bituminous coal will not altogether obviate the situation. We must get anthracite coal into New England.

Is there a cure for our people? If so, come to our assistance. So if my colleagues or other officials can offer any concrete specific method of assisting in the correction of that condition, let us get at it before the patient dies. [Applause.]

The critical situation demands prompt action, and if it can be discovered that the fault lies at the door of any one person or any group of persons, let correction be promptly made.

If it is true miners will not load cars unless a guaranteed number are on the track, if it is true that transportation lines fail to return cars to the mine for loading, if it is true that transportation lines prefer to supply customers on their own line, if it is true that coal is diverted from its original destination, if it is true that some dealers are mercilessly profiteering, if numerous other similar complaints that come to us are true—does no authority exist to overcome these conditions?

In spite of improved business conditions throughout Massachusetts, we hear many references made to the spirit of unrest broadcast among the people. Who is at fault? Certainly not the man or woman who, in these bitter winter days, finds it impossible to make the dear ones at home comfortable. The family hearthstone instead of being a place of comfort and pleasure will, in our section, soon become the center of distress. This must not be and we ask for the help of such authorities as either individually or collectively can correct existing conditions and prevent them reaching a point in the next few weeks of positive misery.

Christmas cheer is at hand. No brighter smile could spread the countenance of the people of Massachusetts than knowledge that Uncle Sam in the bounty of his provision had supplied Santa Claus with comfort for the people for the next three months.

The last speaker made reference to President Harding's address. One sentence, I think he did not quote, that struck me as being of considerable interest, and it was this: "Agriculture is a vital activity in our national life. In it we had our beginning, and its westward march with the Star of the Empire has reflected the growth of the Republic."

The President recognizes that agriculture had its inception in this country in the East and has proceeded West. I have frequently told my friends at home that there is one drawback in our relationship as a group of men. It is hard to get out of the mind of the average Member of this House that New England is not altogether an industrial section. We are an agricultural section and have absolute sympathy with agriculture so ably aided by the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I want particularly to commend the work of the special commission of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] was chairman, and the very voluminous report which that committee made. [Applause.] I also want to commend the purpose of the so-called farm bloc. I have not agreed with their efforts always, but they have known what they wanted and have gone to work to get it, and for that reason within the last session or so it has been a very marked success. [Applause.]

[Mr. TREADWAY had leave to extend his remarks.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE.]

Mr. LITTLE. During the war prices went mountain high. I am able to announce that the price of wheat has gone back to normal, and I also find it necessary to announce that wheat finds itself very lonesome. The farmer is about the only man who is compelled to take for his work whatever anybody will give him. Everybody that sells the farmer arbitrarily fixes the price that the farmer must pay. He is, therefore, totally unable to protect himself under the laws of supply and demand. Labor organizations throw a cordon about their wages that enables them to get bigger wages than laboring men are paid anywhere else in the world at any time and always know what they will get. The protective tariff assists in protecting those wages, and also in enabling the manufacturers to defy the world. The farmer's business is always a precarious one. He puts the seed in the ground every year and bets a nickel it grows. Every crop is an adventure and a gamble. If nature is bountiful, the surplus cuts the price down to where he isn't much better off. The wheat gamblers can evade the laws of supply and demand, form a bloc, pyramid the price of wheat, and make a fortune almost any time. Is it not curious that nobody has ever thought of any way by which the farmer could take advantage of the laws of supply and demand for his own welfare? He has reached the point where somebody has got to apply the rules of common sense under the laws of supply and demand or the wheat farmers will all be ruined and compelled to quit. They can not pay three prices for machinery and everything they buy and not get the cost of their wheat. They fight with the whole world for their prices. In 1915 there were some 3,500,000,000 bushels of wheat, with which they competed, of course. During the six years before that, Russia produced a little more wheat than did the United States, and the rest of the world produced more wheat than did Russia and the United States combined. The time has come when the Government of the United States should take some intelligent steps to assist the splendid people engaged in this industry. The farmer is about the only old-fashioned workingman we have left; he puts in 12 hours a day, never watches the clock, and never strikes. You then reply that he never will and that we can get along anyway. Just a few months ago laboring men who quarreled with their employers made a terrific attempt to wreck, ruin, and destroy the transportation system of this country to get what they claimed was justice. Do not, gentlemen, trespass too much on the farmer's patience and on his chance of making a living.

BRAZIL BUYS ALL ITS COFFEE.

Ten years ago Russia was producing more wheat than we did. Well, the Russian farmer struck; what wheat does the world get from there now? Half the fortunes of our big business are simply castles in the air. Take heed, gentlemen, that they don't take flight as did the magnificence of the czars and their associates. Two men can always have their way with a third man whenever they want to. You tell me that nothing can be done. Twenty years ago the price of coffee had fallen from 132 francs per 50 kilos to 30 francs, and the coffee planters of Brazil were ruined, as was the country and its revenues. Brazil adopted the radical and thorough policy of buying all the coffee produced there and restricting the amount of acreage. They reached a place where the Government of Brazil had on hand 8,000,000 sacks of coffee themselves, but they won; the tide turned; the government made a fortune; the people engaged in coffee planting all became prosperous; coffee went back to 90 francs per 50 kilos. The gentlemen who claim they are against the Government going into business should begin to shape their steps to make it unnecessary and take warning by such a success in Brazil. In 10 years Russia will be back in the wheat markets with a supply as great as ever. They will handle their wheat just exactly, in effect, as Brazil handles its coffee, and the American farmer will be up against that kind of organized and ferocious competition, and, gentlemen, you will then, at the point of the gun, launch your country into the necessary combat that will arise. Let us now endeavor to take safe, conservative, wise, prudent steps to make it unnecessary for the Government to go into business.

THE SENATE COMMITTEE'S BILL.

Now, do not tell me that we will loan them some money. That, gentlemen, is not going to solve this problem. I hope we will establish this winter a satisfactory credit system that can enable the farmer to finance his enterprises, but that won't make wheat worth $1 a bushel, which is as little as they can raise it for and still live. It does not require any great tax on a man's mental processes to make a motion to pay them $2 a bushel for all the surplus either, and every time you simply pay a fancy price and take in the surplus, you have given an overstimulation that brings you next year a bigger and more dangerous surplus and puts you further in the hole. The other day a great committee in another body reported favorably a bill to establish a corporation and endow it with $100,000,000 and authority to borrow $500,000,000 on bonds that it might go into the wheat business. You can adopt that policy if you wish and see what happens. Personally, I think if the Government is going into the business it ought to go into it itself and not be mixed up with corporations which will get beyond its control and spend its money as they please. Whether such an enterprise which would attempt to do business just like any other wheat buyer would be a success, you can figure as well as I can. If you like, there is your chance to try something. On the other hand, gentlemen, I have ventured to present a proposition that, in my judgment, will make it unnecessary for the Government to go into the wheat business, but will make it as certain that the farmer will get at least $1 a bushel for his wheat as it can be without getting into conflict with the laws of supply and demand, and without endeavoring to set the

Government up as the universal almoner of the wheat grower. The suggestions I shall venture to make are grounded on the rules of common sense. Instead of being a scheme to get into the wheat business, it is a plan to keep out. Of course, if you are opposed to the Government carrying the mails and handling the schools and building the Panama Canal, you might be opposed to the proposed legislation, but if you are, why I shall insist that you be consistent and vote against the appropriation for the Post Office Department. If not, gentlemen, come with me a moment.

STAR OF EMPIRE STUCK IN WHEAT FIELDS.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts told me that he would quote a beautiful expresssion in the President's message about the Star of Empire progressing westward. I take the liberty of calling your attention to the fact that the Star of Empire is stuck out there and that it is not going any farther if the farmers of this country can not have some assurance of the stability of the price of wheat. There is a system of handling wheat through the storehouses in the grain elevators with warehouse receipts. If there were not such a system I should not have proposed the legislation I have presented to the Agricultural Committee. Without that opportunity I would not regard it as feasible.

If H. R. 13352 becomes a law, an appropriation of $30,000,000 will be made and the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized to expend it in the purchase of wheat at not to exceed the local market price, not to exceed $1.10 a bushel, and at such times and places as he selects, and of such grades and qualities as he designates. He will be authorized to buy at not more than the market prices at each place. The wheat he purchases will be deposited by him in elevators and he will receive warehouse receipts. As the wheat is shipped and replaced from month to month, it will never deteriorate, and the charge for its care, which will include the insurance, will be very small, and in this way he will gradually accumulate and store that much wheat.

FINANCES ITSELF.

When he has accumulated 25,000,000 bushels he may, with that as security, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, secure an issue of Treasury certificates equaling the amount paid for that 25,000,000 bushels, and use the same to purchase another stock. As the first 25,000,000 bushels is sold, the money received for it will be used to pay off the said Treasury certificates, and that process may be repeated as he shall see fit. If any 25,000,000 bushels should not bring quite enough to take care of those Treasury certificates, he may draw on the revolving fund for that purpose. In this way Congress will never be asked for any further funds with which to purchase, but the proposition will thus finance itself after the first appropriation. He will thus have more money as becomes necessary.

As he does not pay above the market price anywhere, wheat buyers will be able to purchase whatever wheat they need at the price they then find in the market. They will take what they need and the Secretary will merely absorb the surplus wheat offered for sale gradually and in full accord with the ordinary laws of supply and demand, just as any other purchaser would get it, until the Secretary has taken up the slack and has absorbed that immediate surplus, whereupon the purchasers in the market, having ascertained that that surplus is gone, will stop the Governments' further purchases by paying $1.11 for wheat, which drives the Government out of the market and gives the farmer the benefit of this increase in price, just as would result under any competition. From then on, wheat, having a good foundation, will continue under the ordinary laws of supply and demand, and the Secretary will have accumulated his reserve supply of wheat at the lowest market prices and he will have no high-priced wheat at any time.

SECRETARY CAN HOLD WHEAT UP TO $1.

This proposed legislation further provides that whenever wheat shall go below $1 a bushel anywhere, the Secretary may, if he sees fit, pay $1 a bushel. Without any effort to fix a price for wheat and leaving to the Secretary the option of declining to pay $1, the farmer is reasonably assured of $1 a bushel, which, to say the least, is as little as he should ever be expected to raise wheat for anywhere in this country. The idea of this legislation is that whenever nature gives a bountiful crop with an exceptionally large number of bushels per acre, the Secretary will absorb in the course of the year the surplus; but whenever speculators, stimulated by the probability that the Secretary will buy at $1 all they offer, shall plant an area artificial as compared with the real demand, the Secretary will decline to purchase the surplus. The Federal reserve banks announced the other day that as long as these cooperative societies confined their operations to the ordinary course of trade, their paper would be handled by the banks, but whenever they undertook to hold their crops for speculative gains the banks would not handle their paper. The Secretary will, it is supposed, apply the same theory to the wheat growers, and the probability is that the cooperative societies and farmers' associations and the Secretary working together will be able to keep the acreage within bounds so that the farmer can be practically certain of a reasonable acreage and at least $1 a bushel. The prices that I have suggested of $1 and $1.10 are, of course, purely tentative and subject to correction by the committee or the House if it shall be demonstrated that they are too much or too little to effect the purpose.

PROVIDES FOR 5-CENT LOAF.

This bill would provide that whenever wheat can not be bought for less than $1.85 in New York City and Chicago, the Secretary shall begin selling from his stock to relieve the scarcity and maintain a bread supply at a reasonable price, maintaining a 5-cent loaf, it is hoped. Whenever this stringency comes, or whenever speculators have pyramided wheat up to $1.85, the Secretary must sell at such prices as he deems proper and as long as he deems to the best interests of the Nation. This makes impossible any corner by gamblers that would profit by exorbitant prices, which will be one of the valuable results from having on hand this continual reserve of wheat.

At any time the Secretary may sell wheat at not less than the market prices in Minneapolis, Buffalo, Kansas City, Kans., Chicago, and New York if he deems proper for the good of the Nation. As he sells at the market prices, he does not interfere with business, and it is intended that he shall not put at any time enough wheat on the market to affect those prices, except at $1.85 or more, but as he buys wheat at $1.10 or less, it is anticipated that during the course of the year he will be able to sell some wheat at more than that and net a profit for the department, which will carry on its incidental expenses and maintain its funds, but it is not the purpose of this plan that the Secretary shall go so far as to be engaged in the wheat business in competition with other wheat traders, except when wheat is down to $1.10 or up to $1.85.

WORKS LIKE GOLD RESERVE.

This bill will thus make it unnecessary for the Government to go into business as a wheat firm, and is intended to keep the Government out of that business.

As soon as the gold reserve was formed, the currency became worth 100 cents on the dollar. Nobody wanted gold when they found they could get it. As soon as the Secretary has shown people that the Government stands ready to buy wheat at $1, the same result will be achieved; wheat will not be sold for less than $1 with the Government ready to pay that.

To convince the public of the Government's good faith, it will not be necessary to buy in all the States. If the Government is known to be ready to pay $1, the influence of that on the market would assure them of $1, or if they purchased wheat in any half dozen States the same result would be reached.

This will also give the Secretary the power to break up the pyramiding of wheat for speculative purposes. He can buy wheat at not over $1.10 and break in whenever he sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. People respect the good faith of their Government after many years of experience. When they understand that it will pay them $1 for wheat, or a dollar in gold for a paper dollar, they will not any more come to the Secretary with wheat to sell for $1 than they would come to Washington to ask the Secretary of the Treasury to give them a dollar in gold. This is the judgment of many sound business men who have examined the bill. If we would by law fix the price at a given amount, that would not affect the market price effectually at all like the Government's readiness to buy it at that. On the other hand, if he were directly ordered to pay that in all events, that would leave the plan no elasticity and would add greatly to the difficulties of its execution and success. In Brazil, where they buy all the coffee, they directly restrict the acreage in coffee and have great success. The surplus makes all the trouble, and no proposition can succeed unless it takes due notice of the possibilities of a surplus and guards against being carried too far by it. With these qualifications and limitations which guard against too great an acreage, it is as certain that wheat can thus be held at $1 as is any other business proposition in which men ever engage. In reaching that conclusion, the business experience of centuries has been

taken into consideration. Everything has been considered except the flood, which of course would wreck my plan. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. May I inquire why the gentleman does not include other crops in the bill to stabilize wheat values?

WHY WHEAT ONLY.

Mr. LITTLE. As I stated in the beginning, this bill would never have been drawn but for the fact that the system of storage in wheat elevators at a nominal price, where the wheat is never allowed to deteriorate but can always be found by the Government, makes wheat peculiarly the crop for attempting this stabilization of values. Except perhaps oats and barley, no other crop can possibly be handled with equal facility and economy, and I would not have drawn the bill but for these facts. If such a bill can not pass, where there is practically no possibility of failure, it would not be worth while to attempt it with any other crop. I am glad the gentleman asked this question because it again directs attention to the readiness with which this crop alone can be handled without interference with the orderly course of the market and without any investment by the Government in great warehouses. Again, there is no other food crop that compares with it in extent and importance to the consumer and the producer. Furthermore, there is no other crop so situated as to be so in need of some such method as this. The purpose of this bill is to stabilize the price of wheat, and I drew it for that purpose, and one reason I did not put in other crops was that I proposed this bill to accomplish that and if others have bills to propose they can read this bill and go ahead and write their own. My method is entirely at their service. While it is true that no such proposition was ever before made, it is also true that nobody has suggested any serious criticism of the proposition, and if I have overlooked somebody's crops, this opportunity is much more at his disposal than it was before I drew this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, while this has nothing to do with the subject matter before the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in discussing the constitutional amendment presented to the House yesterday made a criticism that is in one sense so serious that it seems desirable to answer it to-day, so that those Members who desire to think over the whole proposition between now and the time when it will again come before the House may have the opportunity to weigh the merits of the criticism.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] says that the amendment is fundamentally defective in that theoretically at least this situation might arise: The United States Government might have no securities outstanding and it would then be in a position to discriminate against State and municipal securities by taxing the income derived therefrom at a higher rate than, let us say, railroad bonds or industrial securities. I say that the objection is theoretical, because certainly not in 150 years and more, if our experience with the Civil War debt means anything, if England's experience with the Napoleonic war debt means anything, will the United States find itself with no outstanding securities. But is it sound as a theoretical proposition? The resolution submitted by the committee provides that the United States may tax the income from State and municipal securities providing that it does not discriminate against income derived from State securities and in favor of incomes derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article, by or under the authority of the United States. If it stopped there, there would be some merit in the suggestion of my friend from Texas, but the words "United States" are followed by the words "or any other State."

There are, therefore, two limitations. The United States may not discriminate in favor of its own securities, and it may not discriminate in favor of any securities issued by a State or under the authority of a State. Corporations are not natural persons. They owe their existence to the laws of the State which creates them. Securities issued by a corporation are issued by virtue of the authority given by the State which creates the corporation, and the very words of the resolution providing that you can not discriminate in favor of securities issued under the authority of a State is a limitation against discriminating in favor of any securities issued by a corporation created by the State. That is the specific purpose intended by that language. If we attempted, for instance, to discriminate in favor of railroad bonds, taxing their income at a lower rate than the income from State and municipal securities, we would violate specifically the words of lines 2 and 3 on page 2 of this resolution by discriminating in favor of securities issued by virtue of the authority granted by a State.

If the gentleman's objections are unsound, I suggest to him that his remedy—the remedy which he proposes—is even more unsound. His amendment will not only limit the taxing authority of the United States, but let me point out to him that he is going to limit very strictly the taxing authority of the States. He limits the taxing authority of the Federal Government when he provides that there shall be no discrimination in favor of income derived "from any source." He will thereby knock out our present income tax law, in which we do discriminate, in so far as the normal tax is concerned, with reference to the dividends paid by corporations. He will further knock out the exemptions granted to holders of outstanding Federal securities, because he wipes out the words "issued after the ratification of this amendment" contained in the committee resolution; and he will make it impossible in the future for the Federal Government to discriminate between earned and unearned income, a reform urged very earnestly and with considerable force by some of the wisest of our tax reformers.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I prefer to finish the statement, as I have only eight minutes. What does he do to the States? As the amendment now stands, the State may keep inviolate its present method of taxing securities. It can still tax all securities except Federal on their property value, whether at the general property rate or at a classified property rate. It can, in addition, if this amendment be adopted, tax Federal securities in so far as their income is concerned; but if we do as the gentleman suggests, and that is introduce the words "from any source," then if the State desires to tax income from Federal securities it will have to wipe out all of its property taxes on securities and adopt a general income tax or forego the right to tax the income from Federal securities. Even when it comes to drafting that general income tax, unless it is willing to tax the incomes from Federal securities at the lowest rate adopted, it is going to find itself unable to classify income-tax payers; it is going to find itself unable to discriminate between interest and dividends; it is going to find itself unable to discriminate between earned and unearned income. In short, if my friend's amendment be adopted, he is putting the States in a straitjacket in so far as future income tax legislation is concerned. In order to meet an imaginary danger to the sovereignty of the States he is prepared by his amendment to seriously limit that sovereignty by compelling the State first to adopt income taxation as the only method of taxing all securities, and then limiting the State to one particular kind of income tax. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not think the premise of my friend from New York is correct. This amendment deals entirely with Federal securities and securities issued by the State and subdivisions thereof. Now, if you will take your amendment and refer to it you will find that it uses the language "State securities or subdivisions thereof." Now, let me illustrate for a moment and see if I am correct. For instance, is the Pennsylvania Railroad a subdivision of the State of Pennsylvania, taking it for granted it is a corporation created under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania? I submit to the gentleman from New York that question, whether or not the Pennsylvania Railroad, assuming that it has its charter by virtue of the State laws of Pennsylvania—whether or not the Pennsylvania Railroad is a subdivision of the State of Pennsylvania. Now, if it is not, it does not come within this amendment, because the amendment says "securities issued by a State or subdivision of the State, or under its authority."

Mr. MILLS. Under the authority.

Mr. GARNER. Certainly. Does the gentleman from New York agree to this premise, that he desires to limit the Federal Government power in levying its taxes against State and municipal bonds to the tax that it levies against other property of the citizens of the United States and incomes from property of the United States? Does the gentleman agree to that?

Mr. MILLS. I want to limit the right of the United States Government to tax Federal and State bonds in their incomes to the rate applicable to all securities of whatever kind.

Mr. GARNER. All right. If you do and if you will draw that amendment accordingly, I will accept it. [Applause.] I ask you, sir, whether or not this amendment will reach rents derived from property of an individual? I will yield to the gentleman to answer.

Mr. MILLS. I will say frankly it does not reach rents, and the gentleman knows that is the only thing that it does not reach, and knows that it does it so far as securities are concerned——

Mr. GARNER. When the gentleman answers the question he answers his own argument. When you have one exception that is sufficient. I for one deny the right of this Government to ask the States to surrender that right and place a heavier tax upon the income of a State agency than it does the individual of that State. If the gentleman is in earnest, if he means what he says, that he wants the Federal Government to be restricted to the right to the taxes that it may levy on any income, then prepare your amendment to this proposed amendment carrying that into effect, and I for one, speaking for myself, will accept it. I seek only by this amendment and by my crude effort, maybe, to protect the States against the power of Congress, should it think proper to do so, to destroy their ability to issue bonds and issue securities under the various divisions of a sovereign State. And so I say again, once and for all, that if the advocates of this amendment are serious in their contention that they only desire to levy the same rate of tax on receipts from bonds of States and municipalities that they levy against other property, other receipts, if you will prepare an amendment I will accept it. I do not know, I am probably not as good a lawyer as the gentleman from New York, but as I came here the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] suggested to me that the creature of a State as referred to in this proposed amendment did not contemplate other than the subdivision of a State such as a county or precinct of that State.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Just a moment.

Mr. WINGO. Or necessary agency.

Mr. GARNER. Or necessary agency of the State. And a corporation created by virtue of law is not necessarily an agency of a State. I have had no opportunity to examine the authorities, and I am not prepared to express an opinion, but that seems to me to be the purpose of this amendment. I understand that what is meant is a State or subdivision or creature of a State, such as counties, precincts, school districts, road districts, and so forth. I now yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that we clearly understood the gentleman's proposition. The gentleman does not contend, I assume, that under the amendment Congress could lay a heavier rate of income tax on securities issued by the State and its subdivisions than upon Federal securities?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not going rather far afield, is it not almost absurd to suggest that Congress would lay a burdensome tax on its own securities in order to reach the State?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that is the contention of every man who wants to take away from the State some right and put it in the Federal Government; that you are not going to do any wrong. I do not want to give you a chance to do wrong.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman voted for an income tax.

Mr. GARNER. In just a moment. I want to fix this amendment, if it is to become a part of the Constitution of the country, so that your and my successors can not do a State an injustice.

Now, I ask you to help us fix it, and if you are in good faith and mean what you say when you assert that you do not intend to do that, you will fix it now so that you can not do it.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not agree with the gentleman in regard to the income from securities at all.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman means the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONDELL. But even if what the gentleman urges were true, it strikes me that it is most extraordinary to suggest that the Congress, for some reason not now in anyone's mind, would lay an enormous burden on Federal securities and those of the States. Would it not be entirely fair if the tax on State securities be the same as those on Federal securities?

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman evidently was not here yesterday when I spoke. I thought I had made that clear to everyone.

Mr. MONDELL. I am waiting for the answer.

Mr. GARNER. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman and to those responsible for this proposed amendment that I gave on the highest authority the fact that the principal purpose of those gentlemen who would tax State securities is to restrict and, if need be, prohibit the issuance of them. I gave the President of the United States as my authority. I suggest that the gentleman read the President's message.

Mr. MONDELL. That is not the reason.

Mr. GARNER. He said, in substance, he wanted to stop the issuance of these bonds in order that the money might go into other industries. I contend that the industries of a State are as important to this country as any other industry, whether it be the manufacture of steel or of aluminum or of anything else. The construction of schoolhouses and the construction of roads or the construction of irrigating systems is just as important as some of these securities that you gentlemen want to tax.

Mr. MONDELL. The irrigation securities are not tax free.

Mr. GARNER. I want the gentleman to understand that they are in my State, because they are issued under the authority of the State, and they are a part of the State taxation system, which exempts the income from them from Federal taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Supplementing what the gentleman said, I read from the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] and ask the gentleman from Texas to answer whether this was actually stated by the gentleman from New York before the committee:

> We have got to look at this from the national standpoint. We are giving to the States the privilege, to be sure, of taxing national securities, but in return we are getting the great mass of securities that on the whole are going to constitute a much larger tax base than the Federal securities are. And what is more, we are asking for the benefit—and we are getting the benefit—of taxing them at a much higher rate than the States are likely to do. You are only giving to the States the privilege of taxing income from these bonds.

Mr. GARNER. I am much obliged to the gentleman. The gentleman from New York knows that the gentleman from Pennsylvania declared that the absolute reason, and the only reason that you can give, for the State provision in here is that it was offered as a sop to the States to try to get them to adopt this amendment. That is all it was put in for. No one would dream of putting this second section in here unless it were an attempt to try to buy the States into agreeing to allow us to tax their securities. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Chairman, in President Harding's last message to Congress he gave cold comfort to the friends of liquor. His wise and timely words declaring, not for a loose and liberal modification of our prohibition law but for its strict enforcement, were worthy of their high origin and wholesome in their influence. Regardless of former predilections and alignments on this question, they will be indorsed by every true patriot who remembers that this is "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and that the people who have fought so long and unselfishly for the legal overthrow of the liquor traffic have won a fair and open fight by due governmental process. President Harding recognizes the truth uttered by former President Taft—himself admittedly an anti-prohibitionist—that this law has not had a fair opportunity to function, and that every citizen, and especially every official who has sworn to stand by the Constitution of the United States, is called on to give the law a square deal by precept and by practice. [Applause.]

It is highly, and I may say painfully, significant that the President has felt the necessity of calling a conference of governors to take counsel together concerning the most effective way of enforcing a part of our Federal Constitution.

Of course I indorse the call, but I deprecate the necessity for such a conference. What does it mean—that there must be a coming together of the President of the Nation and the governors of the States in behalf of the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment, when the other provisions of the Constitution stand alone and regnant in their fundamental and governmental majesty? If the situation is that serious, if the President is right when he declares that conditions "savor of a Nation-wide scandal," if the flagrant violation of this law means the physical and moral debauchery of illicit sellers and illicit buyers and, above all, the debauching of individual and national respect for all law, threatening the security of our most sacred ideals and our most cherished institutions, then God knows that that conference of our President and our governors ought to leave no stone unturned to make that exceptional round table a practical and national blessing. [Applause.]

But we might as well be plain about it, the plain people are justly skeptical of many of these high officials. They laugh at their high-sounding pronunciamentos because they doubt their sincerity. The people—the plain people—have cumulative evidence that some of these "conferring" governors and many other high officials do not practice the prohibition enforcement which they preach to others. The people—the plain people—believe that many of these high officials believe in that highfaluting autocracy which claims the privilege of buying and drinking illicit liquors themselves while denying that privilege to the poor devils down among the masses who are foolish enough to want the opportunity to buy and drink illicit liquid damnation. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

[Mr. UPSHAW shook his head.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Here is a timely editorial from the Dearborn Independent of December 9 which hits the spot:

"DRY" ENFORCEMENT BEGINS AT HOME.

President Harding and his Cabinet are reported to have been in serious conference regarding ways and means of enforcing the "dry" laws. Will the gentlemen permit a suggestion? Why not begin at Washington? Why not begin in official circles? Why not begin in those sumptuous homes which entertain the very highest personages in our Government?

This is not a taunt; it is a serious and respectful suggestion. Everyone knows what has transpired at Washington since prohibition arrived. Only the loyalty of certain men to the sentiment of respect for the personages of the Government has prevented a crushing scandal at times. To these men whose forbearance has been intensely patriotic it has come with hopefulness that the Cabinet meeting may result in obedience to law in the city of Washington.

[Applause.]

Let the word go forth that members of the executive and administrative branches of the Government have set themselves a rigid standard of obedience to the letter and spirit of the law—and see what a difference it will make in Washington.

[Applause.]

That is the end of the editorial. It is now time to applaud this editor's timely wisdom. [Applause.]

If these governors who put their feet under the President's mahogany at the White House really wish to get anywhere in their conference for law enforcement, let them remember what the beloved and immortal Sam Jones said:

"If you want to reform the world, begin on yourself and then you will have one rascal out of the way." [Applause.]

Let these governors, led by the President and Vice President of the United States and all the Members of the Cabinet, walk out in the open and lift their hands before high heaven and take a new oath of allegiance to the whole Constitution and the American flag. Let them sacredly declare that, regardless of what their tastes and practices have been, they will never again build up a bootlegger's barbarous business by drinking any form or any amount of illicit liquors at any dinner, at any function, or in any "ballroom or any back alley." Let every Member of Congress and every United States Senator follow suit; let every State and Federal judge and every prosecuting attorney in America stand up like patriotic men and declare that they will never again personally trample the Constitution which they have sworn to obey and defend. [Applause.]

Let the President issue a ringing Christmas proclamation calling every citizen, and especially every official, to total abstinence for the common good. No longer must these "higher ups" say "Go" at the end of an official lash. They must say "Come," in all the glory and effectiveness of consistent leadership.

I think it would be well for the President to put in that proclamation a call to those splendid, forward-looking citizens—those organizations that do things worth while—the Rotarians, the Kiwanians, the Civitians, the Optimists, and the Lions, and the Elks, and the Eagles, and the Owls, and what not——

Mr. CLARKE of New York. How about the Klan?

Mr. UPSHAW. Yes; for they declare allegiance to the whole Constitution, and every organization that stands for the rule of democracy and the supremacy of a sober flag. Let them stand for it now, or forever after hold their peace.

Anything less than this will make the conference itself a farce and a scandal. Timorous souls have never inspired anybody. This is no time for pussy-footing utterances and actions on the part of our State and National leaders. [Applause.] Some of these governors—most of them, let us hope—are men of personal sobriety and positive character and patriotism, and most Congressmen and Senators, I am glad to believe, practice the prohibition which their votes profess, but there are enough who do not to cast an ominous cloud on the official sky.

Let us wipe that cloud away as a Christmas gift to society and sobriety! And let these officials be followed by "society" leaders everywhere who have been counting it a "smart" thing to serve illicit cocktails to dinner guests, remembering that every such deed is more than "slackerism" in the presence of a common foe. It is a shocking case of "trading with the enemy"—yea, of seeking, harboring, and using stolen goods. And no father or mother, citizen, or public official can do this thing and then blame anybody but themselves if their sons and daughters grow up to break their hearts by defying every law of God and man. [Applause.]

Let them honor their own laws, like the gallant French general, Marshal Foch, who refused to touch intoxicants in any form while on American soil, out of respect for the "dry" Constitution and "the stainless flag" of the country where he was an honored guest. [Applause.] Let them follow the inspiring example of that chivalric Texan, that whole-hearted American, Alvin Owsley [applause], the beloved commander of the American Legion, who as my breakfast guest last week authorized me to say on the floor of Congress and everywhere that, realizing the importance of this question and the responsibility of leadership, regardless of what his personal inclinations might be, he would not touch a drop of intoxicating beverage in private or public while he is commander of the American Legion. [Applause.]

I stand uncovered, I call on the friends of "young America" everywhere to stand uncovered before such loyal, stainless patriotism on the part of the gallant leader of America's soldier-citizens.

I can not close this honest, desperate Christmas exhortation to the governors of America and all other high officials without the inevitable observation that that conference of governors will be in a bad fix and will leave the President and his Cabinet and the whole country in a bad fix if they are all down with the same complaint which afflicts that visionary hero of windmills, the fantastic Governor of Louisiana. Hitherto holding him in high esteem, we have seen him plunge from his high pedestal of State and National confidence by rushing to the Nation's Capital for help to free his State from the tumultuous reign of "goblins" and "wizards," when his own Representatives in both branches of Congress, Protestant and Catholic alike, rise up to discount his flaming follies, declaring that Louisiana is beautifully tranquil and grandly able to take care of her own police powers. And now you can judge of the value of the dismal declaration of this same Governor Parker, who says to the governors' meeting on West Virginia soil that "prohibition is a flat failure." Thus he indicts the majority of the citizens of his State as lawbreakers and liars. I do not believe it. Shades of American heroism! Paraphrasing the words of the judge to the man who is going to be hung, "May the Lord have mercy on his timorous soul." If prohibition is a failure in Louisiana or any other State it is because the women made a mistake when they got married and the people made a mistake when they elected a governor. [Laughter.]

If the enemies of good government were making and selling a concoction that would poison our pigs and colts and calves and chickens for money, the militant manhood and womanhood of America would stop it. And when we begin to love our boys and girls as well as we love our domestic animals and our selfish appetites, then we will consecrate ourselves anew to their protection and set for them a safe example in refraining from the illicit use of intoxicants anywhere and everywhere. [Applause.]

In face of the legal enactment of this prohibition law which found its way into our Constitution and on our statute books through the prayers, the tears, and the consecrated wisdom of the best men and women on earth, any governor or any other State or Federal official who will patronize a bootlegger by drinking illicit liquor is a disgrace to the position of leadership which he holds and a dangerous example to the young manhood of America. [Applause.]

I want to declare to you that any man who stands here or anywhere and swears allegiance to the Constitution and then helps a bootlegger to trample that Constitution under foot is unworthy to represent any State or to hold any office under the sun. [Applause.]

I renew my call to Christmas consecration. Come on, governors! Come on, Cabinet officers! Come on, Congressmen and Senators! Come on, officials and patriots everywhere; and before the eyes of American youth and the watching world illustrate that brave, red-blooded, 100 per cent Americanism that accepts the full-orbed Constitution, eighteenth amendment and all; that reverent, consistent Americanism that practices what it preaches in building "that righteousness that exalteth a nation"—a leadership, pray God, that fulfills Goldsmith's dream of the "Village Preacher," who—

Lured to brighter worlds,
And led the way.

[Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] five minutes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I hold in my hand a printed document which a few days ago was mailed generally to the Members of Congress. It is a rather severe criticism of and attack upon House bill 7452, a bill which I introduced and which is now pending on the calendar of the House, a criticism and attack entirely unjustified. The statement is not signed, but in the upper right-hand margin there is stamped:

From W. G. Van Name, 121 High Street, New Haven, Conn.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the title of the bill which the gentleman refers to?

Mr. BARBOUR. It is the Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park bill.

Doctor Van Name, who, I assume, is the author of this statement, is a very estimable gentleman, one who is deeply interested in the conservation of our natural resources. But his fears as to the result of the enactment of this legislation are entirely ungrounded, and for the reason that his statement contains little of fact and considerable of imagination I wish to submit a few observations in reply.

The bill simply provides for the enlargement of the present Sequoia National Park, in the State of California, and the changing of the name to Roosevelt-Sequoia, the new park to be a great natural memorial to the late President Theodore Roosevelt. It also provides for the exclusion of a portion of the present park. In fact, the scheme is to exclude 105 square miles of the present park and to add 953 miles of additional territory. I read from Doctor Van Name's statement, as follows:

"The Sequoia National Park, in southern California, 252 square miles in area, was established in 1890 to preserve several fine tracts of the primeval forests of California, the most remarkable in the world for the extraordinary size and beauty of their trees. It is the only national park—except the General Grant Park, which is insignificantly small and sadly mutilated by lumbering—whose express purpose was to preserve some of these magnificent forests. For 32 years it has protected them, but it is to do so no longer. The Barbour bill, supposedly a bill to enlarge the park, while adding much land, mostly of little value for park purposes or for anything else, contains a concealed joker that cuts the park in two and turns over the half containing the larger part of the fine forest to the United States Forest Service, a bureau conducted entirely for commercial and utilitarian purposes, which can legally—and may be expected to—sell the greater portion of the trees for lumber."

Now, the fact of the matter is that the bill retains in the park 804 of the large Sequoia, commonly known as the California big trees. It will exclude 550 of these trees and will add 500 others. Of the 550 excluded, 410 are publicly owned and 140 are privately owned. If the bill is passed, the net result will be that there will be a gain of 90 of the publicly owned large Sequoia trees preserved within the park boundaries.

POLICY OF THE FOREST SERVICE TOWARD THE BIG TREES.

The fact that there are a large number of giant trees in the area now within the forest reserve which it is proposed to add to the park should be satisfactory evidence that it is not the policy of the Forest Service to destroy these trees. As to the policy of the Forest Service in regard to these trees and as further assurance that the same will not be destroyed, even though some of those in the present park should revert to the Forest Service, I submit the following extract from a statement recently made by United States Forester Greeley:

"To the Government forester these trees are most cherished possessions, and as such they receive veneration and loving care. Long ago the Forest Service decided that these trees, as living examples of nature's wonderful handiwork and as survivors of the pregiacial period, would contribute much more to human progress and welfare in a living condition than they could possibly contribute as manufactured timber commodities. It therefore has been the fixed and invariable rule that no standing redwood shall be cut from national forest land. The United States Forest Service has not sold a single giant sequoia except those dead and prostrate upon the ground and subject to decay if not utilized. Most of the giant sequoia occurring within the exterior boundaries of the national forests are on land in private ownership, over which the Government has no control, and here, unfortunately, the removal of these superb trees has been rapid and complete. From time to time the Forest Service has considered and made tentative plans for exchanges with private owners whereby some of the existing groups in private ownership would become public property in exchange for national forest stumpage of less scientific and historic value, but absence of legislative authority has prevented the consummation of these arrangements, and the best the Forest Service could do is to preserve the trees already in Government ownership. This it is doing with religious care, and no lover of these great trees need fear that the Forest Service will ever forget the obligations of its custodianship to the point of consenting to the sacrifice of a single living tree to any commercial or utilitarian purpose."

The bill in its present form has been indorsed by the following organizations or their representatives, all of which are enthusiastic advocates of the policy of conservation of our natural resources:

"Boone and Crockett Club, Roosevelt Memorial Association, American Civic Association, National Parks Association, Society for Protection of National Parks, American Defense Society, California Academy of Sciences, Association for the Protection of the Adirondacks, New York Zoological Society, National Arts Club, Camp Fire Club of America, Associated Mountaineering Clubs, Save the Redwoods League, American Society of Landscape Artists, National Geographic Society, Appalachian Mountain Club, and the Sierra Club."

Relative to the indorsement of the bill by the Camp Fire Club of America, I offer for the consideration of the House the following letter received by me to-day from William B. Greeley, chairman of the committee on conservation of forests and wild life, of that organization. Mr. Greeley states that in view of the efforts of Dr. W. G. Van Name to defeat the bill, the matter was further investigated by his committee and that after such investigation the committee voted unanimously to confirm the action previously taken in support of the bill:

THE CAMP FIRE CLUB OF AMERICA,
New York, December 19, 1922.

Hon. H. E. BARBOUR,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This committee, speaking in such matters for the Camp Fire Club of America, some time last winter went on record as approving heartily your bill H. R. 7452, known as the Barbour Roosevelt-Sequoia Park bill.

During the summer efforts of Dr. Willard G. Van Name, of the American Museum of Natural History, of this city, to defeat the bill were brought to the attention of some members of this committee who were much impressed by his contention. As a result, the matter was further investigated by this committee, considerable correspondence was had, and last night Mr. Horace M. Albright, of the National Park Service, known to most of us, attended a meeting of the committee at my invitation and discussed the whole situation with us.

I am glad to say that after hearing Mr. Albright, considering the letters received and discussing the matter thoroughly, the committee voted unanimously to confirm the action previously taken by the committee in support of the bill.

Because of the circularizing campaign carried on by Doctor Van Name, and the possibility that some members of the club might have put themselves on record as opposing the bill, as requested in an anonymous circular which is now before me, but is admitted to have been prepared by Doctor Van Name, it has been thought best that I should inform you immediately of the action of the committee at its meeting last night, and say to you that all such matters as this are intrusted to this committee and the action of the committee in this matter is to be taken as voicing the sentiment of the club.

We wish you success in your further efforts to bring about the passage of this bill.

Yours very truly.

WILLIAM B. GREELEY, *Chairman.*

Doctor Van Name's circular shows that he is not familiar with the scenic features of the area which it is proposed to add to the park or that he does not appreciate those features. The following quotation from the bulletin of the National Parks Association of June 7, 1922, describes one of the scenic wonders of this area:

TEHIPITE, WONDER OF CANYONS.

"The floor of the valley is exceedingly rough but fascinating. It could accommodate hundreds of campers. And the river! It is times larger than the Merced. From the beginning to the end of the valley it is a succession of cascades, swift rushes, and pools. It is the finest trout river I ever fished.

"Opposite Tehipite Dome, Mount Harrington rises a thousand feet higher than Clouds Rest above Yosemite, namely, 7,000 feet. From near its summit cascades tumble into the Middle Fork.

"The Tehipite Valley is nothing short of the most inspiring chasm in the Sierra. It ranks in its own way with the greatest American spectacles!

"Unquestionably, it is one of the most striking features in American scenery; wholly lacking the Yosemite type of beauty, it is far ruggeder, more virile. It is bigger. It has power, majesty. Its walls are loftier. The Tehipite Dome, 3,200 feet above the valley floor, is one of the five greatest rocks of the scenic world, the others being El Capitan and Half Dome in the Yosemite, the Grand Sentinel in the Kings River Canyon, and El Gobernador in Zion National Park. Just for comparison's sake, the famous Rock of Gibraltar, if transferred to Tehipite Valley, would rise 700 feet less than halfway up on the Tehipite Dome.

"The walls are correspondingly striking; on the whole they rise higher than Yosemite's. They are perpendicular and remarkably eroded. There is one place where a landslide has rolled rocks as big as houses more than halfway across the valley floor."

Bulletin 24 of the National Parks Association, issued on January 30, 1922, and referring to an amendment prohibiting the development of power projects within the proposed park, contains an article advocating the passage of the bill in its present form under the following title: "Barbour bill amended. Now let's help pass it."

I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter received from the Acting Director of the National Park Service commenting on the statement of Doctor Van Name. The following quotation from the letter of Mr. Cammerer, the acting director, shows how unfounded are the criticisms of Doctor Van Name and how groundless are his fears:

"One statement made in the printed circular—that the area to be added is barren and inaccessible mountain land—is absolutely without foundation. Forests of very fine pines and firs in the two Kings River Valleys which will be added to the park will alone more than offset the forests in the park area to be returned to the national forests; and besides this there will be added several hundred square miles of main forest belt, which carry groves of yellow pine, sugar pine, and white and red fir, running much larger and finer on the average than those in the forests of the park area to be returned. The gain to national park control in fine forest, not including sequoia, is several hundred per cent.

"As you have stated in your letter, most of the statements contained in the printed circular are far from the truth. One which stands out is that made in connection with the General Grant Park, which it is said is insignificantly small and sadly mutilated by lumbering. As a matter of fact, there has never been any lumbering in General Grant Park."

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time now remains as follows: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] has 15 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer for just a moment to the question that was up the other day, when the naval bill was under consideration, as to the enlisting of minors or those under 21 years of age. The question was raised as to whether the recruiting officers should be permitted to enlist boys under 21 years of age without securing the consent of their parents or guardians, or in the alternative securing affidavits showing their exact age. There seemed to be an almost unanimous inclination to adopt the amendment that was suggested by my colleague from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], until the chairman of the committee read the existing law, which, according to his interpretation, seemed to cover the case already. I just want to read in this connection the exception that is in the law which practically nullifies its operation.

It so happens now that when a young man who is less than 21 years of age goes before the recruiting officer he may be accepted practically on his own affidavit. Of course, they have alluring advertisements and signs which indicate the beauties of travel and the attractive side of naval service for the purpose of getting the young men into the service. As was suggested in the discussion the other day, the services of every young man in this country are the property of his parents until the young man reaches the age of 21 years. It seems entirely right that before the Government takes the boy's services the consent of the parent or guardian should be obtained. That was the attitude of the House until the law was read which seemed to require at the present time the consent of the parents. But there is an exception in the law, which reads as follows:

Except in cases where such certificate is unobtainable—

That is, the certificate as to age, and so forth—

enlistment may be made when the recruiting officer is convinced that oath of applicant as to age is credible.

I understand that when a young man comes up to enlist the practice now is to have a blank affidavit for him to sign along with the other papers, stating that he is of a certain age, and then he is in, and if the parents undertake to get him out of the service the department issues to him an ordinary discharge which for all practical purposes has about the same effect as a dishonorable discharge. But this law has still another defect in that it applies only where the minor is under 18 years of age. Now I submit to the Congress that the Navy is in a bad way if it is necessary to go out and secure through alluring advertisements and signs and blandishments, through a process that amounts in some instances to deception, the services of the boys of this country who are less than 21 years of age, more especially when their services belong to their parents. Surely the American Navy can be maintained and the necessary recruits may be had by the naval officers being as clean and as careful in their enlistments as they are in their discharges, because while they will take a boy under 21 years of age into the Navy on his simple affidavit that he is 21 years of age, when it comes to discharging him they require not his affidavit but a birth certificate or the affidavit of two or three disinterested persons, which they should secure prior to his admission. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am sure all of us who are particularly interested in the problems of agriculture have been very greatly interested this afternoon as we have listened to various Members in their discussions of many phases of agricultural thought. I myself am under great obligation to them.

Recently, upon the occasion of the visit of the President of the United States in presenting to Congress some recommendations for legislation, attention was called to many things of particular interest in connection with agriculture. Probably more than any other we were attracted by his recommendations on the subject of agricultural credit. And so there has been unusual interest in this discussion along that particular line this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that in the near future we are to pass judgment in the House upon the resolution which was the special order of business yesterday, I have thought it might be of some interest to the committee to present some ideas I have in mind in connection with an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending resolution, namely, the resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States with reference to tax-exempt securities. I will read it for the information of the committee. It is to follow the second section as it is now, with the following language:

Provided, That nothing contained in this amendment shall be construed to refer to securities or bonds issued under the terms of the act known as the Federal farm loan act.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my amendment proposes to exempt from the provisions of the constitutional amendment the bonds or securities issued under the terms of the Federal farm loan act. The total amount of Federal farm loan bonds sold to November 30, 1922, is $641,208,375. If the total of tax-exempt securities issued amounts to $16,000,000,000, then the amount of such total affected by my amendment is approximately 4 per cent. I am aware that there should be unusual merit in any proposition that seeks to modify the application of a proposed amendment to the Constitution. In support of my amendment, therefore, I present the following considerations:

1. The Federal farm loan system has clearly established itself as a sound, practical, and indispensable credit agency for American agriculture. Its operations have been interrupted by hostile interests through court procedure and limited by the natural hesitancy our people manifest in adopting a new plan in so vital a matter as mortgage loans. Its present popularity is shown by the fact that during the period from November 1, 1921, to November 1, 1922, the Federal land banks loaned $219,780,649 to 70,993 farmers and sold Federal farm loan bonds to investors to the amount of $278,150,000. The Treasury holdings of these bonds have been reduced $69,650,000, and Secretary Mellon says that—

The system is rapidly approaching a condition which meets the original intention that it should be a mutual organization operated under Government supervision and control with the capital stock supplied by the borrowing farmers and not by the Government.

Until such time shall come it appears clear to me that no action should be contemplated by this House that will seriously limit, if not entirely suspend, the operations of the Federal farm loan system by advancing the interest rates.

In the second place, I invite the attention of the committee to the fact that the saving in Federal taxes on these farm-loan bonds would be infinitesimal in comparison with the increase in interest charges which the farmers will pay on the mortgage indebtedness.

In proof may I quote what I believe will be accepted as good authority, Professor Putnam, of Washington University, of St. Louis, who says:

The Federal tax on each billion dollars' worth of tax-exempt securities would be $8,820,000. If this is correct, the amount of revenue to be derived from taxing joint-stock land-bank bonds now outstanding, $78,000,000, would be negligible. And if the time should come when the joint-stock land banks had outstanding in future issues $250,000,000 of bonds, the revenue to be derived from their taxation at the present rate would be but $2,000,000.

If the surtax should be reduced, as is recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, from 65 to 40 per cent, the revenue to be derived from joint-stock land-bank bonds would be reduced to an amount slightly in excess of $1,000,000.

When we recall that from ten to twenty billions of tax-exempt securities are now outstanding the inquiry suggests itself: Why strain at a gnat and swallow a camel? Why remove the tax exemption in the very quarter where it is doing the most good? Why remove it in these abnormal times before there has been opportunity to give the plan a fair test? Why of all times do it now, when agriculture is crippled and least able to stand this blow?

Under the Federal farm-loan system the interest rate varies from 5½ to 6 per cent. The farmer who borrows from a land bank at this rate is a direct beneficiary, and all others who borrow through the regular channels are likewise beneficiaries, through the wholesome competition of the land banks. When we stop to contemplate what would be the situation if we do away with the tax-exempt feature in connection with the farm-loan bonds and reckon what the increased interest rates on $4,000,000,000 of farm mortgages held in the United States with the competition of the land banks removed, I am sure we will see that the saving that would be made to the Federal Government in taxes would be very small in comparison.

An average increase of 1 per cent in the interest rate would amount to $40,000,000 on the total mortgage indebtedness of the farms of the country. This is certainly a modest estimate of the increase in the interest rate, if our former experience is a fair example. Contrast this with Professor Putnam's estimate of an increase of $8,000,000 in taxes on each billion of bonds denied tax exemption, and every friend of agriculture will hesitate before voting for the proposed constitutional amendment without the limitation I have proposed.

The effect that the loans made through the land banks have upon the general interest rate on farm mortgage loans is indicated by the comparison of the total amount loaned by the land banks with the total farm mortgage indebtedness of the country. The former is $664,986,000 and the latter $4,000,000,000 in round numbers. Fifteen per cent of the total mortgage loans are made by the land banks. No one will say this is a negligible factor in shaping interest rates on the whole amount.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. My time is limited, but I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman made one statement—that no one would dispute but that the rates would be advanced to the farmer. That has been and will be disputed by very high authorities. The gentleman forgets that only a small portion of the farmers' loans are from the farm loan banks, and even about that there is a dispute, and the other part, the 95 per cent, will be very much lower to him.

Mr. KETCHAM. All I can say in reply to the gentleman is this, that during the time the operations of the farm loan system were suspended by reason of the court procedure brought against it the interest rates through ordinary channels were not only increased but the increase was so appreciable as to give point to the argument that I am making.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The rates were increased to everybody during that time; interest rates were going up everywhere.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I just refer to the indirect effect of the interest rates by quoting the following language from a high authority:

The influence of the loans made by the banks of the farm-loan system was to stabilize interest rates on farm loans throughout the entire country. In Montana and Texas, where rates had been 10 and 12 per cent, farmers were able to get money at 5½ and 6 per cent under the farm-loan system, and the rates charged by commercial concerns dropped considerably. Every farmer, no matter of whom he borrowed, was benefited by the farm-loan system, because all money lenders had to meet, in a measure, the competition of the land banks.

We got the "reverse English" on this proposition when the banks of the farm-loan system were compelled to suspend operations owing to a suit in the courts to test the constitutionality of the act.

Third. Reference has been made to the attitude of the farm organizations, and I think the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Rules quoted from one of these farm organizations. May I in that connection read the action of the National Grange at its recent session in Witchita?

The Grange favors an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit further issues of all tax-exempt bonds, but so long as tax-exempt bonds of any kind are permitted we oppose the repeal of the tax-exempt features of the Federal farm loan act.

That indicates very clearly that while they favor the general proposition of abolishing tax-exempt securities they do hold in this resolution to an indorsement of the operations of the Federal farm loan act, and are especially insistent that no action shall be taken that in any way affects that act.

May I also refer to the action of another great farm gathering on the same question? Probably no farm conference in the history of the United States has created so much interest as the one held not quite one year ago here in Washington, and I now quote from the committee on taxation in the report of the National Agricultural Conference, page 141. I quote the second recommendation, which, by the way, was adopted unanimously by more than 400 delegates from various agricultural activities attending this conference:

We recommend—

Second, a constitutional amendment prohibiting issuance of tax-free securities: *Provided*, That inasmuch as agricultural lands and mortgages are both taxed and that agriculture is a fundamental industry upon which all industries depend, nothing in these resolutions shall apply to bonds, debentures, and certificates of indebtedness issued under authority of the Federal farm loan act or any amendments thereto.

My amendment to the resolution will give point to this recommendation unanimously adopted by this great gathering of farmers uniting in one of the best expressions of farm opinion that we have ever had in this country.

Finally, may I present for your consideration the very wide distribution of the farm loan associations? There are now in the country 4,463 of these land-bank associations. Herewith I give a table showing the number of individual farmers in the several States who have loans through the farm land banks together with the amount loaned:

Table showing the number of individual farmers to whom the farm land banks have made loans to date in the several States, with the amounts loaned in even thousands.

State.	Number of loans.	Amount loaned.
Maine	1,274	$3,362,000
New Hampshire	300	684,000
Vermont	597	1,591,000
Massachusetts	1,050	2,840,000
Rhode Island	85	250,000
Connecticut	358	2,724,000
New York	2,909	9,339,000
New Jersey	595	2,198,000
Virginia	6,111	17,135,000
Maryland	617	2,246,000
Delaware	37	121,000
Pennsylvania	2,565	6,882,000
West Virginia	1,652	3,354,000
North Carolina	6,597	13,527,000
South Carolina	4,955	14,414,000
Georgia	5,787	14,632,000
Florida	2,765	4,998,000
Alabama	9,686	18,626,000
Louisiana	6,029	11,458,000
Mississippi	14,236	23,439,000
Tennessee	5,457	15,246,000
Kentucky	4,360	15,129,000
Indiana	5,883	21,337,000
Ohio	2,214	8,664,000
Michigan	4,751	10,520,000
Illinois	4,070	17,705,000
Wisconsin	3,937	12,995,000
Minnesota	6,747	26,869,000
Iowa	4,980	34,320,000
Missouri	6,063	23,499,000
Arkansas	10,595	18,217,000

Table showing the number of individual farmers to whom the farm land banks have made loans to date in the several States, with the amounts loaned in even thousands—Continued.

State.	Number of loans.	Amount loaned.
North Dakota	8,321	$30,625,000
South Dakota	3,332	14,212,000
Nebraska	5,376	24,376,000
Kansas	6,582	26,437,000
Oklahoma	4,779	12,004,000
Texas	23,558	70,719,000
New Mexico	3,533	6,565,000
Colorado	5,182	12,474,000
Wyoming	1,464	3,842,000
Montana	6,156	15,667,000
Idaho	5,367	18,557,000
Washington	8,939	23,450,000
Utah	3,726	11,942,000
Nevada	141	541,000
Arizona	734	2,964,000
California	5,182	17,450,000
Oregon	5,526	17,995,000
Total	225,937	664,986,000

When it is recalled that the percentage of mortgaged farms is alarmingly high in this country and increasing with each decade, and when we are called upon to submit to the people an amendment that makes the future of the farm land banks at least uncertain, it is my judgment that we should hesitate a long time unless my limitation is adopted.

The farm land bank works. It helps the members directly and all other mortgage debtors indirectly. Pending legislation is designed to extend its usefulness. Why not make sure that the helpful influence it has exerted shall continue? Why take a chance in limiting seriously, in not completely stopping the operations, of a system that satisfactorily and completely answers the farmers' demand for long-time mortgage credit?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KETCHAM. Oh, no; I asked only to revise them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he would put in his remarks the figures on Maryland. I have no objection to his revising and extending his remarks.

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be very glad to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

SALARIES.

Secretary of Agriculture, $12,000; Assistant Secretary, $5,000; director of scientific work, $5,000; director of regulatory work, $5,000; director of extension service, $5,000; solicitor, $5,000; chief clerk, $3,000 and $500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary, $2,500; traffic manager, $3,000; administrative assistant, $3,000; executive assistants—3 at $2,500 each, 2 at $2,250 each, 1 $2,100, 1 $2,000; stenographer and executive clerk to Secretary, $2,250; private secretary to Assistant Secretary, $2,250; private secretary to director of scientific work, $2,250; appointment clerk, $2,000; officer in charge of supplies, $2,000; inspectors—1 $3,000, 1 $2,250; attorneys—1 $4,000, 2 at $3,500 each, 2 at $3,250 each; law clerks—4 at $3,000 each, 2 at $2,750 each, 4 at $2,500 each, 8 at $2,250 each, 1 $2,200; superintendent of telegraph and telephones, $2,000; telegraph and telephone operator, $1,600; assistant chief clerk and captain of the watch, $1,800; clerks—1 $2,000, 5 of class 4, 14 of class 3, 1 $1,440, 18 of class 2, 31 of class 1, 2 at $1,100 each, 1 $1,020, 3 at $1,000 each, 4 at $900 each; messengers or laborers—1 at $1,000, 16 at $840 each, 8 at $720 each, 4 at $600 each; lieutenants of the watch—1 $1,000, 2 at $960 each; watchmen—30 at $840 each, 51 at $720 each; skilled laborers—1 at $1,200, 5 at $1,000 each, 3 at $960 each, 1 at $900; messenger boys—2 at $720 each, 8 at $600 each, 7 at $480 each; charwomen—1 $540, 1 $360, 14 at $240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, $12,480; in all, $382,520.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I call the gentleman's attention to the new legislation, the office created, director of extension service. That is new legislation, not authorized by law.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think, under the decision of the Chair last year, it would not be held to be new legislation. However, I may say to the gentleman that the establishment of this office is in accordance with a reorganization which was adopted two years ago, under which the three lines of work in the department—regulation, research, and extension—were combined under three heads. We completed two parts of that last year by creating a Director of Research and a Director of Regulatory Work. The object of this office is now to fully complete that reorganization by bringing all of the extension service under one head, under one director, so that it will all clear through one place.

Mr. HAUGEN. I take it for granted that the additional office is required providing the reorganization is effected. What is the reorganization suggested in the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand in effect that the reorganization is effected now and this only gives a legal status to the method of doing it that is in existence to-day.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then it is legislation and subject to the point of order. I would prefer to pass it for the present and let the policy be determined as to whether the reorganization shall be effected or not.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is subject to a point of order, but if the gentleman wants to reserve it until we pass the item with reference to the extension service which is connected with it, I shall have no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman's contention is that this legislation is absolutely necessary—the reorganization suggested.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is, anyway. It certainly is if the reorganization is effected.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to hear the gentleman on the reorganization. I have read the hearings. It does not seem to throw very much light on the subject and what is to be gained by the reorganization. I have read the testimony of Mr. Pugsley and the rest.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman would not expect me to throw more light than the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and the others?

Mr. HAUGEN. What saving could be effected by it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think we can throw some light on that proposition later on.

Mr. HAUGEN. If we pass it for the present we will then decide.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa make the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed for the present without prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we might as well thrash that question out now. There are several matters in here I would like the Chair to pass on.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I understand the gentleman to object?

Mr. BLANTON. I think all of the points of order ought to be passed on now and not be suspended over.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Iowa does not I am going to make one or two points of order. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph for the present, Mr. Chairman, until the gentleman acts.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman reserves the point of order, I suggest that we pass the paragraph because this proposition is coming up on pages 3 and 4.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask a question or two if the gentleman from Iowa has finished. To create this new director of extension the gentleman in his opening speech admitted would require the creation of a new bureau in this department?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. BLANTON. I so understood it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Under the reorganization no new bureau is created. The office of Home Economics, which as now carried is under the States Relations Service, becomes a separate bureau under this reorganization and becomes such separate bureau with exactly the same statutory force and the same appropriation they now have.

Mr. BLANTON. But with the passage of this paragraph, as it now stands, will there or will there not be an additional bureau in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, this particular paragraph will not have any effect in reference to the creation of the bureau to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BLANTON. But there is an additional bureau created by this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not an additional bureau.

Mr. BLANTON. More than we have at this time?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; not at all. The office is there; it is now under the States Relations Service; it has a statutory roll; it has an appropriation. All this reorganization does,

or one of the things it does, is to take that office from under the States Relations Service and make a separate bureau, with exactly the same statutory force and the same appropriation that it now has.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention to the growing list of help that the department annually is getting in the way of legal advice, and I presume, by reason of getting the extra legal advice from time to time, that they must have created new bureaus. For instance, this paragraph gives a solicitor to the Secretary at $5,000 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. They have always had that.

Mr. BLANTON. They have always had that—that is an attorney?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The solicitor is an attorney?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Down a little further, in line 15, after giving a solicitor at $5,000 a year they give attorneys. I do not know why they have a different specification and do not call them solicitors, but they are called attorneys—one at $4,000, two at $3,500 each, two at $3,250 each; law clerks, four at $3,000 each—I may say that used to be the salary that a circuit judge would draw in the States of Minnesota and Texas not so many years ago, but they call them law clerks here. Two additional law clerks at $2,750 each, four at $2,500 each, eight at $2,250 each, and one at $2,200. What is the necessity for so much legal advice to be lodged in the Department of Agriculture in addition to the swarm of lawyers in the Department of Justice?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman knew more about the Department of Agriculture than he apparently does he would not ask this question.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope some of these days I may know half as much as the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, because sincerely I believe he knows more about the Department of Agriculture than any other man on this floor. I am hopeful some day to know partly as much as he does. But I am down there frequently; I am in the various bureaus frequently; I am asking questions down there frequently, trying to find out, just as the gentleman from Minnesota used to do, something about the business of this country, and for my life I can not see why they should need so many high-salaried lawyers down there in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I can answer the gentleman's question, and I shall be glad to. In the first place, the solicitor's roll under this paragraph carries $2,500 less than it carried before.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman means than last year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. How about the fiscal year 1917?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me answer the gentleman's question. There are two new places in the solicitor's office, one attorney at $4,000 and one at $3,500. They take the place of five law clerks at $2,000 each, so that there is an actual saving as the result of that readjustment of $2,500.

Now, the Department of Agriculture is charged with the enforcement of a large number of very important laws—the pure food law, the grain futures act, the packers and stockyards act, and a large number of other very important laws. Now, of course, the actual prosecution of violations of those acts is conducted by the Attorney General's office, but the cases have all to be prepared, the evidence has to be secured, the cases have to be proved up, and the whole business has to be put into the hands of the Attorney General as ready for trial. That requires quite a large force of attorneys.

In addition to that, there are constantly arising in the department questions of interpretations of these laws, the interpretation to be put upon appropriations, and a great many other matters, all of which require a considerable amount of research and the giving of sound legal advice to the Secretary in connection with his duties.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure that explanation appeals to the gentleman from Minnesota, but I was under the impression that this particular administration, and especially the gentleman himself, was in favor of a consolidation rather than an extension of the various bureaus of the Government, and from my investigation I believe that much of this work that is now done by the various lawyers in the Department of Agriculture should be left to the lawyers in the Department of Justice. May I ask the gentleman this question for information? How many more lawyers—and when I speak of lawyers I am speaking of these law clerks that draw $3,000 a year, and I suppose they are lawyers——

Mr. ANDERSON. They are.

Mr. BLANTON. How many more of them are we giving to the department in this bill than the department had in 1917? That was the last normal fiscal year.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am afraid I can not answer that question, but my guess would be that under this bill we have a less number of lawyers than we had then.

Mr. BLANTON. I am afraid the gentleman is mistaken about that conjecture. If the gentleman has those figures there, I would like him to give them to us.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have not got them here.

Mr. BLANTON. On the statement of the gentleman that it does not create a new bureau, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, before passing from this I notice there is an increase in the total amount. Is that due to bringing some activities under this paragraph that are now under some other paragraph?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will be very glad to explain that to the gentleman. Of course, the gentleman understands, in the first place, that the office of the Secretary here includes a great deal more than the language itself signifies. It includes the office of the Assistant Secretary, and it includes the office of the solicitor, and it includes quite a number of agencies that are directly under the Secretary's office in addition to what would ordinarily be meant under the language "Office of the Secretary."

Now, while this does show an apparent increase in the amount, in reality it is not an increase. It has been the practice for a good many years to carry on the various rolls of the department employees who are detailed to the Secretary's office. Now, where the addition of activities of one kind and another results in increasing the work in the Secretary's office, these details become permanent. When they do become permanent in that way we take them off the lump-sum roll in which they are carried and carry them on the Secretary's roll; so that this sum now, though apparently representing an increase, actually represents a decrease because of the persons taken from the lump-sum appropriation and placed in this paragraph.

Mr. TILSON. Is this item here, "Salary of director of scientific work," new?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; since last year.

Mr. TILSON. And so with a number of others, aggregating about $20,000 increase?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] desire to make a point of order on the paragraph?

Mr. HAUGEN. My idea was to withdraw the point of order and ask that the paragraph be passed over until later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and compensation of necessary employees in the mechanical shops and power plant of the Department of Agriculture, $90,000.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Who is to determine the number of these so-called "necessary employees"?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman, I suppose, is familiar with how this item comes to be in this form?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. We formerly had a statutory roll in the mechanical shops, and prior to that there was carried a number of employees in all the bureaus doing this kind of work. These employees were all gathered under one statutory item in the Secretary's office. Some of them are employed part of the time and some are employed the year round. Last year we made a lump sum of $90,000, which represented a decrease, as I recall, of $19,000, and placed them at fixed salaries on the statutory roll.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The number of employees not being fixed by law but left to the discretion of some officer, he can pay all the salary he may please to any individual provided the aggregate of all salaries shall not exceed $90,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. Within the limitation of existing law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What would be the maximum salary possible to be paid?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would depend on the character of the employees. They are all obtained through the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Exactly. Have we any law to-day which would fix the maximum salary which could be paid under these two lines?

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as I know, possibly not. I could not answer the gentleman's question definitely.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If we have not, then we have this situation: We have $90,000 appropriated in a lump sum, and the number of employees and the salaries to be paid to them not fixed, and it is left entirely to the discretion of some man to pay any salary as large as he pleases to any employee, provided the aggregate of all salaries shall not exceed $90,000. Now, with all respect to the gentleman and the committee who have done such fine work in preparing this bill, it seems to me that this is a discretion that ought not to be lodged in any man who has charge of the expenditure of the public funds. There are very few private employers who would turn over to any man the right to take out of the employer's bank account $90,000 and pay it all to as few men as he might decide to pay it to—to fix the salaries in his discretion; and inasmuch as we are expending money out of the Public Treasury it would look as if there ought to be something to limit that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say in answer to the gentleman that, of course, there is so much work of this kind to be done in the department that the department would only be spiting itself by fixing salaries so high that it could employ only an insufficient number of people to do the work. But the real answer to the gentleman, it seems to me, is that the salaries which have been paid heretofore do not justify his fear. For example, we have employed now under this item a mechanical superintendent who gets $3,000 a year. We have an assistant mechanical superintendent who gets $2,500 a year, a chief engineer who gets $2,040, an executive clerk who gets $2,000, a foreman who gets $1,800, a messenger who gets $720. Then we have two mechanical assistants who are paid $1,400 to $1,800. We have 17 carpenters who are paid from $840 to $1,600. I am sure the gentleman would not say those salaries are exorbitant.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No; I will say that those figures seem to be very reasonable; and that leads me to ask, Why should not specific mention of those salaries be incorporated in the pending bill, and these not be left entirely to the discretion of some person to determine the number of employees and the salaries to be paid?

Why should a department official be given a lump sum of $90,000 to expend in his discretion when the figures that the gentleman has just read show that it is not at all necessary to legislate in that way?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the figures show anything to be feared. They show that the policy which we adopted when we established this lump sum has fully justified the confidence we reposed in the department in doing it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then why did the gentleman in the first paragraph of the bill go into such details, mentioning particularly the employees, the number of them, and the salary of each?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because that class of employment is entirely different. Those people are employed at annual salaries, while a part of the mechanical force is employed for day work, part of it month by month, and part of it for the entire year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The reason I propounded the question I did was not because I have any doubt as to the integrity of any gentleman, especially not of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], or of any man in the department who has the employing of these people, but because I do know that wherever possible—and it is possible here—the Congress of the United States should not turn over lump sums of the people's money to be expended in salaries in the discretion of any department official. With all respect to the gentleman from Minnesota, who says he has the utmost confidence in these particular officials, you could say that of every official in the public service, and never have a bill of rights, either in the Federal Constitution or in the constitutions of the respective States. If you are to believe that all public officials are honest, and that there need be no restrictions around them, what necessity is there for your bill of rights? Not only that, but, as Thomas Jefferson said, governments are founded on distrust of human nature. Men may use their own money as they please, but the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of the Nation ought to be regulated, in as far as possible, in the letter of the law enacted by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. It seems to me that the general policy followed by the committee is a sound one. If there were necessity for making a limitation that no salary under this lump-sum appropriation should be larger than a certain sum, as is done in other departments, that might be worth while; but it seems to me that to attempt to write out a statutory roll in all its details would be an unwise thing; because when a person gets on the statutory roll the head of that bureau has a very difficult task ever to dislodge him from that roll, and there is less chance for improvement in a department if thus hampered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think there would be anything improper in saying that no salary should exceed a certain sum?

Mr. TILSON. I do not. That very thing is provided in the naval bill that we passed the other day. Many of the paragraphs of that bill contain such a limitation, and I do not say that it is inadvisable.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is all I had in mind. You can readily see that a man having a lump sum of $90,000 to expend might pay to some man of whom he was fond a larger sum than would be necessary; and inasmuch as the paragraph which the gentleman from Minnesota read shows that the highest salary paid last year was but $3,500, I had in mind that there ought to be some limitation of that sort.

Mr. TILSON. After all, these lists of the employees paid out of the lump-sum appropriations are gone over with a fine-tooth comb every year by the committee in order to see what the department has done with the money the year before. I believe that leaving a little bit of leeway, a little discretion on the part of the department, makes for better service than can be obtained by tying it up with an absolute iron-bound statutory roll.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin also that accompanying the estimate is an itemized statement showing each necessary employee and the salary at which he is going to be employed under this appropriation, and the department has always been bound by that statement.

Mr. TILSON. I do not believe that we are running a serious risk of the department abusing its trust. I believe that this gives sufficient leeway whereby the department can pay some of the employees more than it has been paying them and cut off a few that are unnecessary. For my own part, I think that we ought to have a less number of Government employees and at the same time require a higher degree of efficiency and pay higher salaries to those remaining in the service.

Mr. HAUGEN. After all, it leaves it to the department in its discretion to pay any salary within the appropriation.

Mr. TILSON. Of course it can not go beyond that.

Mr. HAUGEN. What is the present limitation?

Mr. ANDERSON. That would have no application here. The present limitation is for a certain number at $6,500, a certain number at $5,500, and a certain number at $5,000.

Mr. TILSON. According to the class of civil service under which they are employed. It seems to me that the policy of the committee is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Three thousand dollars is the highest paid to the mechanical superintendent, and the ordinary law which applies to the use of lump-sum appropriations applies here as well as elsewhere.

Mr. HAUGEN. There is no general law. You have a law affecting the salaries in certain departments. Is there any limitation put upon the salaries except the $4,500?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman give us the salaries paid under the statutory roll, so that we may know whether these salaries have been increased or decreased?

Mr. ANDERSON. The roll under 1922, which I think was the last year, carried exactly the same salaries that are paid now.

Mr. HAUGEN. The salaries were not increased by the lump sum?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Do I understand that there is a law which would prohibit the paying of larger salaries than is mentioned in the list which the gentleman read?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is the law on the subject, which is not applicable, however, to mechanical employees because there is a question, of course, of the price which is being paid to mechanical employees in competition with other private agencies that use them. But, speaking generally, the lump-sum funds can not be used to increase the salary of a person taken from the statutory roll and placed in a lump-sum appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICES OF EDITORIAL AND DISTRIBUTION WORK.

Salaries: Assistant in charge of editorial office, $5,000; assistant in charge of office of distribution, $3,500; editor, $3,000; executive assistant, $3,000; assistant editors—1 $2,250, 2 at $2,000 each, 1 $1,800; assistants in charge—1 of addressing, duplicating, and mailing, $2,400; 1 of indexing, $2,000; draftsman or photographer, $2,100; chief clerk, $2,000; assistants—2 at $2,500 each, 3 at $2,000 each; indexer or compiler, $1,800; artist and designer, $2,500; draftsmen or photographers—1 $1,600, 1 $1,500, 3 at $1,400 each, 1 $1,300, 10 at $1,200 each; lantern-slide colorist, $1,200; executive clerk, $2,000; clerks—3 of class 4, 4 of class 3, 10 of class 2, 18 of class 1, 19 at $1,100 each, 45 at $960 each; mechanical assistant, $1,980; machine operators—1 $1,500, 4 at $1,400 each, 13 at $1,200 each, 7 at $1,100 each, 5 at $1,000 each; folders—1 $1,200, 2 at $1,000 each; messengers or laborers—3 at $900 each, 8 at $840 each, 4 at $780 each, 10 at $720 each, 1 $600; 8 skilled laborers, at $1,100 each; messenger boys—5 at $720 each, 1 $660, 5 at $600 each, 6 at $480 each; charwomen—3 at $480 each, 3 at $240 each; in all, $263,670.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. Here is an assistant in charge of editorial office, $5,000. Where do we get that?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is in the Division of Publications under a new title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Have we had an assistant in charge of the editorial office at $5,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have not; that is a new position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then you have an assistant charged with the office of distribution, $3,500.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And an editor at $3,000, an executive assistant at $3,000, and assistant editors—one at $2,500 and two at $2,000 and one at $1,800.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The price of editors must have come down. Assistant in charge of the editorial office—I suppose that means an assistant secretary; if not, what does it mean?

Mr. ANDERSON. It means an assistant to the Secretary in charge of this office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think it means an Assistant Secretary in charge of the office; $5,000 is the pay of an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. ANDERSON. It means substantially the same as Chief of the Bureau of Publications.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What was his salary?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think $3,500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not wish to object to the whole paragraph, but I will ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he would object to an amendment reducing the salaries of the various editors?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman can reach that by his point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am withholding the point of order. I do not care to destroy the editorial work going on, but I think it is unnecessary to have it overdone.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said that the assistant in charge of the editorial office is a new employee. I was in error. There is an assistant in charge of the editorial office who is now paid out of the lump sum for extension service $5,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is he mentioned in any provision of law?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he is not carried on the statutory roll. His duties are the same as under the reorganization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not care to tear up the bill by making points of order, because that means a lot more work for the committee. Would the chairman be willing to accept an amendment reducing the salary to $4,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no information particularly as to whether the work is worth $4,000 or $5,000. This is a very important division.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We are developing a systematic plan, and we have consolidated much of the printing, and yet here we have printing scattered all through the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is all collected in one item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. On the very next page you say that the provisions of a certain paragraph shall not apply to such printing and binding as is now specially authorized by law or by the decision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. ANDERSON. We can take that up when we reach it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not want to lose any rights under the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman can not lose any rights under a point of order as to a paragraph not yet reached.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If you ever get an editor under the title of assistant in charge of an editorial office at $5,000 a year you will never get rid of him, and everybody who has ever been around these Government establishments knows that.

Mr. ANDERSON. But I do not want to get rid of him. I think if he is put there that he ought to be kept there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is creating a new office.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not, because we have him now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But he is hidden out under a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not better to put him where we can see him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We have him now where we can see him, and let us get rid of him.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman makes the point of order as to the $5,000 position and the Chair sustains him, it will go out, and the gentleman from Minnesota will then offer his amendment to restore him at $3,500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Just one moment. Do not let us lose this thing. We are out for economy, and while we are all in favor of the Agricultural appropriation bill, we would like to discuss these things when we discover them. We have discovered a $5,000 man hiding behind the lump-sum bush.

Mr. BLANTON. And the way to reach him is by a point of order to the $5,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and then we would get the $3,500 man under the previous law, and the $5,000 editor will still be hiding behind this lump sum.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I think you will knock him out completely.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not sure of that, because these editors are everywhere and always irrepressible.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to know why the assistant gets $5,000 and the editor $3,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Because the assistant is going to boss the editor.

Mr. BEGG. What are the assistant's duties?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, these editors and bosses of editors and bosses of bosses of editors. We know the brand.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it makes much difference what you call these gentlemen, but certainly I would not call an editor as badly as my friend here who is one.

Mr. BEGG. Well, he knows what they are.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I know that the market is down for editors just now.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Just to what part of the paragraph is the gentleman making the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I make the point of order to that portion of the paragraph beginning on line 15, page 4, and running as far as line 16 after the figures "$3,000." I make the point that it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, this is not a new position. A person employed under this title is now employed in the Department of Agriculture and is paid out of a lump-sum appropriation for extension activities, and is engaged in substantially the same work as he will be engaged in under this appropriation, according to the chief of the division.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is not this an entirely new position?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was so stated on page 31 of the hearings. Mr. Pugsley says:

There are only two new positions asked for; one is for a man to take charge of this editorial work in the Secretary's office, and the other is the director of extension work.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know which one of the gentlemen is right, but, on page 35, Mr. Cobbs, who has been in charge of the division of publications, stated:

> The first place, page 11, assistant in charge of editorial office, at $5,000, is a transfer from a lump-sum fund to the extension service, which has been correspondingly reduced and is to provide for a person to take charge of the offices of the editorial and distribution work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I suppose that is to be Mr. Cobbs?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it will not be Mr. Cobbs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope not; but it will be somebody else equally adept in jockeying these things around from lump sums to high-sounding titles.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, the Chair is familiar with the general law applicable to the Department of Agriculture with reference to the employment of persons in connection with the services authorized by the appropriation.

I call the Chair's attention to section 523 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows, and this is a very old law:

> The Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk with a salary of $2,000 a year, who in all cases during the necessary absence of the commissioner, or when the office of commissioner shall become vacant, shall perform the duties of the commissioner; and he shall appoint such other employees as Congress may from time to time provide, with salaries corresponding to salaries of similar officers in other departments of the Government, and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in the natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

Of course that language does not specifically state that the Secretary of Agriculture may employ an assistant in charge of the editorial office, but it does in general language give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to employ such persons as Congress may provide for by appropriations.

Mr. BEGG. Does not that language specifically require that Congress shall provide for and then that the Secretary shall appoint?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Instead of the way it is being done, the Secretary appointing and then coming down and asking Congress to provide?

Mr. ANDERSON. Congress provides the appropriations, and it has always been the practice under these appropriations for the Secretary to employ the necessary persons to carry out the purpose which Congress designated in the appropriation.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit just one question further?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. On the gentleman's statement that Congress provides the appropriation before there is any excuse for an appropriation, that Congress felt the necessity for the office, instead of filling the office and then coming down and showing the necessity for the appropriation, I think we have just reversed the actual working of the law that the gentleman read.

Mr. ANDERSON. I can not agree with the gentleman at all. The whole question which arises, so far as the rules of the House are concerned, is whether there is statutory authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to employ a person to do this job. Is not that it?

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will permit I will say it is just exactly the contrary. Congress creates a department down there to do a specific work authorized by Congress. Now, under the interpretation the gentleman has put on it the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture could go to unlimited lengths and if he can, on the gentleman's contention, name one officer without specific authority and then come to Congress and say, "Under the authority you have given me originally I have named one officer," why, under the same authority he can name 100 officers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not claim he can name one officer. There is a distinction in the law between officers and employees of the department.

Mr. BEGG. I change my verbiage and use the word "employee" instead of "officer," and I still contend that under the authority of the general law if the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture can name one new employee he can name 100, and he is the sole judge and not Congress at all.

Mr. ANDERSON. I take the gentleman on his own statement. Let us suppose we should put in this bill some such language as this, "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to assist farmers in dehorning cows, $100,000," I venture to say the gentleman would not contend for a moment that under that appropriation the Secretary would not have the power to employ any persons necessary to carry that appropriation into effect.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will permit, I will concede in that specific case, but does the gentleman contend that under the language "to assist in the development of agriculture" the deciding power as to how far the Government shall go in the development rests with the Secretary? In the illustration he gave he made a specific work, to dehorn cattle, $100,000, but in this appropriation it is to assist in the development of agriculture, and I say the authority to say how far the United States shall go rests with the Secretary or with Congress, one of the two. The gentleman's contention is that it rests with the Secretary, and my contention is that no Congress intended to go that far.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not question at all the power of the Congress to strike out this proposition and everything which pertains to the division of publications. The only question that arises is, Is there legal authority from the standpoint of the rules of this House to create this place? That is the only question, and the only determining factor there is, Has the Secretary of Agriculture the legal authority to employ a person to do this job? I think he clearly has.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the Chairman to hear me just for a moment. Mr. Chairman, clearly the hearings show conclusively that this is a new position. I call the attention of the Chair to page 30 of the hearings. In speaking of this new employment Mr. BUCHANAN asked this question:

> Is that the only new person you contemplate securing?
>
> Assistant Secretary PUGSLEY. On the extension end of the work it is. The Secretary is also asking for an editor in chief, at a salary which will permit him to get some person competent to do a lot of things that ought to be done in connection with the department bulletins.
>
> Mr. BUCHANAN. Are these two men outside of the service you contemplate employing?
>
> Assistant Secretary PUGSLEY. Those are the only two new positions we are asking for.

Now, on page 31, I call the attention of the Chair to the following:

> Mr. BUCHANAN. You have no increases in salaries. What are those? Just let the record show that.
>
> Assistant Secretary PUGSLEY. If there are any increases those will be taken up under the items as we come to them. There are no increases in salary due to the reorganization other than already explained.
>
> Mr. BUCHANAN. You have a chief in charge, at $5,000.
>
> Assistant Secretary PUGSLEY. That is the editorial position I spoke of a moment ago, the man that the Secretary wants to take charge of all the publications of the department.
>
> Mr. BUCHANAN. That is one increase, is it not?
>
> Assistant Secretary PUGSLEY. That is a new position by transfer from a lump sum of the extension service, which fund has been reduced accordingly.

Now, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shows this is a new position, in which he is asking that this man be employed at $5,000, and I am willing to take the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], who is not only a distinguished Member of this Congress but a distinguished editor of long experience, that this editor is not worth $5,000 a year, and that the old salary authorized by law of $3,500 ought to be sufficient to get the very best of help for this department. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. TILSON. Will the Chair hear me for a moment on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TILSON. I am afraid that I shall again have to take issue with my good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] on a parliamentary matter. As I view this question, Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference whether it is a new position or an old one. Whether it is a transfer from a lump-sum appropriation or whether it is entirely new, the question is whether the service here proposed to be appropriated for is a service authorized by the law.

Some of us who sometimes give attention to parliamentary questions have been fooled on this Agricultural appropriation bill before. The organic law of the Department of Agriculture is broader than that of any other department in the whole Government, so that the rules applicable to other departments do not apply in many cases to the Agricultural Department on account of this difference in the organic law of the department.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me while I read a quotation from the fundamental law?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I read:

> For the diffusion among the people of the United States of useful information in connection with the subject of agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

Mr. TILSON. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Texas has supplied the quotation from the organic law that I was not able to give from memory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I was not able to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TILSON. I was addressing my remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman contend that the words "assistant in charge of editorial office" are admissible in a bill of this kind under the fundamental law?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. If these words were stricken out here it would make no difference. The Secretary of Agriculture could put the same man now holding the position on again at the same salary. In order to prevent this, the gentleman would have to put in a limitation by means of an amendment to the effect that no man who is employed by the Department of Agriculture as an editor shall receive more than $3,500, if that is the limit to which the gentleman is willing to go in salaries for editors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If it said "Assistant Secretary, in charge of editorial office, at $5,000," and established the Assistant Secretary, we have no recourse?

Mr. TILSON. We are not establishing anything. We are appropriating for a certain work that is authorized by existing law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And in a sly sort of way here we are giving some tone to an office that has been hiding. Is not that what we are doing?

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman from Washington may characterize it as he pleases. It does not change the facts or the law in the case. This service is authorized by the fundamental law creating the Department of Agriculture, and we are here called upon to appropriate for it under a name. It makes no difference what the name is, whether it has a name at all. We are authorized under the law to appropriate for it if we so desire, and therefore, in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think the decision of this particular point of order is a determining factor in the question as to what the policy of the Congress shall be and how far any Secretary of a department may go under a general authorization.

I would like to call the attention of the Chair to the last part of section 523 in the volume known as "Laws Applicable to the Department of Agriculture," specifically referring to new appointments. I will concede the contention of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] that the Secretary of Agriculture may do what he wants to do with his lump-sum appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman mean section 622?

Mr. BEGG. I mean paragraph or section 523 in this book. It is found on page 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a copy of another code.

Mr. BEGG. I want to read that. Speaking of the commissioner, it says:

> And he shall appoint such other employees as Congress may from time to time provide, with salaries corresponding to the salaries of similar officers in other departments of the Government, and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in the sciences.

Now, I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that that language specifically requires this Congress to provide the office before this committee, which is an appropriating committee, has any right to come in and make an appropriation for an office that is not in existence.

I will concede again, as I did a moment ago, that under a lump-sum appropriation the Secretary of Agriculture may spend this money for this identical purpose. He can do it if the money is carried in a lump sum. But this committee has no legal right under the rules of this House to come in with an appropriation for a specific office which has never been created under a statute by this body.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that is all there is in the point of order. I will not deny that the Secretary can appoint a man out of the lump sum to do this very thing. I am denying that this committee, which is deprived of legislative power under a specific rule, can bring in an appropriation for a specific office before that office has been created by Congress under general statute creating that organization, because that statute plainly says that the Secretary may appoint and shall appoint after Congress has provided the office.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this, that if the gentleman is right, then 99 out of 100 specific appropriations in this bill are subject to a point of order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman is correct in his assertion, that is not any reason why we ought to continue to go wrong. [Applause.]

Now, if I am right the Chair ought to uphold that, and it is a simple case of a judicial decision on the language. If the English language here does not mean what it says, then I do not know what it does mean. It says the Secretary may appoint after Congress has provided the job. I maintain again that this committee can not appropriate for something that is not in existence. They can get around that particular thing by adding $5,000 to the lump sum, and the Secretary can go ahead and do what he pleases with the lump sum. But we have no right to put it in in that shape.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As to the lump-sum provision at the bottom of page 5, "General expenses, offices of editorial and distribution work," could $5,000 be taken from that for this purpose?

Mr. BEGG. Unquestionably you could take it all if you wanted to.

Mr. ANDERSON. You could not take a dollar of it. It is for another purpose.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the creation of a new office or a new bureau has universally been held to be subject to a point of order; clearly it is legislation not authorized by law. I recall that time and time again such a provision has been held to be subject to a point of order. If one office can be created, then any number of offices can be created. If this office can be created, it is possible also to create the office of a Third Assistant Secretary. That question has been decided in the past, and it has been held that such a provision was subject to a point of order.

Mr. TILSON. I do not believe anybody would deny the statement of the gentleman, which is absolutely sound, but I do not think anyone here claims this creates an office. I do not believe the gentleman from Minnesota claims that it creates an office. It is not legislation at all. It is simply an appropriation.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] states that it does not create a new position, but there is a change of title, which makes it subject to a point of order.

Mr. FESS. If this change is made, which the chairman of the committee claims is only a change in title, will there be any additional appropriation required by making the change?

Mr. HAUGEN. I understand the gentleman to say that it carries an increase of $1,500.

Mr. FESS. How is it the creation of a new office, if there is no additional amount of money required to be appropriated and if it is not creating some work that has not yet been done? If this work is being done under a different name and this is merely changing the name, is there any new office created?

Mr. HAUGEN. It changes the title.

Mr. FESS. The question might be answered more clearly if I put it this way: If you make this man an assistant editor instead of what you first called him, will the assistant editor be an additional officer, or will you continue an office that would otherwise be displaced?

Mr. HAUGEN. If you made the title exactly what it was before it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FESS. As a matter of fact, is this an additional office?

Mr. HAUGEN. Under the rules of the House a change of title or the creation of a new bureau or a new office is subject to a point of order.

Mr. FESS. I should not think a change of the character of work the man is doing would be a change of law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman has had some experience in seeing bureaus created, and he knows that if this position is created and there is anything left in the lump sum and they need another editor to do mimeograph work or to cut clippings out of a newspaper, they will employ that other man out of the lump sum, and thus the bureau grows. It is the old story.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has got right to the crux of the thing. The point I am after is this: If we make this change, will the other place for which this is substituted be continued?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As long as there is anything left in the lump sum and somebody thinks there is additional editorial, or so-called editorial, work to be done.

Mr. FESS. If the other place is to be continued, of course this would be the creation of a new office.

Mr. HAUGEN. The present title is chief of division, which is stricken out, and this new language is chief editor, and this language is a substitute for the other.

Mr. FESS. When you create the position of chief editor is the chief of division continued?

Mr. ANDERSON. None of these officers under the Division of Publications has ever been established by any law

whatever; not one of them. I will challenge the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] or anybody else to find one law that ever has established these places. The only thing that has ever been done was to pass a law which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to disseminate useful information.

As a result of that, a bureau was built up to carry out that authorization, and from time to time these places were created.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They get certain appropriations for a forestry service, or field work, or anything you please, and most of them contain the words "and for other purposes," and they generally develop an editor and a newspaper. Now, is the House of Representatives helpless when it is proposed to create in an appropriation bill a position equal to that of an assistant head of a department—are we helpless when we make a point of order because there has been a lump-sum appropriation somewhere?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had concurred in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 14 to the bill (H. R. 13232) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says most of these positions are in the same fix. They have not been stricken out heretofore because the Members of the House thought they were salutary and did not care to make points of order against them. But I ask the gentleman to remember the situation of the Indian bill, when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] was on the warpath and stood on the floor here and made a point of order against practically every single paragraph of the bill and was sustained, and it required a special rule of the House to make the entire Indian bill in order, because that committee had been doing just exactly what this committee has been doing—carrying legislative provisions for years and years without any authority of law. But when the membership sees fit to raise points of order against some position which shocks the conscience, if they think it ought to stop, it is not a good argument to say that the members of the Committee of the Whole have permitted it heretofore.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Does the gentleman think that a salary of $5,000 for a man of this kind shocks the conscience of the House?

Mr. BLANTON. I am taking the evidence of the distinguished editor from Washington, Mr. JOHNSON, who says that it is $1,500 more than the very best talent in the country can be obtained for.

Mr. ANDERSON. This man is not merely an editor. He is in charge of one of the most important divisions of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BLANTON. And probably does less work than the editor or subeditor or assistant subeditor does. Whenever you raise a grade or increase a salary you get more dignity and golf but less work out of the individual.

Mr. HAUGEN. I desire to reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair realizes that there are complications in this point of order and appreciates the force of the argument advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], but last year an almost similar situation arose, and at that time the Chair went into the matter very thoroughly and quoted a number of authorities. Without taking the time of the committee to rehearse the precedents, it seems to the Chair that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] has expressed the controlling factor in this case, and that is: Does the authority to engage these employees rest with the Department of Agriculture under existing law? The law creating that department and the law under which it is operated is probably the broadest of any law relating to any department of the Government, and last year when an appropriation for a new employee was presented against which a point of order was made the Chair addressed himself to the question whether the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority. The Chair thought then and thinks now that he has, and basing his decision on that decision rendered by the present occupant of the chair, and fortified further by a decision of Chairman TOWNER on January 24 last, the Chair believes that this item is in order and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the gentleman has his amendment reported, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] reserved a point of order, and it seems to the Chair that had better be disposed of first.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I reserved a point of order on the section.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is that it changes the title of "Division of publications" to "Offices of editorial and distribution work."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I revert to the question of fact that the division of publications by name has never been created by any act of Congress. It is merely a convenient title by which the division which conducts a certain class of work in the Department of Agriculture is carried on. When that was created in the department by the Secretary it could have been given any name which he pleased to give it. It has no sanction of law. It is not so sacred that it can not be changed either by us or by the Secretary. This title does not change the appropriation status of this division at all. It is simply a convenient subtitle under which certain appropriations are placed in order to designate in a general way the division in the Department of Agriculture which shall perform this function. It is not legislation in any sense, because the original title was not legislation.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think under the rule it is not in order. If this never has been authorized it is out of order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that it is a change of title and therefore legislation. The Chair agrees with the gentleman from Minnesota that the appropriations have not been altered by a change of name and that it is not legislation. By giving a title is simply a method to designate certain activities, and therefore a change of name by the department is not a change of authority or the creation of a new activity. No legislation was enacted to create the title and no legislation is proposed creating a new bureau. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 14, strike out the figures $5,000 and insert in lieu thereof $3,500.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this reduces the salary of the assistant in charge of the editorial office to an amount which is $500 more than the editor, and should be enough to justify and require the assistant in charge of the editorial office to be in a position slightly less than that of Assistant Secretary, and make his position in true relation to that of the Assistant Secretary, who is or should be his superior officer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were 16 ayes and 16 noes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The question of ordering tellers was taken, and 10 Members rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—GARTENSTEIN v. SABATH.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report (H. Rept. 1308) from Committee on Elections No. 3 on the contested-election case of Gartenstein v. Sabath.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contested-election case of Jacob Gartenstein v. Adolph J. Sabath, fifth district of Illinois.

Mr. DOWELL. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the unanimous report of the committee.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee for 10 days on account of important business.

To Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee) for 10 days on account of personal illness.

To Mr. SHAW, until January 2, 1923, on account of illness.

RUSSIAN RELIEF.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by the act of Congress for the relief of the distressed and starving people of Russia, approved December 22, 1921, I transmit herewith reports from the American Relief Administration, the United States Grain Corporation as fiscal agent for the Purchasing Commission for Russian Relief, and the Comptroller of the American Relief Administration, which organizations were designated to carry out the provisions of the said act.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 20, 1922.*

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 21, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

846. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting report of claims arbitrated or settled by agreement by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation from October 16, 1921, to October 15, 1922; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

847. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Passaic River, N. J., from the Montclair & Greenwood Lake Railroad bridge to the Garfield Bridge, city of Passaic, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 513); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

848. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on the feasibility, desirability, and cost of the best and most practicable connection between the Nome-Shelton system of communications and the coal deposits of the Nugruk River, Chicago Creek, and the Keewalik mining district, whether by wagon road, sled road, tramway, trail, or other means (H. Doc. No. 514); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEA of California: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4069. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Colorado River near Yuma, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Committee on War Claims. S. 851. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAPES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13000. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOWELL: Committee on Elections No. 3. H. Report 1308. A report on the contested election case of Jacob Gartenstein against Adolph J. Sabath. Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 13508) providing for the sale of land comprising the military reservations on Shaw Island, San Juan County, Wash., and a grant of land to the county of San Juan, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 13509) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Goshen, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13510) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Newburgh, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 13511) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13512) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a new public building at Tulsa, Okla.; and also for the sale of the present post-office building and its site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13513) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Miami, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13514) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Vinita, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13515) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Nowata, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13516) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pawnee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13517) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Pawhuska, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13518) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Bartlesville, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13519) to extend the benefits of the employers' liability act of September 7, 1916, to James H. Lomasney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 13520) to amend sections 404 and 408 of the war risk insurance act as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 13521) for the establishment of a Pacific coast national highway system; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS: A bill (H. R. 13522) to make valid and enforceable written provisions or agreements for abitration of disputes arising out of contracts, maritime transactions, or commerce among the States or Territories or with foreign nations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13523) relating to sales and contracts to sell in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13524) to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, or cause to be sold, either in whole or in two or more parts, certain tracts or parcels of real property no longer needed for military purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13525) to fix the compensation of employees in post offices for overtime services performed in excess of eight hours daily; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLTON: A bill (H. R. 13526) granting a pension to Mary C. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 13527) granting a pension to Liberty E. Frank; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 13528) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Stine; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13529) granting a pension to Edith M. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 13530) granting a pension to James E. Moran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13531) for the relief of Walter Dickey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 13532) for the relief of Capt. Henry Marcotte; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 13533) granting a pension to David Graff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6649. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializes the Congress of the United States to so amend the law now existing that the manufacture and use of light wines and beer for beverage purposes may be permitted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6650. Also, petition passed at a public meeting of American citizens, favoring Irish political independence, held December 17, 1922, at Odd Fellow's Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6651. By Mr. BRIGGS: Petition of C. J. Sweeney and others, for the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6652. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of Herbert Holton, Esq., associate professor of hygiene, accountable officer, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, New York City, N. Y., urging support of House bill 12819; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6653. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Swan Nelson and 19 others, of Newaygo, Mich., favoring the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6654. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of Earll V. Gray and other citizens, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6655. By Mr. REBER: Petition of 15 members of Kalmia Chapter 261, Order Eastern Star, of St. Clair, Pa., favoring the passage of the Sterling-Towner bill creating a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6656. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Ole Gunderson and 18 others, of Corinth, N. Dak.; E. G. Borchardt and F. H. Specht, of Underwood, N. Dak., urging the immediate passage of emergency legislation to stabilize the price of farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6657. Also, petition of John Lyderson and 27 others, of Rawson, N. Dak., urging the immediate passage of emergency legislation for the relief of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6658. Also, petition of Dr. J. R. Pence and 20 others, of Minot, N. Dak., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; also similar petition by Capt. H. Saunders and 20 others, of Minot, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6659. Also, petition of J. O. and Rudolf Ramstad, of Beach, N. Dak.; James A. and Helen McCulloch, of Fargo, N. Dak., for the passage of immediate legislation for agricultural relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6660. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Ernest M. Riggs and others, of Dolgeville, N. Y., to abolish the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6661. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the executive committee of the Commercial Club of Bismarck, praying that legislation be enacted providing for the enlargement of the Federal building at Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Saturday, December 16, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

REPORT OF THE WAR FINANCE CORPORATION (H. DOC. NO. 512).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report of the War Finance Corporation, for the year ended November 30, 1922.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presume the report will be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will depend upon the order of the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented the petition of Harris G. Hale and sundry other members of the congregation of the Leyden Congregational Church, of Brookline, Mass., favoring the passage of the so-called Near East refugee act, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. LADD presented memorials of C. M. Scidmore and 15 other citizens of Park River, and H. H. McCumber and 24 other citizens of Pettibone, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of A. M. Thompson and 1 other, of Wildrose; O. J. Freeman and 2 others, of Esmond; Albert H. Westphal and 2 others, of Clyde; N. M. Marvel and 2 others, of Moffit; M. M. Freiland and 2 others, of Cummings; A. L. Ede and 2 others, of Courtenay; C. C. Jensen and 2 others, of Kenmare; Aug. Arvidoon and 2 others, of Wimbledon; E. Buhrn and 1 other, of Wheatland, all in the State of North Dakota; and O. Coequyt and 2 others, of Carbondale, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the fifty-fifth annual session, National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, at Wichita, Kans., favoring the passage of the so-called Capper-French truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I report back from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 957) thereon.

Mr. WARREN. I desire to give notice that the bill just reported, the naval appropriation bill, will be brought up to-morrow morning immediately after the routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Meanwhile the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4218) for the relief of E. G. Crews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 4219) to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NORBECK (by request):

A bill (S. 4220) to provide credit facilities for the agricultural and live-stock industries of the United States, to amend the Federal farm loan act, to amend the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CERTAIN FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

Mr. PEPPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 545) for the allowance of certain claims for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. DIAL obtained the floor.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I desire to take a little time of the Senate just at this hour so that I may speak on the shipping bill. I am compelled to leave the city at 3 o'clock and perhaps the Senator from South Carolina will accommodate me?

Mr. DIAL. I am glad to accommodate the Senator from New York, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think we ought to have a quorum present before the Senator from New York proceeds. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Glass	McLean	Simmons
Ball	Gooding	McNary	Smoot
Bayard	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Brandegee	Harris	Nelson	Stanley
Brookhart	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Calder	Heflin	Nicholson	Swanson
Cameron	Hitchcock	Norbeck	Townsend
Capper	Johnson	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Underwood
Colt	Kellogg	Overman	Wadsworth
Culberson	Kendrick	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Keyes	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Phipps	Warren
Dial	Ladd	Poindexter	Watson
Dillingham	La Follette	Pomerene	Weller
Ernst	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	Williams
Fernald	Lodge	Reed, Pa.	
Fletcher	McKellar	Robinson	
George	McKinley	Sheppard	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it would be well for the information of Senators to state what I shall ask the Senate to do. When the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] complete their addresses I shall move that the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of executive business, and then at the close of the day's business I shall move to adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire at this time to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns on to-morrow, Friday, it be to meet on Tuesday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. Reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it is the policy of the management of the Senate to limit the holiday season, so far as the Senate is concerned, from Saturday to Tuesday?

Mr. LODGE. We propose to limit it to three days.

Mr. ROBINSON. The purpose is to adjourn from Friday evening until Tuesday?

Mr. LODGE. It is.

Mr. ROBINSON. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that that will deny all Senators, except those who live in adjoining States, an opportunity to return to their homes. It has been the custom for a great many years to recess or adjourn for at least a week or 10 days, and I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that it would suit the convenience of many Senators, whom I happen to have heard express themselves, to adjourn from to-morrow until the Tuesday following New Year's Day.

Mr. LODGE. That we can not do without the assent of the House. The House, I understand, is going to adjourn on Saturday until Wednesday. The House will not take a longer adjournment, and I think they are right. I think we ought not to take a protracted recess at this time. We hope to have the rural credits bill before the Senate next week, and I do not think it is proper to take a long recess at this season.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. At the proper time I shall make the motion, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Of course, the Senator can do that.

Mr. SIMMONS. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if it would not be better to provide for reassembling on Wednesday after the Christmas holiday?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senate prefers to take the adjournment from Saturday until Wednesday, as the House is going to do, I have no personal objection at all; but we can not adjourn for more than three days without the consent of the House.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that, but I assume that we could amend the House resolution and probably send it back to the House amended.

Mr. LODGE. The House is not going to send to us any resolution of adjournment. It is not required to send such a resolution. We can adjourn for three days, and that is all the House is going to do.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it would be a great deal better to adjourn from Saturday until Wednesday than from Friday until Tuesday, for the reason that many of us who want to go home and spend Christmas with our families—for many Senators do not bring their families to Washington until after the holidays—would have to leave our homes during Christmas Day. Indeed, some would have to leave early in the morning on Christmas Day in order to get back here on Tuesday.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to make the order to adjourn on Saturday until Wednesday if the Senate prefers it. That is what the House is going to do.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator understands I am not speaking for this side of the Chamber at all; I am only representing my own views about it. I say that so far as I am concerned, and I believe other Senators share in my view, I would a great deal rather that our adjournment should be from Saturday until Wednesday than from Friday until Tuesday.

Mr. LODGE. That will be perfectly agreeable to me. I have no objection to it at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from New York yield to me to make a suggestion?

Mr. CALDER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I have observed from what the Senator from Washington has stated that he expects to-day to move to adjourn instead of taking a recess. I presume all Senators realize what that move means. It means that the motion which is now pending which I have made to take up the bill which is stated in my motion will go by the board. An adjournment, as I understand, will have that result.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska has mentioned that. I was talking about that awhile ago, and it was something I had overlooked. I am very willing to ask, and I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the unfinished business is laid before the Senate tomorrow, or whenever it shall be laid before the Senate after our adjournment, that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] be considered as pending. It was not my intention to displace the Senator's motion.

Mr. NORRIS. I am glad to hear the Senator from Washington say that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska could renew his motion, but I do not wish the motion to be put in the position of having been displaced.

Mr. NORRIS. I have had an understanding with the Senator from Washington in regard to there being a recess, and——

Mr. ROBINSON. May I inquire——

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to say, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit me, that I should be glad if we could vote on my motion now. I have not desired this delay from day to day; I should like to reach a vote and have a roll call and let that determine it. It is true that I could, as the Senator from Washington stated, renew my motion; it would be in order for me to do that; but if there is a plan on the part of those who are in control to sidetrack my motion in that way, they will be able to do it, because I shall not, perhaps, be able to get recognition; and I should have to get that in order to make the motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Nebraska knows that I would not be a party to anything of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not think the Senator from Washington would.

Mr. JONES of Washington. So I submit the request for unanimous consent which I have stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. May not the request for unanimous consent which has been made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] be submitted by the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the request for unanimous consent.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that the following agreement may be entered into:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that when the unfinished business is laid before the Senate on Friday, December 22, or whenever it is laid before the Senate after adjournment to-day, the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to take up the bill for the purchase and sale of farm products be considered as pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the early history of American shipping reads almost like a romance. Before the Revolutionary War the Colonies, although subjects of another country, were carrying much of their overseas trade in vessels built and owned on this side of the Atlantic, and with the conclusion of the War for Independence and the establishment of a stable government here the new Republic possessed a merchant marine which was the envy of every maritime nation in the world.

Between 1790 and the second war with England, we developed this fleet of sailing craft until we carried 90 per cent of our oversens trade in vessels flying the American flag and our ships could be found in every port inhabited by civilized people. In the War of 1812 Great Britain practically drove our flag from the seas, but with the increasing need for our products abroad and with the subsequent enactment of tonnage and port-tax laws favorable to American merchant vessels, shipbuilders and operators were again encouraged to renew their calling with the result that the famous American clipper ships, trading between Europe, South America, Africa, Australia, and the United States, became renowned throughout the world. They were the largest of their kind and by far the swiftest. They carried the products of this country to every clime and returned to our shores with cargoes of silks, tea, and spices from China, coffee from Brazil, and the varied products of Europe.

The days of the American clipper ship that carried the flag and the products of this country to all parts of the world are gone. The men and women who read the story of the development of our merchant marine up to 1850 will be amazed at the fact that since the Civil War we have been practically unable to compete with the nations of Europe, particularly Great Britain. Although we built the first iron hull in this country, the decline of our shipping dates from the building of iron and steel ships and the introduction of steam power.

AMERICA TURNS FROM SHIPPING.

In the early days the United States ranged along the Atlantic seaboard; our forests grew down to the water's edge; a few hundred miles inland the country was occupied by uncivilized tribes, wild animals, and impassable forests, but as habitation trended westward, the discovery of coal, iron and copper, the advancement of commerce on the Great Lakes, the development of our wide agricultural areas, the introduction of steam and the building of railroads turned the minds of the men interested in the development of America from the sea to the opening up of the land west of the Alleghenies and later to the country beyond the Mississippi, which they soon found to be more profitable than the building or operating of shipping, and the men who had formerly followed the sea gave their attention to more lucrative undertakings because in doing so they found opportunities for education, higher wages, and better living conditions.

Great Britain, taking advantage of our neglect, never ceased in her struggle, not only for naval supremacy of the seas, but commercial leadership as well, and to-day we find our country with wealth untold and an area equal to that of all Europe, including the British Isles, without a well-balanced merchant marine, while England, step by step, day by day, month by month, year by year, has extended her commercial activities until now her ships carry her wares equal in value to that of all the maritime nations combined. The gradual westward trend of the world's affairs and the recent war have made it necessary for all nations to come to us to work out their great financial and business problems, but despite our banking and industrial strength the United States has made no real progress toward taking her rightful place in the maritime affairs of the world.

CREATION OF THE SHIPPING BOARD.

As a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate, extending over a period of 18 years, I have voted many times for legislation dealing with the reestablishment of our merchant marine, and often it seemed as if our hopes in this direction were to be realized, but it was not until 1916 that a law creating the Shipping Board was finally enacted. This act gave the board authority to study and if possible develop an interest in American shipping. They were clothed with little authority, however, as I have indicated, but they did organize and were preparing to function when we became involved in the World War. Instantly Congress, realizing that we were without the necessary equipment to carry our men and supplies overseas, appropriated vast sums of money for the construction of vessels. Many of the Senators present will recall the speech of Balfour, England's representative, in this very Chamber, when he urged us to build ships, more ships, and still more ships. But in other days we had neglected to make provision for the hour of war. Had we spent $25,000,000 each year previous to the war for Government aid, encouraging the building and operation of American ships, we would not have faced the difficulties presented to us when we were called upon to aid in preserving the civilization of the world. In the selection of the first Shipping Board, the President unfortunately appointed men who lacked experience in large affairs. In the main they were without knowledge either in the construction or operation of vessels.

BUILDING OF WAR TONNAGE.

President Wilson's intentions, of course, were of the best, but inexcusable mistakes were made. We spent nearly $3,000,000,000 in this ship construction program.

Previous to the signing of the armistice we had laid the keels—and these figures are very interesting—of approximately 5,000,000 dead-weight tons of steel ships; much of this, however, was only partially completed.

Since the armistice the keels of 5,500,000 dead-weight tons have been laid. If we had stopped the whole program immediately on the ending of the war, we would have undoubtedly saved at least one-half of all the money spent and would be in much better condition concerning our shipping program to-day.

Out of this vast sum nearly $300,000,000 were used for the building of wooden ships. I recall distinctly in the earlier days of the war, at my invitation, Mr. Homer Ferguson, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., and Mr. Joseph Powell, of the Bethlehem Co., were invited to appear before the Commerce Committee, of which I was a member. These two men, the best-equipped shipbuilders in this country, strongly advised against the building of wooden ships, but, despite their objections, we constructed all told 514 of these vessels. They were recently sold for a little over $10,000,000; the last 200 of them, although costing $500,000 each, were disposed of for less than $20,000 each. In my judgment—and I want it recorded in the RECORD to-day—the men who are responsible for the building of these wooden ships are entitled to the condemnation of the American people. They committed one of the gravest errors of the war. The sum wasted in their building would have provided for sufficient Government aid to establish a merchant marine that would have been a credit and glory to the people of this country.

There are also many steel ships built by the Shipping Board at a cost of more than $225 per ton which are now of very little value. In fact, Mr. President, I predict that at least one-half of the steel ships now the property of the Shipping Board will never be sold for more than $10 per ton, and the Government would be saving money in the end by scrapping these absolutely worthless vessels. They may have had some value, of course, if the war had continued two or three years longer or if the sinking of other craft by the enemy had been great enough to require their use in carrying the Army and supplies overseas, but the character of their construction makes them almost worthless in competing with the larger and more economically operated vessels.

Mr. President, it is costing more to-day for skeleton crews and the up-keep of at least one-half of these steel ships built in war time than we shall ever realize for them.

THE PROBLEM OF DISPOSING OF WAR TONNAGE.

Surely the present Shipping Board inherited a task which seems to those of us who have studied the situation insurmountable. It is a mess indeed, and the Nation can not unravel this tangle unless a measure such as the one under consideration is enacted, and let it be known that the present administration has had no part whatever in bringing about the condition in which the country finds itself to-day in relation to this subject.

The other day—and my colleague will bear me out in this statement, because he has seen that fleet in the Hudson River very often—I had occasion to travel over the New York Central Railroad from New York to Albany, along the Hudson River, and in passing the cove at Stony Point I saw anchored over 100 steel ships, the property of the Shipping Board. They have been there for nearly two years. It would be an object lesson to the people of the Nation to observe them huddled together, smoke emanating occasionally from stacks, and guarded by a few men who are protecting the Government's property. It would not be fitting at this time if I should denounce the whole scheme of the Shipping Board's business since the war. Many men engaged in that work were actuated by the best motives, and while I should never accept an excuse for the building of wooden ships, the steel ships were undoubtedly constructed with the thought that they could be profitably utilized.

The board was wrong, however, in not stopping construction immediately after the armistice was signed. Great Britain stopped building at once and rearranged her plans so that she would no longer have any more of these obsolete and extravagantly operated vessels on hand. In the American shipyards, men who were barbers, tailors, shoemakers, and watchmakers to-day were building ships to-morrow and receiving two or three times the wages they were entitled to, and when the armistice came the Shipping Board was apparently afraid to cease employment abruptly, but it would have been infinitely better to have stopped the building at once. Had we done this we would have had at least 500 ships less and would have saved at least $1,000,000,000 of the people's money.

During the years 1918 and 1919 Shipping Board officials toured the country, wrote magazine and newspaper articles, spoke publicly and talked via radio for the purpose of encouraging the men and women of America to invest their money in shipping projects. I recall many of these speeches and articles. Our citizens were urged to interest themselves in shipping. They were told it was their patriotic duty to organize shipping companies with which to carry the commerce of America. It was explained that the profits were certain and large. Tens of thousands of innocent people with small savings were so beguiled by these statements that they were induced to invest their savings in the stock of some quickly organized or fly-by-night steamship company.

I have in mind one company which succeeded in securing over 40,000 subscribers. This money was used to purchase vessels from the Shipping Board at prices exceeding $200 per ton, and the board received from this concern something like $2,000,000 on account of the purchase price of six vessels. Because this company failed to make good its obligations, the Shipping Board took over the vessels—and I have no complaint to make with regard to that, because they had a mortgage upon the vessels—they took over these vessels on which the people had paid $2,000,000 down, and are now offering to sell these same ships for about one-eighth of the original price, the entire investment of the 40,000 subscribers being wiped out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the Senator happen to refer in the statement he has just made to the steamship company whose stock was sold almost entirely to American citizens of Polish descent?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; I refer to that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I merely make this observation: I think that is one of the saddest experiences that any group of citizens have encountered in connection with any business undertaking.

Mr. CALDER. I am glad that my colleague has pointed out the company to which I refer.

Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, the Shipping Board officials toured the country, presented beautiful pictures of the future of American shipping, encouraged the organization of this shipping company and many other like companies, and sold these ships at war prices. Of course, some one should have known that these vessels would never hold up their price, and that the commerce of the world would shrink. Then, after getting 50 per cent of the purchase price, they took away the vessels—and I do not complain of that. The Shipping Board was bound to do that; but the thing I complain of is the attitude of the Shipping Board of that day, which really betrayed these people into losing their money.

Examination of the records will show that very few of the older and experienced shipping men of the country were induced to invest their money in the purchase of vessels built under the abnormal conditions of the war. Some of them are now, however, taking advantage of the low prices of to-day.

I repeat, Mr. President, that about one-half of the steel ships now owned and controlled by the Shipping Board have little or no value. These vessels should be sold at any price to any buyer. My own judgment is that no one will buy them, except perhaps some shipping interests in foreign lands, who may take them over at a nominal figure. I believe a market can be found for the better vessels of the Shipping Board at a fair price. They can be operated for the benefit of the American producer as well as American shipping interests. Government aid must be obtained to insure the sale of the better vessels; and I predict, Mr. President, that unless this or some similar measure is passed, we will dribble away these better vessels one by one, perhaps carry 20 per cent of our foreign trade for the next five or six years in American bottoms, but at the end of 10 or 15 years most of these ships will have disappeared from the sea and we will be back to where we were before the World War.

We can save and maintain what we have; we can assure the continuance of the operation of our merchant fleet, and the higher prices secured for the better vessels because of Government aid will help materially to meet the subsidy paid in the 15-year period.

THE COST OF OPERATING AMERICAN AND FOREIGN VESSELS.

The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], as I recall his very able speech in opposition to this measure, stated that "the records show that we can operate American vessels as cheaply, or nearly as cheaply, in competition with Great Britain."

I have inquired into the subject and from every hand I have the assurance that foreign ships can to-day be operated at from 25 to 40 per cent less than American ships of like character. Their supplies are cheaper; upkeep is less; higher wages are paid by us and our seamen's act provides for better care of our men. I submit, Mr. President, a statement of the cost of operating several vessels of different flags:

The Swedish steamer *Italia*, 2,960 tons deadweight, cost $107 per day for total operating costs including insurance.

Danish steamer *Jomsborg*, 3,069 tons deadweight, cost $80 per day to operate including all costs.

American steamer *Commercial Scout*, 2,200 tons deadweight, cost $131.26 per day to operate. I am unable to break down the foreign costs, but the *Commercial Scout's* costs are made up as follows:

Crew's wages	$63.24
Insurance	19.07
Stores	22.00
Repairs	12.00
Subsistence	14.95
Total	131.26

Swedish steamer *Graecia*, 5,200 tons deadweight, cost of operation $160 per day.

Danish steamer *Albistan*, 5,500 tons deadweight, $140 per day total cost.

American steamer *Honolulu*, 8,080 tons deadweight, cost per day $232.25.

American steamer *Delco*, 5,100 tons deadweight, operating cost $190.26.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator there to inquire whether the vessels he has just mentioned are all operating under the same power—that is to say, whether they are all coal burners or all oil burners, or some coal burners and some oil burners? There is a difference in the cost of operation.

Mr. CALDER. These vessels are all coal burners.

Mr. President, I have here some interesting figures, and I should like the attention of the Senator from Florida to them. They are the most striking figures of Government operation of vessels that I have yet come across. This is the line of which Mr. Rossbottom is the president and manager, which includes the *George Washington*, the *America*, and others. These are nearly all of them ex-German vessels, and they are being operated in the north Atlantic trade, in competition with the vessels of other countries, by the United States Government Shipping Board under the name "United States Lines." In these figures no allowance is made for depreciation, insurance, or interest on the investment, which would increase the cost on every one of these vessels by at least $30,000 per month. In other words, the loss on the steamship *President Polk*, which the United States Lines reports as $47,615.66, should be at least $77,615.66 if you include insurance, depreciation, and interest upon investment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the period of time?

Mr. CALDER. The period is one trip from New York to Bremen and return. I simply list these vessels.

Steamship *President Polk*, voyage New York to London, November 9–December 15, 1921. Loss $47,615.66.

Steamship *President Van Buren*, New York to London, November 2–December 7, 1921. Loss $24,106.54.

Steamship *President Adams*, same voyage, October 25–November 29, 1921. Loss $34,563.25.

Steamship *President Monroe*, same voyage, October 19–November 23, 1921. Loss $37,755.46.

Steamship *President Garfield*, same voyage, October 12–November 16, 1921. Loss $28,062.85.

Steamship *President Polk*, same voyage, October 5–November 9, 1921. Loss $34,717.82.

Steamship *President Van Buren*, same voyage, September 28–November 1, 1921. Loss $31,048.56.

Steamship *President Adams*, same voyage, September 27–October 26, 1921. Loss $18,826.37.

Steamship *President Monroe*, same voyage, September 18–October 18, 1921. Loss $26,527.53.

Steamship *President Garfield*, same voyage, September 18–October 12, 1921. Loss $23,382.11.

Steamship *President Polk*, same voyage, September 1–October 5, 1921. Loss $20,717.

Steamship *President Adams*, same voyage, August 16–September 20, 1921. Profit $2,744.90.

Steamship *President Van Buren*, same voyage, August 23–September 27, 1921. Loss $25,202.41.

Steamship *President Monroe*, same voyage, August 14–September 14, 1921. Loss $11,673.98.

Steamship *President Garfield*, same voyage, August 2–September 6, 1921. Loss $12,311.16.

Steamship *President Roosevelt*, on her round voyage between New York and Bremen, Germany, began July 29, ended September 5, showed a revenue of $33,191.49. This vessel received for carrying United States mail $29,955, which amount is also equal to her total net income and is included therein.

Steamship *President Harding*, same voyage, from August 8 to September 12. Net revenue $19,258.06. Received for carrying United States mail $22,220.

Steamship *President Fillmore*, same voyage, August 22 to September 26. Net loss $18,371.06, including mail revenue of $5,945.

Steamship *America*, same voyage, September 2 to October 3. Net revenue $9,187.57, including mail revenue of $14,440.

Steamship *President Arthur*, same voyage, September 6 to October 9. Net loss $21,959.13.

Steamship *Susquehanna*, same voyage, August 28 to October 9. Net loss $40,181.46, with mail revenue of $3,545.

Steamship *President Roosevelt*, same voyage, September 6 to October 9. Net revenue $8,527.77, including $22,260 for mail.

Steamship *President Harding*, same voyage, September 9 to October 16. Net loss $6,229.18, including mail revenue $16,650.

Steamship *George Washington*, same voyage, September 18 to October 24. Net revenue $95,920.13, including $22,685 mail.

Steamship *President Fillmore*, same voyage, September 28 to November 1. Net loss $23,228.36, with mail revenue $5,970.

Steamship *America*, same voyage, October 4 to November 8. Net revenue of $22,425, with a mail revenue of $16,175.

Steamship *President Roosevelt*, same voyage, October 12 to November 15. Net loss $14,559.65, with mail revenue of $22,180.

Steamship *President Harding*, same voyage, October 18 to November 22. Net loss $15,754.22, with mail revenue of $35,300.

Steamship *George Washington*, same voyage, October 24 to November 27. Net revenue $376.10, with a mail revenue of $18,165.

Steamship *President Fillmore*, same voyage, November 1 to December 6. Net loss $28,397, with a mail revenue of $12,920.

Steamship *America*, same voyage, November 8 to December 12. Net revenue $2,528.32, with a mail revenue of $31,435.

Steamship *President Arthur*, voyage between New York and Dantzig, August 1 to September 6. Net loss $11,178.16.

Steamship *President Arthur*, same voyage, October 9 to November 18. Net loss $51,729.07.

In all of these figures where I have noted the mail revenue, attention is called to the fact that this was included in computing the net result of the voyage and is not an additional revenue.

Your attention is further invited to the fact that out of all the voyages listed, only one would have shown an actual net revenue had the vessel been compelled to pay insurance, depreciation, and capital charges. That voyage is the one of the *George Washington*, which showed a net revenue of $95,000; but if we take from that the interest upon the capital investment, insurance, and depreciation there is only a very small net profit upon the whole transaction.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would like to quote from Mr. Rossbottom's testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, sitting together in the hearings on this very bill. At page 362 he said:

> In voyage No. 2 of the *George Washington* my net operating revenue was $237,088; on voyage No. 3 it was $124,000; on voyage No. 4 it was $148,000.

That was the net revenue. Then, I call the Senator's attention to page 363 of these hearings, where there is a tentative statement of revenue and expenses of the United States Lines by services and by vessels for four months ending December 31, 1921, showing a total net operating revenue of $585,259.43. I admit this does not include insurance, depreciation, or repairs made by the United States Shipping Board, but the statement does include all expenses incurred by the United States Lines; also coal, oil, and advertising paid by the United States Shipping Board as well as office rent and wharfage billed by the United States Shipping Board. I submit that the testimony of Mr. Rossbottom does not at all bear out what the Senator has said.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I read the testimony to which the Senator has referred when I was preparing this statement. But the figures I have quoted are from the records of the United States Lines and can be authenticated in the office of the Shipping Board here.

On only one trip of the *Roosevelt*, and several trips of the *George Washington*, and on two trips of the *America* was there an actual net profit to the Government, and, as the Senator has indicated, on no one of those trips did the profit reported include interest upon the investment, insurance, or depreciation. These statements are from the records of the United States Lines, and, with the exception of these four vessels I have noted, on practically every trip made by these Government-operated vessels there was a loss shown.

Wages on ships form about 10 to 15 per cent of the daily cost of operation. However, there can be no thought of further economizing along this line. Seamen are being paid from $45 to $60 a month and firemen from $50 to $65 a month. These wages must be increased if we are to attract competent Americans to the sea. This fact must be obvious when you consider ordinary laborers in New York—that is, foreigners who can scarcely speak a word of English—are receiving $5 a day. The surprising thing is that we get anyone to go to sea at all, and, as a matter of fact, we are now experiencing considerable difficulty in getting full crews.

SHALL GOVERNMENT AID BE GIVEN TO COMPANIES OPERATING AMERICAN AND FOREIGN SHIPS.

I shall be glad to refer for a few moments to section 400 of the pending measure. Under the terms of the bill, as passed by the House, provision is made that no shipping company, owner, or agent for foreign-flag vessels shall receive any benefit for their American ships unless within three years at least 75 per cent of the vessels owned and operated, chartered, or acting as agent for are under the American flag. This provision was changed in the Committee on Commerce to 50 per cent.

The distinguished senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in his speech on the bill in the Senate the other day, criticized the committee for making this change, and stated that it was done in the interests of the International Mercantile Marine Co. It was on my motion that the change was made in the committee. I offered the proposal because I was anxious to induce well-organized shipping companies in the United States, who are operating American and foreign tonnage to gradually dispose of their foreign vessels and engage in business with American ships. I am informed that several companies would be affected by this; I do know that it would particularly affect the International Mercantile Marine Co. This company, 95 per cent of whose stock is owned by Americans, has been engaged for a number of years in trans-Atlantic business. I am informed that to-day approximately 85 per cent of the vessels operated by this company are of foreign registry, including British and Belgian, but in the main British. If the House provision prevails, it is almost certain that no effort will be made by the company to increase its American tonnage sufficiently to comply with the bill, because it is almost physically impossible to do so. If the Senate proposal is agreed to, I am reliably informed that this company will either make an effort to dispose of part of its foreign tonnage and begin the purchase of American vessels or construct in American yards ships for their overseas trade. And, so, this Senate amendment will materially aid American shipping; American vessels will ply across the Atlantic, flying the American flag, carrying American products, and in the end be available to the United States in case of an emergency.

UNDER THE AMERICAN FLAG.

I hold no brief for the International Mercantile Marine, but in all fairness it seems to me just that the country should know that this is the one concern, who, during the past 25 years, has maintained an American express passenger service across the North Atlantic; in fact, until very recently, it has been the only company that has sailed American vessels in the passenger service in that route, and it is also an interesting fact that it was the one concern, who, after the war, came forward and made a substantial offer to purchase and recondition at their own expense the ex-German passenger ships,

with the understanding that they would be operated by this company under the American flag in the Atlantic trades.

I recall distinctly the discussion on this question in January, 1919. Senators will remember that Mr. P. A. S. Franklin, president of this company, made a public bid for all of the ex-German ships. One of his bids was to purchase 30 of them for the lump sum of $28,500,000; in another bid he offered to purchase 17 of the 30 mentioned at prices aggregating $21,576,000; and another to purchase 17 for $23,000,000. He agreed to pay 25 per cent in cash upon delivery of the ships, recondition them at the entire expense of his company, which, if we are to judge from the cost of reconditioning the *Leviathan*, would have meant an additional expense to the International Mercantile Marine of from 50 to 75 millions. In this connection it is interesting to note that this bill contains a provision that the *Leviathan*, one of the vessels for which Mr. Franklin bid $4,000,000, can not be sold for less than the reconditioning costs.

If the International Mercantile Marine had not been interfered with this ship would have been in the North Atlantic trade to-day flying the American flag; and we would have had $9,000,000 in the Treasury of the United States, the cost of reconditioning the vessel and the $4,000,000 additional which Mr. Franklin bid for her, so that to-day we would have had all of these vessels operating under the American flag which Mr. Franklin offered to purchase, together with the $28,000,000 he offered for them and the great cost of reconditioning the vessels. In other words, we would have had in operation a fleet of American-flag ships and many millions in pocket. I point out these facts to demonstrate to what great advantage it will be to the United States if we but encourage men who know the shipping business, who understand its problems, who have worked at them for a quarter of a century, and who have the courage and resources to go into the business on a large scale.

I have pointed out the tremendous losses we are incurring to-day in our attempt to operate American ships in the North Atlantic business. As I have already noted, in a single round trip of one ship under Government operation we are often compelled to pay out $40,000 in losses.

The Senator from Wisconsin in his statement called attention to the fact that this company, the International Mercantile Marine, has under its control a large amount of British tonnage. This is true. But, it is also a fact and a matter of record that early in 1918, the International Mercantile Marine had practically consummated a deal with a British syndicate to dispose of all of their British flag tonnage when the President of the United States, on November 18, 1918, wrote to Mr. Franklin requesting him not to conclude the transaction. The letter from the President is as follows:

WHITE HOUSE,
November 18, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. FRANKLIN: With regard to the sale to the British Government of the International Mercantile Marine, may I not request that no action be taken in the matter until the views of this Government are fully presented and considered?

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WOODROW WILSON.

Later the President, through the Shipping Board, definitely requested that the negotiations with the British syndicate be stopped, and the Government offered to buy this tonnage from the International Mercantile Marine—its offer was accepted and the ships were sold to the United States Government. After numerous delays in carrying out the terms of the sale, and without offering any reason, the Government withdrew from its share of the bargain and left the ships with this company. Instead of their being criticized for ownership of this tonnage, it seems to me that they have been dealt with very unfairly by the Government and should be the subject of sympathy rather than harsh criticism.

Let me read a letter dated April 1, 1919, addressed to Mr. Franklin and signed by R. B. Stevens, vice president of the Shipping Board, stating that the Shipping Board was no longer interested in the purchase of these vessels, and expressing appreciation of the spirit in which the company had worked with the American Government.

APRIL 1, 1919.

Mr. P. A. S. FRANKLIN,
President, International Mercantile Marine Co.,
9 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR MR. FRANKLIN: In answer to your letter of the 25th of March, you are informed that national reasons no longer make it compatible with the interests of the United States to consider further the possible acquisition of the ownership of your British tonnage, and that accordingly you are free, so far as the interests of this Government are concerned, to dispose of such tonnage to the British syndicate or otherwise as your company may consider desirable.

This Government is fully appreciative of the patriotic and considerate spirit in which your company has responded to the previous communication of the Government in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) R. B. STEVENS, *Vice President.*

I am sure that an examination of the records will demonstrate that this is the only company in the United States which has attempted to acquire a large fleet of American-flag passenger ships, and particularly, to purchase those owned by the Shipping Board which have been the subject of so much trouble for the last three years. If they had succeeded in purchasing the ex-German tonnage, we would have had for the past year and a half a large passenger fleet which the American people would have been proud of, instead of the makeshift which we are now putting up with.

I feel that this company should be encouraged, and this bill should be drawn to induce them to acquire additional American tonnage rather than to discourage and exclude them. Every additional American ship which is built and operated by that company constituted a gain to the American merchant marine, regardless of what other ships they may have.

The thing the American merchant marine needs to-day, more than anything else, is not ships, but it is the active participation in the business of men who know how to operate ships successfully. We can not do this all in a day; we must build slowly; we need every single man and every organization in the United States to help do this work. There are to-day innumerable American concerns in the United States who have been acting for many years as agents for British and other foreign ships. Why? Because there were no American ships.

These men are experts, and it is this class of men that we should encourage to operate American ships.

I am of the opinion that the 75 per cent clause in the bill should have been omitted entirely and I believe an American company, operating one American ship, even if it operated 100 foreign flag ships, should have Government aid for that one ship, and the Government should be only too glad to induce that company to operate that one American ship.

Under the terms of the bill as it passed the House, they will not do so because it will mean that they must give up their existing foreign connections, which means the giving up of a going business on the gamble that the American ships will succeed. On the other hand, if they would acquire first one American flag ship, operate it and find that with the help of the subsidy they are able to make a profit, this would encourage them to purchase another one, and so on until their operations were largely American. Their income from acting as agents of foreign ships has permitted them to build up a business under the American flag. This is the logical way for the transition to take place and for our merchant marine to grow.

THE NECESSITY OF GOVERNMENT AID.

From every point of view I am convinced that there is no possibility of our maintaining an ocean-going fleet to carry American products overseas without the assistance of the Government. I am a strong believer in a protective tariff. Protection is levied for the purpose of making up the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Our Democratic friends, in the enactment of tariff legislation, provide for the levying of a duty so as to give a limited protection. Our party believes in a higher tariff, and on this same theory we come to the Senate and insist that we are powerless, as a nation, to operate in competition with foreign nations, unless we encourage this business by Government assistance, in exactly the same manner as levying a tax upon imports for the purpose of equalizing the costs of production.

During all of my service in Congress the Democratic party has constantly opposed legislation of this character. They have defeated numerous attempts to establish and maintain an American merchant marine. I know that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] sought to encourage American shipping in the tariff law of 1913, and his own administration under President Wilson refused to put into effect the very helpful provision that he inserted in that measure. Here is a counterproposal in this bill for direct Government aid, and we find almost unanimous opposition on the other side, and to my regret a number of Senators on this side who live away from the seaports and whose people are apparently satisfied to ship their products in foreign vessels.

We can not blame men for purchasing things where they can be obtained the cheapest; we can talk of patriotism all we will; we can argue that people should send their products abroad in American ships, but they will not do so whether they live in Topeka or Boston, in Little Rock or New York, if they can ship in foreign vessels for less money. It is human nature and common sense to buy where we can get the lowest prices.

Senators on the other side and some of my Republican brethren lose sight of the ultimate advantage to their country. We have spent three billion dollars, at least two billions of which was thrown away, because of our short-sighted policy of the past 50 years. The interest on that wasted $2,000,000,000

alone would have supplied much more than the needed Government aid for years to come, and to-day we find Senators with lack of vision on this great important American question who will plunge their country into the same condition which confronted us prior to 1917; and when war comes again, as it will some day, if we fail to give Government aid to encourage the maintenance of our merchant marine, we may not have Great Britain to carry our men overseas the next time. She may be on the other side and we will be helpless. Mr. President, I feel very strongly on this subject from the standpoint of the future needs of my country.

I live in the great seaport of the nation. I have stood on the shore driveway in my native Brooklyn, overlooking the Narrows, through which pass majestically in and out of the harbor the great commercial ships of the world. In other days I observed the wonderful development of German commerce. I have seen Great Britain vying with Germany, struggling against the efforts of this Central European power to surpass Great Britain in character, size, and speed of her merchant ships. France, Italy, and even little Norway in the days before the war excelled America, and I then find Senators here who have had no intimate knowledge of these things, who have never seen them, and who have no contact touch with these conditions fighting against the best interests of their country. The opportunity is here and I am wondering whether or not we will permit it to pass. Shall we have a smaller merchant fleet than Norway or shall we equal the greatest in the world?

THE VALUE OF A MERCHANT MARINE AS A NAVAL AUXILIARY.

We have been discussing of late the question of naval armament. As I recall it, some reference was made the other day to the conference of last winter, when we arranged with Great Britain and Japan a 5–5–3 naval policy, when Great Britain for the first time in her history agreed that another country should have a navy as large as hers. I have always felt that she was confident that the chances of war with the United States were remote indeed, and I, too, believe we are less likely to quarrel with her than with any other nation. She is our neighbor on the north; our race largely springs from the Anglo-Saxon; we speak the same language; our first settlers came from the British Isles; but when Great Britain made this agreement at the recent conference she had something back of it which the American public did not know about, but we know now that it was her great second line of defense. I took the trouble recently to make inquiry about the number of steel ships over 10,000 tons operating in American, British, and Japanese commerce to-day. It is as follows:

Great Britain has ships of—	
27 knots	1
26 knots	1
24 knots	1
23 knots	2
21 knots	2
20 knots	1
19 knots	1
18 knots	22
17 knots	40
16 knots	47
15 knots	76
Total	194
United States has ships of—	
25 knots	1
23 knots	1
22 knots	2
19 knots	1
18 knots	2
17 knots	19
16 knots	9
15 knots	15
Total	50
Japan has ships of—	
19 knots	1
17 knots	5
16 knots	2
15 knots	15
Total	23

Great Britain to-day possesses 194 steel seagoing merchant ships whose speed exceeds 15 knots per hour; United States possesses 50 of the same type, while Japan has 23. In making this summary, I have excluded vessels 25 years of age and over. These figures indicate that Great Britain has four times as many vessels of this character as the United States, and if, in a sea fight, we should lose all of our Navy and Great Britain should lose all of hers, she would still have this second line of defense, which, properly armed, could ravish the seas and drive from the ocean every vessel possessed by the nation with whom she was at war. Surely as an aid to the Government in case of an emergency the expenditure of $30,000,000 a year would be an investment entirely justified by the circumstances. This $30,000,000 would not even pay for the building of one modern battleship, while if expended as a subsidy we would have a tonnage valuable in war, constantly earning its way, and carrying our products in times of peace.

THE VALUE OF A MERCHANT MARINE TO PRODUCERS.

The upbuilding of a merchant marine has been advocated by the Republican Party since its organization. While the Democrats have talked of it in their platforms, they have done nothing to materially aid it. We hear constant reference to the shipping trust. There is no shipping trust, because to-day there is no large investment in American shipping, except in cases like the Standard Oil, the United States Steel Corporation, and the United Fruit Co., who utilize their vessels entirely for carrying their own products. In the case of the Standard Oil Co. there is no shipping company equipped to handle their business. This company is thereby enabled to build good ships, pay their men good wages, and carry their own products at a profit. The same is true of the Steel Corporation and the United Fruit Co., and under the proposed bill the shipping companies carrying their own products exclusively are not permitted to receive a subsidy from the Government. I am thinking of the general advantage to the Nation, to the farmers of Kansas and Iowa, the cotton growers of the South, the lumber interests of the Northwest, and the manufacturers of the East.

We have just passed a protective tariff law which gives the American producer a better opportunity in his own market. The passage of that bill will not seriously affect our foreign trade. Under it, the American worker will be earning better wages; he will be steadily employed; he will be able to buy more of our own goods; and he will buy more of the things that come from abroad, such as tea, coffee, sugar, and other commodities not produced here. While America is busy and her workers employed at good wages our imports increase. Statistics prove that our foreign trade has always increased when we were operating under a protective tariff. This trade has always been good when Americans were busy and prosperous.

Last year the Shipping Board sent one of its officials to Buenos Aires to take charge of its office there and attempt to develop the Shipping Board's business. When this official arrived he found that our representative in that country was a gentleman of German extraction, who, although acting for us, had little or no interest in the development of our business. Our representative was in constant difficulty from the moment he arrived, in an effort to present to the people of the Argentine the advantages of trading with this country. Buenos Aires and Argentine business firms are organized for British and German trade, and we can not hope to achieve any great business standing there without American agencies or without American ships going to and from their ports to our own.

South America has been thinking for years in terms of German and British business, largely because Great Britain and Germany have operated vessels directly from South American ports to Europe. Until recently when the Shipping Board established a direct line of steamers from New York to leading South American ports, it was the practice of South Americans intending to come to the United States to reach our shores via Europe, very few coming direct to America. They did this because the European vessels were better and conditions of sailing more favorable and when they arrived in London, Paris, Berlin, or Barcelona, they naturally traded there. If this bill fails to pass how long does any Senator believe we will continue the operation of the Shipping Board Line to South America? I do not know what it is costing the Government to operate this line, but I venture to state that it is taking several million dollars out of the Treasury annually. Now if this bill passed it will encourage some shipping company to purchase these ships, and the subsidy will be much less than it costs the Government to operate the line to-day. Shipping Board vessels are being operated by private concerns at a direct loss to the Government at almost every point to an extent that almost warrants their ceasing operations.

I can not understand how Senators bring themselves to believe that the subsidy is a raid upon the Treasury. I am not speaking to-day as a Senator from New York. I am trying to look at the subject with the viewpoint of the entire country. As I stated before, New York City is the center of activity of the civilized world and we are the great market place of America. New York belongs to the Nation. There is no city in all the world which belongs so completely to the entire country as does New York, with its Wall Street, its Fifth Avenue, its wonderful Hudson River front, its tremendous industries, its great shipping interests, its imports and exports. These are all yours. Through our gates passes the trade of the world.

I repeat, our exports are yours; you send them to us to ship abroad for you. Our imports are yours. You complain at times of the great deposits in our banks, but the small bankers all over the country send these deposits to us because of the interest we are able to pay and the fact that we take care of them when they need help. Your farmers send their products to us because they believe ours is the best market; your manufacturers ship their goods to us because we are able to dispose of them. These great tasks which confront us every day convince us that it is to your best interest, as much as for our own, to pass this bill. We are confident the enactment of this measure will tend immeasurably to help every State in the Union, every single city, town, village, and farm.

Government aid would help shipbuilding and all its allied industries; would give employment to tens of thousands of men. The construction of a ship calls upon every State in the country. We must have steel from Minnesota, copper from the Rocky Mountain States, lumber from the South and the great Northwest, coal with which to operate the vessel, if she is a coal burner, from Pennsylvania or West Virginia, and oil from Oklahoma or Texas. The men who build the ships must be clothed; they must be fed; they must be housed, and the food, housing material, and clothing come from every little hamlet and farm in this broad land. Of what interest is it to the American farmer or worker or miner if these ships are built in England or Germany; if they are operated by English, German, Scandinavian or Japanese crews? There are so many elements from every standpoint that enter into this whole subject that the small amount of Government aid contributed to build and operate these vessels is insignificant when one comes to consider the great advantages that will flow to all of our people when built and operated by Americans.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present a resolution in the nature of a petition adopted by the Brightwood Parent-Teachers' Association of the District of Columbia asking for more school buildings and better school facilities. For the reason that the resolution is typical of other resolutions which during the last year I, as chairman of the subcommittee on education of the Senate District Committee, have received from more than 100 civic associations, I ask that the resolution may be printed as a part of the few remarks I desire to make on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Without objection, the petition will be received and printed as a part of the Senator's remarks.

The petition is as follows:

Resolutions of Brightwood Parent-Teachers' Association.

Whereas the educational facilities for the children of the District of Columbia are decidedly inadequate to meet existing needs, in that there are insufficient school buildings or playgrounds to accommodate the present enrollment; and

Whereas salaries are too low to encourage properly qualified persons to enter the teaching profession or to secure and hold the most capable teachers in the schools of this District: Therefore be it

Resolved, (1) That the Brightwood Parent-Teachers' Association urge upon Congress the necessity of appropriating sufficient money for the construction of new buildings and extensions to provide a seat for every child of school age in the District of Columbia for full time throughout the school year, also for the purchase of sites at once for the location of new schools which clearly will be needed within the next few years.

(2) That we indorse the very reasonable estimates submitted by the Board of Education for the fiscal year 1924 and recommend the restoration of the items stricken from the estimates as finally submitted to Congress.

(3) That we call upon Congress to give careful consideration to the present and future needs for school facilities in the District of Columbia with a view to abandoning unsuitable buildings and to providing suitable and sufficient schoolrooms and playgrounds for the proper education of our children in this District.

(4) That we whole-heartedly indorse the pending teachers' salary and school reorganisation bill, known as S. 3136 and H. R. 10390, which has recently passed the Senate; also the compulsory attendance and school census bill, known as S. 2040 and H. R. 72; and the free textbooks and educational supplies bill, known as S. 2860 and H. R. 9543.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee on education of the Senate District Committee, I have had an opportunity in the last year to acquaint myself with conditions in this city. I do not hesitate to say that the school situation here is a disgrace to the National Capital. One-third of the 154 school buildings in Washington are ramshackle testimony to the inefficiency of the Congress that designates the kind of public schools for the city. A large proportion of these buildings are so poorly adapted for school purposes that it is a travesty upon childhood to continue them in use. Congress has repeatedly appointed commissions to make educational surveys in the District of Columbia, and as often has failed to act upon their recommendations. In 1908, for instance, a commission recommended that 10 buildings be abandoned. But apparently with the same viewpoint as it has at present, Congress proceeded assiduously to forget the recommendations and these 10 buildings are still in use. That was 14 years ago, and meanwhile the number of buildings which should be abandoned has increased to at least twice that number.

The mention of playgrounds to the average parent in Washington provokes a smile. Playgrounds are so few and so small that it is a misuse of the word to call them such. Virtually all of the schools are without electric lights, and only 13 out of the entire system have assembly halls. Many of the buildings have been in use for nearly half a century, yet even with this dilapidated equipment it is necessary to use 78 portable schools. Over 3,000 children right here in the Capital of the Nation are receiving their education in these portable schools, buildings which are inferior even to the schools found in the mountainous sections and the thinly settled States of the West.

Twenty-seven rented buildings, including the back room of a colored church and several second-story apartments, are being used for school purposes. At the end of last fiscal year there were approximately 490 oversize classes in the school system. Doctor Ballou, superintendent of schools, has informed me that in spite of the new classrooms which have been opened, this number has grown larger since the opening of school this fall, another instance of shortsightedness on the part of Congress. Our subcommittee on schools finds in Washington to-day more than 7,000 children receiving three and a half hours of instruction instead of the average five hours that is provided in all adequately financed school systems. Children are forced to be at school at half past 8 in the mornings and are sent home at 12 o'clock in order to make room for new groups which come at 1 o'clock. This latter group, even with three and a half hours' instruction, does not get out until 4.30, or just in time to get home before dark. I am told by the school officials that under present conditions the 70,000 school children are receiving only 60 per cent of a normal public-school education.

Mr. President, these statistics mean nothing unless the Members of Congress are sufficiently interested to visualize the conditions which they describe. But whether or not the Senate is interested, these are testimonials of disgrace; and the Members of Congress can not escape the disgrace.

In the high schools, conditions are even worse. There are 4,000 more students in the high schools than the buildings can adequately accommodate. This city has one of the highest percentages in the country for high-school attendance. It is an admirable tribute to the quality of teaching. But instead of encouraging this spirit Congress has withheld the material support which it justly deserves.

Mr. President, Congress has failed miserably in supplying even the physical basis for a healthy and vigorous educational system. And when I say Congress, I do not mean to shift the responsibility to an abstraction; I mean the Members of this body and of the House of Representatives. Congress has been generous only with expressions of good intentions. We hear much talk of "a model school system for the Capital of the Nation." It is a beautiful phrase. It is a phrase which the Members of Congress are accustomed to use in placating the parents of Washington who come to us asking for better schools for their children.

This situation is not new to the Members of the Congress. I am sure that they have seen the articles which appear daily in every Washington newspaper, setting forth the run-down conditions of the schools, but apparently we are not awake to the acuteness of the problem. Certainly the meager legislative results justify the belief that Congress has lost interest in this great city which is forced to depend upon us for its government. The citizens of the National Capital are too often justified in feeling that Congress has adopted the blind and arbitrary policy of granting only those things which they are forced to grant, and even then of cutting appropriations to a degree that renders effective carrying out of school legislation impossible. The inadequate school buildings and the prevailing salary schedule is a splendid example of what I mean.

Mr. President, the responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia is on Congress. As long as that is true it is the duty of the Members of Congress to acquaint themselves with the needs of this city and to meet them in an intelligent way. Certainly there can be no good reason for the Members failing to keep themselves informed at least as to the progress of education, the most important of the activities over which Congress has control.

But the disgraceful condition of the schools of Washington does not show, and has not shown for a decade, evidence of such attention by Congress. I am glad to say there is no evidence of inefficiency on the part of those charged directly with school administration, but through the failure of Congress to

grasp a large perspective for the educational system, and to use common judgment in providing for normal expansion, we find here a broken vehicle for the training of 70,000 children. It is a condition that Congress can not defend from any standpoint.

Recently this branch of Congress passed the two bills known as the teachers' salary bill and the compulsory education bill. To those members of the Senate who have familiarized themselves with the scale of pay now in force for teachers in Washington schools the need for an increase does not have to be explained. It is recognized that the very life of the school system depends upon it. The importance of the compulsory education bill must be apparent to the most elemental student of the public educational system.

The passage of these two bills is the first step toward placing the schools of Washington on a plane with the public schools of other American cities, but under no circumstances should the members of this body consider that they have disposed of the District of Columbia school problem by the approval of these two important pieces of legislation. It is not untimely to warn the Senate against such a view. Because, in my opinion, the present decrepit condition of the Washington educational system is due largely to the habit of Congress lapsing into a state of inaction as far as Washington is concerned.

The needs of this school system can not be met by piecemeal legislation. The Senate can not discharge its duty by the intermittent passage of bills. Nothing less than a constructive program of school legislation, taking into consideration the normal growth of the city and making up for the past neglect of Congress, can meet the need in a practical way. These bills we have passed are part of a program our committee believes is essential to a proper upbuilding of the public-school system in Washington. And it is my opinion that the Senate and House of Representatives must act upon this program in full or assume complete responsibility for the breakdown of public education in Washington.

Mr. President, let me make one point plain. If the Members of Congress are to talk school improvement, they have got to talk money. And unless they are willing to talk money their fine phrases are empty utterances. Instead of saying "a model school system for Washington," are we ready to vote for a $10,000,000 school appropriation? If not, then it seems to me we have little right to indulge in school talk which relates to the District of Columbia. Efficient administration can carry the educational system so far, but it can not supply the foundation for development. And it must be realized that it will take a larger amount than has ever been voted before. I think the amount recommended by the Budget commissioner is entirely too low.

If this brings us in conflict with the policy of reducing expenditures, I would remind you that to save money by sacrificing young minds is not economy. I am aware that it is the boast of many of the Members of Congress that they keep a watchful eye on expenditures. And in so far as it is compatible with good sense I am in hearty sympathy with the curtailing of appropriations. But to cut the school budget of the National Capital at this critical time, to crowd 70,000 children into buildings meant for 50,000, and then to provide only 60 per cent of an average public-school education, is a very great blunder. Do not overlook the fact, either, that the taxpayers here pay 60 per cent of the cost of their schools and are now pleading for the right to spend more of their own money for educational purposes.

Mr. President, Congress is not in any sense meeting its obligation to the city of Washington. The District of Columbia is, perhaps, the most arbitrarily governed area in the United States. The indifference and the lack of intelligent consideration which the people of the District of Columbia have to meet in their governing body is almost sufficient cause for them to gather in force and march on Congress. The citizens of Washington have a right to feel that they are ruled by a group of men unrepresentative of the people of this District and unresponsive to its needs. It has suffered in all departments from inattention and oversight, but with reference particularly to education. Congress will always have embarrassing explanations to make regarding its efficiency as long as the schools of the District of Columbia lag behind the other cities of the country. Because of its relation to the Nation, the country looks to the National Capital to set a standard, which means, of course, that Congress shall establish that standard. Retrenchment of expenditures is desirable, but it must not be done at the expense of education. I am sure that I am in accord with all thinking persons when I say that statesmanship is not evidenced by the paring of educational budgets. I believe that the people of this country have enough interest in their capital to expect Congress to give it an educational system commensurate with its importance to the Nation.

PUEBLO INDIAN LANDS IN NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have before me a communication from the Secretary of the Interior relating to Senate bill 3855. That bill, it will be recalled, passed the Senate at the last session and upon my motion was recalled from the House at the present session. It is known as the Pueblo Indian bill. It is now before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. The Secretary of the Interior in his letter discusses the subject very fully, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and also that my very brief reply may likewise be printed in the RECORD and so referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, December 13, 1922.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BORAH: Some time since, upon your motion, a resolution was adopted withdrawing from the House consideration of S. 3855, entitled "A bill to ascertain and settle land claims of persons not Indian within Pueblo Indian land, land grants, and reservations in the State of New Mexico." I understand that this bill was rereferred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys for the United States Senate.

This action having been taken, I presume that consideration of the bill will not be possible at the present short session of the Congress of the United States.

In the meantime, however, I assume that your action in this matter was caused by the clamor which has been heard in various quarters and publications, and charges which have been made in various papers and periodicals, and through letters and the representations to individual Congressmen and Senators.

The general tenor of these newspaper articles, representations, and letters, etc., has been to the effect that a "raid" was being made upon the lands of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, and that the rights of these Indians were not being properly guarded or attempted to be protected by the sworn officers of the administrative branch of the Government, whose duty under the laws passed by the Congress of the United States is to properly guard and protect such Indian rights.

I realize fully that the opinion is held in many quarters that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a Member of Congress for 14 years, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, is not the proper person to guard and protect the rights of the Indians of the United States, but that such protection and guardianship rests in the hands of volunteer associations or individuals, many of them among the best people in the United States.

I am further aware of the fact that among some people the Secretary of the Interior is regarded as a ruthless despoiler, at least in intention, of the Indians, ready at all times to acquiesce in the effort of anyone to deprive them of their civil, religious, and property rights and property.

I am further aware of the fact that in many instances the Congress of the United States, or at least Members of the Congress and Senate, are influenced by propaganda or statements made by parties who have no official responsibility in the premises to take action without consultation with the departments and the heads of the departments and bureaus charged under the laws with exactly such official responsibility. There is no measure of resentment in making the foregoing statement, but it is made as a matter of simple, well-known fact.

As it was upon your motion that the action recited with reference to this bill was taken, I am addressing this letter to you with the request that you at least read it, and that if you see no reason why you should decline the request you may have it printed in the RECORD, and, if it is worthy of such treatment, that it be made a public document.

Since I have been Secretary of the Interior I have made no speeches to the public, dictated no statements for the newspapers, and engaged in no propaganda of any kind or character, even in the attempt to answer charges made against myself or my department, which charges have sometimes been of a most villainous character; as, for example, in the so-called discussion of the present bill by various volunteer representatives of the Indians and through them presumably printed and commented upon by newspapers and periodicals which the public naturally have a right to presume would investigate charges before indorsing them. My course has been to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, or to the President of the United States, with reference to the actions of my department, treating them as officials of the United States Government, among whom I am one. This I have conceived to be my duty, and I am following that course in the present instance, and this is my justification for imposing upon you.

May I be permitted first to give a rough outline of the history of the pueblos of New Mexico and of their property rights and of the conditions existing there under Spanish and Mexican administration, and of the conditions existing since American occupation and at the present time. The settlements occupied by these particular Indians are known as the pueblos and are as follows: Zuñi, Ácoma, Laguna, Isleta, Sandia, Santa Ana, Cia, Cochiti, San Felipe, Santo Domingo, Jémez, San Ildefonso, Pojoaque, Nambé, Santa Clara, Taos, and San Juan, in connection with which may be mentioned Moqui or Hopi villages of Arizona.

These people are of sedentary habits and not of the nomadic tribes of Indians, and they were found by Coronado and the first Spanish explorers in 1541 and the following years, many of them residing in the present villages and cultivating the same lands which they are now cultivating and on which they are residing at the present time. The rights of these Indians to certain lands were recognized by the Spanish conquerors from early days, and provision was made under the

decrees of the Cortes and the Government of the viceroys and other Crown representatives for the protection of these Indians and the recognition of their land holdings.

Under the strict terms of the Spanish, and later of the Mexican, laws the holdings so recognized and provided to be confirmed to these Indians were to each community 1 league square. At the same time the method adopted in granting and confirming rights to other settlers, particularly the Spaniards or Mexicans, was to compute 4 leagues square, measuring 1 league in each direction from the center of the village or from the door of the church.

In New Mexico the first settlements of the Spaniards were adjacent to or within the existing settlements of the Indians in many instances; and the civil government in the early days being in the hands of the representatives of the church, missions were immediately established among these Indians and churches built within the settlements.

Later the policy was pursued of measuring 1 league in each direction from this church, thus making the Indian communal allotments of equal size with those of the Mexican communities—that is to say, 4 leagues instead of 1 league.

The Spaniards were driven out of New Mexico by an uprising of all of the Indians in about the year 1680, and many of them took refuge at the Indian pueblos below El Paso, Tex., from which points later the expeditions for the reconquest and settlement of New Mexico proceeded.

Titles are said to have been issued by some Spanish authority while these Spaniards were at the Texas pueblo settlements granting to them in writing the titles to the 4 leagues of land, which under the conditions referred to had theretofore been set aside to each community.

These evidences of title were incidentally or in some direct proceedings examined by the officials of the Court of Private Land Claims created by the Congress of the United States in 1891, and the expert officials of that court were of the opinion that these so-called Spanish muniments of title were forgeries. This matter is not material to any legal issue, however, as the Congress of the United States in 1858 made a grant to each of these pueblos by metes and bounds, granting the same amount of land—that is to say, 4 leagues to each pueblo—application for patent of which had been made by the Congress. Later, under the direction of the Congress, following surveys made by the surveyor general of New Mexico, patents were issued to these communities for the amount of land so granted. In these patents, as in the law, however, was inserted the following clause:

* * * "Do give and grant to the said pueblo of ———, in the county of ——— aforesaid, and to the successors and assigns of the said pueblo of ——— the tract of land above described as embraced in said survey, but with the stipulation, as expressed in the said act of Congress 'that this confirmation shall only be construed as a relinquishment of all title and claim of the United States to any of said lands, and shall not affect any adverse valid rights, should such exist.'"

The titles to these lands were not generally presented for adjudication to the Court of Private Land Claims above mentioned, but in one instance claims were made by the Pueblos for adjacent lands, or other lands claimed by them by purchase from individuals or through grantees, and in at least two of such claims the court considered the same and found that the Indians were entitled to certain lands which were later patented to them even as late as 1909. For example, one of the pueblos had purchased of a grantee of the Spanish administration 40,000 or more acres of land, and the pueblo itself presented a claim for adjudication to the Court of Private Land Claims embodying this purchase and had title confirmed to it and received patent for this land. Questions of disputed boundary have arisen, particularly since American occupation, between the Indians of the pueblos and adjacent landholders and claimants to the public lands under the public-land laws of the United States. In one instance recently a homesteader had a patent issued to him for approximately 160 acres of land and the patent was withdrawn after being forwarded to the local land office for delivery because of the conflict of approximately 7 acres embraced in the entry with a land-grant area. The applicant represented that he was willing to accept the patent with the area in conflict excluded, and the patent itself was issued to him after such action was taken through myself as the Secretary of the Interior.

In the Spanish days conflicts were constantly arising between Spaniards and others claiming lands by one title or another within the exterior limits generally recognized as the legal limits of the pueblo. Under the Spanish administration two classes of officers were appointed to protect the Indians against the rapacity of the Spaniards and others, and I may say that the Spanish archives of New Mexico are full of instances displaying the good faith of the Spanish officials with relation to such Indian matters.

One of the more serious conflicts which was not finally and definitely settled at that time, more than 150 to 175 years ago, has in one form or another practically continued to this day. In the pueblo of Taos, which was a frontier pueblo subject to constant attack from the marauding savage Comanches, Apaches, Utes, and other Indians, the Indians themselves invited the adjacent Spanish settlers to come within the boundaries of their grant and occupy certain designated areas and assist them in repelling the attacks of such Indians, particularly the Comanches. Several years thereafter a dispute arose, the Indians insisting that the Spaniards should be ejected simply because of the fact that technically titles for the lands occupied had not been made to the Spaniards and that it was Indian ground. These difficulties were patched up by agreements from time to time, but no final determination as to the rights was made. No such determination has been definitely made as to these and other disputed titles since the years mentioned, and disputed questions still arise. The home of Kit Carson for the greater portion of his life was at Taos, and the first governor appointed before the creation of the Territory, named by General Kearny—that is to say, Governor Bent—and his family were residents of Taos.

An examination of the documents relating to the titles of these pueblos will display very many curious and interesting facts. For example, Mexicans and Spaniards intermarrying with Indians, their children claimed in many instances all the rights of Indians, including property rights. In at least one interesting case, as shown by the archives, the Indians of one little village set aside a portion of their lands for the occupancy of such children, who are designated officially as "coyotes," and in some titles made by the tribe later the instrument specifies that the land described is situated within the place occupied by the "coyotes."

I am thus hurriedly attempting to give you the background of the situation.

These Indians, under the Mexican law, were regarded and declared to be citizens. Of course, the fact that they had a political status as citizens did not necessarily give them authority or power over other properties or real estate except under the laws or customs adopted and followed.

Distinct provision was made in the laws of Spain for the alienation of Indian lands through the approval of the "protector" or other official in charge of the Indians. In some instances the custom recognized the right of the Indians to purchase additional lands and hold same, while no law specifically provided for such purchase nor how such purchased lands might thereafter be disposed of, nor whether land so purchased was subject to any restrictions whatsoever as to disposition. I have before me a report containing, among other things, a historical review of the Spanish and Mexican laws and the situation of these Indians with relation thereto, their status under the law, etc., which was prepared by the Hon. Ralph E. Twitchell, assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, appointed for the purpose of making such historical research and making reports to the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs concerning any remedial measures necessary. This report was in the hands of the Senate committee when the bill in question passed the Senate, and if any Senator will give time to the perusal of it he may find it interesting, and in event he regards the subject as of importance, may find it also instructive. I shall refer to this report again, and in this connection will add that Mr. Twitchell was appointed to do this work because of the fact that he is a thorough Spanish scholar, has given years to the examination of the Spanish archives of New Mexico, has made translations of the original documents, has written a history of New Mexico in three volumes, and has prepared and published two volumes, subjecting, indexing, and analysing these old Spanish and Mexican archives. Colonel Twitchell has been a resident of New Mexico for approximately 40 years, is to my personal knowledge one of the prominent lawyers of that State, and in my judgment was best qualified to handle this particular subject. He is also representing the Government of the United States in litigation now pending against settlers on and claimants to some of these Indian lands in good faith, and with exceeding ability is attempting to rectify some of the errors, both of omission and commission, of United States special or general attorneys with reference to Indian matters.

AMERICAN OCCUPATION.

The first civil Governor of the Territory of New Mexico, after the same was created, was James S. Calhoun, who, during the military occupancy and prior to the creation of the Territory, was Indian agent for all of the Indians in what was known as New Mexico at that time, and his jurisdiction extended over what is now known as New Mexico, Arizona, parts of Colorado, etc. He was appointed by President Taylor and proceeded immediately to New Mexico. His official correspondence with the Indian Office under Secretary of the Interior Luke Lea and others is on file, of course, in our archives, but was collected and printed three or four years since under the title of "The official correspondence of James S. Calhoun while Indian agent at Santa Fe and superintendent of Indian affairs in New Mexico."

Accompanying this document will be found the first maps of portions of New Mexico made after American occupancy. Of course, while Calhoun had jurisdiction over all the Indians within his territory he was in more close touch at all times with the Pueblos, whose matters we are now considering.

Among other things well known to residents of New Mexico and others who have given consideration to pueblo questions, Mr. Calhoun first calls public attention to the fact that these pueblos, the names of which have heretofore been recited, are inhabited by people many of whom do not speak the same language. Among other things, in a report under date of October 1, 1849, he says that of the 20 pueblos the languages of at least 10 of them are said to be entirely different and that they communicate with each other through the instrumentality of Mexican interpreters or pantimimic action. I may state to you that while a Member of the United States Senate several years since I myself presented to the then Commissioner of Indian Affairs three pueblo "governors" who could not communicate the one with the other in Indian language, but must communicate through the common medium of the Spanish, and that much surprise was expressed by the commissioner upon being informed that these Indians did not speak a common language, and that rules and regulations for their government applicable to one could not be well applied to another where any attempt was made to give jurisdiction to the Indians of one pueblo over any Indians of another. All through the correspondence of Mr. Calhoun will be found instances upon the settlement of the disputed questions of titles and of boundaries of these Indian lands and conflicts between claimants of property rights within the exterior limits of recognized pueblo grants. Insistence upon legislation and conferring of jurisdiction upon some one tribunal to try all such cases is repeatedly made in such correspondence. Detailed information concerning specific conflicts is furnished from time to time. Among other things, a treaty was drawn up by Mr. Calhoun and signed by the head men of the majority of these pueblos with reference to the settlement of titles through some tribunal to be created by the United States. A letter was written under date January 25, 1850, to the Indians of Taos concerning this question. Various suits brought in the territorial courts or in the circuit courts are referred to in the same concerning Indian rights or property, and the difficulties in the matter of jurisdiction and other matters are referred to and pointed out.

These Indians having been recognized as citizens, their status as voters became a subject of interest in the election of 1850.

Apparently the agent, Mr. Calhoun, advised the Indians to take no part in the election, while the military governor, Colonel Monroe, issued a proclamation stating that they were entitled to vote for all Territorial officials and for State officials, United States Senators, etc., as the people of the Territory were, under the invitation of President Taylor, at that time attempting to form a State government and were electing two United States Senators and a Congressman. These Indians took part in the election for the Delegate to Congress, Mr. Smith, who served in the Congress of the United States. From time to time, running back over a known period of approximately 250 years, parties have claimed lands within the Indian pueblos by virtue of supposed titles or sales to them by individual Indians and by the Indians as a tribe. A great many American citizens, Mexican by descent, and others are living within the exterior limits of these pueblos and claiming title not only by occupancy but claiming to be able to establish the fact that their titles originated through regularly executed conveyances from the Indians to their predecessors in interest. In many cases possession by such claimants may be traced back more than 200 years. There

are various decisions of the Territorial, State, and United States courts concerning the status of these Indians and diverse opinions with reference to the rights of the Indians to dispose of their properties to other parties.

The Indian can not understand the difference between a State court and a United States court, and to him an officer of the Government is an officer of the Government, whether his office is held under a State or a National commission. Conflicts between the courts yet continue. The situation from time to time has taken on a very serious caste, particularly within the last few years, since Americans have been going into the Territory, and now State, of New Mexico, and many of such Americans have been purchasing lands claimed to be held in private ownership by American citizens holding possession of such claims possibly, as I have stated, through generations of such occupancy. In 1850, as shown in the collection of the Calhoun correspondence, while Delegate Smith was in Washington, he received and replied to letters from the then Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Brown. In a letter under date March 9, 1850, Delegate Smith refers very feelingly to the Pueblos and to the fact that provision should be made to have judicial settlement of all conflicting title questions. In August, 1851, Mr. Calhoun refers to Hon. Luke Lea in connection with a letter from himself, a report made to Calhoun by Mr. Tulles, who had been authorized to settle some conflicting claims. In this communication Mr. Tulles relates that he has met the agents of different pueblos and has ordered a line recently run between these pueblos by Government surveyor, and that he had also another line, giving certain natural objects as terminating points, and Mr. Tulles closes with the statement that all of the Indians of both pueblos were satisfied, with the exception of the governor of the Lagunas, who was by this decision dispossessed of a few acres cultivated by himself. He also relates that he had examined into the controversy between the Laguna Indians and the Mexicans concerning the north line of Laguna grant and concerning a dispute as to the use of water for the irrigation of lands claimed by the respective parties. I am possibly tedious in calling attention to these matters at such length, but I see no other method by which the present situation can be understood and proper provision made for a definite settlement of these questions which have been pending for more than 300 years.

It will be noted that by the grant to the Indians made by the Congress of the United States in confirmation of their supposed titles from the Spanish Government, which titles were theirs, at least by recognition, the total area within the exterior limits became fixed, but that the Government conveyed no other title than by confirmation of the title to the Indians, and with specific reservation concerning any other titles.

I have hereinbefore stated that the Court of Private Land Claims did not consider itself vested with jurisdiction to pass upon these pueblo claims which were confirmed under the congressional grants. However, in the act creating the Court of Private Land Claims, and providing for the discharge of its duties, general provision was made for the survey and ascertainment of the boundaries of individual claims which might be affected by the decisions of the court.

Later attempts were made to have the Congress of the United States appropriate moneys with which to cause surveys to be made within the Indian pueblos of the claims occupied by individuals other than Indians. About the year 1913 surveys of this character were ordered, and under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior were made and detailed reports thereupon filed by the surveyors, maps accompanying the same, etc.

Noted upon these maps and reports is the distinct provision that the surveys and mapping should not be construed in any manner whatsoever as conveying, or attempting to convey, any intimation that the parties whose lands were thus mapped or surveyed and reported upon had any rights of any kind recognized by the department itself, the clear attempt being made to convey the information that the department had no jurisdiction over these specific questions and that it would not recognize the validity of any such claim.

The matter was considered from time to time by the Congress in applications for appropriations, etc., and I may refer you to the hearings of the committee of the House of Representatives, volume 8, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, page 647, et seq., where it is stated by the representative of some of the claimants in answer to a question of the chairman that the surveys referred to were made for the purpose of segregating the American and the Mexican lands which had been possessed for a certain length of time, etc.

These surveys were made through the use of appropriations for Indian allotments and surveys under a ruling by the comptroller, based upon a question propounded by this department.

While the surveys were being made the parties claimant, apparently through some common understanding, made written statements with corroborative affidavits, to the surveyors, showing the character of title which they claimed to have, etc. The principal survey, commenced on November 2, 1915, was made by Francis E. Joy, United States surveyor. The original application and accompanying affidavits were reported, with the maps and notations thereon, as hereinbefore indicated, to this department. Of course, they were recorded as not being in the nature of legal claims demanding decisions, but they were made upon forms furnished by some one else, headed "Small holding proof." These applications, affidavits, reports, etc., indexed, are contained in several volumes in the archives of the General Land Office, and in the volume before me I notice that the first application of applicant is made by the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America by C. R. Garcia, agent. The application is for three small tracts, and it is stated that each was purchased from some other holder who was in possession of same at time of purchase. These documents and files, of course, are at the service of the Congress of the United States should either body or any committee thereof desire to examine the same, together with any other documents or instruments on file in the department relative to these questions.

While these particular claims just referred to have not been properly filed, except as just stated, there are formally filed claims numbering several hundred, possibly made by some of the same individuals, which claims are pending in the General Land Office.

Notwithstanding the fact that the surveyors distinctly informed each individual that the surveys were merely being made for information and for assistance in the matter of suits, etc., and were not intended to convey any intimation of any prospect of the patenting of any titles therethrough, yet the occupants of these lands generally have supposed for years that they were really in the situation of the small land-holding claimants under the act of 1891, and they have been living in expectation of some adjudication of what they think are rights in the premises.

Right here and now, Senator BORAH, it may be as well understood that, notwithstanding all of the clamor of the most excellent ladies and gentlemen who are besieging you and others with their appeals for protection to these Indians, and the denunciation of the officials having in charge Indian lands, there is no new raid by anyone being made or attempted upon any Indian lands known as the pueblo lands in New Mexico. The demand for some final, definite settlement of these disputed questions is insistent from all parties, and it is these demands and the action of the department thereafter taken thereupon, which I shall now shortly refer to.

That these are not new questions of occupations of so-called pueblo areas finds very persuasive proof in a census made by the mission authorities at each of these pueblos in the year 1819, as follows:

Church census (1819) attending mission churches at these pueblos in 1819.

Pueblo.	Indians.			Spaniards and other classes of people.			Spaniards and Indians.
	Men.	Women.	Total.	Men.	Women.	Total.	Total.
Pecos	26	28	54	366	372	738	792
Tesuque	89	98	187	141	159	300	487
Nambe	113	118	231	29	32	61	292
Pojoaque	42	51	93	140	146	286	379
San Juan	117	115	232	1,210	1,272	2,482	2,714
Picunas	158	162	320	515	532	1,047	1,367
Taos	372	381	753	624	636	1,260	2,013
Santa Clara	88	92	180	600	605	1,205	1,385
Cochiti	182	157	339	191	168	359	698
San Felipe	170	140	310	215	193	408	718
Santa Ana	238	233	471	4	3	7	478
Zia (Cia)	107	89	196	1	2	3	199
Xemes	163	167	330	280	254	534	864
Laguna	402	377	779	246	217	463	1,242
Acoma	245	232	477	5	3	8	485
Zuni	794	803	1,597				1,597
Isleta	234	277	511	1,145	1,168	2,313	2,824
Sandia	192	213	405	199	207	406	811
San Ildefonso	262	265	527	317	351	668	1,195
Santo Domingo	358	368	726	118	141	261	987
Total	4,352	4,366	8,718	6,348	6,461	12,809	21,527

This table shows that these people, Indians and non-Indians, were worshiping at these missions and residing upon or immediately adjacent to the Indian pueblo villages more than 100 years ago.

Prior to the introduction of this bill (S. 3855) of which I am writing you, Senator BURSUM on May 31, 1921, introduced Senate bill 1938, and on July 19, 1921, Senator BURSUM introduced Senate bill 2274.

Senate bill 1938 provides, very shortly, that all persons who for more than 10 years have had actual, continuous, and adverse possession of lands not exceeding 160 acres within the exterior boundaries of any Indian pueblo grant in the State of New Mexico confirmed to such pueblo by act of Congress or by decree of the court of private land claims, or whose ancestors, grantors, or predecessors in interest had such possession are hereby recognized and declared to be the legal owners of the land so possessed and confirmed in the possession thereof and the title thereto. "No action at law or suit in equity shall be commenced or maintained by the United States or by any Indian pueblo to recover the possession of such lands or to quiet title thereto, and this act may be plead in bar of any such action or suit now pending."

There were various suits pending at this particular time, and of course the bill speaks for itself as to its objects, to-wit:

I. To confirm all claims of title held for more than 10 years;

II. To prevent the prosecution of any pending suits affecting same.

Under date of June 27, 1921, I addressed a letter to the Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the United States Senate, dictated and signed by myself personally, calling attention to the provisions of this bill and stating, among other things, that an attorney had been appointed by the Attorney General of the United States to represent the Department of Justice in the matter of Indian litigation, and that instructions had been given this attorney that he should go into all pueblo titles—that is, the original grants, surveys, history, history of individual holdings, disputes concerning water rights—and make a comprehensive report to the department upon which could be based a request for legislation, if same was necessary, in justice to the Indians or the settlers; that it was the purpose of this department to attempt to seek justice for all parties; that "the passage of the act in question would simply forestall a settlement based upon a full and comprehensive report of actual conditions, the legal status, the equitable rights and claims of both the Indians and others claiming rights, and so forth.

It was stated that this action was taken prior to the introduction of these bills, and so forth.

Communications were sent to individual Senators and others at the same time and along the same lines, and the bill in question was not acted upon.

On August 16, 1921, during my absence from Washington, a very similar letter was directed to the Hon. REED SMOOT as a report upon Senate bill 2274, and as a result of the objection of this department this bill was likewise held up.

Later the report made by Colonel Twitchell, and hereinbefore referred to, was received and, as before stated, a copy of it was immediately furnished to the Senate committee having charge of the bill S. 3855.

The history of the latter bill is this:

Mr. A. B. Renehan represents a large number of private claimants; Col. R. E. Twitchell, Assistant Attorney General, represents the Department of Justice in charge of Indian Affairs litigation, etc., in connection with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

Commissioner Burke visited New Mexico and while there visited several pueblos and discussed matters with various Indians. He also had a conference with Messrs. Twitchell and Renehan at Santa Fe, and with other attorneys, concerning this much vexed question.

Colonel Twitchell had the outline of a proposed bill drawn up and Mr. Renehan also had a proposed measure. The two attorneys were requested to come to Washington and did so. A conference was again held here between themselves and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Later a conference was sought with the Secretary of the Interior, and the draft of the bill as it stands was discussed, and, as I understand, one or two suggestions made by the Secretary were included therein before the final draft was made. The bill was then introduced by Senator BURSUM. My impression is that it was not sent to him from the department but that may have been and he most likely was told that it had the general approval of the department. In any event, I wrote a letter, under date of July 31, 1922 to Senator SMOOT, in answer to his official communication, in which I stated that I had given the provisions of the proposed law my attention and that the bill met with my approval. I further stated that the attorneys representing the Indians and the claimants, respectively, had been brought here, and that all parties had agreed to the bill.

I may say to you that the bill was, of course, a compromise; that it was presented with the general approval of the department for the consideration of the Congress of the United States, for the purpose of enabling that body to adopt some legislation tending to bring about a conclusion or finally to put at rest the controversial questions which have agitated the people of New Mexico, as heretofore stated, for more than 300 years.

Now, sir, the particular exigency demanding the passage of some measure had theretofore recently arisen in a threatened armed conflict between certain American citizens claimant and certain Indians on one of these pueblos.

The claimants of these lands are American citizens who exercise the right of suffrage. The Indians themselves are understood to have the right of suffrage but do not exercise the rights.

Ever since 1850 political agitation has ensued in the different counties where these Indian questions are unsettled, at every election.

Under our system of appointing superintendents and shifting them from one place to another, superintendents have been sent in from the Northern States, or other localities, to represent the Government in the matter of these different Indian pueblos. There are several of them located in the State, their jurisdiction being divided into districts.

Due to this near armed conflict various protests were made concerning the action of one of the agents and demands made for his transfer, and equally strong demands made for his retention. These demands came from Americans, from volunteer associations representing the Indians, from claimants to rights within Indian lands, and others.

At this time I wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, after having discussed this particular incident with him, calling his attention to the fact that these disputed Indian questions were being dragged into politics at every election; calling his attention to the fact that American citizens speaking the Spanish language, lived within the exterior limits of these Indian pueblos and had so lived through their ancestors in many instances from time immemorial; calling his attention to the fact that these pueblo Indians did not speak the same language, while practically every one of them speaks Spanish, and that in my judgment great care should be exercised in the selection of agents who would have some little knowledge of the particular pueblos which they must deal with and preferably, at least, some smattering knowledge of Spanish, through which language they could communicate with the non-English speaking Indians of the different pueblos, and that such agent should have instructions with reference to the peculiar political status of and political agitation among these Indians.

Again, let me impress upon you the fact that villages almost entirely inhabited by American citizens are situated within the exterior limits of these pueblos; that the pueblos themselves pay no taxes and that all taxable values are assessed against the property of Americans (generally Spanish-speaking Americans) who conduct mercantile and other businesses of the communities. This is peculiarly the case with reference to the settlement of Española and the settlement of Taos.

Now, what does Congress propose to do about it?

We have, in good faith, attempted to furnish them with the foundation for legislation and with information upon which they can base some definite conclusion.

It is held by Mr. Twitchell that while Pueblo Indian tribes, as a tribe, had legal authority under the Spanish and Mexican law to dispose of lands that the individual Indian could not make good title to any portion of such lands. The contrary opinion is held by very many and it may be possible by a majority of the lawyers who have given consideration to this question.

It is not generally understood that these pueblo lands consist of a very small portion, approximately speaking, of cultivable, tillable, and cultivated lands; that this small area, situated in the narrow valley of some stream, is divided up between the different individual Indians running in long strips generally from the "acequia madre," or "mother ditch," so that each holding is as near as possible to the main water supply. The remainder of such lands consists of grazing lands generally, with no timber of any kind or character except scrubby "mezquite" and cottonwood, the roots of the former being used for firewood; that these grazing lands are supposed to be held in common by all the tribe, while the individual Indian cultivating lands within the pueblo areas under allotment from the pueblo official did not have any title other than by consent of the official of the pueblo. The title to areas so occupied was in common, but in practice and custom such lands were actually cultivated and used by succeeding generations.

Now, legally or illegally, it has been the custom for a great many years for these individual Indians to part with their titles, or supposed titles, to these small individual holdings. Whether they had a legal right to do so remains to be settled and is a subject upon which there is a very material difference of legal opinion as indicated.

In correspondence concerning this bill I have indicated that possibly it might be necessary, in equity and good conscience, to provide compensation for the American claimants of the lands in event they were dispossessed thereof, either through cash payment of the ascertained value of the particular tract or through the granting to such claimant of an equivalent value of lands of the United States, or that it might be necessary to make some such provision for the Indians or any individual Indian in event the holdings of the American claimant might be sustained.

My purpose is to inclose herewith various documents, some of which have been referred to, and also correspondence, etc. I have, however, only given you very hastily a mere outline of the very interesting problems, and have attempted to show to you that those charged with the legal duty and with the legal responsibility of administering Indian matters have proceeded in the best of faith.

I have shortly referred to the fact that Colonel Twitchell is representing the interests of the Indians in litigation.

I can not refrain from calling attention to one particular case now pending.

A former attorney for the Pueblo Indians some time since brought suit for such Indians in the State court for the recovery of certain lands claimed by them as against the claims of individuals. Suit was brought in the name of the pueblo. It was tried by a State court, and was decided against the Indians and in favor of the claimants. No appeal was taken from this decision. The record does not disclose why such appeal was not sued out.

Later a suit was brought in the United States court; "res adjudicata" was pleaded. The case came up to the Supreme Court of the United States, and was entitled "The Pueblo of Laguna *v.* Jose Candelaria et al.," and the case was dismissed on the ground of no jurisdiction.

Shortly after the appointment of Colonel Twitchell he requested authority, both through the Department of the Interior and directly through the Attorney General of the United States, to be allowed to file a suit in the name of the United States for the benefit of this pueblo for the recovery of these lands. Instructions were issued that such suit should be brought, and it is now pending. What the result will be it is impossible to say, but at any rate the utmost industry has been displayed by Colonel Twitchell in this matter as in all others under his care, and he is assiduously endeavoring to rectify what was certainly a very serious blunder made by a former attorney for the Indians.

And yet, Senator BORAH, you doubtless have in your possession a published article, written by one Mrs. Cassidy, in which, among other things, she is relating what occurred at a meeting of these Pueblo Indians, recently held, and in the course of which she very sympathetically repeats some statements in the form of an interrogatory by one of these Indians who, after reciting the loss of these lands to his people, desired to know "whether they were to be deprived of their lands by the man in Santa Fe (referring to Colonel Twitchell) or the man in Washington" (referring to either the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior).

Now Mrs. Cassidy follows this quoted statement by referring to Mr. Wilson, former attorney of the Indians, as having been then present and denouncing the bill under consideration as an outrage, etc.

And yet, Senator BORAH, Mr. Wilson was the attorney referred to who litigated the case for these Indians, and either Mr. Wilson or his successor in office, Jacob H. Crist, failed to take any appeal to the State supreme court. Mr. Paisano, the Indian referred to, well knew it—he is a supposedly intelligent Indian capable of making a most eloquent plea, which appealed to Mrs. Cassidy, and Mr. Paisano knew that he had only recently consulted with Colonel Twitchell, and that Colonel Twitchell had brought this suit in the name of the United States on behalf of the Indians to rectify the error or mistake of Mr. Wilson, who was so highly complimented and was, as I am informed, the attorney for the volunteer "association" representing so many of the good women of this country.

These facts are disclosed by the documents, and if either the Senators, Members of the Congress, or the Congress of the United States will provide for an immediate investigation of all these matters the department will be very glad indeed to have the same called and held and to have Mrs. Cassidy, Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Atwood, and all other parties interested or claiming to be interested appear before the committee, whether a standing or special committee of Congress or of either House, and the department holds itself ready to present every particle of evidence which it has or may be able to obtain, including the report of special agents heretofore appointed at the request of the Volunteer Associations for the Protection of the Indians, and among which reports may be found interesting matter concerning certain of the particular individuals who are now, under the cloak of protection to the Indians, engaged in misleading statements, some of them in absolutely false statements, knowing same to be false, and some of them in defamatory statements concerning officials of the Indian Bureau and of this department.

It may also be added that under the act enabling New Mexico to become a State and the compact of the people of the State with the United States all of the pueblo areas owned and occupied by the Pueblo Indians is declared to be "Indian country," and the Indians and citizens of New Mexico are entitled to know what lands are so owned and occupied as to make them "Indian country." This is also one of the reasons for providing for decrees of segregation of non-Indian from Indian lands, as is seen in the bill under consideration, which gives the United States court exclusive jurisdiction in these as in all other matters covered by the bill.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. FALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

P. S.: I am attaching hereto—

(1) Report of Col. R. E. Twitchell containing the history of the pueblo grants in New Mexico, together with a discussion of the legal status of the Indians thereupon and of their titles, with recommendations as to the necessary steps to be taken to settle the disputed question.

(2) Various letters, or extracts therefrom, taken from the correspondence of James S. Calhoun, Indian agent, concerning conditions existing among the Pueblo Indians with reference to titles, etc., 1849–50, as follows:

(A) October 4, 1849, Calhoun to Medill.
(B) Extract.
(C) Extract.
(D) November 16, 1849, Calhoun to Brown.
(E) March 29, 1850, Calhoun to Brown.
(F) Tullis to Calhoun.

I am requesting that if feasible to do so the inclosure be printed, together with my letter to you, as a public document.

F.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
December 14, 1922.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your communication under date of December 13. I have not had time to go thoroughly through this statement, but I shall do so. And I thank you for sending it to me.

At the time I moved to have this bill recalled from the House I had not yet been brought under the influence of any propaganda. At that time I had received one letter from a lawyer in New Mexico

and a telegram from a woman in California. The telegram did not have any bearing upon my action, as it stated no facts. But the letter called my attention to the purport of the bill. I discovered at once that there was a misunderstanding as to the terms of the bill at the time it passed the Senate. If you will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time the bill passed, you will find that I asked certain questions in regard to the purpose and effect of the bill. Senator BURSUM replied to these questions, and I felt satisfied, upon an examination of the bill, that there was an entire misunderstanding by the Senate, including Mr. BURSUM, as to its effect. I therefore recalled the bill, not because I had felt the effect of propaganda but because I felt quite sure that the bill had not been sufficiently considered and that it passed the Senate under a misunderstanding as to its terms.

I shall be glad, indeed, to examine the entire statement as you have furnished it to me, and I will ask at the proper time that it be printed and probably made a public document.

Very sincerely,

WM. E. BORAH.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BORAH submitted an amendment requesting the President to call a conference of the nations of the world to consider economic problems and the limitation of armaments on land and sea, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4050) to provide for the purchase and sale of farm products.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I made a few remarks yesterday, before the recess hour, on the pending bill. At the conclusion of the session I had announced my remedy for the disposition of the ships which the Government has. If it were in my power, I would have a new stock taken of our condition in the United States. I feel that it is time to make a second Declaration of Independence. On account of the war world conditions have changed, and it is time that we should look out for our interests primarily, and then look out afterwards for the interests of the world.

This question of the operation or disposition of these ships is a serious proposition that we have on our hands. Personally, I am opposed to the Government going into any business. If it were a new proposition, I certainly should oppose the Government construction of ships; but we find now that we have something like 10,000,000 tons on hand, and we should pursue the best method to dispose of them.

I stated yesterday that the first thing I would do would be to ask the different committees of Congress to consider laws that fall within each one's province, and see if we could not improve our condition. I am not well posted on the seamen's act, but it seems that the shipping public thinks it is a great handicap to the prosperity of our shipping. I do not hope that labor conditions will ever go back to pre-war conditions; that is not to be desired at all, and I do not know that there are so many unreasonable restrictions in this act; but, if there are some, they should be modified.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIAL. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. If I understand the testimony of Mr. Furuseth, who is president of one of the seamen's organizations and is familiar with the so-called La Follette Act, the conditions of seamen not only in the United States but throughout the world, the question of wages, and so forth, it is that the wages paid to American seamen since the La Follette Act, during and since the war, have been in the main paralleled by the wages paid in such countries as Denmark and Great Britain, and that in those two countries wages now are substantially as high as the wages paid to American seamen. As I recall the testimony, conceding all of the claims made by the proponents of this bill and those who urge that the wage question cuts a very important figure in the discussion of this question, their position is scarcely tenable and not borne out by the facts, because even if the wage distinctions are as they contend it would make a difference of only about 2 per cent in operating expenses; and that includes, as I understand, the expenses involved in the maintenance of a very high-salaried clerical force and administrative force which we find in many of these corporations. So I think the question of wages is a mere camouflage urged by a good many of the men who are insisting upon this subsidy. American seamen are now paid very low wages—many of them $40 per month, some of them perhaps less than that, and the general efficiency of the American seaman, I think, is recognized.

Mr. DIAL. And it counterbalances any greater cost that there may be.

Mr. KING. Yes; if they should be paid higher wages than those of other countries, their services are that much more efficient. So I think that the Senator may dismiss as a reason for a subsidy the proposition that the wages paid to American seamen are so much greater than those paid to seamen in other countries as to call for the benevolent bounties of the Government of the United States.

Mr. DIAL. I thank the Senator from Utah. I will confess that before we had these hearings and before looking into the subject I thought that the wages were out of proportion, but after a thorough investigation I find the condition to be exactly as the Senator from Utah states.

I am not opposed to paying proper wages. In fact, I think that the payment of good wages encourages efficiency, competency, and faithfulness, and, as the Senator said, it counterbalances the disadvantage growing out of the payment of lower wages to less efficient people. However, what I am trying to say is that if there is anything wrong in our laws we should meet it manfully, and change it.

In this magazine, American Industries, from which I was reading yesterday afternoon, I see expressions of the views of various people connected with so-called big business, and they hit the Congress very hard for not changing these laws. Whether or not this is a just criticism I do not know. It may be propaganda, but it is evidently in the minds of the public.

On page 9, reading from an expression by Mr. Henry Abbott, he says:

> Responding to your conundrum, "Do we need a ship subsidy, and why?" It would undoubtedly be productive of public benefit to have a sufficient tonnage of American-owned ships upon the seas and to insure their permanence by making their operation profitable. If under our peculiar shipping laws and the higher cost of American labor to man and operate our ships they can not compete with foreign-owned vessels, then our Government must, in some form, grant pecuniary aid to the individuals or corporations owning such American ships.

He expresses here the view that there is something wrong in the law.

On page 10, he also says:

> If as a Nation we have any self-respect, if we wish the respect of other nations, we will at once repeal our absurd shipping laws and enact others that will encourage the building and operation of American ships. If they can not be profitably operated without a subsidy, then let us have a ship subsidy law.

Reading from Mr. William H. Douglas, who seems to be president of Arkell & Douglas, on the same page, he says:

> It is well known, by reason of our laws and other disadvantages under which we labor in competition with other countries who favor their shipping in many ways, that without proper Government aid we can not maintain our flag on the ocean.

Reading from Mr. Knobloch, on the same page, he says:

> American shipping, whether owned privately or otherwise, must also be freed from some of the drastic handicaps that are driving it from the seas.

Reading from Mr. George W. Todd, president of the Todd Protectograph Co., on page 11, he says:

> Congress has loaded our ships down with many unnecessary laws and restrictions that put us at a great disadvantage. In fact, I firmly believe if we were on an equal footing with other countries that subsidies for other than fast passenger and mail ships would be unnecessary.

On page 12, reading from Mr. Augustine Davis, who is president of the Davis Automatic Equipment Corporation, he says:

> Our shipbuilding has already fallen below that of other principal nations; and the burdensome regulations established by our Government in the employment of seamen on ships carrying our flag make their services more costly than that of any other nation, thus creating a handicap that tends to make investment in American ships less and less inviting.

Reading from Mr. Hodson, on the same page, he says:

> It is an accepted fact that the cost of construction and the cost of operating American-built vessels under the American flag are greater than similar costs of vessels of foreign registry. It is also generally agreed that an adequate merchant marine is a key industry upon which the prosperity of our entire industrial structure largely depends. On that basis it would appear that the shipping industry is entitled to the same protection against lower cost foreign competition that is granted to other industries by the protective tariff. To my mind the ship subsidy is nothing more or less than a tariff which will equalize the operating costs of foreign vessels operating under foreign flags and American vessels operating under the American flag.

Reading from Mr. Richard H. Edmonds, editor of the Manufacturers' Record, on page 13, he says:

> A subsidy to American ships is not a bonus or profit paid into the treasuries of their owners but is the price that we must pay for the maintenance of laws which make the cost of running an American ship very much heavier than the cost of operating ships under other flags.

On page 14 I ask permission to insert in the RECORD the views of Mr. Henry F. Grady, director of the foreign and

domestic trade department of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. It is a very interesting statement, but I will not take the time of the Senate to read it. I might say that Mr. Grady's statement is along the same line.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The matter of subsidizing shipping is one that is intimately related to our foreign trade and any ship-subsidy program should be worked out as part of a general foreign-trade policy. The purpose of a subsidy is to give a bounty to foreign commerce, and that bounty is justifiable only in so far as it results in the development of foreign commerce. No bounty is a satisfactory substitute for cargoes. The theory of the bounty is to increase cargoes. Therefore, the stress should be placed on the development of foreign commerce, and the bounties given through the medium of subsidized transportation should be merely an aid to the outflow and inflow of commodities where conditions warrant.

One gets the impression from a great deal of the discussion on the ship subsidy that it is regarded as an end in itself. It is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and that end is the development of trade. A country serious about its foreign trade will therefore do everything in its power to foster foreign trade and will furnish a bounty through the medium of subsidized transportation only where there are obstacles to the flow of commerce that can not be overcome in any other way. Moreover, these obstacles must in the nature of things be temporary, and the bounty or subsidy an aid in the overcoming of these temporary difficulties.

Bounties to any form of economic activity are only justified as temporary aids and as a means of bringing that activity to its full vigor. If there are inherent weaknesses in an industry, the sound procedure is to correct these weaknesses rather than subsidize them by permanent governmental aid. In the case of our shipping we should, on the one hand, take legislative action to remove any impediments in the way of reduced cost of operation, and, on the other, the industry itself should seriously take up the matter of improving its technique, and in that way work toward a position where competition without subsidies is possible.

A policy of restricting commerce through prohibitive tariffs, on the one hand, and of subsidizing shipping, on the other, has always been and will always be irreconcilable. If we seriously want foreign trade let us formulate a national policy along the lines to secure foreign trade, and then put our shipping on a sound basis through such legislation as is necessary and such temporary subsidies as will aid the industry during its period of infancy. Subsidies are thoroughly justified from this standpoint, and I believe we should have them, but I also believe most emphatically that it is futile to discuss a merchant-marine program that is not made part and parcel of a foreign-trade program. We must build up our shipping as an adjunct to our trade, but it would be absurd to attempt to build up our shipping at the time we are killing trade. The way to make shipping profitable is to stimulate the flow of cargoes. If the cargoes are adequate the problem of subsidies will be greatly reduced, and the effect of such subsidies as are justified will be greatly augmented.

Mr. DIAL. On page 15, Mr. J. R. Monroe, who is president of the Monroe Calculating Machine Co., says:

The reasons are many. Two of the most important are, I believe, first, assistance in the form of a subsidy or otherwise is given by other countries; and, second, legal requirements of our country add greatly to the expense of running our ships. It may be that these legal requirements are more burdensome than is necessary to protect the interests of the seafaring man and the traveling public, but I do not believe it would be possible to get native sailors for our ships without giving them greater protection and advantages than are enjoyed by most foreign seamen.

On page 16, reading from the views of Mr. W. A. Layman, president of the Wagner Electric Corporation, he says:

I am in favor of a ship subsidy, but there is one difficulty with the situation which I think is going to be insurmountable, namely, the La Follette seamen's bill.

It may interest you to know that in conversation with a very level-headed retired farmer a few days ago, he expressed the view that it was a waste of energy to talk about a ship subsidy measure until the seamen's bill had been repealed, or so amended as to put our shipping on a reasonably competitive labor basis with that of other nations. This old gentleman said that he would vigorously oppose a ship subsidy, the net effect of which was simply to pass a gratuity into the hands of American seamen. It was his opinion that if the law would give American shipping an opportunity, it could compete with the world without a subsidy.

I now read from Mr. Philip S. Tuley, on page 19:

UNFAVORABLE LAWS A SERIOUS HANDICAP.

(Written especially for American Industries, by Philip S. Tuley, president-treasurer, Louisville Cotton Mills Co.)

I have long felt that we should establish a ship subsidy in order to develop the American merchant marine. I think that our failure to adopt such a national policy prior to the war was responsible for our having to accept the humiliating position of being powerless to transport our Army when the emergency arose and having to accept the shipping of other nations to accomplish this essential matter. Of course, unfavorable legislation affecting shipbuilding is likewise responsible in large measure for this and until such legislation is repealed we question whether a ship subsidy can be adopted successfully without perpetuating the unwholesome and unfavorable conditions of operation and construction now existing as a result of the legislation mentioned.

As a nation, it is my belief that the American people are not fully alive to the necessity for making provision for the transportation of their raw materials and finished product to foreign countries. We are not yet fully awakened to the necessity for developing our export trade without which it is certain to result that our own markets will be prejudicially affected. Assuredly we can not expect in this country efficient service in shipping provided for us by nations with which we are in competition. Their interest would be, of course, to give preference to the trade of their own respective nationalities. In every way it would seem to me a foregone conclusion that American trade in foreign fields would be seriously hampered to the extent of the necessary reliance upon foreign bottoms for transportation of products of field and forest, of mine and factory in America.

In an article written by Mr. Landon C. Bell, appearing on page 20, he said:

NEED FOR A WISE SHIP SUBSIDY POLICY.

(Written especially for American Industries by Landon C. Bell, W. M. Ritter Lumber Co.)

One of the greatest needs of this great Nation is an adequate merchant marine.

The comparison of tonnage carried in American bottoms now with that carried in American bottoms four decades ago, considering the population, wealth, and commerce of the country at the two periods, can not but produce the most painful reflections. The history is one of retrograde instead of progress.

A comparison of the volume of our foreign commerce, whether imports or exports, now currently carried by American ships with that carried by foreign ships shows a state of affairs not likely to excite our enthusiasm or give us pride in pointing to the facts.

The situation viewed from any angle and in any point of comparison is one of which the country may be well ashamed, and over which our citizenship can hardly feel otherwise than deeply chagrined.

The important phases of the subject can not be covered in a few brief paragraphs, but one fact is outstanding. Our ships will always be in competition with those of all the world in respect to our sea-borne trade.

Our standards of living and our wages are the highest in the world. American shipowners can not pay wages high enough to maintain our standards and earn a reasonable profit, if indeed any margin at all, under present laws and regulations, in competition with ships of other countries where standards are not so high, where wages are low, and legal restrictions more favorable.

No great country with far-flung sea coasts such as ours can prosper in peace or be secure and well cared for in war without an adequate merchant marine.

Under world conditions as they have existed for some time, and will likely continue indefinitely, America can not have such a merchant marine as she imperatively needs without a wisely conceived ship subsidy policy.

Mr. President, I do not know what legal restrictions he has reference to, but if there are any unnecessary legal restrictions, they should be repealed. I ask now to have inserted in the RECORD a short article on this subject written by Mr. Frederick L. Chapman, editor and owner of Better Farmer, to be found on page 22 of this magazine. The views of Mr. Chapman are very interesting.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO NOT SELL OUT ON A BEAR MARKET.

(Written especially for American Industries by Frederick L. Chapman, editor and owner Better Farming.)

I favor a ship subsidy, but not the ship subsidy which is now proposed. A subsidy is an assistance given by government to private interests engaged upon an adventurous enterprise, the continuance of which will convey a benefit to the public. Great Britain, France, and even poor Italy have subsidized steamship lines connecting the home land with distant ports carrying mails and unprofitable traffic, while developing trade in far-away parts which in the immediate or distant future will be to the general profit. We may properly do the same.

The proposal, however, to dispose of our national merchant marine for a nominal price of $200,000,000 less $125,000,000 for its rehabilitation, less $75,000,000 paid yearly by the Government for 10 years, less exemption from certain taxes during that period, can not be properly named a subsidy. It is a gift outright of more than half a billion dollars in net cash, plus whatever property value the ships now have.

I am opposed to this plan at the present time for the further reason that the low state of our foreign trade, resulting in the lack of demand for shipping, has destroyed the present market value of this marine property. Our shrinkage in export of raw materials and food products during the first half of this year compared with the first half of 1921 is about $934,000,000. For the same period the shrinkage in manufactured exports has been more than $2,500,000,000. Stating the above shrinkage in tonnage it has been 5,000,000 tons.

That is why I think this is an inopportune time to sell. I would rather wait until the country came to its better economic sense and realized that—

1. We can not be a trading or shipping Nation unless we are willing to trade under fair terms with foreigners. The present tariff forbids that.

2. We can not trade with foreigners until they become once more our friends. Our proud pose of isolation and indifference to human problems across the seas is not conducive to international friendship. We are beginning to appear even to ourselves in that attitude asinine and silly.

3. We can not operate our ships by public or private control with profit under the restrictions of the present seamen's act. It should be rescinded.

Meanwhile we would better lease these ships to private operators under liberal terms, or if that is impracticable operate them even at the present loss of $50,000,000 yearly until we have laws and conditions more favorable to their sale.

I believe it will not require 10 years to get them. Then, if we wish to sell, sell! It will be on a bull market.

Mr. DIAL. The result of these various replies to inquiries from this magazine is that there must be something wrong in the law, some unnecessary restrictions thrown around our shipping interests. I do not know what the details are, but if there are any such restrictions we should change them, modify them, and amend them. It is not to the benefit of anyone to have unnecessary restrictions laid around our shipping. In fact, the people of this country should be encouraged to buy our ships and to give our people employment. We should go at

it in the same way in which we developed this country, with the same energy, and for the purpose of making money, giving better facilities to the citizens of the United States.

We all admit that a merchant marine would be a great help to every interest, farming, mining, and all our varied interests. In fact, Mr. President, I have thought that if Mr. Lasker had used some of his great energy in trying to educate the people of the United States to buy these ships and to use them in the proper way instead of trying to work up a sentiment for a subsidy, possibly by this time we would have had the attention of the American people riveted on shipping. I believe there is no more tonnage in the world to-day than there was before the war. It is true we built a great deal in this country during the war, but a great deal was destroyed. I am sorry I have not the figures before me of the tonnage of the different nations of the world; I had them, but they have been mislaid. Of course, German tonnage has been almost totally obliterated.

We should go to work with the vim and the energy necessary to interest the people of this country in our shipping. Unfortunately, those of us who live back from the seacoast do not feel that we are much interested; we do not see our interest directly, but every man in the whole country is interested in shipping. If we would go to the different States and try to get them to take pride in patronizing our ships it would help matters. Perhaps every State in the Union has some product which its people want to export. I had thought of trying to get the people of the different States interested in forming companies to buy these ships with a view to having the people of those States patronize those particular ships. Then, if we could get the railroads interested and get them to fix proper rates to the different ports of this country, we could encourage and awaken a lively interest in shipping.

Take, for instance, the South with her great cotton industry. We ship many bales to New York and to Boston to be shipped across the ocean, whereas the ships ought to come direct from the different countries of the world to our southern ports and take the commodities on there. Our people would be interested in buying ships if they had proper assurance that their interests would not be militated against through the Interstate Commerce Commission diverting shipments by rail to other sections of the country.

The distance from Chicago to Charleston is the same as the distance from Chicago to New York, or practically the same, and it is down grade. We could bring the great merchandise of the Middle West to those southern ports. There is some talk of the roads not getting return freight, but that could soon be worked up, and if we would let the people of the West know that they could ship their grain in that direction it would encourage them to ship it that way.

I believe if proper efforts were made the great beef interests, the coal interests, the oil interests, and the other interests of this country would become interested in our shipping and would patronize our ships.

I think it should be said to the everlasting shame of the United States that our railroads have had contracts with ships of foreign nations to transport their goods across the ocean. I feel that people who live in this country, and who enjoy protection under our laws, and who have their enterprises chartered here, should do everything they can for the common good, and I believe if it were brought to the attention of the railroads in the proper way they would gladly annul whatever contracts they have now of that kind, if they could get proper accommodations in our ships. If Mr. Lasker had put some of his energy into that line of propaganda, instead of having ships tied up, we would now have them ready to meet the increased business of this country, and they would be furnished with cargoes.

There is no use of this country being timid about treaties with other nations. We have become the creditor of the world, and if those treaties are against our interests, and if they have grown obsolete, then our proper officials should take the necessary steps to have them annulled or modified. The time has come when there is no use splitting hairs or being timid about it. It is necessary to our self-preservation that we look after our interests and the interests of our people. I know we have been encouraged to look over the world and try to donate to one country and to another, and try to improve conditions all around, but we are getting so that we can scarcely help ourselves in some sections, and we should wake up to that.

It might be a good thing to sell some of these ships to the people of some weak nations, and I would be glad to see that done, as we have more ships now than we could use profitably. I would be glad to encourage some Chinese interests to buy some of these ships, or some interests in Poland, or even in Russia. In Russia are to be found the finest cotton mills in the world, and they have come back into the market recently for our products, and while I would not advocate recognizing the Russian Government, yet I see no reason why trade relations should not be restored and encouraged, following the example of England and France. It might be a very profitable act to sell ships to the people of those nations, as well as to Czechoslovakia, which is a large customer of ours in cotton. They need grain, it would encourage business, and we would engender the right spirit.

I would like to see a great effort made in this country to encourage our young people, soldiers, men of energy and men of vision, and the working people to buy these ships. If they would just come to feel that they could purchase them at a small price, on long time, they perhaps would organize companies and develop them with a new energy and a new vision. They would make it profitable.

It is unwise to provide in the bill that all but 10 per cent should be taken away from the operator and covered into the Treasury. I can see no sense in any such provision. If a man is going in and take the risk, he does not care to have a top put on his profits. The ocean is free; people have a right to traverse it at their pleasure; and they should be encouraged to make all the profits they could consistent with reasonable freight rates. I would be delighted if the American Legion would suggest the matter to our soldiers, and if they would go in and buy some of these ships and run them in a proper way.

The propaganda which has been spread over this country has not been propaganda of the right kind; it has not been for the purpose of encouraging people to invest their funds in these ships or to aid in disposing of the ships, but it has been for the purpose of making our people look to Washington with the expectation of getting some favor. I must deplore the idea of always encouraging people to depend upon their Government for support. That is not governmental, and we can not make our people an independent population by taking from one class and giving to another. We have done it so much that everybody wants some special favor and there are not enough special favors to go around. Our Republican brethren have taught the people, through their tariff legislation and their other special legislation, that it is right to come to the Government, and that they need not work, that the Government is going to support them. We have tried that experiment about long enough. We have borrowed from one, and we have pillaged another, until we have to go to creating and to making a surplus.

Some time ago I read with a great deal of interest a circular by some one, whose name I do not now remember, entitled "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's."

Mr. CARAWAY. That is in the Bible.

Mr. DIAL. The quotation is from the Bible, but the pamphlet is not. If we would read that we would see where there is no wealth to the world except surplus. It was a very interesting discussion of the origin of profit.

As I said yesterday, it is surprising to me that more money was not lost on these ships under Lasker's management, operating about 400 out of about 1,400, with the others tied up. His testimony was that he let the Government ships take only the surplus cargoes. Wherever there were private operators he would hold our ships back and let the private operators have advantageous cargoes, and he would run our ships only as a kind of overflow. It is a wonder to me we did not sink more money than we did.

I am satisfied that with a proper effort on Lasker's part, instead of losing this considerable sum of money we could have had an even balance sheet. Personally, I would not have cared particularly whether we made much money or not until we sold the ships, but there is no use in our losing money.

I am satisfied that wherever ships are tied up in cold ports, where there is ice clear through the winter months, if we would transfer them to warmer waters it would be less expensive to keep them up, would cost less for coal and for labor, and it would advertise the benefits of this Government in different sections of the United States. I am satisfied they could have been maintained with much less expense, and that they would have been maintained in reasonable order. I confidently believe as our commerce increases within the next year or perhaps the next few months that a demand will again spring up for the ships, and we can get rid of them at a reasonable price at least.

Mr. President, it is a serious situation. I feel that it is a situation that has been brought about designedly by the head of the Shipping Board. It is more serious than our people realize. But in addition to trying to sacrifice these ships it seems to be the desire now to put on this great subsidy. In other words, they would then, under the provisions of the bill, be simply hothouse plants, and there would be no attempt to go after business in a businesslike way.

Mr. President, I understand it is the desire to have an executive session, and it is now 2 o'clock. I had intended to speak on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], but I shall refrain from doing so at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 3 hours and 40 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

CONFIRMATION OF PIERCE BUTLER.

In executive session this day, following the confirmation of Pierce Butler to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, on motion by Mr. NORRIS and by unanimous consent, the rules were suspended, and it was

Ordered, That the vote by which the Senate declined to refer the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary and the vote by which Mr. Butler was confirmed be made public.

The vote, on the motion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE to recommit the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary, resulted—yeas 7, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—7.

Harris	La Follette	Norris	Trammell
Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard	

NAYS—63.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Reed, Pa.
Ball	George	McLean	Robinson
Bayard	Glass	McNary	Shortridge
Brandegee	Gooding	Moses	Smoot
Broussard	Hale	Myers	Stanley
Bursum	Harrison	Nelson	Sterling
Cameron	Hitchcock	New	Sutherland
Caraway	Johnson	Nicholson	Townsend
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Norbeck	Wadsworth
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Oddie	Walsh, Mass.
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Kendrick	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Keyes	Pepper	Watson
Ernst	King	Phipps	Weller
Fernald	Lenroot	Poindexter	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Reed, Mo.	

NOT VOTING—26.

Borah	Elkins	Owen	Spencer
Brookhart	France	Pittman	Stanfield
Calder	Gerry	Pomerene	Swanson
Capper	Harreld	Ransdell	Underwood
Couzens	Ladd	Shields	Willis
Culberson	McCormick	Simmons	
Edge	McKinley	Smith	

Mr. BROOKHART announced his pair with Mr. CALDER, and stated that if he were not paired he would vote "yea."

So the Senate refused to recommit the nomination to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The vote on confirmation resulted—yeas 61, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—61.

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	McLean	Shortridge
Ball	Glass	Moses	Smoot
Bayard	Gooding	Myers	Spencer
Brandegee	Hale	Nelson	Stanley
Broussard	Harrison	New	Sterling
Bursum	Hitchcock	Nicholson	Sutherland
Cameron	Johnson	Oddie	Townsend
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Wadsworth
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Kellogg	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Warren
Dial	Keyes	Poindexter	Watson
Dillingham	King	Pomerene	Williams
Ernst	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.	
Fernald	Lodge	Reed, Pa.	
Fletcher	McCumber	Robinson	

NAYS—8.

George	Heflin	Norbeck	Sheppard
Harris	La Follette	Norris	Trammell

NOT VOTING—27.

Borah	Elkins	McKinley	Smith
Brookhart	France	McNary	Stanfield
Calder	Gerry	Owen	Swanson
Capper	Harreld	Pittman	Underwood
Couzens	Ladd	Ransdell	Weller
Culberson	McCormick	Shields	Willis
Edge	McKellar	Simmons	

Mr. BROOKHART announced his pair with Mr. CALDER, and stated that if at liberty to vote he would vote "nay."

So the nomination of Pierce Butler as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States was confirmed.

ADJOURNMENT OVER CHRISTMAS.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was—

Ordered, That when the Senate adjourns on Saturday, the 23d instant, it stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CIVIL WAR PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. BURSUM submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the House amendment after the enacting clause, and substitute the following in lieu thereof:

"That any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or whose name is now on the pension roll, including those thereon under any act of Congress, public or private, and every person who served 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $72 a month, payment to be made in accordance with the pension roll, without further application by the person entitled thereto.

"SEC. 2. That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who has heretofore been or may hereafter be granted a pension under any law, public or private, for service in the Civil War, such widow having been married to such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1915, or who if legally married after said date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with the soldier, sailor, or marine for at least two years and continuing until his death, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $30 a month, and an additional pension of $6 a month for each child of the officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability: *Provided further*, That the additional pension herein granted to the widow on account of the child or children of the husband by a former wife shall be paid to her only for such period of her widowhood as she has been, or shall be, charged with the maintenance of such child or children; for any period during which she has not been, or she shall not be, so charged, it shall be granted and paid to the guardian of such child or children: *Provided further*, That a widow or guardian to whom increase of pension has been, or shall hereafter be, granted on account of minor children, shall not be deprived thereof by reason of their being maintained in whole or in part at the expense of a State or the public in any educational institution, or in any institution organized for the care of soldiers' orphans: *Provided further*, That the rate of pension for the widow of any person who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the War of 1812, or for 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be $50 a month: *Provided further*, That all provisions of this section shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted under any law, public or private.

"SEC. 3. That the rate of pension for the former widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or who, having so served for less than 90 days, was discharged for a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, such widow having married the officer or enlisted man prior to June 27, 1915, or if legally mar-

ried after such date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with such soldier, sailor, or marine for a period of at least two years and continuing until his death, and having remarried, either once or more than once after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce for any cause other than adultery on the part of the wife, shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month: *Provided*, That where a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, a widow or former widow shall not be entitled to pension under this act until the pension to such child or children terminates unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and upon the granting of pension to such widow or former widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other law.

"SEC. 4. That the benefits of this act shall be extended to and shall comprehend and include each and severally the classes of persons enumerated in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of section 4693, Revised Statutes of the United States, who served during the Civil War, and also any person who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, or the acts of January 29, 1887, March 3, 1891, and February 17, 1897, on account of service during the Civil War and the war with Mexico, and the widows and minor children of such persons: *Provided*, That service under this section shall be proven in the manner and form specified in section 2, act of March 4, 1917, and the act of September 1, 1922: *Provided further*, That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension to the soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the acts of July 27, 1892, June 27, 1902, May 30, 1908, or under the act of March 4, 1917, shall be $30 per month, and that the rate of pension to the widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed thereon under said acts shall be $20 per month.

"SEC. 5. That all Army nurses of the Civil War who have been, or who may hereafter be, allowed a pension under existing laws shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month.

"SEC. 6. That all persons now on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $80 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the forearm or any part of the bones of the leg below the tuberosity of the tibia, the rate of pension shall be $75 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or at any point above the elbow or a leg at or at any point above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $85 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur, or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is an ankylosis of either the elbow or knee or shoulder or hip joint, the rate of pension shall be $80 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or shall have lost one hand or one foot and in addition thereto shall have lost a portion of the other hand or foot, or shall have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $100 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $90 a month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms or both legs or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $125 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $100 a month; and it is hereby directed that the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be reviewed, upon request of the pensioner, all cases wherein there is an excision or resection of any part of the bones of an arm or leg, shoulder or hip, or any of the joints, or an ankylosis of any of said joints, and shall place the name of the pensioner on the roll at the rates herein provided.

"SEC. 7. That in the adjudication of claims for widows' pensions marriage of the parties and the legality thereof may be established by any competent testimony, and in the absence of direct proof of a ceremonial marriage, satisfactory evidence that the parties lived together as husband and wife and were so recognized by their neighbors and acquaintances until the death of the husband may be held to constitute sufficient proof of marriage; and cohabitation continuously for seven years or more may be accepted in lieu of proof that no impediment existed to the marriage of the parties. A widow otherwise entitled to pension under this act may not be barred from being granted such pension for the reason that she failed to live and cohabit with the 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person continuously from the date of the marriage to the date of his death,' unless it be shown that she willfully deserted such 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person' without good cause; and all provisions of law requiring such continuous cohabitation in any case are hereby repealed, except as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 8. That the pension or increase of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rates herein provided on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law, but who may be entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check; and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

"SEC. 9. That nothing in this act contained shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as 'The Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll,' as provided in the act of April 27, 1916, but any increase herein provided for shall be in addition thereto; and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

"SEC. 10. That no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of $10 shall be allowed for such services in other claims thereunder, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall directly or indirectly otherwise contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed or due to such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every such offense, be fined not exceeding $500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 11. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read:

"An act granting pensions and increase of pension to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines."

And that the House agree to the same.

H. O. BURSUM,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
T. J. WALSH,
Managers on part of the Senate.

CHAS. E. FULLER,
JOHN W. LANGLEY,
WM. W. RUCKER,
Managers on part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, December 22, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Nominations received by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Allison B. Alford to be postmaster at Ashford, Ala., in place of M. H. Rigell, resigned.

John R. Harris to be postmaster at Wadley, Ala., in place of W. H. Welch. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

ARIZONA.

John W. Brown to be postmaster at St. Johns, Ariz., in place of J. W. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1922.

ARKANSAS.

Edna M. Reed to be postmaster at Bigelow, Ark., in place of W. E. Jones, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

William J. Ohlheiser to be postmaster at Crescent City, Calif., in place of J. L. Childs, declined.

George B. Tantau to be postmaster at Exeter, Calif., in place of T. E. Awbrey. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Frank L. Powell to be postmaster at Lemoore, Calif., in place of F. L. Powell. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

COLORADO.

Flossy H. Ritter to be postmaster at Austin, Colo. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Ethel M. DeBerry to be postmaster at Kennesburg, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

James R. Lysaght to be postmaster at San Acacio, Colo. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Robert L. Newton to be postmaster at Arvada, Colo., in place of R. L. Newton. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Kelly W. Liles, jr., to be postmaster at White Oak, Ga. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

ILLINOIS.

Pearl W. Norman to be postmaster at Galatia, Ill., in place of E. O. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1921.

Lyman S. Graves to be postmaster at Wyoming, Ill., in place of P. B. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Edna M. McDermott to be postmaster at New Point, Ind. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

Wade Denney to be postmaster at Farmersburg, Ind., in place of J. H. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Reuben Hess to be postmaster at Kentland, Ind., in place of Reuben Hess. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

John S. Lightcap to be postmaster at North Judson, Ind., in place of F. J. Vessely. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

Dennis L. McDonnell to be postmaster at Bernard, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1921.

John F. Schoof to be postmaster at Denver, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

Bertha Zadow to be postmaster at Blencoe, Iowa. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Ben W. Stearns to be postmaster at Logan, Iowa, in place of T. A. Massie. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

KANSAS.

Dell D. Jackson to be postmaster at Winona, Kans. Office became presidential April 1, 1921.

Horace A. Fink to be postmaster at Russell, Kans., in place of A. L. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

KENTUCKY.

Lewis A. McCoy to be postmaster at Owingsville, Ky., in place of S. A. D. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

MAINE.

Jessie E. Nottage to be postmaster at Solon, Me., in place of M. P. Pollard. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1921.

Harry M. Robinson to be postmaster at Warren, Me., in place of F. E. Mathews. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

MICHIGAN.

Dana Stowell to be postmaster at Comstock Park, Mich. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

Marie L. Mottes to be postmaster at Alpha, Mich., in place of C. J. Kazilek, resigned.

Elmer E. Fales to be postmaster at Belding, Mich., in place of W. F. Bricker. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Oscar W. Fowler to be postmaster at Greenville, Mich., in place of P. D. Edsall. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Neil W. Roe to be postmaster at Lake Odessa, Mich., in place of Edward Shellhorn. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Oscar W. Greenlund to be postmaster at Stambaugh, Mich., in place of P. W. Segelstrom. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Frank R. Church to be postmaster at Stanton, Mich., in place of C. E. Utley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Arthur C. Omholt to be postmaster at Sacred Heart, Minn., in place of G. O. Bergen. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

MISSOURI.

William T. Thompson to be postmaster at Eugene, Mo. Office became presidential April 1, 1922.

Walter G. Gieck to be postmaster at Belle, Mo., in place of Andrew Poe, removed.

Robert F. Stalling to be postmaster at Lexington, Mo., in place of B. C. Drummond. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

NEBRASKA.

Chester C. Alden to be postmaster at Whitman, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1922.

James J. McCarthy to be postmaster at Greeley, Nebr., in place of J. J. McCarthy. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Victor J. Banfield to be postmaster at Van Etten, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1921.

Michael Gleason to be postmaster at Carthage, N. Y., in place of W. H. Barry. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Mary R. Newlands to be postmaster at West Point, N. Y., in place of M. R. Newlands. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

NORTH CAROLINA.

James E. Connell to be postmaster at China Grove, N. C., in place of G. G. Blackwelder. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Russell A. Strickland to be postmaster at Elm City, N. C., in place of R. A. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired July 21, 1921.

OHIO.

Jesse L. Bales to be postmaster at Jackson, Ohio, in place of Thomas Kyer. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

Mayme Pemberton to be postmaster at Roseville, Ohio, in place of F. W. Pace. Incumbent's commission expired March 8, 1922.

Duane G. Keener to be postmaster at West Salem, Ohio, in place of O. E. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Ottis E. Thompson to be postmaster at Wright City, Okla., in place of J. M. Dollarhide, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA.

William T. Cruse to be postmaster at Derry, Pa., in place of C. H. Cullen. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1922.

John S. Steinmetz to be postmaster at Richland, Pa., in place of H. G. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Jacob L. Bergstreser to be postmaster at Willow Lake, S. Dak., in place of G. W. Turley. Incumbent's commission expired September 11, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

Michel K. Freeman to be postmaster at Westmoreland, Tenn., in place of C. H. O'Meara, removed.

TEXAS.

Paul B. Mueller to be postmaster at Beeville, Tex., in place of E. M. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Murt J. Sullivan to be postmaster at Comanche, Tex., in place of W. H. Carpenter, resigned.

William F. Moore to be postmaster at Kemp, Tex., in place of E. B. McDougald. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Edward N. Mulkey to be postmaster at Sherman, Tex., in place of W. H. Lankford. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1919.

Ernest G. Laughammer to be postmaster at Somerville, Tex., in place of E. G. Laughammer. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1922.

Miles B. Earnheart to be postmaster at Trenton, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilson, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Hiram G. McGuffey to be postmaster at Three Rivers, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1922.

WASHINGTON.

John T. Johnston to be postmaster at Wapato, Wash., in place of H. R. Whitney. Incumbent's commission expired October 14, 1922.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Joseph P. Dawson to be postmaster at Widen, W. Va., in place of R. T. Price, resigned.

Edward J. Jenkins to be postmaster at Manbar, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1922.

WISCONSIN.

John S. Farrell to be postmaster at Green Bay, Wis., in place of W. L. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of December 16), 1922.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Pierce Butler to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

MEMBERS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Charles C. McChord.
Joseph B. Eastman.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Nelson T. Hartson to be Solicitor of Internal Revenue.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Mary D. Bass, Butler.

CALIFORNIA.

John W. Drane, Alturas.
Edward F. Hopkins, Arroyo Grande.
Fred W. Busey, Balboa.
Edna J. McGowan, Belmont.
James A. Lewis, Carpinteria.
Hazel M. McFarland, Folsom City.
Frederick Welk, Glendora.
George M. Heath, Ione.
Phyllis V. Henry, King City.
Bert C. McMurray, Lancaster.
Paul Huneke, Lemoncove.
Kathleen M. Fleming, Lincoln.
Ida P. Durkee, Newport Beach.
George W. Fraser, Pinole.
Bernice C. Downing, Santa Clara.

ILLINOIS.

Hanson A. Garner, Chandlerville.
John F. Flickinger, Lanark.
Ora C. Hays, Villa Grove.

MASSACHUSETTS.

James N. Young, Adams.

MINNESOTA.

John R. Forsythe, Cohasset.
Gunstein D. Aakhus, Erskine.
Edith B. Triplett, Floodwood.
Odin D. Krogen, Fountain.
Ferdinand J. Reimers, Stewart.
Alfred Anderson, Twin Valley.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Amos J. Dinsmoor, Laconia.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John G. King, Burlington.
Vernon W. Faris, Henderson.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Charles C. Bohrer, Cathay.
Meeda McMullen, Forest River.
Paul Keller, Hebron.
Joseph W. Mahon, Langdon.
Paul K. Hanson, Upham.

OHIO.

Harry R. Kemerer, Carrollton.

VIRGINIA.

Ollie M. Colbert, Gretna.

WASHINGTON.

Edward Van Dyke, Lake Stevens.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Nora V. Roberts, Glenville.

WYOMING.

Hubert S. Ladd, Hudson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 21, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Because Thou dost know, blessed Lord, the power and pressure of temptation and art perfect in holiness, Thou wilt have mercy upon us. Pity us in our failures and pity us in our tendencies and hearken when we call. From Thee no secret thing is hidden; all hearts are open before Thee. Come, then, and withhold not and ever be unto us a sun and a shield. Give to all parts of our country that guiding wisdom by which every difficulty shall be settled justly. O let the blessings of Christian civilization be thoroughly diffused through the instrumentalities of our Republic. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FORT CARROLL, MD.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House yesterday introduced a bill to sell certain real property no longer needed, including Fort Carroll, in Baltimore Harbor.

In reference to Fort Carroll, this morning I made the following inquiry of the Secretary of War:

DECEMBER 21, 1922.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF WAR,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I note that the chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee yesterday introduced a bill (H. R. 13524) to sell certain real property no longer needed for military purposes, including Fort Carroll, in Baltimore Harbor.

On October 24, 1921, I introduced a bill (H. R. 8819) providing for the donation of Fort Carroll to the city of Baltimore, to be kept and maintained in perpetuity as a national monument and memorial. On May 31, 1922, the War Department disapproved the proposed donation and expressed its desire to sell.

I am writing to ask at what price Baltimore City could purchase Fort Carroll should legislative authority be granted.

This fort was named after Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, first United States Senator from Maryland and last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence, and was constructed by General Robert E. Lee when a Colonel of Engineers.

Respectfully, JOHN PHILIP HILL, *M. C.*

The disposition I suggested in 1921 was contained in the following bill. It referred also to Fort McHenry.

A bill (H. R. 8819) to preserve in perpetuity Forts McHenry and Carroll, located in Baltimore, Md.

Be it enacted, etc., That Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Md., and Fort Carroll, Baltimore, Md., if and when not required for military purposes, be deeded at once to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, to be kept and maintained in perpetuity as national monuments and memorials.

In reference to the bill the Secretary of War, on May 31, 1922, reported as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, May 31, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In further reply to your request of March 13, 1922, for a report on H. R. 8819, a bill "to preserve in perpetuity Forts McHenry and Carroll, located at Baltimore, Md.," you are advised as follows:

The Fort Carroll Military Reservation is an island of about 4 acres, artificially constructed about 1847, and located four and one-third miles from Baltimore. It is without armament or garrison and its improvements consist of an old fort, wharf, and small stone barracks.

Under license from the War Department the Department of Commerce is occupying the reservation for lighthouse purposes. In view of this fact, and since it is not understood that this fort has historic value, the War Department can not recommend the proposed donation thereof to the city of Baltimore. It is believed preferable to authorize a sale of so much thereof as Government departments or agencies do not need, in which event the city of Baltimore would be given preference as a purchaser should it desire to buy.

Should Congress favor the passage of this bill, attention is invited to the absence therefrom of any specific provision as to whether the Government or the city of Baltimore will defray the costs of maintaining these "national" monuments and memorials.

Fort McHenry has historic value on account of its connection with the "Star-Spangled Banner." It contains an area of about 46.75 acres and the site was acquired in 1795 and subsequent years. It has no armament or garrison and has been reported to Congress for disposition as property for which the War Department had no further military use. Under the present law (act of May 26, 1914; 38 Stat. 382) the city of Baltimore may have the use and benefit of Fort McHenry for park purposes, title remaining in the United States but maintenance costs falling upon the city. As such city will thereby obtain the advantage of this 46-acre addition to its park system without expense save such maintenance cost, it is believed that the advantages to the city will far outweigh any disadvantages and the historical value of the fort be preserved, since occupancy by the city will be under rules and regulations of the Secretary of War. Such city, in fact, had possession of this fort for park purposes until same was taken over by the Government during the World War. Numerous buildings were erected thereon by the War Department and Public Health Service at a cost of several million dollars. In view of the present state of the law the War Department can not recommend the passage of H. R. 8819. If Fort McHenry is to be made a national monument or memorial the retention of title in the Federal Government is recommended.

Attention is invited to the inclosed copy of a recent report to the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, upon S. 3349, which is a duplicate of H. R. 11083. By the provisions of these bills, if passed, the United States will restore Fort McHenry to its original condition, maintain same, and the citizens of Baltimore and Maryland will be permitted to use this property as part of the Baltimore park system. As will appear from the inclosed report, the War Department recommends that such legislation be not adopted.

Respectfully,
JOHN W. WEEKS,
Secretary of War.

The situation as to Fort McHenry is complicated by its present use, but the Fort Carroll status is simple. It is not needed by the United States and should be preserved by Baltimore city as an historic memorial.

The Baltimore American to-day has given a most valuable account of Fort Carroll, which will be of interest to the House and the public. In the latter part of this account the president of the Maryland Historical Society details the historic significance of Fort Carroll. The article in the Baltimore American is as follows:

Fort Carroll may be sold by the Federal Government to the highest bidder.

And it may become the site of a memorial expressing Maryland's historic ideal of complete religious freedom.

Both ideas are quite new. The first was embodied in a bill introduced yesterday in Congress by Senator JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York, providing for the sale of numerous bits of War Department property not actively in use for military purposes.

The second was expressed last night by DeCourcy W. Thom, vice president of the Maryland Historical Society, when he heard of Senator WADSWORTH'S measure. Judge Henry Stockbridge indicated that the question of what should be done with the fort in case it is to be sold would be discussed at the January meeting of the Maryland Historical Society, of which he is the president.

"The fort itself is a fine monument to one of America's greatest men, its builder, Robert E. Lee, then captain and brevet colonel of Engineers, United States Army," said Mr. Thom. "It ought to be preserved for that if for nothing else. It has become a landmark for hundreds of thousands of Maryland people, its very name enshrining the memory of a patriot renowned in Revolutionary history.

"Fort Carroll well might be made the site for a permanent memorial which shall express the ideal which made Maryland unique when the world was torn by sectarian strife—the ideal of complete religious freedom. It could become for all who behold it what the Statue of Liberty is in New York Harbor to the devotees of civic liberty.

"From an architectural and artistic standpoint nothing could be better. There is ample room in the more than 3 acres of its area for a magnificent monument and a playground; and there is ample material in the fortifications for any new structures that might be desired. If the fort is to be sold, the city ought to buy it, by all means, for some such development when the time arrives."

The square, squat block of granite which is Fort Carroll is observed by hundreds of thousands every year, but few have been within its walls. The site was chosen for a fort in 1799, but nothing definite was done until the spot had been ceded by the State of Maryland to the Federal Government in 1846. General Totten, then Chief of Engineers, drew the plans, which were similar to those of Fort Sumter, at Charleston. Major Ogden began construction work in 1847. He soon was succeeded by Captain Lee, who carried the work forward until he was transferred to West Point in 1852.

Water stood 12 and 15 feet deep over the site, above a deep bed of silt and clay. Piles were driven, a wooden grillage laid, and the foundations placed upon the grillage with the aid of a diving bell. The walls are of granite blocks, filled with concrete, and the inclosed space is filled with material dredged from the channel. It was intended to have about 225 guns, three tiers in casements and one in barbette.

But the fort was never finished according to the original design. When the walls had been carried up above the level of the second tier of casements the entire structure began to settle. Work was abandoned for 40 years. Changes were made in the plans and the work finished a quarter of a century ago, with batteries of a then modern type.

Within the old fort is an artesian well, from which a supply of good water, adequate for any possible need at the spot, can be obtained. This was a provision against siege in the days when it was begun. That it would have proved adequate for the waterside defense of Baltimore, if need had arisen, is shown by the record of its sister stronghold, Fort Sumter, which successfully resisted powerful attacks by Dupont and Dahlgren and succumbed only when bombarded by heavy batteries from the landward side.

When I suggested the matter of Fort Carroll last year I was moved by the considerations so well expressed above. I hope that the Secretary of War will report that the sale price to Baltimore City will be nominal. If Fort Carroll can not be donated to Baltimore, it should be bought by Baltimore at a nominal price and preserved for posterity. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 279) to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence indefinitely for my colleague, Mr. SPROUL, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows and former widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and the widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Dale	James	Moore, Ohio
Ansorge	Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Miss.	Mudd
Barbour	Deal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson, Me.
Beedy	Dominick	Jones, Pa.	O'Brien
Benham	Drane	Jones, Tex.	O'Connor
Blakeney	Drewry	Kahn	Olpp
Boies	Dunbar	Keller	Osborne
Bond	Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Overstreet
Brand	Dyer	Kennedy	Paige
Brennan	Echols	Kiess	Park, Ga.
Briggs	Edmonds	Kindred	Parker, N. Y.
Britten	Fairchild	Kirkpatrick	Patterson, Mo.
Brooks, Ill.	Fairfield	Kitchin	Patterson, N. J.
Brooks, Pa.	Faust	Kleczka	Perlman
Brown, Tenn.	Fess	Knight	Rainey, Ala.
Browne, Wis.	Fish	Kuns	Rainey, Ill.
Burke	Focht	Layton	Ramseyer
Cable	Free	Lee, Ga.	Ransley
Campbell, Kans.	Freeman	Lee, N. Y.	Reber
Cantrill	Frothingham	Lineberger	Reece
Carew	Fulmer	Linthicum	Reed, N. Y.
Chandler, N. Y.	Gallivan	Little	Riddick
Chandler, Okla.	Gifford	Longworth	Riordan
Clark, Fla.	Goodykoontz	Luce	Robertson
Classon	Gorman	Luhring	Rodenberg
Cockran	Gould	Lyon	Rosenbloom
Codd	Griffin	McCormick	Rossdale
Cole, Ohio	Hammer	McDuffie	Rucker
Collier	Hawes	McKenzie	Ryan
Collins	Henry	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sabath
Connally, Tex.	Herrick	McSwain	Sanders, N. Y.
Connolly, Pa.	Hogan	Maloney	Schall
Cooper, Ohio	Hudspeth	Mead	Scott, Mich.
Coughlin	Humphreys, Miss.	Michaelson	Sears
Cullen	Hutchinson	Mills	Shaw
Curry	Jacoway	Moore, Ill.	Shreve

Siegel	Stoll	Tinkham	Wheeler
Sisson	Sullivan	Tucker	Williams, Tex.
Smith, Mich.	Tague	Vaile	Winslow
Smithwick	Taylor, Ark.	Vare	Wise
Snyder	Taylor, N. J.	Voigt	Wood, Ind.
Sproul	Taylor, Tenn.	Volk	Woodyard
Stafford	Ten Eyck	Walters	Yates
Stedman	Thompson	Ward, N. Y.	Zihlman
Steenerson	Thorpe	Weaver	
Stiness	Tillman	Webster	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 8275) entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the House amendment after the enacting clause, and substitute the following in lieu thereof:

"That any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or whose name is now on the pension roll, including those thereon under any act of Congress, public or private, and every person who served 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $72 a month, payment to be made in accordance with the pension roll, without further application by the person entitled thereto.

"SEC. 2. That the widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War, and was honorably discharged from such service, or regardless of length of service was discharged for a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in service and in line of duty, or who has heretofore been or may hereafter be granted a pension under any law, public or private, for service in the Civil War, such widow having been married to such soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the 27th day of June, 1915, or who if legally married after said date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with the soldier, sailor, or marine for at least two years and continuing until his death, shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month, and an additional pension of $6 a month for each child of the officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, and in case of the death or remarriage of the widow leaving a child or children of such officer or enlisted man under the age of 16 years, such pension shall be paid such child or children until the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise mentally or physically helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of such child, or during the period of such disability: *Provided further*, That the additional pension herein granted to the widow on account of the child or children of the husband by a former wife shall be paid to her only for such period of her widowhood as she has been, or shall be, charged with the maintenance of such child or children; for any period during which she has not been, or she shall not be, so charged, it shall be granted and paid to the guardian of such child or children: *Provided further*, That a widow or guardian to whom increase of pension has been, or shall hereafter be, granted on account of minor children, shall not be deprived thereof by reason of their being maintained in whole or in part at the expense of a State or the public in any educational institution, or in any institution organized for the care of soldiers' orphans: *Provided further*, That the rate of pension for the widow of any person who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States in the War of 1812, or for 60 days or more in the war with Mexico, on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto during the war with that nation, and was honorably discharged therefrom, shall be $50 a month: *Provided further*, That all provisions of this section shall apply to all pensions heretofore granted under any law, public or private.

"SEC. 3. That the rate of pension for the former widow of any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States for 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service, or who, having so served for less than 90 days, was discharged for a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, or who died in the service of a disability incurred in the service and in line of duty, such widow having married the officer or enlisted man prior to June 27, 1915, or if legally married after such date shall have subsequent to such marriage lived and cohabited with such soldier, sailor, or marine for a period of at least two years and continuing until his death, and having remarried, either once or more than once after the death of the soldier, sailor, or marine, if it be shown that such subsequent or successive marriage or marriages has or have been dissolved, either by the death of the husband or husbands, or by divorce for any cause other than adultery on the part of the wife, shall be entitled to and be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month: *Provided*, That where a pension has been granted to an insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless child, or to a child or children under the age of 16 years, a widow or former widow shall not be entitled to pension under this act until the pension to such child or children terminates unless such child or children be a member or members of her family and cared for by her; and upon the granting of pension to such widow or former widow, payment of pension to such child or children shall cease; and this proviso shall apply to all claims arising under this or any other law.

"SEC. 4. That the benefits of this act shall be extended to and shall comprehend and include each and severally the classes of persons enumerated in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs of section 4693, Revised Statutes of the United States, who served during the Civil War, and also any person who is now or may hereafter become entitled to pension under the acts of June 27, 1890, February 15, 1895, and the joint resolutions of July 1, 1902, and June 28, 1906, or the acts of January 29, 1887, March 3, 1891, and February 17, 1897, on account of service during the Civil War and the war with Mexico, and the widows and minor children of such persons: *Provided*, That service under this section shall be proven in the manner and form specified in section 2, act of March 4, 1917, and the act of September 1, 1922: *Provided further*, That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension to the soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed thereon under the acts of July 27, 1892, June 27, 1902, May 30, 1908, or under the act of March 4, 1917, shall be $30 per month, and that the rate of pension to the widows of soldiers of the various Indian wars and campaigns who are now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed thereon under said acts shall be $20 per month.

"SEC. 5. That all Army nurses of the Civil War who have been, or who may hereafter be, allowed a pension under existing laws shall be entitled to and shall be paid a pension at the rate of $50 a month.

"SEC. 6. That all persons now on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $30 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the forearm or any part of the bones of the leg below the tuberosity of the tibia, the rate of pension shall be $75 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or at any point above the elbow or a leg at or at any point above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $85 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur, or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is an ankylosis of either the elbow or knee or shoulder or hip joint, the rate of pension shall be $80 a month; that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or shall have lost one hand or one foot and in addition thereto shall have lost a portion of the other hand or foot, or shall have been totally disabled in the same, shall

receive a pension at the rate of $100 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $90 a month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms or both legs or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of $125 a month; and where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of both of said arms or legs, the rate of pension shall be $100 a month; and it is hereby directed that the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be reviewed, upon request of the pensioner, all cases wherein there is an excision or resection of any part of the bones of an arm or leg, shoulder or hip, or any of the joints, or an ankylosis of any of said joints, and shall place the name of the pensioner on the roll at the rates herein provided.

"SEC. 7. That in the adjudication of claims for widows' pensions marriage of the parties and the legality thereof may be established by any competent testimony, and in the absence of direct proof of a ceremonial marriage, satisfactory evidence that the parties lived together as husband and wife and were so recognized by their neighbors and acquaintances until the death of the husband may be held to constitute sufficient proof of marriage; and cohabitation continuously for seven years or more may be accepted in lieu of proof that no impediment existed to the marriage of the parties. A widow, otherwise entitled to pension under this act, may not be barred from being granted such pension for the reason that she failed to live and cohabit with the 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person continuously from the date of the marriage to the date of his death,' unless it be shown that she willfully deserted such 'soldier, sailor, officer, marine, marine officer, or other person' without good cause; and all provisions of law requiring such continuous cohabitation in any case are hereby repealed, except as provided in section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 8. That the pension or increase of pension herein provided for, as to all persons whose names are now on the pension roll, or who are now in receipt of a pension under existing law, shall commence at the rates herein provided on the fourth day of the next month after the approval of this act; and as to persons whose names are not now on the pension roll, or who are not now in receipt of a pension under existing law, but who may be entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, such pensions shall commence from the date of filing application therefor in the Bureau of Pensions in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check; and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

"SEC. 9. That nothing in this act contained shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as 'The Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll,' as provided in the act of April 27, 1916, but any increase herein provided for shall be in addition thereto; and no pension heretofore granted under any act, public or private, shall be reduced by anything contained in this act.

"SEC. 10. That no claim agent, attorney, or other person shall contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting claims for the increase of pension provided for in this act; and no more than the sum of $10 shall be allowed for such services in other claims thereunder, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall directly or indirectly otherwise contract for, demand, receive, or retain a fee for services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under this act, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension allowed, or due, to such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every such offense, be fined not exceeding $500 or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 11. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict with or inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Amend the title so as to read:

"An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines."

And that the House agree to the same.

CHAS. E. FULLER,
JOHN W. LANGLEY,
WM. W. RUCKER,
Managers on part of the House.

H. O. BURSUM,
P. J. MCCUMBER,
T. J. WALSH,
Managers on part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3275) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to the widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conference committee:

On account of the numerous verbal changes in the phraseology of the House substitute the conferees have rewritten the entire bill and recommend the adoption of the same as so rewritten. Most of the changes agreed upon are mere changes of phraseology and do not materially change the bill as passed by the House. The rates of pension provided by the original House substitute bill are not changed in any respect, except some slight changes in the rates granted to certain maimed soldiers. The principal change agreed upon is the proviso in section 4, reinserting in the bill the original section 7 of the Senate bill granting an increase of pension to the veterans of the various Indian wars from $20 per month to $30 per month and to the widows of such veterans from $12 per month to $20 per month. The verbal changes made in the other sections of the bill relate merely to administrative matters, and have been inserted in the bill on the recommendation of the officials of the Pension Bureau.

CHAS. E. FULLER,
JOHN W. LANGLEY,
WM. W. RUCKER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill as agreed upon in conference is substantially the bill as it passed the House several weeks ago. The only material change made by the conferees was to reinsert the original section 7 of the Senate bill, which provided an increase of pensions for certain veterans of the Indian wars from $20 to $30 per month, and of widows of such veterans from $12 to $20 per month. That section of the Senate bill was stricken out in the report made by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, principally for the reason that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has never assumed jurisdiction of any matters concerning Indian wars. There was no real objection to the provision on the part of any of the members of the committee, except that they thought they did not have jurisdiction of that subject. I can say, however, that the Committee on Pensions of the House, which has jurisdiction of that subject, or at least the chairman, expressed the desire that this provision be reinserted in the bill, as was done by the conferees.

The other changes in the bill consist of some slight changes as to the rates provided for certain maimed soldiers of the Civil War, and the other changes, I think, are mere verbal changes that do not in any manner change the substance of the bill as it was originally passed by the House. Those changes were made principally upon suggestions of the officials of the Pension Bureau as purely administrative matters, to aid them in construing the measure.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the bill as it now stands, does the pension automatically change, or is it necessary for the pensioner to make an application to the pension department?

Mr. FULLER. If the gentleman will read the first section of the bill as it appears in the conference report he will find that question fully answered. It is expressly provided there that the increase of pensions shall be automatic, and that it will not be necessary to make any application therefor, but in another section of the bill it is of course provided that those not now on the pension roll must make application.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Does the pension then date from the date of the law or the date of the application?

Mr. FULLER. The increase of pension under the bill as to those whose names are now on the pension roll dates from the 4th day of the month after the approval of the act. That provision was inserted because of the fact that the monthly payments are made as of the 4th day of each month and in order to have payments commence with the even month, as payments of pensions are made on the 4th day of the month.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the bill under consideration are the pensioners who are receiving pensions under a special act all included in this bill?

Mr. FULLER. They are.

Mr. DOWELL. Do all of them come within its provisions?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. As to new applications for pensions that are made now pensionable, when will their pension begin?

Mr. FULLER. From the filing of the application.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I want to know whether under this bill it is provided that if a young woman marries a veteran of the Civil War in his dotage and he lives two years she gets $50 a month for her life?

Mr. FULLER. Under the bill, if a woman is married to a soldier prior to the 27th day of June, 1915, which extends the limitation to the date of marriage 10 years beyond the present law, she is entitled to a pension under this bill. If married after that date it is required she shall be legally married to the soldier and that she shall live with him at least two years and until his death.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That is what I asked, if she marries him now and he lives two years she gets the pension of $50 all her life?

Mr. FULLER. That is correct. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would not be opposed to this bill or to the conference report if we did not already have very liberal pension laws. But it seems to me this goes beyond the sphere of liberality and approaches prodigality. It is very difficult for anyone to determine just what additional charge this bill will impose upon the Treasury, but I think that it is safe to say that it will increase the annual pension bill of the Government $100,000,000. Now, our Republican friends have been going to the country with a constant iteration and reiteration of the economy that they are effecting. We hardly have a debate upon appropriation bills but what some of the leaders upon that side boast of the economy effected by the Bureau of the Budget. Their constant reiteration of these things reminds me of the formula suggested by Doctor Coué, "Every day and every way I am getting better and better." Now, these gentlemen think that by paraphrasing that formula into saying, "Every day in every way we are economizing, we are economizing," they will make the country believe that they are doing it. I have a great deal of faith in Doctor Coué's formula if a man reforms his habits so that his habits of life and his habits of thinking are correct and along the right line, but I have very little faith in constant reiterating that "Every day and every way I am getting better and better" if I continue vicious habits of thought and deed. I must abandon the error of my way if I get better. Likewise, I have very little faith in this constant iteration and reiteration on the part of Republican leaders that "every day in every way we are economizing" when every day and every way you are coming in here bringing in bills and passing them which impose additional charges upon the Public Treasury. What does this bill really do? In the first place, it takes every Civil War veteran who is now upon the pension rolls, either under the general law or special bill, and pays him a service pension of $72 a month instead of $50. The pension is paid for service of 90 days or more during the Civil War and does not require that the soldier was disabled or injured in any way. What else does it do?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just for a moment?

Mr. BLACK. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does the gentleman recall when it was that the amount was made $50? I think in the last three years.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, yes; within a shorter period than that, as I now recall. It has certainly not been very long, and Congress thought then we were passing a very generous pension law. And it was. Now, what else does this proposed new law do? It takes every widow of a Civil War veteran who is now upon the pension roll, either under the general law or by a special bill, and increases her pension from $30 a month to $50 a month. It goes much further than that; it allows all widows who have married a Civil War veteran up to June 27, 1915, to apply for a pension and receive $50 a month. The present law only gives those widows a pensionable status who married the Civil War veteran prior to June 27, 1905. Not only is the change made which I have mentioned above but the bill goes still further and says even if the widow marries a soldier since June 27, 1915, and has lived with him two years up to the time of his death, she shall be entitled to receive $50 a month. Now, gentlemen, I want to call your attention to just how far going and how far-reaching and how discriminatory this widow provision is.

Under the war risk insurance act, which we enacted in 1917 to apply to veterans of the World War, the widow of a soldier who was killed in battle or who died from disabilities received in the service is paid $25 per month plus the soldier's war-risk insurance, if he had any, and yet we are now asked to pass a law to pay the widow of a Civil War veteran, not for death caused by disability received in the service, not for death upon the field of battle, but death from the infirmities of age—we pay her $50 a month. I am not going to lend my vote to any such rank discrimination and indefensible provision.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the gentleman recognize any distinction between the age and the infirmities of a widow of a veteran of the Civil War and the youth and ability to provide for herself of a widow of the recent war?

Mr. BLACK. I shall be very glad to answer that. The pension department, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Pensions, asked the Committee on Pensions to limit this increased widows' pension to widows who have reached the age of 70 years, but the committee did not do it. This conference report does not do it. Under the terms of this bill a young widow of a Civil War veteran, not over 20 years of age or 25, can draw $50 just the same as if she was weighted down by the infirmities of age. Now, why did not the Committee on Pensions, if they wanted to make these pensions apply only to widows who were burdened with the infirmities of age, put in a provision limiting the increase to widows who had reached the age of 70?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Because I should imagine they did not think the arbitrary age of 70 years, not taking into account the infirmities or disabilities, was giving a fair measure of relief.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, the gentleman says he "imagines" the committee did not think so and so. This bill is not limited to what one might "imagine," but the language is definite and explicit and includes widows regardless of their age. They may be 20, they may be 70 years of age. Now, there is another bad provision in the bill, which I want to discuss briefly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But, as a matter of fact, generally speaking, it applies only to those who are weighed down by age and infirmities.

Mr. BLACK. I do not admit that fact. The bill applies generally.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I say as a matter of fact, not as to language. As a matter of fact and of application it does.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman give us any statistics which will show the average age of the Civil War veterans?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think, if the gentleman has ever seen a Grand Army of the Republic parade, he would not need any statistics.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, the widows do not parade. [Laughter.]

Mr. DEMPSEY. Oh, the widows as a rule are of the comparative age of their husbands.

Mr. BLACK. Another thing this bill has in it which I was about to mention a while ago, that the House has consistently refused to adopt, is that it recognizes a common-law marriage and removes the requirement of law which now requires proof of a ceremonial marriage, and permits the proof of a common-law marriage. I do not believe in our anxiety to let down the bars in pension legislation we should go so far as to recognize a common-law marriage. It would open up too wide a field for fraud.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Can the gentleman state the cost of this little piece of legislation, if we pass it?

Mr. BLACK. I stated, before the gentleman from South Carolina came into the Hall, that it would be difficult to determine the cost, but I feel sure that it would be as much as $100,000,000 a year.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will tell the gentleman. It is the opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions, who has submitted the estimate to the Committee on Appropriations, that the probable additional raise by reason of the enactment of this bill is $8,795,000 per month.

Mr. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for his information. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee and speaks with authority. The figures which he gives, computed upon an annual basis, would mean an increase in the Nation's pension bill of $105,540,000. This would be $5,540,000 more than I stated was my approximate estimate a while ago.

Already we have a pension bill of $255,000,000 annually. This addition will make it $360,000,000 hereafter; and add this amount to the amount which Congress will appropriate for compensation to World War veterans, vocational education, and other obligations of a similar nature which we must meet, one can readily see we will soon have an expenditure of $1,000,000,000 per annum for the Pension Bureau and the United States Veterans' Bureau.

We should be liberal in pension legislation, but the bill covered by the present conference report goes entirely too far, and I shall vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. FULLER. I can yield him five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I can not support this conference report on the pension bill now before the House for a great many reasons. In the first place, it will add about $100,000,000 extra burden to the taxpayers of America just at this time when the people are crying out for a reduction of expenditures and, in my humble opinion, its adoption simply means that there will never be a reduction in the amount annually spent for this purpose.

In 1876 Mr. Garfield said on this floor, during the debate on the pension appropriations bill which at that time amounted to $27,936,209, that in his opinion we had "passed the maximum" in pension appropriations. What if Mr. Garfield should awake to-day and witness the passage of this bill, which carries more than ten times the amount which he thought at that time, 46 years ago, was the "maximum" to be expended for this purpose in any one year? And the end is not yet.

In 1921 the pension appropriations amounted to $258,720,820.67. The next year the amount fell off about $5,000,000 We thought then that surely we had passed the "maximum" and that the amount would steadily decline. But here comes this conference report which adds about one hundred millions of dollars to the present appropriation and runs the amount far above the "maximum" reached in 1921.

As a member of one of the pension committees I realize, possibly more clearly than some of the rest of you, that we are going at breakneck speed in the expenditure of money for pensions. I have fought these unnecessary increases on the floor of the House, but to no avail. Those of you whose constituents are to reap the vast and unprecedented benefits of this extravagant expenditure are going to vote to adopt this conference report, and unfortunately you are in the majority.

What is the effect of this conference report? In the first place, it increases the pensions of the Federal soldiers of the Civil War from $50 to $72 a month, or from $600 a year to $864 a year, which is more than one of these men could make if he were young and able-bodied. It was stated upon the floor of the House on yesterday that the average farmer in the United States is making less than $500 a year, and that statement was not contradicted or questioned. Indeed, it could not be questioned by anyone familiar with the conditions of the farmer at this time. If he is a tenant, out of that $500 he must pay his rent, amounting to from one-fourth to one-half of his entire crop; if he is a landholder, he must pay his taxes out of it, together with the "upkeep" of his farm, and in addition to that the interest on the money he owes. For it is well known to every man in this body who has taken the trouble to investigate the proposition that a vast majority of the farmers of this country have been compelled to mortgage their farms, and on those mortgages they must pay interest of from 6 to 15 per cent. A vast majority of those who are going to vote for this conference report voted also for the ship subsidy bill, which, in addition to giving to the Shipping Trust a direct subsidy of $30,000,000 a year out of the Federal Treasury, together with an indirect subsidy out of the pockets of the American people of from $50,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year, proposed also to advance the shipping interests operating money at less than 3 per cent interest. But when it comes to the passage of laws to enable farmers to get cheaper money you seem to regard it as a matter of too small concern to engage the attention of this administration. No wonder there was such a political revolution in the agricultural States during the recent campaign.

The farmers appealed to you to put a stop to profiteering in manufactured articles and bring the cost of those commodities down to within their reach, but you answered that by the passage of a tariff bill that will take from the toiling masses of America from three to four billions of dollars a year and pour it into the pockets of the manufacturer. As a distinguished Senator said, in discussing that iniquitous bill, "You levied a tax on everything the workingman buys, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age is laid away."

They appealed to you to assist them, through the Bureau of Markets, in getting a reasonable price for their products by bringing them more nearly in direct contact with the consumers and eliminating the profiteers in agricultural products, and you answered that by repealing the excess-profits tax and relieving those profiteers of a tax of $450,000,000 annually, which now must be made up by the masses of the American people themselves.

They have implored you to accept Henry Ford's offer and turn the Muscle Shoals project over to him in order that he might give work to the unemployed and at the same time bring down the cost of fertilizer by manufacturing that article in competition with the Fertilizer Trust. But you answered that by saying that it would be too much a financial sacrifice, and then bring in this bill in which you propose to give away every year practically as much money as the Muscle Shoals project has cost.

Under this bill a woman may marry an ex-Federal soldier to-day, or five years from to-day, and live with him two years, and at his death she will be placed on the pension roll for the balance of her life at $50 a month, even though she may have been born 40 years after the war closed. There are 78,313 more widows on the roll now than there are soldiers, and if this conference report is adopted we will be paying these young women who are marrying these old men for the next 50 or 75 years. There are now 49 widows drawing pensions as a result of the War of 1812, which has been closed for practically 110 years.

You are eliminating the marriage qualification, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and substituting therefor the common-law marriage, a thing never before attempted in the passage of a pension bill so far as I have been able to ascertain. But you are even going further and eliminating the property qualification and paying this increase to men and women who are not in need of it, but to some who are immensely wealthy.

Of course, I am from the South, where our old soldiers do not get Federal pensions. Those brave men who wore the gray and who gave to the world those examples of heroism, patriotism, and self-sacrifice during the terrible period of the Civil War, and saved our southern civilization from destruction at the hands of the vandals of reconstruction, have struggled along on small pensions of $10, $15, $20, or $25 a month until they have redeemed the South from her once dilapidated and deplorable condition. They have set an example that it would be well for the rest of the country to follow, if you expect to preserve the Republic in the years to come.

If the precedent set by this conference report is carried to its logical conclusion it will only be a matter of a few years till you will have 5,000,000 names on the pension roll, entailing a burden that will be far too heavy for the American people to bear. By the adoption of this report you are setting a precedent that will rise up to smite you or your successors in the years to come. I for one refuse to accept that responsibility; I shall vote against the adoption of the conference report. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What is the occasion for this extraordinary procedure? What justification is there for it? What facts are presented at this time to justify this extraordinary raise?

Mr. RANKIN. Absolutely none. I have heard it referred to as a Christmas gift even among the Members of the House.

There is no reason for it, and a vast majority of the Members know that it ought not to pass, but they have not the moral courage to stand up and say no. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I will have to decline to yield to my good friend from Minnesota, much as I regret to do so, because I am limited as to time and have more to say than the time allowed to me will admit of.

I spent nine of the best years of my life as an examiner in the Pension Office and as a member of the Board of Pension Appeals, and I think I know something about the situation with regard to the administration of the pension laws and the difficulties in their administration which this bill is designed in part to remove. I will not go into detail with regard to these matters, not only because of my limited time but likewise because of the severe hoarseness with which I am suffering, but I can not refrain from calling attention to the fact, at least, that while it is a liberal bill, it is in line with the record which I have made in behalf of the soldiers and sailors of all wars and their widows and dependents during my years of service in this body and of which I am proud. [Applause.] The old soldiers for whose benefit this bill is primarily designed, and in the preparation and reporting of which I am proud to say I took part, are dying now at the rate of one every 15 minutes. I have no doubt that some old hero of the Republic is breathing his last at this moment; and the same is true of many of the old widows who are increased under the provisions of this bill to $50 a month.

I can not express to you, gentlemen of the House, how proud I am of the privilege of supporting this measure, and of the privilege which the people of my district have given me of aiding in its preparation. The average age of the old soldiers is now more than 78 years, and all this talk from gentlemen on the other side of the House about this provision in behalf of the widows opening the way to indiscriminate marriages is tommyrot and nonsense. Now and then an abuse of the privilege might occur, but in the main it will result in justice to the thousands of women who have married the soldiers in good faith and who have been loyal to them to the day of their death. The truth of the matter is that this bill, agreed upon by the conference committee of which I was a member, is in fact in large measure the same bill which the House passed a few days ago as a substitute for the Senate measure. I do not wish to claim undue credit in this connection, because I think my record in Congress all these years will show that I have done everything I could for the soldiers and the widows of soldiers and their dependents of all wars, but gentlemen of the House, especially on the Democratic side, have inveighed against the bill on grounds which they should have presented when the House bill was up for consideration as a substitute for the Senate bill and which was practically agreed to by the Senate conferees with minor modifications.

I wish I had the time and the voice to answer the arguments that have been presented, especially by the gentleman who spoke a few moments ago, but I have not. I wish to renew my statement that the proudest memory of my public life in Congress has always been that I have never missed an opportunity to help give the old boys and their widows what they deserve. [Applause.]

The rates which we allow in this bill are not as much even as we have been allowing recently to soldiers who fought in other wars. I have no objection to that; but, on the contrary, have aided in liberalizing these laws as to compensation to soldiers who served in the World War, but we must remember that these old fellows and their widows are fast disappearing from the earth, and while it will cost quite a sum of money for a year or so, they will soon be only a precious memory to us, and I for one am willing to retire from Congress if my attitude on this question is not approved by the people of my district.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]?

Mr. FULLER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I favor the utmost liberality toward our former soldiers, but I do not think we ought to discriminate between the soldiers of the various wars. What I object to in our pension legislation is the inequalities of it. Soldiers of the World War receive what we choose to entitle "compensation," but, of course, it is a pension. The totally disabled soldier of the World War gets $80 a month. I am willing to concede that a Civil War soldier has, by virtue of his age, now become and should be regarded as totally disabled, and I am wondering why he should not also receive $80 a month. A totally disabled Spanish War soldier is allowed a pension of only $30 a month. I am wondering upon what footing World War soldiers and Civil War soldiers may be considered to stand to entitle them to such a great advantage above the Spanish War soldiers.

The widow of a Civil War soldier, by this bill, is allowed $50 a month, upon the theory that her husband's life was shortened by his service. The widow of a World War soldier gets only $25 a month, while the widow of a Spanish War soldier gets only $20 a month. The minor children of Civil War soldiers get $6 a month each. The minor children of World War soldiers get $7.50 to $10 per month, while the children of Spanish War soldiers get only $4 a month.

Upon what sound basis do these inequalities rest? Are pensioners of one war more worthy than those of another war, or is it a purely fanciful, arbitrary, and unjustified discrimination? So far as I can see, the only basis of the difference is the political strength of the several groups. The fact that certain groups are organized and are able to make their voice heard by Members of Congress is, so far as I know, the only reason why they are preferred above other groups.

It just so happens that I served for six months as a volunteer private soldier in the Spanish War. I do not claim for myself any great merit because of that fact; but surely, gentlemen, I am entitled to just as much credit for having been a soldier in the Spanish War as I would be for the same service in the Civil War or in the World War. I can not believe that my comrades of the Spanish War are less worthy than soldiers of other wars.

What we ought to do is to get down upon a basis of equality in our recognition of the men who have served the country. I challenge any member of this committee or anybody else who chooses to deal with the subject to show why we should not deal with soldiers of all wars upon a basis of equality and without discrimination. That is all that I rose to say. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE]?

Mr. FULLER. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have read at the Clerk's desk the remarks made by the late Mr. Mann of Illinois when a bill was under consideration here in January, 1920, proposing an increase of service pension to $50 a month.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Most of these pensions are paid in the North. Some are paid abroad. Some are paid in the South. Some of the Southern States provide for the payment of pensions, small in amount. The total does not amount to a great deal. We in the North have taught our old soldiers to believe that they need not rely upon self-effort, while the old soldiers of the South were taught to believe that they must rely upon self-effort. So far as my observation goes, they have done quite as well or better in private life than our old soldiers in the North have done. If we teach people to be self-reliant, that is the most valuable lesson that can come to mankind. We are proposing not only to pauperize the soldiers of the Civil War but to advertise to those who served in the recent war that the Government of the United States will support them and that they do not need to work for themselves. They do not ask for it, but in the course of time, with that education, it has its effect, and it is a bad effect. [Applause.]

[Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as it appears in the conference report, is almost precisely as it passed this House under suspension of the rules by more than a two-thirds vote. I think the opponents of the measure have had ample time in which to discuss the matter here now, and I am very glad to give them that time. I think enough has been said, and I move the previous question.

Mr. BLACK. I had promised the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] that I would seek to get him five minutes. The gentleman will not save any time by moving the previous question now. Will the gentleman yield five minutes?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FULLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, we have met in the Pension Bureau continuous rulings that a soldier must have had an honorable discharge from every service. This House in repeated special bills has determined that soldiers are entitled to pensions if they served honorably in their last service, and many such bills have been passed by the committee and this House. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULLER] whether there has been any change in the language of this bill

which will compel or warrant the Pension Bureau in conforming in its rulings to the interpretation placed upon the law by the House and its Invalid Pensions Committee?

Mr. FULLER. The language of the first section of this bill is substantially the same as it has been in every service pension bill since the first one passed in June, 1890; that is, that if a man served for 90 days or more and was honorably discharged from that service he was entitled to a pension under the act. This bill contains substantially the same language that has been in every service pension bill. It is true that the Pension Bureau had interpolated into the law the requirement that a man must have been discharged honorably from every other service, either before or after the service on which he claims. They have even gone so far as to decide that where a man served faithfully for the three years under his first enlistment and was honorably discharged from that service and then again enlisted as a veteran and served faithfully clear through the war, if he then happened to go home without the formality of getting a discharge from his last service the Pension Bureau has refused to recognize his honorable discharge from the three years' service and has denied him a pension. I do not think that is or ever was the law. I do not think that the law justifies any such ruling. My judgment is, and I have always insisted, that where a man served 90 days or more during the Civil War and was honorably discharged from such service the Pension Bureau had no right to go back and inquire whether he had some prior service or some subsequent service from which he was not honorably discharged. The law does not say that he must have been honorably discharged, not only from the service under which he claims but also from every former or subsequent service. Under this bill, if it should be enacted into law, there can be no possible doubt, from a legal standpoint, that every man who served 90 days or more during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge from that contract of service is entitled to the pension provided, regardless of any former or subsequent service.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree with the gentleman. Will the chairman permit another question? In view of the fact that we all now know that this interpretation will be put upon the law by the Pension Bureau, would it not be wise to interpolate into this present act such language as would indicate that we desire that the construction which this House intends be placed upon the act by the Pension Bureau?

Mr. FULLER. Of course, the gentleman understands that this bill has gone beyond the amending stage. The only question now is the adoption of this conference report. The Senate passed one bill, the House amended it by substituting an amended bill, and the conferees have agreed and now report the completed bill. Therefore it is too late to consider any amendments to the bill as presented by this report. It may not be a perfect bill. I do not know, and I do not think anyone knows, just how to draft a perfect bill that would do equal and exact justice in every case, or that would be entirely satisfactory to every one. The committee has done the best it could, and now it is of the utmost importance that this bill should become a law at the earliest possible date. It will be a fitting present for the grand old veterans and widows and will make a happy Christmas in thousands of American homes. These old veterans are fast passing away, and in only a few years there will be but a mere handful of that grand army of the Union to tell the story of heroism, of the battles and the weary march, the privations and sufferings of that titanic contest for the preservation of the Union. This is undoubtedly the last act of the Congress for the recognition of what the country owes to its gallant defenders and the dear old widows of those who have pitched their tents on the other shore. Let us hark back to the dark days when the Union was in peril, when the boys of the North were baring their breasts to the hail of leaden bullets, and then to the glad time of the grand review here in the Capital City, when these brave boys came marching back and let us look again at the great banner then stretched across the Capitol front containing the words:

The only debt we can never pay is the debt we owe to our victorious Union soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Whatever of that debt we are ever to pay will be paid now by the enactment of this most just and truly generous measure. Loyal men and women all over the land will applaud our act, and let me tell you now that there is no money ever appropriated by Congress for any purpose that does so much real good as that we appropriate for pensions to the aged veterans and widows. Every dollar of it goes into immediate circulation in every town and hamlet of the land, so that it benefits many besides the immediate beneficiaries. I hope this conference report may be approved to-day, so that the bill can go to the President and receive his approval before the coming holidays.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] may have leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may have leave to extend his remarks on this conference report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the conference report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this conference report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object to the general leave.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. BLACK. We have only one more speech on this side if leave can be granted to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN].

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, all this hurry to get through this bill which taxes the people $8,000,000 a month is unseemly. It looks to me that the House might hesitate a few moments before gouging the people to that amount. [Laughter and applause.] The people of the United States know that the Congress has been liberal in pension matters to the soldiers of the various wars, except the Spanish-American War. There is not a man who will stop and think but that knows that a service pension of $50 a month, under the existing law for the soldiers of the Civil War, is ample. Not only that but this bill provides $72 a month pension to every man whether he smelled gunpowder or not, if he was an enlisted man. The bad feature of it is that you have increased the marital part so that a woman who is married to an old soldier up to 1915 can draw $72 a month.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Fifty dollars a month.

Mr. QUIN. Women who have married old soldiers for the express purpose of getting this pension—and there are thousands of them—have been born since the war was over in 1865 and then have married these old soldiers. These young women will continue to draw that pension for the rest of their natural lives. And yet there is a great hue and hurrah about putting this through, when everybody knows that the people of the United States are shouting for us to stop this excessive burden of taxation. And yet you are proceeding with such measures that necessitate the paying out of millions of dollars. This one bill will yearly take $96,000,000 increase from the Treasury, and everything else in the same proportion. You come before the people and say you are curtailing the expenses of the Government. This measure should not pass this House. I believe in being just to the men who defended the country's flag; but when you increase the pension from $50 a month to $72 a month, with all the trimmings that go with it, you are committing a wrong against the taxpayers of this Republic. It is 50 years since the war ended, and you have a tax bill here of $375,000,000 a year for pensions for the men and their widows. Can it be possible that we are going now to increase it to that extent? Your great and lamented distinguished leader on your side, Mr. Mann, of Illinois, made some remarks which have just been read at the desk, and his stand ought to penetrate into your intellects. This is not a question of the heart; it is a cold-blooded question of what is right under the law. It is a cold-blooded right to the 110,000,000 people of this Republic to have their Government economically administered. We ought not to legislate for a special class and say that they shall have all this unequal share given to them out of the Treasury of the United States. What are you going to say—and it will be bound to come from all of these 4,500,000 soldiers of the late World War—what are you going to say when they come forward and ask for this same classification? They will say you did it unto those who fought from 1861 to 1865—even to those who only fought for 60 days—and why can not you give it to us who went over the seas and fought the enemy on foreign soil? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK) there were 44 ayes and 93 nays.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote just taken on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 66, nays 183, answered "present" 1, not voting 180, as follows:

YEAS—66.

Abernethy	Dupré	Knutson	Rankin
Anderson	Fisher	Kraus	Rouse
Aswell	Gahn	Lanham	Sanders, Tex.
Bankhead	Garner	Lankford	Sandlin
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen, Ga.	Sisson
Bland, Va.	Garrett, Tex.	Lee, Ga.	Steagall
Blanton	Gernerd	Logan	Stevenson
Bowling	Gilbert	Lowrey	Sumners, Tex.
Box	Goldsborough	Mansfield	Turner
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Martin	Upshaw
Burtness	Hill	Moore, Va.	Vinson
Burton	Hooker	Newton, Minn.	Ward, N. C.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hudspeth	Oldfield	Wilson
Byrns, Tenn.	Jeffers, Ala.	Oliver	Woods, Va.
Collier	Johnson, Ky.	Perkins	Wright
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Pou	
Doughton	Kincheloe	Quin	

NAYS—183.

Ackerman	Favrot	Kopp	Rhodes
Andrew, Mass.	Fenn	Kreider	Ricketts
Andrews, Nebr.	Fields	Lampert	Roach
Anthony	Fitzgerald	Langley	Robsion
Appleby	Focht	Larson, Minn.	Rogers
Arents	Foster	Lawrence	Rose
Atkeson	Frear	Lazaro	Rucker
Bacharach	Free	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Ind.
Barbour	French	Leatherwood	Scott, Tenn.
Barkley	Fuller	Lehlbach	Shelton
Beck	Funk	London	Sinclair
Beedy	Gifford	Longworth	Sinnott
Begg	Glynn	Luhring	Smith, Idaho
Benham	Graham, Ill.	McArthur	Smithwick
Bird	Graham, Pa.	McClintic	Snell
Bixler	Greene, Mass.	McCormick	Speaks
Bowers	Greene, Vt.	McFadden	Stephens
Bulwinkle	Griest	McKenzie	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Hardy, Colo.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Haugen	McPherson	Swank
Cable	Hawes	MacGregor	Sweet
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	MacLafferty	Temple
Carter	Hayden	Madden	Thomas
Chalmers	Hays	Magee	Thorpe
Chandler, N. Y.	Hersey	Mapes	Tilson
Chindblom	Hickey	Merritt	Timberlake
Christopherson	Hicks	Michener	Tincher
Clague	Himes	Miller	Towner
Clouse	Hoch	Montoya	Treadway
Cole, Iowa	Huck	Moores, Ind.	Tyson
Colton	Huddleston	Morgan	Vestal
Cooper, Wis.	Hukriede	Morin	Wason
Crago	Hull	Murphy	Watson
Cramton	Humphrey, Nebr.	Nelson, A. P.	Webster
Curry	Husted	Nelson, J. M.	White, Kans.
Dallinger	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	White, Me.
Darrow	Jefferis, Nebr.	Norton	Williams, Ill.
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Parks, Ark.	Williamson
Denison	Kelly, Pa.	Petersen	Wingo
Dickinson	Kendall	Porter	Winslow
Dowell	Ketcham	Pringey	Wood, Ind.
Driver	King	Purnell	Woodruff
Elliott	Kissel	Radcliffe	Wyant
Evans	Kline, N. Y.	Raker	Young
Faust	Kline, Pa.	Reed, W. Va.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Copley

NOT VOTING—180.

Almon	Clark, Fla.	Dunn	Henry
Ansorge	Clarke, N. Y.	Dyer	Herrick
Bell	Classon	Echols	Hogan
Blakeney	Cockran	Edmonds	Humphreys, Miss.
Bland, Ind.	Codd	Ellis	Hutchinson
Boies	Cole, Ohio	Fairchild	Jacoway
Bond	Collins	Fairfield	James
Brand	Connally, Tex.	Fess	Johnson, Miss.
Brennan	Connolly, Pa.	Fish	Johnson, S. Dak.
Briggs	Cooper, Ohio	Fordney	Jones, Pa.
Britten	Coughlin	Freeman	Kahn
Brooks, Ill.	Crisp	Frothingham	Kearns
Brooks, Pa.	Crowther	Fulmer	Keller
Brown, Tenn.	Cullen	Gallivan	Kelley, Mich.
Browne, Wis.	Dale	Gensman	Kennedy
Burke	Davis, Minn.	Goodykoontz	Kiess
Campbell, Kans.	Deal	Gorman	Kindred
Cannon	Dominick	Gould	Kirkpatrick
Cantrill	Drane	Green, Iowa	Kitchin
Carew	Drewry	Griffin	Kleczka
Chandler, Okla.	Dunbar	Hammer	Knight
Kunz	Ogden	Rosenbloom	Taylor, Colo.
Layton	Olpp	Rossdale	Taylor, N. J.
Lee, N. Y.	Osborne	Ryan	Taylor, Tenn.
Lineberger	Overstreet	Sabath	Ten Eyck
Linthicum	Paige	Sanders, N. Y.	Thompson
Little	Park, Ga.	Schall	Tillman
Luce	Parker, N. J.	Scott, Mich.	Tinkham
Lyon	Parker, N. Y.	Sears	Tucker
McDuffie	Patterson, Mo.	Shaw	Underhill
McLaughlin, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Shreve	Vaile
McSwain	Paul	Siegel	Vare
Maloney	Perlman	Slemp	Voigt
Mead	Rainey, Ala.	Smith, Mich.	Volk
Michaelson	Rainey, Ill.	Snyder	Volstead
Mills	Ramseyer	Sproul	Walters
Mondell	Ransley	Stafford	Ward, N. Y.
Montague	Rayburn	Stedman	Weaver
Moore, Ill.	Reber	Steenerson	Wheeler
Moore, Ohio	Reece	Stiness	Williams, Tex.
Mott	Reed, N. Y.	Stoll	Wise
Mudd	Riddick	Sullivan	Woodyard
Nelson, Me.	Riordan	Swing	Wurzbach
O'Brien	Robertson	Tague	Yates
O'Connor	Rodenberg	Taylor, Ark.	Zihlman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Collins (for) with Mr. Cullen (against).

Mr. Copley (for) with Mr. Cooper of Ohio (against).

Mr. Brand (for) with Mr. Thompson (against).

Mr. Johnson of Mississippi (for) with Mr. Moore of Ohio (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Burke with Mr. Almon.

Mr. Davis of Minnesota with Mr. Linthicum.

Mr. Osborne with Mr. Crisp.

Mr. Fordney with Mr. Rainey of Illinois.

Mr. Mondell with Mr. Carew.

Mr. Wurzbach with Mr. Montague.

Mr. Brooks of Illinois with Mr. Humphreys of Mississippi.

Mr. Dunn with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.

Mr. Patterson of New Jersey with Mr. Kindred.

Miss Robertson with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Snyder with Mr. Lyon.

Mr. Kahn with Mr. McDuffie.

Mr. Johnson of South Dakota with Mr. Stedman.

Mr. Edmonds with Mr. Clark of Florida.

Mr. Hutchinson with Mr. O'Brien.

Mr. Olpp with Mr. Dominick.

Mr. Reed of New York with Mr. Riordan.

Mr. Frothingham with Mr. Kitchin.

Mr. Ramseyer with Mr. Williams of Texas.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Shreve with Mr. Rayburn.

Mr. James with Mr. Deal.

Mr. Browne of Wisconsin with Mr. Briggs.

Mr. Kiess with Mr. McSwain.

Mr. Bond with Mr. Drane.

Mr. Paige with Mr. Sabath.

Mr. Keller with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Swing with Mr. Tague.

Mr. Reece with Mr. Cockran.

Mr. Lee of New York with Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Michaelson with Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. Taylor of New Jersey with Mr. Cantrill.

Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Mead.

Mr. Britten with Mr. Drewry.

Mr. Codd with Mr. Gallivan.

Mr. Mudd with Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Smith of Michigan with Mr. Jacoway.

Mr. Vare with Mr. Tillman.

Mr. Patterson of Missouri with Mr. Wise.

Mr. Brennan with Mr. Hummer.

Mr. Cole of Ohio with Mr. Sears.

Mr. Ransley with Mr. Fullmer.

Mr. Moore of Illinois with Mr. Connally of Texas.

Mr. Chandler of Oklahoma with Mr. Overstreet.

Mr. Voigt with Mr. Stoll.

Mr. Underhill with Mr. Park of Georgia.

Mr. Lineberger with Mr. Taylor of Arkansas.

Mr. Echols with Mr. Rainey of Alabama.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FULLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], has a live pair on this conference report. He requested me to say that if he had been present he would have voted for the conference report, but he is unavoidably kept away.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRUCKS AND GOOD ROADS.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute in order to make an announcement that I think will be of interest to the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, to those who are interested in good roads, and I think that includes all of us, I desire to announce that to-morrow morning at 9.30 o'clock, on the Connecticut Avenue Bridge and at the other side of it, there will be an exhibition of a caterpillar tractor which I believe will be of genuine interest. It is something that has grown from the tank development of the war, which it is believed will go a long way toward solving the problem of using the truck on the highway without utter destruction of the road. It is to be exhibited to-morrow morning before the Army and Navy representatives, because, if successful, it will be of very great importance in time of war. I believe that every Member of the House will be interested in the demonstration, owing to the great interest it holds for the important subject of good roads as well as for the national defense. I hope that there may be a very large attendance of Members at the demonstration.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. When the committee rose last evening a point of order of no quorum had been made. Just prior to that the question of ordering tellers had been taken and tellers were refused. The taking of tellers disclosed the fact that there was no quorum present, and thereupon I made the point of order of no quorum. Have I now the right to renew the request for tellers?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already taken under consideration the situation in which the committee finds itself, due to the inquiry of the gentleman from Washington. In the interest of orderly procedure and applying the rule as the Chair interprets it, the Chair thinks that the committee should now revert to the point in its procedure where the voting commenced on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington and that the several votes taken on the amendment be considered void. The Chair feels that when a vote is taken to which objection is made, due to the absence of a quorum, the matter rests in the same state, so far as voting is concerned, in which it was in before the vote was taken. Should the committee rise when the point of no quorum is made, action must be resumed at this point when the bill is again considered. The Chair fortifies his position by a decision of Chairman TILSON on March 16, 1920, and by one of his own on December 5, 1919. The Chair therefore holds that the question now before the committee is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 4, line 14, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,500."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as the amendment standing by itself means nothing, that I may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. From the opinion just rendered it might seem to follow that by declaring void the vote taken yesterday the amendment would now be open for further debate and that the parliamentary situation would be the same as if no vote had actually been registered. While the Chair holds that the cancellation of the vote renders void the disposition of the amendment under that vote, he can not concede that this cancellation erases the fact that voting had commenced. A vote had been taken, and this would indicate to the Chair that debate had been exhausted; otherwise further discussion would have been engaged in and the vote would not have been taken when it was. In the opinion of the Chair the purpose of the rule by which votes are avoided when objected to because of the absence of a quorum is to protect the committee against action by a minority; it is to protect the right of every Member to have propositions passed upon in the presence of a quorum. In the opinion of the Chair when that protection has been afforded no further rights arise under the rule. The rule applies only to the reconsideration of the vote and does not apply to the reconsideration of the time for debate. If further discussion is to be permitted is it not competent to ask why additional time should accrue because of the absence of a quorum, when the presence of a quorum would have disposed of the amendment without further debate? Why should the absence of a quorum give advantages and permit additional time which the presence of a quorum would have denied? The Chair finds a recent ruling which bears out his contention. It was rendered by Chairman Walsh on January 25, 1921, when the sundry civil bill was under consideration. On the previous day the question was taken and the result announced on a pending amendment. A division was had and the result of this vote was announced. Then a point of no quorum was made and sustained, whereupon the committee rose. The debate on the amendment had not been closed by motion or agreement. On the following day when the amendment was again reported a motion to strike out the last two words was made. In denying the right of further debate the Chair said: "The Chair will state that debate upon this amendment is exhausted. The question had been put and the point of no quorum was raised and the committee rose." The present Chairman feels that that ruling was correct and will rule in this instance that the debate has been exhausted and can proceed only by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOWELL. But a Member has the right to the floor until the vote has actually been concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that the debate has been exhausted and that further time to discuss it can only be had by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I assume that I am entitled to close debate upon the item. If the gentleman from Washington will agree that I may have three minutes to close debate, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to debate the amendment for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. If the vote is set aside by the Chair on his ruling, and it is reopened again for another vote, then the position of the Chair would be incorrect, because no vote has been taken at all, and the gentleman from Washington, the question being reopened, is now entitled to five minutes, the same as if no action had been taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realized that this was a matter that might come up this morning. The parliamentarian and the Chair have been endeavoring to ascertain what the situation would be, and from what has been done in the past the Chair has concluded that the best solution and the most orderly procedure will be to consider that the time for debate upon the amendment has terminated and that further debate upon it can be had only by unanimous consent. If that ruling be incorrect and not in accordance with the views of the committee, the Chair would be very glad to have the committee determine the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I submit the point of order that if we had had no vote yesterday evening, it would have been in order on this amendment pending for any member of the committee to move to strike out the last word, which would give him five minutes' debate. The Chair having held correctly, following all of the precedents, that there was no vote yesterday evening, that that vote did not come to a conclusion, then the matter would stand in exactly the same position as if there had been no vote attempted. Therefore, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] would be in order if he should move to strike out the last word, which would give him five minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, no such case is presented to the House. The gentleman from Washington has asked unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. How

can a point of order lie as to what the gentleman might do if he were to move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. As five minutes' time is not insisted upon by the gentleman from Washington, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the amendment provides that on page 4, line 14, we strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert "$3,500," so that it will read: "Offices of editorial and distribution work. Assistant in charge of editorial office, $3,500." I stated yesterday that the reason for placing it here was to place an assistant, paid from a lump-sum appropriation, in the position of chief, to all intents and purposes as assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture. In other departments the office is called assistant to Secretary with power to sign the name of the Secretary, thus getting around the organic act which creates the offices in the department. This is apparently to pay as assistant to somebody, to the Secretary with an office in the office of the Secretary of Agriculture in charge of editorial offices. Then you see they do not pay the assistant in charge of distribution as high a salary. The assistant in charge of the editorial office is paid more than the assistant in charge of the office of distribution. Then you get down here to editors, and they are out of all proportion to these chiefs. To all intents and purposes it is an attempt on an appropriation bill to create some office equivalent to that of Assistant Secretary. Now I have offered an amendment to reduce the pay of the assistant in charge of the editorial office from $5,000 as proposed here to $3,500, and if the motion prevails I shall go through this list of editorial assistants, who are head editors, and reduce them in proportion in the interest of economy and the management of that office. I yield back any time that may remain.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, after we have finished this item I shall undertake to make a statement as to just what is done under this paragraph, but in answer to what the gentleman from Washington says I would like to state that this place is an assistant in charge of the whole distribution activities of the department. This includes the editorial office under which all of the editorial work in connection with bulletins and reports of all sorts passes. It embraces the office in which all the mimeograph work is done. It includes the publications work of the department——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman state—I have not heard—how much this officer is now receiving?

Mr. ANDERSON. He is now receiving $5,000 on a lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the service be practically the same or greater than it was before?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say it will be practically the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Just another $5,000 man coming up in his place?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A $3,500 man coming up in his place.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say another thing. The chief in charge of this office is, from the standpoint of the Members of the House and Senate particularly who deal with the department in connection with farmers' bulletins and who have daily requests for all sorts of information for which they have to ask the Department of Agriculture, an exceedingly important one. I have no predilection for $5,000, but I think the importance of this place, both from the standpoint of the department and public and the Members of this House, justifies the salary which it is proposed to pay him. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us come down to the point. I ask the question if it is not understood that the Secretary of Agriculture proposes to bring one of his editors from one of the farm publications to take a $5,000 job in his office?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. If it is true, I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will state that that is the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: On page 4, line 15, after the word "distribution," strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, that is another one of these places being created. This is an assistant in charge of distribution at $3,500. Mind you, these are all assistants. Now, if we care to pay an assistant in charge of the whole office $5,000, I am firmly of the opinion that in the interest of economy we ought to pay the assistant in charge of distribution not more than $3,000, and that is the amendment I offer. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have another amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 4, line 16, after the word at the beginning of the line, strike out "$3,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope the membership will appreciate this amendment. It is an amendment to increase a salary. Inasmuch as an assistant is to get $5,000, the proposition is to pay the chief editor $3,500, instead of $3,000, as provided for in the bill. I ask for a vote on that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This is an existing place under the statutory roll of the division of publications and now carries the salary of $3,000 and I know of no reason why it should be increased. Now I would like to make a statement in reference to this particular paragraph. It would rather seem from the attitude of gentlemen yesterday and this morning that they are burdened with the idea that the Department of Agriculture is conniving with the Committee on Appropriations in a raid upon the Treasury by juggling offices and bureaus of the department and the appropriations for them.

I want to assure the gentleman that nothing of the kind is contemplated. I can appreciate the fact that, with the readjustments that are made in this appropriation bill gentlemen might very well entertain that opinion. If I had had the opportunity I should have made an attempt to explain these readjustments, along with the others, in an effort to make it perfectly clear just what is being done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me first finish the statement.

The division of publications in the last Agricultural appropriation bill had an appropriation of $299,900. In this paragraph we are dropping 12 places, aggregating $9,000, representing an actual reduction in the force of the Department of Agriculture doing this work of $9,000. Previously the division of publications included the office of exhibits and the office of motion pictures.

Those two activities are being taken out of the Division of Publications and put under what was formerly the States Relations Service, but now the Extension Service. That makes a further reduction in the appropriation of $31,160. In addition, positions having salaries of $5,000 are transferred from this item to a lump sum. There are brought into the appropriation four places, if my recollection is correct, amounting in the salaries that they cover to $8,930. Altogether, these readjustments of the appropriations result in a total appropriation for the statutory roll of what was formerly the Division of Publications, now the Office of Editorial and Distribution Work, of $263,270, as compared with $299,900 last year. I want to make it perfectly clear, however, that of that reduction only $9,000 represents a real reduction in the force, and that similar reductions are made in other offices and bureaus in the readjustments which amount to something like $16,000, as I now recall.

Now I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will take the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the Members present that, of course, it is quite apparent that the various editing and printing amendments will not get anywhere, because most of the Members of the House are out at lunch or out on business, and those who are here are those who expect to support the committee. However, there is no harm in looking into what is apparently a consolidation of editorial and press agency service, which is to be under the eyes of the Secretary of Agriculture, and that apparently involves a saving, according to the chairman—and I do not dispute his claim, because I think he sees it that way—of about $8,000 or $9,000.

The minor inquiry I have been able to make—and I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture; neither am I a member of any one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations—leads me to believe that the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this bill is being imposed upon. They do not get the facts, apparently. I am afraid the reason is that those who have the facts are afraid to tell them. I think if you search a little you will find that there has already been added one editor down there at $4,000, and there is no place for his salary to come from unless it is the lump sum. They say they have a $5,000 editor. I think that probably the $5,000 editor and the $4,000 editor are one and the same, and that the real pay is $4,000 and not $5,000. There is a man down there in charge of the press service. What becomes of that job? This Department of Agriculture has a gigantic press service. It writes letters to Congressmen and gives out mimeograph copies before the Member gets the original. This is extraordinary if the bureau sees fit to attack some proposition of the Congressman.

Read some of these reports. Start with the report of the Secretary himself. He states what he has saved in printing. Good. The House of Representatives laid a foundation for him when it ordered publications consolidated and combined. I am glad he is bragging about it a little. I am also glad that the money has been saved.

In spite of that saving the printed agricultural information, numbered by pieces, has greatly increased—increased, I think, by 35 per cent. And here we have a consolidation of editorial activities put right up in the front, and it will not be more than a couple of years before those who are now doing it or helping to do it will be wondering how they got that powerful bureau established, and in the speeches yet to come there will be many a good knock at bureaucracy.

But in spite of the office of editorial and distribution work—and mind you this is a new bureau—we are proposing in this bill a real saving. Five positions in this bureau have been dropped—one messenger or laborer, at $840; one messenger boy, at $720; one messenger or laborer, at $720; and two charwomen, at $240 each, have been dropped. These positions have been dropped in accordance with the Secretary's desire to decrease the personnel. Five laborers, including two charwomen, at $240, are cut off the pay roll in order that they may have a $5,000 assistant over another assistant, who is to tell these editors how to grind out something for the farmer and the people. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] in his effort to effect this economy. The membership of the House may not know it, but I have found out that the gentleman from Washington, as chairman of the Committee on Printing, has effected several very important reforms that have saved much money to the Treasury of the United States. But we have outvoted him here on this $5,000 position for a bureau chief. On his amendment, the last vote that we took yesterday afternoon, the count stood 16 for and 16 against, 32 Members voting in a membership of 435 on a question of economy.

I know that the idea of a $5,000 salary does not mean anything to the membership. We hear so much of bigger salaries that we have grown careless of what the amount really means. But I want to tell you that back at home among our people a $5,000 salary is a pretty good salary.

We pass upon various high salaries. The people of the States pass upon the salaries that they shall pay their governors. Let me show you what the governors of the States are drawing. The Governor of Alabama draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Arkansas draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Colorado draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Connecticut draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Delaware draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Georgia draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Idaho draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Iowa draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Kansas draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Maine draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Maryland draws $4,500 a year. The Governor of Michigan draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Mississippi draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Missouri draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of New Hampshire draws $3,000 a year. The Governor of New Mexico draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of North Carolina draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of North Dakota draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Oklahoma draws $4,500 a year. The Governor of Oregon draws $5,000 a year.

Mr. McARTHUR. The Governor of Oregon draws $7,500 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is a very recent increase. You want to get the Congressional Directory corrected. I am now reading from page 179 of the issue of July, 1922.

Mr. McARTHUR. That is the fault of the directory, and not my fault.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the increase in Oregon has just been granted. The Governor of South Carolina draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of South Dakota draws $3,000 a year. The Governor of Tennessee draws $4,000 a year. The Governor of Texas draws $4,000 a year. The Governor of Vermont draws $3,000 a year. The Governor of Virginia draws $5,000 a year. The Governor of Wisconsin draws $5,000 a year. And the Governor of Wyoming draws $4,000 a year.

Mr. McARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. So you see, $5,000 a year salary to the people back home in a whole lot of these States seems to be adequate for as important a personage as the governor of the State. But when the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] gets up here and shows that $3,500 is as much as a bureau chief in a certain capacity ought to draw and seeks to cut down this increase, which the hearings show is an increase, and to cut it down from $5,000 a year to $3,500, he loses by 1 vote. The vote was 16 for his amendment and 16 against it, and therefore his amendment loses, and his effort to economize and save the people's money is lost. Now I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. McARTHUR. I wanted to know if the figures the gentleman read had any bearing upon the historical remark of the Governor of North Carolina to the Governor of South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I know that is uppermost in the minds of most Members absent and present just now during the Yuletide, when one paper says it is coming in and other papers say the President is keeping it out. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the question here is on the salary of an assistant in charge of the editorial office in the office of editorial and distribution work in the Department of Agriculture.

The committee has reported an appropriation of $5,000. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington provided for a cut of that to $3,500. After listening to this debate I feel that whoever has charge of that important work in the department is entitled to a salary of $5,000, and I am against the amendment.

Now, just in order that the record may be clear, during the last week——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman wait a moment while we clear the record?

Mr. HILL. I have only five minutes. I understand from the chairman of the committee that the work of this editorial department is entirely in editing Government publications.

It is not a propaganda bureau and does not come under the heading of the questions that I raised about an appropriation of $150,000 last week for a certain unit in the Treasury Department, the prohibition enforcement unit.

This office edits the proper publications of the Government for the farmers of America, and is not a unit for the praise of any particular theory of government or any particular officers, or against any class of Members of Congress. In other words, it is not a "press bureau" in the sense of the objections made in this House on December 8 and 9. Therefore, I think this House should stand by the committee and vote for proper coordination in the Department of Agriculture. I know the value of this work to the people of Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a short editorial from the Chicago Tribune of December 9 on "The Government Press Bureau," which bears on this matter and on the fight I made last week for the principles therein stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to be allowed to insert as a part of his remarks the editorial in question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The editorial is as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT PRESS BUREAU.

Representative HILL of Maryland has asked Congress to eliminate from the appropriation for the enforcement of prohibition $150,000 included in the bill for the maintenance of a press bureau. We should like to know what the prohibition press agents do. It is astonishing to discover, out here where Government methods are not all revealed, that there are press agents hired by the Government to propagandize in favor of one of its policies.

There are laws of necessity and laws of policy. It is necessary to have laws protecting life and property or there would be no society. Laws of policy represent opinions. One government or one party has one line of policy dealing with railroads, agriculture, commerce, industry, shipping, etc. Another has another line. Out of these policies we get laws. The laws remain in political controversy and they are changed as parties and governments and opinions change.

A great many people in the United States think the prohibition enforcement act is a wise, just, and necessary law. A great many others think it is unfair, unjust, and unwise. The question is in politics. It is presented at elections. Congressmen are elected on the issue. If Congressmen who pass a prohibition law then make an appropriation for a press bureau to support their policy, they use public money to advance a cause supported by part of the people.

If government may use public money to support one policy politically, it may use public money to support any policy politically. The Esch-Cummins Railroad Act is a law, but it is in dispute. It is attacked. Should the Government hire press agents, paying them with public funds, to defend the railroad act?

Should a party in power and constituting the Government be permitted to make appropriations from the Public Treasury to use against the other party in political argument? We know that a government does campaign on public money and that can not be avoided. Federal patronage forms a machine, but it is a more serious matter to permit the establishment of press bureaus for the support of party policies.

People nearly always make exceptions where their interests and beliefs are deeply involved. People who believe that prohibition is a godsend to the United States will not care what governmental transgressions are permitted in its enforcement. That is unwise.

The Tribune believes that Congress should pass an act prohibiting the manufacture and sale of the pistol by private firms. Just as the prohibitionists think an alcoholic beverage is deadly, the Tribune thinks a pistol in the pocket of an irresponsible, enraged, or brutal person is deadly. But the Tribune would not consent that the Government should make an appropriation to propagandize for such a law. The transgression against principles of democratic freedom is too great and too dangerous.

Americans are forgetting an old phrase which their forebears used a great deal: Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom. Our forebears had vivid personalities in their minds. There was danger that some nation in arms or some man on horseback would take away the liberties of a democracy.

In our generation we do not see that groups, animated by high purposes, are attacking the foundations of liberty to gain ends which they regard, and which may be, good. It is a sacrifice of principle to expediency and it never worked well in the long run.

There is a highly competent organization supporting prohibition as a Government policy. There is another organization opposed to it. Good citizens of the United States are in both organizations. They contribute to the Treasury of the United States. Shall the money of one set of citizens be used against them?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope the gentleman will not press that. I have two or three amendments I wish to offer, in order to make a feeble effort to rearrange and coordinate these salaries. I do not desire to use unnecessarily the time of the House or the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will withdraw the motion if the gentleman has an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 4, line 16, after the words "executive assistant," strike out "$3,000" and insert "$2,250."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this creates the position of the executive assistant. There is no reason why he should have $3,000. He seems to be an assistant to an assistant who is an assistant to an assistant. Are we drawing it pretty fine and getting it pretty thin? Now, for fear that some Members may think my distinguished friend from Maryland [Mr. HILL] is firm in his faith that there is no propaganda work going on in these offices, let me call his attention to the fact that during the past year the press service has been moved up into this office, and the press service is the propaganda office by which this department undertakes to reach the daily press, and also the service by which the dope is written that makes up three-fourths of the reading matter of the little dollar-a-year farm publications. The Government writes that stuff.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have only five minutes. There are other activities that have been already moved up. Press-agent work is the thing. Sell the idea. What is the law? Oh, no matter. I venture the assertion right now that the assistant in charge of the editorial office will do as much lecturing out in the States as he will do actual, literal assistance in the performance of editorial work in the course of one year's time.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield the floor.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, there are four reasons why I rise in opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. The first is that it is offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a good reason.

Mr. LONDON. Reason No. 2 is that it is supported by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. [Laughter.] The third is that I have not said anything on the floor for a week or 10 days. The fourth reason is that the gentleman from Washington having been formerly an editor shows a profound contempt for the profession [laughter and applause], a profession which, in my judgment, is very much underpaid.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman from New York misses the whole point. I have a great admiration for editors, but I do not want the editors overridden with assistants put over them with better pay.

Mr. LONDON. When the gentleman from Washington refers to the valuable information furnished by the Agricultural Department as "stuff" and "dope," it does not appeal to me at all. I do not know of any department in the country that furnishes more valuable information than does the Department of Agriculture. I do not know of any branch of the service that is more closely connected with the progress of agriculture than is the Agricultural Department. I do not know why the gentleman from Washington has chosen this particular branch of the service for his assault. On yesterday before he spoke there were 16 votes in favor of his amendment, and to-day after he had spoken there was nobody to support it except himself and the gentleman from Texas. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman think that this is a field where we can better spend the money than in sending out little packages of seed?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, when you take away the seeds you take away nine-tenths of the statesmanship of many Members. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were 5 ayes and 34 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 16 and 17, after the words "assistant editors" strike out "1, $2,250, 2 at $2,000 each, 1, $1,800;" and insert in lieu thereof "1 at $2,000 and 3 at $1,800 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were 4 ayes and 25 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 18, after the word "mailing" strike out the figures $2,400 and insert $2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were 7 ayes and 24 noes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote because no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count.

[After counting.] Eighty-one Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Fordney	Lineberger	Rosenbloom
Ansorge	Foster	Linthicum	Rossdale
Aswell	Frear	Little	Rucker
Bell	Free	Logan	Ryan
Benham	Freeman	Longworth	Sabath
Bird	Frothingham	Luce	Sanders, Ind.
Blakeney	Funk	Luhring	Sanders, N. Y.
Boies	Gallivan	Lyon	Schall
Bond	Gensman	McClintic	Scott, Mich.
Bowers	Glynn	McCormick	Scott, Tenn.
Brand	Goodykoontz	McDuffie	Sears
Brennan	Gorman	McFadden	Shaw
Britten	Gould	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shreve
Brooks, Ill.	Graham, Pa.	McSwain	Siegel
Brooks, Pa.	Green, Iowa	MacGregor	Smith, Mich.
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Maloney	Snell
Burke	Hammer	Mead	Snyder
Burroughs	Hayden	Michaelson	Sproul
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Mills	Stafford
Cantrill	Henry	Montague	Stedman
Carew	Herrick	Moore, Ill.	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Stiness
Clark, Fla.	Himes	Mott	Stoll
Classon	Hogan	Mudd	Sullivan
Clouse	Hukriede	Nelson, Me.	Tague
Cockran	Humphreys, Miss.	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.
Codd	Husted	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Cole, Ohio	Hutchinson	O'Connor	Taylor, N. J.
Collins	Jacoway	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Connally, Tex.	James	Osborne	Ten Eyck
Connolly, Pa.	Jefferis, Nebr.	Overstreet	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Jeffers, Ala.	Paige	Tillman
Copley	Johnson, Miss.	Park, Ga.	Tinkham
Coughlin	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Crowther	Jones, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Tucker
Cullen	Kahn	Patterson, Mo.	Underhill
Davis, Minn.	Kearns	Patterson, N. J.	Vaile
Deal	Keller	Paul	Vare
Dominick	Kelley, Mich.	Perlman	Vestal
Drane	Kendall	Pringey	Voigt
Drewry	Kennedy	Purnell	Volk
Dunbar	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Volstead
Dunn	Kindred	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Dyer	Kirkpatrick	Ramseyer	Weaver
Echols	Kitchin	Ransley	Wheeler
Edmonds	Kleczka	Reber	Williams, Tex.
Ellis	Knight	Reece	Wise
Fairchild	Kuns	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Fairfield	Lampert	Riddick	Wurzbach
Faust	Larson, Minn.	Riordan	Yates
Fess	Layton	Robertson	Zihlman
Fish	Lee, N. Y.	Rogers	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called, when 223 Members had answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote comes now upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 4, line 18, after the word "photographer," strike out "$2,100" and insert "$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 4, lines 20 and 21, after the word "assistants," strike out "two at $2,500 each, three at $2,000," and insert "five at $2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were—ayes 8, noes 58.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For labor-saving machinery and supplies, envelopes, stationery and materials, office furniture and fixtures, photographic equipment and materials, artists' tools and supplies, telephone and telegraph service, freight and express charges; purchase and maintenance of motor trucks; purchase and maintenance of bicycles; purchase of manuscripts; traveling expenses; electrotypes, illustrations, and other expenses not otherwise provided for, and including not to exceed $1,300 for extra labor and emergency employments in the District of Columbia, $47,850.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the matter beginning at the top of page 5, ending on line 10 with the total, has not been read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk began reading at line 11 on page 5.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the matter to which the gentleman from Washington refers was read yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, then I ask unanimous consent to return to the former paragraph in order to offer an amendment in the nature of a restriction upon the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to return to the former paragraph to offer an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let us hear what the amendment is?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 10, after the figures "$263,670," insert: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in advocacy of or in opposition to legislation or bills before the Congress of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, of course, as the appropriation is for the payment of salaries, the amendment would be without any effect whatever. If the gentleman wants to offer it I have no objection to returning to the paragraph for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 5, line 10, after the figures "$263,670," insert: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in advocacy of or in opposition to legislation or bills before the Congress of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were—ayes 31, noes 30.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Washington and Mr. ANDERSON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 35, noes 50.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was granted leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I now ask unanimous consent that certain documents I desire to insert be printed in 8-point type.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that certain documents in an extension of his remarks be printed in 8-point type. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not object, but that is a matter to be taken up in the House, as I understand it.

Mr. BARBOUR. I took the matter up with the Speaker, and he said it would be appropriate to make the request in the committee, as it is a matter concerning the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have now an amendment to offer to the last paragraph on page 5, line 21, after the word "expenses," to strike out the words "electrotypes, illustrations."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Page 5, line 21, strike out the words "electrotypes, illustrations."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do this for the reason that in my opinion this is legislation on an appropriation bill. Other methods are provided for this work.

I had not made the point of order; I am letting the House vote whether they want it in there or out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRINTING AND BINDING.

For all printing and binding for the Department of Agriculture, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services, located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, $760,000, including the Annual Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, as required by the act approved January 12, 1895, and in pursuance of the joint resolution numbered 13, approved March 30, 1906, and also including not to exceed $250,000

for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to such printing and binding as now is or may hereafter be, specially authorized by law or by the regulations or decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing, Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I make the point of order against the proviso beginning on line 14:

Provided, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to such printing and binding as now is, or may hereafter be, especially authorized by law or by the regulations or decisions of the Joint Committee on Printing, Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and a further point of order that the Joint Committee on Printing has no appropriating power. Still a further point of order is that it undertakes to direct the expenditure of money that has not been appropriated anywhere.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the further point of order that it changes existing law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, without conceding the point of order at all, I have no objection to the proviso going out. I ask unanimous consent that the proviso may go out; that it may be considered as disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the proviso be considered as disagreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman just what it means.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman does not know what it means, why does he want to strike it out?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think I know, but I would like to find out what was in the mind of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when it undertook such a proposal as this, whatever it means.

Mr. ANDERSON. My understanding of the proviso is that it was intended to establish the paragraph on such a basis that in the event of a direction by Congress or a resolution passed by Congress for the printing of documents by the Department of Agriculture the cost of printing the documents would be covered by a special appropriation and not taken out of the fund carried in this item. It is quite possible the language as it now stands is broader than that, and consequently I have no objection to its going out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw any objection I have and join with the chairman in trying to strike it out of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the proviso on page 6 be stricken from the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. In order that the RECORD be clear, I suggest that the gentleman from Washington withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say the proviso having been stricken out, there is nothing remaining on which to make the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES—OFFICE OF EXPERIMENT STATIONS.

To carry into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," the sums apportioned to the several States, to be paid quarterly in advance, $720,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I submit that while the point of order is reserved it is not in order to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair agrees with the gentleman. The gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. I make the point of order that the change of title from States Relations Service to that of office of experiment stations in this bill is not authorized by law. I call attention of the gentleman to the decision of the Chair found in Hinds' 4, paragraph 3651.

It is the attempted establishment of a new bureau in an appropriation bill without any previous authority of law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is that on the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. On the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr Chairman, I do not think the decision cited by the gentleman from Iowa is in point in respect to this particular appropriation, particularly in view of the view expressed by the Chair yesterday in regard to the general powers of the Secretary of Agriculture under the organic act. The act of March 2, 1887, provides for the establishment of agricultural experimental stations and provides for Federal aid for those stations in the sum of, I think, $15,000 per State. Obviously it is necessary to set up some agency in the Department of Agriculture to administer this act. Now, it does not make any difference whether it is called "experimental stations" or whether it is called nothing at all. The words "office of experiment stations" as used here, as I stated yesterday, creates nothing. It is simply a convenient title to designate the organization in the Department of Agriculture and established by force of the order of the Secretary to administer this act, and I submit that the use of this title in the bill does not establish the office of experiment stations in the legal sense at all. The situation would be exactly the same as if the title went out altogether. The Secretary could still have in the department the office of experiment stations.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands this work is now going on?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is going on in pursuance of the law passed by Congress 20 or more years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what title was the work carried on in the last bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. This work was formerly under the States Relations Service and carried on as part of that service, which, by the way, has no more legal status than this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there was no legislation creating the other title than creating this title?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. There are no more positions paid under this title than are now paid for.

Mr. HAUGEN. May I call the Chair's attention to a more recent ruling, a ruling of the present occupant of the Chair on January 22, 1921. The proposition then before the House was practically in the same form as this. The paragraph then under consideration was "Bureau of Farm Management and Farm Economics, Chief of Bureau, $5,000," and so forth. I made the point of order with reference to the use of the word "Bureau." The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] then argued as he argues to-day. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the words are subject to a point of order. The whole question is whether by using the word "Bureau" in the place of the word "office" we thereby create something that does not now exist. The use of the word "Bureau" in lieu of the word "Office" does not create anything. It is simply a distinctive title under which we are making these appropriations.

The Chair sustained the point of order. That is exactly what is here undertaken to be done—to create something that does not exist without authority to create it. It is a change of title, and it has universally been held to be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that, in the light of the decision of the Chair rendered yesterday, that a change of title does not change an activity or create a new bureau, he should not sustain the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am calling the attention of the Chair to the ruling made a year ago. I simply call the attention of the House and the country to what we are drifting into; that we are now surrendering our power to legislate, and that this Bureau of Budget is to legislate instead of Congress. If that is the purpose of Congress, then the present ruling is in accord with that idea. I am not questioning the decision of the Chair, but that will be the result. It certainly was not contemplated at the time the Budget Bureau was created that Congress would surrender its power, its prerogative to determine and make these appropriations, that the Budget should also have the power to legislate. That was not contemplated. Congress should reserve to itself the exclusive right to legislate and should proceed to legislate on matters that affect the Government's policy. If the Budget Bureau is to incorporate legislation in appropriation bills, it will thus be able to direct legislation. I believe in Congress asserting its rights and doing its duty as prescribed in the Constitution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, this is not directly on the point of order. Perhaps I am permitted to say that if this situation is not what it ought to be, no man is in a better position to correct it than my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN]. If he believes that these bureaus ought to be established by law with a definite personnel of officers prescribed by law, I do not. His committee has the power to report out to this House a bill which will establish these bureaus, divisions,

and offices in the Department of Agriculture beyond the power of the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of this House to change it, and if he believes this should be done, he and his committee should act. There is pending to-day before his committee a bill which is designed, in part at least, to do that. It is entirely within the power of the House to establish this situation exactly as it wants to establish it, if it will take the trouble to legislate upon the subject.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I beg pardon for making this statement, but perhaps it may be important in the future that we should know just exactly what the powers of the Chair are with regard to matters of this character.

The objection is made by my colleague [Mr. HAUGEN]—and I sympathize with his point of view—that to change the title, for instance, of a class of appropriations might be considered as making law. But, Mr. Chairman, if we consider the matter for a moment, we will see that we are not legislating upon that proposition. The fact is that this title, "General expenses of the Office of Experiment Stations," is expressly stated to be for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act," and so forth, "to establish agricultural experiment stations."

Now, that constitutes the law. What we may call it in the bill is not law, and never has been and never should be. If, as a matter of fact, these things are what they purport to be—general expenses for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that act—then certainly there is no change in existing law, and that would be necessary in order to justify a point of order against this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the chairman of the committee [Mr. ANDERSON] that these changes must be made from time to time. I presume it is unnecessary for me to say what we all know, that the Secretary of Agriculture, not for the purpose of increasing expenditures—because in this bill he does not, and probably will not in the future—is rearranging, for the purpose of greater efficiency, for the purpose of preventing duplication, some of the work of the department. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call particular attention to this fact, because I believe it to be a fact: If in doing so, and if in accordance with his suggestions and recommendations, the appropriation items are so arranged that they carry such appropriations for the express purpose authorized by the law as stated in the appropriation, then it can not be said that because they may be named differently or arranged differently or placed in different positions there is a change of existing law. I think it is quite important that we should understand this, for the benefit of the furtherance of the purposes and objects we all hope for in the great work of the Committee on Agriculture. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, let me ask my colleague if he has examined the law establishing this States Relations Service?

Mr. TOWNER. No; I have not.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman, I understood, asserted that it has been established by law.

Mr. TOWNER. No; I say this, that if it can be shown that it is not under the provisions of the act referred to——

Mr. HAUGEN. That is a question.

Mr. TOWNER. Of course it is the question. I understood that objection was made because it is called the "office" instead of the "Bureau of States Relations Service."

Mr. HAUGEN. It is proposed now to change it to something else.

Mr. TOWNER. I am going to suggest what I think the test should be. If this appropriation does carry out the provisions, as it states here, of the act to establish experiment stations, then unless there is some change in that law the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am simply calling attention to the rulings made in the past. It seems to be the universal ruling in the past that a change of title is subject to a point of order.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. If you eliminate the words "Bureau of," would that remedy it?

Mr. HAUGEN. The title formerly was "States Relations Service." It is now proposed to change the title to that which appears in the bill. It is clearly a change of title, and the rulings in the past have always been that a change of title or the creation of a new bureau was subject to a point of order. That was the ruling a year ago by the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. Does not this come within the act to establish agricultural experiment stations, and is not that proper?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am speaking of the title, the very first line.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. The title is perfectly in harmony with the wording of the act.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is in harmony, but changed from what it was.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to the system of the Agricultural Department in increasing salaries without authority of law. There are a number of statutory offices provided for in the Department of Agriculture. When the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to increase the salary of some person who holds one of those offices he can not increase the salary of a statutory office, but he transfers the officer or employee to the lump-sum roll, gives him a new title, and increases his salary to any amount he desires out of the lump-sum appropriation, and then next time in his recommendations to Congress he includes that new title with the increased salary and sends it up through the proper channels to the Committee on Appropriations, and thus without authority of law creates a new office and a new salary. I think it is time that Congress stopped that illegal and inexcusable system of increasing salaries and positions. I do not say that the salaries are too large. I do not say that there are too many employees, but I do say that when a change of that kind is necessary it should be made properly by recommendation from the Secretary of Agriculture to Congress, and that the Committee on Agriculture should consider the bill and report it to the House, and it should be considered and acted upon in due course according to the rules of the House. I do not think Congress ought to condone this unjustifiable system of increasing salaries and creating new positions at the whim of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that what I shall say will have a direct bearing on the point of order, but something that has been said seems to justify a word from me.

The bureaus of the Department of Agriculture have from time to time been established by law. It is true that some have grown up, and Congress has permitted the use of the word "bureau" respecting certain parts and divisions of the department, but strictly speaking the bureaus have been authorized by law, each one of them. It has often happened that when by an appropriation or by the direction of Congress the Department of Agriculture has taken up some new line of work, or by reason of shifting of operations in the department employees have been gotten together in a new combination, almost universally I believe when those new divisions have been organized they have been called "offices." They have not been given the dignified term of "bureau." It has often happened that the Department of Agriculture in submitting its estimates to the committee has suggested the change of the word "office" to "bureau," recognizing that it must have the authority or the recommendation of the committee and the authority of Congress to make the change. In my judgment when work is carried on in the department under the head of an office and an effort is made and a desire is expressed to call that division of work a bureau there must be authority of Congress for the change of name, and the change appearing in an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order. If the matter we are speaking about is of the nature of the matters of which I have been speaking, then the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] ought to be sustained. I did not notice it in its inception, so, as I say, I do not know that my remarks apply to the point of order that is pending; but if it has developed that it is in the line of the matters I have spoken of, in my judgment the point of order is good.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, the gentleman from Minnesota said that a bill is now before the Committee on Agriculture and that if desired the matter might be considered and determined by that committee. A bill was before the committee, and the committee reported the bill; so the committee has disposed of it. That bill granted as much authority as was thought should be given to the Appropriations Committee.

Now, another word. It has been suggested that this does not increase expenditures. It evidently does not tend to decrease the expenditures. Yesterday I called attention to the statement of Mr. Pugsley that two officers are to be added, one at $5,000, and another at a salary which no one seems to know how much. The gentleman knows that in this bill it is proposed to increase the number of salaries above the maximum limitation.

I call his attention to pages 79 and 80:

During the fiscal year 1924 the maximum salary of any scientific investigator or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriation of the Department of Agriculture shall not

exceed the rate of $6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924 no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500 each, and not more than 5 in excess of $5,500 each.

The proposed legislation gives authority to increase the salaries of 12 scientists to $5,500 and 5 to $6,500 and all other scientists in the department to $5,000. We know that the creation of new bureaus or the creation of new offices have in the past resulted in millions of dollars of additional expenditure. I will read from the gentleman's report, page 2:

A reorganization of two offices, recommended by the President and transmitted to Congress in the Budget, has resulted in the establishment of four separate units. The two offices consolidated and reorganized are the Division of Publications and the States Relations Service, and the four units resulting therefrom are (1) the Offices of Editorial and Distribution Work, (2) the Office of Experiment Stations, (3) the Extension Service, and (4) the Bureau of Home Economics. The first three of these units have been placed under the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, while the fourth, the Bureau of Home Economics, is recommended as a separate bureau. This reorganization makes necessary a readjustment of the statutory rolls and the accompanying necessary changes in the designation of general expense appropriations.

So you add one bureau and one division, which, judging from past experiences, means millions of dollars of additional expenditure. The testimony of Mr. Pugsley, who will be in charge, shows that positions are carried in the bill which mean additional expenditures.

The gentleman has said that $9,000 is dropped.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not doubt that; but the gentleman also knows that it has been the practice not to ask for appropriations for low salaries. The gentleman from Washington has pointed out that the $240 salaries, the $480 salaries, and the $600 salaries are to be dropped. We are told that there is going to be a reduction in expenditure by dropping a number of places now vacant.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the Chair has already overruled the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order now pending and the Chair is ready to rule. Yesterday the Chair ruled on a point of order similar to this, and then gave his reasons for so ruling. Without repeating those reasons on this point of order which is similar to that of yesterday the Chair overrules the point of order. The Chair realizes that in rendering this decision, as in rendering the one yesterday, he is reversing his position of a year ago, but the Chair takes his present position because, after further consideration, he feels that the decision of last year was in error. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, including the erection of buildings, the preparation, illustration, and distribution of reports and bulletins, and all other necessary expenses, $205,000, as follows: Alaska, $70,000; Hawaii, $50,000; Porto Rico, $50,000; Guam, $15,000; and the Virgin Islands of the United States, $20,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell such products as are obtained on the land belonging to the agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, and the amount obtained from the sale thereof shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That of the sum herein appropriated for the experiment station in Hawaii $10,000 may be used in agricultural extension work in Hawaii.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the spelling of the word "elsewhere," in line 20, page 7, will be corrected by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the reason for reducing the appropriation for work in Alaska below what it is during this current year.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only reason that I know of is that the Director of the Budget thought it could be done for $5,000 less.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I presume the gentleman reads, as I do, of the development going on in Alaska and the abundant opportunity for further development, also the limited progress up there because of lack of money in these very lines. If my judgment is correct, it would be unwise to reduce the amount of money available for work in Alaska, where results have been very satisfactory.

Mr. ANDERSON. My own view about it is that we have too many stations in Alaska for the amount of money which we are expending on them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How many have we?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think there are five there now altogether, doing various kinds of work. I would not be sure of that—either three or five.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Territory of Alaska is immense in size and I am not surprised that there are five. But sections are so different from one another. A different character of work is to be done in different sections. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the figures "$70,000" and insert "$75,000" on page 8, line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 13, strike out the figures "$70,000" and insert the figures "$75,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. May I suggest that if that is what the gentleman proposes to do he ought to increase the amount in line 12 to $210,000?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That would seem to follow automatically, I presume, but I can combine the two in one. I further move to strike out in line 12 the figures "$205,000" and insert "$210,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page, 8, line 13, strike out the figures "$70,000" and insert "$75,000"; and, in line 12, strike out "$205,000" and insert "$210,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to discuss the amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXTENSION SERVICE.

Salaries: Assistant in charge of office of motion pictures, $3,000; chief cinematographer, $2,500; chief clerk, $2,000; clerk or chief accountant, $2,400; financial clerk, $2,000; executive clerks—1 $2,000, 1 $1,740; assistant editor, $1,800; clerk or proof reader, $1,800; clerks—5 of class 4, 11 of class 3, 2 at $1,500 each, 27 of class 2, 1 $1,320, 38 of class 1, 12 at $1,100 each; draftsmen or photographers—2 at $1,600 each, 1 $1,500; clerk or artist-draftsman, $1,200; clerk or machine operator, $1,200; clerk or laboratory helper, $1,100; laboratory aids—2 at $960 each, 1 $900; assistant photographer, $960; 2 skilled laborers at $1,000 each; messengers or laborers—3 at $840 each, 1 $720; messenger boys or laborers—4 at $720 each, 1 $600, 1 $480; messenger boys—1 $720, 5 at $600 each, 4 at $480 each; 13 charwomen at $240 each; in all, $176,700.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, every generation—every individual, in fact—should leave the world a little better than he found it.

The protection and utilization of our national forests in a broad and worth-while way gives us this opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of Members to an item in this bill, which we shall reach somewhat later, in regard to the construction of roads in national forests. There was an attempt on the part of the Director of the Budget to cut down the amount authorized by Congress for this very important purpose, and it is my desire at this time to lay before the House some facts in regard to the importance and the extent of our national forests.

EXTENT OF FORESTS.

There are 149 national forests in and belonging to the United States, comprising 156,000,000 of acres—an area equal to that of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. This enormous acreage, as extensive as the 13 States I have named, represents 17 per cent of the area of all the forests and 25 per cent of the value of all the forests of the United States. These forests are estimated to be worth at this time $2,000,000,000. There are about 600,000,000,000 feet of standing timber that is now ripe.

Five and a half billion feet could be cut yearly without depleting the national forests. We are at this time only cutting 800,000,000 feet annually. At that rate it would take 750 years to cut over our national forests. We do not want to overcut, destroy, or injure this great national asset, but the point is we are not utilizing the timber as we should. Timber ripens the same as grain. If it is not harvested, in the course of time it becomes wind-shaken and falls, and we have not only lost the mature timber itself but much smaller growing timber is destroyed. Fallen timber also adds enormously to the fire hazard. So it is wise from every consideration that we utilize this timber as it ripens and conserve other forests that are being overcut and rapidly exterminated.

We are deriving from the sale of timber at the present time about $2,000,000 annually. We could and should cut ten times that amount, or $20,000,000 annually, without in any way depleting the supply.

FOREST FIRES.

The future of our forests depends on their protection from fires especially. We are having at this time about 6,000 fires annually in the national forests. Forty per cent are due to

lightning, and fires from lightning usually occur in remote places like the higher mountain tops. We are spending in addition to the regular amount provided for United States rangers and guards as much as $750,000 annually for emergency fire-fighters. A single fire in a great forest, such as I have seen in the Cascades, may destroy timber to the value of very much more than the cost of a road system in the forests which would have given protection. A fire not only destroys the mature timber but it sweeps out all of the young timber and leaves only a mountain waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes, briefly.

Mr. ARENTZ. It is the gentleman's idea that there should be timber cruisers going throughout the entire timber sections of the United States owned by the Government, and if there is ripe and mature timber, cut it?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; if we have the roads through which the logs can be marketed.

Mr. ARENTZ. Is money being spent for this purpose or for seeding purposes?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; for both purposes. Of course, the timber is cut under the direction of the Forest Service and only mature trees are cut.

Mr. ARENTZ. The roads could be completed into the forest and serve both purposes?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Certainly. At this time if a fire breaks out in some of our vast forests it is five days from the time you see the smoke till you reach the fire on foot and three days on horseback. Successful fire fighting necessitates the prompt arrival of the fire department. Why expend enormous sums annually for fire fighters and then provide neither roads nor trails by means of which they can reach the fire?

The poet has graphically told us what we plant when we plant a tree—the same might be said of the protection of our trees:

PLANTING A TREE.

What does he plant who plants a tree?
A scion full of potency;
He plants his faith, a prophecy
Of bloom, and fruitfulness to be;
He plants a shade where robins sing,
Where orioles their nestlings swing;
A burning bush, a miracle!
Who plants a tree, he doeth well!

What does he plant who plants a tree?
He makes a strong mast for the sea;
He makes the earth productive, fair;
He helps the vines climb high in air,
And from their censers shed perfume
To sweeten night, and bless high noon.
Against the vandals who despoil
He sets his protest in the soil.

What does he plant who plants a tree?
An emblem of the men to be;
Who lightly touch terrestrial clay,
But far above the earth, away
From sordid things and base,
Incarnate ideals for their race,
Who plants a tree, he doeth well,
Performs, with God, a miracle!

NEED OF FOREST ROADS.

There are 3,685 townships, or 47 per cent of all of our national forests, which have no roads whatever. There are 2,418 townships, or 31 per cent of our forests, which have very poor roads; a total of 78 per cent either with no roads at all or with very indifferent roads, approximately only wagon trails.

Transcontinental highways in many instances must cross national forests. In my own State of Washington every east-and-west highway and every transcontinental highway must pass through a national forest. In such cases the forest road serves many purposes. This may be illustrated by the Lewis and Clark or Lolo Pass Highway, now building through the Selway National Forest in the State of Idaho. While this highway will make available vast timber resources and facilitate the protection of the forest, it also shortens the distance from the Atlantic to the Pacific more than 200 miles, and thus becomes of interest to every tourist who would view the unsurpassed scenery of the Pacific Northwest. The old tollgate road in east Oregon is highly meritorious and is now under investigation. I urge the full appropriation already authorized by Congress in order that this and other worthy highways now under construction may be pushed to speedy completion.

We are deriving from the pasture rentals in these forests about two and a half million dollars annually, but we are only pasturing 110,000,000 acres out of the 156,000,000. Two million cattle and horses and seven and a half million sheep are grazing our national forests, but we ought to be deriving very much more in the way of grazing fees from these forests if they were made more accessible.

There are in these forests 16,000,000 hydroelectric horsepower, or 25 per cent of all in the United States. Much of this, of course, is not utilized and can not be utilized on account of its being inaccessible.

OBLIGATIONS TO STATES AND COUNTIES.

There is an obligation upon the part of the Government to build and maintain the roads in and approaching these forests. If these lands were on the tax rolls in the various States and counties, they would be paying to-day fourteen and a half million dollars annually in taxes. Since my own State of Washington, for example, collects no taxes from the 10,000,000 acres of national forest in that State, clearly the Federal Government owes a road-building obligation to that State and the counties of that State, which is not met by the 25 per cent of forest receipts that go to our road and school funds, nor by the 10 per cent of receipts that is spent by the Forest Service on State and county roads.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes, for a question.

Mr. LONDON. Did the gentleman say 16,000,000 hydroelectric horsepower constitutes 25 per cent of all the hydroelectric horsepower in the United States?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; 25 per cent.

Mr. LONDON. That is too large a percentage.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I do not believe so. The construction of roads would add greatly to the value of the forests. They would aid in logging operations, enabling small concerns to operate, whereas now the advantage is all with the big operators. Roads would facilitate the protection, conservation, and utilization of the forests. There is a national obligation and responsibility resting upon the Congress of protecting this and all other national resources.

Our 149 national forests are not all found in one section of the country. They are located in 25 States of the Union, as follows:

	Forest land, acres.
Alabama	81,302
Alaska	20,573,444
Arizona	11,267,640
Arkansas	944,091
California	19,181,508
Colorado	13,291,280
Florida	320,273
Georgia	144,668
Idaho	18,752,625
Maine	32,164
Michigan	123,647
Minnesota	1,047,941
Montana	15,933,889
Nebraska	205,944
Nevada	4,976,137
New Hampshire	404,207
New Mexico	8,423,338
North Carolina	334,480
Oklahoma	61,480
Oregon	13,132,659
Porto Rico	12,443
South Carolina	18,454
South Dakota	1,058,745
Tennessee	245,251
Utah	7,451,548
Virginia	365,938
Washington	9,934,275
West Virginia	103,459
Wyoming	8,414,452
Total	156,837,282

We ought at all times to act as trustees and guardians of these national resources.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to heartily indorse his plea for the protection of our national forests and believe they should be enlarged where conditions seem to warrant it. I have in mind now a very beautiful tract of timber in Virginia that should be preserved for future generations.

There have been constructed up to the present time 4,786 miles of roads and 6,711 miles of trails. The Federal expenditure on the forest roads amounts to $15,000,000 since 1912, and the cooperative work on the part of States, counties, and individuals has amounted to almost $7,000,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman is making a very interesting statement indeed. I wonder if it is his idea that the appropriation provided for on page 38 of $3,261,862 is too small an amount. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. My remarks have reference to the forest-road item, which is on page 80. There was an attempt to eliminate $3,500,000 from the amount authorized by the preceding session of this Congress, and it is with a view to laying some of the facts before the House and of securing the $6,500,000 authorized by Congress that I speak at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative agricultural extension work, to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L. p. 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," $1,300,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914: *Provided*, That of the above appropriation not more than $300,000 shall be expended for purposes other than salaries of county agents.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee to make a statement, so that it may be a matter of record, as to how much of these different appropriations which we are now considering, also how much of the money available under what is known as the Lever Act, is used by the department as the cost of administration. There has been a good deal of discussion on that proposition, and some wide difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the course pursued by the department in spending so much money for administration. I do not make that criticism now. I might have something to say along that line if I were to take it up. I think it will be interesting for us to know what the percentage of expenditure for administration is.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to answer the gentleman's question. I have the figures before me. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the total amount from all sources for extension work was $18,819,894. That includes $4,580,000 of Federal Smith-Lever funds; $4,100,000 of State Smith-Lever funds, which is the offsetting fund appropriated by the States; $1,300,000 as a so-called supplementary Federal Smith-Lever fund and $1,300,000 supplementary State funds, offsetting that, in addition to that item which has just been read, I think, of $1,029,981. Of that total sum of $18,819,894, $1,014,569 was spent in administration, and of that sum $519,090 is taken out of the Federal Smith-Lever fund; $321,178 out of the State Smith-Lever fund; $3,007 from the supplementary Federal Smith-Lever fund and $689 from the State supplementary Smith-Lever fund; and $10,350 from the farmers' cooperative demonstration work. In other words, practically all of the administrative expenses are paid out of the Smith-Lever funds, State and Federal.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The fact is that the $18,819,894 the gentleman mentions, made up of these items, is used for just about the same kind of work.

Mr. ANDERSON. Practically all of it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. We call this farm demonstration and agricultural extension work, but it is practically all of the same nature, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Practically all of it. It includes, of course, the county-agent work, the farm demonstration, the home demonstration, the home economics, the boys' and girls' pig and calf club work, and all sorts of extension work.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. As I understand the figures given by the gentleman from Minnesota, the total expenditures were about $18,900,000 and the total expenditures for administration about $1,000,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is substantially the figure.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Or one-eighteenth; approximately 5½ per cent for administration?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think the department and the colleges are to be congratulated on administering that fund so economically. I think the report of the manner in which they are doing their work shows that they are properly spending less on administration and are therefore able to use more of the money for practical work than was the case when their work was newer.

I remember very well when this money was asked for in the first place. It was due to statements made, representations made, and reports made by the department that important investigations and discoveries very helpful to agriculture had been made by the department, the result of scientific and practical and experimental work, but that the results of that work had not been carried out for the farmers who wished and needed them and for whose benefit they were intended. These important and helpful results were kept stored away in the archives of the Department of Agriculture. The department appealed to the Congress for money with which to carry those results to the farmers of the country. The Congress responded by making liberal appropriations. It seems to me it was unfortunate at first that so much of these appropriations was spent in administration. Evidently the department has worked out plans and a larger part than formerly is now devoted to practical work and a reasonably small sum only is paid for administration. It is splendid work. Few of the many good things the department does are better than this demonstration and extension work. It is being well done, and I believe the department has improved in the manner in which it is carrying on that work. It is entitled to credit for the manner in which it is being done, also for using more for practical work and less for administration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I undertook this morning to show to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, which has under consideration the Agricultural bill, the program by which the editing, and so forth, was being consolidated, and a new $5,000 position was being created without authority of law. My statement is disputed, but I must still insist that the committee has been misinformed. This will develop in the course of time, when, of course, it will be too late. In spite of the attempt to consolidate the printing items, as required by law, such items are scattered throughout the bill. I shall not delay the great committee further, because I know that the members of the agricultural bloc are here full force for the express purpose of preventing any changes in this bill, whether for good or ill. I know, too, that members of the seed bloc are in waiting to march onto the floor at the opportune moment for an attempt to reestablish the free-seed distribution. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time remaining to me.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the demeanor of the genial gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] ought to convince our entire membership that he is not out of humor. He is in perfect good humor. When he was trying a while ago to cut down expenses here and asked for a vote in behalf of his various amendments I heard one of our colleagues who had just come in say, "What is JOHNSON mad about? What is he cutting up so much about on the floor to-day?"—as though it was not his duty to try to save the people's money in the Treasury. Why, he is the chairman of the Committee on Printing. He knows more about that subject than any other man on the floor.

Mr. REED of West Virginia. But he was talking about meat. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. He was directing his remarks to the provisions of the bill that were increasing the salaries of the editors about $25,000 a year. He was qualified and prepared to speak intelligently on that subject, and yet the membership could hardly wait at all for him to give his views.

The time has come, I will say to the gentleman from Washington, that whenever a man gets up here and proposes to stop extravagance and proposes to curtail expenses, he is placed in a minority the very moment he rises. He is placed at a disadvantage. There is antagonism manifested against him on the floor immediately on the part of the committee having the bill in charge. I was hopeful for a while that the few Members who study these bills and who really seek to stop the growing expenses of the Government at least could stop the enlarging of expenses—in other words, hold the expenses where they now are—but I have come to the conclusion that even that is impossible, because when a committee brings in a bill here it is impossible in the Committee of the Whole to change a single item, except to change it upward instead of downward, as will be done with the gentleman's bill when we reach page 22, when an amendment will be offered to insert $360,000 additional for the purchase of garden seeds.

Most of the Members present understood what the gentleman from Washington said when he mentioned "the seed bloc." For the benefit of the gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY], who is a new Member, who may not know what that means, I will say that he probably has noticed that our friend from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], although almost out of breath and hardly able to speak, is still on the floor and watching. And he may have noticed that our beloved friend from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] has been here all afternoon. He may

also have noticed the prominent Member from the State of New York [Mr. LONDON], who stays here most of the time, has been waiting here all afternoon. What are they all here for? They are here to change the bill, Mr. Chairman, when we reach page 32, and they are going to put $360,000 more on the bill to pay for garden seed.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know how the two gentlemen from New York are going to vote?

Mr. BLANTON. One gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is not going to vote against sending out that great system of information to the people of New York that comes from a package of garden seeds. He wants the people educated in a socialistic way, and he wants to send out garden seeds. [Laughter.] His colleague over there from New York [Mr. SNELL] probably will not do it. How would you like to be out on a farm with a wife and five children dependent upon a garden to supply most of the food that goes on the family table, when, having the ground all prepared for planting, you ask for the seed, and your wife goes into the house and brings out that measly little package of garden seed that was sent to you from a Congressman? [Laughter.] The man would say, "Oh, throw it away and go to town and get me some garden seeds that will grow and be sufficient to really furnish food to the family." [Laughter.] I say to my people down in the country, "I send this seed out simply to prevent its being wasted. If I do not send it out myself it will be sent out by the Secretary of Agriculture."

That proposed $360,000 garden-seed amendment is cut and dried, and if you let it come up this evening these Members will put that item on, and you can not stop them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make suitable agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States; for the purchase of necessary supplies and equipment; for telephone and telegraph service, freight and express charges; for travel, and for every other expense necessary, including the employment of assistance in or outside the city of Washington, $95,080: *Provided*, That $25,000 shall be immediately available for an exhibit at the National Dairy Exposition.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 11, after line 12, insert the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to make available to the public the information which may be presented or developed at the World Dairy Congress to be held in the United States during October, 1923, and that there is hereby appropriated the sum of $30,000, which sum shall be available immediately, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for paying for the interpretation, translation, and transcription of discussions and the printing and binding and distribution of the proceedings of the World Dairy Congress, including the payment of postage to foreign countries and the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere as may be necessary to accomplish these purposes."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that. It is legislation unauthorized by law.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the gentleman will not make a point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold it, but I reserve it.

Mr. HAUGEN. The World Dairy Congress is to be held in this country in October, 1923. In an act approved March 3, 1921, Congress authorized the President to extend invitations to foreign countries to participate, and the dairy industry of this country is contributing approximately $100,000 to its support. Now, it is suggested that $30,000 be appropriated by Congress for the translation, interpretation, printing, binding, and distribution of the proceedings and valuable information that may be developed at the dairy congress, so that it may be made available. The amount suggested seems to be a very reasonable amount.

The dairy people are very much interested in it, as well as the Department of Agriculture, which is also greatly interested in it.

Mr. SNELL. Just what are you going to spend the money for?

Mr. HAUGEN. As stated in the amendment, for the interpretation and translation of the discussions and the printing, binding, and distribution of the proceedings of the World Dairy Congress.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. If I thought that the dairy interests of the United States would receive 25 cents on the dollar benefit out of this appropriation, I would not only withdraw the reservation but I would vote for the gentleman's amendment; but my experience in watching these matters has been such as to lead me to believe that most of this $30,000 will be eaten up in administrative expenses and that the dairy interests will not be benefited.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; it can not be used for administrative expenses, because the amendment provides what the money shall be expended for. The gentleman is aware of the fact that we have spent millions of dollars on publications, and there is no reason why this valuable information should be bottled up. If it is of value, it should be made available to the people interested.

Mr. BEGG. There is nobody in the department capable of translating French or Portuguese or whatever is to be spoken in this convention, is there?

Mr. HAUGEN. Delegates are invited from all parts of the world. This is a world congress.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman say there is no one down there capable of translating?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are unquestionably able translators down there.

Mr. BEGG. What is the idea of hiring new ones?

Mr. HAUGEN. They have in the department translators who are capable of translating 15 or 20 languages; they are as able translators as they have in any other department or probably anywhere else; but whether they have or have not, provision is made here that these proceedings may not only be translated but disseminated.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not a parliamentary sharp, but in my judgment there is little in the proposition offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] except the publication and dissemination of matters of information relating to agriculture and of interest to the entire country. There is little, if anything, except to provide for the printing and disseminating of information collected by the Department of Agriculture. This will be an international gathering. Men from all parts of the world will attend. It is an annual affair, as I understand. The association has accepted the invitation of our Government to hold its convention in the United States in the coming year. In my judgment, there is little, if anything, in this amendment except the publishing of information to be given out at the convention relating to agriculture to be widespread throughout the country. That kind of work is authorized by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In addition to what the gentleman has just said, which I indorse, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the point of order in my judgment is not good.

The amendment is offered to a paragraph which reads as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make suitable agricultural exhibits at State, interstate, and international fairs held within the United States; for the purchase of necessary supplies and equipment; for telephone and telegraph service, freight and express charges; for travel, and for every other expense necessary, including the employment of assistance in or outside the city of Washington, $95,080: *Provided*, That $25,000 shall be immediately available for an exhibit at the National Dairy Exposition.

I submit that the point of order comes too late, because it is made against an amendment offered to a paragraph which itself is subject to a point of order, and the rule is that all germane amendments to such a paragraph are in order.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a case so flagrantly in violation of the rules of the House that it is unnecessary to discuss it or even offer a word on it. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan discussed germaneness. I will concede the germaneness of the amendment. But here is the point I should like to direct to the attention of the Chair for just a moment. This amendment is the identical bill that was reported out of one of the major committees or ordered reported less than a week ago, to legislate to make available the information received at this conference. If this is not legislation, it is

impossible to find anything that is legislation on an appropriation bill. It does not make any difference what the information is about. It does not make any difference what good it will do. This is providing the machinery for disseminating that which is clearly legislation, and can not be done without the Department of Agriculture being given authority to do it by special legislation.

Mr. HAUGEN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. BLANTON. My point of order is that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, unauthorized by law.

Mr. HAUGEN. The organic law authorizes this very thing.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is arguing against the position that he so soundly took yesterday and this morning on another proposition.

Mr. HAUGEN. My suggestion yesterday was that there was no law authorizing that particular thing to be done.

Mr. BLANTON. Let me make this suggestion in order to keep the record straight. The position taken by my colleague [Mr. BUCHANAN] as to amendments is eminently correct where an amendment is offered from the floor which is out of order and no objection is made to it, and then an amendment is offered to that amendment. In such a case a point of order to the second amendment would not be sustainable, but the rule does not go as far as my colleague indicates. This is a part of the bill, and the gentleman offers an amendment out of order from the floor. The same rule does not apply.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is very clear in his mind that this amendment directs the Secretary of Agriculture to do certain specific things, and is therefore legislation on an appropriation bill and subject to a point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 11, after line 12, insert the following:

"There is hereby appropriated the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for paying for the interpretation, translation, and transcription of discussions, and the printing, binding, and distribution of the proceedings of the World's Dairy Congress, including the payment of postage to foreign countries and the employment of such persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere as may be necessary to accomplish these purposes."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law. There is no question but what it comes within the same rule just followed by the Chair. It is practically the same amendment. If this were in order you could call any other kind of a conference imaginable without special authorization.

You could call any other kind of a conference in any way connected with agriculture and have delegates come from all over the world and print the deliberations and disseminate it throughout the country by action on an appropriation bill, which would clearly be out of order.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to get this thought to the mind of the Chairman in passing on this subterfuge. The President of the United States himself can not call a conference similar to this without being specially authorized by Congress so to do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Perhaps the gentleman knows it, but the President of the United States was authorized by law to call this conference.

Mr. BEGG. I grant that, and he needed that authorization. The President himself can not call such a conference as this without authority granted by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. But there is nothing in the amendment in reference to that.

Mr. BEGG. The President has been authorized to call the conference. Now, if the President can not call the conference, certainly the President's servant, the Secretary of Agriculture, can not distribute the proceedings of that conference without special authority, because in the law granting the President authority to call the conference there was no authority granted him to disseminate the information acquired at that conference. The only way you could disseminate that would be by extending the authority given the Department of Agriculture. To undertake to do it by this process is nothing short of a subterfuge in order to avoid the rules of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Independent of the act authorizing the President to call the conference, does not the gentleman believe that the organic law creating the Department of Agriculture is authority for making this appropriation? That organic act reads:

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

Now, the conference having been legally called by the President of the United States, has not this House on this bill, without being subject to a point of order, the right to make that appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to comply with the organic law creating the department?

Mr. BEGG. I will say in reply to the gentleman that the organic law does not permit the Secretary of Agriculture to go beyond the power of the President of the United States in jurisdiction. Congress has limited the jurisdiction of the President in calling the conference by a statute; in other words, it passed a law—and it required the special permission of Congress—saying to the President, you may call that conference, but that does not carry with it permission to his servant to disseminate and do as he pleases with the proceedings of the conference.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I call attention to the fact that one purpose of the expenditure of the $30,000 is to translate into our language addresses of representatives of the various foreign delegates from foreign countries, and that there is no provision whatever in the organic act that contemplates anything of the kind.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is right about that. I would like to offer a further suggestion, and then I have nothing further to say on the proposition. Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of Agriculture should deem it advisable to mail a hand-bound gilt-edged volume of the proceedings to everybody in the United States. Does anyone contend that he could do that under authority of law and then bring in a deficiency appropriation? If he has the right to go ahead and do this under the authority that the bureau grants him, he has a right to bring in a deficiency appropriation the same as other departments do.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to Rule XXI, page 363, which reads as follows:

By a general provision of law, appropriations for investigation and the acquirement and diffusion of information by the Agricultural Department on subjects related to agriculture are generally in order in the agricultural appropriation bill.

This provides for the diffusion of information and the translation would be a part of it.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman contend that that rule gives jurisdictional powers outside the United States to the Secretary of Agriculture in the face of the fact that our own law prohibits the President, his superior, from doing that thing?

Mr. SNELL. This conference is going to be held in the United States—something that has been permitted by Congress. This authority says "the acquirement and diffusion of useful information." That absolutely covers everything that you want to do here.

Mr. BEGG. I do not think so. I do not think that by any stretch of the imagination you can give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture beyond the power that the President of the United States has.

Mr. SNELL. This has nothing to do with the power of the President; it is the diffusion of information, the acquirement and diffusion of information definitely provided for in this rule, and that is all we want to do.

Mr. BEGG. The President of the United States had to come here to get authority to call the conference.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will read the organic law creating the Department of Agriculture, he will see that it gives ample authority.

Mr. BEGG. I do not think so.

Mr. DOWELL. In this section of the act creating the Department of Agriculture we find the following as one of its functions: "The acquirement and the diffusion among the people of the United States of useful information on subjects connected with agriculture."

Mr. BEGG. Acquired where—in South America?

Mr. DOWELL. It does not limit it—wherever it is acquired, if it is useful, he has that authority.

Mr. Chairman, in view of that language in the organic law creating this department, there can be no question that this amendment is in order. As the amendment first read, with direction to the Secretary, it was not in order, because it was a direction which was not contained in this law; but under the present status of the amendment, which merely makes an appropriation for the purpose for which this section provides,

he has authority. It seems to me there can be no question that this appropriation is in order.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As seeming to test the correctness of the gentleman's view, we find that now the Department of Agriculture, without specific provision to that effect, distributes a number of pamphlets every year that have relation to the dairy business.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] is correct in his contention, the Department of Agriculture has greatly exceeded its authority.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; and if the gentleman from Ohio will go back to his original proposition, it would not be permissible to publish any information not secured within the United States, which would be a preposterous proposition.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I do not concede that point. Where did this information that is to be specially prepared and put out get any authority for being? Through an act of Congress granting permission to the President of the United States; and in no other way can it come about.

Mr. DOWELL. Congress granted the authority to the President of the United States to call a certain conference. That conference is being called in accordance with the authority given the President by the act of Congress. That has already been accomplished. I want to again read a part of this section for the benefit of the Chair, because it seems to me it is so clear that there can be no question about it—

the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of the word.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] can not so limit this authority when it is so clear in language that it does not admit of the construction the gentleman from Ohio has seen fit to place upon it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; for a question only.

Mr. BEGG. I simply want to put a question and make a brief statement.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman has the opportunity to present his case. I yield for a question.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman's contention is correct, under the broad provisions of the statute the Secretary of Agriculture has the right and the authority to do anything that he wants to, if he believes it will stimulate agriculture. He could even take all of these foreign representatives that come here and without any added legislation under the general grant send them into every county in the United States to make a speech on agriculture.

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. BEGG. There is not a bit of difference in the position.

Mr. DOWELL. Oh, there is a reasonable construction upon this language.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like recognition to ask the gentleman a question. If the gentleman's position is correct, and usually he is sound, why does not the committee, instead of taking up 72 pages in this bill of printed matter for specifications, just bring in a three-line bill granting the Secretary of Agriculture the $68,000,000 that they give him and let him proceed under this organic act, if it is so broad?

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman think that that would be out of order?

Mr. BLANTON. It would be out of order, and it is out of order to translate from various languages at an expense of $30,000 the information of this international dairy conference without specific authorization therefor.

Mr. DOWELL. That method would not be subject to the point of order, but certainly it would be bad legislation. It would be within the authority granted under the organic law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realizes, as has already been stated by the Chair, that the organic law creating this department, particularly with reference to the dissemination of useful information, is extremely broad. The Chair feels that this is information useful to the people of the United States, and as there is a law providing for the dissemination of this knowledge the Chair feels that the amendment is in order. The Chair quotes from Barnes Federal Code as follows:

(618. Establishment of department.)

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES, WEATHER BUREAU.

For carrying into effect in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, in the West Indies, in the Panama Canal, the Caribbean Sea, and on adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, in Bermuda, and in Alaska, the provisions of an act approved October 1, 1890, so far as they relate to the weather service transferred thereby to the Department of Agriculture, for the employment of professors of meteorology, district forecasters, local forecasters, meteorologists, section directors, observers, apprentices, operators, skilled mechanics, instrument makers, foremen, assistant foremen, proof readers, compositors, pressmen, lithographers, folders and feeders, repairmen, station agents, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, special observers, displaymen, and other necessary employees; for fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, ice, dry goods, twine, mats, oil, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, and washing towels; for advertising; for purchase, subsistence, and care of horses and vehicles, the purchase and repair of harness, for official purposes only; for instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers and repairs thereto; for rent of offices; for repair and improvements to existing buildings and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary outbuildings and sidewalks on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds; and the erection of temporary buildings for living quarters of observers; for official traveling expenses; for telephone rentals, and for telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreements with the companies performing the service; for the maintenance and repair of Weather Bureau telegraph, telephone, and cable lines; and for every other expenditure required for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations and for the issuing of weather forecasts and warnings of storms, cold waves, frosts, and heavy snows, the gauging and measuring of the flow of rivers, and the issuing of river forecasts and warnings; for observations and reports relating to crops and for other necessary observations and reports, including cooperation with other bureaus of the Government and societies and institutions of learning for the dissemination of meteorological information, as follows:

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to call the attention of the chairman to this language on page 13, line 11:

Including the construction of necessary outbuildings.

I do not know whether the chairman has investigated it or not, but at many of these weather bureau stations, scattered over the country, the observer is permitted to live in the station building. Usually that ground has been either donated by the community or purchased by the Government, and in many places it embraces as much as a quarter of a block of land. In many instances there is nothing but the one building, just the weather bureau station. All of these observers get very moderate salaries. They can barely exist on the salaries allotted to them. You will find that practically all of them are men of families. I happen to know that in instances they have asked the Weather Bureau, at an expense of not over $200, to construct an outbuilding on one corner of the quarter of block of ground, in which they could keep a horse or a milch cow, which would mean probably a third of their family expenses, and in such instances such requests have been turned down. These men are required to build the structure at their own expense, if they can get permission to do so. That is a permanent improvement to Government property. In the long run it costs very little, and yet it means very much to these low-salaried officials, and I want to say right here that this is one of the most important bureaus in the Government, in my judgment.

I happen to have had that impressed upon me several years ago when with my family I was camping 17 miles from Galveston on Galveston Island with campers all around and beyond, and at noon one day a man came riding up on a horse covered with foam and said, "You must get out of here immediately or everybody will be drowned." That man came from the weather bureau there, and one of the greatest storms of the history came and these hundreds of people, men, women, and little children, were enabled to get out of there and get to Houston before the storm came because of that notification. Under this language here, has any provision been made as to appropriation, I am asking the chairman, for the construction of necessary outbuildings? Would the Weather Bureau be authorized to give these observers these little outbuildings for which they have asked?

Mr. ANDERSON. I presume they would under that language if they had the money to do it with.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know whether or not this appropriation gives sufficient money where such outbuildings are necessary?

Mr. ANDERSON. We give the amount estimated for. I do not think it is the practice or policy of the Weather Bureau to build these buildings. If they were to build them it would be an exception, in my judgment, to the general policy.

Mr. BLANTON. I am in favor of economy everywhere as much as any man in this House, but in cases of that kind I

think it is money well spent, and where we are giving $5,000 to a chief in charge of bureaus and $1,000 and $1,200 to an observer who is really doing important work, I think it is highly proper to build these outbuildings in which they can keep their family milch cow.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I just want to say that what the gentleman from Texas has just stated is illustrative of a very interesting characteristic of human nature. The gentleman from Texas is very much interested and very much in favor of the work being done by the Weather Bureau. I agree with him. It is a very important bureau and they do very fine work, work which saves millions of dollars every year. He is in favor of it because he knows about it, knows what it does, and its value. I expect with most of us the things we are against are the things we know the least about.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inspection and quarantine work, including all necessary expenses for the eradication of scabies in sheep and cattle, the inspection of southern cattle, the supervision of the transportation of live stock, and the inspection of vessels, the execution of the 28-hour law, the inspection and quarantine of imported animals, including the establishment and maintenance of quarantine stations and repairs, alterations, improvements, or additions to buildings thereon; the inspection work relative to the existence of contagious diseases, and the mallein testing of animals, $529,640: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 shall be used for improvements and repairs to quarantine stations: *Provided further*, That no part of this sum shall be used for the manufacture, preparation, or distribution of blackleg vaccine.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the preceding paragraph for the purpose of correcting the spelling in the word "quarantine" in line 25, page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to the page indicated for the purpose of correcting an error in spelling. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "quarantine" in line 25, page 16, may be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of tuberculosis of animals, for its control and eradication, for the tuberculin testing of animals, and for researches concerning the cause of the disease, its modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and such other means as may be necessary, either independently or in cooperation with farmers, associations, State, Territory, or county authorities, $2,877,600, of which $850,000 shall be set aside for administrative and operating expenses and $2,027,600 for the payment of indemnities: *Provided, however*, That in carrying out the purpose of this appropriation, if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture it shall be necessary to destroy tuberculous animals and to compensate owners for loss thereof, he may, in his discretion, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere out of the moneys of this appropriation, such sums as he shall determine to be necessary, within the limitations above provided, for the reimbursement of owners of animals so destroyed, in cooperation with such States, Territories, counties, or municipalities, as shall by law or by suitable action in keeping with its authority in the matter, and by rules and regulations adopted and enforced in pursuance thereof, provide inspection of tuberculous animals and for compensation to owners of animals so destroyed, but no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be used in compensating owners of such animals except in cooperation with and supplementary to payments to be made by State, Territory, county, or municipality where condemnation of such animals shall take place; nor shall any payment be made hereunder as compensation for or on account of any such animal destroyed if at the time of inspection or test of such animal, or at the time of condemnation thereof, it shall belong to or be upon the premises of any person, firm, or corporation, to which it has been sold, shipped, or delivered for the purpose of being slaughtered: *Provided further*, That out of the money hereby appropriated no payment as compensation for any tuberculous animal destroyed shall exceed one-third of the difference between the appraised value of such animal and the value of the salvage thereof; that no payments hereunder shall exceed the amount paid or to be paid by the State, Territory, county, or municipality, where the animal shall be condemned; and that in no case shall any payment hereunder be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any pure-bred animal, and no payment shall be made unless the owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Page 18, line 24, strike out "$2,877,600," and in lieu thereof insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, by my amendment I am suggesting an increase of a little more than a million dollars in the total amount of money to be available for this tuberculosis work. As will be noticed, by leaving the sum of $850,000 for administration as it is and by increasing the total appropriation there will be a little more than $1,000,000 more money available to the department for the purpose of cooperating with the State in the payment of indemnities. This work of eradicating tuberculosis was started several years ago and has been progressing very satisfactorily. I have always been very much interested in it. As proof of my interest, I may say that the language of this provision is my own, it having been committed to me by the Committee on Agriculture to draft the provision after the committee had determined that the work should be done and a substantial amount of money appropriated to carry it on. The States have been showing a very commendable interest in the work. Many of them have made substantial appropriations. It is evident, however, and becoming more evident as time goes by, that if the work is to be carried on as it should be, and as there is every promise it will be in the very near future, the amount of money necessary for paying indemnities must be increased over the amount carried in this bill. We hear from many sources and we have it officially in the hearings that many States have already made large appropriations that will be available, largely increased over those that have been available in the past, and that several States are getting ready at the sessions of their legislatures which will be held after the 1st of January largely to increase their appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman permit this question? I am very much interested and I want to say to the gentleman that the State of New York's present appropriation is a million and a half dollars; that one State, to take care of this proposition, and the feeling among the farmers of our whole State is that the Federal Government should be a little more generous than at present, although they appreciate what has been done by the Congress.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In that connection I might say that the amount of money appropriated by the State of New York for this fiscal year is only $532,000.

Mr. SNELL. But the next time it is a million and a half?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And next year there will be in that one State $1,500,000, as the gentleman from New York says.

Mr. SNELL. I notice in the hearings there are quite a number of more claims this year than last year. How are we going to cut them unless we increase the appropriations a little in order to cut them? The average number of claims remaining over were about 9,000 last year and something over 10,000 this year. It seems to me we ought to keep up. We can not decrease the number unless we do.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The hearings show that the number of claims are rapidly increasing, the increase running into the thousands.

It is evident from any standpoint from which you look at the proposition that a very large amount of money over the amount now available and to be provided by this bill will be necessary.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Is it not also an additional factor that should be taken into consideration that a great many of the herds have been tested and reactions have been obtained from the tests, and when reactions are ended it is sometimes necessary to go forward with follow-up work and have additional tests in order to clear up all these herds, so that we should make an appropriation at least of $4,000,000, as suggested?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes. As I understand, in doing this work it is often necessary to make more than one test, or by follow-up work, as the gentleman says.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. It is the follow-up work that is the most necessary.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; as the gentleman from New York says, the follow-up work is an important part of the work.

I notice from the hearings that the gentlemen of the bureau who are carrying on this work say that if the same amount of work that is done by them relatively is carried throughout the entire country more money for administration will be necessary. I will add to that, Mr. Chairman, this remark, that this work is so big that it will be impossible for the agents of the Federal Government to do all of it or even to take part in all of it. The Government has started the work. Government officials, very able and competent men, have shown how the work can be done and how it ought to be done, and it is not necessary for Government agents and employees to do or to take part in all the work.

What I am saying now is in line with the position I have often taken heretofore. I have always been in favor of the Government of the United States carrying on experimental work, carrying on all kinds of investigational work, and doing the necessary amount of demonstration work, taking the results of its scientific inquiry out to the country, thereby showing their value, how they can be used and applied, and how the people taking them up can themselves make use of them. I am objecting to the Government, after doing all this scientific work and all this investigation, analysis, and experiment, going out into the country and actually doing the physical work of applying and making use of all these improved methods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more. I may not use it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks for five minutes more? Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Is it not a fact that this work more than doubled in the last fiscal year?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have it in mind that it just about doubled throughout the country; in many of the States more than that during the year.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The statistics show that it did, as a matter of fact, more than double last year.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I call the gentleman's attention particularly to lines 10 and 11, page 20, where it is provided that the payments shall not be more than $25 for any grade animal or more than $50 for any pure-bred animal. I do that for the purpose of asking a question. I judge those operations were established when the relations of the grades and pure breds were somewhat adequately represented by those two amounts. Does not the gentleman believe that the amount provided for the payment for pure-bred animals should be more, or at least that the relation should be changed in this increased appropriation that he is asking for, in view of the fact that the grades are lower and the pure breds are higher?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. When this matter was considered in committee and in the House and in conference there was a difference of opinion as to what these amounts should be. I was in favor of a larger amount to be paid for the slaughter of a pure-bred animal. Many of those animals are very valuable. But it was the consensus of opinion then that the amount ought to be fixed at $50. That was the best we were able to do at that time. The best we could do was to put it at $50.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is not that in line with my suggestion that the amount for the pure-bred animal should be increased if this amendment prevails? Is it not a fact that tuberculosis is very much more prevalent in the pure breds than in the grades?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In the amendment I offer no change will be made in the amount of payment for any animal destroyed. I will say to the gentleman that he has perhaps overlooked the fact that this amount, $25 or $50, as the case may be, is merely the Federal Government's contribution and that the Government is not permitted to pay more than the State pays, nor more than one-third of the entire amount to be paid to the owner.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The hearings show that instead of there being an increase in the average appraisal there was a decrease. It was reduced from $149.68 in 1921 to $111.67 in 1922, or an average reduction of $38.01 per head.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes. I think inasmuch as these amounts were found to be satisfactory during the war, when high prices prevailed, they will be found satisfactory now.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. Has it not been the policy of the Committee on Agriculture, to a certain extent at least, to hold down the valuation? In other words, has it not been the policy to throw a part of the responsibility of having a pure and clean herd of cattle upon the owner of the cattle? If the Government is going to carry on the policy of covering anything like the full value of the cattle in the payments of indemnity for tubercular cattle destroyed, there would be no incentive to the farmer to use care and discrimination in the selection of his herd and to have a clean herd. That is to say, the owner should not be permitted to profit at least by having a herd that was affected with tuberculosis.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; he should not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If officials of the Government are expected to do or supervise all the work in all the States, they will not be able to meet all demands if the work be increased and extended, as it certainly will be if the amount of money available for indemnities is increased by $1,000,000, as my amendment proposes.

They will not be able to do as much work as they would like to do or cover as much territory as they would like to cover. But they have discovered the remedy and have learned how to apply it. The work they have done in various parts of the country is and ought to be a demonstration of the method and plan to be pursued. It is now the duty and the privilege of the States to take upon themselves the burden of the actual physical work.

The States are now prepared to take up a larger part of the work. The States wish to do it, as appears by the large appropriations they have made and are preparing to make. The States wish only the advice and cooperation of Federal officials and agents, also that the Government shall provide money to pay a portion of the value of animals destroyed.

If the Government is willing to supply money necessary to pay its share of the indemnities, the States are ready and more than willing to do a large part of the work of investigation, inspection, and so on, and to relieve the Government of a large part of the expense of such work. These things being considered, in my judgment, the amount of money for administration need not be increased; but it is absolutely necessary that the money for indemnity be increased.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does it not appear fairly from the hearings that unless an increase is made the work will be slowed down; that it will not be conducted in the vigorous way necessary, and that the department will not be able to carry out its conception of eradicating tuberculosis substantially within 10 years? I desire to emphasize that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman did not give me a chance to answer the question of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 13481, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that December 18 they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine-hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916; and

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of the officers and employees of Congress for December, 1922, on the 20th day of that month.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KELLER, indefinitely, on account of sickness (at the request of Mr. CLAGUE).

To Mr. RAMSEYER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. PATTERSON of Missouri, on account of the death of his father. (Leave requested by Mr. ROACH.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, December 22, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

849. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Miami Harbor, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 516); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

850. A letter from the chairman of the War Finance Corporation, transmitting Fifth Annual Report of the War Finance Corporation for the year ended November 30, 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

851. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, for cooperative construction of rural post roads, $25,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 517); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 13540. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TINCHER: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1452. An act providing for establishing shooting grounds for the public, for establishing game refuges and breeding grounds, for protecting migratory birds, and requiring a Federal license to hunt them; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1034. An act to establish a game sanctuary in the watershed of the south fork of the Flathead River in the Flathead National Forest, to perpetuate a breeding place for game animals; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 13534) granting allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13535) to authorize payment of expenses of Washington-Alaska military cable and telegraph system out of receipts of such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13536) to authorize the Secretary of War to distribute available aeronautical equipment to educational institutions, manufacturers, and designers of aircraft, and to others engaged in aeronautical research work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 13537) defining the legal status of all children under 18 years of age in the District of Columbia, creating a parental court, and providing for a child relief allowance for the assistance of certain mothers; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13538) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Red Lion, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 13539) granting the consent of Congress to the village of South Elgin, Kane County, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Fox River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 13540) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 13541) authorizing a loan of $20,000,000 to Armenia, provided the conference at Lausanne, Switzerland, makes adequate territorial provision for an Armenian national home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 415) for the relief of St. Helens, Oreg., by improving the channel between the harbor of St. Helens and the Columbia River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PERKINS: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 76) for the appointment of a commission of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House to investigate the needs of the Patent Office and to report not later than January 24, 1923, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 13542) granting a pension to Esther Hill Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13543) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah B. Thomson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 13544) granting a pension to Evaline Tichenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 13545) for the relief of Jeremiah F. Mahoney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13546) for the relief of Harry H. Burris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 13547) granting a pension to Samuel G. Riggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13548) granting a pension to Joseph S. Rounds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 13549) granting a pension to Irene S. Slagle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6662. By Mr. FENN: Petition of M. Harkiewich and L. Sydorak, Ukrainian residents of Glastonbury, protesting against outrages of the Polish Government against the Ukrainian population of East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6663. Also, petition of B. Milczuk, L. Appanovich, and Rev. M. Oleksiw, Ukrainian residents of Hartford, protesting against outrages of the Polish Government against the Ukrainian population of East Galicia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6664. By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Petition of Dr. Guy W. Bailey, president of the University of Vermont, and his associates, for a national archives building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6665. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, relative to an adequate Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6666. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the department of streets and public improvements, Newark, N. J., urging that the Government do not permit construction of a bridge by the Central Railroad of New Jersey across the mouth of Newark Bay below the transcontinental railroad freight yards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6667. By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Resolutions adopted by the military affairs committee of the Chamber of Commerce and the Commercial Club of Salt Lake City, Utah, and concurred in by the board of governors of said chamber of commerce, in favor of legislation which will maintain an Army with a minimum force of 150,000 enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6668. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry residents of Indiana County, Pa., favoring repeal of discriminatory tax on small arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6669. By Mr. TEN EYCK: Petition of sundry American citizens of Ukrainian descent and Ukrainian residents of Watervliet and vicinity, on December 17, protesting against the wholesale slaughter and arrests of the Ukrainians by the Poles in the Western Ukrainian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *December 22, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we look with gladness of heart toward Thee this morning. We bear in mind the time of the year with all its happy associations, and ask that we may have in our hearts the larger conception of human kindness, that we may deal with the things of time and sense as in Thy presence, and always feel inspiration new and bright and holy as we think of the Christ born in Bethlehem. And we ask that in His name our hearts may be full of hope this day. Amen.

ROBERT N. STANFIELD, a Senator from the State of Oregon, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Saturday, December 16, 1922, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. SWANSON] as a Member of the Senate for the term beginning the 4th of March next. I ask that the credentials be accepted and filed in the usual course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting.

This is to certify that at a meeting of the board of State canvassers, held at the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth the fourth Monday in November, 1922, on an examination of the official abstract of votes on file in that office, it was ascertained and determined that at the general election held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1922, for United States Senator from the State of Virginia, CLAUDE A. SWANSON was duly elected United States Senator from the State of Virginia for the term prescribed by law.

Given under my hand and seal of office at Richmond, this 27th day of November, 1922.

[SEAL.] B. O. JAMES,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PETITIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of Jacksonville Chapter, Florida Daughters of the American Revolution, of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the prompt passage of legislation establishing a national park at Yorktown, Va., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LADD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wheelock, Spring Brook, Fullerton, Park River, Baldwin, Portland, New Salem, Russell, Carrington, and Tappen, all in the State of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation stabilizing the prices of wheat, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reports from that committee what is known as the truth in fabric bill (S. 799), and asks that it may be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 799) to prevent deceit and unfair prices that result from the unrevealed presence of substitutes for virgin wool in woven fabrics purporting to contain wool and in garments or articles of apparel made therefrom, manufactured in any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia, or transported or intended to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and providing penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 425) fixing the salaries of certain United States attorneys and United States marshals, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 962) thereon.

GRADING OF COAST GUARD OFFICERS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10631) to distribute the commissioned line and engineer officers of the Coast Guard in grades, and for other purposes, I report it without amendment and submit a report (No. 958) thereon.

Mr. President, this is a bill which was very carefully considered in the House and finally passed. It provides for a regrading of the Coast Guard and enables promotions to be made, but does not add to the number of the personnel at all. The Coast Guard under the present system is absolutely deteriorating and unless something is done it will disappear. The committee considered the matter very carefully and report the House bill without any amendment.

According to a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, it would entail about $12,500 additional expense. It provides for a little more rapid promotion of the officers. There are men in the service who have been there for thirty-odd years who are now simply lieutenants, and we feel that some action ought to be taken to relieve the situation. Under these circumstances I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the bill had better go over.

Mr. BORAH. I did not apprehend that there was going to be a request for its present consideration and, therefore, was not paying attention to what the Senator said. I did not suppose it was going to be brought up for consideration at this time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Utah has said he would like to have it go over. I hope Senators will look into it fully, in the hope that we may at an early date pass what I think is very much deserved legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ART AND INDUSTRY BUILDING.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 218) to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 959) thereon. I ask that the joint resolution as proposed to be amended be read and that it may have immediate consideration. I should like to make a brief statement after the reading of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the joint resolution as requested.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 3, after the words "consisting of," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; on page 2, line 2, before the word "Members," to strike out "three" and insert "two"; and in line 4, before the words "to consider," to insert "and four additional members to be selected by the President of the United States, who shall represent the executive branch of the Government and the public," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas the American Arts and Industries Association proposes to create a national art center for applied and industrial arts to encourage, organize, and develop American art and industry to higher standards of quality for supremacy in world trade; and

Whereas the association has expressed a desire to establish this center in the District of Columbia because of the national industrial, artistic, and patriotic significance of such center; and

Whereas the association contemplates the erection of a central building and is desirous that it should harmonize and accord with the public buildings program of the District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created, consisting of two Members of the Senate, appointed by the Vice President, and two Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, from the Senate and House Committees on Public Buildings and Grounds, respectively, and four additional members to be selected by the President of the United States, who shall represent the executive branch of the Government and the public, to consider the proposal of the American Arts and Industries Association and to report upon it as soon as practicable with such indorsement and recommendations as are deemed advisable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand this is merely a joint resolution appointing a committee of the two Houses to consider the proposition of reporting a bill for the development of art and industry. I have no objection to the proposition because there is nothing final in it up to this time.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no expense attached to it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maine what is his object in having a congressional committee for this purpose? What ends are to be served?

Mr. FERNALD. It is a great proposition. It is proposed to erect a building that will cost in the neighborhood of $20,000,000, not at the Government's expense but at the expense of men who are amply able to erect it for philanthropic purposes. When the proposition was first presented to me I felt that it was a visionary matter, but upon investigation and from letters that were received from large financial interests of the country, as well as the most talented people—and the association is numerically very large—I became convinced that it is a proposition worthy of attention by the Government. Of course, any building erected in the District would necessarily have to be under Government control.

Mr. CARAWAY. It would be under the Fine Arts Commission?

Mr. FERNALD The joint resolution would authorize the President of the United States to appoint four members. We have changed the original resolution, which provided for three members from the House and three from the Senate, so that it now provides for two from each body and that each party might be represented. The proposition is large enough and has sufficient glory for the whole country. It ought to be nonpartisan, and I feel that in that way we might have the entire Congress behind the proposition.

Mr. CARAWAY. Pardon me, but may I ask what useful purpose the committee is to serve?

Mr. FERNALD. The committee would go into the details of the matter, determine the size of the building, where it should be located, under what governmental supervision, and so forth.

Mr. FLETCHER. The committee would then ascertain what the prospects were for putting up the building and who would pay for it, and so forth?

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; it would go into all the details.

Mr. FLETCHER. Without any expense to the Government?

Mr. FERNALD. Without any expense at all to the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it proposed that the Government shall be called upon for any help in erecting the building or taking part in it?

Mr. FERNALD. Not in the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it finally intended?

Mr. FERNALD. It is not proposed finally, except that possibly the Government should donate a site for the building. That is all that is contemplated.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it not something like the proposition when we built the Lincoln Memorial? We agreed it should cost so much, but built it without the approaches. Will there not finally be a contribution somewhere from the Government? Is not that the object of it?

Mr. FERNALD. It is the purpose of the committee to ascertain all the details.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it the purpose finally to unload the burden of construction largely upon the Public Treasury?

Mr. FERNALD. Not at all.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is not now, but is it not to be done after the site has been determined upon?

Mr. FERNALD. I would not approve of anything of that kind.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not saying that the Senator would, but the people who are sponsoring it would want it.

Mr. FERNALD. No; the people who are behind the proposition have proposed to erect the building. It has been under consideration for some years. It has never been finally determined where the building should be erected.

Mr. CARAWAY. Would not that be largely left, if we had this committee, to the Commission on Fine Arts?

Mr. FERNALD. It would be left to this committee. They could call in such people as they might deem proper.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator if there is any money already raised for the purpose of carrying out the project?

Mr. FERNALD. Not at all, except that the association has already expended more than $100,000 in getting plans and making preparations for the erection of the temple.

Mr. CARAWAY. Are the plans already prepared?

Mr. FERNALD. They are roughly prepared.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then what object is there in calling in a committee after the plans have already been adopted?

Mr. FERNALD. I assume it will be necessary to have somebody go into the details on behalf of the Government.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator think there is anyone in Congress qualified technically to pass upon the plans and specifications for a building costing $20,000,000?

Mr. FERNALD. They could bring in such experts as they pleased.

Mr. CARAWAY. And who would pay those experts?

Mr. FERNALD. There is nothing provided in the joint resolution for that purpose.

Mr. CARAWAY. But the Senator knows who is expected to pay for them.

Mr. FERNALD. I suppose the association is to pay all the bills. That is the proposition. It is a philanthropic work. The association is composed of very many multimillionaires. They have decided long since to erect a temple which shall be the finest in beauty and architectural grandeur of anything that has ever been conceived in the world's history, a building which it is conceived will cost at least $20,000,000 to $30,000,000. Every city in the United States would be anxious to have the building erected within its borders, but the District, it seemed to me, was the proper place for it.

We have been for some years now doing nothing toward beautifying the city of Washington, and now, without expense to the Government at all, because we are asked for no appropriation, these people, after deciding that they would erect the temple, have presented the proposition to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. We considered it very carefully, went into details so far as we could, and decided that it was at least worthy of consideration; and in the appointment of a committee to investigate it, the association asks for no money at all, but I assume the Government would be asked to furnish the site.

Mr. CARAWAY. I wonder if back of all that——

Mr. FERNALD. If the joint resolution is to lead to discussion, of course, I do not want to consume the further time of the Senate now.

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall take but a moment. I presume back of all this would be a provision also to exempt it from the payment of any taxes?

Mr. FERNALD. Those details would be worked out by the committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is not that the object in having the Government furnish the site? I am just trying to find out.

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know about that. I have not gone into that question. That proposition has not been presented to our committee.

Mr. CARAWAY. When did the idea first occur to those people that they wanted Congress to have something to do with it?

Mr. FERNALD. It is supposed that Congress ought to have something to do with the erection of the building. It is not assumed, of course, that the Congress of the United States would allow such a building to be erected in this city unless the Government did have supervision over it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am curious to know why.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the joint resolution go to the calendar.

Mr. FERNALD. If it seems necessary to discuss the matter further, I am willing to let the joint resolution go to the calendar and not take the further time of the Senate now.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not going to take more than a minute. We shall lose just as much time by discussion on the next bill as we will on this if we are denied the right now to discuss the matter.

Mr. FERNALD. I shall be glad to answer any question which the Senator from Arkansas may desire to ask.

Mr. CARAWAY. I simply wish to know—and I am not trying to cross-examine the Senator from Maine; he understands that——

Mr. FERNALD. I understand that.

Mr. CARAWAY. But the Senator has the information, and I have not. Is there any reason why the association indicated in the joint resolution desires Congress to supervise the construction of the proposed building?

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know that they wish Congress to do so, but I desire that Congress shall. The committee felt that Congress ought to supervise the construction of a building of such magnitude.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did the suggestion originate with Congress or with the association?

Mr. FERNALD. To what suggestion does the Senator from Arkansas refer?

Mr. CARAWAY. I refer to the suggestion to pass a joint resolution creating a commission.

Mr. FERNALD. The committee felt that it was very proper that such a commission should be created.

Mr. CARAWAY. And there was no such suggestion from those who desire to erect the building?

Mr. FERNALD. I do not know that they made any suggestion of that kind.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I call for the regular order, if this discussion is going on all day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CARAWAY. I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now before the Senate is whether the unanimous consent asked for by the Senator from Maine shall be granted.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] wishes to take me off my feet in that way, I will object to the request for unanimous consent, and then I will take just as much time in the discussion of the next bill as I had intended to consume on this bill, so the Senator will not save any time. He can be personally offensive if he wants to, but he is not going to save any time by it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am not trying to prevent the Senator from Arkansas from speaking; he may take all day if he wants

to; but I understood the Senator from Maine to say that if the joint resolution consumed more than a brief time he would not press it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know the Senator from Maine so stated. The Senator from Minnesota can take me off my feet if he wants to do so, but I shall take the time on the next bill, so the Senator from Minnesota will be disappointed if he thinks he will save time by this rather unusual procedure. I am going to make my statement now or I am going to make it later on, and I am going to object to the joint resolution if this procedure is to be followed; otherwise it will take but a few moments of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it is desired to stop business by a rough-house a day or so before Christmas. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may be allowed to make his statement.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not wish to have unanimous consent for that purpose. If the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] desires to insist on his objection I wish him to do it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the demand for the regular order be withdrawn.

Mr. KELLOGG. I withdraw my demand for the regular order. If the Senator from Arkansas desires to do so he may occupy the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand the demand for the regular order is withdrawn, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands.

Mr. CARAWAY. All I wish to know is, under this proposed legislation how much is Congress probably going to be asked to expend? I do not like to rush into these things without fully understanding the situation.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I am glad to answer the Senator's question. The committee went into this matter very carefully. I am not not easily carried away by visionary or ethereal proposals. Before we would consider the subject at all I told the representative who appeared that until I was satisfied that the project had financial backi..g sufficient to erect the building and that the association wanted to erect it, I did not feel that it was of sufficient importance to bring the matter before the committee. Mr. Bradley, of New York, the attorney for the association, appeared and stated that the money was forthcoming from somewhere to erect the building, and that the Government would not be asked to make any contribution at all; but I assumed on my own responsibility that the Government might be asked to furnish a site; and I think that will be the extent of the Government's contribution. Those back of this project propose to erect the building with their own money.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ESTABLISHMENT OF BATTELL NATIONAL PARK, VT.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys I report back the bill (S. 1080) to provide for the establishment of Battell National Park, in the State of Vermont, with the recommendation that the bill be indefinitely postponed. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, in lieu of the bill which has just been indefinitely postponed, I report a Senate concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the concurrent resolution for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) was read, as follows:

Whereas Joseph Battell, deceased, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept said devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection, unless it shall lead to debate.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think it will lead to any debate; but I will say a word of explanation, if the Senate desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the record I ask that a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior may be printed in the RECORD in order to explain the action taken by the committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, June 2, 1921.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
Chairman Committee on Public Lands,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your request of April 23, 1921, for a report on S. 1080, Sixty-seventh Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to provide for the establishment of Battell National Park, in the State of Vermont." This bill is identical with S. 4644 of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

From our records and the form of the proposed bill it appears that the area in question covers about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren in the State of Vermont, which were devised to the United States of America for national-park purposes under the will of Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, Addison County, Vt.

Before these lands could be accepted for the purpose indicated, they would require a careful inspection by a representative of the National Park Service. A large number of details have to be considered preliminary to the creation of national parks, such as whether the area in question expresses in the highest terms the kind of exhibit they represent, and whether the park, if and when created, would be susceptible of effective administration and control. No investigation of these features has been made in the case of the lands covered by the present bill, and until it has been made the department is not in a position to render a report.

Respectfully,

E. C. FINNEY, *Acting Secretary.*

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4221) to amend section 439 of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 4222) to amend the act entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved May 19, 1921, as amended and extended; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. JONES of New Mexico (by request):

A bill (S. 4223) to establish a court of claims and to provide for the settlement of land claims of persons not Indian within Pueblo Indian lands and land grants in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 4224) authorizing a loan of $20,000,000 to Armenia, provided the conference at Lausanne, Switzerland, makes adequate territorial provision for an Armenian national home; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4225) for the relief of John W. Coontz; to the Committee on Military Affairs;

A bill (S. 4226) for the relief of Frances V. Dodge; and

A bill (S. 4227) for the relief of the General Hospital of Weston; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 4228) granting a pension to Oscar E. Glenn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK (by request):

A bill (S. 4229) to provide credit facilities for the orderly marketing of agricultural products and for the preservation

and development of agriculture and of the live-stock industry of the United States; to extend and stabilize the market for United States bonds and other securities; to provide fiscal agents for the United States; to amend the Federal reserve act; to amend the Federal farm loan act; to provide for Federal cooperative banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 261) providing for proportionate distribution among the States of surplus war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE RULES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and lie on the table, and I give notice that I will call it up at the first opportunity hereafter.

The resolution (S. Res. 385) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five, to be composed of Senators who will be Members of the Sixty-eighth Congress, to be appointed by the Vice President, no more than three to belong to the same political party, is hereby authorized. Such committee is authorized and directed to study the rules of procedure of the Senate and to report and recommend what changes should be made in order to expedite business and to enable a majority to bring a question to a vote for final action and at the same time afford reasonable protection for the rights of the minority. Such committee shall submit its report and recommendations to the Senate on or before the second Monday after the opening of the first session of the Senate in the Sixty-eighth Congress.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to submit the notice which I send to the desk and ask that it may be read and printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho presents a notice, which will be read by the Secretary.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

I hereby give notice that under Rule XL I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI in order that I may propose to the act (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, the following amendment:

SEC. —. That the President is authorized and requested to invite such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient to send representatives to a conference which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions; and also to consider the subject of further limitation of armaments with a view of reaching an understanding or agreement upon said matter both by land and by sea, and particularly relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement, or less, and of aircraft.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13374, being the naval appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13374, being the bill making appropriations for the Navy Department. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the bill to which the Senator from Wyoming has just directed attention is one of great importance.

Mr. WARREN. I asked unanimous consent, Mr. President, for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KING. I so understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair propounded the request of the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Utah is now making some observation.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator from Utah object to the request?

Mr. KING. Certainly; the Senator from Wyoming can not take me off the floor, and ought not to insist upon a categorical answer.

Mr. WARREN. I had the floor and the Senator can not take me off the floor.

Mr. KING. The Senator did not have the floor. The Chair had asked if there was objection, and I arose, addressed the Chair, and received recognition.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if there is objection to the request for unanimous consent, I shall move that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had propounded to the Senate the request of the Senator from Wyoming and was awaiting the response of the Senate.

Mr. KING. And I addressed the Chair and received recognition.

Mr. LODGE. It is not a debatable question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the two distinguished Senators upon the other side who are now standing in their places and looking alternately at me and at the Chair would possess their souls in patience for a moment, we might reach a happy termination. I was about to ask the Senator from Wyoming, in view of the fact that it is an important bill, carrying more than $300,000,000 in appropriations, and in view of the fact that it was but yesterday reported by the committee to the Senate, so that there has been no opportunity for an examination of its provisions, if he would not consent to let it go over for a day and give us full opportunity to investigate the bill and the numerous items which are found therein?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator is addressing his question to me——

Mr. KING. I am.

Mr. WARREN. I should like, as I always like to do, to accommodate the Senator from Utah; but the time is somewhat limited, and the bill has been under preparation a good while, and very carefully scanned, and it makes very few changes as to the various matters. I will ask the Senator if this suggestion will not meet with his views: I think we would better take up the bill and proceed with it, and if the Senator at any one point would like to lay a matter aside until we go on with the other items we will proceed not in any hurried way, but we must move along.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that I am not disposed to offer any impediment whatever to a fair consideration of these bills.

Mr. WARREN. I shall endeavor to cooperate with the Senator.

Mr. KING. And yet the Senator knows that the Navy bill as well as the Army bill, particularly the Navy bill, ought to receive considerable attention at the hands of the Senate; and the fact that a subcommittee or a full committee have considered the items, and the members of those committees may be familiar with them, does not argue that the rest of the Senate ought not to have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the various items, and to satisfy themselves as to the wisdom of the very large appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming will endeavor to see that the Senator from Utah has abundant opportunity, as we go along, to give such consideration as we are able to give to these matters; but there are 96 Senators, as the Senator knows, and it would be difficult to arrange these appropriation bills, of which we have so many to dispose of in a short time, so as to comport exactly with the request of each and every Senator. I think that with the condition the bill is in, as the Senator knows—perhaps he has already given it attention—we could go along, and the Senator certainly will have abundant time to correct anything that he thinks is wrong.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Senator appreciates the fact that sometimes, without an opportunity to examine the testimony which was submitted in the House—and I find here testimony of seven or eight hundred pages—inquiries are made upon the floor of the Senate which would not be made if full opportunity were given to examine the testimony and the hearings. In other words, the debate is more or less unsatisfactory. It consists, perhaps, in asking questions which would not be asked if opportunity were given to Members to investigate. It is obvious that since this bill came before the Senate no Senator has had an opportunity to examine it, to go through the hearings, and to familiarize himself with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there are thousands of pages of testimony concerning these appropriation bills. Of course, neither the committee nor I have any power of compelling attention to those matters, but the desire on the part of the committee is to extend every courtesy. I know the Senator will not complain of the way we have conducted the bills.

I move that we now take up the appropriation bill for consideration.

Mr. KING. I realize, of course, the power of the Senator to have it taken up on motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming withdraws his request for unanimous consent and moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 13374.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, it is usual to ask consent to omit the formal first reading of the bill and then to have it read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall be first considered. I therefore make that request now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be

dispensed with, and that the bill be read first for action on the committee amendments.

Mr. KING. That means, of course, a reading of the full text of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Absolutely.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the request, but I should like to know what the program is with reference to this bill. There seems to have been an impression that there would not be very much consideration of this measure, but I am satisfied that there will be considerable consideration of it.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator. I think there will be great consideration of the bill; and that is one of the reasons why I wish to have it taken up early and proceed with it according to the convenience of the various Senators.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I shall not object to this request, but may I ask another question? Is it anticipated that we are to conclude the consideration of this bill to-day?

Mr. WARREN. I consider it somewhat doubtful, but I should like to pursue its consideration as long as we can. As the Senator knows, if it goes over until next week we are likely to lose an entire week except for the consideration of this bill; so we must move along.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to take up a moment's time except to consider those things which I think are very vital. I certainly shall not object to this request; but I doubt if there is a quorum in the city, and certainly we would not want to undertake to dispose of this measure without a quorum of the Senate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the request of the Senator from Wyoming. I should just like to inquire if the total appropriation carried in this bill is larger than the last appropriation, just prior to the Arms Conference which was held in the city of Washington?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The comparative figures are given in the report of the committee. They exceed the appropriations for 1923 by $1,250,904.75.

Mr. HEFLIN. How much was the last appropriation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The last appropriation, for the fiscal year 1923, was $294,353,473.25.

Mr. HEFLIN. Was that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; that was for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1923.

Mr. HEFLIN. Was that the last appropriation bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; that was the last act.

Mr. HEFLIN. And this appropriation is larger than that?

Mr. POINDEXTER. This is larger than that by a million and a quarter dollars.

Mr. HEFLIN. So that it is costing more money to keep up the Navy now than it was before we had the Arms Conference?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; it is not costing as much, but an increased appropriation is carried in this bill in the interest of economy, to carry out without interruption and without slowing down the work upon the ships that were retained under the Arms Limitation Conference and treaty.

Mr. HEFLIN. But the point I am making is that this appropriation is larger than the appropriation which was made before we undertook to do something to prevent excessive armament and the expenditure of enormous sums of money in the upkeep of the Navy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The last appropriation was made in contemplation of the Arms Limitation Conference. That appropriation was affected by the conference. It would have cost over $305,000,000 to complete the building program under the act of 1916. It will cost only a little over $100,000,000 to complete it as limited and modified by the Arms Limitation Conference.

Mr. HEFLIN. There is one other question that I want to ask the Senator. Is the amount provided for in this bill as reported by the Senate committee larger or smaller than the amount which was provided for in the bill when it came over from the House?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is larger.

Mr. HEFLIN. I simply want to call attention to that point—that frequently appropriations are cut down in the House, and some Republican rushes into print with the statement that they are going to save to the Government so many million dollars on this item and that, and when those bills get over here the amounts are put back and more, and the amounts are larger than they were when the bill left the House, and the amount that they claim is saved to the people is not really saved at all. Instead of cutting down the appropriation it is increased, at the cost and expense of the taxpayers of the United States. I am not going to object to the request of the Senator. I have no objection to taking the bill up for consideration at this point.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to suggest——

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I had not yielded the floor. I had yielded to the Senator from Florida, but the Chair did not hear him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is of the opinion that a discussion of the bill is not in order upon a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. HEFLIN. I had completed what I had to say.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator from Alabama was not discussing the bill. He was asking some questions about it, and I was simply pointing out that the bill exceeds the estimates for 1923 by over $800,000.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in further answer to the question asked by the Senator from Alabama as to the effect upon the appropriations of the Arms Limitation Conference, I should like to call his attention to the fact that the amount carried in the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922, the last appropriation bill preceding the Arms Limitation Conference, was $413,239,949, which was $180,879,181 more than the appropriation for the first year under the Arms Limitation Conference treaty.

TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the consideration of the naval appropriation bill, but there is a matter of very great importance to the whole country which I feel it my duty to call to the attention of the Senate for a few moments. It is the rule for the taxation of national banks.

More than a year ago bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate—in the Senate by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and myself—to change the law permitting the States to tax national banks and to change the rule of taxation. One bill passed the House, a bill which was absolutely ineffectual, which did not give any relief whatever. When the bill came to the Senate it went to the Committee on Banking and Currency, about a year ago. Last June it was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I personally appeared several times before the committee and argued the matter, showing how in some States banks were recovering back their entire taxes. In the city of New York alone the banks have recovered $20,000,000, and they have no way of raising the amount of money which should be properly assessed upon the banks, by reason of the fact that Congress insists on not changing the old rule, which has been in existence for more than 40 years.

Very briefly I want to call that to the attention of the Senate and to say that if the Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, or the full committee, do not report a bill covering the subject by Wednesday next I shall move to discharge the committee, and will bring it before the Senate, and I wish very briefly to state the very great importance of that legislation to the country.

When the national bank act was passed Congress provided that the stock and real property of banks might be taxed by the States under two conditions, one that the real estate should be taxed at no greater rate than was assessed against other real estate, and the other that the stock of the banks should not be taxed at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of the States.

At that time, of course, we had no national banks. The banking business of the country was in the hands of State banks, and very largely in the hands of private individuals. There was no such thing permitted in the State as a private bank; they were all State banks or trust companies, and in some States they had banking firms. I am not going to weary the Senate with a discussion of the legal problem. I just wish to bring up the importance of this question.

For many years it was considered as the rule that only banking capital which came in competition with national banks was to be considered as the basis for this rule; in other words,

because the money and intangible credits in the hands of the individual citizen came in competition with banks the banks should not be taxed at a greater rate than the moneyed capital in the hands of private citizens. There ceased to be any such thing.

Eighteen or twenty of the States, finding it impossible to tax the individual citizen upon his goods and bills receivable, intangible assets, and money in bank at the same rate at which bank stock was taxed, passed laws, some providing for income taxes, some of them so many mills on the dollar. To give an illustration, in my own State when we had a direct system of taxation of intangible assets of private individuals we used to collect about three hundred or three hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. We changed to a 3 mill a dollar tax on individual intangible assets, and we are now collecting a million three hundred thousand. I am informed that in the State of New York, while formerly they would get a little over a million dollars, to-day they collect in the neighborhood of thirty-five or forty million dollars.

About a year ago the Supreme Court of the United States, in a case coming up from Virginia, held that the rule was that intangible credits in the hands of the individual citizen—that is, deposits in banks, notes, bills receivable, and accounts held by individuals—were within the rule, and that the national banks could not be taxed any more, although any man who knows anything about business knows that those things do not come in competition with national banks at all. It was stipulated in the case that they did.

Without going into the discussion of it, I introduced a bill which changed the rule, and provided that the tax imposed shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital employed in the business of banking. That includes individuals, private banks, State banks, trust companies—all capital engaged in banking which comes in competition with the banks.

This is a serious situation. The trouble is due to Congress maintaining a rule which has outgrown its usefulness. I certainly do not think banks should be taxed more than other property and other business is taxed, but it is absurd to say that a bank which receives deposits and does a regular banking business shall pay no more on its stock than the individual citizen on his notes, bills receivable, credits, and so forth.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. I think I understand the question as presented by the Senator, and the cause of complaint, in brief, is this, that a larger amount of taxes has been collected from national banks than ought to have been collected, particularly in view of the recent decision of the Supreme Court, and it is further contended that if the right amount of taxes were collected it would bankrupt State treasuries. The plan is to devise some scheme whereby some of our States may not be required to refund to these banks.

Mr. KELLOGG. That is part of the plan.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator give me his view as to this proposition: Could the State, by the passage of a statute, prevent the banks from paying this tax which they ought to have paid, but have not, and make it retroactive?

Mr. KELLOGG. In other words, does the Senator mean, can a State pass a curative act and make it retroactive?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes; and make it retroactive.

Mr. KELLOGG. There is no question about it whatever. The States have absolute power, if Congress consents to it. As I said, notable examples of the injustice of this exist in the State of New York and the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I put another question to the Senator?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes; I will answer the Senator's question.

Mr. POMERENE. In the State of Ohio all property, real and personal, tangible and intangible, is taxable according to a uniform rule and according to its real value in money. Presumably, therefore, these taxes have all been levied in accordance with the constitutional rule. Assume, for the sake of the argument, that they have taxed the national banks more heavily than they ought to have taxed them, but in fact they have not taxed them over and above the real value in money. What relief could those banks get?

Mr. KELLOGG. They do not get any relief at all. The Supreme Court has held that the States may tax real estate at one rate and bank stock at another; corporations at one rate and bank stock at another; but they must not tax banks more than the individual citizen pays on his intangible credits. There is no consistency in such a rule as that. They can exempt corporations generally and tax banks, and yet they must tax banks no more than the ordinary citizen. I will mention the question of ratification in a minute.

I now send to the desk and ask to have read a short statement by the comptroller and the mayor of New York, showing the deplorable condition they are in; and, as I understand from the Senator from Massachusetts and the tax authorities in his State, Massachusetts is in much the same position.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, the State of Massachusetts is in the same position as New York and many other States are in, and unless some remedy is given by Congress, the decision to which the Senator has referred will put an intolerable burden on the cities and towns, and will go far toward bankrupting some of our towns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the statement sent to the desk by the Senator from Minnesota.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

BOARD OF ESTIMATE WILL APPEAL FROM BANK-TAX DECISION—CRAIG SAYS RULING WILL COST CITY ULTIMATELY $20,000,000—COMPTROLLER FORESEES IMMEDIATE INCREASE OF FIVE POINTS IN THE TAX RATE.

The board of estimate decided to-day to appeal the recent decision of the court of appeals nullifying the 1 per cent national-bank tax. If the decision stands, Charles L. Craig, city comptroller, said it would cost the city ultimately $20,000,000.

In addition to this, Mr. Craig said in a statement read to the board, the decision means a rearrangement of the city budget, since the city has already expended over $10,000,000 of funds collected through the tax. He declared that it would necessitate an increase of 5 points in the tax rate next year to make up the deficit, and ultimately an an increase as high as 20 points.

The bank tax, Mr. Craig went on to say, has always been counted on as a source of revenue in making up the budget. Last year the amount accruing from this source was $5,000,000, and this year a total of $7,000,000 was anticipated.

According to the court of appeals decision, the banks are not only exempted from future payments but the city is obliged to pay back money collected on the bank tax in 1910 and 1921.

DENOUNCED BY HYLAN

Craig's announcement drew a general chorus of protest from members of the board. Mayor Hylan said that if the courts and mandatory legislation continued to shift the financial burdens of the State from the corporations to the small taxpayers the government of the city might just as well cease to function.

"For my part I would rather go to jail than take bread and butter from the mouth of a poor workingman," the mayor said. "As I see it, if the legislature keeps on passing mandatory legislation and the court of appeals continues to make decisions which practically take the burden away from banking and corporate interests and place it on the shoulders of the people we might as well close down.

"I don't see what can be done. Here are large sums of money which must be taken from the pockets of the taxpayers of the city, and the banking interests are relieved of the burden. I am glad that the matter has come up in open meeting, so people here will know that besides this they are compelled to raise thirty or forty million dollars to meet the demands of mandatory legislation for the new budget. I pity the poor taxpayers."

The comptroller called attention to the state of the city finances as affected by the decision. The nonavailability of the bank tax for 1922, he said, would create a deficit in the city's general fund for this year alone amounting to about $2,000,000, which will wipe out the balances and leave the deficit to be carried into the new year.

"There appears to be no provision of law," the statement concluded, "under which the city is authorized to make good such a deficit except to reduce the expenditures to be financed from the general fund. In other words, some way must be found, such as the shutting down on the purchase of supplies, the making of necessary repairs, the closing down of public offices, and reducing them to part-time service.

"I will not disburse moneys that have not actually been made available for disbursement by taxes lawfully levied."

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I had the article read so as to bring the attention of the Senate to the situation. The same situation exists in Massachusetts and I do not know in how many other States. I wish to suggest to the mayor of New York that he need not blame the Supreme Court of New York or the legislature of New York, although if he does I would remind him that the legislature which enacted the law which was in question was a Democratic legislature and the law was approved by Governor Smith, I am informed. But that is neither here nor there.

The trouble is with Congress. The Supreme Court of the State of New York is simply following the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. If Congress is going to keep in existence without modification an act which prevents the States from adopting a substituted system of income tax and different systems of taxation as to individual credits and compels the States to tax the banks exactly the same as they tax individual citizens, then of course we must expect such legislation and such decisions and such results.

I do not ask that the States shall be free to tax the banks exorbitantly. It is to the interest of the national banking system and of the whole country that the States should not have the power to excessively tax national banks and discriminate in favor of State institutions and trust companies and other moneyed capital which does come in competition with national banks, but to select out simply the intangible credits of an individual and say that the banks shall not be

taxed at a greater rate than that because the individual comes in competition in the banking business with the banks is, in my judgment, an absurdity in legislation. I dare say there is not a city in the United States where the individual credits really come in competition with the great banking business of the country.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] asked whether the States have the power retroactively to cure the taxes which have been held illegal. There is not the slightest doubt about it. The States have no power to tax the banks except by the consent of Congress. Congress lays down the rule under which they are to be taxed, and if the States violate the rule of course the tax is illegal. Now the States alone can not ratify the illegal tax, but Congress can give its consent to the States and then the State legislatures may ratify it, because it is a familiar rule of law that whatever the State could originally have done in taxation or whatever Congress could originally have done it can cure by a curative act.

The position is simple. The committee may come to some conclusion to remedy the situation, and if it is not remedied during this Congress the city of New York will have placed a burden on other taxpayers, as will the State of Massachusetts, and I do not know how many other States, and it is going to destroy the taxing systems of 18 or 20 States.

Mr. President, I am willing to wait a reasonable time, but if the measure is not reported by next week or some report made on the bill, either adversely or in some other way, I shall move to discharge the committee.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter upon a discussion of the subject adverted to by the Senator from Minnesota. It is in justice, however, to the committees that I desire to speak a word or two.

There are several bills pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency bearing upon this question, one introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] and several by other Senators. There are many more or less grave questions at law involved in the proposed legislation. First, it is not quite so certain that Congress has the power to validate invalidly levied taxes by a given State. That is a debatable question. Briefs have been submitted to the subcommittee upon that question and lawyers of reputation and learning differ as to that point. I am inclined to the view that it is competent for Congress to validate, or, rather, authorize a State to validate, invalidly assessed and levied taxes on national banks by the several States; but I am by no means certain in my own mind of the soundness of that view. The latest decision of the Court of Appeals of New York holds that the system of taxation in that State in so far as it affects a tax on the capital stock of national banks is contrary to the Federal statute, and hence that such tax is invalid.

When the erudite mayor of New York undertakes to criticize the courts and the law and legislation generally, and speaks of the poor taxpayer, it ought to be borne in mind that the laws of New York, as administered, taxed national banks in a certain way and exempted from like taxes such poor taxpayers as J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and other poor concerns engaged in the banking business.

But I did not rise to discuss the many points involved in the proposed legislation. I wish merely to advise the Senator from Minnesota and the Senate that the Committee on Banking and Currency will be ready, I think, within a few days, perhaps during the coming week, to make report in respect of the several bills referred to. I hope and think I shall be able to support the bill which they shall favor.

I appreciate that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case known as the Richmond case, the late decision of the Court of Appeals of New York, and other decisions, and the existing facts, not only in New York but in Massachusetts and other States, make it incumbent upon us to take some action within our power to relieve the situation and to provide for wise and valid State action in the future.

Let me add a thought or two which may be worthy of consideration by Senators before the proposed measures come up for fuller discussion. Of course, no State can assess a Federal or national bank without the consent of the Federal Government. Now, it may become necessary, it may be wise, to amend the Federal statute as to the power of States to assess national banks. But whatever law the Congress enacts on that subject must, of course, be observed in spirit and purpose by the several States when they come to legislate on the subject. Another question to be considered is the question of validating hitherto invalidly assessed and levied taxes by a given State. Now, unless an appeal is prosecuted from the decision of the highest court of New York to the Supreme Court of the United States, the law will stand in that State at least as being that certain taxes paid by the national banks amounting to some $20,000,000 must be returned to them. I scarcely need to remark that the mayor of New York City has no power over the matter.

I question very much whether the legislature of that State has immediate power to relieve the situation; that is to say, prevent recovery by the national banks. But in any event there are two big questions to consider: First, how and in what way shall the Federal statute be amended in respect to future taxation of national banks by the several States; and second, is it competent for Congress to validate or authorize the State government to validate taxes which according to decisions were invalidly levied. I merely mention these controverted questions. But upon all this subject and many of the points involved I may find it necessary to enlarge when the bill comes before the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Has the matter been referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes; a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator from Minnesota appeared before the subcommittee?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Yes.

Mr. KELLOGG. Several times.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And he has filed a brief. We have received many briefs upon both sides of the question. We have listened for several hours to oral argument, and the matter may be said to be sub judice now.

Mr. LODGE. The House bill has been over here nearly a year, has it not?

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. The practical thing to do is to have a meeting of the subcommittee and thrash it out.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. We have had many meetings of the subcommittee. Of course it has headway; but I am not here apologizing for anything, because I know of nothing that calls for apology.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, one suggestion of the Senator from California is that the law of New York discriminates in favor of J. P. Morgan & Co. The Senator knows that the bill which I drew provides that the tax imposed on national banks shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon all moneyed capital employed in the business of banking, it does not make any difference whether it is Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., or who it is. They, of course, should be taxed at the same rate. Anybody engaged in the business—I do not care whether it is a private individual, a trust company, or whoever it may be that is engaged in the banking business in competition with banks—using his capital or the capital of the corporation, should be taxed at the same rate as the banks. So there is no question of J. P. Morgan & Co. in the matter.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. There is a very big question about the exemption of J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., engaged in the banking business, from the payment of like taxes paid by the national banks.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator deny that my bill would prevent any discrimination in their favor?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. No.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then what does the Senator mean when he insinuates——

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do not insinuate. When I say a thing I undertake to speak directly and with accuracy.

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well, then.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I make no insinuations; far from it; but since some spirit has been manifested——

Mr. KELLOGG. I have the floor, and I do not yield any further to the Senator until I get through.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I thought the Senator from Minnesota had yielded the floor.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have not yet finished.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I submit that the Senator from Minnesota yielded the floor——

Mr. KELLOGG. I did not.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And I was recognized by the President pro tempore; but if the Senator desires to say more, I shall be glad to listen.

Mr. KELLOGG. I am not criticizing the Senator.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. And neither was I criticizing the Senator from Minnesota; far from it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I have not criticized the committee, but I have stated that the matter involved in these bills has been pending before the subcommittee since last June. I appeared

before the committee last fall in reference to the bill of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] which is pending. I hope the Senator will give the question as early consideration as possible. I know it is a grave problem, which needs very careful consideration.

So far as the mayor of New York is concerned, I have already stated—and if the Senator had listened to me he would have known it—I do not believe his criticism of the court is just at all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. That is what I meant to say.

Mr. KELLOGG. As to the question of ratification, I know the Senator from California is too good a lawyer not to agree with me as to that. I do not claim that the Congress itself can ratify the tax; and the bill does not provide for any such thing. The bill simply proposes to give the consent of Congress to a ratification by the States.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Minnesota knows I am in full sympathy with what he is trying to do and with his bill; but would it not be possible now to allow us to go on with the consideration of the naval appropriation bill? Of course, I do not wish to cut off debate.

Mr. KELLOGG. Very well.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield the floor to the Senator from California.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I shall not detain the Senate longer. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may be absent, and for all Members of the Senate, I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD the recent decision of the Court of Appeals of New York in reference to this matter. I think it will be useful in the future discussion of this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The decision is as follows:

December 12, 1922. Tax on capital stock of national banks invalid.

COURT OF APPEALS.

People ex rel. Hanover National Bank of the City of New York, appellant, v. Henry M. Goldfogle et al., respondent.

Appeal from order of the appellate division, first department, affirming order of special term, dismissing writ to review tax assessment.

Martin Saxe for appellant.

William H. King for respondents.

Charles D. Newton, attorney general (Edward G. Griffin, of counsel), for State of New York, intervening.

POUND, J.: Relator, a banking corporation organized under the national banking act of the United States, seeks to review an assessment of its capital stock for taxation for the year 1921 on the ground that taxation thereof by the State is at a greater rate than is assessed on other moneyed capital in the hands of individuals. A national bank is an agency of the National Government. The State has no constitutional power to lay any tax upon it. Its shares of stock are taxable by the State only when and as Congress permits. (McCulloch *v.* Maryland, 4 Wheat. 316; People ex rel. Bridgeport Sav. Bank *v.* Feitner, 191 N. Y. 88, 92; Van Allen *v.* Assessors, 3 Wall. (U. S.) 573.)

Section 5214 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. Comp. Stat., sec. 9779) imposes upon national banks the obligation to pay to the Treasurer of the United States certain duties "in lieu of all existing taxes," and section 5219 (U. S. Comp. Stat., sec. 9784; Barnes Fed. Code, sec. 9256) provides that nothing contained in the Federal national bank act (13 Stat. 99) shall prevent "all the shares in any association from being included in the valuation of the personal property of the owner or holder of such shares, in assessing taxes imposed by authority of the State within which the association is located; but the legislature of each State may determine and direct the manner and place of taxing all the shares of national banking associations located within the State, subject only to the two restrictions, that the taxation shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of such State, and that the shares of any national banking association owned by nonresidents of any State shall be taxed in the city or town where the bank is located and not elsewhere. Nothing herein shall be construed to exempt the real property of associations from either State, county, or municipal taxes to the same extent, according to its value, as other real property is taxed." This section prescribes the full measure of the power of the State to impose taxes upon national banking associations or their shareholders. Any assessment not in conformity therewith is unauthorized and invalid. (First Nat. Bank of Gulfport *v.* Adams, 42 Sup. Ct. 323.)

The tax law of the State of New York Consolidated Laws, CR. 60 (sec. 24, enacted long before any State income tax was imposed, and repealed by ch. 603 of the Laws of 1922), provided: "In assessing the shares of stock of banks or banking associations organized under the authority of this State or the United States, the assessment and taxation shall not be at a greater rate than is made or assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of this State." * * *

The tax law also provides for a tax of 1 per cent on the book value of shares of stock in all banks and banking associations (sec. 24b) and that such tax (sec. 24c) "shall be in lieu of all other taxes whatsoever for State, county, or local purposes upon the said shares of stock, and mortgages, judgments, and other choses in action and personal property held or owned by banks or banking associations the value of which enters into the value of said shares of stock shall also be exempt from all other State, county, or local taxation."

This tax of 1 per cent is a direct tax on the shares of stock without regard to the amount of income earned thereon, whether such income has been retained as surplus or distributed as dividends.

The personal income tax law (Laws 1919, ch. 627; tax law, sec. 352), adopted as part of a new program of tax reform, imposes upon every resident of the State of New York an annual tax upon his net income of from 1 to 3 per cent. Such taxes "are in addition to all other taxes imposed by law, except that money on hand or on deposit with or without interest, bonds, notes, and choses in action and shares of stock in corporations other than banks and banking associations, owned by any individual or constituting a part of a trust or estate subject to the income tax imposed by this article, shall not after July 31, 1919, be included in the valuation of the personal property included in the assessment rolls of the several tax districts, villages, school districts, and special tax districts of the State."

The statute further provides (Laws 1920, ch. 647; tax law, sec. 4a): "Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter, or of any other general, special, or local law, intangible personal property, except shares of stock of banks, or banking associations, whether referred to as personal property, capital, capital stock, or otherwise, after June 30, 1920, shall be exempt from taxation locally for State or local purposes. This exemption shall be in addition to all other exemptions of personal property from local taxation, whether based upon the character, ownership, or amount of property. The term 'intangible personal property,' as used in this section, means incorporeal property, including money, deposits in banks, shares of stock, bonds, notes, credits, evidences of an interest in property, and evidences of debt."

Shares of stock in banks and banking associations, both State and National, are thus subject to a 1 per cent valuation tax. Certain other corporations are subject to franchise taxes, but moneyed capital in the hands of individuals is exempt from taxation locally for State or local purposes. A long line of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States defines the business of banking and holds that the words "moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens" includes moneys invested in private banking houses such as J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and others, together with investments of individuals in securities that represent money at interest and other evidences of indebtedness such as normally enter into the business of banking.

The National Government permits State taxation only on terms of substantial equality in law and in fact, and entire fairness and friendliness. The tax on national-bank shares must not discriminate in favor of moneyed capital entering into competition with the national banks. (Evansville Bank *v.* Britton, 105 U. S. 322; Mercantile Bank *v.* New York, 121 U. S. 138; Aberdeen Bank *v.* Chehalis Co., 166 U. S. 440; Owensboro National Bank *v.* Owensboro, 173 U. S. 664, 676; Amoskeag Savings Bank *v.* Purdy, 231 U. S. 373; Merchants' National Bank of Richmond *v.* City of Richmond, 256 U. S. 635.) The court below has found that the competing capital in the hands of individuals, subject only to the personal-property income tax, is very large. "If the principle of substantial equality of taxation under State authority, as between capital so invested and other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens, however invested, operates to disturb the peculiar policy of some of the States in respect of revenue derived from taxation, the remedy therefor is with another department of the Government, and does not belong to this court." (Boyer *v.* Boyer, 113 U. S. 689, 703.)

The first question is whether the State of New York discriminates against national-bank shares by imposing a tax both on the shares and the dividends, while it imposes a tax on the income only of other competing capital in the hands of private bankers and other individuals. It was held below that if the direct tax and the income tax were both imposed the discrimination would be clear. The respondent contends, by a process of statutory construction which would exclude by implication the particular from the general, that no income tax is imposed on the dividends of bank stock. The test to be applied is not whether such dividends may lawfully be included in the income of individuals taxed by the State but whether they are in fact so included. It is urged that the State had no power to tax such income, for the reason that section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States above quoted permits a tax on valuation only, and, therefore, that it did not tax it. (People ex rel. Alpha P. C. Co. *v.* Knapp, 230 N. Y. 48, addenda page 65, herein.) The language of the statute suggests no such punctilious regard for those whose income is derived from dividends on national-bank shares. On the contrary, it plainly includes such dividends in gross income. Gross income includes (tax law, sec. 359) income from dividends. Dividends from stock in bank corporations owned by resident taxpayers are not included in the list of exemptions.

A clear discrimination is made against resident holders of bank shares which are taxed according to their book value, who are also taxed on their income. The shares of bank stock are taxed by one method and the dividends thereon are taxed by another method. Competing moneyed capital in the hands of individuals is exempt from taxation based on valuation and is assessed by one method, according to income only. The provisions of the law are explicit. The discrimination is unfortunately too clear to escape recognition. We can not assume that any exemption of dividends on national-bank shares from the provisions of the income tax was in the legislative mind. On the contrary, the report of the special joint committee on taxation and retrenchment submitted to the legislature March 1, 1922, the opinion of the Attorney General (March 31, 1920), and the practice of the Income Tax Bureau indicate that by legislative and administrative construction a personal tax upon dividends on the shares was contemplated and collected.

The amount of such moneyed capital in the State of New York thus exempted from taxation, except on income, is not inconsiderable. It is relatively of much consequence. In the city of New York in the year 1921 such competing capital was nearly twice the total capital of the State and National banks. The tax on the capital stock of national banks becomes invalid when it appears that it has become discriminatory. No way of escape from such a conclusion is open except by disregarding the rule which requires us to give a plain meaning to plain words plainly used. (United States *v.* Goldenburg, 168 U. S. 95, 102; Rodgers *v.* United States, 185 U. S. 83, 86.) The validity of the tax on dividends from national-bank stock may be considered when it is assailed by a taxpayer in a proceeding in which it becomes necessary to decide that question.

But assuming for the purpose of the discussion only that dividends on national-bank stock are exempt by implication from the income tax or that the tax thereon is invalid and may be disregarded, the tax on bank shares is discriminatory for another reason. The State may, so long as it observes the rule of fairness and good faith, tax national-bank shares by one method, while it taxes competing capital by another method, without exact uniformity or equality. (Mercantile Bank *v.* New York, supra; People ex rel. Bridgeport Savings

Bank *v.* Feitner, supra.) In doubtful cases the burden may rest on the bank to establish inequality. (Bank of Commerce *v.* Seattle, 166 U. S. 463; First National Bank of Wellington *v.* Chapman, 173 U. S. 205.) Yet the rule laid down for our guidance by the Supreme Court of the United States in substance requires that the shares of the bank shall be taxed only to the same extent that other moneyed capital invested in the State is taxed. (People *v.* Weaver, 100 U. S. 539; Boyer *v.* Boyer, supra.) If the inequality is palpable the State courts are without discretion. It becomes their duty to declare the right asserted under the Constitution of the United States and the statute enacted by Congress in uniformity therewith and to hold the tax invalid. (Merchants' National Bank *v.* City of Richmond, supra.)

When it appears on the face of the statute that bank shares are taxed on valuation at a flat rate and that the owner of competing moneyed capital relatively material in amount is taxed on income only, the court is powerless to say that equality of taxation has been secured and injustice prevented. We are forced to compare two methods which are wholly unlike. How can equality be established or presumed as the necessary result of the taxing statutes? In a very considerable number of cases the valuation tax must inevitably be the heavier burden. It is fixed and certain. The income tax is variable and dependent on income and amount of income. It is conceivable that when returns on such capital are low the bank stock would be taxed and the competing capital would be exempt. In no event would equality exist unless the income on competing capital were large beyond the dreams of avarice and the usual returns on investments.

The relator is entitled to the relief asked for. The orders should be reversed and the assessment vacated, with costs in all courts. (L. S. 359(1).)

Hiscock, Ch. J., Cardozo, McLaughlin, Crane, and Andrews, JJ., concur. Hogan, J., not voting.

Ordered accordingly.

Mr. KELLOGG. I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD a memorandum in the form of a brief which I submitted to the committee, which gives my views on the question, which I think might be of use to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JUNE 9, 1922.

Hon. SAMUEL M. SHORTRIDGE, *Chairman;*
Hon. GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER,
Hon. CARTER GLASS,
Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

GENTLEMEN: Having under consideration S. 2903, to amend the banking act, permitting States to tax the stock of national banks, I desire to make a brief statement in relation to this bill. Under section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States the States are permitted to tax the shares of stock of national banks provided that the taxation "shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens of such State."

I am not going to review the long line of decisions in the State and Federal courts construing this provision, but simply to refer to the last case—the Merchants National Bank of Richmond *v.* City of Richmond, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 6, 1921, and one or two other decisions. In the City of Richmond case it was held that a lower rate of tax imposed on moneys and credits than that upon the bank shares rendered the taxation of bank stocks invalid. It must be noted, however, that the court said "it also was shown by evidence, without dispute, that moneyed capital in the hands of individuals, invested in bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness, comes into competition with the national banks in the loan market," and the court based its decision on that evidence.

Whatever may be said about the long line of decisions appearing on this question, at least for 25 years the general understanding has been that only capital invested in State banks and trust companies which directly comes into competition with national banks was included in the inhibition of section 5219, providing that the shares of national banks should not be taxed at a greater rate than other moneyed capital in the hands of the individual citizens. The court in the case of Aberdeen Bank *v.* Chehalis County, 166 U. S. 440, on page 458, said:

"The business of banking, as defined by law and customs, consists in the issue of notes payable on demand, intended to circulate as money where the banks are banks of issue; in receiving deposits payable on demand; in discounting commercial paper; making loans of money on collateral security; buying and selling bills of exchange; negotiating loans, and dealing in negotiable securities issued by the Government, State and National, and municipal and other corporations. These are the operations in which the capital invested in national banks is employed, and it is the nature of that employment which constitutes it in the eye of this statute 'moneyed capital.' Corporations and individuals carrying on these operations do come into competition with the business of national banks, and capital in the hands of individuals thus employed is what is intended to be described by the act of Congress."

This was followed in the case of the National Bank of Wellington *v.* Chapman, 173 U. S. 205.

During all of these years there grew up in the various States methods of taxation by which a different rate of tax was placed upon intangible credits and moneys, different rates of income taxes imposed, until it has become a system in many of the leading States of the country. Some 19 States have adopted such systems. This appears more in detail in the statement made by the tax commissions of the various States in the hearings, page 246 and subsequent pages. The States found that it was impossible to impose upon intangible credits a direct ad valorem tax at the general property rate and to obtain any considerable return in taxes. Take the State of Minnesota, to illustrate. When we had the ad valorem tax at the general property rate, we collected about $300,000 to $350,000 per year.

The law was changed to impose 3 mills upon the dollar, and we now collect more than $1,300,000. Take the State of New York: When it had the old system of taxation it collected about $1,000,000 a year. To-day, under the income provisions in the State of New York, it is collecting $37,000,000, a large amount of which comes from intangible property. Many of the States have mortgage taxes, whereby when a mortgage is filed on real estate the tax is paid in advance in a lump sum. These systems of taxation have never injured national banks in the slightest degree. On the contrary, they, together with all other taxpayers, have benefited thereby and to-day are more prosperous than ever before and the banking capital has enormously and progressively increased.

In fact, the bankers themselves have been very influential in promoting the very laws some of their attorneys are attacking before this committee, and I wish here to state that the attorney or the president of the American Bankers' Association has no right whatever to come before a committee of Congress and claim that he represents all the banks of the country. I know that in my State the banks are in favor of this change in the law, and I believe they are generally throughout the country. Much of the opposition to this bill comes from attorneys who have suits to collect for the banks from local communities, money paid in taxes claimed to be invalid under the present act of Congress and under the Richmond decision. Furthermore, it is idle to say that intangible credits, in the hands of individual citizens, come in competition with the moneyed capital of banks to any perceptible degree. I venture to say that not even in the financial centers in the United States does money loaned by individuals come in competition with the business of the banks to any appreciable extent. It is purely negligible. The money loaned by banks to commercial and business institutions on direct paper is of such enormous volume that the amount loaned by all the individuals in the country is insignificant by comparison. We know that, as a practical matter, mortgages, bonds, and investments of this kind do not come in competition with the short term credits of banks. It is only banking institutions which do the great credit business of the country that really come in competition with national banks; and to require every State and municipality to go into court and prove that intangible credits generally in the hands of citizens do not come in competition, or to go into litigation of that question, is an absurdity and a hardship in the face of the general understanding about business of this kind in the country.

Is it possible that Congress, in order to protect national banks, is going to disrupt all the different systems of taxing moneys and credits at different rates than those imposed upon the shares of national banks? Certainly banks have been prosperous and have not been overtaxed. The taxes hitherto imposed on banks by States and municipalities are naturally reflected in the present value of their shares, and to reduce their taxation to the basis of the money or credits or income taxes in the various States would constitute a gift to the stockholder and seriously hamper the States and municipalities.

What should be done is that Congress should pass a law, similar to the bill which was introduced by Senator Wadsworth, or the one which I shall submit, which is designed to carry out the same purpose, providing that the taxes imposed shall not be at a greater rate than is assessed upon other moneyed capital employed in the business of banking, and thereby carry out the general understanding and practice which has existed for years.

The inconsistency of the claim of the Virginia bankers that they were harmfully discriminated against by a lower rate on privately held intangible investments (the rate in 1915 being 95 cents on such property as against the bank rate of $1.45) is shown by the fact that the Virginia Legislature, in 1922, actually reduced the rate on such privately held intangible investments to 55 cents; and, I am informed, so anxious were the bankers to secure for the State the benefit of such a low rate that they voluntarily submitted to a rate of $1.10 on their own shares.

I ask the committee how this comports with their previous contention that such privately held investments are in competition with the resources of the banks. Incidentally, the present Virginia situation illustrates one of the evil consequences which the Wadsworth bill would cure, namely, that in order to overcome the absurd fiction that a lower rate on intangible investments is hurtful to the banks, an arrangement has to be entered into whereby the banks voluntarily submit, by way of a gentleman's agreement, to a higher rate of tax. We therefore have a new practice in taxation growing out of the Richmond decision, namely, the taxation of banks by gentlemen's agreement. It goes without saying that such an arrangement can be upset at any time by the action of a single bank or of a single stockholder.

We find that Virginia has thus been forced to adopt the Chinese method of taxation by voluntary contribution as a direct result of an economic fallacy.

I next refer to subdivision (3) of my bill, known as the validating clause. There is a similar clause in the Wadsworth bill. The Richmond decision has apparently presented to the national banks in the aforesaid 19 States an unlooked-for opportunity to recover back taxes paid by the banks upon the shares thereof during several years last past, and thus to evade altogether taxation for the years in question, even though such taxes were paid by them at the time without objection or protest. In New York I am informed that something like 90 suits of that character have been instituted and that a test case is now on its way through the courts, and that both sides have announced they will carry the same to the Supreme Court of the United States—that if this test case is successful, practically every one of the 500 national banks in that State may be required to contest taxes for as many years as under the circumstances they are able to do.

In Massachusetts, I am informed that some 40 banks have instituted similar suits; that in Connecticut, while no suits have been started, it is probable that a successful termination of such suits in the other States will give rise to a very large number of similar suits in that State. The same is undoubtedly true as to the remaining States of the 19 which have departed from the general property tax, and in this statement I include my own State of Minnesota. In short, if this matter is allowed to take its course, we will be confronted with a flood of litigation in nearly half of the States of the Union, whereby every local community containing a national bank will find itself subject to a judgment for moneys collected in good faith on the understanding that the levy was legal and regular, where the money has been spent, and where the remaining taxpayers will be required to make good the sums required with interest. Such a situation is, to my mind, intolerable.

With regard to the legality of validating such taxes and thereby quieting the suits referred to, I will not say more than to refer to the case of Grim *v.* Weissenberg (57 Pa. 433), which was cited with approval in United States *v.* Heinszen (206 U. S. 370), where the court said:

"If an act of assembly be within the legitimate scope of legislative power, it is not a valid objection that it divests vested rights. If the

use is public, if it is taxation, the rule against divesting vested rights for private benefit does not apply."

In general, it may be said to be a settled policy of the courts of this country that the legislature may validate any tax theretofore levied which would have been within its jurisdiction to impose in the first instance. In other words, that the legislatures may do retroactively what they might have done prospectively.

On page 241 of the record made before the House committee will be found a letter to the Hon. Samuel Lord, chairman of the Minnesota Tax Commission, signed by three officers of the First National Bank of Minneapolis, the largest bank in the State, viz: F. M. Prince, chairman of the executive committee; F. A. Chamberlain, chairman of the board of directors; and C. T. Jaffray, president. The letter follows:

"We have examined the McFadden bill (H. R. 9579), identical with the Wadsworth bill (S. 2903), now pending in Congress, and wish to advise you that we are in favor of the passage of the same, or one covering substantially the same ground.

"We wish to assure you that we are not disposed to put any obstacle in the way of the collection of the 1921 State personal-property tax on national banks. This tax is assessed and levied against national banks upon the same basis as is the tax upon State banks, and with this general system we are quite satisfied.

"We are advised by our attorneys that upon passage of the McFadden bill, or one substantially like it, the assessment and levy of personal-property taxes in this State upon national banks will be validated and that the same may then be safely paid by the national banks."

This letter, I believe, correctly expresses the attitude of the national banks in my State.

Very respectfully, FRANK B. KELLOGG.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have been absent from the Chamber for a few moments. May I inquire of the Senator from California if any explanation was made by the subcommittee or by the full committee of the reason for the delay in reporting the bill, and if the report thereon may be expected within a short time?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The report may be expected soon. I will say to the Senator from Utah. There were many delays which were due to known causes.

Mr. KING. I am making no complaint at all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. The subject is not to be disposed of by the ipse dixit of anyone. It involves many debatable questions, questions, for example, as to the power of Congress either directly to validate taxes which have been held to be invalid, or, as is designed by the bill of the Senator from Minnesota, whether Congress has power to authorize a given State through its legislature to validate taxes which have been invalidly levied. There are many questions involved in the consideration of the subject which are not to be disposed of by a wave of the hand; but, of course, that is no excuse for indefinite delay.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the former Secretary of the Treasury, and I also, to the extent of my humble ability, as a subcommittee have severally read many briefs upon the subject by gentlemen favoring or opposing these bills—and there are three or four such bills. We have listened to lawyers from Boston, New York, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and possibly from other places upon the various phases of the proposed legislation. Very lately, within a week, indeed, the Court of Appeals of New York has held that their State system of taxing national banks is contrary to the Federal statute, which means in its ultimate that if the decision holds there must be refunded to certain national banks of New York some $20,000,000. It is upon that decision that the mayor of New York comments in the editorial contained in the newspaper clipping which was read by the Secretary.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not deduce from the inquiry which I propounded any criticism of the committee by reason of delay.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Not at all.

Mr. KING. I appreciate, as the Senator has stated, that the question is one of complexity, and many lawyers of ability have differed and will continue to differ regarding the decision of the court and as to the constitutionality of the proposed legislation.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The Assistant Secretary proceeded to read the bill, and read to line 6, on page 2.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when the Senator from Washington had the floor a moment ago, responding to the question propounded by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], he stated the figures carried by this appropriation bill. I rose then for the purpose of asking the Senator if he had not omitted several million dollars which, directly and indirectly, are carried by the bill, which, to that extent, would augment the figures which he gave of $294,000,000 or $296,000,000. As I recall, there is an authorization in the bill for the sale of property and the utilization of all the funds derived therefrom. That may aggregate several million dollars. Then there is carried over from appropriations heretofore made which have not been exhausted a considerable sum. So that in the aggregate my understanding is that this bill appropriates and reappropriates, if I may be permitted that expression, more than $320,000,000. If I am in error as to that, I should be glad to have the Senator correct me.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is a fund, known as the "general supply account of the Navy," which is not in the general fund of the Treasury but is already held by the Navy for the purchase of supplies. It is a revolving fund. The bill as it came from the House to the Senate, no change having been made in it by the Senate committee, does authorize the use of $35,000,000 of that fund for carrying on the work of completion of ships now under construction.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator if the bill does not authorize the application of proceeds derived from the sale of certain properties to some of the purposes defined in the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes; to the amount of $450,000 received from the sale of ordnance property.

Mr. KING. That is the aggregate, is it?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. A fund derived from the sale of ordnance and ordnance materials to the extent of $450,000 is made available by the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there was some controversy in the Committee of the House, as I recall—I have not had time to read the hearings, but I saw some reference to it—in regard to a $19,000,000 charge, being an aggregate of various items, which seemed to lead to considerable dispute as to what was the total carried by the bill. Can the Senator advise me as to that item and what that embraces?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible to tell what the Senator has in mind, unless he can be a little more specific. I have given him quite specific information as to what the bill carries. If the Senator will point out definitely any feature of the bill concerning which he desires information, I will supply it, if possible.

Mr. KING. I will endeavor to secure more definite information regarding that item before the bill is finally disposed of.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was in the item for experimental and research laboratory, on page 7, line 7, after "$20,000," to insert "in addition to the amount authorized by the preceding proviso," so as to read:

Provided, That $25,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the temporary employment of civilian scientists and technicists required on special problems: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for technical, drafting, clerical, and messenger service shall not exceed $20,000 in addition to the amount authorized by the preceding proviso.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 14, to insert:

NAVAL WAR RECORDS.

Toward the collection or copying and classification, with a view to publication, of the naval records of the war with the Central Powers of Europe, including the purchase of books, periodicals, photographs, maps, and other publications, documents, and pictorial records of the Navy in said war, clerical services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, and other necessary incidental expenses, $19,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 4, to increase the appropriation for officers and employees in the office of the Judge Advocate General from $76,420 to $78,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I inquire of the Senator having the bill in charge what reductions, if any, have been made in the clerical force and in the civilian employees of the Navy Department here in Washington and in the various agencies and naval instrumentalities for which provision is made by this bill? What I have in mind particularly is that we have been promised material reductions in the civilian personnel of the various departments of the Government. The Senator will recall that during the war the number of Government employees in the District of Columbia necessarily was greatly increased until the total was considerably more than 100,000, whereas prior to the war the civilian personnel of the departments in Washington was approximately 37,000. I was wondering what diminution there had been, first, in the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, and, second, in the various agencies outside of Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There have been very considerable reductions in the civilian force. The Senator is probably familiar with the public controversy on that subject and the attempt to meet the demand for employment of men employed on the work

of the Navy by curtailing the number of working days in a week and having a 5-day week instead of a 6-day week, so that by that system, without the expenditure of more money, an increased number of employees might be given part-time work.

There has been a very substantial reduction going on, and a readjustment of the working forces of all of the navy yards. A great deal of pressure has been brought to bear toward that end by officers of the Navy and by strict orders of the President to the heads of the various departments, and the result has been a cutting down of the forces to the bone and very much lower than was desirable, according to representations made by the department as to the required force.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Washington whether it is expected to finish this bill to-day? As I understand, it will go over until to-morrow in order to consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no agreement to that effect. I think the understanding was that we would go ahead with the bill in the ordinary way, and give everybody an opportunity to discuss it at such length as he desired. How much time will be required in the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho it is impossible to tell, but when it is reached it will be taken up and considered, and such adjournments as may be necessary will be taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason of the inquiry is that I desire to introduce an amendment to another bill and have a few words to say about it, and I thought I would do that now unless there was great haste in passing this bill.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will allow us to make a little bit of progress with this bill I shall be very much obliged to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not take much time.

Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary read the amendment which I send to the desk, and which I desire to offer to the shipping bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The READING CLERK. On page 62 of H. R. 12817, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 712. Whereas the convention between the United States and Great Britain concluded on the 22d day of December, 1815, and extended by amendatory commercial convention, ratified April 2, 1828, between said countries, provides in Article II of the amended convention, "Either of the contracting parties, in case either should think fit, at any time after the expiration of the said 10 years—that is, after the 20th of October, 1828—on giving due notice of 12 months to the other contracting party, to annul and abrogate this convention, and it shall, in such case, be accordingly annulled and abrogated after the expiration of the said term of notice"; and

Whereas in section 34 of the merchant marine act passed by the Congress and approved June 5, 1920, the President was "authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice to the several governments, respectively, parties to such treaties or conventions, that so much thereof as imposes any such restrictions on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods for the giving of such notice by the provisions of such treaties or conventions"; and

Whereas the President of the United States refused and failed to give notice as required by said act of Congress; and

Whereas in the opinion of the Congress the convention aforesaid discriminates against the trade and commerce of the United States; and

Whereas in any event said convention is no longer responsive in various respects to the commercial needs of the countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall within 90 days after the passage of this act give notice to Great Britain, as required in said conventions as amended, by leaving a copy of this act with the British ambassador to the United States, or, by mailing to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain, London, England, a like copy of this act.

Resolved further, That 12 months after said notice is received by the British ambassador or by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Great Britain the said convention between the United States and Great Britain of date December 22, 1815, as amended by the said convention of date April 2, 1828, is hereby entirely abrogated and annulled, as provided in Article II of said amended convention ratified April 2, 1828.

Resolved further, That the President is hereby requested upon the abrogation of the said treaty as amended to negotiate with Great Britain in lieu of the convention hereby abrogated a convention more in consonance with modern conditions of trade and commerce between the two countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, several days ago, in the debate on the shipping bill, section 34 of the merchant marine act was referred to, and mention was made of the action of President Wilson first and the action of President Harding later in declining to give notice as required in section 34 of the said act of Congress. I stated at the time that I should offer later an amendment looking to the abrogation of those commercial conventions referred to in section 34. I thereupon wrote a letter to the Secretary of State asking for a list of the nations that were affected, the nations with which we had treaties which were or might be affected by the provisions of section 34 of the merchant marine act. I ask unanimous consent to put into the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DECEMBER 13, 1922.

Hon. CHARLES E. HUGHES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920 authorized and directed the President, within 90 days after the act became a law, to give notice to the several governments, parties to the treaties, which restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States. As I recall, both President Wilson and President Harding declined to carry out the provisions of this act.

Would you be good enough to give me a list of the treaties containing such restrictive provisions? Should your office have copies of the several treaties, I would like to have copies; but if copies can not be obtained, will you give me the number, the dates, the countries with which they were negotiated, and the time of notice required to annul as to each treaty? I will greatly appreciate it.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH McKELLAR.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD—and I shall not read it now, but simply refer to it—the reply of the Secretary of State to me, of date December 20, giving the names of the various nations that are affected by that provision of the act of 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 20, 1922.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of December 13, 1922, asking for a list or copies of the treaties to which the United States is a party, containing provisions of the kind referred to in section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920, which restricts the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States. You also ask for information as to the time of notice required to annul each treaty.

Section 34 of the act of June 5, 1920, provides for a notice of the termination of treaty provisions between the United States and other countries "which restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminating customs duties on imports entering the United States in foreign vessels and in vessels of the United States, and which also restrict the right of the United States to impose discriminatory tonnage dues on foreign vessels and on vessels of the United States entering the United States." It is not clear what treaty stipulations Congress intended should be covered by this provision. I may, however, invite your attention to certain stipulations relating to discriminatory duties and shipping charges.

Nearly all of the so-called commercial treaties between this Government and other nations contain provisions securing for the nationals of each of the contracting parties complete equality in the matter of duties imposed on the cargoes of vessels of each country in the ports of the other. The purpose of such provisions is evidently to prevent any discrimination against vessels through the imposition of discriminatory duties on their cargoes. The following article in the treaty concluded with the Argentine Republic on July 27, 1853, is an example of a provision of this character:

ARTICLE VI.

"The same duties shall be paid and the same drawbacks and bounties allowed upon the importation or exportation of any article into or from the territories of the United States, or into or from the territories of the Argentine Confederation, whether such importation or exportation be made in vessels of the United States or in vessels of the Argentine Confederation."

The treaties just mentioned generally also contain other provisions securing for the nationals of each of the contracting countries reciprocal equality generally with regard to duties on goods shipped from one country into the other. Such stipulations stand in the way of discriminatory tariff duties without reference to agencies of transportation. The following comprehensive provision of this character is also found in the treaty with the Argentine Republic:

ARTICLE IV.

"No higher or other duties shall be imposed on the importation into the territories of either of the two contracting parties of any article of the growth, produce, or manufacture of the territories of the contracting party than are, or shall be, payable on the like article of any other foreign country; nor shall any other or higher duties or charges be imposed in the territories of either of the contracting parties on the exportation of any article to the territories of the other than such as are, or shall be, payable on the exportation of the like article to any other foreign country; nor shall any prohibition be imposed upon the importation or exportation of any article of the growth, produce, or manufacture of the territories of either of the contracting parties to or from the territories of the other which shall not equally extend to the like article of any other foreign country."

It will be noted that provisions such as those in the above-quoted article relate to the importation of goods by land and by sea, and are not limited merely as are those rereferred to in the act of June 5, 1920, to goods imported in American vessels or in foreign vessels.

The treaties in question further contain provisions obligating each of the contracting Governments not to impose on the vessels of the other higher tonnage dues than those payable on its own vessels. Article V of the treaty with the Argentine Republic is illustrative of such provisions. It reads as follows:

ARTICLE V.

"No other or higher duties or charges, on account of tonnage, light or harbor dues, pilotage, salvage in case of average or shipwreck, or any other local charges, shall be imposed in the ports of the two con-

tracting parties on the vessels of the other than those payable in the same ports on its own vessels."

The purpose of the so-called most-favored-nation clauses in treaties may be said to be to prevent discrimination in general and comprehensive terms by securing to each contracting party the benefit of any favor awarded to a third nation by the other contracting party. Article III of the treaty with the Argentine Republic may be cited as an example of such provisions. This article reads as follows:

ARTICLE III.

"The two high contracting parties agree that any favor, exemption, privilege, or immunity whatever, in matters of commerce or navigation, which either of them has actually granted, or may hereafter grant, to the citizens or subjects of any other government, nation, or State shall extend, in identity of cases and circumstances, to the citizens of the other contracting party, gratuitously, if the concession in favor of that other government, nation, or State shall have been gratuitous; or, in return for an equivalent compensation, if the concession shall have been conditional."

Provisions of the four general classes to which I have referred are found in treaties with the following countries: Argentine Republic, July 27, 1853; Belgium, March 8, 1875; Bolivia, May 13, 1858; Borneo, June 23, 1850; China, November 17, 1880, and October 8, 1903; Colombia, December 12, 1846; Costa Rica, July 10, 1851; Denmark, April 26, 1826; Ethiopia, June 27, 1914; Great Britain, July 3, 1815; Honduras, July 4, 1864; Italy, February 25, 1871; Japan, February 21, 1911; Liberia, October 21, 1862; Muscat, September 21, 1833; Netherlands, August 26, 1852; Norway, July 4, 1827; Ottoman Empire, May 7, 1830; Paraguay, February 4, 1859; Persia, December 13, 1856; Serbia, October 14, 1881; and Spain, July 3, 1902. It is possible that certain of the provisions of the treaty of commerce and navigation concluded with France on June 24, 1822, are within the intent of section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920.

As you probably recall, the treaty concluded between the United States and Cuba December 11, 1902, provides for free entry of certain commodities shipped from one country into the other and establishes certain rates of duties. Section 34 of the act of June 5, 1920, would seem to require the abrogation of all treaty stipulations that in any way restrict the Government of the United States from imposing discriminatory duties. This treaty with Cuba obviously stands in the way of imposition by the United States of discriminatory duties on certain Cuban products.

The majority of the above-mentioned treaties contain the customary stipulations with regard to termination of a treaty as a whole (not in part) by either party on 12 months' notice. The treaty of 1911 with Japan, which has an initial duration of 12 years, may be terminated by either party on six months' notice given on or after January 17, 1923, and the treaty of 1822 with France may be terminated on three months' notice under the agreement signed July 17, 1919. Of the treaties listed above, those with the Argentine Republic, Borneo, China (November 17, 1880), Liberia, Muscat, and the Ottoman Empire do not contain any stipulation with regard to notice of termination. The treaty of October 8, 1903, with China is operative for successive periods of 10 years from the exchange of ratifications on January 13, 1904, and may be revised at the end of any 10-year period on notice given by either the United States or China. The earliest date on which the treaty of June 27, 1914, with Ethiopia may be terminated is September 19, 1928.

The treaties and conventions concluded by the United States with foreign countries up to the year 1913, which are printed in the United States Statutes at Large, may be conveniently consulted in the compilation entitled "Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements between the United States and Other Powers," in three volumes, which is published by the Government Printing Office. Treaties concluded since the compilation of the third volume of this publication may be consulted in the several volumes of the Statutes at Large.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now offer as an amendment to the shipping bill the amendment that has just been read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. That amendment is in furtherance of the plan that was suggested by me to abrogate those treaties.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the convention between the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty of date December 22, 1815, as extended and amended by a commercial convention whereof the ratifications were exchanged on April 2, 1828. I ask unanimous consent to have both of them printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GREAT BRITAIN—REGULATING COMMERCE.

Convention between the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty to regulate commerce between the two countries.—Signed at London July 3, 1815. Ratification advised by the Senate December 19, 1815. Ratified by the President December 22, 1815. Ratifications exchanged December 22, 1815. Proclaimed December 22, 1815.

James Madison, President of the United States of America, to all and singular to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Whereas a convention between the United States of America and His Britannic Majesty, to regulate the commerce between the Territories of the United States and of His Britannic Majesty, was signed at London on the 3d day of July, in the year 1815, by plenipotentiaries respectively appointed for that purpose, which convention is in the words following, to wit:

"The United States of America and His Britannic Majesty being desirous, by a convention, to regulate the commerce and navigation between their respective countries, territories, and people in such a manner as to render the same reciprocally beneficial and satisfactory, have respectively named plenipotentiaries and given them full powers to treat of and conclude such convention; that is to say—

"The President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, hath appointed for the plenipotentiaries John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and Albert Gallatin, citizens of the United States, and His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, acting in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, has named for his plenipotentiaries the Right Hon. Frederick John Robinson, vice president of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Plantations, joint paymaster of His Majesty's forces, and a member of the Imperial Parliament; Henry Goulburn, Esq., a member of the Imperial Parliament and undersecretary of State, and William Adams, Esq., doctor of civil laws.

"And the said plenipotentiaries having mutually produced and shown their said full powers, and exchanged copies of the same, have agreed on and concluded the following articles, videlicet.

"ARTICLE THE FIRST.

"There shall be between the Territories of the United States of America and all the territories of His Britannic Majesty in Europe a reciprocal liberty of commerce. The inhabitants of the two countries, respectively, shall have liberty freely and securely to come with their ships and cargoes to all such places, ports, and rivers in the territories aforesaid to which other foreigners are permitted to come, to enter into the same, and to remain and reside in any parts of the said Territories, respectively; also to hire and occupy, houses and warehouses for the purposes of their commerce, and generally the merchants and traders of each nation, respectively, and shall enjoy the most complete protection and security for their commerce, but subject always to the laws and statutes of the two countries, respectively.

"ARTICLE THE SECOND.

"No higher or other duties shall be imposed on the importation into the United States of any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of his Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe, and no higher or other duties shall be imposed on the importation into the territories of His Britannic Majesty in Europe of any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States than are or shall be payable on the like articles being the growth, produce, or manufacture of any other foreign country nor shall any higher or other duties or charges be imposed in either of the two countries on the exportation of any articles to the United States or to His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe, respectively, than such as are payable on the exportation of the like articles to any other foreign country, nor shall any prohibition be imposed on the exportation or importation of any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States or of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe to or from the said territories of His Britannic Majesty in Europe, or to or from the said United States, which shall not equally extend to all other nations.

"No higher or other duties or charges shall be imposed in any of the ports of the United States on British vessels than those payable in the same ports by vessels of the United States, nor in the ports of any of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe on the vessels of the United States than shall be payable in the same ports on British vessels.

"The same duties shall be paid on the importation into the United States of any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe, whether such importation shall be in vessels of the United States or in British vessels, and the same duties shall be paid on the importation into the ports of any of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, whether such importation shall be in British vessels or in vessels of the United States.

"The same duties shall be paid and the same bounties allowed on the exportation of any articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe to the United States, whether such exportation shall be in vessels of the United States or in British vessels, and the same duties shall be paid and the same bounties allowed on the exportation of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States to His Britannic Majesty's territories in Europe, whether such exportation shall be in British vessels or in vessels of the United States.

"It is further agreed that in all cases where drawbacks are or may be allowed upon the reexportation of any goods the growth, produce, or manufacture of either country, respectively, the amount of the said drawbacks shall be the same whether the said goods shall have been originally imported in a British or an American vessel. But when such reexportation shall take place from the United States in a British vessel or from the territories of His Britannic Majesty in Europe in an American vessel to any other foreign nation, the two contracting parties reserve to themselves, respectively, the right of regulating or diminishing in such case the amount of the said drawback.

"The intercourse between the United States and His Britannic Majesty's possessions in the West Indies and on the Continent of North America shall not be affected by any of the provisions of this article, but each party shall remain in the complete possession of its rights with respect to such an intercourse.

"ARTICLE THE THIRD.

"His Britannic Majesty agrees that the vessels of the United States of America shall be admitted and hospitably received at the principal settlements of the British Dominions in the East Indies vide licit, Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Prince of Wales' Island, and that the citizens of the said United States may freely carry on trade between the said principal settlements and the said United States in all articles of which the importation and exportation, respectively, to and from the said territories shall not be entirely prohibited—provided only that it shall not be lawful for them in any time of war between the British Government and any State or power whatever to export from the said territories, without the special permission of the British Government, any military stores or naval stores or rice. The citizens of the United States shall pay for their vessels when admitted no higher or other duty or charge than shall be payable on the vessels of the most favored European nations, and they shall pay no higher or other duties or charges on the importation or exportation of the cargoes of the said vessels than shall be payable on the same articles when imported or exported in the vessels of the most favored European nations.

"But it is expressly agreed that the vessels of the United States shall not carry any articles from the said principal settlements to any port or place except to some port or place in the United States of America where the same shall be unladen.

"It is also understood that the permission granted by this article is not to extend to allow the vessels of the United States to carry on any part of the coasting trade of the said British territories, but the vessels of the United States having in the first instance proceeded to one of the said principal settlements of the British Dominions in the East Indies and then going with their original cargoes or part thereof from one of the said principal settlements to another shall not be considered as carrying on the coasting trade. The vessels of the United

States may also touch for refreshment, but not for commerce, in the course of their voyage to or from the British territories in India, or to or from the dominions of the Emperor of China, at the Cape of Good Hope, the Island of St. Helena, or such other places as may be in the possession of Great Britain in the African or Indian Seas, it being well understood that in all that regards this article the citizens of the United States shall be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations of the British Government from time to time established.

"ARTICLE THE FOURTH.

"It shall be free for each of the two contracting parties, respectively, to appoint consuls for the protection of trade, to reside in the dominions and territories of the other party, but before any consul shall act as such he shall in the usual form be approved and admitted by the Government to which he is sent, and it is hereby declared that in case of illegal or improper conduct toward the laws or Government of the country to which he is sent, such consul may either be punished according to law, if the laws will reach the case, or be sent back, the offended Government assigning to the other the reasons for the same.

"It is hereby declared that either of the contracting parties may except from the residence of consuls such particular places as such party shall judge fit to be so excepted.

"ARTICLE THE FIFTH.

"This convention, when the same shall have been duly ratified by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of their Senate, and by His Britannic Majesty, and the respective ratifications mutually exchanged shall be binding and obligatory on the said United States and His Majesty for four years from the date of its signature and the ratifications shall be exchanged in six months from this time or sooner if possible.

"Done at London this 3d day of July in the year of our Lord 1815.

[SEAL.] JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.
[SEAL.] H. CLAY.
[SEAL.] ALBERT GALLATIN.
[SEAL.] FREDERICK JOHN ROBINSON.
[SEAL.] HENRY GOULBURN.
[SEAL.] WILLIAM ADAMS."

Now, therefore, be it known that I, James Madison, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the foregoing convention, have, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, accepted, ratified, and confirmed the same, and every clause and article thereof, subject to the exception contained in a declaration made by the authority of His Britannic Majesty on the 24th day of November last, a copy of which declaration is hereunto annexed.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed, and have signed the same with my hand. Done at the city of Washington this 22d day of December, A. D. 1815, and of the Independence of the United States the fortieth.

[SEAL.] JAMES MADISON.

By the President:
JAS. MONROE,
Secretary of State.

DECLARATION.

The undersigned, His Britannic Majesty's chargé d'affaires in the United States of America is commanded by His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, acting in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, to explain and declare upon the exchange of the ratifications of the convention concluded at London on the 3d of July of the present year for regulating the commerce and navigation between the two countries, that in consequence of events which have happened in Europe subsequent to the signature of the convention aforesaid, it has been deemed expedient and determined in conjunction with the allied sovereigns that St. Helena shall be the place allotted for the future residence of Gen. Napoleon Bonaparte under such regulations as may be necessary for the perfect security of his person, and it has been resolved for that purpose that all ships and vessels whatever, as well British ships and vessels as others, excepting only ships belonging to the East India Co. shall be excluded from all communication with or approach to that island.

It has therefore become impossible to comply with so much of the third article of the treaty as relates to the liberty of touching for refreshment at the island of St. Helena, and the ratifications of the said treaty will be exchanged under the explicit declaration and understanding that the vessels of the United States can not be allowed to touch at or hold any communication whatever with the said island so long as the said island shall continue to be the place of residence of the said Napoleon Bonaparte.

ANTHONY ST. JNO. BAKER.

WASHINGTON, *November 24, 1815.*

GREAT BRITAIN—COMMERCIAL.

Commercial convention between the United States of America and Great Britain. Concluded August 6, 1827. Ratification advised by the Senate January 9, 1828. Ratified by the President January 12, 1828. Ratifications exchanged April 2, 1828. Proclaimed May 15, 1828.

By the President of the United States of America, a proclamation:

Whereas a convention between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was concluded and signed by their plenipotentiaries at London on the 6th day of August, 1827, which convention is, word for word, as follows:

"The United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, being desirous of continuing in force the existing commercial regulations between the two countries which are contained in the convention concluded between them on the 3d of July, 1815, and further renewed by the fourth article of the convention of the 20th of October, 1818, have, for that purpose, named their respective plenipotentiaries, that is to say:

"The President of the United States of America, Albert Gallatin, their envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to His Britannic Majesty;

"And His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, the Right Hon. Charles Grant, a member of his said majesty's most honorable privy council, a member of Parliament, and vice president of the committee of privy council for affairs of trade and foreign plantations; and Henry Unwin Addington, Esq.;

"Who, after having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in due and proper form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

"ARTICLE I.

"All the provisions of the convention concluded between the United States of America and His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, on the 3d of July, 1815, and further continued for the term of 10 years by the fourth article of the convention of the 20th of October, 1818, with the exception therein contained as to St. Helena, are hereby further indefinitely, and without the said exception, extended and continued in force from the date of the expiration of the said 10 years in the same manner as if all the provisions of the said convention of the 3d of July, 1815, were herein specifically recited.

"ARTICLE II.

"It shall be competent, however, to either of the contracting parties, in case either should think fit, at any time after the expiration of the said 10 years—that is, after the 20th of October, 1828—on giving due notice of 12 months to the other contracting party, to annul and abrogate this convention; and it shall, in such case, be accordingly entirely annulled and abrogated after the expiration of the said term of notice.

"ARTICLE III.

"The present convention shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in nine months, or sooner if possible.

"In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the same and have affixed thereto the seals of their arms.

"Done at London the 6th day of August, in the year of our Lord 1827.

[SEAL.] ALBERT GALLATIN.
[SEAL.] CHA. GRANT.
[SEAL.] HENRY UNWIN ADDINGTON."

And whereas the said convention has been duly ratified on both parts, and the respective ratifications of the same were exchanged at London on the 2d day of April, 1828, by William Beach Lawrence, chargé d'affaires of the United States at the court of His Britannic Majesty, and the Right Hon. Charles Grant and Henry Unwin Addington, Esq., on the part of their respective Governments:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, John Quincy Adams, President of the United States of America, have caused the said convention to be made public, to the end that the same and every clause and article thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of May, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-eight and of the independence of the United States the fifty-second.

[SEAL.] JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

By the President:
H. CLAY,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the remarkable fact that we have had no commercial treaty with England since 1815 except this treaty just read. The commercial treaty that we agreed to at that time was agreed to under very peculiar circumstances. The War of 1812 was brought about by Great Britain's impressment of our seamen and by what we called her illegal blockade of ports. As we all recall from history, that war was fought with varying fortunes; and finally, in December, 1814, we agreed to a treaty of peace. Under that treaty the United States got nothing. Not a word is said in that treaty about the impressment of our seamen, and not a word is said about illegal blockades complained of by us—the two things for which we went to war. The only real thing favorable to us accomplished in that war was the Battle of New Orleans, which was fought by Gen. Andrew Jackson on the 8th of January, 1815, after the treaty of peace had been signed, but of which General Jackson did not know. It was under those circumstances, where we had come out in not a successful way, to put it mildly, that the commercial convention of December 22, 1815, was entered into between Great Britain and the United States.

That convention contains a number of discriminations against the American merchant marine. It is very natural that it should. Various discriminations were made. In reality, it applied only to dealings or commerce between the British Isles proper and the United States. It did not refer, except in certain particulars, to colonies. In all matters pertaining to the colonies of Great Britain, the United States was put to a very great disadvantage by the treaty, and under this treaty great discriminations have been practiced against the merchant marine of the United States ever since. I will say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], in charge of this bill, that one of the great reasons for our merchant marine not having been a success was because of the inequality and injustice of the treaty of 1815 between the United States and Great Britain, which, for some remarkable reason, has been in force ever since, and is in force to-day. I have already asked and received permission to put it in the RECORD; but, as giving an illustration, I want to read certain provisions of it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I just want to say to the Senator that there will be no dispute between him and me on that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was sure there would not be. I want to read from article 3 of the treaty:

It is also understood that the permission granted by this article is not to extend to allow the vessels of the United States to carry on any part of the coasting trade of the said British territories, but the vessels of the United States having in the first instance proceeded to one of the said principal settlements of the British dominions in the

East Indies, and then going with their original cargoes, or part thereof, from one of the said principal settlements to another shall not be considered as carrying on the coasting trade.

But here is the sentence to which I particularly refer:

The vessels of the United States may also touch for refreshment but not for commerce in the course of their voyage to or from the British territories in India, or to or from the dominions of the Emperor of China, at the Cape of Good Hope, the Island of St. Helena, or such other places as may be in the possession of Great Britain in the African or Indian seas, it being well understood that in all that regards this article the citizens of the United States shall be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations of the British Government from time to time established.

Somebody suggested here not long ago that it was very outrageous that American ships taking American cargoes to Egypt were prohibited by Great Britain from taking any Egyptian cargoes back to the United States, but had to bring their ships back in ballast; and that is true, but it is directly within the terms of this agreement. The United States has no power to trade in her own ships or, at all events, to bring cargoes from any of the British possessions in any Indian sea or in any African sea against Great Britain's objection; and as Great Britain has large possessions in those seas, the United States is thereby cut off from an enormous trade under this treaty. It is a discriminatory treaty all the way through. It ought to be abrogated. Both parties have outgrown it. It is in a different situation from the other twenty-odd treaties that were referred to in section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920, and for that reason ought to be treated separately. In the amendment that I have offered it is treated separately and it is abrogated, and the President is requested to make a new treaty with Great Britain which will give us the right to trade in British possessions without discrimination as well as in Great Britain itself.

Of course, as long as this treaty is in force America will be discriminated against by the British in trade and commerce, and it should not be so. We ought to be permitted to discriminate in return in the event a discrimination is continued against us.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am rather inclined to think that that situation has been changed by the acceptance by Great Britain of our act. I think it was in 1828 that we repealed our discriminating provision on the condition that other countries would accept it. England, I think, accepted it along about 1853.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that the act of 1828 did not apply to Great Britain, because we already had a treaty with Great Britain; but it did apply to Germany, it did apply to France, and it did apply to some others. At all events, the Secretary of State says in his letter that this treaty is included in section 34.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think the Senator will find that it did apply to Great Britain, although I have not looked the matter up recently.

Mr. McKELLAR. At all events, I am sure the Senator will agree with me, and I believe the Senate will agree with me, that we should not be bound by the provisions of that old treaty, made more than a hundred years ago, before the introduction of steam, before the tremendous improvements which have been made in trade and commerce all over the world, and that it ought to be abrogated. It not having been abrogated in the usual way, then the Congress, in its wisdom, should direct an abrogation of the treaty and request the President to negotiate a new treaty.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, the Senator knows I have been trying to get those treaties abrogated.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it will be done if the Senator will vote for the amendment. I send to the desk a second amendment abrogating other treaties. I do not ask that this amendment be read, but I will ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I have an amendment here providing for the abrogation of treaties with all of the nations, except Great Britain and Japan, which the Secretary of State wrote me would be effected by the provision known as section 34 of the merchant marine act of 1920. This amendment, if adopted, would abrogate all of those treaties except two, one with Great Britain, which I have already discussed, and one with Japan, which I will now discuss for just a moment.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD and offered as an amendment to the pending shipping bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 52, after line 17, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 712a. Whereas in section 34 of the merchant marine act passed by the Congress and approved June 5, 1920, the President was authorized and directed within 90 days after this act becomes law to give notice to the several Governments, respectively, parties to such treaties or conventions, that so much thereof as imposes any such restrictions on the United States will terminate on the expiration of such periods for the giving of such notice by the provisions of such treaties or conventions"; and

"Whereas the President of the United States refused and failed to give notice, as required by said act of Congress, to the nations affected by said section; and

"Whereas treaties with the following countries, together with the date of conclusions of such treaties, are within the intent of section 34 of said merchant marine act of 1920: Argentine Republic, July 27, 1853; Belgium, March 8, 1875; Bolivia, May 13, 1858; Borneo, June 23, 1850; China, November 17, 1880, and October 8, 1903; Colombia, December 12, 1846; Costa Rica, July 10, 1851; Denmark, April 26, 1826; Ethiopia, June 27, 1914; Honduras, July 4, 1864; Italy, February 25, 1871; Liberia, October 21, 1862; Muscat, September 21, 1833; Netherlands, August 26, 1852; Norway, July 4, 1827; Ottoman Empire, May 7, 1830; Paraguay, February 4, 1859; Persia, December 13, 1856; Serbia, October 14, 1881; and Spain, July 3, 1902; and the treaty of commerce and navigation, concluded with France on June 24, 1822; and

Whereas the said conventions are no longer responsive in various respects to the commercial needs of the several countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall, within 90 days after the passage of this act, give notice to each of said nations, as required in said conventions, by leaving a copy of this act with the diplomatic representatives of each of said countries in Washington or by mailing to the officer conducting the foreign affairs of each of said countries a copy each of this act.

Resolved further, That within the time limit mentioned in each convention after said notice is received by the diplomatic representatives at Washington of each of said countries or after said notice has been received by the officer conducting the foreign affairs of each of said nations the said conventions, and each of them, between the United States and each of said countries of dates mentioned herein are hereby entirely abrogated and annulled, as provided for in said conventions.

Resolved further, That the President is hereby requested, upon the abrogation of the said treaties, or any of them, to negotiate with the diplomatic representatives of said countries, in lieu of said conventions hereby abrogated, a new convention more in consonance between the United States and the said several countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. In reference to the treaty with Japan, that treaty was made in 1911. It is a recent treaty and is different from all of the treaties which have been mentioned in the two amendments I have offered. It is very different from the treaty with Great Britain. It very greatly differs from the various commercial conventions which have been made with the other nations mentioned in the second amendment I have offered. As yet I think the Japanese treaty ought to be treated separately, and it ought to be considered more carefully than I have had time to consider it, and I shall not offer that amendment now but shall avail myself of the opportunity of offering it before the bill is finally passed upon.

I have taken occasion to bring these matters before the Senate at this time so that these amendments might be put in the RECORD, in order that the treaty with Great Britain might be put in the RECORD, and in order that this letter of Secretary Hughes might be put in the RECORD, for the benefit of Senators in their further consideration of the shipping bill.

I think those things are very pertinent. I think it is absolutely necessary, if we are to build up a real merchant marine in this country, that those treaties be abrogated and that American rights shall be protected in such new treaties as may be negotiated. As all such new treaties will have to come before the Senate of the United States, I take it that the rights of Americans will be protected properly in the negotiation of those treaties. No one is more concerned than I am in building up our merchant marine. We can not do it by giving a cash subsidy, but we can do it by taking off the shackles that now bind it and passing laws getting business for it.

That is all I have to say about the matter at this time.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, recurring to a few items we had passed, and in view of the question which I propounded to the Senator having the bill in charge relative to reductions in the number of civilian employees and a diminution in the cost of operation, I want to call the Senator's attention to the item of $108,000, appearing on page 2, line 5. I find that in the appropriation bill approved July 1, 1922, which carried the naval appropriations for the current year, there were appropriated, under the head of "Office of the Secretary, salaries, Navy Department," $72,080. If the Senator has the bill of last session before him he will find the allocation of that amount to various persons. In the pending bill this plan seems to have been dispensed with. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend $108,000 for employees in any way he may deem necessary. It gives him carte blanche authority. In all there are appropriated $125,000 under the head of "Office of the Secretary," as against $72,080 in the appropriation bill for the

current year. I was wondering why this carte blanche authority was given the Secretary; why the plan followed in the preceding bill was not followed, and why the various officials were not pointed out, and the salaries which each should receive indicated.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator failed to take into consideration the fact that in addition to the specific appropriation of $72,080 in the act for the current year, there was $58,340 appropriated in a lump sum, making a total appropriation of $130,420 in the act for the current year, against a total of $125,000 in the pending bill. In other words, the pending bill is a reduction in this item of $5,420, instead of an increase.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that we were promised, when the last naval appropriation bill was under consideration, either in the committee or on the floor, I do not recall just which, that the large number of temporary employees provided for in the bill were temporary, and that those employees would not be continued after the current year. As the Senator states, there were $53,340 provided for temporary employees, under the promise, as I understand, that those employees would not be retained as a permanent appendage to the department. Under the Senator's statement, there is a saving of only $5,000 in the office of the Secretary of the Navy, notwithstanding the fact that $53,000 plus were for temporary employees for the current year. It seems to me that after the end of this year those temporary employees should no longer be attached to the office.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator has considered this reduction in only one office, and the Naval Establishment is the same as it was last year. There are the same number of vessels. In fact, there is considerable additional work in the decommissioning of vessels, in carrying out the terms of the arms limitation treaties, and in going on with the construction of those ships which we are to retain under those treaties. It seems to me the department is entitled to considerable commendation for being able to reduce, in one office, the appropriation for clerks, messengers, draftsmen, technical employees, and so forth, to that extent.

In that connection I would call the Senator's attention to the fact that from June 30, 1922, to September 30, 1922, the total decrease of civilians in the entire Naval Establishment, including the department, was from 55,843 to 48,641. Such a decrease is general in all the offices, both of the department and of the establishment outside of the department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the fact that during the war it was necessary to largely increase the forces in practically all of the departments of the Government, and particularly in the War Department and in the Navy Department, it does seem to me that the decrease to which the Senator now refers is inconsequential.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the comparison which I made did not relate to the war force at all. That was reduced on June 30, 1922, enormously. On June 30, 1917, there were 62,224 civilian employees in the department and in the Naval Establishment; on June 30, 1918, there were 100,392; on December 31, 1918, there were 129,843. In addition to those civilian employees on those dates there were large numbers of naval reservists employed on work ordinarily performed by civilian employees, and there has been a reduction from the civilian war force, of which the Senator has spoken, from 129,843 to 48,641.

Mr. KING. I am not sure I understand the Senator. As I understood him a few moments ago, there was a reduction during the past year from 55,000 to forty-odd thousand, and, as I understand the Senator, that related to the civilian force.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It did relate to the civilian force, but immediately following my statement the Senator from Utah said that was a small reduction to have been effected from the war force. I was pointing out to him that that was not the war force, but that the war force was very much greater.

Mr. KING. What I intended to state was that during the war the Government was necessarily compelled to employ a very largely increased force in all departments, and I mentioned particularly the War Department and the Navy Department. As the Senator knows, our Army was increased from a few thousand to more than 4,000,000, and the Navy was increased from a few thousand to more than 400,000, with the marines and all of the auxiliary departments or agencies.

The point I am making is that years after the war is over, and with the plea of the department that pending a return to normal conditions a certain number of temporary employees must be allowed, there is not the reduction in the temporary force that I was led to believe would be brought about.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator would point out and give information to the committee or to the Senate, even now while we are considering the bill, as to opportunities for further reduction of this force, requiring of the force ordinary industry and the hours of labor that are established by the law, I personally would be very glad indeed to join with the Senator in endeavoring to secure further reductions.

I call his attention to the fact, however, and I think the Senator will agree with me, that there has been a very energetic effort made by the Budget officers, I know much to the embarrassment of the Navy, to reduce the force and cut down expenses in every direction. Notwithstanding that effort, and notwithstanding the fact that the desires of the Navy were curtailed by the officers of the Budget, the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs reported the bill containing an amount less in this item than was recommended by the Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before we proceed further in the consideration of the bill, I desire to submit some general observations. I think we may perhaps save as much time as we shall save later by discussing some general propositions at the present time.

It is perfectly clear to me that we are again threatened with a naval race. Different reasons for it have been assigned. I am not going to discuss it with reference to individual responsibility. But it is perfectly apparent that it is here, for the reasons which I shall undertake to disclose as the debate proceeds.

The House committee report which accompanied the bill had this to say:

> It is the committee's information that already large programs are planned of vessels up to the maximum size permitted under the agreement, and that new and larger types of subsurface craft have begun to put in an appearance. In other words, competition is on again in the single direction to which the unratified agreement does not extend, and if it be allowed to go on unchecked the purse strings again must be relaxed and this Government, like all the others, will be constrained to launch upon a new program to the extent necessary to keep us at least abreast of any of the other powers.

I am of the opinion that that statement is well founded, and unless something can be done to prevent it, the purse strings will again be relaxed and we are to have what we had hoped to avoid by the disarmament conference. Building is going on abroad, we are told, along all lines not specifically covered by the disarmament conference treaty. The things which were covered by that treaty have been regarded to some extent as not essential to a modern navy, and therefore the course now being pursued is that of a naval race in those things which really count in modern naval warfare.

There is a very pronounced propaganda in the country in favor of an increased or enlarged navy. There is also a very remarkable propaganda in favor of an increased or enlarged army. The reasons which are assigned for this are because not only of the building abroad in naval affairs, but because of the economic conditions and the discontent and distress which prevail throughout the world. We are told almost daily by the admirals of the Navy or by those who are high in authority in the Army that we may expect almost any day a condition of affairs abroad which will necessitate our having a vast navy and a very much larger army.

There was no more pronounced advocate of disarmament at the time of the disarmament conference was on than General Pershing. He stated, and stated truly, that unless some course could be adopted which would prevent the continuation of increased armament a practically universal breakdown must follow. On the 20th of December, 1920, General Pershing said:

> Unless some such move (as disarmament) be made, we may well ask ourselves whether civilization does not really reach a point where it begins to destroy itself and whether we are thus doomed to go headlong down through destructive war and darkness to barbarism.

That statement was made just about two years ago. For some reason, owing, I assume, to conditions which the general sees or thinks he sees, he has concluded that we should not commit ourselves to a program of disarmament, but, upon the other hand, we should build a much larger and stronger navy and also provide for a much larger army. He has been speaking throughout the country for the last two months upon this

subject and has over and over again stated that conditions were such as to endanger the safety of the United States unless we should prepare upon an enlarged and increased scale both with reference to our Army and our Navy. I take it, therefore, that General Pershing has come to the conclusion that the theory of disarmament or limitation of armaments under present conditions is an impractical or an impossible one.

Speaking on the 12th of December, the present month, in New York City, it was said, according to the press reports:

At 11 o'clock yesterday, four hours to the minute from the hour of the armistice, Gen. John J. Pershing, speaking before the National Civic Federation at the Hotel Astor, began an earnest plea for America to abandon its "fallacious, fatuous, and foolish" policy of disarmament and to adopt a program for preparedness to defend the national life of the United States.

I shall not read at length from the address, but the address carries out the statement of the paper fully. General Pershing gave as his reason for his views the disturbing questions and problems of an economic or financial or business nature of the Old World, believing, apparently, that unless these can be adjusted and settled there is no possible way for us to remain out of another conflict, perhaps equal to the one from which we emerged four years ago.

General Harbord, the assistant of General Pershing, speaking shortly thereafter in the city of Washington, said that—

An effort was being made to disparage the work of the Army, deny its claims for further extension of credit, and displace its "old-line insurance" with a much-advertised substitute called "disarmament, presented as a panacea for every national ailment."

Continuing, he said he thought—

that there were probably trying days ahead for "Uncle Sam, Limited," and while "ologies" and "isms" might come and go and conferences might confer, human nature remained the same—"men will be men, trade is trade, and nations will fight for economic supremacy."

Again, he said:

It is being handled—

That is, disarmament—

on the market by the same class of irresponsible speculators who for years have dabbled in similar fakes and cheap imitations. It will be presented to you in very attractive form by some of the smoothest agents of the business, among them those who, in the enthusiasm of newly conferred suffrage and anxious to do good, will endeavor to flood the market with this fake substitute for our old-line insurance, urging with all that fascinating inconsistency of mingled charms and hysterics which so often characterizes lovely woman.

I might quote at great length and by the hour from the views of different representatives of the Army and the Navy and of others also high in official position. I only quote them, Mr. President, to show that there already exists in the minds of these men the necessity for throwing off all effort in the limitation of armament under present conditions and to depart entirely from the program which they indorsed so earnestly and enthusiastically a year ago.

I take it, Mr. President, that they have sufficient reasons, from their viewpoint, for these statements. It is not my intention, as I said a moment ago, to indulge in personal criticism. I only call attention to the condition of affairs, and that is that we are again entering upon a competitive race in armament, that we are practically abandoning any further effort along the line of disarmament or the limitation of armament. Before we accept such a course we ought to survey the situation with reference to our present condition and as to what will probably follow. It is my purpose briefly to call attention to some of the conditions in this country at this time.

Mr. President, our present national indebtedness is between twenty-one billion and twenty-two billion dollars—an almost inconceivable sum when one attempts to measure it with any degree of accuracy or intelligence. In these days we speak of billions in glib terms, but when one comes to measure what $22,000,000,000 means in the way of an indebtedness it is pretty difficult to get a thorough comprehension of it. At the close of the Civil War we had an indebtedness of about two and a half billion dollars.

In the space of about 50 years we had reduced it about one-half. At the same rate of reduction we now have an indebtedness which it will take us over twelve hundred years to pay. When we seek to measure the payment of this debt in human toil, in energy, in sacrifice, and in suffering it is beyond the power of human language to portray the seriousness of this burden. The entire amount of gold which has been produced since 1493 is $5,000,000,000 less than our present national debt.

In addition to our national debt we have at present an annual expenditure of something about three and one-half billion dollars a year—possibly a little less, possibly a little more. It has not been so very long since we were regarded as unduly extravagant when it was known that we had had "a billion dollar Congress" in the way of appropriations; but now, four years after the close of the World War, after all those expenditures which have particularly to do with the prosecution of the war are supposed to have been eliminated, or at least greatly modified, we still have a national expenditure of some three and a half billion dollars a year.

That, however, Mr. President, only gives a very inadequate glimpse of the real condition of affairs in this country. When we take into consideration the national debt and the national expenditure we have only a portion, and a very inadequate portion, comparatively speaking, of the entire debt and the entire burden which rest upon the American people at this time. I have before me some figures with reference to the indebtedness of the States and the cities and the annual tax levies in the States, and the increase of indebtedness and of taxes, which has been furnished me by the Census Bureau. I am not going to take the time of the Senate to call attention in detail to all of the figures, but I wish to direct attention to the enormous increase of indebtedness and the enormous increase of taxes during the last four or five years.

I shall compare the statistics for a period prior to our entrance into the World War with those for a period after the termination of the war in various States, some of which were under the administration of one party and some under the administration of the other party. I desire to disclose what is actually taking place throughout this country not only in the way of increasing our burdens by the Federal Government, but what has become, in a sense, a national disease, the increasing of indebtedness everywhere. I cite, for instance, the increase of the levy of general taxes on real and personal property in the following States:

The levy in Arizona June 20, 1915, was $1,830,262, which increased in three years to $3,746,137; in Colorado on June 30, 1915, it was $1,830,262, and on November 30, 1920, it had increased to $5,518,229; in Idaho on September 30, 1914, it was $1,044,880, and had increased on September 30, 1920, to $3,095,482; in Illinois, covering the same period, the tax levy had increased from $11,788,000 to $16,939,000; in Indiana it had increased from $7,889,000 to $11,677,000; in Massachusetts from $8,750,000 in 1914 to $14,000,000 on November 30, 1920. In Minnesota on July 31, 1914, the tax levy was $6,974,000, but it had increased on June 30, 1921, to $11,493,000—not giving the hundreds of dollars. In Nebraska in 1914 it was $3,681,000, but increased in 1920 to $8,124,000; in New Jersey it increased from $11,160,000 to $22,334,000; in New York from $1,103,449 in 1914 to $14,130,000 in 1920.

Mr. LODGE. Do the figures which the Senator from Idaho is giving refer to State taxes?

Mr. BORAH. They cover the increased levies in taxes on real and personal property.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In New York it should be billions of dollars, should it not?

Mr. BORAH. I thought that myself and I called up the Census Bureau. I could not understand those figures, but that is the way they were furnished to me.

In North Dakota the tax levy increased from $1,347,000 to $2,941,000; in South Carolina from $1,843,000 to $3,401,000; in Texas it increased from $10,286,000 to $21,023,000; in the State of Washington it increased from $8,317,000, in 1914, to $17,459,000 on September 30, 1920; in West Virginia it increased from $1,276,000, in 1915, to $3,220,000 in 1921; in Wyoming in 1914 the tax levy amounted to $580,659, but it increased to $1,547,955.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question: Do I understand him to say that the figures stated by him represent the increase in taxes which are laid and collected in the various States enumerated by him?

Mr. BORAH. Yes. They represent the increase in the general property taxes levied on real and personal property in the respective States.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, has the Senator from Idaho made any inquiry in order to ascertain how much of the increase in the taxes referred to by him is due to the inability of the States to raise revenue from other sources which hitherto were available? The result was inevitable in my State.

Mr. BORAH. I am not interested in that question, Mr. President, because it is immaterial to me from what part of the goose the feather is plucked.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to follow my inquiry——

Mr. STANLEY. If the Senator will excuse me, I desire to say if you have two geese and kill one of them, you have got to pluck the other a little cleaner.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it is just that much harder on the goose that is living. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho if the authorities who furnished him these statistics furnished figures showing the increase in property values upon which the taxes were collected?

Mr. BORAH. No; they did not do so. Such figures can be obtained, of course, but I do not happen to have them.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In other words, I wish to know whether the rate of taxation or the taxes themselves had been increased out of proportion to the increase in the value of the property upon which the taxes have been levied or assessed?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether in compiling the figures as to the increase in taxes to which he refers as having taken place in the various States any account has been taken of what the States have voted for the soldiers' bonus, for which bonds have been issued, or whether any account has been taken of the bonds which have been authorized and issued in various States for the building of roads. For instance, in my own State the increase of indebtedness is entirely due to bonds which were issued for the construction of public highways.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the purpose for which I cited the figures did not involve the question of the cause of the levy of the taxes. I am only seeking to show the increase in taxation. So far as I am concerned now, for the purpose of the question which I have in mind, it is immaterial to me whether the taxes were increased because of the issue of bonds or whether they were increased for one purpose or another; but this tax burden is now resting upon the people of the different States. Those States may have imposed it upon themselves—of course they did; the burden would not be there if they had not—but it is a form of extravagance, an increase of the burden, regardless of the reasons which actuated the people when they laid on the burden.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the figures submitted by the Senator from Idaho, which he has obtained from the Census Office, do not include the indebtedness to which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. NICHOLSON] referred, namely, bonded indebtedness.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; it does not include bonded indebtedness.

Mr. KING. So the Senator from Colorado is entirely in error, in my opinion, in attempting to include within the figures mentioned the indebtedness of his State resulting from the issuance of bonds. The figures which the Senator from Idaho is citing merely represent the increase in the taxes.

Mr. BORAH. The figures given by me do not include bonded indebtedness.

Mr. KING. And, may I say, they do not include the taxes which are levied by counties, by municipalities, and school districts of the States.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is all very true; but you can not pay the interest on bonds without levying taxes, and bonds bearing interest issued for roads and for schools have a very direct bearing upon the amount of these taxes; but none of it has anything to do with the support of the Military Establishment because not a dollar or a cent of those moneys is expended for that purpose.

Mr. BORAH. I quite agree with that. I am simply undertaking to show the economic condition of this country as it is developed by the burden of taxes which we are carrying, whether imposed by the city, the State, the county, or the Nation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator will agree, I suppose, that the burden has not been increased if the valuation of the property has increased in proportion to the amount of taxes laid upon it. The size of the actual figures would be increased, but the burden would not be increased.

Mr. BORAH. No; if that is true, provided the income of the property kept pace with the assessed value; but there is the rub.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am inclined to think that the amount of taxes levied upon the people has increased beyond all bounds, beyond the increased value of the property on which the taxes are assessed; but if the property has increased in valuation the burden would not be increased.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, that formula would be correct as applicable to real estate if the productivity of the land increased with its nominal value; but a mere rise in the price of the land without any increase in its productiveness, with a corresponding increase of taxation, would be an unalleviated burden, as I see it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I had occasion not long ago to look into this matter. The best test is what part of the aggregate annual earnings of the people each year is taken for taxation. At the time indicated by the Senator the aggregate percentage of earnings taken for taxation purposes was about 6 per cent or less. Now about 16 per cent of the aggregate earnings of the people is taken for State, local, and Federal taxes. I think that is a pretty fair test as to whether or not taxation is excessive when nearly one-sixth of the earnings of the people annually is now taken for tax purposes. Before the date indicated by the Senator about 6 per cent of the aggregate annual earnings was consumed for taxation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of course, as the Senator from Kentucky says, it is a question of the income from the property; and the test of that is disclosed by the fact that you can go into any agricultural region that I know of west of the Mississippi River and pick up any county newspaper and you will find hundreds or perhaps thousands of acres of land advertised for sale for taxes—land which is as valuable and as rich land as lies outdoors. I remember that in passing through one agricultural State I happened to buy two papers on the train, and I looked over the list of tax sales, and I found—and you will find it everywhere you go—that thousands of people are being sold out for taxes; so it must be that there is a disparity between the income from this property and the taxes, regardless of the fanciful value which they may put upon the property itself.

I take another test of this proposition, and that is the per capita increase of taxes in these States.

The per capita increase in Montana from 1914 to 1920, omitting the cents, was from $7 to $12 per capita. In Nebraska the increase was from $3 to $10; in New Hampshire, from $4 to $14; in New Jersey, from $6 to $11; in New Mexico, from $4 to $15; in Oregon, from $6 to $26; in Rhode Island, from $6 to $14; in South Dakota, from $5 to $20; in Vermont, from $7 to $14; in Washington, from $8 to $13; in Wyoming, from $7 to $24; in Colorado, from $4 to $11; in Idaho, from $5 to $16; in Illinois, from $3 to $7; in Iowa, from $3 to $10; in Minnesota, from $7 to $17. All other States, should I take the time to read the figures, would disclose a similar situation.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] observed that this had nothing to do with the matter which is now before the Senate. I think it has a vast amount to do with it in one way. The capacity of the people of the United States to respond to the taxes which are now being placed upon them, by the Federal Government down, is becoming a very serious proposition. The man who pays the tax to the city or State is the same citizen who pays to the Federal Government.

We all know that there is widespread discontent throughout the United States; that there is complaint from almost every line of business and every avocation that they are unable to meet their taxes and the interest upon their mortgages. All that has its bearing when we come to consider the question of entering upon another great naval race or an armament race, and thereby adding millions if not billions to the already crushing burden. You can only get money out of the Treasury of the United States after you have put it in, and you can only get it by taking it from these people who are already carrying this superhuman load now resting upon them, from the county up to the Federal Government. It all has its relevancy upon the question as to the economic condition of the people of the United States at this time.

I call attention to one other item, Mr. President, and that is the taxes upon railroads. I am not going to consider all the railroads, but enough to give an illustration.

We discuss considerably in these days the question of reducing freight rates; and the reduction of freight rates is an indispensable step in the recovery of our producing classes, because at the present time the freight rates are such as to take away all possible profit from that which they may produce. It will be very difficult to reduce freight rates if we continue in this country to increase taxes upon the railroads as we have for the last four years. More than one-half of all the net earnings of the railroads which I shall mention was taken during the last year to pay taxes. That comes back upon the producer, upon the shipper. It is a part of the tax which he pays, ultimately and inevitably, as much as if it were levied upon his personal property or upon his real estate. These public utilities must collect this money from but one source, and that is from those who ship; so, as a matter of fact, it is another form of tax directly upon that class of people.

In 1916 the tax upon the railroads in Idaho was $540 per mile. In 1920 it was $1,458 per mile.

In 1916 in Oregon it was $530 per mile. In 1920 it was $1,061 per mile.

In 1916 in the State of Washington it was $772 per mile. In 1920 it was $1,709 per mile.

The taxes per mile upon the following roads in 1921 were as follows:

Santa Fe, $1,226 per mile.
Chicago & Northwestern, $1,007 per mile.
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, $809 per mile.
Great Northern, $1,016 per mile.
Northern Pacific, $1,354 per mile.
Southern Pacific, $1,779 per mile.
Union Pacific, $1,355 per mile.

I have also the per capita increase in some of the large cities of the United States.

The per capita tax in 1918 in Chicago was $26; in 1920, $32.

In New York in 1918 it was $30; in 1920, two years afterwards, $38.

In San Francisco in 1918 it was $26; in 1920, $36.
In Cincinnati in 1918 it was $27; in 1920, $36.
In Pittsburgh in 1918 it was $35; in 1920, $45.
In Philadelphia in 1918 it was $25; in 1920, $35.
In St. Louis in 1918 it was $19; in 1920, $28.
In Boston in 1918 it was $33; in 1920, $49.
In Minneapolis in 1918 it was $28; in 1920, $42.
In Los Angeles in 1918 it was $28; in 1920, $45.
In Seattle in 1918 it was $31; in 1920, $56.
In New Orleans in 1918 it was $19; in 1920, $36.

Without taking further time of the Senate to go into these figures, there is no place where you touch the producer, the business man, or the man who has to pay the tax, that there has not been a doubling and trebling of the taxes during the last three or four years. We know the result from the conditions which confront us in this country at the present time. We must bear in mind that the Secretary of the Treasury advised us only a few days ago not only of the conditions which prevail throughout the country with reference to the increase of taxes, but also that there has been a drying up of the tax receipts to the amount of about $1,000,000,000.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STANLEY. At that point I respectfully suggest to the Senator—not to divert him—that I am deeply impressed with what he says with reference to the drying up of the sources of taxation.

Mr. BORAH. I did not intend to touch that sensitive nerve. [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. I do not mean to intimate that it is not perfectly proper and perfectly right to dry up these sources; but it is just as well for us to face the music, and to realize that we have transferred the burden of taxation from the luxuries of the rich to the necessities of the poor, from the vices of the vicious to the virtues of the good.

For instance, the average rate of taxation in these States, I should say, would be about 40 cents on the hundred dollars, and, as a rule, farm lands are assessed at 75 per cent of their value. At a 40-cent rate and a 75 per cent valuation, it takes $300 invested in land to pay the State $1 in taxes. The same $300 formerly invested in an alcoholic beverage, with a tax of $10 on the gallon, would pay the Government just $15,000. In other words, that business was just fifteen thousand times as able to bear the burden of taxation as the land.

It is all right, we have done it; but it is the inevitable consequence that this richest source of taxation having been, as the Senator has said, dried up entirely, the overwhelming burden must fall upon virtuous and abstemious citizens like the Senator and myself. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. BORAH. The Internal Revenue Bureau reports that for the year ended last June the receipts decreased $1,397,905,978, to be exact.

I also observed in the London Outlook a few days ago this statement:

> On March 31, 1919, there were arrears of income tax—excluding the second installments, due in July—amounting to £55,000,000. In 1920 the figure had risen to £73,000,000. By 1921 it was £86,000,000. And this year it had reached the gigantic total of £110,000,000.

Of course, if we were the only nation embarrassed by heavy taxes or suffering from economic conditions such as confront us we might very well conclude that it would be only a question of time when we should escape from them. But we are surrounded by nations who are infinitely worse off. The conditions in Europe and elsewhere, other than possibly one nation in the Orient, are very much worse than are the conditions in the United States, and that helps to accentuate the economic conditions which torment our own people. I call attention very briefly to some of the conditions abroad, because later I propose to discuss that more at length.

Sir George Paish, who visited this country a few days ago, said:

> The credit of Europe is practically exhausted and the credit of other borrowing nations in almost the entire world will be exhausted, and trade will collapse and there will be almost universal bankruptcy, national and individual. * * *
>
> Will the prime ministers of the Entente nations when they meet recognise that the policy hitherto pursued enhances the mischief that the war caused to the credit of Europe and that all the great nations of Europe are either bankrupt or on the verge of bankruptcy and several other nations in the world approaching bankruptcy?

Some months ago there was a commission appointed in England to make a particular study of economic conditions and of the increase of taxes, and later it made its report, one of exceedingly great interest. I shall not read it all, but only the concluding lines. The report states:

> We see, therefore, that at present we are slithering down an inclined plane of prodigality and indebtedness that will land us, unless we act promptly and resolutely, in the ditch. We must cut down our expenditures, we must reduce taxation, otherwise there is nothing before us but a progressive series of Budget deficits, with all the prejudice to national credit and all the trade depression which accompany them.

We are advised within the last few days by the Prime Minister of England that under present conditions England can not pay her debt. We are advised also that France is unable to meet her debt. We know that Russia is unable to meet her indebtedness. In other words, all of the great powers of Europe are now either bankrupt, confessedly so, or are approaching or nearing bankruptcy.

This is the condition, inadequately and most briefly stated, which confronts us at the beginning of the year 1923; $250,000,000,000 of indebtedness resting upon the great nations of the world; $22,000,000,000 of it ours, with the leading nations in the world, outside of our own, announcing to the world that they are unable to meet their indebtedness. Of course, if there is no escape from adding to that burden we will undoubtedly go forward and add to it. What the consequences may be no man can know. But if there is any possible way to avoid adding to the burden which already rests upon the energy and the brain of the human family, every effort ought to be made which can be made to avoid it. It is the most vital problem with which we are confronted. Additional taxes spell disaster.

These figures which I have given, Mr. President, tell their own story. They reveal a condition of affairs the seriousness of which can not be overestimated. They disclose a tendency in our own national life the evil consequences of which, if not arrested, no one can adequately foretell. It is not the fault of this or that political party alone. It can not be remedied by partisan denunciation of the opposition. It is a broader and deeper question than that. It is a national question. It is a national problem. It is a national disease. If we can not as a people, as a nation, come to comprehend its significance, its demoralizing and destructive effect, not only upon the individual but upon our institutions, and deal with it as a great national problem, then we shall not deal with it efficiently or effectively at all. There is no enemy of orderly government at once so subtle and still so powerful as oppressive taxes. There is no adversary with which free governments have had so often to contend and none with which they have contended so unsuccessfully. In our plan the contentment of the average citizen is the foundation upon which the whole structure rests. We built a Government dependent almost entirely upon the character, the physical and moral well-being of the people. Without that the whole fabric crumbles. Without that the whole scheme fails utterly. Nevertheless, in 150 years there has been laid upon the backs of our people a burden in the way of taxes and debts such as no free people ever before undertook to carry. I look upon it as a distinct menace, a supreme tragedy. To refuse to lighten this load in every way possible is a reckless trifling with the orderly well-being of society. To unnecessarily increase it is a betrayal of representative government. The crisis is here. The painful question, the accusing interrogatory, is: Are the men here equal to the task which fate and circumstances have imposed upon them?

I know it will be said that notwithstanding our debt is very large, our expenses enormous, our taxes most onerous, still we are a strong people—comparatively speaking, a young people—and the load may be made even heavier without signal disaster. Possibly so. The people may toil on like beasts of burden, and again they may not. Anything in which there is life may strive and eat and sleep and strive again. But just anything can not be a responsible citizen in a republic. We dare not leave out of consideration the fact that our system of government calls for men and women, not merely so many foot-pounds of human energy; for homes, not hovels. Intelligence, character, confidence, outlook, faith in the Government,

and faith in the future are just as essential to the citizenship upon which our Government rests as muscle and brawn. Contentment in the home, education for the child, are to free institutions what armies and navies are to despotic powers. A fiscal policy which destroys these is an abandonment of government itself. And yet we know the first baneful result of oppressive taxes is to turn the child out of school and plant discontent and distress in the home. The struggle in life may go on, but education can obtain only where there is to a certain extent at least economic ease. There is much excitement in certain quarters of late over the activity of those who would teach our children to hate war. But if I had to choose security for my country between a discontented, tax-ridden people and a large standing army upon the one hand and a nation of happy homes and prosperous people and no army, not a soldier, not a gun, I would choose the latter. In the former instance there may come a time when the soldier will fraternize with the discontented citizen and your security crumbles in a single hour. In the latter instance, the citizen is a soldier every hour of his life when his country is assailed. The people best prepared to meet the demands of the future, whether of war or peace, are the people economically sound and strong. Modern warfare is not a test of armies or navies, but a test of peoples.

It seems to be the view of many that since we have not yet experienced, as a people, "The pestilence that walketh in darkness nor the destruction that wasteth at noonday," therefore, we need have no fear—that we need not take even the precaution of the mariner of old to study the signs of the sky as the clouds begin to gather. But is that the line of security in modern representative government? Is it the part of wisdom to await actual outbreaks? Will nothing move us but misery and want? In these days when men mingle their thought with their labor and in a world rich with natural wealth, throbbing with God's own blessings, men and women demand, and have a right to demand, of their Government, of organized society, something more than the mere right to live and serve, something more than sheer existence. They demand, and have a right to demand, the privilege to share the world's comforts and blessings as well as it burdens and responsibilities. One has studied to little purpose the lessons of this war, the teachings which have come out of this seismic change, who does not realize that the people see more clearly their rights and also their opportunities; that they feel far more released from parties and leaders and creeds than ever before. They will not consent that waste and incompetency, extravagance and inefficiency shall stand between them and their rightful portion of the world's wealth and the world's blessings. The beauty of this blessed old Republic of ours is that it is not necessary for the citizen to go into the street or appeal to force in order to get relief. He can effectuate his purposes through the ballot box and the commanding power of public opinion, and effectuate his purposes at will, as every political sign of the zodiac now unmistakably indicates.

The American people ask, indeed, in my opinion, the people of the world ask, in their great struggle to regain their own, to get from under the ruins of a world cataclysm, that governments shall appreciate the crushing load under which they are bending and make known that appreciation by withholding additional burdens. Bless their energy with hope, baptize their efforts with promises of reward, and they will rebuild upon the ruins of war even a nobler civilization, for into its woof and warp they will weave the experiences so dearly bought. There is nothing finer in all the history of our country than the spirit, the courage, the willingness to sacrifice, with which business men, farmers, laborers, and all classes have carried the load placed upon them for the last 10 years. They have worked and schemed and carried on, bought Liberty bonds, and given millions for charity and paid taxes. They have met the task with fortitude and rare courage and until lately with marvelously little complaint. But four years have passed since the war. The load increases and the hour has come when relief must be had. The country must, for the whole country's sake, experience a change. There is such a thing as moral breakdown as well as physical exhaustion.

Later in the debate I shall seek to show that this whole economic condition is associated directly or indirectly with the reparation clauses of the Versailles treaty; that until that problem is adjusted upon a basis of reason and sound economic principles they can not get better and may become very much worse. My remarks to-day are preliminary to the discussion of the question of whether we can be of service in making that adjustment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think it would be impossible even for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], with all of his eloquence and power, to emphasize too greatly or to inveigh too vehemently against the growing tendency of public debt. But I believe it would be a great mistake to allow the statement which the Senator has just made, in which he has called the attention of the country to the burden of taxation, to go in such way as to create the impression that the part of taxation to which he has referred and which he has put in the RECORD has been caused by the maintenance of national defense or that in any respect whatever even the entire abandonment of the Navy and the wiping out of existence of the Army would reduce the rates in the various States, the table of which the Senator has just given to the Senate.

The Senator started his remarks by calling attention to the report of the House committee upon the bill. He followed that by an indorsement of what the committee said as to the continuation of competitive armament and competitive naval construction between the naval powers of the world. The Senator did not call attention to the fact, but no doubt he had it in mind, that the bill as it came from the House not only was accompanied by a report calling attention to this condition, but that the House undertook to meet the evils which were pointed out in the report and which have been emphasized by the Senator's speech by incorporating in the bill this language:

> The President is requested to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft.

So that the very issue which the Senator suggests here has been foreseen by the House of Representatives. It has been approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for naval affairs, and if the Senate passes the bill which is now pending it will be in strict accordance with the argument which the Senator from Idaho has just now made.

But, Mr. President, I happen to have at hand some figures indicating quite clearly and, in fact, startlingly the enormous burden of taxation imposed upon the people for local, municipal, and State purposes in the various States, which was a very large part of the substance of the matter to which the Senator from Idaho referred; and it would not be affected in any way whatever, even though such a conference as proposed in the bill should be called and even if it should result in a further limitation of armament along those lines that were not covered by the agreement which was reached in the conference recently held in this city between the great naval powers of the world. In a statement prepared by Captain Overstreet it was said:

> Where does the taxpayers' money go? It goes largely to meet city, county, and State budgets, which are constantly increasing at an alarming rate. In New York City the city budget in 1901 was little over $99,000,000; in 1911 it was $174,000,000; while in 1921 it had grown to nearly $346,000,000.

I turn to another portion of his statement and call attention to the fact that in 1922 it had increased to $345,530,000. Proceeding to read from the former paragraph:

> The budget of 1901 would not pay the interest on the city debt of 1921, as the debt is over a billion dollars.
>
> In the agricultural States of the West it is surprising to find even higher rates of taxation to meet State and county budgets, with high rates to meet city budgets. The taxpayers of Lincoln, Nebr., a city of only 55,000 people, have to meet a city budget of over $1,000,000; have to meet their quota of a county budget of $534,000; and their quota of a State budget of $30,000,000. Their quota to build battleships (on a population basis) is but $34,000, but on a Federal income tax basis it would be much less.

That calculation was based upon a naval appropriation bill of $400,000,000, more than $100,000,000 in excess of the amount covered by the pending measure. I continue reading:

> The agricultural county of York, Nebr.—population 17,146—must raise over $172,000 to meet the State budget, nearly $520,000 to meet township and county budgets. The people of the county seat, York—population 5,388—must raise annually nearly $190,000 to meet city, township, county, and State budgets. The farmer should realize that the tax he pays on his land, buildings, live stock, and crops goes to meet the ever-growing expenses of his township, county, and State, and that not one penny of these taxes goes to build battleships or to the support of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, that merely illustrates the condition in all the States, the burden to which the taxpayers are subjected and the purposes for which these taxes are collected.

The greatest menace to the world to-day, in my opinion, both as to imposing the necessity for the burden of taxes and as a menace to the peace of the various peoples of the world, is the ultrareactionary bolshevistic government of Russia. It was established under a plea of universal peace, and yet to-day it is maintaining a highly drilled and constantly exercised army of 1,500,000 men. The purposes of that government, while calling itself progressive in a term that is so loosely used in these times, are as a matter of fact ultrareactionary. It proposes not only to go back to previous decades and to previous

centuries but to go back scores of centuries and to establish again in the world a condition of primeval communism.

The next great menace in the world is the reactionary influence of the military party of Germany. It proposes to go back not necessarily to a state of communism but it does propose to go back as far as the feudalism of the Middle Ages and to establish on the ruin of modern democracy an autocracy to which the whole world will be subjected if it can organize the power to bring it under its will.

I do not know what can be accomplished by calling a conference of nations to consider these matters. There was a time not many years ago when if the prudent statesmen of the world had looked a few years into the future they could have seen an opportunity to use the power of the armed democracies of the world—France, Great Britain, and the United States, having equipped and in a thorough state of training millions of veterans who had just come through the Great War, to exterminate both of those great menaces from which the world is now suffering, necessitating national defense, imposing the necessity of taxation, disturbing the psychology of the people, keeping them in a constant dread and terror that at any day there may be launched upon the world another great horror as that which such a short time ago plunged it into unspeakable distress.

If these armies had marched into Berlin and collected the reparations there and ended the war, we would have been saved the necessity of these constant series of conferences which each winds up in a wider disagreement and a more unsettled condition than existed before the conference was called.

If when the Bolshevists of Russia broke down the army of the eastern front and under the pay of Germany betrayed the Allies, the Allies had sent even a few divisions of the veterans of that war to sustain the great leaders of constitutional democracy in Russia and to reestablish the lines which were standing for the principles for which the Allies were fighting, that menace would have been exterminated, and the conditions to which the Senator from Idaho refers with so much eloquence would not confront and vex and trouble the world to-day.

I do not know, Mr. President, what would come in case the President should consider and should act upon the suggestion which is contained in the bill and call another conference of the naval powers to consider the question which the Senator from Idaho has discussed. I know that it is but a short time since such a conference was called. There was general acclaim and general approval of the representatives appointed by the President to represent the people of the United States in that conference. There was no criticism as to their patriotism and none as to their ability and their statesmanship.

At the time at least it was considered that the results of the conference were a substantial gain in the interest of economy and of the peace of the world. It can not be said that the questions which the Senator from Idaho has discussed were not submitted to that conference, for they were considered and discussed, and out of it all came the best that could be obtained, in view of the practical difficulties, the conflicting views and the conditions of the various countries whose representatives were assembled around the table here in Washington.

It was stated on the floor of the other House by a Member of that body while this bill was under discussion there that the President was already taking steps to endeavor to bring together another meeting of the nations for the purpose of a further limitation of naval armament. I do not know upon what authority that statement was based, but I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It may be so, because I know that it would be in accordance with the wishes and with the policies as manifested by the previous actions of the administration. It may be that some good would come from it; possibly no harm would result; although harm has resulted, in my opinion, from the continued agitation, the continued series of conferences, the continued discussions, and the continued controversies between the nations of Europe over the question of German reparations and the reestablishment in Europe of normal conditions, economically and otherwise.

What would be the effect upon the question of peace if we should reach an agreement more comprehensive than the one which was formulated in the recent treaty providing for the limitation of naval armament, which was confined to capital ships and to aircraft carriers and to other types of ships of a tonnage greater than 10,000 tons? It was thought by the naval experts and the foreign relations offices of the various Governments, whose representatives were assembled there, that the agreement which was made between the powers participating in the conference for the limitation of the construction of battleships, which they agreed upon as the standard unit of naval power, would tend to bring about an end of competitive naval construction.

It was hopefully and confidently announced by many at that time that the result of the conference meant perpetual peace, although, of course, it was realized by practical men that that was largely a visionary dream.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield the floor in just a moment. I was merely going to add that the experience of a few brief months since that conference ended has been that it was a very easy matter for those nations to find other lines of competition rather than in the line of the construction of battleships. The information which now comes to us is that they are engaged in a modernization of their old ships; increasing the range of their guns, adding subsurface armor protection, increasing the thickness of the decks of their vessels, making them more formidable engines of war within the terms of the treaty; that they are building fast cruisers; that they are engaged in the construction of submarines of a larger type; and that the same menace which grows out of the competition of nations in the construction of navies exists as it did before. From that experience it is not very hard to realize that even if we should altogether put a stop to the construction of naval vessels it would be a very easy matter, if the nations desired to do so, to continue a rivalry of sea power by putting guns upon merchant ships. The nation which possessed the largest fleet of merchant vessels and the ability to arm them, other nations having disarmed in accordance with such proposed agreement, would be just as completely the mistress of the seas as though she had constructed 100 battleships of modern type.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that in order to arrive at the desired result of peace among the nations it is necessary to develop the will for peace; that it is necessary that there should be the desire for peace in the hearts of peoples and the hearts of governments. Peace can not be obtained by a pacifist policy, merely by disarmament, in the face of world contentions which arouse the passions of peoples and make for conditions out of which war will inevitably ensue, and in it such weapons and agencies as are available will be used.

Mr. President, we have reported this provision, and I am very glad indeed to see that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is in favor of it. There is no issue involved in what he has said in so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. POINDEXTER subsequently said: I ask unanimous consent to incorporate at the conclusion of my remarks on the subject of taxes the article from which I quoted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TAXES COMPARED WITH STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL TAXES.

[From extension of remarks of Hon. MELVIN O. MCLAUGHLIN, of Nebraska, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, February 21, 1922.]

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave granted to me to extend my remarks I will print the following letter from Capt. L. M. Overstreet, United States Navy, showing the amount of Federal taxes compared with State, county, and municipal taxes.

The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 11, 1922.*

MY DEAR MR. MCLAUGHLIN: There seems to be a general feeling that a holiday in battleship building will greatly reduce taxes. A little study of the budgets and taxes shows the fallacy of this idea. In our county of York, Nebr., the tax is nearly $40 per capita to meet township, county, and State budgets. The per capita tax for the whole United States for building battleships this year is 64 cents, but Nebraskans contribute about half this amount due to their small Federal income tax, as will be shown later.

According to the World Almanac, 1922, the city of New York has a population of 5,620,000, with a city budget of $345,530,000 (including county budgets and $22,041,000 which goes to the State); the State of New York, a population of 10,385,000, with a State budget of $145,798,000; and the United States, a population of 106,000,000, with a national Budget of practically $4,000,000,000. Of this national Budget of $4,000,000,000, about 10 per cent, or $400,000,000, is allotted to the entire Navy, and but 1.7 per cent of the national Budget, or $68,000,000, to continue the construction of battleships and battle cruisers during this present fiscal year.

If we prorate, according to population, the money to be raised in New York City to help support the government of New York State and of the United States, we find that the people of New York City must raise annually $313,460,000 to support their own city, $10,029,000 to support the five counties in New York City, $78,000,000 to help support the State government, and $212,000,000 to help support the United States Government, or a total of $613,489,000. This means that for every dollar the New York City taxpayer contributes to build battleships and battle cruisers (year ending June 30, 1922) he pays $78 to meet city expenses; $3 to meet county expenses; $22 to meet New York State expenses; and $58 to meet the expenses of the United States Government (building battleships omitted). A holiday in building battleships would reduce expenses in New York City from $100 to $99.38, or a reduction of about six-tenths of 1 per cent.

In the following table a comparison is made between the total annual expenses of New York City and the portions spent on the whole Navy and on building battleships:

Total expenses	$613,489,000
Spent on the whole Navy	21,200,000
Spent building battleships	3,604,000

In Chicago the annual amounts to be raised are as follows: $132,000,000 for the city (additional funds are raised for parks and for the sanitary district); $10,800,000 for Cook County; $25,300,000 for the State of Illinois; and $100,000,000 for the United States Government, or a total of $268,100,000. Of this amount about $10,000,000 would go to the whole Navy and $1,700,000 to continue building battleships. The following table illustrates the annual expenses of Chicago graphically:

Total expenses	$268,100,000
On whole Navy	10,000,000
On building battleships	1,700,000

In San Francisco the city must raise annually $24,467,000 to meet city and county expenses; $6,033,000 for the State expenses of California; and $19,170,000 for the United States Government, or a total of $49,670,000. Of this, $1,917,000 would go to the whole Navy and $326,000 to continue construction of battleships. The following table shows these figures:

Total expenses	$49,670,000
On whole Navy	1,917,000
On building battleships	326,000

From these tables it will be seen that the reduction in city expenses due to a holiday in battleship building will hardly be noticeable. This is a popular saying: "The taxpayer is groaning under a crushing load of taxes for battleship building." The above figures do not support such a statement.

Many papers have stated that we will save hundreds of millions annually by stopping battleship construction. How can this be when we are only spending $68,000,000 this year to build battleships? Now, when we break our contracts with the shipbuilders and scrap these ships it will take much of this sixty-eight million to settle legitimate damage claims. The remainder will be needed for the five plane carriers which we are to build in accordance with the terms of the treaty.

WHAT ABOUT THE FARMERS?

Some may say, "Why, these charts illustrate what the city taxpayers save by the holiday in building battleships, but what about the farmers?" It will be shown later that battleships are built from money obtained from the Federal "ordinary receipts." The farmer contributes to these Federal "ordinary receipts" a slight amount through the customs (duty on imported articles he might purchase), a slight amount through internal revenue, and, thirdly, directly through his personal Federal income tax. It is assumed that the farmer does not pay a corporation income tax. After taking out his exemptions for himself, wife, and children, few farmers pay much Federal income tax.

In fact, the Treasury Department publication, Statistics of Income, 1919, Income Tax Returns, shows that over half (or 56 per cent) of the personal income taxes for the whole United States come from four States—that is, 31 per cent from New York, 10 per cent from Pennsylvania, 8 per cent from Illinois, and 7 per cent from Massachusetts. If we add Ohio, 4.5 per cent; Michigan, 4.4 per cent; New Jersey, 3.7 per cent; California, 3.9 per cent; and Texas, 2.5 per cent, we can show that over 75 per cent of the personal Federal income taxes for the whole United States, including Hawaii, Alaska, and the District of Columbia, come from nine States. Very little personal Federal income tax comes from the agricultural States. The great grain and cattle States of Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, and the cotton and tobacco States of Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana altogether pay but 6.7 per cent of the Federal income taxes, or less than the one State of Massachusetts.

In our agricultural State of Nebraska there were but 87,344 personal Federal income-tax returns from a population of over 1,296,000 in 1919. The taxpayers who make personal Federal income-tax returns in the whole United States pay an average tax on these returns of over $239, while those making returns in Nebraska pay an average of less than $99 per return. While New York State has but nine times the inhabitants of Nebraska, New York State pays over fifty times the amount of personal Federal income tax and nearly sixty times the amount of Federal corporation income tax. Taxes to support the Federal Government come largely from the Eastern States and from large manufacturing districts.

WHERE DO NATIONAL FUNDS COME FROM?

Where does the money come from which is used to meet the National Budget? The Treasury Department, Division of Bookkeeping, Form 778, shows that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, the "ordinary receipts" amounted to nearly $5,578,000,000. This is the money which is used to meet congressional appropriations. Of this amount $308,000,000 came from the customs, $1,500,000 from the sale of public lands, 683,000,000 from miscellaneous items—coinage profits, Pacific railways, tax on national bank circulation, fees, fines, penalties, etc.—$1,352,000,000 from internal revenue, and $3,228,000,000 from income taxes—of which about two-fifths comes from personal income taxes and the other three-fifths from corporation income taxes. The money from these personal Federal income taxes, therefore, meets about one-quarter of the National Budget. As 1.7 per cent of the National Budget goes to build battleships, this means that one-quarter of 1.7 per cent of a taxpayer's personal Federal income tax, or 40 cents out of every $100, will go to build battleships during the year ending June 30, 1922, at a time when we have six battle cruisers and nine battleships under construction, a number considerably above the average. The cessation of battleship building will, therefore, reduce the taxpayer's personal Federal income taxes from $100 to $99.60, but the taxes on his property to meet city, county, and State budgets will remain the same. From every dollar the taxpayer pays as a personal Federal income tax one-fifth of 1 cent goes to continue the construction of battleships.

WHERE DO TAXES GO?

Where does the taxpayer's money go? It goes largely to meet city, county, and State budgets, which are constantly increasing at an alarming rate. In New York City the city budget in 1901 was little over $99,000,000; in 1911 it was $174,000,000; while in 1921 it had grown to nearly $346,000,000. The budget of 1901 would not pay the interest on the city debt of 1921, as the debt is over a billion dollars.

In the agricultural States of the West it is surprising to find even higher rates of taxation to meet State and county budgets, with high rates to meet city budgets. The taxpayers of Lincoln, Nebr., a city of only 55,000 people, have to meet a city budget of over $1,000,000; have to meet their quota of a county budget of $534,000; and their quota of a State budget of $30,000,000. Their quota to build battleships (on a population basis) is but $34,000, but on a Federal income tax basis it would be much less.

The agricultural county of York, Nebr.—population 17,146—must raise over $172,000 to meet the State budget, nearly $520,000 to meet township and county budgets. The people of the county seat, York—population 5,388—must raise annually nearly $100,000 to meet city, township, county, and State budgets. The farmer should realize that the tax he pays on his land, buildings, live stock, and crops go to meet the ever-growing expenses of his township, county, and State, and that not one penny of these taxes goes to build battleships or to the support of the Federal Government.

The following 18 cities have budgets of over $10,000,000 each, given to the nearest million:

	Millions of dollars.
1. New York City	346
2. Chicago	133
3. Philadelphia	59
4. Baltimore	57
5. Boston	44
6. Milwaukee	28
7. San Francisco	24
8. Buffalo	24
9. Newark	22
10. St. Louis	21
11. Pittsburgh	19
12. Seattle	19
13. Jersey City	14
14. Cleveland	14
15. Minneapolis	13
16. Los Angeles	13
17. Rochester	11
18. Providence	10

The following 23 States have budgets of over $10,000,000 each, given to the nearest million:

	Millions of dollars.
1. New York	146
2. Pennsylvania	117
3. Illinois	60
4. Washington	59
5. Ohio	56
6. California	41
7. Massachusetts	40
8. New Jersey	32
9. Nebraska	30
10. Connecticut	26
11. Wisconsin	26
12. Texas	23
13. Oregon	23
14. Michigan	17
15. Virginia	16
16. Minnesota	16
17. Missouri	15
18. Maryland	14
19. North Carolina	13
20. Mississippi	12
21. Iowa	10
22. Louisiana	10
23. Oklahoma	10

No data is available to show how many counties have budgets in excess of $10,000,000, but the five counties of New York City have a combined budget of over this amount, while Cook County, Ill., has a budget of over $12,000,000.

The writer believes that the money appropriated for the Navy is well invested, that the taxpayer contributes but a small part of his taxes to the Navy, and that this amount could not be materially reduced. Further, it seems certain that millions of dollars could easily be saved by cutting city, township, county, and State expenses. This is where the cuts should be made to relieve the taxpayers of this so-called "crushing load of taxation."

Sincerely yours,

L. M. OVERSTREET,
Captain, United States Navy.

Hon. MELVIN MCLAUGHLIN, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I did not intend anything that I said to be construed as a criticism of the committee. I was speaking in favor of the provision reported by the committee, in so far as that provision goes. It may go far enough; I do not know. That is a matter that may be determined later; but I do know that there is opposition here in the Senate to the provision. While I presume the committee, as a committee, favors it, there are other Members of this body who are not in favor of it.

I agree perfectly, Mr. President, with the able Senator from Washington in the basic proposition that world peace can only result from the desire of the people to have peace, to will peace; but I know that a race in armaments absolutely prevents the accomplishment of anything in the way of education for peace. For instance, how can we educate the people of the United States to peace or educate the people of the world to peace when the representative of France visits our country and preaches to 110,000,000 people that we are on the verge of another war; that war is inevitable; that enemies are contriving and planning now to overcome the great so-called peace-loving nations of the world? He recounts how arms are being manufactured in a secret and clandestine way, thereby inciting fear, distrust, passion, hate. How can we have peace, Mr. President, or educate the people to peace when every rep-

resentative of the Navy who has spoken to the public for months has insisted that the situation is so serious and so dangerous that we must at once prepare for war; when the generals of the Army are discussing the question from every rostrum? I assume, of course, that those gentlemen, well informed as they are, have in their minds some conditions which justify their statements and that they are speaking from a patriotic standpoint; but, Mr. President, the way to accomplish something in the direction of peace is to strive to bring the nations together upon the question of the limitation of armament. Armaments have always begotten war.

The great World War came on as the result of competition in armaments more than from any other cause. The Triple Alliance was formed; then followed the Triple Entente; and then followed the building of battleships. Every time the Triple Alliance would construct a battleship or enter upon an extra building program the Triple Entente would do likewise, or vice versa; and every time the army of the Triple Entente was increased the Triple Alliance would increase its army.

All we have to do is to go back and read the history of Europe from the Moroccan affair down to 1914 and place it over what is happening now throughout the world, and we have a complete duplication, as it were, of the transactions, the events, and the discussions which led to the World War. In other words, we are told that as Japan is now building a large navy we must build more ships in order to match it; we are told by the visitor from France that conditions in Europe are such that war must inevitably follow; we are advised by the representatives of France that their situation is such that they will not ratify, for the present at least, the disarmament treaty. We can not lead people to will peace under such conditions as that.

I do not disagree at all with the able Senator from Washington if the provision to which he refers goes far enough, but I want it understood that I am an utter disbeliever in the proposition that peace can be obtained by building armaments; I am an utter disbeliever in the proposition that peace can be achieved by increasing the armies and the navies of the world. Such a course inevitably leads to war; it has done so for 3,000 years, and it will do so for 3,000 years more.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Idaho how much it is probable we may save by the proposed reduction, say, for the next fiscal year?

Mr. BORAH. How much we could save in what way?

Mr. STANLEY. In expenditures for armament in this country. How much does the Senator propose to cut the Navy? How much are we going to save in dollars and cents to the Government by the proposed reduction? Has the Senator any definite idea on that point?

Mr. BORAH. I am advocating a conference for the purpose of bringing about an understanding between the different nations as to the limitation of their building programs.

Mr. STANLEY. We must have some sort of a navy.

If the Senator from Idaho were chairman of a subcommittee engaged in making a reduction in our naval armament, how much does he think we could, with the consent of the rest of the world, safely cut the naval force of the United States, at the same time leaving us an adequate sea power?

Mr. BORAH. I have not reduced the matter to figures; I do not know; but what I am particularly interested in, if the Senator please, is not so much the mere matter of dollars and cents and the saving which may be involved for a year or so, but I want to avoid competition in war preparations and arousing the antipathy which naturally follows as a result of such competition.

Mr. STANLEY. With that laudable purpose I am in hearty accord, and I approve of what the Senator says in that respect. I have not asked the question in a controversial spirit, but the Senator has called the attention of the country to the fact that armaments and the improvement of weapons of destruction are provocative of war, as I understand him, and that a reduction of navies to the point where each nation would feel its inability to contend upon the seas, in other words, would feel its unpreparedness, would be a deterrent to war. In that I heartily agree. The Senator, however, has, as only he can, perhaps, vividly and emphatically called the attention of the country to another reason and that is the great burden of taxation due to the expenditures of the Government for naval armament and for other purposes, and he proposes, among other reasons, for this reduction that it will in a measure alleviate that burden, as I understand.

Mr. BORAH. I hope so.

Mr. STANLEY. It is bound to, if you reduce it. To that I wish to call the attention of the Senate; and I had hoped that I might get from the Senator some statement of the amount of the saving, if he has any definite idea as to just how much it would save the country, how much he thought it was in the realm of probability that we might reduce our naval expenditures if this conference were as successful as the Senator hopes.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, that would involve the question of what the conference would finally accomplish; but if it did not save a dollar——

Mr. STANLEY. It would still be a good thing; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. If it did not save a dollar as to the present amount, but did prevent the increase from year to year that will inevitably follow, it would be a tremendous benefit. The Senator knows, of course, that if this naval race begins, as the House indicates, we will not have a bill carrying $300,000,000 here next year; we will have a bill carrying four hundred or five hundred million dollars, and it will continue from year to year.

Mr. STANLEY. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Remember that in 1916, the year the building program of the large Navy began, we spent $170,000,000. Now, four years after the war, we are spending $300,000,000 plus, and so on.

Mr. STANLEY. Three hundred and twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. BORAH. And so, if we discontinue or are unsuccessful in our efforts to get an understanding, the increase from $170,000,000 in 1916 to $300,000,000 in 1923 will be very small compared with what it will be in the next 10 years. That is what I have in mind more than what we shall cut this particular bill, although I think we might possibly accomplish something along that line.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, as a sedative to the high-strung nerves, the inflamed animosities, the almost neurotic war spirit which displays itself in the Old World, the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho is entirely opportune, and, I trust, may receive the favorable consideration of this body and a sympathetic and earnest response from the civilized world.

The Senator, however, has called our attention to another matter—the matter of the burden of taxation; to the fact that we are burning our candle at both ends; that, on the one hand, while we are drying up the source of taxation we are inordinately increasing its amount and its burden.

The Senator from Idaho may see his brightest hopes realized, may see the armaments of the world scrapped, and a few revenue cutters preserving the peace of the world upon the high seas for a new era and a new civilization; and still he will not have appreciably lightened the burden of taxation upon the shoulders of the American people. As well attempt to bail the sea with a tin cup as to cure this disease by the saving of three hundred millions to the American people. You must go further and deeper, and you must secure a more widespread and a more drastic reform.

Why, Mr. President, a short time ago I had the most careful and detailed calculations made of the expense incident to the operation of this Government without regard to war, eliminating pensions, eliminating interest upon the national debt, eliminating all appropriations for fortifications, for armies and for armaments, and for everything directly or indirectly connected with wars, past, present, or future. In the year ending in 1916 we spent a little over $232,000,000 for post offices, public improvements—rivers and harbors and buildings—and for the various courts and commissions. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for the same purposes, with the additional commissions and courts and multitudinous officers, we spent over $1,115,000,000. Outside of war, we have increased the cost of government nearly 500 per cent in five years.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I perfectly agree with the Senator that this is only one step.

Mr. STANLEY. I understand.

Mr. BORAH. But this is the one which is now before us. I know that the increase of governmental expenditures has been exorbitant all along the line; but I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, notwithstanding these other increases, at the present time our war burden is $2,650,000,000.

Mr. STANLEY. I quite agree, and I am not saying this with a purpose of indirectly obstructing the Senator's present proposal; but I hope to secure the cooperation of the able Senator from Idaho in still further and still deeper cuts, in a still wider and a more thorough reform. We must go further, because this burden must be lifted. As the Senator has well said, to-day agriculture staggers; to-day, not knowing why nor how, there is a profound discontent, the fecund mother of violence and revolution, over a great portion of this country. The reason why it is a mere blind discontent, the reason why now it is a cry of anguish and of despair, rather than of wrath, is because they who suffer know not why they suffer. If they who

are on the verge of ruin and bankruptcy knew the extent to which this is due to bungling public officials, ill-considered legislation, wanton and reckless extravagance, expenditures for things for which this Government never should have spent a dollar at all; if they realized not only that they have paid the taxes the Senator has mentioned, but if they knew that through their freight rates, through their cost of living, if they knew that whenever they entered a hotel or place of public amusement, in the purchase of food and clothing, and the implements of toil—everywhere, as wide and general "as the casing air," they are literally enveloped by an inquisitorial, vexatious, and incompetent Government plundering them in a thousand ways, sucking like a vampire their sweat and toil; if they knew all this I would tremble for the safety of this Republic. An increase from $232,000,000 to $1,115,000,000 in five years for the same service! You could a few years ago milk a cow without a Federal inspector at your heels.

One hundred and three years ago, in his second inaugural address to Congress, Thomas Jefferson said:

> At home, fellow citizens, you best know whether we have done well or ill. The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses, enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These, covering our land with officers and opening our doors to their intrusions, had already begun that process of domiciliary vexation which once entered is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of property and produce. * * * It may be the pleasure and the pride of an American to ask, What farmer, what mechanic, what laborer ever sees a taxgatherer of the United States?

Think of it! What would be the relief to-day of the Washington farmer who is pouring his apples into the Columbia River; what would be the relief to-day of the potato growers in the West who are seeing their crops freeze because it costs more to dig it than it will bring, if they could say, with their mortgaged farms and their inordinate taxation, that the day is at hand when no man will see a taxgatherer of the United States!

Why, it was only a few years ago that I heard that great Senator from Ohio, with whom I did not agree politically, Senator Foraker, in 1906, upon the floor of this body bemoaning the fact that 10 years previously we had 167 marshals and deputy marshals, delators, and sleuths in the United States, and that in his degenerate day the number of spies and inspectors had increased to 3,000—3,000 busy gentlemen qualified to regulate every detail of the business of the people of the United States—3,000! Governor Haskell the other day, speaking at the McAlpin Hotel, said there were an army of 42,000 now. There were not half a dozen times in the Civil War when either side commanded an army as numerous or as active as the marshals, deputy marshals, and special agents who infest our highways and byways, our business houses, and homes, peering into every nook and corner, and supervising every detail of the industrial and private life of citizens of the United States. Now, you can not operate an inquisitorial, omnipotent Government, reaching every detail of the private lives and domestic activities of the people, without paying for it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. STANLEY. I do, with pleasure.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I want to ask the Senator if he has had an estimate made of the cost of this army of 42,000 spies, and so forth, and compared it with the total cost of the American Army? I am just wondering if it does not amount to more than the whole cost of the Army.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, the cost within the last five years of unnecessary commissions and regulatory concerns, commissions to control and regulate railroads, to regulate every butcher shop and every slaughterhouse, to regulate the production of fuel and its sale, to regulate the practice of medicine, to supervise the birth of babes and the burial of the dead—everything which the heart can desire or fancy can conceive, from the setting of a hen to the running of a railway—all this has actually cost the difference between $232,000,000 in 1916, and we had too much of it then, and $1,115,000,000 in 1922. The cost of the Government's doing things which it has no business to do, employing people who ought to be paying taxes instead of eating taxes, regulating matters which should be left to the States or the citizens thereof, is now more than the cost of operating this Government, everything included—Army and Navy, post offices, post roads, and everything else—from the inauguration of George Washington to the Civil War.

You can not conceive its enormity. Does the Senator from Idaho realize that it has been conservatively estimated by Mr. Ulm, in the Independent, that there are only about 30,000,000 people in the United States to-day who are producing wealth, actually producing it?

With his intimate acquaintance with Adam Smith, the Senator will concur with me that it is only those who are engaged in productive enterprise upon whom the whole structure rests so far as the production and distribution of wealth is concerned. In its production and in its distribution there are 30,000,000 people at work to-day in the United States, and there are 15,000,000 pensioners upon public bounty. Every two laborers carry a tax eater on their backs.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator say there are 15,000,000 holding Government jobs?

Mr. STANLEY. The Independent estimates that there are 15,000,000 who are pensioners upon public bounty in one form or another. I will have the whole article incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to see that. It is a very astonishing statement. I never heard any such statement as that before. I thought, as far as the Government itself was concerned, there were 3,000,000.

Mr. STANLEY. That is the Federal Government. Mr. Ulm estimates the number of pensioners, State and Federal officers, and so forth, at 15,000,000 people. It is a startling statement. It may well cause the Senator to ponder.

Mr. WATSON. My understanding of the statement was that there are 3,000,000 men holding Government positions——

Mr. STANLEY. Fifteen million.

Mr. WATSON. And that they each averaged five in the family, making a total of 15,000,000. I did not understand the Senator to say that 15,000,000 are on the Government pay roll.

Mr. STANLEY. I did not make the statement that they are on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. WATSON. On all pay rolls.

Mr. STANLEY. On some sort of pay roll or receiving some sort of pension. I give my authority. I think it is a conservative estimate, and I will take pleasure in incorporating it in the RECORD. He estimates that 10 per cent of the entire resources of the country are consumed in one form of taxation or another.

Says Aaron Hardy Ulm, in the Dearborn Independent of December 17, 1921:

> Do you know that the operations of government in these United States now provide income approximating the support of 15,000,000 persons, or about one out of every seven individuals in the country? Do you know, furthermore, that 10 per cent of the national earnings now go for governmental operations having to do alone with the protecting of man against man?
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> What amounts to the "support" of around 15,000,000 individuals passes in the form of taxes from the public as a whole to a minority of the people in these United States. Only about one-third of the population is made up of what by strict interpretation can be called producers. Not many more than 30,000,000 persons are actually engaged in producing and distributing food, clothing, and other necessaries of life. Every two actual producers now maintain, in addition to "dependents" and other nonproducers who draw from production, the equivalent of one individual that is maintained by governmental expenditure of some sort.

We have reached the breaking point, Mr. President. We have come to the time when unrequited toil staggers under its load. We have reached the point when the faithful, diligent plodder at the plow, or at the anvil, or with the pick, knowing not why, finds that his labor is the labor of Sisyphus; that at the end of the year the burden falls from his shoulders only to be taken up again at the foot of the weary hill; that he can not accumulate; that wages are a mockery; that the purchasing power of the dollar decreases faster than his wages increase. There never was a time, from the discovery of America till now, when it was as hard for the average man to provide food, raiment, and shelter, and pay taxes, and to live; and that agony, when it grows much more acute, is going to end, as the Senator from Idaho has well said, in revolution.

There is a time, says Victor Hugo, when the mind takes fire and a tattered rag becomes a banner. This is the thing that feeds Bolshevism. This is the thing that causes anarchy to whet its knife and to light its torch. This is the seismic disturbance, the volcano that now rumbles under our feet. We must make this Government cost less, and in order to make it cost less we must make it do less. The time to start is now, and I am ready to start with the Senator from Idaho; but I ask him to go further and to do more.

Mr. WATSON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I am very much interested in the statement the Senator has made. Of course, we all understand that if we are to have all sorts of governmental inspection, it means added numbers to the pay roll, with increased appropriations;

but in order to be practical I would like to ask the Senator where he proposes to begin to lop off. That is to say, would he repeal the pure food law?

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to the Senator that it would take me a long time to answer that question. I made a speech on the floor of the Senate some time ago of several hours' length, in which I took up the laws now governing the Department of Agriculture. There was a bill before the Senate to create a meat-inspection service, and right side by side we provided for inspectors under one department to do exactly the same thing inspectors were doing under another department. I would immediately go over the whole Budget and I would eradicate this duplication. That is the thing to which Senator Aldrich referred a few years ago when he said he could save $300,000,000 a year. That is just one instance.

Again, I would review the various commissions which have been created, carrying appropriations, and wherever I found that the work could be done by the State as well as by the Nation, and where they had concurrent authority, I would cut out the Federal appropriation wherever possible. Again, with the exception of the construction of public roads, I would forever and eternally stop this pernicious policy of a 50-50 cooperation between the General Government and the States on all sorts of new and untried experiments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion to the Senator from Indiana of a matter which is a practical one right now? We are about to pass a ship subsidy bill some of these days. We now have a Shipping Board of seven men drawing $12,000 a year each. There is not a business man in the United States who would stand that overnight; seven men drawing $12,000 a year each, where one man could operate it infinitely better, and the responsibility would be greater and more direct if we had one single individual doing it. You can review the commissions now created by the Government of the United States, and by eliminating the number—cutting them down to one, two, or three at the outside—you will get infinitely better service and you will save hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of dollars.

Mr. WATSON. I think there is something in that; but, after all, the Senator would not have one man constitute the Interstate Commerce Commission or one man constitute the Federal Trade Commission. I do not imagine we would want any of our big commissions, which have tremendous jurisdiction, to be reduced to one man in number. As to the Shipping Board, I am not advised.

Mr. STANLEY. I will make another suggestion.

Mr. WATSON. The big point about it is that if we are greatly to reduce public expenses by reducing the number of men on the pay roll we must strike at the system itself, not at a few individuals here and there.

Mr. STANLEY. I would first start with duplication, and right there we would save hundreds of millions.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator is aware of the fact that already that has been undertaken. We have been working at that for a year and a half.

Mr. STANLEY. But we do not cut deep enough. We are afraid to go deep enough.

Mr. WATSON. It is exceedingly difficult to do that.

Mr. STANLEY. Take the labor board, for instance. Two years ago on the floor of the Senate I said that when you cut compulsory arbitration out of the transportation act of 1920 you did away with your labor board, because you had left a body of men who could stir up a row, and then give advice with no authority whatever in the way of a settlement. It was emasculated; it was a political eunuch, and the thing ought to have been abolished right then. You went to work and spent thousands and thousands and thousands on this intricate machinery.

The other day the President said that the labor board could do nothing but give advice, that it was perfectly impotent, that it had been rendered almost contemptible, and that the carriers and the laboring men took turns defying its orders and ignoring in contempt its recommendations. You can do away with that board and save several hundred thousand dollars. I would like to talk until 10 o'clock in the morning making suggestions to the Senator about useless boards, useless offices, useless officers, the perversion of one governmental function and another, the reckless expenditure of public funds for impossible or improper purposes; but the startling and appalling fact remains that you are expending nearly a billion more now than you did five years ago with about half the sources of revenue you had five years ago.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator in that connection that one fault is the creation of a lot of temporary commissions for temporary purposes, making appropriations for those purposes, and having those commissions continue, with all their clerks, and asking for additional appropriations?

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President, 10 years ago, in an investigation of the United States Steel Corporation, Mr. Gary came before the investigating committee and suggested that the Government fix prices and wages. I had the pleasure the other day of reading a beautiful introduction to one of Herbert Spencer's essays, in which the same Judge Gary said, "They are best governed who are least governed." He has turned a complete industrial and political somersault, and, thank God, he has at last landed on solid ground. At that time, whenever a commission was appointed, they would point to the Interstate Commerce Commission, exercising in its incipiency legitimate Federal power. The right to regulate tolls charged upon public highways is almost as old as civilization. It was to give Congress power over interstate commerce more than any other one thing that caused the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

It was the essential weakness of the old Articles of Confederation. As long as the Interstate Commerce Commission exercised those powers, it was a blessing and beneficent influence and still is. But every day you are preparing to unduly increase the personnel and the powers of that commission, to give it control over wages, to give it purchasing power, to give it police power, and the first thing you know you are going to have an Interstate Commerce Commission of about 50 members costing about $50,000,000, and the people will rise in their wrath and abolish the whole business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I am not going to enter into any controversy at this time with reference to the Shipping Board or whether it should be composed of one or more members, but I am going to say that I quite agree with Senators in the suggestion, if they were to suggest it, that the Emergency Fleet Corporation should be controlled and its functions carried out under the control of one man. But the Shipping Board is an entirely different organization, and an entirely different body. It is as nearly like the Interstate Commerce Commission in its relation to shipping as any organization could be and, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] suggested, I do not think anybody would think about putting the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission into the hands of one man. If Senators investigate the proper functions of the Shipping Board they would no more think of putting those functions in the hands of one man than they would think of putting the functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the hands of one man. It is a matter that will no doubt come up in connection with the shipping bill and will be discussed more fully at that time.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I agree perfectly with the Senator from Washington. I have examined the functions of the Shipping Board under the pending bill and I would not put them in the hands of one man, and I would not put them in the hands of 100 men. The functions of the Shipping Board being created under the new bill are practically governmental functions and ought not to be lodged anywhere except in the elective bodies of the United States, the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am not talking about the functions of the Shipping Board under the bill. I am talking about the functions of the Shipping Board under the law now on the statute books.

Mr. BORAH. The function of the Shipping Board just now is to make speeches in favor of the ship subsidy bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator knows that is a very attractive remark, but that is not the function of the Shipping Board; not that laid down to them by law.

Mr. BORAH. I agree to that, too.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course the Senator knows that.

Mr. BORAH. It is not the duty laid upon them by law, but one can not pick up a newspaper that he does not find therein a speech or an article from some member of the Shipping Board advocating some feature of the bill. My view is that one man would be plenty to do that.

Mr. STANLEY. I am not conscious of having said a word about the Shipping Board.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was not referring to the Senator from Kentucky. I was referring to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. STANLEY. I purposely kept away from that board. I am reserving a shot at them for a later day. I will say in passing, however, that I would not confer the powers that this bill confers upon the Shipping Board upon any authority in the heavens above or the earth below or the waters under the earth.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before leaving the question of taxation, I wish to add to the record a few figures. The total indebtedness of 227 cities in the United States of more than 30,000 population in 1919 amounted to $2,619,551,824. I might add that since that date many of the cities have greatly augmented their bonded indebtedness. There are many cities in the United States whose population is less than 30,000 which have also very large municipal indebtedness. I have not been able to ascertain the aggregate amount of the indebtedness of the cities under 30,000 population, but from the best information I have it exceeds $200,000,000.

The State indebtedness in 1919—and this does not include the political subdivisions of the States—exceeded $520,000,000. Since that date the State indebtedness has been very greatly increased. I have been unable to ascertain exactly the amount of the present State indebtedness, but it is, as I am advised, in excess of $1,000,000,000.

On November 30 our national debt, not including, of course, the outstanding paper currency issued and guaranteed by the Federal Government, was $22,963,696,739.92. In 1920 corporations paid interest upon indebtedness to the amount of $2,835,369,000. Assuming this interest to have been 5 per cent, the capitalization would be $56,705,380,000; that is to say, if the interest paid was $2,835,000,000 upon the indebtedness, then the indebtedness was substantially $57,000,000,000 owing by those particular corporations.

In 1920 the Treasury estimate of deductions allowed individuals for interest paid amounted to more than $700,000,000. This sum capitalized at 5 per cent represents a gross individual indebtedness reported of more than $3,500,000,000. The outstanding paper currency issued and guaranteed by the Federal Government was more than $3,875,490,000.

So that the indebtedness of the United States and the people of the United States, as I have indicated, amounts to over $90,000,000,000. That does not include the indebtedness of school districts and counties and thousands of unreported obligations, and hundreds of millions of indebtedness which bears no rate of interest and which is not reported. So that it is safe to say that the debts of the United States and the people of the United States to-day—and when I say the United States I mean the Federal Government, the State government, the county and municipal subdivisions—would amount to more than $100,000,000,000, perhaps one-third of the value of all the property in the United States. A debt so stupendous of necessity must be oppressive, and unless some steps be taken to liquidate it and to cut down expenses, the people of the United States, notwithstanding the tremendous resources of the country, must pass through a state of great financial depression, if not bankruptcy

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 13, to increase the appropriation for employees in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations from $55,000 to $57,450.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 8, after the words "For travel allowance" to strike out "of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment," and insert "or for transportation and subsistence as authorized by law of enlisted men upon discharge."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 13, page 10, "Recreation for enlisted men."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, under this heading I desire to call attention to an amendment which I wish to offer. On board the battleships and other ships of the Navy they print little newspapers giving news of athletics and other matters of interest to those on board. I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be reported.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 10, in line 13, after the last word in the line, add the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That ships' newspapers are authorized to be published on board ship as heretofore, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to the amendment. It does not increase the amount of the appropriation. The difficulty the Senator from Virginia is trying to remove is on account of the law which forbids the use of the appropriation for printing. However, this is an exception on account of the printing of little sheets for the amusement and entertainment of the men on board the ships, which, of course, could not be done at the Public Printing Office.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the chairman of the committee if it permits the establishment of a small printing plant on each ship?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Only a very small hand press. The appropriation is, of course, limited. The amendment does not increase the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. They have the little hand presses already, but their use will be prohibited under a recent law unless the amendment is agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, while we are talking about printing, I ask the Senator why there is such an increase in the allowance which is carried in this bill for printing and binding?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will answer very briefly that it is because allowances for printing have been taken out of other items and placed in the printing appropriation. Formerly various items contained appropriations available for printing, but those appropriations have been reduced by the amount that had been heretofore appropriated for printing and the corresponding amounts were added to the printing appropriation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I add that that has been done as to all of the departments? Separate amounts for printing in the various bureaus have been eliminated and the appropriations for printing have all been put under one head; so that we now know just where the money is going and how much of it is appropriated for printing.

Mr. KING. I think that is very wise. I can not understand why there should be half a dozen different items in the various bills for the printing of the same department. May I ask, then, whether the appropriation for printing and binding, say, for last year, which appears to have been $212,250, was greater than the appropriation for printing provided by the pending bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was greater last year.

Mr. KING. Then, eliminating the various printing appropriations of the bill of last year from which drafts might be made, does the aggregate this year exceed the aggregate of last year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; there is a decrease of $9,000 in the total amount.

Mr. KING. Then, the amount of "$550,000, including not exceeding $90,000 for the Hydrographic Office," is less than the appropriation of last year?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. KING. I discover, however, that the Hydrographic Office last year had only $50,000 and that this year it has $90,000. There is an increase of $40,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator from Utah is speaking of the appropriation for printing, the appropriation for the printing of the Hydrographic Office is about $5,000 less this year than it was last year.

Mr. KING. The bill of last year—and I am now reading from it—states:

For printing and binding for the Navy Department, $212,250, including not exceeding $50,000 for the Hydrographic Office.

In the pending bill—the one we are discussing—I find the following language:

For printing and binding for the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment executed at the Government Printing Office, $550,000, including not exceeding $90,000 for the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the same amount for printing for the Hydrographic Office as was allowed last year, but the total appropriation for the Hydrographic Office is less this year than it was last year.

Mr. KING. I can not say that I understand the Senator. The pending bill states that there is appropriated $90,000 for printing for the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I say that for the printing of the Hydrographic Office the appropriation is the same as it was last year.

Mr. KING. Then last year it was more than $50,000, as stated in the item which I have just read, but it was carried in some other appropriation? Is that the case?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was carried in a number of different appropriations.

Mr. KING. But the aggregate did not exceed $90,000?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the next amendment.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 12, line 12, after the word "material," to insert "heat, light, water," so as to read:

NAVAL TRAINING STATIONS.

For maintenance, including labor and material, heat, light, water, general care, repairs, and improvements; school books; and all other incidental expenses for the naval training stations that follow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington what, if anything, has been done under the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] with respect to closing a large number of training and other naval stations? My recollection is that the Senator from Illinois offered a resolution dealing with the question. May I inquire of the Senator from Washington what has been done pursuant to that resolution? What modifications have been made and what stations have been closed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The inspection contemplated by the resolution has been made, but there has been no report submitted. As yet there has been no action taken in respect to the resolution, except to create a board and to conduct an examination.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Washington will recall that the Senator from Illinois challenged the attention of the Senate to the fact that there were hundreds of naval stations of various kinds, and it was conceded, as I understood, by the members of the Naval Affairs Committee that there were entirely too many such stations. The suggestion was made that many of them would be closed. May I ask, once for all, without going into details, whether many of them have been closed? When I say "stations" I refer, of course, to training stations, naval stations, bases and radio stations, a large number of which, it was conceded, were wholly unnecessary. I ask the Senator whether any such stations have been closed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just stated to the Senator from Utah that in pursuance of the resolution to which he refers a board was appointed, which has made a careful survey of the various stations, but their report has not as yet been made; they have not completed it. Consequently no action has been taken under the resolution. Orders have been issued closing certain stations; for instance, there was an order issued closing the station at Charleston, S. C., but a tremendous protest arose against that action. I think the matter is in statu quo at the present time; it is held in suspense. There have been great reductions made in the establishments at a number of navy yards, in the navy yard at New Orleans and some other navy yards, but there has been no general action taken, largely on account of the resolution to which the Senator from Utah referred and because of the fact that the question was being investigated by an official board.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations in preparing the naval appropriation bill ought to inquire into the necessity of maintaining a large number of naval stations. They ought not to ask for the appropriation of a single dollar for a naval station, no matter whether it be a base or training station or what not, unless satisfied that such station is necessary.

If the committee has done its duty—and I have no doubt that it has done its duty—and gone into the question of naval stations with a view to determining whether it is necessary to maintain them, it seems to me that they ought not to await the action of the board appointed under the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois. It was understood a year ago, when the naval bill was under consideration by the committee, that a large number of stations were absolutely unnecessary and that they would be closed. Now, it seems to me that the committee ought to know whether or not they have been closed, and if they have not been closed, why, if a spirit of economy is to prevail, they have not been closed. Are we to wait indefinitely and maintain these expensive stations until some Secretary of the Navy may have the courage to come to Congress and insist upon abolishing many of them?

Mr. POINDEXTER. To which station is the Senator from Utah referring? The Senator states that there are some of these stations that ought to be abandoned. Does he state that as a fact?

Mr. KING. That is my opinion.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On what is the Senator's opinion based?

Mr. KING. It is based upon an investigation which I made a year ago, and it is based upon the concessions which have been made in reference to the matter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator ought to call such stations to the attention of the committee. My observation is that the closest scrutiny was given to every appropriation which was requested for a station. There are a great number of navy yards, the usefulness and necessity of which are not questioned at all, for which insignificant appropriations are carried in this bill.

The reductions in the appropriation for navy yards made in this bill run into the millions of dollars as a result of the very scrutiny on the part of the committee which the Senator says ought to be given to the subject. If the Senator knows specifically of a navy yard that ought to be abandoned, we will be very glad to have that information.

Mr KING. Mr. President, the Senator, I am sure, will recall the fact that the Senator from Illinois called attention in a resolution and in a statement which he submitted to a large number of naval bases and stations in various parts of the United States and in some places outside of the United States, and it was understood, I think, by all the committee—certainly the impression was conveyed to the Senate—that many of those stations were not important and that they ought not to be maintained. I feel sure that some naval officers have strongly recommended the abolition of many of those stations, and I am sure the Secretary of the Navy—and I wish to compliment him for his attitude upon that question—has recommended the abandonment of a number of stations. I am also sure that he has sought to unite several training stations, or at least two training stations, and to bring the training station in Rhode Island and the one in Virginia together. Whether he has made recommendations with respect to the navy yard in New Hampshire, I feel sure that matter has received sympathetic consideration at the hands of some of the naval officers. I believe that the interests of the Government would best be served by abolishing that station. I feel certain that we could abolish, to the advantage of the Government, at least two or three naval stations or bases upon the Atlantic coast. I do not understand that this bill has abolished any of them. We are keeping up the Boston Navy Yard and the one in New Hampshire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the bill repeals an appropriation of $750,000 for dredging at one of them, which appropriation was made two years ago and continued in effect last year.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean at the navy yard in South Carolina?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no; at the navy yard in New York. There is practically nothing going on at the navy yard in South Carolina. I think an item of $20,000 for dredging is all there is appropriated for that yard.

Mr. KING. The Senator recalls an investigation was made by a committee of three, of which I was a member, with respect to the South Carolina navy yard, and I feel that it ought to be abandoned.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is no reason why we should not economize on other yards.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator; but what I am insisting upon is that there should be further abandonment and greater economy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I just called the Senator's attention to the fact that the committee has gone a long way in the direction he has indicated, even without the help of the Senator and without his suggestion.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows that under the new plan the Naval Affairs Committee have no voice in the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee; and the only members of the Naval Affairs Committee, so far as I know, who participated in preparing the pending bill were the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. The other members of the committee know no more about the bill, unless they have taken the trouble to investigate it, than other Members of the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that no navy yard can be abolished on the appropriation bill. It can only be abolished by a separate bill.

Mr. KING. The committee can fail to recommend an appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. If the committee undertook in the appropriation bill to abolish a navy yard provided for by existing law, the amendment would be subject to a point of order, and the bill would have to go back to the committee if a point of order were made and sustained. Any measure proposing to abolish a navy yard would have to be reported out by the Committee on Naval Affairs; a navy yard can not be abolished by action of the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee merely recommends the appropriation of money for projects authorized by existing law; it can not abol-

ish anything. The committee in the consideration of this bill have given no more money to any navy yard or naval station than is necessary to maintain the yard until its abandonment is authorized by law. Until that time it is necessary at least to have caretakers, and, as to several of the yards, that is about all that is done by this bill. I repeat, a single navy yard can not be abolished until a law is passed providing that the yard shall be abolished, and that is a matter within the province of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, technically the Senator is right, but, unfortunately, his conclusions are not accurate. There is no doubt that the Committee on Appropriations can refuse to include in the bill an appropriation for any navy yard which they think ought to be abolished; and, by failing to appropriate, that in effect abolishes the yard. I feel that it is the duty of this committee—and when I say "this committee" I mean this committee and the one in the House that has had this matter under consideration—to make such investigations as they may deem proper, and they ought to make very full ones, as to the needs of the Navy; and if they reach the conclusion that any particular yard or naval base ought to be abolished they ought, in the preparation of the appropriation bills, to refuse to include any item for its maintenance. Then, I invite the attention of the House and the Senate to the fact that in the preparation of the bill they have omitted any appropriation for any given base or any given station.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. DIAL. The Naval Affairs Committee is now making a very thorough investigation of some of the navy yards, and a report will be made in a reasonable time.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to know that a thorough investigation is being made; but I submit that this committee ought to have made, and I assume that it has made, a thorough investigation; and the question which I propounded was whether or not, after such investigation as satisfied the committee, it had followed the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] and either abolished by failing to appropriate or recommended the abolition of any naval bases or any naval stations. I regret that the full information I have sought to obtain has not been elicited; and I shall have to avail myself of other channels of information, perhaps, to obtain that which I desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 13, line 21, to increase the appropriation for expenses of organizing, administering, and recruiting the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia from $2,800,000 to $3,800,000, and, in the same line, to increase the total from $2,994,000 to $3,994,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Will the Senator give us any reason for asking to have it passed over?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I hope the Senator will not oppose this appropriation for the Naval Militia and Naval Reserve Force, because that is in the interest of a reduced permanent force—the training of civilians, which is the fundamental, basic military policy of the United States. To cut off appropriations for that purpose would be to discourage altogether the policy of training civilians for military purposes and increase the necessity for permanent establishment.

Mr. KING. I addressed myself some time ago to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and told him that some of these items, where I was not sufficiently advised, I should ask to go over to give an opportunity to investigate them; and I ask that this go over until I can look into it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed; and the Assistant Secretary read to line 2, page 21, the last paragraph read being:

SALARIES, NAUTICAL ALMANAC OFFICE.

For employees necessary for preparing for publication the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac, $18,420: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum except one at $2,500 and one at $2,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I may not be able to be here when the reading of the bill for action on the committee amendments is concluded and it is open to individual amendments; so I ask unanimous consent that I may offer a small amendment in line 2, page 21. After each word "one" in that line I want to put in the word "assistant"—that makes it conform to the appropriations as we have made them heretofore—so that it will read:

One assistant at $2,500, and one assistant at $2,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. That does not change the total?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Washington.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 21, line 2, after the word "one," the first word in the line, it is proposed to insert the word "assistant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "one," where it appears the second time in the same line, it is proposed to insert the word "assistant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 22, line 8, to increase the total of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engineering from $14,440,000 to $14,590,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator the reason for that increase.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is a clerical addition on account of the increase that was made in line 14 from $1,350,000 to $1,500,000—an increase of $150,000 for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material. The increased amount is the same as recommended by the Budget, and the same as carried in the act for the current year. It is necessary in order to carry on with some reasonable degree of currency the work of the Engineering Bureau. They are preparing a manual of engineering which is partly completed, portions of which have been issued, and which has proved to be a means of tremendous saving in the operation of ships; and it is sought in the interest of economy to continue this force to carry on that work.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether any part of this appropriation is to be devoted to changing some of the battleships which will be maintained in commission, either the decks or the gun elevations or the mechanism employed in handling the guns?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No part of it is for remodeling or modernizing any ship. That is a matter which is being urged, but the committee did not act on it at all. Of course the battleship *Maryland* is to have certain apparatus installed under one of the appropriations here, but that is not remodeling. That is the completion practically of a new ship, arranging for control of gunfire.

Mr. KING. May I make a general inquiry? Some criticism has come to my attention—indeed, I will say a naval officer has spoken to me—concerning the report that an effort is to be made to modernize, to use the Senator's expression, some of our fighting craft—not only to change the decks, strengthen and improve them and modify them, but also to change the gun carriages and the mode of elevating, lowering, and so forth, at a tremendous cost. May I inquire whether or not there is any such purpose, and, if so, whether this appropriation bill carries any provision to accomplish that end?

Mr. POINDEXTER. The appropriation bill carries nothing for that purpose. Personally, I should like to see it carry something for that purpose, because other naval powers have modernized their fleets, and if we are to carry out the naval policy which we have agreed upon of having a fleet equal to that of any other power it will be necessary for us to do the same thing; but, however that may be, no provision is made for it in this bill.

Mr. KING. I express no opinion as to the propriety of the proposed changes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 22, line 14, to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,500,000," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and offices of United States inspectors of machinery and engineering material for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, shall not exceed $1,500,000.

Mr. KING. I ask that that item go over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the same item that we have just been considering, involved in the previous line. It is just a correction.

Mr. KING. Then I have no objection. I thought it was an increase in the appropriation for clerical force.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a limitation.

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 23, line 7, to increase the appropriation for services of draftsmen and such other technical services required to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Increase of the Navy" and the appropriation "Engineering" from $150,000 to $170,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 6, in the items for salaries, Navy Department, to increase the appropriation for services of draftsmen and such other technical services required to carry into effect the various appropriations for "Increase of the Navy" and the appropriation "Construction and repair" from $170,000 to $190,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 25, to increase the appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores from $9,000,000 to $9,903,000.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation as to that increase.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is not an increase in the total amount carried by the bill. The amount of $903,000 was stricken from the appropriation for ordnance under "Increase of the Navy" on page 53 and put in here because of the controversy over the question as to whether the *Maryland* should be considered as a completed ship or an incomplete ship. In order to meet the objections on that score, the appropriation was taken out of "Increase of the Navy" and put under the head of "Ordnance" for the purpose of installing antiaircraft guns, fire-control equipment, and ammunition on that ship.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator whether, in the report submitted by the naval authorities, the amounts required for the various items mentioned in this paragraph were separately and specifically set forth—for instance, for the armament of ships, for fuel, for material, for labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance Department, for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and so forth? Did the department submit an itemized statement of the amount which would be employed for each of those items?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, yes; a very minute and detailed statement.

Mr. KING. And is it understood that the general appropriation here may not be differently allocated from the items submitted by the Navy Department?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was all gone into, not only by the committee but by the Budget, and pruned down so that it would be impossible for them to any extent to interchange those appropriations.

Mr. KING. Is there any rule or regulation or any law which, to use the Senator's expression, would prohibit the interchange of any of those appropriations?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think there is any law that prohibits it, but the necessities of the service practically prohibit it, because the amount is calculated upon the necessities of each one of the activities that are specified in this paragraph. If we take it away from any one of them, that activity can not be maintained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 8, to insert the following paragraph:

For the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, to be available until expended, $550,000.

Mr. KING. I ask for an explanation of that item. It was not reported in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was recommended by the Budget Bureau. The purpose of it is simply as stated, for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances. The view of the committee was that it is useless to have ships unless you have ordnance and ammunition for the ships. The allowance of torpedoes for the destroyers which the United States has is short to the extent of eight torpedoes for each destroyer, in order to make the full complement agreed upon by the technical experts of our naval service. In order to maintain the activities at our torpedo factory, and continue to make torpedoes to supply this deficiency, in consideration of the fact that it requires some six months to a year to complete a torpedo, it being one of the most complicated pieces of machinery in the world, it was thought a very wise precaution, so long as we are maintaining a Navy at all, to provide for a supply of torpedoes for the full complement of the vessels which we have.

Mr. KING. Why did not the House committee, which gave considerable attention to the preparation of this bill, and which doubtless heard the experts to whom the Senator refers, make the recommendation?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is impossible for me to tell what mental processes the House committee used in arriving at their conclusions. They probably thought they were willing to take a chance of getting along without the necessary number of torpedoes. Our committee thought we might as well do away with the ships if we did not have them prepared. There was a large supply of the parts of torpedoes made during the war, and those parts should be used and put together, and the necessary finishing and manufacturing should be performed in order that they should not be entirely wasted. If not used in a few months they will deteriorate so that they would be practically useless, whereas if they are put together and completed in torpedoes they can be preserved for an indefinite length of time.

Mr. FLETCHER. Were they included in the estimates?

Mr. SWANSON. They are included in the estimates. There is enough material on hand to construct about 500 torpedoes, material already paid for, which will be wasted if it is not used within the next two years. This appropriation will take care of about half of it, and the department is very urgent, and state that it will probably cost a great deal of money if these torpedoes are constructed in the future. If not used in two years' time this material will deteriorate so that it can not be used.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator from Virginia that the intimation has come to me, although I have not read the testimony in the House hearings, that this is rather to take care of two Government factories, or two private factories, I did not learn which, which were engaged in the past in making torpedoes, and in order to give work to some persons who otherwise might be separated from the service; in other words, that it was not a necessity so much as it was to give employment to individuals.

Mr. SWANSON. That is one of the usual accusations made when an appropriation is asked to continue work. The Navy Department states that the material was bought and paid for during the war to construct about 500 torpedoes, as I previously stated, and they say that there would be great waste if that material is not utilized at this time. It would save from one-third to 25 per cent in the cost of the torpedoes if the material is used now, and they are not compelled to purchase new material later. We need 2,400 torpedoes for our fleet. We have no fast cruisers, and a destroyer is useless without torpedoes. I see no use in spending $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 for a destroyer if we do not put torpedoes on it. The Navy Department says it is absolutely necessary. The Budget Bureau recommended it.

Mr. KING. The information furnished me is not sufficient to warrant a persistent opposition to the appropriation. I shall not object to its being voted upon, with the understanding that if I care upon further investigation to move to reconsider, no objection will be made to that motion.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 16, after the word "reenlisting," to strike out "under honorable discharge" and insert "after being honorably discharged," so as to read "extra pay to men reenlisting after being honorably discharged, $1,839,525."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to page 34, line 12, the last paragraph read being as follows:

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

For surgeon's necessaries for vessels in commission, navy yards, naval stations, and Marine Corps; and for the civil establishment at the several naval hospitals, navy yards, naval medical supply depots, Naval Medical School and Dispensary, Washington, and Naval Academy, $1,760,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, for clerical service in naval hospitals, dispensaries, medical supply depots, and Naval Medical School, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, shall not exceed $150,000.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the chairman if the appropriation under that heading is not larger than it was a year ago?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Last year it was $2,400,000. This year it is only $1,760,000, a very material reduction. It is $640,000 less than it was last year.

Mr. KING. It occurred to me there ought to be a very material reduction in view of the change in conditions from last year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 16, to increase the appropriation for nontechnical employees in the Bureau of Yards and Docks from $50,000 to $53,350.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 22, to increase the appropriation for services of draftsmen and such other technical services to carry into effect the various appropriations and allotments thereunder from $120,000 to $150,340.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to page 53, line 17, the last paragraph read being as follows:

In all, for the maintenance of Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, $8,604,943; and the money herein specifically appropriated for the maintenance of the Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps, shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with the existing law as maintenance, Quartermaster's Department, Marine Corps; and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator consent to taking a recess at this time? I want to make some observations on the Marine Corps appropriation, and move to reduce the force.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There are one or two other minor amendments yet to be disposed of. Will the Senator allow us to complete those?

Mr. KING. I have no objection.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 19, after the words "enlisted men" to insert "and accepted applicants for enlistment," so as to read:

CONTINGENT, MARINE CORPS.

For freight, expressage, tolls, cartage, advertising, washing bed linen, towels, and other articles of Government property, funeral expenses of officers and enlisted men and accepted applicants for enlistment, and retired officers on active duty during the war and retired enlisted men of the Marine Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 22, to reduce the appropriation for "Increase of the Navy" from $20,000,000 to $19,097,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, to strike out lines 7 to 14, inclusive, in the following words, "No part of any appropriation made for the Navy shall be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, including personal services of civilians and of enlisted men of the Navy, except as herein expressly authorized: *Provided*, That there may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time 34 enlisted men of the Navy," and in lieu to insert:

No part of any appropriation made for the naval service shall be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, including personal services, except as herein expressly authorized.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendments have now been completed.

Mr. KING. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next I shall offer an amendment to the pending bill, and perhaps a strict construction of the rule requires that I give notice of my intention to move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI, so that I may offer the amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah gives notice of an intention to move to suspend the rule, which will be read.

The notice was read, as follows:

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that I will move to suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, the following amendment:

That the President is authorized and requested to invite the Governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations to send representatives to a conference to be held in the city of Washington, which shall be charged with the duty of formulating and entering into a general international agreement by which armaments for war, both upon land and sea, shall be effectually reduced and limited in the interest of the peace of nations and the relief of all nations from the burdens of inordinate and unnecessary expenditures for the provision of armaments and the preparation for war.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday next, upon the convening of the Senate, I shall ask the Senate to proceed with the further consideration of the pending bill. Before moving an executive session I yield to my colleague.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. JONES of Washington. On behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], from the Committee on Commerce, I wish to report two bills. First, I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4133) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak., and I submit a report (No. 961) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bills do not involve any question such as we had up between New York and New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; they do not. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4133.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 1, lines 9 and 10, to strike out the words "and that the time for the commencement and completion of such bridge," and on page 2, lines 3, 4, and 5, to strike out the words "shall be commenced within one year and completed within three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the County of Pembina, N. Dak., and the County of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River of the North at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near the City of Pembina, N. Dak., and in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS BIG SIOUX RIVER.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Also, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], I report back favorably with amendments from the Committee on Commerce, the bill (S. 4131) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak., and I submit a report (No. 960) thereon. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask the Senator from Washington if he has personally examined these bills.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I looked over the bills. They are in the usual form.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 7, before the word "two," to insert "suitable to the interests of navigation, about" and in line 8, before the word "between," to insert "and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, about 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, and between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ON TUBERCULOSIS AMONG NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

Mr. SPENCER. I submit a report on tuberculosis among the North American Indians by a committee of the National Tuberculosis Association appointed October 28, 1921. I ask

that this report be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to having it printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be so referred.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 23, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 22, 1922.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Albert H. Reutter to be appraiser of merchandise, collection district No. 38, Detroit, Mich.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Adam C. Cliffe to be United States district judge, northern district of Illinois.

Frederic P. Schoonmaker to be United States district judge, western district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin A. Olson to be attorney, northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

William A. Dollison to be marshal, district of Colorado.

SOLICITOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Stephen B. Davis, jr., to be Solicitor of the Department of Commerce.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

John E. Puett, Cumming.
Frank M. Meaders, Dahlonega.

LOUISIANA.

Ethel I. Montgomery, Delhi.
James L. Hopkins, Marion.
Frank M. Caldwell, Robeline.

MISSOURI.

Charles A. Bryant, Richland.
Albert C. Yoder, Rosendale.

NEBRASKA.

Wilbur B. Alexander, Ansley.
Paul R. Lorance, Auburn.
Joseph N. Fuller, Butte.
Joseph Jones, Carroll.
Sturley T. Stevens, Comstock.
Kathrene Patrick, Ericson.
Lafayette O. Roblee, Lewellen.
Elizabeth Rucker, Steele City.

NEW JERSEY.

Horace E. Forsyth, Bayhead.
Forman R. Thompson, Matawan.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Burt E. Stewart, Minot.
Ettephina C. W. Winkler, Montpelier.

OHIO.

Allen E. Young, Medina.

OKLAHOMA.

Ernest C. Werrell, Depew.
Lan A. Avenett, Goodwell.
Harry Andrews, Marland.
Milton M. Bay, Morris.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John D. Heidtman, Sumter.

TEXAS.

Marvin F. Carroll, Bryan.
Stanley F. Labus, Falls City.
Jesse D. Starks, Floydada.
Curtis D. Crossman, Garland.
John H. Wilson, Jacksboro.
John B. Reneau, Munday.

VERMONT.

Orrin H. Jones, Wilmington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *December 22, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our dear heavenly Father, that Thou art still within the shadows keeping watch above Thine own. The blessing of a great comfort is ours, as we are reminded again that the divine love extends to the very bounds of creation; that all mortals, over whom the skies bend in solemn silence, are within the folds of the Father's arms. The Lord God bless, direct, and endow with great wisdom the House of Representatives. May goodness and truth always be defended against the wrong. We bless Thee that this day is ours. To-morrow and all the future may we leave to Thee, without anxiety and unhappy contemplation, for our times are in Thine hands. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 11903, a bill covering what is known as the Ford proposal to take over Muscle Shoals.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, in asking the unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with H. R. 11903, the bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs recommending the adoption of the Ford proposal, with slight modifications, to take over what is known as the Muscle Shoals property, is the indulgence in a practice which I have been careful to avoid during my service in the House of Representatives, always preferring to say whatever I desire to say from the floor of the House. However, in this short session of Congress, in view of the vast amount of legislative work to be done, I fully realize that time should not be taken by Members to discuss legislation which is not before the House at that particular time for final action, and having this in mind I asked for and was granted the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD on this proposition. It is understood by the membership of the House that as acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs I submitted the report and the recommendations contained therein accompanying H. R. 11903. A copy of this report undoubtedly can be procured by anyone desiring to study it, either from the document room or the clerk of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. In reporting this bill I earnestly endeavored to bring out the facts in connection with this great project without prejudice or favoritism, being impressed with the gigantic undertaking involved and the necessity for carrying out the development and operations at this particular place, to the best advantage of the people of our entire country, and I am at a loss to know what I could add to the reasoning set forth in my report that would tend to aid the Members of the House in coming to a conclusion as to the best method of disposing of this very important matter.

I am not unmindful, nor have I been at any time, of the great diversity of honest opinion in relation to this subject. It is a matter of such far-reaching importance, involving questions of public policy and the establishment of a precedent on which men may honestly differ. There is one point on which I am satisfied, and on which all unprejudiced men will agree, and that is that this question should be definitely settled in some manner and removed from the field of discussion.

It has not been my purpose to assume any pride in the adoption of the particular ideas contained in my report on this matter, and I have at all times stood ready to cheerfully accept any proposition, that at least on its face, guarantees more to the people of our country, than does the proposal submitted by Mr. Henry Ford.

I am prompted to make this extension of remarks as a result of a short speech delivered on the floor of the House, on December 14, 1922, by my colleague on the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. KEARNS, of Ohio. In this speech he proceeded to say that there had been much misleading information concerning the offer of Mr. Henry Ford sent out through Congress and

otherwise, "information that is indeed very misleading to the American people," and among other things he says:

Those who favor the Ford offer have attempted to gain the sympathy of the farmer by pretending to him that Henry Ford, if his offer should be accepted, would use this gigantic plant at Muscle Shoals and the water power at Dams Nos. 2 and 3 for the manufacture of fertilizer. Mr. Ford in his proposition to the Secretary of War has not agreed to make one pound of fertilizer at Muscle Shoals unless he can make it at a profit to himself.

And further says:

Even if he can make fertilizer at a profit to himself, he only agrees to use one-tenth part of that power in the manufacture of this very much needed commodity. The Ford propagandist never, for reasons obvious, tells the country this fact. This is concealed from the public.

In all fairness it may possibly be said, that certain gamblers and land speculators interested in the development of the territory adjacent to the Muscle Shoals project may have made absurd and far-fetched misrepresentations, as is usually the custom with exploiters of that type, hoping to be able to induce people who are not well informed to invest their savings in property contained within imaginary cities which it is assumed will spring up as a result of the acceptance of Mr. Ford's offer by their Government. For all such people who endeavor to exploit their fellow men and to misrepresent the Government under whose protection they are privileged to live, I have but the utmost contempt. It is equally unfair for anyone to make charges against the men in Congress or elsewhere, who have no pecuniary interest in this matter, and whose only desire is to see it finally determined to the greatest advantage of the Government from the standpoint of national defense, and it is also unfair to charge Members of Congress with an attempt to mislead the farmers of the country when their only desire is to secure the greatest advantages possible in the economical production of fertilizer which in turn may be sold at a reasonable price, with additional benefits which will flow to the country generally.

In answer to all of this criticism let us simply analyze the statements made in the light of the facts as set forth in the proposal of Mr. Henry Ford as modified by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and contained in H. R. 11903.

The following extract from the proposal now pending before the House is submitted for the careful consideration of the Members in order that every Member may determine for himself whether or not the language, which was carefully passed upon by your committee and which was submitted to and approved by the representatives of the great farm organizations of the country, does or does not provide that Mr. Ford or his company shall produce annually a certain amount of fixed nitrogen, to wit, 40,000 tons, or its equivalent, and whether or not the 8 per cent net profit mentioned in paragraph 16 of the proposal of Mr. Henry Ford dated May 31, 1922, and in section 15 of H. R. 11903 is not a limitation on the amount of profit which may be enjoyed, and whether it in any way curtails or relieves Mr. Ford or his company from the annual production of the amount of fixed nitrogen, to wit, 40,000 tons, as prescribed in paragraph 15 of the proposal and in section 14 of H. R. 11903, which is now on the calendar for consideration:

FORD'S OFFER.

15. Since the manufacture, sale, and distribution of commercial fertilizers to farmers and other users thereof constitutes one of the principal considerations of this offer, the company expressly agrees that, continuously throughout the lease period, except as it may be prevented by reconstruction of the plant itself or by war, strikes, accidents, fires, or other causes beyond its control, it will manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers, mixed or unmixed, and with or without filler, according to demand, at nitrate plant No. 2 or its equivalent, or at such other plant or plants adjacent or near thereto as it may construct, using the most economical source of power available. The annual production of these fertilizers shall have a nitrogen content of at least 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, which is the present annual capacity of nitrate plant No. 2. If during the lease period said nitrate plant No. 2 is destroyed or damaged from any cause, the company agrees to restore such plant within a reasonable time to its former capacity and further agrees:

H. R. 11903.

SEC. 14. Since the manufacture, sale, and distribution of commercial fertilizers to farmers and other users thereof constitute one of the principal considerations of this offer, the company expressly agrees that, continuously throughout the lease period, except as it may be prevented by reconstruction of the plant itself, or by war, strikes, accidents, fires, or other causes beyond its control, it will manufacture nitrogen and other commercial fertilizers, mixed or unmixed, and with or without filler, according to demand, at nitrate plant No. 2 or its equivalent, or at such other plant or plants adjacent or near thereto as it may construct, using the most economical source of power available. The annual production of these fertilizers shall have a nitrogen content of at least 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, which is the present annual capacity of nitrate plant No. 2. If during the lease period said nitrate plant No. 2 is destroyed or damaged from any cause, the company agrees to restore such plant, within a reasonable time, to its former capacity and further agrees:

FORD'S PROPOSAL.

16. In order that farmers and other users of fertilizers may be supplied with fertilizers at fair prices and without excessive profits the company agrees that the maximum net profit which it shall make in the manufacture and sale of fertilizer products shall not exceed 8 per cent of the fair actual annual cost of production thereof. In order that this provision may be carried out the company agrees to the creation of a board of not more than nine voting members, chosen as follows: The three leading representative farm organizations, national in fact, namely, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, or their successor or successors (said successor or successors to be determined, in case of controversy, by the Secretary of Agriculture), shall each designate not more than seven candidates for said board in the first instance, and thereafter, for succession in office, not more than three candidates. The President shall nominate for membership on this board not more than seven of these candidates, selected to give representation to each of the above-mentioned organizations, said nominations to be made subject to confirmation by the Senate, and there shall be two voting members of said board selected by the company: *Provided*, That not more than one shall be nominated by the President from the same State; that if the Senate shall not confirm all of said seven nominees the President shall send additional names from the said list of candidates until the Senate shall have confirmed seven: *Provided further*, That if either or any of said farm organizations or its or their successors, by reason of the expiration of its or their charter, or ceasing to function or failing to maintain its organization, or for any cause or reason should decline, fail, or neglect to make such designations, then the Secretary of Agriculture shall make such designation or designations for such or all of said organizations as may so decline, fail, or neglect to make such designation; and if such designation is made by the Secretary of Agriculture for only one or two of said organizations, then such designation shall be made so as to give the remaining organization or organizations the same right and in the same proportion to designate candidates for said board as in the first instance, and just as though all of said organizations were making such designations: *Provided, however*, That a failure to make designations at any one time shall not thereafter deprive any organization of its original rights under this section: *And provided further*, That the terms of office of the first seven candidates nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate on the designation of said farm organizations shall be as follows: Two for a period of two years, two for a period of four years, and the remaining three for a period of six years, and thereafter the nominations for membership on said board made by the President, except for unexpired terms, shall be for six years each. None of the members of said board shall draw compensation from the Government, except that any which may be nominated and confirmed on the designation of the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions hereof shall receive from the Government their actual expenses while engaged in work on said board. A representative of the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, or its legal successor, to be appointed by the President, shall also be a member of the board, serving in an advisory capacity without the right to vote. The said board shall determine what has been the cost of manufacture and sale of fertilizer products and the price which has been charged therefor, and, if necessary for the purpose of limiting the annual profit to 8 per cent as aforesaid, shall regulate the price at which said fertilizer may be sold by the company. For these purposes said board shall have access to the books and records of the company at any reasonable time. In order that such fertilizer products may be fairly distributed and economically purchased by farmers and other users thereof, the said board shall determine the equitable territorial distribution of the same, and may in its discretion make reasonable regulation for the sale of all or a portion of such products by the company to farmers, their agencies or organizations. If and when said board can not agree upon its findings and determinations, then the points of disagreement shall be referred to the Federal Trade Commission, or its legal successor, for arbitration and settlement, and the decision of said commission in such cases shall be final and binding upon the board.

H. R. 11903.

SEC. 15. In order that farmers and other users of fertilizers may be supplied with fertilizers at fair prices and without excessive profits the company agrees that the maximum net profit which it shall make in the manufacture and sale of fertilizer products shall not exceed 8 per cent of the fair actual annual cost of production thereof. In order that this provision may be carried out the company agrees to the creation of a board of not more than nine voting members, chosen as follows: The three leading representative farm organizations, national in fact, namely, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, or their successor or successors (said successor or successors to be determined, in case of controversy, by the Secretary of Agriculture), shall each designate not more than seven candidates for said board in the first instance and thereafter, for succession in office, not more than three candidates. The President shall nominate for membership on this board not more than seven of these candidates selected to give representation to each of the above-mentioned organizations, said nominations to be made subject to confirmation by the Senate, and there shall be two voting members of said board selected by the company: *Provided*, That not more than one shall be nominated by the President from the same State; that if the Senate shall not confirm all of said seven nominees the President shall send additional names from the said list of candidates until the Senate shall have confirmed seven: *Provided further*, That if either or any of said farm organizations or its or their successors by reason of the expiration of its or their charter or ceasing to function or failing to maintain its organization or for any cause or reason should decline, fail, or neglect to make such designations then the Secretary of Agriculture shall make such designation or designations for such or all of said organizations as may so decline, fail, or neglect to make such designation, and if such designation is made by the Secretary of Agriculture for only one or two of said organizations then such designation shall be made so as to give the remaining organization or organizations the same right and in the same proportion to designate candidates for said board as in the first instance and just as though all of said organizations were making such designations: *Provided, however*, That a failure to make designations at any one time shall not thereafter deprive any organization of its original rights under this section: *And provided further*, That the terms of office of the first seven candidates nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate on the designation of said farm organizations shall be as follows: Two for a period of two years, two for a period of four years, and the remaining three for a period of six years, and thereafter the nominations for membership on said board made by the President, except for unexpired terms, shall be for six years each. None of the members of said board shall draw compensation from the Government except that any which may be nominated and confirmed on the designa-

tion of the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions hereof shall receive from the Government their actual expenses while engaged in work on said board.

A representative of the Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture, or its legal successor, to be appointed by the President, shall also be a member of the board serving in an advisory capacity without the right to vote. The said board shall determine what has been the cost of manufacture and sale of fertilizer products and the price which has been charged therefor, and if necessary for the purpose of limiting the annual profit to 8 per cent as aforesaid shall regulate the price at which said fertilizer may be sold by the company. For these purposes said board shall have access to the books and records of the company at any reasonable time. In order that such fertilizer products may be fairly distributed and economically purchased by farmers and other users thereof the said board shall determine the equitable territorial distribution of the same and may in its discretion make reasonable regulation for the sale of all or a portion of such products by the company to farmers, their agencies, or organizations. If and when said board can not agree upon its findings and determinations then the points of disagreement shall be referred to the Federal Trade Commission (or its legal successor) for arbitration and settlement, and the decision of said commission in such cases shall be final and binding upon the board.

I submit that if under the language of paragraphs 15 and 16 of Mr. Ford's proposal and of sections 14 and 15 of the bill now pending before the House it is not broad enough to require the production of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, regardless of the question of profit, and that, further, the 8 per cent net profit so often criticized is merely a limitation of profit and in no way could be construed as qualifying the amount of the minimum production, then, I am frank to say, I do not comprehend the English language. But happily for those of us who do take this position that Mr. Ford must produce 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, I submit the Judge Advocate General's testimony before the committee (p. 179):

Congressman HULL. You [Colonel Hull] had something to do, as I understand it, with the drafting of this contract?

Colonel HULL. It was drafted in the office.

Congressman HULL. Then I presume you know something about the liability of Mr. Ford under that contract?

Colonel HULL. Yes, sir; it has been studied.

Congressman HULL. Would he be bound to produce fertilizer under that contract, if it was found possible?

Colonel HULL. As now drafted?

Congressman HULL. As now drafted he would have to produce at least——

Colonel HULL (interposing). To the maximum capacity of plant No. 2.

Congressman HULL. There would not be any question about that?

Colonel HULL. There is not any in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what section?

Colonel HULL. Section 14.

Congressman HULL. Suppose he could not produce it; that it was found physically impossible to produce the fertilizer compound in paying quantities; what would be the result, so far as the contract with the Government goes?

Colonel HULL. If the Government insists, a court of equity would grant relief, and not compel the performance of the impossible.

Congressman HULL. What section of the second contract with Mr. Ford covers that?

Colonel HULL. Section 14.

Congressman HULL. If it was found impossible to produce this fertilizer, I presume, of course, he would be enabled to take the hydroelectric power that was supposed to go into the production of the fertilizer and use it or sell it as he saw fit?

Colonel HULL. Yes; but, of course, he would be obligated to maintain his laboratory and experiments and try to produce.

And further, on page 200 of the hearings, Congressman GREENE asked Colonel Hull, the Acting Judge Advocate:

* * * for the purpose of producing this ingredient necessary for the making of fertilizer at a specified capacity, with this exception, in language set out, "except as it may be prevented by strikes, accidents, fire, or other causes beyond its control." It is reasonable to assume, of course, that notwithstanding Mr. Ford's production of this sulphate of ammonia for fertilizer purposes under this contract, other concerns, chemical laboratories, and similar industries would be at work on all sorts of methods for accomplishing the same thing. That is something which we are always trying to provide for. If in the course of a few years it is demonstrated that this ingredient of fertilizer can be produced through ordinary commercial sources, and if it becomes as common a staple as many other commercial products, it would manifestly not be to the business interest of Mr. Ford to continue the manufacture at his nitrate plant. It becomes a market condition which is one of the causes looking toward its control. Would you think he would be justified then in ceasing to manufacture this ingredient?

Colonel HULL. No, sir. I do not think the conditions which you outline would be construed by any court as another cause beyond his control as specified by this contract. That is a technical question and that is the reason I give you the answer that that language among lawyers would mean that it would have to be something that is set forth.

Mr. GREENE. He must keep apace with the developments in the outside world for 100 years?

Colonel HULL. He is obligated to do that by the contract.

Mr. GREENE. That you think is quite clear?

Colonel HULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREENE. Whatever may be the change in the manner of the outside world producing this product or its equivalent he must meet it, and we are assuming that the laws of chemistry will not change, and it will be this ammonium sulphate?

Colonel HULL. It might be an entirely different compound.

Mr. GREENE. Then he must meet that compound?

Colonel HULL. He would have to meet that proposition to produce fertilizer, because that is covered in the very next clause in regard to maintaining a research laboratory and to keep on experimenting to get the products in a cheaper and more feasible way.

Mr. GREENE. He would have to follow the thing all through the transmutations of chemistry?

Colonel HULL. He has to produce to the maximum given capacity.

Another criticism which might be misleading, and which is an oft-repeated one, is that Mr. Ford or his company agrees to use but one-tenth of the power developed at Muscle Shoals for the manufacture of the products necessary in the making of fertilizer, and in this respect the farmers of the country are being deceived.

Now, the truth is that there is not a single sentence in any paragraph of the proposal or in the bill now before you that will substantiate the statement that Mr. Ford or his company proposes to or agrees to use but 10 per cent of the power developed at Muscle Shoals in producing fertilizer.

What he does agree to do is to use the most economical source of power available to produce fertilizer, with a minimum production of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, mixed or unmixed, according to demand; and to comply with this provision in his offer, Mr. Ford will have to use more than 100,000 horsepower, for this amount is required to produce 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen at nitrate plant No. 2, and in order to manufacture fertilizer, mixed or unmixed, according to demand, Mr. Ford will have to use such additional power over the 100,000 horsepower required to produce a minimum of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen at nitrate plant No. 2 annually as will be necessary to produce an amount of fertilizer that will contain at least 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, together with other plant foods, mixed or unmixed, according to demand.

If, for example, the market demands require the production of a mixed fertilizer known to the trade as "2-8-2," which carries 2 per cent nitrogen, 8 per cent phosphoric acid, and 2 per cent potash, the annual production of such a fertilizer would be 2,000,000 tons, and it is not conceivable—indeed, it will be impossible, according to all the information I can get—to produce this tonnage of fertilizer without the use of this necessary additional horsepower, and as to the amount of additional power it will require, I can not say.

I do not feel that it is a fair assumption to say that Mr. Ford's offer in any way gives color to the suggestion that he will use nine-tenths of the power developed at Muscle Shoals in the manufacture of products which he may deem most profitable to himself unrestrained by any authority. Even if he did enter the field in some other activity, he would be subject to all of the Federal and State laws now controlling the manufacture of like products.

If, for example, Mr. Ford or his company deemed it to their advantage to sell power in Alabama for public utility purposes or for general manufacturing, he or it will be regulated and controlled as to rates and service under the same laws and regulations as the Alabama Power Co. or any other company engaged in a similar enterprise, by the Public Utility Commission of Alabama.

Another criticism of the Ford proposal which is put to the front in all general criticisms is the fact that Mr. Ford's proposed contract with the Government is not drawn and will not be governed under the provisions and regulations prescribed in the so-called "Federal water power act," and particular stress is placed upon the fact that his proposal is to extend over a period of 100 years, while the limitations on water-power grants under the aforementioned act are but for 50 years.

It is true that in many respects the proposal of Mr. Ford is unique and without precedent. However, I believe that sound reasons can be given for excepting his plan from the provisions of this act and for the extended period of 100 years instead of limiting it to 50 years as provided in the water power act. In connection with this point, I desire to quote briefly from pages 44 and 45 of the report, No. 1084, which I submitted as acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, covering this proposal:

The proposal of Mr. Ford to form a corporation and to take over the property for a period of 100 years, during which long period he agrees to maintain and keep in readiness for the production of nitrogen to be used in the manufacture of explosives, to the full capacity of nitrate plant No. 2, as a matter of national defense is a thing of far more importance than the payment of a few millions of dollars. And his second continuing obligation, that during peace times he will run to its full capacity the said plant for the production of the elements of commercial fertilizer, in the interests of the farmers and other users of fertilizers in this country, is perhaps an equal if not a greater undertaking than the maintenance of such plant as an element of national defense. Taking these two propositions together, and in addition thereto his obligation to pay 4 per cent annually on the cost of the completion of Dam No. 2 and the construction of Dam No. 3 and on the cost of the flowage rights for the lease period, and in addition thereto to establish a sinking fund which, accumulating during the lease period, will amortize the Government for the entire expenditure for the completion of Dam No. 2 and the construction of Dam No. 3, in connection with the several minor obligations which he assumes, gives his proposal commanding attention, and one to which the Congress of the United States may well give its early and most earnest attention.

Other criticisms are that Mr. Ford or his company declines to put his or its money into the construction of the proposed hydroelectric plants, but asks that the Government advance

the money for the construction of the dams and certain other facilities, and that he be permitted to carry on the construction without a profit and that when completed he is to pay 4 per cent annually on the cost of construction, and further proposes a plan of amortization which at the end of a period will reimburse the Government for all of the expenditure in construction on Dams Nos. 2 and 3, and, furthermore, that he will pay annually the sum of $55,000 toward the maintenance of these dams.

On this last point Mr. KEARNS in his statement on the floor of the House used the following language:

> And yet every engineer who appeared before our committee testified that the minimum estimate is 1 per cent of the cost of construction for the upkeep of the dam and the maximum cost of upkeep 3 per cent, and the cost of construction would be $67,000,000. So it would cost the American people to keep up the dams for 100 years $670,000 per annum less $55,000 of this sum to be paid by Ford. That is the minimum cost, and if it should reach the maximum cost of 3 per cent it would be three times that amount, or $1,845,000, for repairs alone.

However, my colleague is mistaken as to the facts in this particular instance, for the testimony taken before our committee does not confirm this statement at all; and there is no evidence which I have been able to discover that will corroborate the foregoing statement relative to the cost of maintenance made by an engineer or any other person appearing before the committee.

All of these proposals have been criticized: (1) That 4 per cent is not a sufficient return on the investment; (2) that his plan of amortizing the principal is unsound; (3) that $55,000 will not take care of the maintenance of the dam from year to year.

In the judgment of responsible men who have given this matter earnest consideration the rate of interest fixed at 4 per cent on the cost of construction and the acquiring of the flowage rights is a fair consideration for the privileges granted coupled with the other obligations controlling the contract; and it has been doubted by some as to whether or not the power so produced will be cheap enough to permit the use of it in the manufacture of commercial fertilizer to be sold at a reasonable price, which we all understand is one of the principal elements entering into the proposed plan.

It may be conceded that the plan of amortization is novel, but if it results in the end in making the Government whole, then why criticize the plan?

On the question of maintenance, Major General Beach, Chief of Engineers, United States Army, testified "that the amount mentioned, $55,000, would be ample," and, further, in a letter under date of August 15, 1921, to Hon. A. W. Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury, said:

> Average annual cost of maintenance and repairs for both Dams Nos. 2 and 3, for dams, locks, and gates during lease period is estimated at $50,000 per annum. This estimate of $50,000 per annum relates to about $32,000,000 worth of masonry and $3,135,000 worth of gates and machinery, the balance of the cost being in temporary constructions which could not be maintained after the dams are completed.

I desire again to call to the attention of the Members of the House the criticism relative to the length of the lease period, which in my humble judgment is one of the most important and beneficial provisions of the whole plan in working to the advantage of the Government.

Long lease periods of 100 years or more are not unknown in our country. A case in point is the great Keokuk Dam across the Mississippi River, which was constructed by private enterprise under a perpetual lease, and it is one of the strange things brought out in the investigation of this proposed plan that the distinguished engineer, Col. Hugh L. Cooper, criticizes the proposed term of 100 years to Henry Ford and in his same statement volunteers the information that he is vice president of the company operating the Keokuk Dam under a perpetual lease.

To my mind, one of the conclusive tests to be applied to Mr. Ford's proposal in connection with the foregoing criticism is the fact that no individual or corporation has submitted a more remunerative and practical proposal to the Government. And why?

If the Government is giving so much to Mr. Ford under this proposal, it is strange indeed that with all the splendid, energetic captains of industry and men of financial ability none have appeared before the Secretary of War and urged him to give them an opportunity to compensate the Government in greater measure than Mr. Ford proposes in his offer. Why is this? Let the critic of Mr. Ford's offer give us the answer.

I will assume that you are all familiar with the character of the offers made by the Alabama Power Co., Frederick E. Engstrum, and Dr. Charles E. Parsons, all of which are propositions for leasing the power developed or operating the plant for the Government when constructed, and in some instances asking a fee for superintending construction.

It was the judgment of the committee that as a solution of this many-sided problem, which includes not only the element of national defense but the manufacturing of a commercial fertilizer, the improvement of navigation, and the maintenance of Government property, that the proposal of Henry Ford was the one above all others worthy of serious consideration.

Several bills have been introduced in the House and Senate by different members, aiming at a solution of this problem, but they all, in my judgment, contain the fatal defect of either Government operation or operation of a Government plant by lessee. The only clearly defined proposal, in my judgment, is the Ford proposal. Its terms are plain and easily understood. It proposes action, definite and continuing, and safeguards the vital interests of the people. All of the other proposals contain many elements speculative to a large degree, so far as results are concerned, and all of them leave the burden of maintenance upon the Government, which we all know would be very large and never ending and probably increasing.

We who have in a large measure given our approval to the Ford proposal, as modified by the Committee on Military Affairs, have been criticized and accused of an attempt to deceive the great agricultural interests of our country. Personally, I have the honor of representing one of the greatest agricultural districts in the world. I was born on a farm. I am familiar with the toil of the farmer, from years of experience, and while I have not succeeded in being advertised all over our country as an honorary member of the farm bloc, I am positive that I can give without question my earnest support to any measure which in my judgment will be of practical value to the men and women engaged in agriculture, and I have been amused at times at the frantic efforts of some people to "swear in" on every occasion as "the friend of the farmer" or of the laboring man.

I do not know that in my service here I have ever been able to get more than a 50-50 record as a friend of labor from those who compile reports for their organizations, and this may be due to the fact that I, like many others who have a deep interest in labor and agriculture, have not seen fit to be continuously reiterating and publishing our loyalty to both of these great classes of our citizens.

However, we now have before us pending on the calendar the Henry Ford proposal, as modified by the Committee on Military Affairs, which, in my judgment, carries with it the most vital and momentously potential elements for the benefit of both the farmers and the laborers of our land of any proposal heretofore submitted for our consideration. Where do the friends of labor and agriculture stand on this matter? Are you with us, or do you feel that the farmers are being deceived? Permit me to suggest that the wide-awake farmers and the intelligent laboring men of this country are not deceived on this matter, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The farmers of this country have not forgotten the lesson received by Government operation of our railroads for a brief period, and they are still paying and suffering from its results. Do you think for a moment that they have any hope of getting cheap commercial fertilizer produced at Muscle Shoals by political henchmen operating a great industrial plant, or even as suggested in some of the bills presented to Congress, an experimental station to furnish information for the benefit of the great commercial fertilizer interests? Oh, no, my colleagues! The farmers are not being deceived in this matter. They understand just what it would mean for the Government to undertake to maintain those great plants down there even in a "stand-by" condition, and they furthermore understand the difficulties which would confront the Government if it should undertake the manufacture and sale of electric current in a territory now controlled with a network of transmission lines, the property of the great Alabama Power Co. No; they are not deceived! They know what they want, and I agree with them, that rather than undertake Government operation of this plant, and making it a bone of political contention, it would be infinitely cheaper for the Government to pay tribute to the Chilean nitrate barons and purchase annually large quantities of fertilizer and give it to the farmers.

It is not my purpose to enter a special plea for Henry Ford. I do not know Mr. Ford. I have never looked upon him as a philanthropist, and in the splendid section of the country from which I come we have not as yet learned to worship him. We still worship God in my section, and we are not so familiar with Mr. Ford as my colleague on the committee, Mr. QUIN, of Mississippi, who stated in the hearings:

> We think a good deal of Mr. Ford down in our country; we call him Uncle Henry.

To be serious is my intention and purpose. This is not a question of Mr. Ford or any particular corporation. It has been my intention to deal with this matter as a cold-blooded

business proposition, forgetting personalities, geographical locations, and all the distracting influences brought to bear on this subject.

I am frank to concede that if the bald statement were made by an opponent of the Ford proposition to an American audience that we propose to give to Henry Ford $106,000,000 worth of Government property for the paltry sum of $5,000,000 or less, this statement, standing unexplained, would no doubt bring a negative response from such audience. But when fully explained in all of its details there is little doubt in my mind but what the vast majority of people would approve and recommend the adoption by Congress of the proposal as modified by the committee.

It is always conceded that in considering great problems, especially involving many figures and estimates, that there are many chances for misunderstanding, and it is always possible for one so inclined to juggle the figures in such a way as to frequently mislead the reader. I have avoided the use of figures as much as possible in this extension of remarks on account of the fact that under this privilege opportunity to ask questions is not possible; and it is not my purpose at this time to discuss details or figures but rather call attention to the principles involved in this proposal.

In conclusion, let us just stop for a moment and see if we, in our imagination, can get a clear perspective of the meaning of this whole matter. Muscle Shoals is located on the Tennessee River, one of the great rivers of our country, in the northern part of the State of Alabama. Stretching for hundreds of miles to the south and east, as far as there is land, are the great cotton fields which have clothed America for years, and from that continuous cultivation which has been demanded all of these years the soil has become impoverished in fertility. To the north and east for hundreds of miles stretch the lands which have been cultivated for three centuries, and this soil also has become impoverished to a very large extent. Turning to the north and westward are the great fertile plains of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas, which have not yet been so impoverished. In the cotton fields of the South and in the agricultural districts of the North and Northeast commercial fertilizer is a necessity. Gradually but surely the virgin elements of the fertile plains and prairies of the great West and North are becoming depleted in fertility, and, in fact, are now requiring more and more fertilizer as the years go by.

It is no idle statement to assert that the time is coming when commercial fertilizer will be largely, if not universally, used by the agriculturists of our country. It is inevitable that as the soil becomes impoverished the demand for commercial fertilizer will keep pace. While the far-seeing farmer knows this, no one knows it better than the great commercial fertilizer manufacturers of the country, and they can see very clearly that as the task of the farmer becomes more burdensome and less remunerative on account of soil depletion the flow of profits into their coffers, due to the direct necessity for commercial fertilizer, increases. Therefore it is not strange that this class of people, having in mind their personal welfare, should be found arrayed against the Ford proposal to manufacture "40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, mixed or unmixed, according to demand," which is equal to 250,000 tons of Chilean nitrate, an amount equal to all of the Chilean nitrate used in American agriculture before the Great War.

Are the farmers deceived as to this? Are the farmers of the country so unsophisticated that they can not see that without doubt, with the increased demand, there will come greater cost for the needed fertilizer? Most assuredly not. Is it not natural and perfectly proper that they should favor any proposition that will tend to stabilize and keep within reasonable bounds the cost of this product so vital to their interests?

But what does the Ford proposal offer as a remedy for the existing situation and a hope in the future? To me it is plain. Here at Muscle Shoals is this mighty water power awaiting development. Mr. Ford, with one of the greatest industrial organizations in the world, proposes to establish a plant, the details of which I will not discuss at this time, and he will for the period of 100 years produce "40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually," with a limited profit of 8 per cent, and I am informed that the 2,000,000 tons of 2-8-2 fertilizer, for which this would furnish the nitrogen, would amount to more than 38 per cent of the fertilizer consumption of the United States in 1921. Does anyone doubt that this would have a tendency to stabilize and control prices, or at least prevent the boosting of the fertilizer market? If one has any doubt, let him ask some manufacturer of this product. And in the event that the competitors of Mr. Ford would lower the price of their goods to a point where it might even be unprofitable to manufacture the product at Muscle Shoals, the farmer would again be the beneficiary.

Finally, let me reiterate that there has been no effort on the part of the men most earnestly desiring a solution of this problem, in or out of Congress, to mislead or deceive the farmer or laboring people of the country, and I am fully convinced that they are not deceived, but have a much clearer conception of the vital and far-reaching policies involved than we might without consideration give due credit for, and I am further convinced of the fact, and I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues, that these two classes of our people can not quite understand why it is possible for Congress to find hours and days in which to discuss the problem of paying a subsidy to men to put our flag on the seas for the purpose of competing with other ocean carriers in the transportation of the small fraction of our products which must find a market abroad, or in the taking up of valuable time in the discussion of a proposition to call an international economic congress to be held in Washington to consider the relief from impending bankruptcy of the nations of Europe who would buy the small fraction of our products remaining for export from the farms of our country, while a problem which deals directly with and affects the millions of our own people at home hangs on the House Calendar with danger of being entirely omitted from consideration by Congress during the present short and busy session.

Surely, my colleagues, it is a pertinent question, and if I could arouse a sentiment that would bring about prompt consideration of this measure, which is fraught with so much of benefit for the entire people of our country, before the 4th day of March next, I am sure that the farmers and laborers of this country, in the event this proposition is given favorable consideration, would join in glad acclaim that their Representatives are still responsive to the wishes and best interests of the men and women whom they represent.

Let me express the hope that H. R. 11903 may be given early and favorable consideration, and permit me to admonish you that in my judgment if it is not we will awaken to the fact that the farmers have not been deceived, but have been denied the one thing above all others that they hoped for at our hands.

APPENDIX A.

Ten-year increase in expenditures of farmers for fertilizers from census statistics 1909–1919.

State.	Expenditures.		Per cent increase.
	1909	1919	
Oklahoma	$29,002	$452,492	1,455
Kansas	75,602	979,037	1,196
North Dakota	10,003	119,782	1,098
Montana	12,323	126,232	924
Oregon	68,557	490,524	614
Arizona	6,090	40,892	572
Wisconsin	127,753	779,750	511
Washington	87,023	525,637	504
Missouri	671,073	3,941,488	487
Minnesota	74,053	432,680	479
Iowa	109,570	596,537	444
Utah	20,037	108,956	444
Michigan	940,354	4,872,543	415
Idaho	20,737	105,121	412
Illinois	615,294	2,996,403	387
Colorado	61,113	294,443	383
New Mexico	25,371	113,483	347
Arkansas	598,553	2,572,578	331
Indiana	2,189,695	8,734,698	299
North Carolina	12,262,553	48,795,694	298
California	2,143,993	8,182,998	282
South Carolina	15,162,017	52,546,795	246
West Virginia	528,937	1,709,546	223
Ohio	4,180,485	13,206,018	215
Texas	595,363	1,831,207	208
South Dakota	11,294	34,466	205
Tennessee	1,216,296	3,525,133	190
Florida	3,609,853	10,315,929	186
Georgia	16,860,149	46,196,494	174
Kentucky	1,350,720	3,597,449	166
New Jersey	4,277,604	10,742,682	151
Connecticut	1,954,163	4,893,658	150
Virginia	6,932,455	17,277,705	149
Pennsylvania	6,801,605	15,628,341	130
Maryland	3,387,634	7,610,478	125
New York	7,142,265	15,067,371	111
Nebraska	31,021	64,752	109
Massachusetts	1,965,682	3,906,733	99
Louisiana	2,004,919	3,940,499	92
Maine	4,009,479	7,759,067	91
Alabama	7,630,952	14,006,108	84
Wyoming	5,303	8,489	60
Mississippi	2,703,271	4,288,165	59
Vermont	570,782	857,273	50
Delaware	884,577	1,322,329	41
Nevada	8,279	9,897	18
Rhode Island	325,103	379,785	16
New Hampshire	812,580	936,180	2
Total	114,882,541	326,399,800	[1] 184
Total 10-year increase		211,517,259	

[1] Average.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3275) entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers and sailors, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows."

STATISTICS OF THE FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 276).

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, S. 3295, to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The Clerk read the conference report as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
KNUTE NELSON,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to consolidate the statistics of the foreign commerce in the Department of Commerce. It was a Senate bill passed in the House with three amendments, made necessary owing to the time that had elapsed since the bill was first introduced. The Senate at first disagreed to the House amendments and asked for a conference. The conference was granted, and the Senate receded from its disagreement, and I present the unanimous report of the conferees on the bill as it left the House.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa in his handling of the bill as the head of the conferees and his success in getting the Senate to recede from its disagreement to the amendments.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I believe it is the first time on record that it has been done.

Mr. GARNER. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] have permission to insert in the RECORD resolutions passed by the farm conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. JONES] may extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a resolution of the farm conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter from Carl Williams, acting chairman of the National Council of Farmers Cooperative Associations, inclosing copies of the report of "rural credits" committee and also the committee on resolutions at the recent Washington meeting.

In view of the vast importance to the entire Nation of the questions discussed at this meeting I think these reports should be printed in the RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the communications which I received, together with the resolutions and report.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS,
Dallas, Tex., December 19, 1922.

MY DEAR SIR: The National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations held in Washington, December 14, 15, and 16, was attended by delegates representing more than 100,000 farmers, grouped in 80 of the largest associations, doing an active business of more than $1,000,000,000 per year in the marketing of farm crops.

These business organizations are the groups which, above all others, will be specifically affected by any rural credits legislation which Congress may pass at this session, therefore, their interest in the matter is acute.

You will find inclosed herewith the report of the "rural credits" committee, unanimously adopted by the council, and also the report of the committee on "resolutions," which was similarly adopted.

We sincerely hope that the suggestions contained therein may be of some value to you in your deliberations on these various measures.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMERS' COOPERATIVE MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS,
CARL WILLIAMS, *Acting Chairman.*

—

To Hon. ROBERT W. BINGHAM,
Chairman Conference National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations:

Your committee on rural credits beg leave to submit the following report:

The committee on rural credits of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations has made a survey of the subject of farmers' credits and the legislation proposed on such rural credits.

Your committee recommends as follows:

1. That this national council announces as a general policy that the primary reliance of the farmer for credits for production or for marketing should be upon the local banker, and that under normal conditions the local banker is likely to meet the greater part of such needs.

2. That the Federal reserve system should be modified so as to meet the special requirements of farm credits and to permit the financing of farmers and farmers' cooperative marketing associations conveniently and efficiently through normal banking channels.

3. That such modification involve primarily the extension of the maturity of agricultural paper to a maximum limit of nine months, with the fixing of cooperative marketing for loans on such agricultural paper to any one cooperative marketing association to be fixed as 50 per cent of the capital and surplus of banks members of the Federal reserve system, subject to the State laws wherever applicable, and that encouragement and inducement be made to have more State banks exercise the privilege of membership in the Federal reserve system.

4. That adequate opportunity be presented for the creation of agricultural credit corporations with sufficient minimum capital to purchase or discount ordinary agricultural paper with a maximum maturity paper of nine months and live-stock paper with a maturity of not more than three years, with rediscount corporations adequately capitalized to purchase such paper from agricultural credit corporations, with the privilege of rediscounting any such paper with its indorsement through Federal reserve system.

That the maximum basis of loans from farm land banks be raised from $10,000 to $25,000.

5. That a farm credits department in the Federal land banks established in each of the land banks with a capital of $5,000,000, making a total of $60,000,000 capitalized, against which credits may be issued to the extent of approximately $600,000,000; and that these farm credits departments of the Federal farm banks be authorized to discount or purchase agricultural paper in a broad sense and to make loans or advance directly to cooperative marketing associations and agricultural cooperative credit organizations.

6. That the right of the Federal land bank to purchase production credits shall be limited to production credits where the note of the individual is indorsed by the cooperative credit association, or is secured by a chattel mortgage on implements or animals, or both, and indorsed by the local banks, or where the note or draft itself is made by a cooperative credit association of producers, and that any Federal land bank may exercise any of the powers herein granted in any section or district of the United States.

And your committee further recommends that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate be requested to consider these suggestions and to combine them, if possible, into a rural credits act, to be introduced in such way as the committee may deem advisable.

Your committee recommends that the council announce as its policy that the cooperative marketing associations do not ask anything from the Federal Government except that legislation be enacted to permit farmers and farmers' organizations to have the same access to the Federal credits system, adapted to its needs, that all other industries now possess, and to make provision for unforeseen emergencies by setting up a last reserve in such a manner as is above suggested in the farm credits department of the farm land banks.

Your committee further recommends that this council take action through every individual member representing every cooperative association to make immediate personal contact with the Senators and Congressmen from each State to urge that a rule be secured setting aside consideration of other bills until this legislation is secured, and that all of the farm organizations be asked to unite in support of legislation as generally outlined above.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES C. STONE, *Chairman.*

—

(E. M. de Pencier (chairman), Peanut Growers' Association; J. F. Niswander, California Peach and Fig Growers' Association; Jefferson Thomas, Florida Citrus Growers' Exchange; J. F. Miller, Pennsylvania Farmers' Cooperative Federation; E. C. Weatherby, Cooperative Orange League Federation Exchange.)

To the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Association:

Your committee on merchandising, after careful consideration of our common problems in the distribution and sale of cooperatively marketed products, begs leave to submit its conclusions with reference to certain difficulties by which we are now jointly confronted.

1. As the primary endeavor of a cooperative organization is to render better service to the producer in the marketing of his produce, and as experience has taught us that we best serve ourselves by serving the consumers who purchase our products, we believe every effort should be made to improve and standardize the quality of our respective outputs.

Since the American public is so largely guided in its buying habits by the confidence and the assurances of dependability vouchsafed by reliable producers through their established brands, we believe every effort should be made to fully and honestly indicate exactly the nature of all products offered for sale and the point of origin of such products.

There are annually imported into this country great quantities of fresh and dried fruits, eggs, tobacco, nuts, beans, butter, cheese, seeds, and many other agricultural products extensively produced in this country. The value of these importations runs into many millions of dollars.

Some of these goods are of excellent quality, but a great percentage of them do not conform to American standards of production and pack. In many instances it is impossible for the consumer to distinguish by mere exterior appearance either the good qualities or the defects of such foreign goods. In a great many cases foreign goods are repacked in this country and offered for sale without mention being made of the foreign origin or exact quality of the products.

Equally in the interest of the producers and consumers of foodstuffs we consider it desirable that there be afforded the protection of a law or laws requiring that all containers of any form for foreign agricultural products imported into this country shall be conspicuously marked in English to indicate definitely the following:

(a) The name and nature of the contents of the package.
(b) The name of the country of origin.
(c) The date of original packing.

Further, that in the event of repacking in this country, where the contents are transferred from the original container, that the new container shall bear the same information as that displayed on the import container.

Therefore, we recommend to the council the initiation of requisite action to provide for the necessary legislation.

2. As it is obvious that the continued and increased success of cooperative marketing must be predicated upon a much more complete understanding of the fundamental purposes thereof by the consuming public and by all factors in the business fabric of the country, it is most important that these interests be educated as to the benefits they will derive from the enlargement of this great economic evolution.

We recommend, therefore, to all cooperatives that in every practicable way they consistently and persistently emphasize the beneficial bearing of their operations upon the commercial, financial, educational, and social structures of our country, in order that the ultimate goal of this movement, which is the cooperation of producer and consumer, may be more quickly attained.

Respectfully submitted. E. M. DE PENCIER, *Chairman.*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

Your committee begs leave to report the following resolutions, with the recommendation that they be adopted by the Farmers National Council of Cooperative Marketing Associations:

1. This conference completely indorses the principles of cooperative marketing as most fully offering the opportunity for self-help by farmers. We further desire to express our appreciation of the most friendly attitude toward the cooperative movement that is now being shown by the President of the United States and the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

2. High freight rates have proven an excessive burden to the producers and consumers of the country, and we urge the Interstate Commerce Commission immediately to hold a hearing for the purpose of opening the whole question of revision of the rate structure now in effect with a view to lessening, if possible, the burdens now borne by shippers of primary commodities. But we suggest to cooperative organizations that the development of orderly marketing by farmers themselves will perhaps be the most serviceable method of adjusting transportation tie-ups and embargoes which generally prevail during the usual dumping seasons.

3. We believe that the cooperative marketing and purchasing organizations which farmers have created and are rapidly multiplying need trained executives and employees. There is also need of a wider knowledge among the members of the principles of cooperation and marketing. We therefore express the earnest hope that all of our agricultural colleges, State universities, and the Federal and State departments of agriculture will create more adequate facilities for research work in and the teaching of cooperative marketing and farm management.

4. We called to the attention of all cooperative organizations the investigational work done and the reports issued by the Joint Congressional Commission of Agricultural Inquiry bearing upon the present disparity of prices as between the commodities that the farmer sells and those which he buys. We believe that a full understanding of the facts as set forth in these reports will be greatly serviceable in helping farmers to help themselves. We request the Congress to continue such investigations.

5. In recent years there has appeared on the market compounds made of skim milk and coconut oil, which look, taste, and smell like genuine evaporated whole milk and can not be readily detected from whole evaporated milk except by a chemical analysis. Some of the world's greatest authorities on nutrition have denounced those compounds as being harmful to children and generally injurious to the public health. We therefore urge the passage in this session of the Congress by the Senate of the House bill H. R. 8086, intended to prohibit the manufacture of such compounds within the possessions of the United States and their movements in interstate and foreign commerce.

6. We favor careful but progressive Federal legislation looking toward the establishment of uniform standards for containers of farm commodities used in interstate and foreign commerce.

7. We believe that this conference has been one of the most helpful meetings of farmers which have been held during our experience. We desire to commend the foresight of those agricultural leaders who so wisely suggested and initiated this meeting and to thank them most heartily for their service to the cause of cooperation and to the cause of civilization. We also desire to render acknowledgment and thanks to the daily press of the United States and the farm and trade papers who have assisted in promoting this conference and carrying the news of its deliberations back to the public on the farm.

Respectfully submitted.

MILO D. CAMPBELL,
CARL WILLIAMS.
J. N. BARBER.
M. O. WILSON.
J. N. KEHOE.
J. H. ROSS.
H. C. KAMINER.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE ON TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT ORGANIZATION.

The committee: John D. Miller (chairman), Herbert Foss, Bush Allen, W. D. Farris, W. L. Walker, Gen. A. H. Woods, E. M. de Foncier, Aaron Sapiro.

At the request of Mr. Sapiro, Mr. John D. Miller acted as chairman of the committee.

The committee unanimously recommended that this National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Associations be made a permanent organization; that the purpose and scope of the organization be to consider and handle the problems that are common to and directly affect cooperative marketing associations (which will not parallel or overlap the activities of any other farm organization), but will act as a mouthpiece for the cooperative marketing associations, and confine all publicity, announcements, and operations to their own particular members; and that will maintain contact with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce in behalf of such cooperative associations.

The committee further recommended that a committee of 15, the names to be here suggested, be approved and appointed by this convention with authority to prepare and submit a written plan for such a permanent organization of commodity marketing associations for the consideration of each of them, and to mail out such plan and request the said association to pass thereon at the earliest possible date; and to assume that any association which shall not have noted its written approval and adoption thereof by May 1, 1923, is not in accordance therewith, and that thereafter all membership in the National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives shall be by application to the executive committee thereof and approval by such committee; and, further, that this said committee of 15 shall sit until May 1 for this convention and for the purpose of carrying out the instructions thereof, and after May 1, 1923, shall act as the first regular executive committee of the said national council, and that each member of the said executive committee must be a person delegated or named by the member cooperative marketing association, and that any person whose association has not joined by May 1, 1923, shall be deemed to have resigned from the said executive committee.

And, further, that the said permanent organization shall meet the expenditures of the present convention and operations therefor and the expenses of the national council and its operations during the coming year out of a per capita membership fee to be charged against each member association on the basis of the number of persons included in the membership of each said association; and the committee here estimates that the national organization will include in its membership cooperative marketing associations with a minimum estimated membership of 300,000 persons, and therefore suggests and recommends that the per capita membership fee shall be 5 cents per member for each member of each such association, payable on May 1, 1923, or upon joining the organization thereafter, and that the minimum for any one organization shall be $10, and such fee shall be the fee for 1923 and thereafter annually, unless changed by the action of any future general meeting of the national council.

And, further, the committee recommends that the executive committee here named, in its discretion, select and engage a secretary to act as its representative at the headquarters at Washington on such terms as the executive committee may deem proper; and, further, the committee recommends that the executive committee be authorized to take such actions as it may deem advisable in the name of this national council to carry out any of the resolutions and to secure the enactment of any of the legislation here approved or adopted at this session of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Marketing Association.

The committee suggests and recommends to the national council as the said executive committee the following:

Robert W. Bingham, Louisville, Ky., chairman; Carl Williams, Oklahoma City, Okla., vice chairman; Milo D. Campbell, Coldwater, Mich., vice chairman; M. G. Coykendall, San Jose, Calif.; J. N. Barber, San Francisco, Calif.; John D. Miller, New York; E. N. de Poncier, Norfolk, Va.; Aaron Sapiro, New York, N. Y.; C. H. Foss, Maine; F. B. Chaney, Arkansas; Dr. B. W. Kilgore, Raleigh, N. C.; George C. Jewitt, Portland, Oreg.; Howard Leonard, Chicago, Ill.; G. A. Norwood, North Carolina; Dan G. Wallace, St. Paul, Minn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Wyoming state the program he has in mind for next week?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we might conclude the Interior Department appropriation bill and the Post Office appropriation bill by the last of next week. I am not certain that that can be accomplished. We do not have in mind any other legislation, and I have said to the gentleman from Tennessee that we would not take up anything that was in anywise controverted next week, unless there may be something in these two bills that is in controversy. I know of nothing in either bill on which there is any very serious difference of opinion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that it is the purpose of the gentleman next week when the House adjourns on Saturday to ask unanimous consent that it adjourn until Tuesday of the following week, January 2?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; to adjourn until Tuesday of the following week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the proceedings under the calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to dispense with the proceedings under calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I ask the gentleman from Wyoming a question before he takes his seat? I was not present at the colloquy between the gentleman and the gentleman from Tennessee. Suppose there should be some sharply controverted matter arising during the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. MONDELL. I trust that there will not be any such question. If there was anything that involved a question that was in anywise partisan I should ask to have the matter go over, or if there was anything in regard to which there was a very sharp difference of opinion.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I only asked the question because I understand there will be a matter that is in the field of contest, and perhaps the contest will be very sharp. I do not mean that it is in anywise partisan.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the matter that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. With reference to the Geological Survey.

Mr. MONDELL. As to the amount of the appropriation?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes; as to the amount of the appropriation to enable work to be done that is considered by some Members as very important.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not imagine that we will have such a difference of opinion on that item that it will necessitate putting it over. It is a question whether appropriations should be increased somewhat, and I think we can come to an understanding about that.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday there was an amendment pending, and without objection the Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 24, strike out the figures "$2,877,600," and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan increases the amount stated in line 24 on page 18 from $2,877,600 to $4,000,000. Immediately following that is the provision for the distribution of that fund, the statement of the bill being—

of which $850,000 shall be set aside for administration and operating expenses, and $2,027,600 for the payment of indemnities.

According to the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], it is not intended that the amount to be used for administrative purposes shall be increased. It will be necessary that this distribution, as at present stated in the bill, shall be changed in order that it may be thoroughly understood how the money is to be applied if the increase proposed carries.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It was my intention to include in my amendment an addition of $1,122,400, on line 1, page 19, and it seems to me that if the amendment that I did offer inadvertently leaving out the matter on line 1, page 19, should be agreed to, that as a matter of course the amount on page 19, line 1, would be increased.

Mr. TOWNER. That will be true, and that can be taken care of by a subsequent amendment. I was going to suggest that the gentleman should offer a subsequent amendment, if this were adopted, to change the amount.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified by adding an amendment, on page 19, line 1, to strike out "$2,027,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,150,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. That would make the total amount of the increase the gentleman proposes applicable to indemnities?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Michigan. To indemnities only.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 24, strike out "$2,877,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000," and in line 1, on page 19, strike out "$2,027,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,150,000."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, that makes the amendment complete, so that it can be thoroughly understood that this money, in addition to the amount contained in the bill, shall be purely for the purpose of indemnities, and that no additional cost will be incurred for administrative purposes.

I think we will all agree that we should hesitate before increasing these amounts that have been approved by the Budget Committee, and especially that have been subsequently approved by the subcommittee on agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. It is not for the purpose of making a demonstration or a show of loyalty or a bid for the farmers' support that this amendment is asked. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the increase suggested is a very moderate amount considering the tremendous interests involved and considering the consequences that will follow unless we fully appreciate the situation that confronts us. Tuberculosis is the most dreadful of all human diseases, dreadful not only to the animals which are affected by this provision in the bill but dreadful also to humankind. More human beings die every year from this awful disease than from any other known to the human family. That is not the only thing that makes it important that we should act now in this regard.

Disease is a thing which sometimes can be prevented, sometimes can be stamped out, and at other times can not be, but there is certain demonstration of the fact that tuberculosis can be stamped out. It is absolutely known that by the preventive measures that may be taken tuberculosis and its increase can be prevented as well in animals as in human beings, and when stamped out and prevented in its spread through animals that will be one measure which will lead to its eradication as a death-dealing disease to human beings.

There is only one method of prevention of tuberculosis among animals; one method that is practical, that is efficacious, one method that always under trial brings certain results; and that, of course, is a drastic measure. It is a measure that costs money. It is the destruction of the animals that are contaminated. That is the most efficacious; and is, in fact, a certain and is probably the only preventative of the spread of the disease. If we want to make it efficacious, it is not sufficient to stamp it out in one locality, in one county, in one section of the State, in one State; it must be stamped out generally. There must be a great increase of these efforts made by the persons who are interested in this work to stamp out the disease in the United States among the animals of the United States. This amount is inconsiderable, considering the tremendous character of the undertaking, but, of course, in and to the extent that it is applied it will have its effect. It would be a blessing, it would be an act of economy, if we should amend this bill and make it $10,000,000 instead of $4,000,000. It would be something that would benefit not only the human family, because of the prevention of the spread of disease through animals and mankind, but because economically it would immensely increase the production of foodstuffs in the United States. From every possible standpoint of health, of human life, of economy, we should remember the tremendous nature of this undertaking and the absolute certainty of the benefit and the efficacy of the proposal just made for its eradication when we come to consider the question of the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Is there any evidence that the department has been handicapped during the last year in its work along this line? I understand the amount which the bill carries is the same given last year.

Mr. TOWNER. This method, of course, depends upon the application, either by the authorities in a locality or the State, or by individuals, and there are thousands more applications now than there were before. This is beneficial because it enables the remedy to be applied and made efficient.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Is it not true that this appropriation has to be met by an appropriation from the various States?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. And is it not also true that in the State of Illinois the State had funds but the Federal Government did not have funds with which to meet them?

Mr. TOWNER. I understand that is true. I understand the State of New York has appropriated $1,500,000 for this purpose.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. And I think the State of Iowa this year will appropriate a million dollars. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Has anybody ever complained about the Government of the United States not supplying enough funds when they were wanted?

Mr. TOWNER. I think——

Mr. CLARKE of New York. If the gentleman will permit I will answer that.

Mr. TOWNER. It is absolutely certain that this appropriation, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, can not supply the demands that will be made next year.

Mr. MADDEN. This is all the Government is asking for in the administration of this work.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. I will answer the gentleman if he wishes an answer.

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield the floor.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. As far as the State of New York is concerned, it waited not alone one year but in some particular instances, in several of the different counties in our State, waited two years for the Government to meet the appropriations of the State of New York for carrying on the eradication of tuberculosis in our dairy herds. What we want at this time is an appropriation large enough to meet the essential needs and assure continuity in this work and not do it by spasmodic piecemeal.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement in regard to time on this item?

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to have a few minutes. I am perfectly willing the opposition have all the time it desires.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes, one-half the debate to be in favor of the amendment and one-half in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close at the end of 20 minutes, the time to be controlled one-half by those in favor and one-half by those opposed to the amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to the fact that this amendment seeks to increase the appropriation from $2,877,600 to $4,000,000, which is an increase of $1,122,400, which amendment was argued extensively yesterday evening, without any argument against it, and all that has been said about it this morning was in favor of it, and if the gentleman in charge of the bill expects to keep out any part of this extra appropriation he is placing himself at a disadvantage by this request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, if he cares to be recognized in favor of the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, it would seem now that a well-defined policy has been determined by Congress in investigating the eradication of this dread disease of tuberculosis in animals, Congress should not hesitate to make appropriations adequate to meet the demand and bring about the results desired. I believe its importance commercially is recognized by all; besides it affects the public in general. Now, the situation is this: Unless additional appropriations are made the work can not be continued as it should be continued. If we are to eradicate tuberculosis in animals, let us go at it in a systematic and businesslike way.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understood that the department was not asking for more money.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will read the testimony of those in charge of the work, he will find that the work will most likely have to stop before the 1st of May if further sums are not appropriated. As pointed out by Doctor Mohler, there are 40 State legislatures soon to convene in session, and additional appropriations will be provided for by the States. The State of New York, as has been said, made an appropriation of a million and a half; and, as Doctor Mohler states, we are trying to match these State appropriations that are going to be made with our $2,000,000. The appropriations of the States will probably amount to six or eight million dollars. I take it my State will appropriate at least a million dollars this coming session of the legislature, and that six or eight million dollars will be appropriated by the States. It goes without saying that you can not match $8,000,000 with $2,000,000. Evidently the amount suggested will not be adequate to meet the State appropriations, but it will at least give assurance and evidence that Congress desires to carry out the policy it has adopted.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HAUGEN. In one moment. The policy of the department, first, was to ask small appropriations of $50,000 or $100,000. Some of us of the Committee on Agriculture did not approve of the piecemeal way of handling it and suggested the policy of paying indemnities. The department has adopted this policy, which is definite and undoubtedly effective if adequate funds are provided. Congress, having approved the policy, should now act in good faith by providing adequate appropriations to carry it into effect and thus assure the country that that policy will be carried out. The $4,000,000 undoubtedly will not be adequate, but it will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think the gentleman's explanation is entirely satisfactory and upon his reply I shall support his amendment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I shall vote for the gentleman's amendment, but can the gentleman state what the deficiency has been in the past in this appropriation? I know in my State there is a deficiency where certain animals were destroyed.

Mr. HAUGEN. We appropriated for a deficiency last year—my recollection is that it was $300,000. We now propose to show the sincerity of Congress by increasing the proposed appropriation to carry out the policy approved by Congress. I feel certain that more will be required, but we will at least make a showing with this increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed four minutes. The Chair will recognize the opposition if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] desires to be heard now.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] for three minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, of course, we are all interested in the prevention of disease. Everybody is interested in that. But this bill carries every dollar requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Now, who knows more than he does about what we ought to do in connection with this matter? He is presumed, more nearly than any other one man in the Government, to speak for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask him one question?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not time to answer questions in three minutes.

Now, if the Secretary of Agriculture does not speak for the farmers, who does? And if the Committee on Appropriations complies with his request on this matter and other important agricultural problems, why should that request be changed without any consideration whatever? That seems to be fair. No study has been given to the problem except by the Secretary of Agriculture and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], who has had charge of this appropriation. We have never yet refused to grant an appropriation for this class of work. Every time they have run out of funds they have been given a deficiency appropriation. There has been no denial of assistance where that assistance meant dollars recommended to be granted by this committee.

Now, I plead with you gentlemen here not to overload the appropriation bills. You are not accomplishing any good purpose by adding without limit to the appropriation bill, no matter how meritorious the purpose may be. I do not deny the merits of the purpose for which the money is to be expended, and I am in hearty accord with every movement that will aid in the eradication of this disease among the cattle of the country. We want to cooperate along intelligent lines with the Secretary of Agriculture. He, through his scientific men, knows more about this question than all of us put together. If we denied the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, there might be good grounds for the amendment which has been proposed, but we have not done that. We not only have not done it but we have given him every assistance we can, not only in this bill but in other bills. Whenever he has come for a deficiency appropriation for this work we have been enthusiastic in our support of his request. Now, do not embarrass the Department of Agriculture by imposing on the department

funds which it does not need. When I say it does not need them I assume that if it did need the funds it would ask for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] for six minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much the Secretary of Agriculture asked, hence am not able to say whether or not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is right. But I do know that Doctor Mohler, the chief of the bureau, says—as appears in the hearings—there is a probability of having to close the work by the 1st of next May unless more money is provided. He says he will try to spread it over the entire year, but it is evident that he has no hope of being able to do that.

Now, whether the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for more money or not, the country is asking for it. Almost every State in the Union is complaining that the Government of the United States is not appropriating money enough to enable either the Government or the States to carry on the work or comply with the law in the matter of paying indemnities. The States are anxious to do their part and are urging appropriation enough to enable the Government to do its part, as by the law it has promised. So others have spoken and are entitled to be heard, besides the Secretary of Agriculture. I doubt very much if the Secretary has requested simply the small amount carried by this bill.

There was not money enough last year. As the chairman of the committee says, there was a deficiency of $600,000 asked for and allowed. My understanding is the amount of the deficiency was only $300,000. But the amount, whatever it was, was not enough. There is evidence that the cases are rapidly and steadily increasing in number, practically doubling each year, and it appears also that there were and still are unpaid claims against the Government for indemnity running into the thousands, where inspections had been made and private property destroyed. The Government of the United States had obligated itself to pay these indemnities, but sufficient appropriations were not made to meet them. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CLARKE] says—I can not find it in the RECORD, but I am sure his statement is reliable—there are thousands of cases, many of them in the State of New York, where the owners of the property destroyed had to wait not one year, but two years, to have their claims paid, or the portion that the Government of the United States ought to pay on them. They had to wait until the Government was ready and able to pay.

It is urged, Mr. Chairman, that if the amount available for indemnity is increased, the amount available for administration should also be increased. My answer to that is that with the amount of money the bill provides for inspection the agents of the Federal Government are doing, and will be able to do, fully as much as they ought to do, and that the remainder of the work ought fairly to be done, and will be done, by the States. It never was urged to the Committee on Agriculture when this work was first provided for, and I have not heard it reasonably urged since, that agents of the Government should themselves do all the actual physical work of making the inspection and themselves lay the foundation for the issuing of certificates, the destruction of the animals, and payment of indemnities.

There never was an idea in the mind of anyone who took part in the starting of this work but that the Federal Government would make tests and inspections only as far as they could reasonably be expected to do this kind of work; would give instructions, make demonstrations, and advise and assist to the proper extent, but in a limited way, after all, because the entire country can not be covered by Federal agents going out and doing all the actual physical work.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is it a fact—I think it is an important fact, bearing on this question, if it be a fact—that tuberculosis is on the increase among the dairy herds?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I may not quite understand the evidence that has been offered and the data and statistics that I have seen, but my impression is that tuberculosis in dairy cattle is decreasing, but it is increasing in swine and in poultry.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The evidence before the committee was that tuberculosis is increasing in dairy herds. My colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] asked in regard to that, and the statement was that nearly every dairy herd in Texas was reported with tuberculosis.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Just a word more on the line of the States doing a reasonable amount of this work in cooperation by and with the assistance and advice of the Federal agents. There was a time when the inspection and testing for tuberculosis was neither skillfully nor honestly done by the States. Therefore, it was necessary for the Federal Government to send its agents out in order that proper and honest work might be done. If we had continued on the old line—that is, providing money enough to enable Federal inspectors to go out and do or take part in all the inspecting—the States would have continued in their careless method of doing business, to use no harsher term; but now the States realize that they must come to the front and do this work and do it right, and evidence of their desire to do that is seen in the immense appropriations the States are now making. The States should properly do their part of this work, and the money here provided for administration is enough to enable Federal agents to do all they ought to be asked to do. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] for two minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are all in sympathy with this class of work, but we must all realize that the appropriations for this or any other useful and helpful work must be kept within some reasonable bounds. The Federal appropriations should not be increased tremendously at any given time because in some States there may have been an awakening of interest in the matter. I am wondering what has become of all the resolutions from the farmers' organizations protesting against the matching of the Federal dollar as applied to a thing of this kind. Does that class of resolution, of late so general, apply to this sort of expenditure?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I have only two minutes. Does that kind of resolution apply only to classes of appropriations that those resolving do not approve of and not apply to appropriations that the resolutor does approve of? Let us be consistent about the matter. Let me suggest to the gentlemen most interested that we make the best progress in the long run in matters of this kind if we proceed along lines of reasonable and logical expenditure, and that the most certain way to bring a reaction against just such appropriations as this is to expand them beyond reason and beyond the recommendations of those who have studied the matter and who are in a position to know how much is needed and how much may be reasonably expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] for five minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt whatever that this motion has been offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], and that it has been supported by the gentlemen who have spoken in favor of it in good faith. They have no greater interest in this work than I have. I have supported it from its inception, and I am anxious that it should go forward as rapidly as the condition of the Treasury will permit. After all, the question for us to decide is not how much we ought to appropriate in order to bring this appropriation into some relation with what the States are supposedly going to appropriate, but how much ought we to appropriate for this activity in its relation to what we are appropriating for other activities of the Government and in its relation to the requirements of the Treasury for all purposes. I do not think the gentlemen who are supporting this amendment quite understand the situation. As this appropriation now stands, it is the largest single item in this bill. I think the Federal Government has done pretty well on this item. It started with an appropriation of $500,000 in 1919. It was increased to $1,500,000 in 1920, annd now it stands at $2,877,000. In four years it has increased by about 400 per cent. It seems to me we have done pretty well.

Now, what is the actual condition, so far as this appropriation for the current year is concerned? There has been some discussion here of a deficit in the appropriation which would result in the inability of the department to take care of the demands under this work. Now, the demands of the States are not merely for indemnities. They want the Federal Government to put up its proportion for inspectors to do this work, and on the basis of expenditures so far this year there is a possibility that there will be a small deficiency in the fund for administration; but do these gentlemen propose to supplement that fund? Not at all. Now, on the indemnity side we

have spent this year, up to December 1, $851,000 for indemnities. That is at the rate of approximately $170,000 a month, and if the expenditures for the rest of the year are approximately on the same basis as for the first five months of the year the appropriations for indemnities in this bill will just about cover indemnity expenditures incurred at the present rate of administration.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. In just a moment. I want to finish this statement first. The bill for the current year is $150,000 less than it will be for next year, because the item for this year made $300,000 immediately available, and $150,000 of that was spent last year instead of in the current year. So that as it now stands this appropriation is $150,000 more than it was last year. There has been no word said by anybody who has spoken upon this increase which has shown one single reason for increasing the indemnity fund. There has not been any testimony here that there is a deficiency in the fund for indemnities now. No gentleman here has suggested any reason for increasing the indemnity fund. I could see some reason for it if it were proposed at the same time to increase the fund for administration, but no such suggestion has been made.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. It is true, however, that this money is allotted by the Secretary and that the amount not used by any one State still remains unused, and some other State that is in need of the money will not be able to get the amount that it requires. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman is mistaken there. Of course, there is an attempt at the beginning of the year to allot the money to the different States on a definite basis of expenditures.

Mr. DOWELL. Does it not go further than an attempt? Has it not been already done?

Mr. ANDERSON. But it does not follow, because one State does not use its proportion of the fund, that the money is not available for expenditure in other States, as is the case with the fund for road construction.

Mr. DOWELL. I think the gentleman knows that there is more than an attempt to allot, and that the actual allotment is made, and that no money can be used by a State except its allotted amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, they attempt to allot at the beginning of the year, but the States get no vested right under that allotment. It is to be used wherever it is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were 32 ayes and 47 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representative was requested:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept said devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all necessary expenses for the eradication of southern cattle ticks, $660,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of animals or in the purchase of materials for or in the construction of dipping vats upon land not owned solely by the United States, except at fairs or expositions where the Department of Agriculture makes exhibits or demonstrations; nor shall any part of this appropriation be used in the purchase of materials or mixtures for use in dipping vats except in experimental or demonstration work carried on by the officials or agents of the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When we reach page 54, line 20, I shall offer the following amendment:

Page 54, line 20, strike out the sum of $502,240 in line 20, on page 54, and insert "$652,240: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated $150,000 may be used in California."

Mr. Chairman, so that there will be no delay, I ask that I may insert in the RECORD a letter received from W. P. King, secretary of the California Wool Growers' Association, together with a copy of the resolution passed by the California Wool Growers' Association November 17, 1922, relating to predatory animals. I would like to have them in the RECORD when the matter comes up to-morrow for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to include certain documents he has mentioned in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter and resolutions follow:

CALIFORNIA WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
San Francisco, Calif., December 11, 1922.

Congressman JOHN E. RAKER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAKER: We have recently sent you copies of resolutions concerning the depredations of predatory animals which were adopted by the California Wool Growers' Association in convention assembled at Stockton, Calif., November 17, 1922. This convention was truly representative of the sheep industry of California. We are again sending you copies of these resolutions and would appreciate it if you can give the matter your earnest consideration.

Predatory animals have cost the live-stock interests of California the loss of millions of dollars annually. Predatory animals, and particularly the coyote, have put many sheepmen out of business on account of the great losses due to these animals. Cattle, hog, chicken, and turkey raisers have also suffered losses year after year due to the constant depredations of the coyote.

During the past few years the Biological Survey Division of the United States Department of Agriculture has been able to effectively control the depredations of the coyote in sections where their men have been working. In some Western States the United States Biological Survey has secured appropriations for those districts from the Federal Government so that they can actively go on with their campaign, and, as a result, they have materially decreased and in some sections exterminated the coyote. California has not secured sufficient appropriations from either the Federal or State Governments, up to the present time, to actively go on with this work. The old bounty law, which has been in operation for 50 years, is still used. As one woolgrower said at a meeting held to discuss this situation at Corning, December 9: "Forty years ago I could run my sheep in the mountains, and the herder could go fishing or spend a night or two away from the sheep, and when he came back they would be all right. We had the bounty law then. It has been in operation for 50 years. We have it now. To-day if I leave my sheep for half an hour without a herder I would suffer losses due to the coyote. I have never seen the situation so bad as it has been this last year, and we have had the old bounty system for 50 years."

In another section of the State, and this is a section where sheep are practically the only live stock that can be raised economically, the number of sheep have dwindled in 20 years over 75 per cent.

One grower in Mendocino County stated that 20 years ago there were over 400,000 sheep in the county. To-day there are only 66,000. Coyotes are responsible for the decrease. Well-informed men from Mendocino and Humboldt Counties say that the county is only adapted for sheep, but that they can not raise sheep as long as the coyote is king and are, as a result, in the cattle business to a limited extent, and are losing money every year.

It may interest you to know that in this coast section from Sonoma to Humboldt County the best wool of California is produced. It always commands the highest price. It would be a shame and a disgrace to California if this section had to go out of the sheep business, which it will do unless the coyote is controlled and exterminated within the next few years.

The same situation exists in many other sections of California. In Tehama County the growers have had four meetings within the last two months to discuss this situation.

Our resolutions ask that the Federal Government appropriate $150,000 for this predatory animal control work in California. It is only by systematic control that we can eventually exterminate the predatory animals. The Government system has proved effective and the growers are anxious that this system shall be adopted.

Besides asking the cooperation of the Federal Government, the association has secured the cooperation of the State of California and also of the counties where coyotes are causing damage.

We are only asking the Federal Government to do its share. The county will do its share and the State will do its share.

California, at the present time, has more sheep than any other State in the United States with the exception of Texas. There is no reason why California could not produce a million more sheep if predatory animals were controlled.

If we can count on you to back us up in this matter and to help us secure this appropriation, it will certainly be appreciated and you will be doing a real service for the live-stock interests of California.

It may interest you to know that the live-stock industry in California represents an investment of over $400,000,000.

May we have the benefit of your suggestions in regard to the matter?

Very sincerely,

W. P. WING, *Secretary.*

Whereas the depredations by coyotes and other predatory animals upon sheep in California cause losses to the woolgrowers of this State amounting to millions of dollars annually; and

Whereas the steps toward the systematic control and suppression of these predatory animals by the State Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the United States Bureau of Biological Survey have been extremely valuable and effective, in so far as available funds would permit; and

Whereas it is recognized that the systematic and concerted measures employed are superior to a system of bounty payment to accomplish the necessary protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the California Woolgrowers' Association in convention assembled at Stockton this 17th day of November, 1922, That the State department of agriculture be requested to continue this work undiminished, and if possible greatly augmented, in order to safeguard the sheep industry of the State of California.

Submitted for approval to the resolutions committee for final transmission to the convention.

COMMITTEE ON COYOTE CONTROL.

Unanimously passed by convention, Stockton, Calif., November 17, 1922.

W. P. WING,
Secretary California Woolgrowers' Association.

Whereas the menace to the sheep industry of the State of California by the depredations of predatory animals, particularly coyotes, is of serious consequence and has amounted to losses approaching millions of dollars; and

Whereas the United States Government through its Bureau of Biological Survey, in cooperation with the State of California, has been doing effective work, as is being done in other States, but wholly inadequate to meet even the partial needs to protect this sheep industry; and

Whereas every possible agency, including local associations, county and State governments, are exerting every effort to cope with this serious menace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the woolgrowers of the State of California in convention assembled, To ask assistance from the Federal Government through Congress for an appropriation, not less than $150,000 in amount, for the work in California, thus to make available for predatory-animal control a sum necessary for a much-needed protection.

Submitted for approval to the resolutions committee for final transmittal to the convention.

COMMITTEE ON COYOTE CONTROL.

Passed unanimously by convention assembled November 17, 1922, Stockton, Calif.

W. P. WING,
Secretary California Woolgrowers' Association.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has withdrawn his point of order and the pro forma amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the disease of hog cholera, and for its control or eradication by such means as may be necessary, including demonstrations, the formation of organizations, and other methods, either independently or in cooperation with farmers' associations, State or county authorities, $406,020: *Provided*, That of said sum $195,000 shall be available for expenditure in carrying out the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913, regulating the preparation, sale, barter, exchange, or shipment of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product manufactured in the United States and the importation of such products intended for use in the treatment of domestic animals: *Provided further*, That of said sum $29,520 shall be available for researches concerning the cause, modes of spread, and methods of treatment and prevention of this disease.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to line 13, page 22, to strike out the figures "$406,020" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KETCHAM: Page 22, line 13, strike out the sum of $406,020 and insert in lieu thereof $500,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this would increase the appropriation carried for this important work by the sum of $103,980, and would make the appropriation exactly as it was carried in the bill of last year. I have gone carefully over the hearings before the committee, and I find that those in charge of this very important work are reluctant to have a reduction made. I believe the seriousness of this disease and the peculiar conditions that surround its control and eradication will certainly warrant this very moderate increase. I have taken the pains to find out what the situation is in my own State, and present for the consideration of the committee the following facts: That for the year ending July 1, 1921, there were reported to the United States Department of Agriculture 116 outbreaks of hog cholera.

That does not mean that this represents anywhere near the total number, but it represents the number reported. The following year, ending July 1 last, the total number of outbreaks reported was 326, and for the first five months of the present fiscal year—and all of these years are fiscal years—the number of outbreaks reported was 221, which would indicate that so far as the reports are concerned—and I believe they fairly represent the real condition, so far as the disease is concerned—it is on the increase. I note also, and that is what brings me to offer this amendment, that the men in charge of this work here in the Department of Agriculture propose to limit the expenditure that shall be made in my own State. They refer to it as one of the "outlying" States. Naturally, I am a bit resentful that a State which is so varied and wonderful in its agricultural products should be so designated. When I learn that, notwithstanding the fact that they have had but three men in this work, the proposition is to reduce that number so that we will have still less, I believe the matter is worthy of a word of protest, and I do protest against this reduction and ask that the amount carried in the bill of the previous year be restored. I do not need to enlarge upon the ravages of this disease, what it does, and how necessary it is that the very best efforts shall be used to control it and eradicate it. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think probably no appropriation in the Agricultural appropriation bill has had more ups and downs than the appropriation for hog cholera. Some years ago we entered upon a program of attempting a complete local eradication of the disease. That program went on for two or three years and was finally abandoned. Then the proposition was reduced to an attempt to take care of local outbreaks as they occurred, and that is the basis upon which the work has been going forward up to this time. This is a job in which the methods are thoroughly known. There has been developed, as I suppose every Member of this House knows, a method of absolute prevention of the disease. The methods of sanitation are thoroughly understood. A Federal man can not do the work of immunizing hogs or the work of sanitation any better than a State man can do it, and the whole question is how much of the burden of doing this work of suppressing local outbreaks of hog cholera shall be done by the Federal Government. We feel, and I think the Bureau of the Budget felt, that this is a job in which a larger proportion of the work of controlling the local outbreaks of hog cholera could be put upon the States. The matter is far beyond the investigational stage. The methods are known. A State man can do it just as well as a Federal man. In many instances the farmer himself is capable of applying the serum and immunizing the hog, and in view of that fact we felt it was perfectly justifiable to reduce the appropriation by the amount we propose to reduce it in the present bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word to add to what my colleague on the committee has said. Hog cholera has been investigated by the Federal Government for a long time. The Government has finally developed an absolute cure for hog cholera, which cure is well known throughout the Union and is easily obtained and can be applied by a State man just as well as by a Federal man; can be applied by amateurs, with a little instruction or a little reading. The time has come for the Federal Congress to reduce this appropriation, not only to the amount that it is reduced here, but to cut it in half, and then to cut it in half again and finally to turn the administration of the method of injecting this serum into hogs over to State authorities and the owners of the hogs. We have accomplished our purpose, and I not only indorse this reduction, but would vote for a much greater reduction, notwithstanding the fact that we have a good many hogs in Texas and that there are a good many in my own district.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation of diseases of orchard and other fruits, including the diseases of the pecan, $113,935.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The State of Texas produces now about 90 per cent of all of the commercial pecans raised in the United States. The department, out of an appropriation similar to the one just read, established, about four years ago, what is known as a pecan laboratory in the State of Texas. Just a few months ago, notwithstanding the fact, as I say, that about 90 per cent of the commercial pecans are raised in that State, some one connected with this bureau ordered that laboratory boxed and shipped to some other State. It was boxed up and ready for shipment before anyone knew anything about the proposed change. The pecan growers all over the State of Texas met and had a hearing and showed that in pursuance of the work of this laboratory many farmers and stockmen had planted pecan orchards. They had paid as high as $2 a plant in setting them out, and many of them a dollar and a dollar and a half a plant. In addition to that they have gone to quite a little bit of expense in grafting and budding native trees along the various streams where pecan timber is found in Texas. To ruthlessly take that laboratory away without any reason for it shows to me that poor judgment is not infrequently used in these various bureaus even in the Agricultural Department, and that something else sometimes enters into decisions rendered besides the welfare of the particular product for which we appropriate money.

I call attention to this because it may happen in respect to other items for which we appropriate money, for the benefit of different crops. May I ask the chairman of the committee

whether the Bureau of Agriculture has asked for any additional money to establish additional pecan laboratories anywhere else?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that they have asked for any money to establish an additional pecan laboratory, but there are increases in all three of the items relating to the pecan industry. There are three items, one of them relating to insects, one to the diseases of the pecan, and one to cultural methods. My recollection is that in all three of them we have carried a small increase.

Mr. BLANTON. I am very glad to hear that, because this is one of the most popular nuts raised in the United States. It is one of the most delicious nuts, and it is growing in popularity all of the time. It would be ruinous to the enterprise to have that pecan laboratory moved, and under no circumstances ought it to be moved. If it is needed somewhere in another State, we ought to grant an additional laboratory for the other State. I hope the department will cease to agitate the question of moving that laboratory.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation, improvement, encouragement, and determination of the adaptability to different soils and climatic conditions of pecans, almonds, Persian walnuts, black walnuts, hickory nuts, butternuts, chestnuts, filberts, and other nuts, and for methods of growing, harvesting, packing, shipping, storing, and utilizing the same, $28,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some time ago an appropriation was made for studying and combating the diseases of pecans and other nuts. When was this appropriation started for investigation of the adaptability of soil, and so forth, as carried in this item on page 30, beginning with line 15?

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the item to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Page 30, beginning line 15.

Mr. ANDERSON. That has been in the bill for some time, I think.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How long? I do not remember it. It may be my fault.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will answer the gentleman's question in just a minute. It has been in since 1920, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It strikes me that diseases of some of these nuts have been so prevalent the growers and the bureau, too, found it very hard to combat them. The department had difficulty in getting money enough for that particular work. I should think it would hardly be advisable to go on and make an extensive search for soils and localities for the growth of these products when those that are already grown can not properly be taken care of.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman is making some assumptions which are not entirely justified. There are some diseases and some insect pests which are increasing the difficulties of the pecan grower, but there are also questions of soil adaptability and cultural methods.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is the gentleman entirely right about that? Has it not been found that these diseases affect all or most of these nuts wherever they are grown?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not altogether true; no.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is my understanding.

Mr. ANDERSON. They are far more difficult to control in newly planted orchards carried on on a commercial scale than they are, for example, in the native——

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Was that due to soil conditions or to localities?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would not say it was due to soil conditions.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Done on a larger scale than before?

Mr. ANDERSON. There are problems relating to the adaptation of varieties of pecans to different soils, the question of breeding, grafting, and all sorts of questions with reference to carrying on the industry on a commercial basis.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am inclined to think that we ought to adopt this proviso, particularly because of the importance of the nut industry in Texas.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. What proviso?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am talking about the same one the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I was not talking about any proviso.

Mr. LANGLEY. I mean paragraph. I happen to know personally, as the gentleman from Texas has said, that the nut industry of Texas is of very vital importance and value, and if there is any trouble down there we ought to help the gentleman from Texas out.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman recognizes there is enough trouble with well-known diseases without going out to look for trouble, as this item provides. The bureau has been unable to find cures and preventives of diseases of nuts where they are grown and grown successfully and always have been grown.

Mr. LANGLEY. If a disease is not a trouble, the gentleman from Kentucky has been misinformed as to the meaning of the word.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not mean that, but this does not treat diseases or trouble. This is looking for trouble, and this is going to find it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROACH. I do not believe this paragraph deals with the treatment of diseases at all?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; it does not. There was trouble in getting an appropriation to deal with diseases. Since the appropriation was granted the department found difficulty in combating the diseases and overcoming them. Now they are going to find areas where they can grow more and more and more and increase and multiply their trouble, a trouble that they have made no progress in correcting.

Mr. ROACH. May I ask the gentleman if the item was first carried for the sole purpose of treating diseases, or for the purpose for which it is now carried?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. For the purpose of treating diseases, quite an old item; this is a new one.

Mr. ROACH. The purposes have been entirely changed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No; there is another item for the diseases of nuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROACH. This is a new item.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A new item.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike out the last word. It is quite true that the most pressing problems of the pecan grower are problems of controlling insect pests and diseases. Recognizing that fact, the committee took $2,000 of the estimated amount of this appropriation and put it over into the disease item so as to provide some additional funds for taking care of disease work. However, the pecan industry, commercially exploited in commercial orchards, is a very new industry, and, as in any new industry, cultural problems arise. The question arises, What varieties of nuts are the best adapted to certain soil? There are questions involved in the best methods of grafting trees. There are questions arising in reference to adaptability of soils to one variety or another. The appropriation that is carried in this item is intended to cover the cultural problems arising in connection with nut production. There are two other items, one of which covers the diseases of the orchard nut plants and trees, and the other covers the insects affecting them. This covers only the cultural studies.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. On that point one of the most desirable things that has been sought to be ascertained by the pecan growers is why it is that they have lost from one to three crops by permitting their trees to be threshed. The pecan growers have learned that when they permit their trees to be threshed they will not grow pecans from one to three years thereafter in many instances. That is a very valuable thing they have learned.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is quite right. Another problem is this: These trees will produce a good crop one year, and may not produce a crop in the next year. Nobody knows just why that is so. That question is being studied in order to get a normal crop year by year, or at least to get a less fluctuation or a much more normal fluctuation in the crop from year to year.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the necessary improvements to establish and maintain a general experiment farm and agricultural station on the Arlington estate, in the State of Virginia, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved April 18, 1900, $20,500: *Provided*, That the limitations in this act to the cost of farm buildings shall not apply to this paragraph.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg to say to the Chair that while he, kindly and as a friend, makes a facetious inquiry of me, I rise for a rather serious and important purpose, and that purpose is to offer an amendment to this bill which is very important to the people of this country. I desire to offer it as a new paragraph at the place indicated in the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk..

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. LANGLEY. I propose to insert it as a new paragraph, as indicated at the top of the proposed amendment, which I now send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman proposes to insert it after line 16. We have not reached that part of the bill yet.

Mr. LANGLEY. I ask the Chair's pardon. I thought we had reached line 16.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations in foreign seed and plant introduction, including the study, collection, purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries and from our possessions, and for experiments with reference to their introduction and cultivation in this country, $125,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make a point of order. The Chair announced a moment ago that we had not reached the stage where a point of order was in order. I was going to try to ascertain whether a quorum of the committee is present.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that point of order?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present—a quorum.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I was going to ask if the Chair could count people standing in the doorways. But I see there are enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of new and rare seeds; for the investigation and improvement of grasses, alfalfa, clover, and other forage crops, including the investigation of the utilization of cacti and other dry-land plants, $115,000: *Provided*, That of this amount not to exceed $36,600 may be used for the purchase and distribution of such new and rare seeds.

Mr. LANGLEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to apologize to the Chair and to the committee for mistaking the line, because some one called out to me at that time that it was line 16 that we had then reached. I desire now to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

The Clerk read as follows:

The amendment offered by Mr. LANGLEY: Page 2, after line 16, insert the following as a new paragraph:

"Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For purchase, propagation, testing, and congressional distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, electric current, rent outside of the District of Columbia, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $360,000. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated; and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States; *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, after due advertisement and on competitive bids, is authorized to award the contract for the supplying of printed packets and envelopes and the packeting, assembling, and mailing of the seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, or any part thereof, for a period of not more than five years nor less than one year, if by such action he can best protect the interests of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quality and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants."

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill unauthorized by law, that it changes existing law. And I call the Chair's attention especially to one paragraph which is clearly unauthorized, and that is the paragraph which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a contract for five years' time, which would go beyond the life of at least two Congresses. There is no provision of law that has ever been held to be in order that would authorize a five-year contract in that respect.

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the point of order for a moment, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LANGLEY. I request the gentleman from Connecticut to reserve it for a moment in order that I may make a statement.

Mr. TILSON. I will make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] makes a point of order on this amendment on the ground that it is legislation unauthorized by law, and also that it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a contract for five years.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LANGLEY. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, word for word, figure for figure, without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i," what has been in previous Agricultural appropriation bills. The first time the point of order was raised against this the present occupant of the chair ruled that it was in order. The second time he decided that, in view of a difference of opinion existing, he preferred to leave it to the committee. That was last year. The committee by a decisive majority held that it was in order, and therefore that the point of order was not well taken. [Applause.] It is in the exact language of the other bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I should like to be heard, if the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. LANGLEY. I could not convince the gentleman from Texas if I talked 30 minutes, so that I am willing to quit.

Mr. BLANTON. I know, but it is the Chair we have to convince.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] has the floor.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am trying to talk to the Chair. I am sure, absolutely sure, that the Chair knows the amendment is in order. There is no question about it. He has already ruled on it himself; and, so far as I am concerned, I am entirely willing to leave it to the ruling of the Chair now and stop this debate. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get the committee out of a tangle and at the same time perform a good service, not in arguing the point of order, because I believe that the Chair recognizes that this is clearly subject to a point of order. I think the present occupant of the chair ruled that way on one occasion, but at the same time that decision has been overruled by a higher power, the power of this House, and probably would be again immediately. So, taking the precedent of the House as being superior to that established by an ordinary occupant of the chair [laughter]——

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This is not an ordinary occupant of the chair. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Without any reflection whatever on the present occupant of the chair, it is evident that this paragraph creates a great deal of interest among the membership of the House. The attendance on the floor at this time proves that. Now, I am going to ask unanimous consent that this para-

graph, with the amendment and point of order pending, be passed over——

Mr. LANGLEY. I object.

Mr. TILSON. To be called up at any time at the option of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANGLEY. I object.

Mr. TILSON. I should like to finish my request. The proposition I am offering in the form of a request for unanimous consent will insure a quorum of the committee, and perhaps of the House, in attendance during the remainder of the consideration of this agricultural bill and will be performing a very beneficial and effective service to the House. So I ask unanimous consent that this be passed over without prejudice, to be called up at any time not later than the completion of the bill by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] in charge of the bill.

Mr. QUIN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. QUIN objected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. There is just one point in this amendment which has not been passed upon by the committee in overruling the former decisions of the Chair. That is the provision for a five-year contract. Never has either the Chairman or the committee overruling the Chairman held that the Secretary of Agriculture could make a contract extending over the life of at least two Congresses.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not true that this exact proviso was before the House two years ago and again last year? And the House—another Chairman—presumably knowing every word in the amendment, decided that it was in order. The first year the Chair decided that it was in order, and the next year the same Chairman left it to the decision of the committee, and when upon the Chairman's request it was left to the decision of the committee the committee decided that it was in order. So what is the use of talking about it any further. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. I want to leave it to the Chairman to decide whether or not a provision is in order which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make a contract for five years' time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chairman realizes that he is confronted by a rather complicated situation, especially in view of his personal opinion. If this matter were presented to the Chairman for the first time today, he would have no hesitation whatsoever in upholding the point of order, because in the opinion of the Chair the amendment is clearly subject to such an objection. Last year when the present occupant of the chair was presiding and when a similar amendment was offered he rehearsed this case rather thoroughly, giving the precedents and asserting his dissent to the propriety of the amendment. He will not do so to-day. In view of the conflict of rulings, and while the Chair felt the point of order should be sustained, he realized that the opinion of one chairman was not equal to the opinion of the committee itself. The Chair at that time felt that in all fairness to the committee and in order to establish a precedent for the future it was but proper to refer the matter to the committee itself, and the Chair did refer the matter to the committee and asked for its opinion as to whether or not the amendment was in order. When that question was submitted to the committee on March 9, 1922, the committee by a vote of 113 yeas to 40 nays voted that the amendment was in order. Therefore the Chair, basing his decision upon the verdict of the committee, even though it is contrary to his own views, holds this amendment in order and overrules the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the Chair permit a parliamentary suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course, I do not propose to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but the Chair is backing himself up by the opinion of a court that is not now in existence. It was a last year's court that ruled that way.

Mr. LANGLEY. No; it was a decision of this House during the present year, on March 9, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Vermont appeal from the decision of the Chair?

Mr. LANGLEY. No, Mr. Chairman; he does not appeal. My fellow Members will realize that I am speaking under difficulties, because I am suffering from severe laryngitis, but I will endeavor to make you hear me, if I can.

I want to call the attention of the committee to an article discussing this entire question which was recently printed in the Scientific American. I want to insert that article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. That article shows not only that the Government is better equipped for testing the productivity of these vegetable seeds but that out of the number distributed there were planted 240,000 acres of garden lands, and that the approximate production from that planting was $192,000,000 worth of farm products. [Applause.] And a part of that productivity was due to the stimulation resulting from the distribution of garden seeds by this Government. I speak in behalf of both the agricultural and laboring interests of this country when I say I know they want the continuation of this distribution. If I had my way about it, and but for the inhibitions of the Constitution against class legislation, I would like to have an amendment to this provision that you gentlemen who are voting against garden seeds have your allotment taken away from you and equitably distributed to the real patriots in this Congress. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I can not, much as I regret to be unable to show a courtesy to my friend from Minnesota which he deserves. But I make this prediction, based upon my past experience with him: After this amendment is adopted, as I believe it will be finally, you would not be able, even with a crowbar, to pry from him as much as a single package of "punkin" seed, so anxious is he to get more than his allotment of garden seed for distribution in his district.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to include in his remarks a certain article indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDERSON. I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. BEGG. I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. ASWELL. I move to amend that; that debate close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question being taken, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEGG: At the end of the amendment add: "*Provided*, That the seeds, shrubs, etc., purchased by this money shall not be sent out under the congressional frank."

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is closed. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Let the amendment be reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that the amendment to the amendment be reported again?

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were 44 ayes and 75 noes.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were 65 ayes and 69 noes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. LANGLEY.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 71 ayes and 74 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner that he asked for. I voted against his amendment for seeds, but I think he ought to have the privilege of extending his speech in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky may have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I object, unless the gentleman from Kentucky wants to extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I did not object, Mr. Chairman; I am in favor of letting the gentleman from Kentucky put his remarks in the RECORD. The gentleman from North Carolina said he did not object if the gentleman wanted to extend his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. SNELL. I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the committee for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. LANGLEY. On this subject.

Mr. BEGG. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

SALARIES.

Forester, who shall be chief of bureau, $5,000; chief of office of accounts and fiscal agent, $2,500; inspector of records, $2,400; 7 district fiscal agents, at $2,120 each; forest supervisors—1 $3,240, 1 $2,880, 8 at $2,500 each, 16 at $2,380 each, 44 at $2,180 each, 60 at $1,980 each, 5 at $1,780 each; deputy forest supervisors—1 $1,980, 4 at $1,880 each, 25 at $1,780 each, 28 at $1,680 each, 15 at $1,580 each; forest rangers—11 at $1,620 each, 23 at $1,520 each, 78 at $1,420 each, 288 at $1,320 each, 426 at $1,220 each; for additional forest rangers, guards, or scalers at the rate of $1,220 per annum for periods of 12 months or less, $200,080; clerks—3 at $2,100 each, 4 at $2,000 each, 20 at $1,800 each, 23 at $1,600 each, 9 at $1,500 each, 32 at $1,400 each, 9 at $1,300 each, 140 at $1,200 each, 96 at $1,100 each, 53 at $1,020 each, 30 at $960 each, 100 at $900 each, 2 at $840 each, 1 $600; clerk or compositor, $1,600; clerk or proof reader, $1,400; clerk or translator, $1,400; compiler, $1,800; draftsmen—1 $2,000, 3 at $1,600 each, 2 at $1,500 each, 9 at $1,400 each, 4 at $1,300 each, 16 at $1,200 each, 2 at $1,100 each, 3 at $1,020 each, 1 $1,000, 1 $960; draftsmen or surveyors—2 at $1,800 each, 3 at $1,600 each, 16 at $1,500 each, 6 at $1,400 each; draftsman or artist, $1,200; draftsman or negative cutter, $1,200; artists—1 $1,600, 1 $1,000; photographers—1 $1,600, 1 $1,400, 1 $1,200, 1 $1,100; lithographer or photographer, $1,200; machinist, $1,260; carpenters—2 at $1,200 each, 3 at $1,000 each, 1 $960; electrician, $1,020; laboratory aids and engineers—1 $1,000, 9 at $900 each, 2 at $800 each; laboratory helpers—1 $720, 1 $600; packers—1 $1,000, 1 $780; messengers or laborers—2 at $960 each, 3 at $900 each, 4 at $840 each, 4 at $780 each, 5 at $720 each, 6 at $660 each; messenger boys—5 at $600 each, 2 at $540 each, 3 at $480 each, 3 at $420 each; charwomen—1 $540, 1 $480, 1 $300, 11 at $240 each; in all, $2,471,000.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the Forest Service there are 1,177 statutory employees, of which number 351 are official, 826 forest rangers, and 676 are clerks, messengers, charwomen, and so forth. It seems to me that that ought to be a sufficient number of employees for that bureau to function properly, but it seems that they want more money and more men, although they do not say for what. On page 33, lines 4 to 11, they ask for additional forest rangers, guards, scalers, at the rate of $1,220 per annum for periods of 12 months or less, $200,080.

Now, I want to ask the chairman of the committee what is the necessity for that appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I may explain to the gentleman, this item does not carry any more money than it did before. The object of putting these 164 rangers under the lump-sum appropriation was to give more flexibility in handling them. As it stood before the rangers were annual employees and had to be paid the year round. Some economy could be made by employing them for a shorter period, and the object of making the change was to make it possible to employ the rangers for a shorter period than the entire year, which would make a net result of $8,000 or $10,000 saving in the appropriation in the sense of enabling them to utilize the appropriation to a greater advantage.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, this is simply another evidence of a system which has grown up in the Agricultural Department of illegally adding employees to the pay roll by getting lump-sum appropriations through the Appropriations Committee instead of making the recommendation and having a bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture. If the chairman of the committee thinks it is necessary this year I shall not object, although I believe this item would be subject to a point of order; but I am going to object to the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, illegally and without authorization adding to the pay roll of its bureau. This is the most expensive, arbitrary, and autocratic department of the Federal Government.

It is not worth its salt the way it is being run, and if they can not with 1,177 men run that department in the way it should be run the heads of the department ought to resign and some people be appointed who can. Of that number, you will see there is less than one-half forest rangers actually doing business. I think it is inexcusable; but if the chairman thinks it ought to be done, all right. Next year I shall make a point of order if it is included in the bill in this manner.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to ask the chairman if these employees at less than a year will be paid at the same rate of salary?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. For the part of the time they labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FESS. And they will be paid at the rate of $1,220 a year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I suppose if they need more men, they will put them on; but they should employ those on the statutory roll to do the work that ought to be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I think it is fair to say in reply to the gentleman from California that here is a service where they are expected to cover 153,000,000 acres of land. We have $600,000,000 worth of timber, an enormous amount, and if there is any difficulty with this appropriation it is that it is not enough rather than it is too much.

Mr. CURRY. They had better discharge some of the clerks and charwomen and appoint rangers. One-third of my State is under forest reserve. My State increased in population over 1,100,000 during the decennial between 1910 and 1920, and during the same time that portion of my State covered by the forest reserve decreased over 100,000 in population. The arbitrary and unreasonable rules and regulations of the Forestry Bureau were responsible for that decrease in population. I was one of the first conservationists in this country. I believe in conservation and use, not in paralysis and disuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES, FOREST SERVICE.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved shall not exceed $1,000; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting in the forest reserves to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, and soil waste and the formation of floods, and including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, office fixtures, law books, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telphone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses, including traveling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present. This bill is so important, even without the garden seeds in it, that we ought to have a quorum.

Mr. CURRY. Will the gentleman let me make my point of order first?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-four Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Frear	Lyon	Sears
Almon	Free	McDuffie	Shaw
Ansorge	Freeman	McFadden	Shreve
Anthony	Frothingham	McKenzie	Siegel
Atkeson	Fulmer	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sisson
Bacharach	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Mich.
Barbour	Gifford	McPherson	Snyder
Blakeney	Glynn	McSwain	Sproul
Boies	Goldsborough	MacGregor	Stafford
Bond	Gorman	Maloney	Stedman
Bowers	Gould	Mansfield	Steenerson
Brand	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Stiness
Brennan	Greene, Mass.	Michaelson	Stoll
Britten	Griffin	Moore, Ill.	Strong, Pa.
Brooks, Ill.	Hammer	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Brown, Tenn.	Hays	Moores, Ind.	Sumners, Tex.
Browne, Wis.	Henry	Morin	Sweet
Bulwinkle	Herrick	Mott	Tague
Burke	Hersey	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Cantrill	Hickey	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, N. J.
Carew	Hogan	Norton	Taylor, Tenn.
Chandler, N. Y.	Hudspeth	O'Brien	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Hukriede	O'Connor	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Humphreys, Miss.	Olpp	Thompson
Classon	Husted	Osborne	Tillman
Cockran	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Tincher
Codd	Jacoway	Paige	Tinkham
Cole, Ohio	James	Park, Ga.	Treadway
Collins	Jefferis, Nebr.	Parker, N. Y.	Tucker
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	Patterson, Mo.	Underhill
Connolly, Pa.	Jones, Pa.	Patterson, N. J.	Upshaw
Cooper, Ohio	Kahn	Paul	Valle
Copley	Kearns	Perlman	Vare
Coughlin	Keller	Petersen	Vestal
Crago	Kelley, Mich.	Porter	Voigt
Crisp	Kelly, Pa.	Pringey	Volk
Crowther	Kennedy	Purnell	Volstead
Cullen	Kiess	Rainey, Ala.	Walters
Dallinger	Kindred	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Davis, Minn.	Kirkpatrick	Ramseyer	Ward, N. C.
Deal	Kitchin	Ransley	Watson
Dempsey	Kleczka	Reber	Weaver
Dominick	Kline, N. Y.	Reece	Wheeler
Doughton	Knight	Riddick	White, Me.
Drane	Kreider	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Drewry	Kunz	Robertson	Wilson
Driver	Larson, Minn.	Rodenberg	Winslow
Dunbar	Layton	Rosenbloom	Wise
Dunn	Lee, Ga.	Rossdale	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Lee, N. Y.	Rucker	Wright
Echols	Lehlbach	Ryan	Wurzbach
Edmonds	Lineberger	Sabath	Wyant
Fairchild	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.	Yates
Fields	Little	Schall	
Fish	Longworth	Scott, Mich.	
Fordney	Luce	Scott, Tenn.	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 206 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the RECORD.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following language, on page 35, commencing on line 18, after the word "forests," and down to and including a part of line 22:

and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forest to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated.

That is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill, an attempt to vest power and authority in the Secretary of Agriculture not now vested in him by law.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think, offhand, I should have been disposed to admit the validity of the point of order, but I find that the act of August 10, 1912, chapter 284, provides as follows:

and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests, except the Black Hills and Harney National Forests in South Dakota, to be exported from the State, Territory, or District of Alaska, in which said forests are respectively situated.

That seems to be legislative authority for the language carried in this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, certainly it may be exported from Alaska without this wording. It is so exported now. Nearly all of the timber that is cut in Alaska is exported to foreign countries. We appropriate money for the purpose of protecting timber in the United States, and last year between 1,000,000,000 and 2,000,000,000 board feet of lumber were exported to foreign countries, with the result that lumber used in the Middle West was increased in cost three or four times what it ought to be. The Secretary of Agriculture does need this authority, if he has not it already, to do what he wishes to do. He recognizes the fact that legislation is necessary by having this matter brought before the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture is functioning and has not yet reported on this proposition. I think it is clearly out of order to legislate authority to a Cabinet officer on an appropriation bill. I do not see how the Chair can do anything else than hold it out of order. It is possible that the Agricultural Department may have fooled the Committee on Appropriations. They have not the authority they wish, and they are trying to get it in this indirect manner.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Minnesota please give the Chair the reference which he read a moment ago?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I read from the act of August 10, 1912, chapter 284, and at the time I read it I was under the impression that that was a legislative act. As a matter of fact, it was an appropriation act, which, of course, would not give it the sanction of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels, in view of the fact that the law read by the gentleman from Minnesota was contained in an appropriation act, and therefore terminated when that act terminated, that it does not make this law at the present time, and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fighting and preventing forest fires, $250,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of this amount may be used in meeting emergencies caused by forest insects.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Line 16, on page 38, I move to strike out the figures "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 16, strike out the figuress "$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$300,000."'

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, some time ago, in connection with another item, I offered an amendment to increase the appropriation, but it was outvoted because of the fact it would not be a saving of money. The amendment which I now offer I trust will meet the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee, because it is clearly an amendment which will save money, although it is an increase in the appropriation. I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to the hearings, which are very interesting on this subject. It developed that the loss year before last in connection with the forest fires—and these figures are found in the hearings on page 213—were $212,000, and for the year closing June 30, 1922, the amount of loss was $322,000.

In that same connection the testimony of the chief forester is to the effect there was about 80 per cent efficiency in the fighting of those fires, but that the great loss occurred in the additional 20 per cent which they were not able to control. My amendment would appropriate $50,000 in addition to the amount carried in the bill and, by increasing the efficiency of the fire patrol, would make a saving of one-half the value of the timber that was lost in those two years. The chief forester says that with all the work they can do they do not expect to cut this down to below one-tenth of 1 per cent, whereas the loss is now two-tenths of 1 per cent. This would accomplish a saving of from $100,000 to $150,000, according to the losses of those two years. More than that, there is an additional reason, I trust, that will cause this amendment to prevail. If you will read page 213 of the hearings you will find this language:

The feature of our fire protection that disturbs me most is our emergency expenditures and the fact that we are still on a deficiency basis in meeting these emergencies. In the summer of 1921 we had to spend $536,000 in emergency expenditures for fire fighting, and we had to go to Congress for a deficiency appropriation. During the summer just closed we had to expend $539,000 for emergency fire fighting, and must again go to the Committee on Appropriations for a deficiency.

It strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that the opportunity to save an actual loss in timber of from $100,000 to $150,000 and save in the appropriations at least the very substantial amount of $500,000 is a real economy, and therefore I trust that the chairman will agree to this amendment and that it will prevail.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I am against all increases about forests when you come and strike down the little amount for garden and field seeds to which the farmers of this country are entitled. Talk about economy now! That is not any economy. Instead of fooling around here beating the farmers out of a few field seeds and garden seeds, we should give them some marketing system by which they can get their farm products to the market without being robbed of that

to which they are entitled by the middlemen of the country. You should give some reasonable transportation, so the products of their toil can reach the ultimate market without the farmer, the wealth producer of this country, being robbed. You might give the farmer of this country some fertilizer at a reasonable price, whereby he might put it on the soil, and whereby he can produce the food products necessary for man and beast. [Applause.] Yet what are you doing to bring that about? You have had the Muscle Shoals proposition of Henry Ford before you ever since May, 1922, and here we are on the verge of Christmas and not a thing has been done. [Applause.] Who is opposed to it? First, the great railway systems and the water-power trusts of the United States, together with the automobile trust and the other trusts which have combined and pooled their interests against Henry Ford and the farmer on this question.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. I will yield.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, this speech is very interesting to the membership of the House and to the country, and I think we ought to have a quorum here to listen to the gentleman from Mississippi. I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

During the count,

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Chair ought to announce the result instead of delaying the announcement and sending out for Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was busily engaged in the counting of a quorum.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the Chair is going to do that, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point?

Mr. LANGLEY. Why, certainly, if the Chair is going to wait and send after men to get a quorum, what is the use of my making the point of no quorum?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw it?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; I do. I have got sense enough to know what is going on. I think the Chair has succeeded in seeing a sufficient number of Members here to listen to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, and so I withdraw my point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky withdraws the point of no quorum. The gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the Republicans have not said a word about getting the Henry Ford proposition through this Congress to get the farmers fertilizer so they can make a crop to feed the people and animals of this country. They talk about the salaries of officials, they talk all the time about nonessentials, about items that have been here ever since the Civil War, when the great burning question before you and the farmers through their organizations from one end of the United States to the other ask, What is the matter with Congress considering the Henry Ford proposition? You men know that ramifying from one end of this country to the other to-day the influence of the great money power of Wall Street is shoving aside the Henry Ford proposition that the Committee on Military Affairs reported to this Congress. All of us who believe in legislating in aid of the farmers want it considered and enacted into law.

Not one word can be heard of it, and yet the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] has introduced a bill here and inspired newspaper items calling himself "the head of the farm bloc," and nobody ever heard of his being recognized as a friend of the farmer, hardly, so far as this Congress is concerned. [Laughter.] He said that the matter had been repudiated by the farm bloc. Who is he calling the farm bloc? Is he calling J. Pierpont Morgan the farm bloc? Is he calling the Steel Trust the farm bloc? Is he calling the railway combine interests of the United States and the great banking and manufacturing interests the farm bloc? If he is talking about that, of course it is true they have laid it aside, and do not propose that it shall be passed. But I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa that his bill is the very mouthpiece and the very offspring of the enemies of the Henry Ford proposition, and he knows it. [Applause.] He knows that the bill he has introduced was introduced for the special purpose of laying in the grave the proposition of Henry Ford to operate and control Muscle Shoals for the benefit of the farmers. Yet he sends out his pictures in the newspapers and announces that the farm bloc has gone back on Henry Ford, when he himself is the author of a bill that has got more poison in it for the proposal of Henry Ford than all the other conspiracies that have been conjured up to defeat the Ford proposal for Muscle Shoals. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to present a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think the country or the House can afford to miss this inspiring speech of the gentleman from Mississippi, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BEGG. I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Too late!

Mr. QUIN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Ohio can have all the time. He has spoken in this House almost every other five minutes in the last two days, and yet when I am telling the truth here he rises to object to my having five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio was on his feet objecting at the time the announcement was made. The Clerk will read.

Mr. QUIN. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman from Ohio can not get anywhere with that. I will be here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in behalf of the amendment that has been offered to provide additional funds for fire protection and fire patrol for the national forests. This is to the national forests the same as a fire department is to the city of Washington or our home towns. There is no economy in providing for half of a fire department. The time to fight fires is when the fire first begins, and the testimony adduced before the committee shows that if the fires are taken in hand while they are very small they are one-man fires and they are quickly suppressed, and no serious damages are done and no additional expenses are incurred. But where there are not sufficient fire patrols these fires spread and it becomes necessary to seek and organize fire fighters and transport them long distances, meanwhile the fire gets under way. A single fire may destroy in some cases hundreds and even thousands and in some cases tens of thousands of acres. The direct and indirect cost is enormous before the fire is suppressed. We have been paying out from $500,000 to $750,000 annually for emergency fire fighters in addition to the regular appropriation.

Now, there is no economy in paying out this amount for emergency fire fighters when with better fire patrols we can prevent this enormous expenditure annually and can prevent the destruction of a large amount of valuable timber. So I earnestly urge the serious consideration of every Member to the amendment that has been offered. Especially do we need additional funds in order that there may be an air patrol over some of the larger national forests. Many of these fires, as I stated to you yesterday, result from lightning, and they occur at very inaccessible points, not readily discovered except by an air patrol. Where the air patrol has been in use it has been found very effective. It discovers the fires in their incipiency and makes it possible to extinguish them without the loss of large areas of timber and without the employment of a large number of emergency fire fighters. I ask the support of the committee to this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. QUIN. I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi objects. Does the gentleman from Minnesota move?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks for tellers. Those who favor taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until their names are counted. [After counting.] Not a sufficient number. Tellers are refused. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi objects to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What would be the effect if the objection to the vote, on the ground that there is not a quorum present, is sustained in Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. There would have to be another vote on the amendment. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise; and on that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the committee do now rise, and on that he demands tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. QUIN to act as tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Those in favor of the motion that the committee do now rise will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 4, noes 77.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee declines to rise.

Mr. QUIN. No quorum, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum is sustained, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Fitzgerald	Lineberger	Rossdale
Almon	Fordney	Linthicum	Rucker
Ansorge	Frear	Little	Ryan
Anthony	Free	Logan	Sabath
Arentz	Freeman	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Atkeson	French	Luce	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Frothingham	Lubring	Schall, Minn.
Barbour	Fulmer	Lyon	Scott, Mich.
Bird	Funk	McCormick	Scott, Tenn.
Bixler	Gallivan	McDuffie	Sears
Blakeney	Garrett, Tenn.	McFadden	Shaw, Ill.
Bland, Ind.	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Shreve
Boies	Gifford	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Bond	Glynn	McSwain	Smith, Mich.
Bowers	Goldsborough	MacGregor	Snyder
Brand	Goodykoontz	Maloney	Sproul
Brennan	Gorman	Mansfield	Stafford
Briggs	Gould	Martin	Stedman
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Mead	Steenerson
Brooks, Ill.	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Stiness
Brooks, Pa.	Griest	Michaelson	Stoll
Brown, Tenn.	Griffin	Mills	Strong, Kans.
Browne, Wis.	Hammer	Montague	Strong, Pa.
Bulwinkle	Hays	Moore, Ill.	Sullivan
Burke	Henry	Moore, Ohio	Sumners, Tex.
Burroughs	Herrick	Moores, Ind.	Tague
Byrns, Tenn.	Hersey	Morgan	Taylor, Ark.
Campbell, Kans.	Hickey	Morin	Taylor, N. J.
Cantrill	Hill	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Carew	Hogan	Mudd	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Hooker	Nelson, Me.	Thomas
Christopherson	Hukriede	Nelson, A. P.	Thompson
Clark, Fla.	Humphreys, Miss.	Newton, Minn.	Tillman
Clarke, N. Y.	Husted	Newton, Mo.	Tilson
Classon	Hutchinson	Norton	Tinkham
Clouse	Jacoway	O'Brien	Treadway
Cockran	James	O'Connor	Tucker
Codd	Jefferis, Nebr.	Oliver	Underhill
Cole, Ohio	Johnson, Miss.	Osborne	Upshaw
Collins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overstreet	Valle
Connally, Tex.	Jones, Pa.	Paige	Vare
Connolly, Pa.	Kahn	Park, Ga.	Vestal
Cooper, Ohio	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Copley	Keller	Patterson, Mo.	Volk
Coughlin	Kelley, Mich.	Patterson, N. J.	Volstead
Crago	Kelly, Pa.	Paul	Walters
Crowther	Kennedy	Perlman	Ward, N. Y.
Cullen	Kiess	Petersen	Ward, N. C.
Dallinger	Kincheloe	Pou	Watson
Davis, Minn.	Kindred	Pringey	Weaver
Deal	King	Purnell	Wheeler
Dominick	Kirkpatrick	Rainey, Ala.	White, Me.
Doughton	Kitchin	Rainey, Ill.	Williams, Tex.
Drane	Kleczka	Ramseyer	Williamson
Drewry	Kline, N. Y.	Ransley	Winslow
Dunbar	Kline, Pa.	Rayburn	Wise
Dunn	Knight	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Knutson	Reece	Woods, Va.
Echols	Kreider	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Edmonds	Kunz	Riddick	Wright
Elliott	Larson, Minn.	Riordan	Wurzbach
Fairchild	Layton	Robertson	Wyant
Fairfield	Lee, Ga.	Robsion	Yates
Fields	Lee, N. Y.	Rodenberg	
Fish	Lehlbach	Rosenbloom	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 13481, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he directed the roll to be called, when 172 Members, a quorum of the committee, responded to their names; and he handed in the list of absentees to be printed in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The committee will resume its session.

The committee resumed its session, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division upon my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the parliamentary situation is that the committee will take a vote from the beginning on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. In order that the Members may be informed as to what that amendment is, without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM: Page 38, line 16, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$300,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. KETCHAM) there were—ayes 17, noes 51.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber, for timber testing, and the testing of such woods as may require test to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, for investigations and tests within the United States of foreign woods of commercial importance to industries in the United States, and for other investigations and experiments to promote economy in the use of forest and fiber products, and for commercial demonstrations of improved methods or processes, in cooperation with individuals and companies, $350,800: *Provided*, That $15,000 of this amount shall be used for the investigation by the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture of flax straw as a source of supply for the manufacture of pulp and paper.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why the provision for the preservative treatment of timber is included in this item, when it was also included in the former item, on page 35, in line 3?

Mr. ANDERSON. The item on page 35 is not an appropriation item at all. It is simply a general statement of the functions of the department which it has been customary to carry in the case of each bureau for many years.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Provision is made for it, is it not? In line 17, on page 41, we find an aggregate stated—

In all, general expenses, $4,112,582.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement to which the gentleman refers, of course, is simply a total of the appropriations. It is not an appropriation of itself.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Do we not find a total for Forest Service, $6,583,586, at the close of this paragraph? Does that include the former aggregate stated on page 41?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Why the repetition of the provision?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is merely a matter of record and convenience in the appropriation bill. It makes possible a quick ascertainment of the total for each bureau.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Has the chairman of the committee any information as to what progress has been made in these tests? The chairman of the committee knows that the methods of preserving wood are well known to the great corporations of this country, and the best methods of preserving wood are well known to practically every farmer in the United States. I think that is not an extravagant statement. They are being used constantly on the farms and by the corporations which use timber. Are we getting something new out of this?

Mr. ANDERSON. It may be that the farmers know all that could be known about the preservation of wood.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. They know what I said.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the industries that are asking for these appropriations frankly admit that they do not know very much about it and they are anxious to have these investigations made. In point of fact, a good many of them contribute part of the sums which are spent in making these investigations.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman allow another question?

Mr. ANDERSON. Surely. The gentleman is speaking in his own time.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Can the gentleman state that the processes which are being employed and the investigations

which are being conducted by the Government are adding anything to the knowledge now in the possession of the corporations that are using these processes daily and the farmers who are using them?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should say they were adding a great deal. For example, the present methods of kiln-drying lumber have reduced the time required to dry it very considerably, and have greatly reduced the cost. There are a great many questions with reference to the use of paint and various other materials in the preservation of wood which still require a great deal of investigation.

Mr. SNELL. They are carrying on experiments in the manufacture of wood pulp.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and we have not any really certain method of grading lumber. That is one of the things which is being investigated under this item. Millions of feet of lumber could be saved if it were possible to grade the lumber and to cut it at the mill with better relation to the consuming requirements. All of these things are done in this laboratory. Among other things, they have a machine for testing the strength of wooden boxes, and enormous savings have been made in the cost of making these boxes, as well as a great deal added to their strength and utility, through these investigations. I think this is one of the most valuable items carried in this bill.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. It may be so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I recognize the fact that this science of the preservation and treatment of timber and wood, and so forth, is very interesting, but it is not as important as the necessity for producing food products in this country. The treatment and preservation of timber is a process that is being developed by the corporations that handle these products, and therefore should not be preferred over the productive process. You propose to appropriate $350,000 for this one purpose, $15,000 of which is to be spent in finding out about how flax straw will answer as a source of paper. Awhile ago we had a proposition to spend $360,000 for the furnishing of seeds to the children of this country and the people who have gardens for the purpose of producing something really tangible and worth while.

Mr. Chairman, there are at least 2,000 cottages in the mill villages of my district, which are lived in by cotton-mill people who are furnished with gardens and who are encouraged to produce those things that are necessary for the health and maintenance of their families. Yet a vote of the committee to-day denied them the right to have the seeds for which they continually ask me and without which many of them can not cultivate their gardens or avail themselves of the information which the mill corporations furnish them as to the beautifying and improvement of their gardens which are furnished to them.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will my friend yield to me for a question?

Mr. STEVENSON. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is it not true that the distribution of garden seeds to the people of the country by the Government is not for the benefit alone of the farmers, but that it is more for the benefit of the laboring people who have small gardens that they cultivate in their back yards?

Mr. STEVENSON. Those are the people for whom I am pleading when I say that if we are going to spend $350,000 to test the sources from which paper can be made for the paper industry of this country and testing the timber, especially foreign timber, that is provided for here for the people who deal in that kind of timber, we ought not to be denied seeds that the people in the factory towns, who are frequently not able to buy them and do not know where to get the best, and come to us because they know they can get the best, we ought to provide them with garden and flour seeds tested and approved by the Department of Agriculture.

There is another thing, there is hardly a school district in my district where they have an up-to-date method of school teaching that does not ask me for a package of seeds for every child in the district, and every child is encouraged to produce something for the maintenance of the family and which serves for the protection of the health of the people.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think that that is the very highest order of patriotism, that it is the best line of education and help promoted by Congress?

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I will underwrite any statement that the gentleman from Kentucky will make on that proposition. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see the children of this country discriminated against in flower and garden seeds in favor of people who want $350,000 for the paper industry and the testing of timber, and hence I make a motion to strike out this paragraph, because it is rank discrimination against the school children and the factory people of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STEVENSON: Page 39, line 16, strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States, and with individuals, to determine the best methods for the conservative management of forest and forest lands, $85,000.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: Line 23, page 40, strike out the figures "$85,000" and insert the figures "$110,000."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 23, strike out "$85,000" and insert "$110,000."

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that I make a motion to increase an item in an appropriation bill. But this is a matter that the people of the whole country are very vitally interested in. It has come to me in many ways that one thing the people are much exercised about at the present time is the fast-disappearing forests of the country and the products of the same. They are also all much interested in having the denuded and cut-over lands put back into production. They are of the opinion that the Federal Government should do as much as it can, in a reasonable degree, in the way of encouragement and spreading useful information throughout the country about the most improved and most scientific way to reforest and to put these lands back to producing timber, which we are in so great need of at the present time.

The present bill carries $85,000 for experimental stations. According to the hearings, I notice that we have six of them, and they are all in the States in the South and the southwestern part of the country. There is no question but that they are doing good work and should be continued where they are, but each section of the country has a different problem to work out—a condition that is entirely peculiar to itself—and therefore needs local stations to work out their problems. The Northern and Northeastern States have taken a great interest in the reforestation work; they have gone further in this than any other part of the country. They have spent much money, both individuals owning lands and corporations and States themselves, and they are making considerable advancement; but there is every reason in the world why there should be at least two more small experimental stations placed in the North and East. I understand from the Director of the Forest Service, Mr. Greeley, that if this was increased by $25,000 they could establish two more, one in a North Central State and one in the New England division.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am asking this question in good faith and for information that I really want. I have a faint idea of what "silvicultural" experiments mean, but I would like to have the gentleman explain, if he will, what "dendrological" experiments mean, and then I would like to have him tell the committee if he thinks these experiments are so much more important than the Government distribution of seeds for the laboring men, the farmers, and their children.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman's question needs no special answer at this time. This appropriation is for experimental stations to show the people the best methods of further protecting against fire and the reforesting denuded lands and the general care and production of timber best adapted to the section.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I am not acquainted with what is being done by the Federal Government, but I know that some of the States are taking an advanced position on this matter.

Mr. SNELL. A great many of the States are taking up work along this line. Individuals and corporations are doing a great deal of work, but they need help and demonstrations to show them how to do it in the best way. The Federal Government has advanced ideas and knowledge on this that the States and individuals do not, and it should be given to them.

Mr. FESS. I understand that Pennsylvania has several million acres that they are expecting to reforest, and that they have a school of forestry maintained at Palo Alto. And I un-

derstand they have two or three places that are model forests where they are showing what can be done.

Mr. SNELL. New York has several schools of forestry and is spending a lot of money along this line and are much interested in this work as well as the whole country, and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. It is perfectly manifest that there is no quorum present to listen to this most interesting and enlightening discussion, and I therefore make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that no quorum is present, and the Chair will count.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, two or three of my closest friends have just assured me that they are deeply interested in the discussion of this item and are desirous that the discussion proceed, and in deference to their wishes I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I think I have about concluded my statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Forest Service, $6,583,582.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF CERTAIN REFUGEES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the membership for permitting me to make a short statement. I desire to present a very serious proposition which has to deal with a most serious and distressing situation. I hope the Members generally will assist in the study which is now going on. Every Member of the House knows of the great distress in the Near East, and of the enormous number of refugees in Greece and in almost all of that country known as Asia Minor and on the lands along the seas which touch parts of that region. As the result of a series of disasters, which culminated in the burning of the city of Smyrna, many appeals are coming to the Committee on Immigration for a lifting of the immigration-restriction quota in order to permit the admission of refugees who might come to the United States to relatives already here. These appeals vary in the quantity of relief that might be afforded, but even the most modest appeals are such as to be startling to those who stand for continued restriction of immigration. The committee has held extensive hearings in an effort to ascertain the number that might come, and the figures range all the way from 5,000 to 100,000, and even more. On the islands and shores of the Ægean Sea, including the Grecian mainland, there are 1,200,000 homeless people. In Anatolia and elsewhere in Asia Minor, Armenia, and Greece there are 1,000,000 Christians who have lost their homes or who are threatened with evacuation. In Constantinople Greek and Armenian Christian citizens to the number of 450,000 are refugees, and these figures do not include 50,000 or more refugees in northern Syria, reaching as far south as Damascus, Beirut, and Sidon, thousands of whom are orphaned children. Then there are from 250,000 to 300,000 Armenian refugees from Turkey who are now in Russian Armenia, including 30,000 orphans in that area cared for by the Near East Relief. A careful estimate of the number now homeless or threatened with exile in that part of the world brings the number to 2,500,000 people. It is staggering!

Therefore, when one looks carefully at the proposition, no matter how sympathetic he may feel—and I take it the whole people of the United States are in great sympathy with the situation and the people there—one realizes the futility of attempting to do much of anything in the way of relief by lifting the immigration restriction laws that we now have. However, I have thought that in lieu of the several bills pending, both in this House and in the other branch, looking toward great modifications that might admit 100,000 aliens to relatives or even more, we might at the present time be justified in agreeing by resolution that those countries with exhausted quotas, most of whom have very small quotas, be permitted to use now the quotas which would be coming to them for one year from July 1 next. That is to say, we might extend the right to use the quotas of one year in advance at the present time in an effort to grant what even then would be a very small part of the relief that must be given by the whole world. It is proposed that only relatives of citizens or declarants receive this relief.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does that contemplate an additional allowance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; not one additional alien over the quota is to be admitted. The point is this: If there are, let us say, 300 aliens in Russian Armenia who are entitled to come under next year's quota, which begins July 1, some of whom are now refugees and who might come to relatives here, would there be any harm in letting them come in now or when ships can be had to bring them here?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Cutting off the equivalent to that next year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the RECORD the text of the resolution which I am to-day introducing, and which I hope will be read and studied by all of the Members during the holidays.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that he may include as a part of his remarks the resolution referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution referred to is as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
December 22, 1922.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington introduced the following joint resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and ordered to be printed:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 416) to permit the admission of certain aliens in excess of quotas and to be charged to the quota for the fiscal year 1924, and for other purposes.

Resolved, etc., That whenever the Secretary of Labor finds, in the case of an alien of any nationality seeking to enter the United States, that the quota for such nationality under the percentage immigration act of May 19, 1921, as amended and extended, has been exhausted for the fiscal year 1923, and that the deportation of such alien would result in extreme hardship or likelihood of death, the Secretary of Labor may admit such alien to the United States, if otherwise admissible, upon the application of a citizen of the United States or an individual who has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, if such citizen or declarant is a relative of the alien seeking admission. The number of aliens so admitted during the remainder of the fiscal year 1923 shall be deducted from the total number of aliens of such nationality admissible during the fiscal year 1924; but nothing in this section shall authorize any enlargement of the quota for that fiscal year.

SEC. 2. Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that the operation of the 20 per cent monthly limit provided by section 2 of such act of May 19, 1921, is causing undue congestion in the ports of the United States, or extreme hardship to aliens, he may change or modify such limit to such extent as he deems necessary to remove such congestion or hardship, but nothing in this section shall authorize any enlargement of the 3 per cent yearly limit provided by such act.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of such act of May 19, 1921, the nationality of a minor child seeking admission to the United States shall be determined by the country of birth of either parent who, having custody of such minor, is entitled to admission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, personally this is as far as I have thought we could go at present. I offer the plan for what it is worth. I hope that later it may be accepted. It saves the law. It helps a little in the present misery.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. The gentleman is now discussing a resolution which he contemplates introducing. Does the gentleman mean to say that the resolution would be in substitution for any contemplated legislation along that line?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I mean to infer that so far as I am concerned, as one Member of the House and as one member of the Committee on Immigration, I shall not agree to any bill that will throw open the gates of the United States to a great uncertain number of the refugees of the world. Other propositions are too uncertain. I am proposing to go as far as I think the United States dare go in the face of this tremendous situation, where millions of people are moving, either through persecution or in search of food and shelter.

Mr. SNELL. About how many countries would this apply to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This would apply to the quota from Greece, which is 3,300 or thereabouts, from Armenia in Turkey, the quota for which is 2,300, and Syria, whose quota is 928, and to certain other countries which during the year and a half of operation of the quota law have invariably exhausted their quotas within the five months. The minimum is quite small.

Mr. SNELL. How many people would that bring in altogether?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think less than 10,000 altogether, and each one would come to a relative in the United States.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman's resolution refer to certain countries, or does it open the matter entirely?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. To certain countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The resolution provides that from countries whose quotas have been exhausted and where there are persons who can make an individual showing of distress and that they are coming to relatives, they may be admitted and charged to the quota of next year.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not a fact that all of those countries have exhausted their quotas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They all have very small quotas.

Mr. SNELL. But they have all been exhausted up to the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and the number coming which would be charged to the next fiscal year would be quite small; and inasmuch as there is this terrible distress, why not give this small measure of relief?

Mr. SNELL. How are you going to improve the distress by letting in 10,000, when there are millions in distress?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How are you going to improve it if you let in 100,000?

Mr. SNELL. That is the point. I think if you let down the bars you will be in trouble.

Under leave to extend his remarks Mr. JOHNSON of Washington presented the following table:

QUOTA ADMISSIONS.

Status of the immigration of aliens into the United States under the percentum limit act of May 19, 1921, as extended by Public Resolution No. 55, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved May 11, 1922.

TO DECEMBER 13, 1922.

Country or region of birth.	Monthly quota.	Admitted Dec. 1 to 13, 1922.	Annual quota.	Admitted July 1 to Dec. 13.	Balance for year.[1]
Albania	58	15	288	270	11
Armenia (Russian)	46	12	230	223	(2)
Austria	1,490	454	7,451	4,280	3,110
Belgium	313	94	1,563	1,495	53
Bulgaria	61	5	302	267	15
Czechoslovakia	2,871	815	14,357	13,567	724
Danzig	60	10	301	102	197
Denmark	1,124	49	5,619	2,101	3,496
Finland	784	97	3,921	2,718	1,169
Fiume	14	5	71	36	35
France	1,146	151	5,729	3,086	2,636
Germany	13,521	1,189	67,607	17,374	50,211
Greece	659	114	3,294	3,292	(2)
Hungary	1,123	459	5,638	5,238	309
Iceland	15	.....	73	45	28
Italy	8,411	1,655	42,057	41,885	(2)
Luxemburg	19	.....	92	92	(2)
Memel Region	30	3	150	28	117
Netherlands	721	87	3,607	1,485	2,117
Norway	2,440	244	12,202	4,038	8,141
Poland	4,215	1,387	21,076	16,763	4,240
Eastern Galicia	1,157	355	5,786	2,060	3,659
Pinsk Region	857	304	4,284	1,881	2,275
Portugal	493	20	2,465	2,462	(2)
Rumania	1,484	768	7,419	6,354	919
Bessarabian Region	558	48	2,792	367	2,413
Russia	4,323	1,502	21,613	12,491	8,800
Esthonian Region	270	2	1,348	102	1,240
Latvian Region	308	97	1,540	800	727
Lithuanian Region	462	130	2,310	2,172	103
Spain	182	2	912	912	(2)
Sweden	4,008	171	20,042	7,540	12,501
Switzerland	750	143	3,752	2,567	1,157
United Kingdom	15,468	2,492	77,342	37,679	39,508
Yugoslavia	1,285	577	6,426	5,743	636
Other Europe	17	1	86	55	(2)
Palestine	12	.....	57	57	(2)
Syria	186	99	928	858	42
Turkey	478	270	2,388	2,383	(2)
Other Asia	16	1	81	81	(2)
Africa	25	.....	123	122	(2)
Atlantic islands	24	.....	121	63	57
Australia	55	36	279	279	(2)
New Zealand and Pacific islands	16	11	80	66	5
Total	71,561	13,374	357,803	205,585	150,645

[1] After all charges against the annual quota have been deducted.
[2] Exhausted for year

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the gentleman from California having five minutes, but I shall object to any further remarks out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which committee the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], who has just spoken, is the chairman, I have been listening for many days to the story of the Armenians and Greeks, in respect to the taking of territory from Greece by the Turks. It is a very harrowing story. The testimony shows that one side claims that the other side is to blame, and then when you hear all of it, you will conclude that both sides are to blame. The Greeks are to blame for a great part of it, and the Turks are to blame for a great part of it. This is as the testimony goes. Possibly no other catastrophe in the history of man has been as great as this one, particularly relating to the city of Smyrna and the surrounding territory. Practically all of the Christians, the Greeks, have left the territory and are being provided for now by various organizations. In the territory involved there are about 60,000,000 people, and from 1,000 years before Christ up to the present time this territory has changed hands every few years. Some of it has, the Government of East Silesia, lately. One witness who who had given much time and attention to it said that in the next 10 years the minorities of these various small countries, and we have been making more of them, over 25,000,000 of refugees, like the situation of the Smyrna people to-day, would be appealing for admission to the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Does the gentleman believe that any man in his right mind would make a statement of that kind?

Mr. RAKER. The conditions now are such that, if we leave the doors open to those who are seeking admission, no one can tell the number; as the chairman says it may run into at least 2,000,000, if not more.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Does the gentleman know of any proposition to do that before any committee of this Congress?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that in this way: Open the doors for this two and a half million, no limit placed upon them, who can honestly close the doors to those of like situation who may ask admission in numbers from 100,000 to 1,000,000 from Poland or 5,000,000 from Russia. It is an impossibility. It is asking something of this country that ought not to be asked. What can be done? We have hundreds of ships tied up at our wharfs rotting and decaying——

Mr. SNELL. Steel?

Mr. RAKER. They are not all steel, but the steel is rusting out. We have provisions that will go to waste which these people have been taking from the land. There is an opportunity where they can live, and if we send those products to them we will be able to take care of them——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman knows this arrangement does not add one person to any quota.

Mr. RAKER. I was talking about the letting in of an unlimited number of refugees.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I said I would object to any further discussion out of order, and I feel compelled to object.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Anthony	Barbour	Benham
Almon	Arents	Barkley	Blakeney
Ansorge	Bacharach	Beedy	Bland, Ind.

Boies	Frear	Lineberger	Rose
Bond	Free	Linthicum	Rosenbloom
Bowers	Freeman	Logan	Rossdale
Brand	French	Longworth	Rouse
Brennan	Frothingham	Luce	Rucker
Britten	Fulmer	Luhring	Ryan
Brooks, Ill.	Funk	Lyon	Sabath
Brooks, Pa.	Gallivan	McArthur	Sanders, N. Y.
Brown, Tenn.	Garrett, Tenn.	McDuffie	Schall
Browne, Wis.	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Scott, Mich.
Bulwinkle	Gifford	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scott, Tenn.
Burke	Gilbert	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sears
Burroughs	Glynn	McSwain	Shaw
Butler	Goldsborough	MacGregor	Shreve
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodykoontz	Maloney	Siegel
Byrns, Tenn.	Gorman	Mansfield	Smith, Mich.
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	Mapes	Smithwick
Campbell, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	Martin	Snyder
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	Mead	Sproul
Cantrill	Griest	Merritt	Stafford
Carew	Griffin	Michaelson	Stedman
Chandler, N. Y.	Hammer	Millis	Steenerson
Chandler, Okla.	Hardy, Tex.	Montague	Strauss
Christopherson	Hays	Montoya	Stoll
Clague	Henry	Moore, Ill.	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Herrick	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Clarke, N. Y.	Hersey	Morin	Sumners, Tex.
Classon	Hickey	Mott	Tague
Clouse	Hill	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Cockran	Hogan	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Colo.
Codd	Hooker	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, N. J.
Cole, Ohio	Hudspeth	Nelson, J. M.	Taylor, Tenn.
Collins	Hukriede	Newton, Minn.	Ten Eyck
Connally, Tex.	Humphreys, Miss.	Norton	Thomas
Connolly, Pa.	Husted	O'Brien	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Hutchinson	O'Connor	Tillman
Copley	Jacoway	Oliver	Tilson
Coughlin	James	Olpp	Tincher
Crago	Jefferis, Nebr.	Osborne	Tinkham
Crowther	Johnson, Miss.	Overstreet	Towner
Cullen	Johnson, S. Dak.	Paige	Treadway
Dallinger	Jones, Pa.	Park, Ga.	Tucker
Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Upshaw
Deal	Kearns	Patterson, Mo.	Valle
Dickinson	Keller	Patterson, N. J.	Vare
Dominick	Kennedy	Paul	Vestal
Doughton	Kiess	Perlman	Voigt
Drane	Kindred	Petersen	Volk
Drewry	King	Pou	Walters
Driver	Kirkpatrick	Pringey	Ward, N. Y.
Dunbar	Kitchin	Purnell	Ward, N. C.
Dunn	Kiczka	Rainey, Ala.	Watson
Dyer	Kline, N. Y.	Rainey, Ill.	Weaver
Echols	Kline, Pa.	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Edmonds	Knight	Ransley	White, Me.
Elliott	Knutson	Rayburn	Williams, Tex.
Ellis	Kreider	Reber	Winslow
Fairchild	Kunz	Reece	Wise
Fairfield	Lampert	Reed, N. Y.	Woods, Va.
Faust	Layton	Reed, W. Va.	Wyant
Favrot	Leatherwood	Riddick	Yates
Fields	Lee, Ga.	Riordan	
Focht	Lee, N. Y.	Robertson	
Fordney	Lehlbach	Rodenberg	

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, finding itself without a quorum, under the rule the Chair caused the roll to be called, whereupon 165 Members answered to their names, and he presented the list of absentees for entry in the Journal and RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on a question of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN. For how long a time?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, some differences of opinion have arisen relative to some of the items of this bill, and we all realize that some of our Members are absent whom we would be glad to have here to aid us in the consideration of these matters. It has been suggested that perhaps some of our difficulties might be overcome and the way might be smoothed for action if it were understood that the final vote, after the committee rises, on this bill shall not be taken until about Wednesday, the 3d of January. As far as I am concerned, that would be entirely agreeable to me. I think that could be arranged.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I understand it is the purpose to read the bill through in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MONDELL. To complete the bill in the committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. There is an item involving an appropriation of $50,000,000 to carry out the authorization of Congress heretofore made on roads for the year 1923.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. It is the last item. Does the gentleman think we could dispose of that proposition? There will be an amendment offered to appropriate the whole $50,000,000 for that year, which I desire very much to see adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman from Wyoming will allow me to answer the question, I think I can state to the gentleman from Kentucky that this bill carries substantially $30,000,000 for roads. The committee on deficiencies is carrying $25,000,000 for roads in addition to this.

Mr. KINCHELOE. For 1923?

Mr. MADDEN. For 1923, yes, sir; and we worked the whole question out with the Roads Bureau of the Agricultural Department, so as to preserve the rights of every State and provide such money as may be needed to carry on any work that is in progress or obligated by any State.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I know, and the gentleman knows, but what is the reason we do not carry out the authorization of Congress and appropriate the $50,000,000 provided for the Roads Bureau for 1923 instead of their coming like a blind beggar with a cup in his hand and getting it by piecemeal?

Mr. MADDEN. That is not a fair statement.

Mr. KINCHELOE. That is what will happen if the appropriations are brought in by piecemeal in a deficiency.

Mr. MADDEN. We are doing just exactly what the act which Congress passed last year provided. The act provided that allotments should be made by the Department of Agriculture to the States, and that contract obligations might be created by the States for which appropriations would be made from time to time as the States needed the money; and that provision is already provided for in the deficiency bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] is thoroughly familiar will all the details of that.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know whether Mr. McDonald has changed his mind or not, but he has stated in the hearings that it is absolutely essential that the estimate of $50,000,000 should be appropriated now and all at once.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that will be worked out to the satisfaction of everybody.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wyoming state what the intended program is for next week, provided we put the final vote on the agricultural bill over until the 3d of January?

Mr. MONDELL. The program is to dispose of the bill up to some specific point for the consideration of the committee, and then take up the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. SNELL. But not have a final vote on it until January 3?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. This bill will not be called up for a vote until the 3d of January?

Mr. MONDELL. Until Wednesday.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the 3d.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address an inquiry to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Do we understand that the whole $50,000,000 which has been authorized will all be made available and that the contracts will be left intact?

Mr. MADDEN. It will all be made available, and the contract rights will be kept intact for three years, so that none of the States will lose any rights at any time in the next three years.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It will not interrupt the program?

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION. It is stated that the deficiency bill will carry $25,000,000 of the $50,000,000 authorized.

Mr. MADDEN. Forty-two million dollars more is made available.

Mr. ROBSION. I understand that; but what disposition will be made of the other $25,000,000?

Mr. MADDEN. That will be appropriated just as fast as they make obligations against it. They have said they have contracted obligations against it up to the 1st of July to the amount of $16,000,000, and only $1,000,000 of the total will be needed between now and the 1st of March. If any more is obligated and needs to be provided for before Congress adjourns at the end of the session we will be advised of it and appropriate in the general deficiency bill to meet any obligations that may accrue in the current fiscal year.

Mr. ROBSION. What will be done with the remainder?

Mr. MADDEN. It will be allotted to the States to which it applies.

Mr. ROBSION. How can it be allotted before the time expires?

Mr. MADDEN. It will be arranged before the time expires.

Mr. ROBSION. If we should bring that provision in on an appropriation bill it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be in order if we got a rule. I think everybody will be satisfied with it, so that we shall not want a rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For conducting the investigations contemplated by the act of May 15, 1862, relating to the application of chemistry to agriculture; for the biological investigation of food and drug products and substances used in the manufacture thereof, including investigations of the physiological effects of such products on the human organism, $92,900.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: Page 43, line 15, after the words "to agriculture" insert "and communicating to any person or making public the analysis of any food or drug product that is sold in the market, under regulations to be made by the Secretary."

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the duty of the Department of Agriculture is to procure and diffuse and spread abroad—that is not the exact language—all information relating to agriculture in its broadest sense. At present, if they take hold of the question of food or drug products, they give no information.

If there is anything injurious, they stop it under the pure food act; but they do not give to the people of this country the information that they want. Let me give you an example. I have known a man who dealt in what he called crude spice, which was starch colored in various ways so as to look like spices. Nine-tenths of all the spices are made of some material of that sort which is not injurious, but I think people have a right to know whether they are getting the pure spice or whether they are getting an adulterated spice that is not so strong. This would enable them to do that.

We know that there are various baking powders on the market. I am assured that some of these baking powders that have the largest sale have a large percentage of alum in them, which is held not to be injurious. Other baking powders have no alum in them. No man dares spread that information from his own analysis for fear of an action for libel; but the public have a right to know whether baking powder is pure.

I had a young man write me the other day. He was using a tooth powder and he wanted pure precipitated chalk. He thought from the feeling of this tooth powder that it had a little grit in it, sand, and so on, and he wrote to the department and wanted that information. They put him off and said that was not their business.

So also with reference to drugs. Take the case of tonics. They tell the percentage of alcohol, but they do not tell the other matter in those drugs, and I think people are entitled to know. I do not think it ought to be done without regulation or without notice to the parties who are selling the article on the market. I think even as to beer they ought to have the right to know whether it is made of malt and hops or made of something else.

I am speaking of what is fair. The Secretary of Agriculture would make regulations which would prevent harm to any business, but I think the public has a right to know through the investigations of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of Chemistry what they are getting in the way of foods and drugs.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I think all the preparations containing opiates have marked upon them the amount of opium which they contain as well as the amount of alcohol.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That is true as to opium and alcohol, but I do not think it is true as to the other contents. I do not know whether they would want the Secretary of Agriculture to make that public.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is true as to narcotics, that the narcotic ingredient is stated.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I do not know whether they would want to give information as to all those things; but speaking of spice again, I think people are entitled to know whether they are getting spice or starch, and I think the Secretary of Agriculture could do a good work in simply giving information as to what is in the things that are sold, and that information would make unnecessary a great deal of the rather tyrannical work that is done under what is called the pure food and drugs act in determining whether articles are injurious. I want people to have the right to know whether articles of food or drugs are adulterated or not, as well as whether they are injurious.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. On its face apparently this amendment is very innocent and harmless, but in its final analysis I want to call the attention of the committee to what it may mean to our country and to our Treasury. If you will notice the language, it says:

And communicating to any person the analysis of any food or drug product.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Under proper regulations.

Mr. BLANTON. But think of communicating to any person in the United States who calls on the Secretary of Agriculture. We have 110,000,000 people in the United States. Any one of them able to write a letter can send some kind of a commodity to the Secretary of Agriculture if it comes within the designation of foods or drugs and ask him to make an analysis of it whether there is any reason for it or not. How many extra employees would that require to give all the information?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Will not the regulations take care of that? And as to the furnishing of the information, it could be done by a published bulletin, or it could be addressed to the man himself. There is an "or" in the amendment. It says the Secretary may either communicate to the person or publish.

Mr. BLANTON. There are hundreds of different kinds of canned goods. There are hundreds of different kinds of food products. There are hundreds of different kinds of drug products concerning any of which any individual could then write to the Secretary of Agriculture asking for an analysis. There is no restriction at all in this amendment. The Secretary could not make fish of one and flesh of another and fowl of another. He would have to treat them all alike, if there is any justice in this proposition, and every Tom, Dick, and Harry could go into the department and ask to have some product analyzed, and the department would have to do it, and it would require experts to pass upon the many requests. Every time you employ one of these experts you have to pay him a big salary.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Would it satisfy the gentleman if I changed the words "any person" to "such person as the Secretary may deem proper"?

Mr. BLANTON. No; and I will tell you why. Then the big manufacturers and business men would take advantage of this amendment by making the Government do their research work. Not far outside of the city of St. Louis, as you go in on the Pennsylvania Railroad, you will see the big laboratory for which Libby & Co. have had to expend thousands of dollars. Instead of maintaining laboratories like that, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey would see that some of his big manufacturers would send down here and get information from the Secretary of Agriculture for which they are now paying their own experts; and then when the little farmer from New Jersey wrote to the Secretary there would be discrimination. I say this amendment in its final analysis might cost this Government $100,000,000 a year in expenses if we really carried out the purpose of the words of the amendment as it is written, because it says any person is entitled at any time with reference to any kind of commodity that comes within the term "food or drugs" to write to the Secretary of Agriculture and have him make an expert chemical analysis of it and give it to him either privately or publicly. I say I do not believe the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey wants that done. Here is what has happened. One of his constituents has written the Secretary of Agriculture on some private matter and asked him to give him a chemical analysis and the Secretary has refused. It has made his constituent angry, and he has written the distinguished gentleman, and, just as is always the case, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey is right on the floor here attending to his people's business. He is one of the Members always here; he is alert and faithful, and he is not going to let his constituents in New Jersey be turned down by the Secretary of Agriculture, and therefore he has attempted to put this amendment on the bill. But the amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PARKER of New Jersey) there were 5 ayes and 25 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collaboration with other departments of the Government desiring chemical investigations and whose heads request the Secretary of Agriculture for such assistance, and for other miscellaneous work, $14,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Forest Service, $6,583,582.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, the next paragraph of this bill is very important and there are several important amendments to be offered, and I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.]. Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Fairchild	Lee, N. Y.	Rossdale
Ackerman	Fairfield	Lehlbach	Rucker
Almon	Faust	Lineberger	Ryan
Ansorge	Fenn	Linthicum	Sabath
Anthony	Fields	Little	Sanders, Ind.
Arentz	Focht	Logan	Sanders, N. Y.
Aswell	Fordney	Longworth	Sandlin
Bacharach	Frear	Luce	Schall
Bankhead	Free	Luhring	Scott, Mich.
Barbour	Freeman	Lyon	Scott, Tenn.
Barkley	French	McArthur	Sears
Beedy	Frothingham	McClintic	Shaw
Bell	Fulmer	McCormick	Shreve
Bixler	Gallivan	McDuffie	Siegel
Blakeney	Garrett, Tenn.	McFadden	Sinclair
Bland, Ind.	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Sisson
Bland, Va.	Gensman	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Slemp
Boies	Gernerd	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, Idaho
Bond	Gifford	McSwain	Smith, Mich.
Bowers	Glynn	MacGregor	Smithwick
Brand	Goldsborough	Maloney	Snell
Brennan	Goodykoontz	Mansfield	Snyder
Britten	Gorman	Mapes	Sproul
Brooks, Ill.	Gould	Mead	Stafford
Brown, Tenn.	Graham, Pa.	Merritt	Stedman
Browne, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	Michaelson	Steenerson
Bulwinkle	Griest	Mills	Stiness
Burdick	Griffin	Montague	Stoll
Burke	Hammer	Moore, Ill.	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ohio	Sullivan
Butler	Hawes	Morgan	Sumners, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayden	Morin	Sweet
Byrns, Tenn.	Hays	Mott	Tague
Campbell, Kans.	Henry	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Cannon	Herrick	Nelson, Me.	Taylor, Colo.
Cantrill	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, N. J.
Carew	Hickey	Norton	Taylor, Tenn.
Chalmers	Hoch	O'Brien	Ten Eyck
Chandler, Okla.	Hogan	O'Connor	Thomas
Chindblom	Hooker	Ogden	Thompson
Christopherson	Huck	Oliver	Thorpe
Clague	Hudspeth	Olpp	Tillman
Clark, Fla.	Hukriede	Osborne	Tilson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hull	Overstreet	Tincher
Classon	Humphreys, Miss.	Paige	Tinkham
Clouse	Husted	Park, Ga.	Towner
Cockran	Hutchinson	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Codd	Jacoway	Parker, N. Y.	Tucker
Cole, Ohio	James	Patterson, Mo.	Underhill
Collins	Jefferis, Nebr.	Patterson, N. J.	Upshaw
Connally, Tex.	Johnson, Miss.	Paul	Vaile
Connolly, Pa.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Perlman	Vare
Cooper, Ohio	Jones, Pa.	Petersen	Vestal
Copley	Kahn	Porter	Vinson
Coughlin	Kearns	Pou	Voigt
Crago	Keller	Pringey	Volk
Crisp	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell	Walters
Crowther	Kelly, Pa.	Radcliffe	Ward, N. Y.
Cullen	Kennedy	Rainey, Ala.	Ward, N. C.
Dallinger	Kiess	Rainey, Ill.	Watson
Davis, Minn.	Kindred	Ramseyer	Weaver
Deal	King	Ransley	Wheeler
Dempsey	Kirkpatrick	Rayburn	White, Me.
Dominick	Kitchin	Reber	Williams, Tex.
Doughton	Kleczka	Reece	Wilson
Drane	Kline, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	Wingo
Drewry	Kline, Pa.	Reed, W. Va.	Winslow
Driver	Knight	Rhodes	Wise
Dunbar	Knutson	Riddick	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kreider	Riordan	Woods, Va.
Dyer	Kunz	Robertson	Woodyard
Echols	Langley	Robsion	Wyant
Edmonds	Larson, Minn.	Rodenberg	Young
Elliott	Layton	Rose	Zihlman
Ellis	Lee, Ga.	Rosenbloom	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, and finding itself without a quorum he had directed the roll to be called; that 120 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Bureau of Soils, $358,975.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to suggest to the majority leader that the best thing to do would be to take a recess until next Wednesday, and on Wednesday take a recess until the following Wednesday. We are just wasting time here. It is evident that we will be doing nothing but calling the roll next week, and I do not see why the record of those who have been regular in their attendance should be spoiled by having it appear that they have failed to answer to their names next week.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not the gentleman expect to be here next week?

Mr. LONDON. I expect to come here on Wednesday, in order to make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, the gentleman does not want to be here next week, and therefore he does not want roll calls without his being present. That is the fact, is it?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am satisfied that there will be no further roll calls until the time when the gentleman from Minnesota concludes to rise this evening, and I think we will make excellent progress.

Mr. LONDON. I know, but I think you will find yourselves in the same situation to-morrow. Somebody will make a motion to amend an appropriation item by adding 67 cents, will be disgruntled because it is not agreed to, and will make the point of no quorum.

Mr. MONDELL. When we reach a serious controversy, if we do reach one, a little later, we will rise. In the meantime we are making very good progress.

Mr. LONDON. I think we will do no business at all next week.

The Clerk read as follows:

PREVENTING SPREAD OF MOTHS.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects; by introducing and establishing the parasites and natural enemies of these insects and colonizing them within the infested territory; by establishing and maintaining a quarantine against further spread in such manner as is provided by the general nursery-stock law, approved August 20, 1912, as amended, entitled "An act to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movements of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes," in cooperation with the authorities of the different States concerned and with the several State experiment stations, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $531,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481 and had come to no resolution thereon.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13559; Rept. No. 1315) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and, together with the report thereon, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserves all points of order on the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I desire to pursue my discussion of the subject of immigration, which was injected into the consideration of the Agricultural bill this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I very greatly regret that under the circumstances I feel I must object. I have so frequently objected to requests of that sort from the other side that, in fairness, I must object now. I think during the consideration of the Agricultural bill to-morrow the gentleman will probably have an opportunity to

discuss the matter, and then there will be general debate upon the Interior bill following that.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. If I could have assurance that I might have time to-morrow, I would withdraw my request. I would like to discuss the matter during the consideration of the present measure.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] is present, and I think he can assure the gentleman he will have time in general debate.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure that we will have any time to-morrow for general debate.

Mr. MONDELL. I mean when the bill is taken up.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that that will be the case.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MANN.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, January 14, 1923, be set apart for the holding of memorial exercises in honor of our lately deceased colleague, Mr. JAMES R. MANN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askell;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case;

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening, in connection with lands opened or restored to entry, to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. I make that request in order that we may conclude the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill in committee at a reasonably early hour to-morrow. I think no other business will be taken up after that bill is disposed of.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Do I understand that the gentleman does not object to my request for unanimous consent?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I shall have to object to the gentleman's request to address the House at the beginning of the session for 15 minutes. I think the gentleman will have no difficulty in finding time to make his statement to-morrow, but in just that form I should have to object to his request in order to be fair to other gentlemen who have been denied similar requests.

Mr. CRAMTON. Would the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming indicate that in no event will the Interior bill be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. I doubt if we could take the Interior bill up until late, and therefore I do not think that would be wise. I presume that the gentleman from Michigan does not desire to do that.

If we get through this bill at an early hour, I would like very much to take up the other bill, but I think it will take some time to conclude the consideration of this bill. To-morrow is Saturday and there is no doubt some Christmas shopping is still to be done.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Wyoming whether he has consulted with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not, but the suggestion was made to me by gentlemen on your side.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman just state the reason why we ought to be driven under whip and spur here on Christmas Eve?

Mr. MONDELL. We are not driving under whip and spur, it seems to me. We are meeting a little earlier in order that we may not be driven.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Surely a man is entitled to a little time to buy his children a wagon or make some preparation for the occasion. The gentleman has arranged a program here that will keep us in session all of next week.

Mr. MONDELL. Not until Wednesday. Wagons will have been bought and will be in use before that time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. They will be repairing the wagon on Wednesday.

Mr. MONDELL. I expect to have such a job on hand.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not think the gentleman ought to push us so hard. It occurs to me our regular meeting hour is bad enough on a day which is really Christmas Eve.

Mr. MONDELL. May I again suggest that the request I have made came from the gentleman's side of the House.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will this bill come to a final vote to-morrow?

Mr. MONDELL. The bill is not to be voted on in the House to-morrow.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But the statement was made——

Mr. MONDELL. We contemplate complete consideration in the Committee.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Do I understand the request carries with it the agreement that the bill is not to be voted on to-morrow.

Mr. MONDELL. That agreement was made this afternoon.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It has been made in the Committee but not in the House.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, it is a gentlemen's agreement and it will be followed, whether made in one place or the other.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I did not hear it; I was out answering roll calls.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTION.

Resolved, That JOHN PAUL, Member of Congress from the seventh district of Virginia, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committees of the House as follows: The Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Labor.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on the subject of refugees which was discussed by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, myself, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent—

Mr. EVANS was granted leave of absence until January 10, 1923, on account of business.

Mr. MORGAN was granted leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ was granted leave of absence until January 10, on account of personal matters.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. SPEARS was granted leave of absence for three days, on account of death.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, December 23, 1922, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

852. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to expend $35,000 from the funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma for the purpose of paving portions of streets and alleys adjoining Osage tribal property within the incorporated town of Pawhuska, Okla. (H. Doc. No. 518); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 12777. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the cities of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and East Grand Forks, Minn., or either of them, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Red River of the North; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 13271. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1313). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 13397. A bill repealing so much of an act approved September 22, 1922, granting pension to certain soldiers and sailors and their widows, as grants a pension of $24 per month to Carl Olsen, late of the United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee of Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13356) granting an increase of pension to Hyram Colwell, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 13550) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Elephant Butte irrigation district, of New Mexico, and the El Paso County improvement district No. 1, of Texas, for the carrying out of the provisions of the convention between the United States and Mexico proclaimed January 16, 1907, and providing for compensation therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 13551) authorizing officers who were retired for incapacity resulting from an incident of the service before July 1, 1922, to be given the same pay, according to longevity, as if retired after June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 13552) to extend the provisions of the Federal highway act to Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LEATHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13553) to authorize the temporary reserving and setting apart certain public lands for experiments in sheep growing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13554) authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a dam and other structures across or in the Potomac River at or near Williamsport, Washington County, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13555) to provide for the publication of the code of the laws of the United States, with an index, parallel reference tables, and an appendix thereto; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 13556) to increase the efficiency of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 13557) to provide for the erection of a public building on ground already acquired at Liberty, in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13558) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Cameron, Mo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 416) to permit the admission of certain aliens in excess of quotas and to be charged to the quota for the fiscal year 1924, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 13560) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. Warren; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 13561) providing for the examination and survey of Manhasset Bay, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 13562) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Sage; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 13563) providing for the examination and survey of Black Lake, Mich.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13564) granting a pension to William B. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 13565) granting a pension to Hannah Dougherty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 13566) for the relief of Erve W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 13567) granting a pension to Jennie M. Bond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 13568) for the relief of Nancy Stubbs Swanson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 13569) granting a pension to William L. Delow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13570) granting a pension to Gilbert J. Lalonde; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6670. By Mr. ATKESON: Petition of Charles B. Vickers and 51 other residents of the sixth district of Missouri, favoring the abolition of discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6671. By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, indorsing the attitude of Hon. Harry M. Daugherty, Attorney General, in his effort to secure under the law the protection of life and property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6672. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the New York State Canners' Association, Rochester, N. Y., favoring a liberalization of the immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6673. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of the Humboldt County Historical Society, Eureka, Calif., favoring erection of a national archives building in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

6674. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Arnold Lueck and others, of Edmunds, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6675. Also, petition of W. K. Taylor and others, of Fessenden, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6676. Also, petition of G. E. Bush, hardware merchant, and others, of Oakes, N. Dak., to abolish discriminatory tax on

small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6677. Also, petition of Mr. J. I. Hegge and 45 others, of Maddock, N. Dak., petitioning for the enactment of emergency legislation to stabilize the price of farm products to a level more nearly equal to the price that the farmer has to pay for articles which he purchases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *December 23, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the angels' song of peace and good will to men, and we long for the time when that peace and good will shall be realized in human hearts and lives, that men shall understand one another and man to man be true as a brother. We long to see the time when war and its desolating and destructive influences shall cease and nations shall learn war no more. O for the coming of those thousand years pledged.

And we do ask Thee that this day our hearts may be gladdened by the thought that each one of us can be the minister of peace and good will to tried and sad hearts, as well as to the children and youth of our day. We ask in Christ Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Overhue, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines;

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askeli;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case;

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary;

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing a preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is in receipt of a communication from the Governor of the State of Connecticut, transmitting the certificate of election of GEORGE P. MCLEAN as a Senator of the United States for the term beginning March 4, 1923, which will be read and placed on file.

The certificate was read and ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, GEORGE P. MCLEAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Connecticut a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Everett J. Lake, and our seal hereto affixed at Hartford, this 20th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

EVERETT J. LAKE, *Governor.*
DONALD J. WARNER, *Secretary.*

SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was absent from the Senate Chamber yesterday, and he may be absent for several days. He was called away on a message informing him of the serious illness of a member of his family. He wished me to announce his absence in the event a vote was taken. I believe there was no vote taken yesterday, but as unanimous consent was asked and agreed to, to which possibly he might have objected had he been present, I wish the RECORD to show his necessary absence on yesterday, and the reason for it.

DEFLATION POLICY OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Wall Street Journal addressed 12 questions to me regarding the deflation policy of the Federal Reserve Board. I answered those questions, and the questions and answers have been printed in the Wall Street Journal. I ask to have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in 8-point type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SENATOR HEFLIN REPLIES.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY.
October 3, 1922.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for printing in the Wall Street Journal of September 26, my letter to you of September 12, in which I believe I exploded the claim of ex-Governor Harding of the Federal Reserve Board, which had been printed in your columns, that:

"The Federal reserve banks in acquiring building sites and constructing bank buildings were making capital expenditures, consequently these operations do not diminish in any way the amount of franchise taxes payable to the United States Government."

I gave you figures which showed that the reserve banks had for the years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 charged off over $10,000,000 for alleged depreciation in bank buildings, most of which were as yet unfinished, and had also charged against net earnings about $4,000,000 more for furniture, equipment, vaults, etc.; but my statement was over-conservative, for I omitted important "charge offs" in the calendar year 1921, which would have brought the total of such charges against net earnings and profits up to more than $15,500,000. As a result of those bookkeeping entries the Federal Government was plainly robbed of many millions of dollars to which it was entitled, despite ex-Governor Harding's unwarranted assertion that the cost of land and buildings were "capital expenditures" and that "these operations do not diminish in any way" the franchise taxes due the Government.

You suggest that—

"Granting that the outlays for land and new buildings were right, sound banking and bookkeeping made these depreciation charge offs against earnings equally proper."

I know of no one who can defend the monstrous outlays which I and others criticized and condemned or who can show that either the expenditure or the charge offs were "proper." The absurdity and unfairness of the reserve bank methods of escaping payment to the Government of franchise taxes was well illustrated in the case of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, which purchased property in 1918 at a cost of $2,938,000, declared in the annual report for the same year that the old buildings were "not regarded as being of any value," but before the new buildings were completed the bank had charged off for alleged "depreciation" the sum of $3,024,062, a portion of which was charged against net earnings and a portion charged against "supersurplus."

BANK OF ENGLAND'S SITE.

I note your excuse that the "Bank of England" has written down to all its valuable site in the city of London; but this has been done in the course of 100 years or more, and let me remind you that the expenditures in connection with the New York Reserve Bank's banking edifices have been on such a scale that I understand that the amount paid out for commissions, fees, rake-offs of one kind or another to "architects, contractors, and engineers" in connection with that building exceed the total cost of both land and buildings of the great Bank of England, that classic structure so familiar to the banking world.

You ask that I answer for you 12 questions which you print, and I am pleased to comply with your request.

"First. Under the bank act, with limitation of dividends, are not the surplus earnings of the Federal reserve banks in effect the property of the people?"

Ninety per cent of the surplus earnings of the reserve banks, after the payment of 6 per cent dividends, belongs to the Government, are "in effect the property of the people," and when those earnings are reduced by extravagance and by improper bookkeeping entries the people are robbed.

"Second. Is not the main function of the Federal reserve system the sound underpinning of the whole financial structure?"

The main functions of the reserve system are to provide a scientific and effectual mobilization of bank reserves; to furnish a safe and elastic circulating medium; to furnish credit to member banks for the legitimate needs of those banks; and the country's business of all kinds impartially and promptly. If those banks are to have an "underpinning" of extravagance, extortion, favoritism, and incompetency, instead of being supported on the foundation stones of frugality, conservatism, impartiality, and broad statesmanship, the system is doomed.

REAL ESTATE AGAINST RENT.

"Third. Is it not sounder financial building to put surplus banking earnings into building construction, if rental charges against expenses are thereby reduced, than to use them in National Government expenditures?"

It is sound policy within certain limitations for a bank to own its banking house and thereby reduce its rental charges. But the official records show that no such excuse can be offered to justify the stupendous extravagance displayed by the reserve banks in the cases under discussion. This question is further covered in my anwer to your question No. 10.

"Fourth. Can you divide the capital and accumulated surplus of an institution and say which part has been put into the construction of a building except as a matter of bookkeeping?"

The Reserve Bank of New York in December, 1919, when the preliminary contract was given to contractors for its palatial banking quarters (originally estimated to cost about $30,000,000 and by subsequent estimate, in March, 1921, as shown in board's report to Senate October 31, 1921, reduced to $25,646,000), reported its paid-in capital at $22,387,000, and its surplus at that time, arising from the change in the Federal reserve act which enabled a reserve bank to accumulate a surplus equal to 200 per cent of its paid-in capital before paying franchise taxes to the Government, was $32,229,000. The cost of the building which it was proceeding to erect was therefore equivalent to 115 per cent of its capital, or approximately 50 per cent of the combined capital and surplus. It is immaterial whether the amount invested in banking houses is assigned to capital or to surplus.

"Fifth. Is not the substitution of building construction for rents a sound underpinning for the whole financial structure?"

The substitution of building construction for rents is not sound but a very rotten "underpinning" for the financial structure, when the yearly cost or output for its banking house is multiplied 500 per cent and more by such expenditure, and when these additional costs may involve impairment of the bank's surplus, if not of its capital. Some of the reserve banks, I am informed, are already operating at a deficit and are not making their dividends as a result of their gross extravagance, reckless management, and reduced earnings.

A QUESTION OF SERVICE.

"Sixth: Is not the soundness of the Federal reserve system, the increase of its facilities and abilities to serve the public, and the reduction of rental charges against earnings in the interest of the people and their business?

If a reduction of rental charges against earnings is "in the interest of the people and their business," the converse of that proposition suggests that such a reckless increase in housing costs as has been exposed may be regarded as distinctly against the public interest.

"Seventh: Is it anything more than a question of business judgment as to the proportion of capital or income that shall be put into buildings?"

The monstrous expenditures which have been sanctioned and are now under way, for the erection of banking palaces for some of the reserve banks, have been on such a scale that not the "judgment" but the good faith and sanity of the men who have authorized and directed some of these expenditures has been seriously brought into question. A doctor whose "judgment" impelled him to administer a dozen grains of strychnine to a patient, when only a small fraction of a grain was justified, would probably be either hung or sent to an insane asylum.

A leading and distinguished citizen of one of our large eastern cities recently declared in regard to these exposures concerning the reserve banks:

"If you think the Tweed Ring in their days and ways was any comparison with the Federal Reserve Board transaction, you misapprehend the size.

"I lived in those days, and I remember their sensations, which were tame when compared with these.

"If only the same men who got after Tweed could get after these, they would prove an ornament to the generation and have a life estate that would perpetuate the recollections.

"Then the sufferance was in one State, confined to the city of New York; now the dominion is vast, broadcast throughout the United States."

I am told that the money which it was planned to spend on the banking quarters of the New York Reserve Bank was twice as much as the "Tweed Ring" was charged with squandering in connection with the construction of the old notorious county court house in New York City.

WHO IS THE LOSER?

"Eighth. Might it not better be assumed that what is paid in taxes by the Federal reserve system is lost to the people and its Federal reserve system than to declare that building sites and bank buildings are 'actual losses which the Government has sustained?'"

It might be assumed, but it would be a false assumption. Every dollar of franchise taxes paid into the Treasury by the reserve banks reduces to that extent the amount of taxes to be paid by the people.

When money which would otherwise go into the Public Treasury is squandered on big palaces owned by the banks and not by the Government the Government is plainly the loser.

"Ninth. How can the Government or the people sustain an 'actual loss' by the substitution of construction for expenditure?"

The people did, for example, sustain an actual loss of over $6,000,000 when a few reserve banks charged against the expenses for alleged "depreciation" in bank buildings, not yet completed, over $7,000,000, over 90 per cent of which, or, say, $6,000,000, would have been paid into the Federal Treasury as franchise taxes. The Government has been deprived of millions more by their unwarranted charges made against earnings by the bank.

The people of this country also consider that the Government was unjustifiably deprived of revenues, and that public moneys were squandered when the 12 reserve banks increased their salary lists from $4,768,449 in 1918 to $19,478,250 in 1921. The board's report to the Senate also shows that one of these banks—the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—raised the salaries of about one-half of its 40 officers to more than 500 per cent of the aggregate of the salaries which they were receiving immediately before, or at the time of, their first employment by the reserve system. The official reports show that the salary of one of those 40 officers was raised to 757 per cent of the salary received immediately before employment by the reserve bank. Another was raised to 733 per cent; two more were raised to 694 per cent; and two other officers were advanced to 520 per cent of their old pay. Another was jumped to 454 per cent, and still another to 480 per cent of the salary which he was receiving about the time of his first employment by the bank. The record of a young man, originally employed by the reserve system at $3,600 as a law clerk, who was without practical banking experience, never having been employed by any bank as far as I can learn before going to the Reserve Bank of New York, but who had, in addition to his legal work, been frequently used by the Reserve Board as a lobbyist at the Capitol, was not long since rewarded by being made deputy governor of the New York reserve banks at a salary of $25,000 a year.

BETTER TO BUILD THAN SPEND.

"Tenth. Is it not better for an institution as well as an individual to build rather than to spend—to substitute a home for rents?"

According to the reserve board's reports to Congress, the total amount paid in rents in 1918 by four of the reserve banks, when business in their most important departments was far

larger than it is now, or than it is likely to be for years to come, was $262,879, and in 1920, when rents were generally at their maximum, those same banks paid $590,109 for rents. Do you suggest that it is better and more economical to substitute for annual rentals of $262,879, or even $590,109, the expenditure of $49,878,914, which the board authorized those four particular banks to squander on their banking palaces upon which city taxes (if taxed at cost) and upkeep are alone estimated at over $1,500,000 a year, and the interest on the money so locked up at only 3 per cent per annum would amount to over $1,500,000 additional? If the business interests of the country generally should be conducted on any such basis as that, the country would soon become bankrupt. The money employed in those buildings would not have been taxable if loaned out on commercial or agricultural paper.

"Eleventh. Are not the post-office buildings a proper charge against postal receipts?"

No. Under our laws the Postmaster General could not use as much as $25,000 of post-office receipts to build a post office in any town or city, however greatly it might be needed, without special act of Congress. But until the reserve act was changed last winter—and I helped to have it changed—the reserve board and the reserve banks could spend any amount they pleased on banking palaces, and did actually authorize the expenditure of $25,646,410 for banking quarters for the Reserve Bank of New York alone. Furthermore, preliminary contracts for the monument of extravagance were let in December, 1919, about the very time that the New York Reserve Bank, as the records show, was borrowing from other reserve banks in different parts of the country over $100,000,000, and about the time that the Federal Reserve Board actually suspended its reserve requirements to aid the New York Reserve Bank, which in making huge loans to big speculative institutions had, in the opinion of conservative and well-informed bankers, trampled upon the most elementary precepts of prudence and sound banking. I can furnish particulars, if you want them for the information of the public.

"Twelfth. Does Senator HEFLIN approve of the post office paying large rents to private owners of property or running in debt for building construction? If not, is there any other prudent course to pursue than building construction and amortization of the cost from earnings?"

That depends upon circumstances and upon your definition of "large." Rentals of even $590,109 for four banks certainly and very obviously would not justify an expenditure of $49,878,914 for new buildings in order to avoid the payment of that rental.

I have answered frankly and, I think, fully the 12 questions which you propounded to me and printed in your columns of September 23, and I will thank you to publish my reply at your earliest convenience.

J. THOS. HEFLIN.

AN INJUSTICE TO THE SOUTH.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on Thursday the Senate confirmed the nomination of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and the nominations of certain members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that south of the line drawn from Baltimore to San Francisco, which embraces the entire South and one-half of the country, there is no member on the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and other commissions. I do not refer to this matter in any partisan or sectional spirit. I am sure that the Senators know that I have never uttered one word since I have been a Member of this body that would lead to partisan or sectional debate. I have given all my time to the important work of the Senate.

During the last administration I protested against the injustice done the South in the matter of these appointments. I do not expect the South to get many desirable political appointments, except those purely local, under this administration, and I have not tried in any way to influence the appointments for these positions nor do I intend to. I realize that the most desirable positions are given to the States which furnished votes for the election of President Harding, but I do think that on account of the conditions peculiar to our section we should have just representation on the Supreme Court, Interstate Commerce Commission, and other commissions.

The Supreme Court is the very foundation stone of our Government, and every section, regardless of politics, should have its fair representation. The commercial conditions in the South are different from other sections, and it is all the more important that we should have representation on the Interstate Commerce Commission, which fixes the rates for freight and passengers.

Until two years ago, when I joined several Senators and succeeded in getting the rates lowered from the Southeast, the railroad rates fixed by the commission from the Middle West to the southeastern ports were higher than to the eastern ports and discriminated against the Southeast. We protested against this injustice, and the commission lowered the rates to make them fair to all sections.

The South is discriminated against in the matter of ocean freight rates on cotton and other products. I have urged, and will continue to urge, that this injustice to the South be remedied. I have discussed this matter with several Senators on the other side of the Chamber—Republicans—and they agree that it is a great injustice to the South and should not remain so.

The South has for years been taxed many millions annually by the protective tariff. Our principal production, cotton, is exported and received no protection from the Government, while we must compete with the pauper labor of the world in producing it.

Our country has suffered in many ways from such injustice on the part of our Government. I am proud of the fact that there is no more loyal section of the United States than in all the territory I have referred to from the Potomac to the Rio Grande. It is the one section of our country where the President of the United States can go without any secret agents or bodyguards to protect him, and he is absolutely safe from all harm and danger, no matter what his politics may be.

In the Spanish-American War—I hope I may be pardoned for referring to the fact—Georgia, the State I have the honor in part to represent, sent more soldiers to the war, compared with her population, than any State in the Union. In the World War our section certainly did its full duty and always will. The danger to this country in the future will not come from the South, but from other sections.

Mr. President, I am sure that the records made by southern men in these important positions met with the approval of all the people of our entire country regardless of politics. To-day in the South there are men suitable for these positions who are the equal of Justice L. Q. C. Lamar, Chief Justice White, Justice Joseph R. Lamar, and others who made such a splendid record as members of the Supreme Court, and it is conceded by all that Judson C. Clements was one of the ablest and best men who ever served on the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Some days ago I wrote President Harding a letter, which I asked to be placed in the RECORD, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, November 29, 1922.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to request your consideration of the vast section known as the South in connection with the appointments being made to fill vacancies on the United States Supreme Court and various Federal commissions. Recently two appointments have been made to the Supreme Court by naming citizens from Utah and Minnesota.

I have no desire to present any appeal from a sectional standpoint, but I feel that the people of the South should have representation on some of the courts and commissions through citizens who have a knowledge of their customs, needs, and economic relations to the whole country.

It is my information that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have a single commissioner in its membership who comes from the entire section south of a straight line drawn from Maryland to California. The Federal Trade Commission has no member from the southern section.

I do not seek to secure any political consideration for any particular person, and I have no aspirants to suggest, but I know you will agree with me that the South can furnish splendid men with excellent knowledge of governmental and public affairs.

With high esteem, I am, very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM J. HARRIS.

GREAT PEE DEE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, S. C., and I submit a report (No. 963) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL] to the bill.

Mr. DIAL. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment was to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the counties of Marlboro and Darlington be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Great Pee Dee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and at or near Society Hill, in Darlington County, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE COTTON-GROWING INDUSTRY.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning contains an article from the Associated Press giving the amount of cotton exported for the month of November, and the amount consumed by the spinners of the United States for that month. The total exportation and home consumption amounts to 1,435,878 bales of cotton. At this rate of consumption by our spinners and including also the amount of exports, it would require nearly 2,000,000 bales of cotton more than the Government says the present crop will be. The Government estimates that the present crop will be less than 10,000,000 bales.

Texas is the largest cotton-producing State in the Union, and the commissioner of agriculture of that State has said that it costs about 25 cents a pound to produce the present crop for the State of Texas. I submit in the face of the fact that we have a crop too small to meet the world's demands, and in the face of the fact that it costs 25 cents a pound to produce it, that three-fourths of this crop has already gone out of the hands of the producer at a price less than 25 cents a pound. Much of it has been sold at unprofitable prices to the producer. There is only about one-fourth of it remaining in the hands of the producers and the price is now about 26 cents a pound.

There is no justification or excuse for the present price. The bear speculators are in control of the market and they are depressing the price and by their manipulation holding the price down which to-day, if the law of supply and demand was permitted to operate, would be 30 cents a pound and above.

I simply wanted to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate and the country so that they may know of this deplorable situation. Something has got to be done to enable the farmer of the South to produce cotton at a profit. If he had to-day a credit system under which he could borrow money on his cotton and hold it off the market, he could force the price up to 30 cents a pound. He could force it to a figure that would yield a profit. But not having a credit system responsive to the needs of agriculture he is at the mercy of the bear gamblers of Wall Street, who are to-day forcing cotton out of his hands at a price barely covering the cost of production, and after they get the cotton into their hands it will go to 30 cents a pound and perhaps higher. The speculator and foreign spinner will reap the benefit while the producer is robbed of the fruits of his toil. Senators, this situation is outrageous and indefensible. Something must be done before this Congress adjourns to free our distressed cotton producers from the clutches of market crooks and bear speculators. The business of the cotton producer must be put upon a sound and prosperous basis.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

A bill (S. 4230) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Boulder, Colo.; and

A bill (S. 4231) authorizing the acquirement of a site and the construction of a building for a post office at Brighton, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

STATISTICS OF FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce came over from the House a short time ago with some minor amendments, and I intended to move to concur in those amendments, but the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] desired that the bill go to conference, so that he could investigate it. He made the investigation and has no objection to it. So the conference report was returned to the Senate. The House has acted upon it, and I ask that the conference report may be acted upon at this time.

The report was read and agreed to as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

W. L. JONES,
KNUTE NELSON,
DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. W. FORDNEY,
W. R. GREEN,
W. C. HAWLEY,
JNO. N. GARNER,
J. W. COLLIER,
Managers on the part of the House.

THE CHRISTMAS SPIRIT.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Christmas season is at hand and we are about to adjourn for the observance of Christmas Day. On that subject, I have a brief article from the Christian Observer, of Louisville. In this time of strife, contention, and unrest all over the world, when everybody is seeking peace and contentment and so many are not finding those things, I believe this to be an appropriate time to read the article in question, as expressive of a true sense of appreciation of the spirit of the occasion and as pointing the only true path to peace and remedy for unrest. With the indulgence of the Senate I shall read it:

CHRISTMAS—THE PINNACLE OF THE YEAR.

"Christmas is the pinnacle of the year. No normal heart in a land of light can completely escape the contagion of the Christmas spirit. Society, business, church, and home—all come under the spell of its mystic power. Like a great white flower, rich with foliage red and green, the Christmas season bursts through the snows of midwinter and fills the land with the fragrance of kindliness and with the beauty of happiness.

"There is a bit of magic in the air on Christmas Day. There is something that makes folk smile, whether they are wont to smile or not. There is unheard music that throbs in people's very pulses and warms their hearts and gladdens their countenances. There seems to be a bit more of Heaven in the earth. Yes, that is just it—there is more of Heaven in the earth! The Babe of Bethlehem is in the thoughts of men, and the angels' song is echoing in their ears. Let the joy bells ring!

"The birth of the blessed Jesus compels humanity's acclaim. The angels could not be silent when the manger of Bethlehem cradled Him; neither can men be silent when the circling year brings round the season of His advent. With shepherds and Magi and heavenly heralds, we must burst into praise. 'For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.' Mankind's chiefest need is the need of a Prince. Humanity's most pathetic want is the want of peace. Let the star shine far, and the angels' song be caroled in every land and tongue! For the Virgin's Child is the hope of the world!

"The world needs the Christmas spirit. For the Christmas spirit is a spirit of human brotherhood—'Peace on earth; good will among men!' For 2,000 years the proclamation has echoed in the skies. How long, O Lord, ere it shall echo in the hearts of nations, in the halls of state, and in the parliament of man? Let not hope and courage fail. The war clouds still are red, but the Prince of Peace must triumph. Had the carol of the heavely host found a truer echo in the lives of professing Christians, His coming had not been so long delayed.

"Every community needs the Christmas spirit. For Christmas is a festival of friendship and cheerful generosity. It is the season of God's greatest gift to men. None can enter into the real joy of Christmas without giving. They find the sweetest joy who give to those who can make no return. Such giving partakes most truly of the spirit of Him who gave gifts unto men, and who said, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.'

"Every home needs the spirit of Christmas. For the spirit of Christmas is a spirit of love and tender thoughtfulness; it

is a spirit of self-forgetfulness, and the happy giving of one's self, in gentle ministries, to those with whom one lives. That is the spirit that creates a home. Jesus has taught us the spiritual secrets that make happy home life possible. He has sanctified wedlock and revealed the glory that belongs to childhood. Our ideal of the home has not come out of a king's palace or a lordly mansion, but out of a stable and a carpenter's cot. Christmas is the high carnival of the home. It is the season for sweet reunions and for love's most lavish expressions. It is a season also when homes should be opened to the homeless. Christmas is preeminently the children's festival. It is a day that ought to be filled brimful of joy for every child. But let the joy be sanctified by thoughts of the Holy Child Jesus.

"Thank God for Christmas! Thank Him again for the people who have Christmas in their hearts the whole year round!"

I ask that what I have just read may be printed in the regular RECORD type.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 23, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

COLORADO.

Robert L. Newton, Arvada.
Flossy H. Ritter, Austin.
Joseph A. Measures, Grand Junction.
Ethel M. DeBerry, Keenesburg.
James R. Lysaght, San Acacio.

MICHIGAN.

Marie L. Mottes, Alpha.
Elmer E. Fales, Belding.
Dana Stowell, Comstock Park.
Oscar W. Fowler, Greenville.
Christine Anderson, Holton.
Neil W. Roe, Lake Odessa.
Oscar W. Greenlund, Stambaugh.
Frank R. Church, Stanton.

MONTANA.

Laura P. Johnson, Darby.
Franklin R. Whaley, Fairview.
Malcolm K. Kedzie, Libby.

NEVADA.

Daniel E. Morton, Carson City.
Anna L. Fleming, Jarbidge.
Owen H. Bott, Mason.
George L. Whorton, Yerington.

TEXAS.

Paul B. Mueller, Beeville.
John K. Ford, Bogata.
James S. Mewhinney, Buckholts.
Lou Gammill, Calvert.
Rebecca White, Carbon.
William F. Moore, Kemp.
John L. Dillon, Leonard.
Arthur A. McNeil, Moody.
William Tays, New Braunfels.
Joseph Wren, Normangee.
Gustave Natho, Skidmore.
Ernest G. Langhammer, Somerville.
Evan S. Howell, Stephenville.
James M. Campbell, Strawn.
Hiram H. McGuffey, Three Rivers.
Miles B. Earnheart, Trenton.

UTAH.

Walter O. Lundgreen, Monroe.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *December 23, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Lord, for earth's gladdest day! Thou wilt soon speak Thy deepest note of love! We bless Thee that in the new earth that He shall bring there shall be no hate, and in His Heaven there shall be no cloud. We thank Thee that Thou dost satisfy the hunger-cry of earth. Let the angels' song break forth and flood the unborn years with peace. Give unto all of us the spirit that fulfills the obligations of His mission. Spirit of God, descend upon our whole land and awaken the wearied hearts of men with Christmas cheer and good will. Bind our citizenship together in confidence and create in it strong desires for the things that ennoble our Republic. The Lord bless our President and fill all homes with the sweetest joy. Remember the children, and may they bring to their parents increasing comfort while the days go by. And O the loved ones not at home and far away and the families separated—gather them all beneath the shadow of Thy wing and keep us all strong and pure in the faith of our Heavenly Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PENSIONS—REREFERENCE OF BILLS.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 12157 and the bill H. R. 12545, omnibus pension bills, be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the two bills referred to, omnibus pension bills that are on the calendar, be rereferred to the Committee on Pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed tariff on potash.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that before the recent tariff act became a law and while the bill was still before Congress an attempt was made to impose a small duty on potash imported for fertilizer purposes, to be limited to a period of three years, after which potash was to be placed on the free list.

It is a recognized fact that this country is dependent upon foreign potash for its supply for fertilizer uses, and that the producers in Germany and France practically have a monopoly of this business. This situation was brought home to American farmers with bitterness and to their great cost during the World War, and led to various experiments looking to the establishment of the potash industry in this country with a view to making us independent of the foreign monopoly.

Potash production got under way in America as a result of World War necessities and had already made considerable progress when this tariff duty on potash was proposed. It was not certain that the industry could be developed to that point where it would actually supply all the potash needed in the United States. Some people had doubts that it ever could be, while others were more confident. However, some very eminent authorities believed the experiment was worth trying anyway, and that, even if it did not turn out that we would be able finally to produce all the potash required for our domestic needs, we might succeed in producing enough to hold the foreign monopoly somewhat in check maybe and tend to stabilize the price at a reasonable figure.

At any rate, the tariff duty was to be kept on potash for only three years. If in that time the experiment of domestic production succeeded, well and good; the industry might take care of itself without the tariff after that, and the fact that potash was then to go onto the free list would prevent the establishment of a potash monopoly right here at home in the place of the foreign monopoly it was hoped to escape from by this experiment.

On the other hand, if the experiment did not work the tariff duty would have been imposed for only three years, and would cost the individual farmer very little, comparatively speaking—the average Vermont farmer about 75 cents a year—and agriculture and allied trades would then have definite proof that they had little or nothing to expect from a domestic product—in the immediate future, anyway—and would make plans accordingly. Meanwhile potash would be on the free list.

It was simply the same old common-sense proposition to employ the policy of a protective tariff for the purpose of establishing an American industry that would render the American farmer independent of a foreign monopoly—in one of his necessities, anyway.

Some of us voted for this proposition, but it failed to carry, and potash went onto the free list, leaving the country wholly at the mercy of the foreign potash monopoly.

In view of this fact no doubt the following letter from the Hon. Herbert Hoover, Secretary of Commerce, will be of interest to many people, especially to our farmer neighbors. The news contained in it is only the first whiff from the potash beds of Germany and France since the free traders won out on this item. Here is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 13, 1922.

Hon. FRANK L. GREENE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am pleased to acknowledge your communication of December 11, wherein you ask for verification of information to the effect that potash prices in Germany have increased 250 per cent over the prices of October 1.

In reply you are informed that a cable report received in the Department November 11, 1922, from Commercial Attaché C. E. Herring, at Berlin, stated among other things that "inland potash prices effective November 3 increased approximately 250 per cent over those of October 1."

For your further information I might state that a cable report received a few days ago from Mr. Herring covering the month of November, 1922, advises that German potash prices effective December 1 were approximately 145 per cent higher than those of November 1.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
Secretary of Commerce.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HICKS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13481, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this item carries the sum of $531,000 for the purpose of dealing with the gypsy and brown-tail moths. It has been but a few years since this disease was imported from foreign countries to the Eastern States.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman please state on which page the item is?

Mr. RAKER. On pages 50 and 51, beginning with line 21 on page 50 and ending with line 16 on page 51.

When the legislation was before the Committee on Agriculture a great effort was made to defeat it on the ground that there was about $100,000 worth of equipment all over the East held by foreign importers. In other words, the question of quarantine intervened.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOWELL. Was this paragraph pending last evening?

Mr. RAKER. That is a very legitimate inquiry. The RECORD shows, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph was read last night, and I rose to be recognized. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] moved that the Committee rise, and the Committee rose, and we are now back to the consideration of this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the gentleman from California is entitled to be heard on the item.

Mr. RAKER. Each year there has been expended about this amount by the Federal Government. The State of Massachusetts and the State of New York, I think, have expended a large amount of money for the same purpose.

The only purpose that I have in calling the attention of the committee to this is that it shows what will be done and what can be done by our leniency in permitting foreign infected plants and bulbs to enter the United States, and the large amount of money required to eradicate them after they have once entered. I call particularly to the attention of our good friends from the East the fact that like or similar conditions that destroy the products of the West should be given consideration along with and in connection with the appropriation for the eradication of various diseases and pests in the East, and I therefore trust that when we reach certain items on the next page our friends from the East who are procuring such large appropriations will see that like consideration is extended to the protection of the crops in the various Western States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PREVENTION OF SPREAD OF EUROPEAN CORN BORER.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the spread of the European corn borer and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect throughout the United States, in cooperation with the States concerned, including employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, $200,000: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture $75,000 of this amount shall be available for expenditure only when an equal amount shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, counties, or local authorities, or by individuals or organizations for the accomplishment of such purposes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed over for the present. My colleague [Mr. HAUGEN] has an amendment which he desires to offer to this paragraph, and I make the request because he is not present at the moment. He will be here in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that this paragraph be passed over for the moment without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there are about 20 Members of Congress assembled here to pass this Agricultural appropriation bill. We have already agreed that we will not take the final vote on it until after the holidays. If we are going to pass over a paragraph from time to time to accommodate some particular absent Member, there is no use in holding these men here and keeping them from their Christmas shopping. I object. I think if we are going to pass this bill we ought to pass it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. DOWELL. I make this request, Mr. Chairman, for the reason that my colleague [Mr. HAUGEN] has prepared and desires to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation, I think, some $200,000. I move to strike out, in line 24, page 51, the figures "$200,000" and insert "$400,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DOWELL. I ask this in behalf of my colleague [Mr. HAUGEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOWELL: Page 51, line 24, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$400,000."

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman know whether the Department of Agriculture wants this? I think we ought to give them every dollar they need to fight the corn borer, but if they do not need it, I think it is mere folderol and rot to appropriate more money than they ask for.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman is correct; but my understanding is that this corn borer is spreading very rapidly and that more money is needed than has been appropriated in order to check the spread of the borer. I should like to ask if the

chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ANDERSON] will report the information he has relative to this appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very glad to make a complete statement of the situation in my own time, if the gentleman desires me to do so. I do not care to go into it piecemeal.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Doctor Howard, on page 315 of the hearings before the committee, says:

We ask for no increase there. The European corn borer spread into Rhode Island and Maine this past year and made a slight spread along the southern border of Lake Erie, but the work we are carrying on is the same as last year, and I do not know if you want any further work on it or not.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, this pest has spread into the State of Michigan and other States, and I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee explain the situation, if he will.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very glad to do so. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The statement was made a moment ago that there were only 20 Members present. I want to correct that statement. There are 30 Members present. I have counted them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if there were any likelihood, if, indeed, there were any possibility, of eradicating the corn borer from the United States I would unhesitatingly be in favor of any appropriation, however large, to accomplish that purpose. The situation at present is this: The corn borer came to this country prior to the passage of the plant quarantine act, in a shipment of broom corn from some foreign country, if my recollection is correct. The first infestation was found in the neighborhood of Boston, Mass. It has never been possible to control that infestation, which has now spread to the neighboring States of New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island.

In addition to this infestation there is a smaller one in eastern New York and another larger one in western New York, northern Ohio, and southeastern Michigan, around Lake Erie. The infestation in the vicinity of Boston and in Boston is very intense. There the insect has two broods a year, whereas in the other places it has only one. I may say that in one stage of its life history this corn borer is a moth, and if during the season when it is in that stage there are high winds it spreads to very great distances.

The infestations in and around Lake Erie are very slight indeed, and practically no commercial damage is done there, the infestation amounting to about 1 per cent; that is, a worm in 1 stalk in 100. In addition to infesting corn this worm infests all kinds of hollow-stemmed plants and weeds. In the Boston district the weeds are full of them. It affects certain kinds of hollow-stemmed flowering plants. The consequence is that it is utterly impossible to eradicate it without destroying altogether all vegetation in the district in which it is located, either by gas flames or by chemicals of some sort. The impossibility of eradicating the worm and the insect in a district like Boston, where it infests the garden plots all through the city and the weedy spaces in the vacant lots and in the marshes, is perfectly obvious, and I do not believe there is a single entomologist in the United States of any repute whatever who believes it is possible to eradicate the corn borer from this country; because in addition to burning all vegetation in the district in which it is located it would be necessary to have the complete cooperation of everybody who grows anything in that district.

It has been very difficult to control the spread of the insect in and around Lake Erie because of the light infestation and the small commercial damage, which does not give the farmers the fear that would impel them to adopt the methods and give the cooperation necessary to eradicate the insect there.

There are two or three things which can be done to control the spread of this insect in this country. The first is by quarantine, preventing its spread by commercial shipments of corn or other plants which may be infested.

The second method is by clean-up measures in the cornfields and in the garden patches in the fall of the year, both of the stalks of corn and of the weeds in the fence corners, and so forth; that will destroy a certain proportion of the worms and thus retard the new growths.

The third method is by the introduction of parasites. The Bureau of Entomology is now engaged in a very thorough survey in the sections of Europe where this corn borer is found, studying the parasites with a view of reproducing in this country the complete environment of the corn borer abroad. It infests the corn-growing sections all along the southern Mediterranean, but there the parasites are so numerous that the commercial damage is practically negligible. More than a million of one species of parasites were liberated in this country last year, and it is expected that by the use of parasites in the infested sections of the country it will be possible to control the damage of the insect and in part to control its spread.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Just how does the insect operate, and to what extent does it damage the crops, and has the insect yet gotten into the large corn-growing sections of the country?

Mr. ANDERSON. As I say, in one stage of the life history of this insect or bug it is a sort of grub that infests the corn stalk and sometimes comes up through the end of the ear of corn. It is often confused with the ordinary corn worm that we find in the corn-growing sections of the country. It performs very much like it when it reaches the ear of corn. The commercial damage depends altogether upon the extent of the infestation. If the infestation is very heavy, it is sufficient practically to destroy the utility of the corn altogether, particularly sweet corn.

So far the borer has not reached any of the great corn-growing sections of the country. It has been found two townships west of Detroit, Mich. That is as far west as it has gone. It will probably not infest the corn-growing section of southern Ohio and Indiana, because of the divide there between the rivers running north into the Lakes and the rivers running south into the Ohio. If it should ever get over that divide, for example, if some corn stalks that were infested should be carried over the divide and float down the river toward the Ohio, there might be the possibility of infesting the corn-growing sections there.

Mr. MONDELL. Then, as I understand the gentleman who has given a great deal of study to this question, it is admitted by practically all the students of the habits of this insect and its infestation that it is impossible to entirely eradicate it, and the best that can be done is a reasonable control of it, and that can be done with the appropriation that is made in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. The appropriation as it stands is the amount recommended by the Budget officer and the amount recommended by the Department of Agriculture to the Budget. It covers the quarantine in part; it covers the control of the spread of the disease, the putting on of the campaign for the cleaning up of the fields, the scouting work that is being done to prevent the spread into new territory; and I think it is as large as can be economically used for the purpose.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the statement of the gentleman, what is being done by the department is to retard the spread. There is no statement the gentleman has made to indicate that it is being eradicated. The gentleman says it is spreading constantly and that what is being done now by the department is merely to retard this spread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, if the gentleman will yield, the spread of this insect eventually, according to the statement of the gentleman, unless something is done more than is now being done by the department, will extend into Indiana, Ohio, and through the Corn Belt of the Middle West. Is it not possible, if a sufficient appropriation is made, that this can not only be retarded but a great deal done toward blotting it out and eventually entirely destroying it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it possible at all. I think it is probably inevitable that the corn borer will eventually reach the great corn-growing section of the country.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that mean destruction?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. It is altogether probable that we can introduce the parasitic environment of the insect, and the damage will be very slight if that can be done.

Mr. DOWELL. Then the gentleman comes to this proposition that after its spread into the Corn Belt we will proceed to blot it out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. DOWELL. As it stands now we will let it spread, making slight efforts to retard it, but eventually it will get where we will have to take hold of it in earnest.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we will do everything that is possible to retard its spread, but my judgment is that any program based on eradication of the corn borer in the United States can not succeed and will simply be a waste of money. The $200,000 that the gentleman proposes would not be a drop in the bucket on a program of eradicating the pest. Ten million dollars would not be enough; you would have to burn up all the vegetation of every sort in the section in which the pest is working. You would have to compensate the owners, and you would practically have to clean up the whole area of vegetation for years.

Mr. DOWELL. But that is much cheaper than to have this pest spread into the Corn Belt and destroy corn growing in the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. You can not possibly destroy the pest in this country; you can not completely eradicate it.

Mr. MONDELL. The position of the gentleman from Minnesota is that there is no possibility of eradicating it by any effective means.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is the judgment of the entymologists of this country. It is certainly mine.

Mr. MONDELL. And we must simply introduce the parasites, the counterpests and the counterirritants that keep the insect under control in the land of its nativity.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and prevent its spread.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the gentleman, it will spread into every part of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is possible.

Mr. DOWELL. And according to the gentleman, it will spread into every section of the country; and is it not better and easier now to plan to blot it out, if we can possibly do it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It would be a sheer waste to spend a little more money on it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may present his amendment, I desire to withdraw my amendment, which was offered in view of the fact that the gentleman from Iowa was not then in the Chamber.

Mr. ANDERSON. I suppose I still have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. The chairman has explained what the Federal Government is doing under this appropriation and has stated that the amount of the appropriation is sufficient. Is it not a fact that in addition to what the Federal Government is doing there is a large cooperative work being done by the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has not been as large as it ought to have been, but it will be larger the next year by considerable.

Mr. DOWELL. Let me say——

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I have the floor, and I would like to keep it.

Mr. DOWELL. I simply wanted to say that if it is not permitted to spread into the States, the States will not be required to make an appropriation.

Mr. McKENZIE. As I understand this appropriation, it is simply to pay experts to travel over the country to investigate, to ascertain, whether or not certain sections are infested with this pest.

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Mr. McKENZIE. In other words, it does not carry with it any police regulation that would enable the expenditure of money in eradicating this pest, and if that is true, then $200,000 would not amount to anything.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have, of course, no Federal police regulations which would enable us to control the pest in any event. Police regulations are always enforced by the State boards, the bureaus of entomology, because they have police powers which we have not. I do not want to leave the impression, however, that all that is being done is to scout around and see where this bug is. A very strict quarantine is being maintained, and in addition to that, in cooperation with the States, a campaign is being conducted to clean up the pest, so far as that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask some other questions of the gentleman from Minnesota. At the present time there are but very few States that will contribute to the blotting out of this pest. There is not a State in the Union that is not just as much interested in the matter as is the State where the pest has already taken hold. Under this condition the States will contribute only a very small amount, and is it not better for the States all to contribute and stop this pest where it is than to leave it to the cooperation of two or three States that are now infected? All of the other States have very much interest in the matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman's question is like the question of the lawyer who asked the witness whether he had stopped beating his wife. Whatever you answer it is wrong. The assumption is wrong to begin with that it is probably possible to stop this pest where it is.

Mr. DOWELL. I think if we are going to assume that nothing can be done to stop this pest, then we must assume that it is already beyond control, and that it is too late to do anything.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman subscribe to the chairman's statement as to how this pest is spread; by high winds in the moth stage, as one of the commonest ways of spreading?

Mr. DOWELL. I know nothing of this. If it is spread in that way, there is not any question in the world but that it will spread all over the United States.

Mr. BEGG. Then any appropriation we might make will not stop it, except absolute eradication.

Mr. DOWELL. But it is much easier to stop it if it is in only two or three places than if it is in many.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in stopping this pest, and like the gentleman I would vote for any appropriation that would accomplish the result, but is not the gentleman afraid that some of this money might blow on the wind just like the borer is being blown?

Mr. DOWELL. I am assuming that the department will earnestly make an endeavor to do everything possible to stop the spread of this pest.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I rose also to make a more serious inquiry, and that is this: For what purpose is it proposed that this additional $200,000 shall be used? It is plain that it can not be used for eradication.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman may have a complete answer to his question, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment that I have offered, in order that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] may offer an amendment which he desires to offer to this section and which I favor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is there any difference between the amendment the gentleman has offered and the amendment that his colleague desires to offer? If there is not, why does not the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] take some time now?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not know what the gentleman's amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, that could not authorize an amendment that is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAUGEN: Page 51, line 24, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, the object of the amendment is to increase the appropriation from $200,000 to $500,000. I was pleased to hear the chairman of the committee state that we should do everything in our power to restrict and eradicate this pest. I am heartily in accord with that. I take it that the only way to eradicate this pest is by clipping its wings, and the only way that you can clip its wings is to provide for adequate funds to stop the spread of the pest.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Does the gentleman believe that it is possible to eradicate this pest?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am not an expert on that, but whether it can be done or not it is our duty to do our best to stop it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. What I had in mind was to get whatever information the gentleman has obtained from his extended study of this question as to the possibility of eradication. It has been asserted by some that it is impossible to eradicate it.

Mr. HAUGEN. The information that I can give is that evidently adequate appropriations have not been made. It is now time that Congress does its duty and makes adequate appropriations to stop the spread of the pest. According to the testimony, the corn borer is not now in the Corn Belt west of the Mississippi. What I am trying to do is to stop it crossing the

Mississippi River. It is bad enough that it should destroy the crops of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and other Eastern and New England States.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman is not trying to draw the line at the Mississippi, I hope; some of us are east of the Mississippi.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is in the State of Wisconsin now; it has gone beyond Indiana. It is in Illinois. It is in the gentleman's State.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I want our State to be included in the stopping of this.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then, in that case, the gentleman should vote for the increase. It may be, as has been stated, that $500,000 is not adequate. I am perfectly willing to make it more; yes, $10,000,000 if the gentleman from Minnesota thinks it is necessary. I am interested in eradicating this pest.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman says that we are to blame for not appropriating enough money. Have we ever cut down the appropriation for the corn borer?

Mr. HAUGEN. We have been taking the advice of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BEGG. And the Department of Agriculture does nothing; is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; the representatives of the department are asking for an additional appropriation. I believe it should be granted.

Mr. BEGG. In the hearings which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] just read a few minutes ago it is stated that the department does not want any more.

Mr. HAUGEN. I can read from the hearings. Would that satisfy the gentleman?

Mr. BEGG. I am not making the statement; it was the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HAUGEN. Here is the statement.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think we would all join the gentleman from Iowa in doing everything we can to eradicate this pest or keep it within certain bounds.

Mr. HAUGEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and the honored chairman of that committee for many years, has it not been the policy of the Federal Government to make appropriations to employ experts and men well versed in all these lines to go out into the country and investigate and report on the best plan to eradicate or destroy any and all of these various pests that affect agriculture? Is not that true?

Mr. HAUGEN. The department submitted its estimate some years ago. We told the representatives at that time that the $250,000 asked was inadequate. We suggested that it make further investigation, and when it had ascertained the facts to tell us what would be required and we would make the appropriation, whether half a million or five million dollars. We felt in regard to it exactly as we felt in regard to the eradication of tuberculosis. The only way to eradicate this pest is to do what we did with the citrus canker. The department asked some $25,000 or $50,000. The committee held that the proper way to do it was not to appropriate $25,000 or $50,000 but to give whatever amount was required to stamp it out. The committee increased the appropriation over the estimates, and as a result of having adequate funds the citrus canker was stamped out. Had the same policy been pursued in the eradication or preventing the spread of these pests, we would have at least confined it to a small area and possibly have entirely eradicated it by this time. Now it has spread on. I have been told that it is in the State of Wisconsin, and according to the printed testimony it is in Michigan doing damage and in most of the States east of the Mississippi River.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKENZIE. I ask that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKENZIE. Now, following my first question on the policy of the Government, I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it is possible for the Government with the $200,000 provided in this bill to employ a sufficient number of experts to determine on the best manner of eradicating this pest and then——

Mr. HAUGEN. Certainly not. My friend, there is no question about it. We have given only $200,000, and as a result, with the appropriations made, the corn borer has been steadily moving on from the New England States to Wisconsin. What we want to do is to eradicate it, if possible to do so, rather than to only study and investigate it.

Mr. McKENZIE. Then the gentleman will admit that $200,000 more would simply mean nothing at all?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not admit that. It is possible that $500,000 is not sufficient. It may be necessary to increase that amount. The corn crop for 1917 was more than 3,000,000,000 bushels, valued at more than $3,900,000,000, three times the value of the wheat crop of this country, twice the value of the cotton crop of this country. Are we going to stand by and allow that crop amounting to 3,000,000,000 bushels to be destroyed by this pest?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. If I may have more time. First, I want to put in the RECORD exactly what representatives of the department stated, so there will be no mistake about that. I think the testimony will satisfy the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to read one paragraph.

Mr. HAUGEN. I prefer to read it.

According to the testimony of Doctor Howard and Mr. Walton of the department, printed in the hearings, as before stated, that insect is spreading. I read from page 307 of the hearings:

> There has been a general spread to the northeastward, in the general direction of the prevailing wind. * * * The spread there this year equals the entire area of infestation that had occurred during previous years.

Doctor Howard asked:

> There is extraordinary damage in New England this year, is there not?
>
> Mr. WALTON. In New England we have a great increase of injury to garden crops. * * * There was a great deal of early sweet corn raised in the eastern New England area, and as the injury by the insect increased, farmers began to discontinue growing it, because it was unmarketable, and the consequence has been that the corn borer spread to these other crops—celery, beets, beans, and rhubarb—and at the present time the infestation in these crops is very heavy. There has been a good deal of commercial injury this fall. * * * The injury to corn was so heavy that the sweet-corn farmers have practically ceased producing it, except for local consumption. * * * The insect spread * * * to the center of New Hampshire, and they have flown along the Maine coast for a long distance. There is the heaviest infestation in Massachusetts and New England this year that ever has existed. * * * We are merely attempting to maintain quarantine, scouting, and limiting the area of the infestation (p. 308).

CANADA.

> Mr. WALTON. A very intense infestation of the corn borer was discovered near St. Thomas, in southern Ontario, in 1920. * * * There was very severe injury to corn. Some of the flint-corn fields were an entire loss. Since then either the insect has spread, or the scouting work has been much more effective, and it has been found that practically the entire southern half of the Province of Ontario is infested with the insect (p. 309).
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. Have we got a prospect of getting this bug all over the United States in due time (p. 309)?
>
> Mr. WALTON. It looks that way, although perhaps the spread will be slow.

(Page 307.)

> * * * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. WALTON (referring to Michigan). There is some apparent injury; for instance, one shipment of sweet corn was taken to a canning factory which had 7 per cent of the ears infested, but that was from a single farm.
>
> Doctor HOWARD. We are making a more intense study of European parasites than ever before.
>
> Mr. WALTON. The New York people are doing what they can in the way of education, and we are receiving active cooperation from the State people, the New York and Massachusetts people.
>
> Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any clean-up work?
>
> Mr. WALTON. The commissioner of Massachusetts is endeavoring now to secure funds for that purpose. He thinks he can get $100,000, but he wants the Federal Government to help him. * * * In Massachusetts the funds are insufficient for that purpose.
>
> * * * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. WALTON. The States furnished this year, for the cooperative work, a total of $49,700. This is distributed as follows: Michigan, $4,000; Ohio, $11,000; New York, $15,000; Massachusetts, $15,000; New Hampshire, $2,000; Maine, $2,000; and Vermont, $700.
>
> Doctor Howard is thoroughly scared now.
>
> * * * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. WALTON. Without the conduct of a thorough scouting work in the Mississippi Valley States, which should be done to determine whether the insect is present or not, that we can not do with the present funds. We had to neglect that during the present fiscal year.

That is what representatives of the department had to say about its importance. Is it not worth considering?

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. I prefer that the gentleman discuss it in his own time. Is not the testimony of those in charge of the work of importance and worth considering?

I think there is sufficient evidence here to show that it is spreading. The gentleman from Wisconsin states that it is in Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Indiana stated that it is in Indiana. Virginia, Maryland, and other Eastern States are full of it. The question is whether we are going to stop its spread or allow it to spread all over this country? It is

now up to the Mississippi River. Are we going to allow it to cross? I for one am against allowing it to cross the Mississippi River. I am in favor of driving it back.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Does the gentleman agree with the chairman of the committee that the eradication of this pest is impossible?

Mr. HAUGEN. No. If nothing can be accomplished in that direction, then the $200,000 proposed would be a waste, too. I think a more determined effort should be made than is suggested by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] opens up a wide series of questions in regard to the work carried on under the Department of Agriculture. From time to time new pests injurious to agriculture appear, insect pests and plant diseases. From time to time pests and diseases that have been known from time immemorial increase their ravages and become very destructive. The question always arises as to the practical way of handling and disposing of such enemies of agriculture. It is quite natural that those who live in the regions where the pests or diseases occur, those whose crops are affected, should become very earnest about the matter and should insist that nothing be left undone, that there should be no limit to the expenditure to stamp out, to eradicate, the pests or diseases, as the case may be.

Now, what is the history and experience of that sort of endeavor?

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman had quite a bit of time. If the gentleman will permit me to lay down my proposition and make my statement, he can ask questions later. I am asking this question now in all good faith of the experts and gentlemen before me: Have we ever succeeded, with all our efforts, in eradicating any disease or any insect enemy of plant life that had become widely distributed in the country? Have we ever been able to do that?

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MONDELL. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there is a single case where there has been a complete eradication. There have been cases where it has been practically complete, but not entirely so.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and where that occurs the gentleman from Minnesota will admit, or his experience will lead him to state at least, that the success we have had has not been so much in the direction of eradication by physical process—I doubt if we have ever done that—as eradication through the introduction of enemies of the disease, or of the insect, or the adoption of methods whereby we minimize the injury and destruction. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is quite true. The only exception I know of is the citrus canker, which we eradicated from commercial orchards. There is still some of it in privately owned orchards that are not run on what is known as a commercial basis.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Has not the cattle tick been eliminated from some areas?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but there are still some cases in other areas.

Mr. MONDELL. I am not speaking of animals. You get into a different field when you speak of animals. There is a possibility, I think, of entirely eradicating certain diseases of animals; but we have quite a different situation to deal with when we get into the question of diseases and enemies of plant life.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true, however, that the Government has only just recently taken action with reference to the corn borer? Is not this just a recent pest that has taken hold?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; and as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] very wisely pointed out, we have employed experts, the best experts obtainable, for the consideration of these matters; and I think their judgment is rather better than ours as to the methods to be pursued and as to the work to be done and as to the expenditure necessary to do all that, in their opinion, can be done in a really effective way.

Now, you can spend all the money in the Treasury endeavoring to eradicate pests. My memory runs back much further than that of some of you young gentlemen gathered here. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I remember when we were asked to eradicate the Colorado beetle. I remember when there was a very great deal of excitement on this floor over the invasion of the Russian thistle, and I recall the tremendous effort put forth to eradicate that weed or keep it limited within certain sections. It crossed the continent. It did its work. We got acquainted with it, and we finally began to utilize it as a stock food, and nobody is particularly worried or disturbed over the Russian thistle now. It grows everywhere. It is a common weed. No more harmful than the weeds it crowded out.

Mr. DOWELL. Is the gentleman trying to get an introduction to the corn borer that is destroying the corn? Is that the reason why he does not want it stamped out now?

Mr. MONDELL. I admit that I know little of the corn borer. I have never met one of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have not had the benefit of this argument.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sorry the gentleman has not, because there has been 25 minutes of very illuminating discussion.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is the department getting what it has asked for?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; all it asked.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Would the $200,000 give them ample resources to employ all of the facilities they have at hand for this work?

Mr. MONDELL. They tell us so.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If then that be true, what are they going to do with the other $800,000, with no more facilities to work on?

Mr. MONDELL. We could spend $300,000, we could spend $3,000,000, we could spend $30,000,000 in attempting to physically destroy this pest. We could authorize any amount of expenditure for the destruction and burning of crops, for the burning of the vegetation in the territory infested by the creature, and the experts on the subject tell us that after that was all done it would be impossible to eradicate them.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. If our appropriation utilizes the maximum facilities at our command, it seems to me we will have done all that can practically be accomplished.

Mr. DOWELL. If it costs the Government $200,000 annually with this pest now in only two or three States, and with the testimony here clearly showing that it is bound to spread all over the United States, what is it going to cost us after it has spread all over the United States?

Mr. MONDELL. It may not cost a dollar, and 10 years from now we may have forgotten all about it. Not being a prophet I do not desire to prophesy, but I should not be at all surprised if it was discovered that this insect will be comparatively harmless when it reaches the corn-growing region of the Mississippi Valley. It is an insect pest that has proved very destructive under certain conditions to sweet corn in the regions where field corn does not grow at its best. We have no information that it would be in any wise more injurious to field corn in the corn country than a score of other pests now in that section. It might take the place of some others that now trouble us.

I realize that the people in the Corn Belt, hearing of this pest in the sweet-corn region of the country, in the land not ideally adapted to the growing of corn, may urge appropriations running into the millions to keep this pest away from them. They may say, "We do not care how much you spend; we insist that you shall spend all the money that anybody may suggest in attempting to do something that the experts say you can not do." The probability is that we can only control this pest as we control other like pests, first by the introduction of its enemies. This creature came to America free from some of the conditions and some of the natural enemies that nature had brought into being to control it in its natural habitat. We can adopt methods minimizing the destruction, we can do many things in a reasonable, intelligent, scientific way; but this idea that you can go out into a country as vast as ours, and actually wipe out a pest that has infested not only the cornfields but all

the vegetation of vast areas, is, if I may say so without being offensive—and I certainly do not want to be offensive—a ridiculous one. It can not be done.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman is going to stop this eventually by bringing in its enemies——

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say I was going to stop it.

Mr. DOWELL. That is the policy suggested. And if so, why is it not cheaper to bring in the enemies now than to wait until the pest has spread further?

Mr. MONDELL. We are learning about its enemies now with this appropriation, and we have given all they ask and all they want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wyoming be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. I object, Mr. Chairman. I ask that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes—5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], and 3 minutes to myself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should just like to say that in Maryland we have 645,000 acres devoted to the growing of corn, with increasing production; but I want to say that I think the Agricultural Department has asked for and the committee has made the right appropriation, and I stand by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that anyone interested in agriculture will want to be in the attitude of not being in favor of doing everything within human possibility to eradicate the corn borer, but I think we now have a real Department of Agriculture. There are some other items in this bill that my section of the country is interested in. Take, for instance, the Hessian fly, that works on wheat. I would like to be in a position here of having offered an amendment to increase by $300,000 or $400,000 the item carried for the eradication of the Hessian fly; but time has demonstrated that the only way to fight the fly is with its enemies, in the same way that the Department of Agriculture has decided that the only way to fight the corn borer is with its enemies. I remember my first experience on the Agricultural Committee, when they presented us with photographs of scientists out in the wheat patches with scissors cutting weeds to find the corn borer. They found him, and they have found the parasites that will fight him, and the department say they can use $200,000 successfully for that purpose. Now, what would they do with the other $300,000?

Mr. BLANTON. Waste it.

Mr. TINCHER. It would read good, it would sound good to the people in the Corn Belt. Suppose I should offer to increase the $170,000 provided for in this bill to fight the worst enemy that the breadwinners of this country have in the world, the Hessian fly. What would they do with the money if I should increase the appropriation?

Time has demonstrated that the Government can only fight the fly with the parasites which are its enemies, and they can buy more than there are for sale and they can provide more than there is any way of providing with that appropriation. I do not know who it is on the floor of this House that is in a position to say, "I am so well informed that I want a reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, and I want you to tell them to take more money than they are asking for to fight these pests." I want to compliment Mr. Wallace on the fact that he recalled the scientists and their scissors, and that he is asking for $200,000 to buy some bugs with which to fight the worms, and that is all he wants. I believe he is so interested in this subject, and comes from a locality that is so vitally interested in it, that if there were any possibility of using an extra dollar for this purpose the Secretary of Agriculture would be here demanding it. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, some of these speeches are very interesting. It would be more helpful to the House, however, if the statements of the gentlemen were borne out by the record or otherwise true. The speech of our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is entirely similar to speeches he has made on every occasion when an attempt has been made to increase an appropriation. The gentleman's statement is not startling when he says he knows nothing whatever about the corn borer. I am willing to accept that as entirely true. He says also that the Department of Agriculture asked for this amount and no more, also that it could carry on its work with this money, and therefore did not ask for a larger appropriation. All who have had experience with the departments of our Government know that requests are made by a department largely, if not altogether, on the basis of what it thinks it can get. Where we find no affirmative statement by Agricultural Department officials requesting larger appropriations it is not at all fair to conclude that no more is wished or needed.

Now, the hearings on this proposition before the Committee on Appropriations are meager, but I find on page 310 some very significant statements, not at all in line with statements made by the gentleman from Wyoming. The chairman of the subcommittee asked, "Is the amount sufficient to maintain the work on the present basis?" The witness from the department, Mr. Walton, said: "Yes; without the conduct of thorough scouting work in the Mississippi Valley, which should be done to determine whether or not the insect is present." There is indubitable testimony to the effect that the corn borer is now in the Mississippi Valley States. He continues by saying: "That we can not do with the present funds; we had to neglect that during the present fiscal year."

We know the department does not ask for all it wishes or all it needs. We are able to get no information whatever as to the hearings, if they may be called such, before the Budget Bureau, or commission, or whatever it may be called. We are kept in ignorance of the demand made of the Budget. We do not know what hearings were had or what testimony was offered in support of any proposition in this bill or in any other bill.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman been able to learn whether or not the hearings before the Budget Committee are taken and transcribed?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No. It is a secret-chamber proposition, as far as I am able to learn. I have never seen any hearings. I think they are not published. Budget hearings have never been referred to on this floor. My impression is the representatives of the departments and of various branches of the Government go to the Budget Committee, make their statements, such as they are permitted to make, and no one outside of the walls of the room in which hearings, so called, are held, knows anything about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Michigan out of my time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have spoken of the principal effects as I see them. There is no doubt about the seriousness of this situation. Corn is one of our great crops and it is very seriously menaced. When the department started its work it did not know how to do it, and some of the early work was crude and ineffective. Stories of the efforts they made are really amusing, but they have worked out a better plan and are prepared to extend the work and do it efficiently, and in my judgment the appropriation ought to be increased to enable them to do so.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; although my time is short.

Mr. KETCHAM. I wonder if my colleague has not missed one of the most important features of the testimony. I want to call attention to the reply of Doctor Howard in response to a question of the chairman of the committee. It was, "They do not seem to be very scared up there?" Doctor Howard replied, "Massachusetts is thoroughly scared now." Does not my colleague think that when Massachusetts gets scared on an agricultural proposition it is time for the rest of the people to wake up? [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Massachusetts is scared because of the actual infestation of that State by this terrible plague, and the reason the large corn-growing areas of the country are not now scared is because they have not been infested to the extent necessary to arouse them. But the pest is spreading and reaching the great corn-growing areas, and the time to combat it is now, when it is in its early stage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, there were one or two statements that might give a wrong impression as to what the situation is which I want to correct. It has been indicated, perhaps unintentionally, that this infestation around Lake Erie and eastern New York came from Boston. As a matter of fact,

all the indications point to the fact that these three areas were all infested at the same time, and consequently had we undertaken the eradication program in and around Boston as soon as the infestation was learned of, it would have been wholly without effect, because the infestations were in other parts of the country.

Another statement I would like to make is that notwithstanding what has been said about the inability of the department to present its needs, the fact remains that the department asked the bureau for an appropriation of $200,000, and that appropriation was agreed to by the Budget Bureau and the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Committee on Appropriations. They all agreed to the amount of $200,000 as representing the amount which the department and the Bureau of the Budget finally agreed would adequately continue the work on the basis of such control of the disease as they believed to be possible.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAUGEN) there were—13 ayes and 33 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, $502,240.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 54, line 20, strike out the sum "$502,240" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$652,204, provided that of the sum thus appropriated $150,000 may be used in California."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, that is placed there deliberately and for a good purpose. The general situation is that this amount of money allowed in the appropriation bill this year, as in previous years, covers the Western States as well as the Northwest, the Mississippi Valley, and other States where there are predatory animals and others of the character named in the bill. It covers a wide stretch of territory. In the western Pacific Coast States, known as the public-land States, a large amount of the land is in public ownership, and it becomes a breeding ground for these predatory animals. Owners of land in the various States referred to must eradicate most, if not all, of these animals when the local authorities ask them to do so. If they fail to eradicate them, then a lien is attached to the land and the land is sold, so that when you live in these communities you have to participate to the extent of a large sum. Your home is involved. This is the law in California.

All we ask now is that the Government meet the conditions as we find them there. Yesterday I had inserted in the RECORD a letter and some resolutions from the California Wool Growers' Association. I want to read a short extract from those resolutions to show the purpose of my amendment. It is to be found on page 881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 22, 1922, and reads as follows:

Whereas the menace to the sheep industry of the State of California by the depredations of predatory animals, particularly coyotes, is of serious consequence and has amounted to losses approaching millions of dollars; and

Whereas the United States Government through its Bureau of Biological Survey, in cooperation with the State of California, has been doing effective work, as is being done in other States, but wholly inadequate to meet even the partial needs to protect this sheep industry; and

Whereas every possible agency, including local associations, county and State governments, are exerting every effort to cope with this serious menace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the woolgrowers of the State of California in convention assembled, To ask assistance from the Federal Government through Congress for an appropriation, not less than $150,000 in amount, for the work in California, thus to make available for predatory-animal control a sum necessary for a much-needed protection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. How much does the State of California itself appropriate for this same work?

Mr. RAKER. California has appropriated for this, but at this moment I can not give the exact amount.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any evidence to show what the direct appropriation of the State is?

Mr. RAKER. I shall get it and put it in the RECORD later. We have been appropriating money for this and other purposes right along, not only for the coyote, but for all other animals, and, as I stated before, every man's property in the State of California is subject to having a lien placed upon it and sold for the destruction of rodents.

Mr. SNELL. I do not find any evidence that the gentleman's State, through its legislature, has appropriated any money for this specific purpose.

Mr. RAKER. It makes general appropriations.

Mr. SNELL. I asked for the specific purpose.

Mr. RAKER. No more than the item I just called attention to a short time ago for the destruction of the brown-tail moth and the gypsy moth in the gentleman's State, where we appropriate five times as much as this.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD the definite amount that California appropriates for the items that he wants to have increased?

Mr. RAKER. I shall try to get the information for the gentleman, and at a later date will insert it. I want to call attention to the hearings on this subject. I call attention to the testimony of Doctor Nelson, found on pages 319 and 320 of the hearings. From that it will be seen that $388,000 was collected by the department from the sale of hides that were obtained under and by virtue of this appropriation. Doctor Nelson says:

The $502,000 is not appropriated for the predatory-animal work alone. For the predatory-animal and the rodent work combined the Government puts up about $400,000, and the States are putting up approximately $1,000,000 in cooperative funds. They are contributing practically two-and-a-half times as much as the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I think we should settle first the point of order. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman in his increased appropriation desires to have $150,000 of it spent in the State of California alone, but the gentleman still has not any information as to what his own State has done in respect to this particular item.

Mr. RAKER. We find that the wool growers of California have met and have discussed this matter. They are familiar with it. Years ago they could put their sheep out, and they did not have to take the care and attention they do now, and they were not destroyed, but now, for the purpose of legitimately raising sheep, you must have a herder on the job; otherwise these animals are in your sheep, and you have lost a year's profit.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Why does the gentleman want to limit the use of the $150,000 extra to the State of California? There are other places where they raise sheep, where they have predatory animals, as, for instance, in New Mexico. They have public land there and lots of animals, and the animals have never been properly reared to recognize the State lines, and they get across into the State of Texas at times.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, we have coyotes and wild cats that pay no attention to State lines; and they come from Texas up into California. The reason why I am asking the $150,000 just before Christmas is that I have not had very much, and these people have not been provided for very extensively. This association is unanimously behind this. I hope the Congress will be open-minded enough to make this appropriation, to the end that the industry in the State of California may be protected and encouraged.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there is less reason for increasing this appropriation than there was for increasing the appropriation with respect to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] offered his amendment a short time ago. This more than the other requires complete eradication, if you are going to get any substantial benefit from the appropriation. But eradication is impossible. Take the State of Texas, for instance. It is 900 miles across it from east to west, and nearly 1,000 miles across it from north to south. Our sheepmen have learned that whenever they protect their flocks against

coyotes they must do the eradication themselves on their own ranches.

They build wolf-proof fences, put one wire even under the ground so that the wolf can not get into the ranch. What could the Federal Government do toward eradicating even the wolves in Texas with the kind of an appropriation we annually carry? Why, it would take millions and millions of dollars to eradicate them in the United States, and unless we go far enough to eradicate them everywhere our money is wasted, for they breed almost as fast as white mice. It is a continual restocking.

I have come to the conclusion that on voting for a proposed increase of appropriations by way of amendments offered from the floor that I am going to hew to the line, first, on the Budget Committee's recommendation, and, second, the only time I am going to stray any beyond the Budget Committee's recommendation is when the committee itself comes in here and for some good reason asks for an increase.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. We have men on this Appropriations Committee who fully understand this question. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] knows about as much about the Agricultural Department's business as any man in the House. He is in charge of this bill on the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] knows about as much as any other man in the House on this subject. They have not seen fit to ask for an increase, they have not seen fit to ask for $150,000 extra to be presented as a Christmas present to the State of the distinguished gentleman from California——

Mr. HAUGEN. According to the gentleman's statement, why do not the rest of us go to our offices or go home and leave the chairman and the assistant and the ranking Member on the Democratic side here to run the business?

Mr. BLANTON. Because we have got to stay here and help keep the good fellows from increasing the appropriations; that is why. That is why I am here. My vote counts one. [Applause.] I am going to try to do my part as one Member to keep these appropriations within bounds.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California is always modest, unusually so in this case. He only wants 60 per cent spent in California on this work as is spent in all the United States put together. If the State of California would abandon its policy of paying bounties for predatory animals and adopt the same policy which the United States Government has adopted it would not be necessary for the gentleman from California to ask for this $150,000. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserved the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proviso makes the whole amendment subject to the point of order because the proviso is clearly legislation unauthorized on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us dispose of the point of order first, if the gentleman will permit. The Chair, looking at this amendment, and especially the proviso, thinks it is worded in such a way as not to make it mandatory upon the department to spend the money in California. It is only an indication of where the gentleman proposing the amendment would like to have it spent, and is colorless and without force. It is not binding upon the department to spend it in that particular State; it could be spent anywhere, despite the proviso, and for that reason the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California: At the end of the amendment add the following: "*Provided further*, That the sum of $150,000 here appropriated for the State of California shall not be available unless and until the State of California appropriates a like sum for the same purpose."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California as amended by the amendment just adopted.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To investigate and encourage the adoption of improved methods of farm management and farm practice, $281,987: *Provided*, That of this amount $150,000 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will say to the chairman of the committee if he does not know just where we are in the bill, it is on page 62, at the beginning of line 6.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I notice the proviso that of the total amount of appropriation $150,000 may be used in ascertaining the cost of production of the principal staple agricultural products. I would like to know what progress has been made in that particular line of work and how the work is carried on?

Mr. ANDERSON. The work has been carried on under two systems; one of them the so-called survey method, under which quite a large number of farms keep account, and once a year those farms are visited by the representatives of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Their accounts are gone over and the results tabulated in accordance with the general plan of the bureau. The other method is a more intense method by which representatives of the bureau visit the farmers more frequently and in such cases give them assistance in keeping these records. Of course, the latter method is by far the most accurate and scientific. Cost studies are now being made in reference to the cost of producing corn-fed beef, and the cost of producing milk on dairy farms, the cost of producing cotton, the cost of producing wheat, and a considerable number of diversified farms in reference to the cost of the farm plant as a unit and the profit arising from it. I think the work is progressing very satisfactorily, indeed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How does the amount of money here made available compare with the amount last year and in previous years. The gentleman has outlined a very ambitious program if the department visits a very large number of farms and makes anything at all of an investigation a great deal of time is required and the employment of a very large number of men is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the gentleman that these are practically all conducted in cooperation with States, and the total amount of expense in the course of the last three years—1922, $47,929; 1923, $85,027; and 1924, $85,037.

In none of these three years has a total amount of $150,000 been spent for this cost-of-production work.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says the work has been carried on very satisfactorily. Does the gentleman mean that the work is done as carefully and skillfully as it can be done, or does he mean that results reached have been satisfactory?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think both things are true. Of course, the cost-of-production work is fairly new, and it is probable that an improvement of methods is being made all the time. But we are getting a very large volume of sound, fundamental information which is, or ought to be, valuable to the farmers of the country in connection with their problems of farm organization and farm management.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Is not this along the same line as the investigation made some years ago by Doctor Spillman?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but, of course, it is on a different basis from the work that was done by Doctor Spillman.

Mr. HAUGEN. It was practically abandoned at one time, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it was practically abandoned at one time, but it has been going on under the present plan for at least three years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Of course, the matter of crop-production costs is important, and if by any kind of investigation the department can reach satisfactory results, its work ought to be encouraged. There is, however, a wide difference of opinion as to whether results can be reached that will be at all satisfactory. I have always been in doubt as to the wisdom of this appropriation, not because it is not of interest to me, but because I am doubtful as to whether any kind of investigation will give tangible, satisfactory results as to the cost of production. The cost of production depends upon so many different things—the quality of the land, the manner in which the farmer keeps his soil fertilized, the manner in which he cultivates his crops, the time at which he puts in his crop, the time at which he harvests it, and the weather conditions,

which are changeable and variable, affecting one part of the country favorably, perhaps, and another near-by part unfavorably; there are, I say, so many things upon which success depends that it seems to me difficult, if not impossible, to reach anything like an adequate conclusion as to what the production of any particular crop has cost or will cost.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the results reached by the department in investigating the cost of production within the last few years in selected counties in the State of Iowa, for example?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I can not give the gentleman the information he wishes. I am entirely willing, if you please, to have this work go on, because if satisfactory work can be done the results will be very interesting and helpful, not only to those who are engaged in agriculture but also to consumers, because prices that prevail and prices that ought to prevail are dependent largely upon the cost of production. The farmer ought to know what it costs; the buying public also ought to know.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Can the gentleman tell whether any of the reports that are made are available to the membership?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota is entirely right in saying that the work is satisfactorily done, and that gratifying results will be reached. I repeat that I am in favor of the appropriation, although I am in a class who doubt very much if satisfactory results can ever be reached.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. The reason why the Chairman stated that the work was being conducted in a satisfactory manner and "everything was all right along the Potomac" was the fact that the farmers themselves already know exactly what it costs to produce their various farm commodities.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I had not heard of that.

Mr. BLANTON. They do down in my country. They have found it out through sad experience. They know what it costs them to produce cotton, they know what it costs them to produce corn, and they know what it costs them to produce wheat, and wool, and sheep, and cattle, and hogs.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Has it been found out down there that the cost of production is the same on any two farms in the State?

Mr. BLANTON. They have found out exactly what it costs them to produce their commodities, I will say to the gentleman from Michigan. What the farmers down in Texas are most concerned about just now is the cost of production of their manufactured wearing apparel, their shoes, boots, and farm implements. They want to know why they used to be able to buy a good 3½-inch Studebaker wagon for $75, and now they have to pay $200 for it, and the same with all the farm implements. They would like to know something of what the cost of production is on those articles.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not blame them.

Mr. BLANTON. They would like to know what is the cost of the production of coal, for which they are now paying $16 and $17 a ton.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not blame them at all, inasmuch as the selling price of their products is down and going still further down, whereas the prices of the things they have to buy are up and still going further up.

Mr. BLANTON. If we were to follow the wise admonition of the President of the United States a few years ago, when Woodrow Wilson told us that there was only one way to solve this cost-of-production business, and that was to require stamped on the article the selling price of the wholesaler, that of the middleman, and that of the retailer, then we would be performing a service to the people of the country that would be valuable indeed. Then improper profits would stop. We are wasting time and money, so far as the spending of this $150,000 in this item is concerned, in order to tell the farmers what it costs to produce their products. They already know it, every one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. ROACH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question concerning the item on page 60, "For supervising the preparation, distribution, and use of picric acid" and other explosives. Are these explosives to be obtained on the application of individual farmers, or must they be obtained through some connection with an agricultural college?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the distribution is made through the State agricultural colleges as a rule to the county agents.

Mr. ROACH. The gentleman's information, then, is that the distribution is made through the agricultural colleges from the Agricultural Department here at Washington?

Mr. ANDERSON. The usual method, I think, is for applications to be concentrated with the county agents. Then they go through the State college or the State department of agriculture, and the distribution is made in substantially the same way.

Mr. ROACH. The distribution, in other words, is made from the Agricultural Department here to the various State agricultural colleges, and they in turn distribute it to whom?

Mr. ANDERSON. Usually through the county agents to the persons who make the appplication in the first instance.

Mr. ROACH. Then the information does finally reach the individual who made the application?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; of course it does.

Mr. ROACH. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to say just a word on the cost of production work. As I said a moment ago, this is pretty largely new in its present form. It is probable that it has not had the value which it would have had if the conditions had been entirely normal so that comparisons of cost of production year by year could be made more accurately. In other words, to some extent, of course, the value of these studies for purposes of comparison is destroyed by the inflation which has taken place in the credit and currency of the country, which has had a very marked effect upon prices in general. But on the whole the cost of production studies are the basis of farm management and farm organization. As we progress with this study of farm costs it should be possible to demonstrate more thoroughly the better methods of agricultural practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stock, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms, in cooperation with the Extension Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, $397,000: *Provided*, That $65,000 shall be available for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products when offered for interstate shipment or when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, $275,000.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the proviso. I would like to ask the chairman is this the substantive law at the present date, that the certificate issued by authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has been carried in the appropriation bills for many years. As far as I know, there is no law on the subject.

Mr. RAKER. And does it work to good advantage?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; it would be almost useless without it.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3295) to consolidate the work

of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4131) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Sioux City, Iowa, and to Union County, in the State of South Dakota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sioux River at a point 2½ miles north of the mouth of said river, between section 14, township 89, range 48, Woodbury County, Iowa, and section 15, township 89, range 48, Union County, S. Dak., in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4133) granting the consent of Congress to the State of North Dakota and the State of Minnesota, the county of Pembina, N. Dak., and the county of Kittson, Minn., or any one of them, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, $401,400.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 18, strike out the figures "$401,400," and insert in lieu thereof "$426,400."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman and my Christmas colleagues, this is a little Yuletide amendment; and I recall that it is written that even during such seasons, when a hundred are gathered together in the Government's name, they have authority to grant such legislative Christmas relief as is here sought. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, it was evidently intended by the subcommittee which framed this bill that the market news service, which has proven of such great interest and importance to the agricultural and stock-raising sections of the country, should be carried on effectively and without curtailing or impairing its usefulness. It was thought at the time the figures in this bill were submitted by the department to the subcommittee that they represented a sufficient sum for the proper functioning of this governmental activity. It has developed subsequently, however, that in order for the southwestern part of the country to enjoy the continuous benefits of this service an increase of $25,000 in this appropriation is necessary.

In other words, the amount stipulated in this measure will assure to the western region the proper dissemination of market news for the full 12 months of the fiscal year, but in the southwestern section of the Nation, which is equally important in this regard and deserves similar consideration, Texas will be restricted to nine months of operation and Oklahoma will be entirely excluded. And so, I say, in that fair Christmas spirit which should preclude the possibility of discrimination among the gifts to the sister States involved, it behooves us now to play the proper rôle of Santa Claus and see that Uncle Sam displays an equal concern for the farmers and stockmen of the great Southwest.

The amount by which this amendment will increase the appropriation is not arrived at arbitrarily. I have had this matter up with the authorities in the Department of Agriculture who have administrative control of it, and the additional figure of $25,000 has been supplied by them after a careful analysis of the situation. I think the subcommittee itself is in possession of this recent information, and for this reason I do not anticipate any serious objection to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. In what way is this discrimination made?

Mr. LANHAM. The discrimination is not intentional. It arises from the fact that it was originally thought that the sum specified in the bill would be sufficient to carry on this work in all the various sections where it is undertaken, but that now it is found that this additional amount will be necessary if the southwestern part of the country is to have the same service during the entire year that is accorded the West.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman explain how it is that the southwestern part of the country under the law, as it stands, is not to benefit from this appropriation for the whole year while the western part of the country is?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman from Texas will pardon me, I will say that this wire service has only been extended to Texas within the last year, and the department went as far as they had the money to go and then stopped. It had been previously established at other places, and the service in those places is complete, but Texas having been the last place they went as far as they had the money to go.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. During the war Texas had such service, but after the war, on account of the great sum then necessary to carry on this work, it was discontinued. Within the last year it has been resumed, and the latest investigation of the department shows that the slight increase proposed in this amendment is essential to equalize the service in these various sections. The Southwest is very productive in fruits and vegetables and live stock and dairy and poultry products, as well as the other activities specified in this paragraph of the bill, and its farmers and stockmen, of course, are entitled to the full benefit of such information as the market-news service may afford.

For the information of the committee I desire to quote the following from the hearings on this measure, indicative of the increased demand for this service:

Mr. MARQUIS. During the past year there has been a strong demand for the market-news service. As we have observed the demand for market news is greatest when prices are low or failing. Farmers are not particularly concerned about prices as long as they are high and satisfactory. They are not searching for a market, and they are not so much interested in the choice of markets with reference to which will pay the best prices, but when prices begin to go down, then comes the call for more market information. The result is that we have had a greater call for information of this character during the past 12 months than in the past, due to the low prices. The farmers seeking markets wished to know the difference in prices at various markets, the best time to sell, and the danger of gluts; also to know the relative prices for various qualities of products. All of these things have tremendously increased the call for this sort of information, with the result that we have had frequent requests to extend this service into areas that are removed from our regular lines of communication.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is this service maintained with respect to all these various commodities—live stock, fruits, and vegetables—or only as to some of them?

Mr. MARQUIS. All of the four principal lines, live stock, meats, fruits, and vegetables, dairy and poultry products, and hay, feeds, and seeds are included, and that includes a variety of reports which go all the way from the spread in price quotations to market movements, the entire range of various kinds, grades, and qualities, and any other news that bears upon the market situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, as I have just stated, they have a leased wire to Fort Worth, Dallas, and Austin, but they can not make a complete use of it unless the appropriation is increased. It seems to me that as long as we have the service there the people of Texas and Oklahoma ought to have the full benefit of it, and therefore I do not oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, after line 18, add:

"*Provided*, That $500,000, or so much of that amount as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated from any unappropriated funds in the Federal Treasury for providing seed wheat for wheat growers in the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington: *Provided further*, That all loans contemplated herein shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate and shall become due and payable on November 1, 1923, and shall bear 6 per cent interest per annum."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is new legislation, not authorized by law.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman withhold it?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will withhold it for five minutes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the State of Washington has some of the best and most productive wheat lands in all the world. It also has some dry wheat lands. The farmers have been struggling for the past 15 years, some years making good crops and others very indifferent crops, but during the last five years the dry-land section has been very much reduced on account of drought. Especially has this been true during the past three years, and the year just passed has brought them down to the very minimum of production. Their credit is gone, they are mortgaged up to their ears, they are doing everything that they can do to remain on their farms and continue to grow wheat.

While this is legislation on an appropriation bill, it is nothing new for this Congress. Last year we appropriated for this same purpose for drought-stricken farmers in other States a million and a half dollars, and two years ago we appropriated $2,000,-

000. There was loaned to the wheat growers this present year for spring seeding in the State of Idaho $24,000; in the State of Montana, $756,000; in the State of North Dakota, $661,000; in the State of South Dakota, $37,000; and in the State of Washington only $1,730. In other words, the wheat farmers in the State of Washington have continued to grow wheat as best they could, although suffering from drought for the past five years in certain counties, without calling on the Federal Government for loans with which to buy seed wheat. What has been the result of these loans in the other States? This year they have produced the best crops that they have had for a number of years.

These farmers were enabled to remain on their farms, and have produced millions of bushels of wheat and are now able to continue their farming operations. The drought has now fallen farther west and one part of the State of Washington this year has been very hard hit. A careful investigation has been made, and it is found that there is almost 400,000 acres of ground plowed, harrowed, free from weeds, ready for seeding, but that can not be seeded unless Federal aid is procured with which to buy seed wheat.

Mr. SNELL. Has the State of Washington made any provision for an appropriation to take care of these farmers?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Our own State financiers have helped these farmers in the past, the banks have helped them, the merchants have helped them, everybody has helped them, until they have come to the point where it seems in justice to them, as compared with other farmers in other States, they are entitled to a little relief from the Federal Government.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman will remember that when we passed these other appropriations, which I myself opposed, it was stated that the credit of the States was in such condition that they could not raise the money to help these people out.

The gentleman would not want to claim that the great, big, rich State of Washington is in such financial condition that it can not help these farmers, provided it desires to do so.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. No; I would not make that claim, neither would I make the claim that the great State of New York could not improve the harbor of the great city of New York or that Mississippi, Louisiana, and other States could not prevent floods on the Mississippi. Nevertheless, we appropriate Federal funds for these purposes.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman should bring up a similar argument, and then I will meet him on it. Those are general propositions. Any specific request the State of New York makes from this Government, it will put up its proportionate share for, and it seems to me that a big, rich State like the State of Washington should help these farmers first, before they come to the Federal Government.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am stating that the State of Washington, and the financial institution of that State, have helped them over five bad years, and now everything they have is mortgaged and they are not able to procure seed wheat with which to seed the 400,000 acres of land on which they have expended from $4 to $5 an acre in preparing the seed bed. These farmers do not want to leave their farms. They are anxious to stay. If they vacate their farms, it will be difficult to find others to occupy them. The net result will be a loss to the whole Nation.

I have seldom looked upon a sadder sight than the empty homesteads that may be found in this section. Little empty shacks with unhinged doors, broken windows, the broken wheel at the well, and the general air of desertion bear mute evidence of blasted hopes and blasted fortunes. The fortunes may have been meager, consisting of only a few hundreds of dollars—their all. But when they went upon those homesteads, their hopes were as buoyant and impelling as ever surged through human breasts. They ate the dust of the desert for years. They fought the dreary, lonely battle of the dry-land homesteader, and lost. Without money, without credit, with crushed ambitions and without hope, many of these unfortunate homesteaders have gone drifting—we know not whither.

I am endeavoring to bring a ray of hope and to give one more chance to the dry-land farmers who still cling to their farms and wage an all but hopeless battle.

Weather conditions at this time are better than for many years past and there is every probability they can grow a remunerative crop this year if seed wheat is provided.

I am asking a loan which shall be repayable on November 1. I have provided that the interest shall be 6 per cent instead of 5 per cent, which was charged the farmers in other drought-stricken regions, so that if there is any difficulty in making any of these collections the excess interest collected on some may take care of the difficult collections in other cases. I hope the chairman of the committee, in justice to these farmers, will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the provision is legislation, and it is not germane at this point. It is a matter that has always been considered heretofore by the Committee on Agriculture and I am sure if the proposition is one where the Federal Government should appropriate, that committee will very promptly report the necessary authorization if the matter is submitted to them. It is not properly a matter that ought to be taken up in this way and put on an appropriation bill without consideration by the proper committee. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Was not the appropriation of last year incorporated in the Agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. My recollection is upon authorization by the Committee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment against which the gentleman from Minnesota directs a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not germane to the paragraph. The Chair feels that it is not germane to the paragraph; that it is an appropriation unauthorized by law and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I can not in five minutes make a full statement of the facts which we probably will want to present to another committee. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, expenses, $1,891,660.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, line 19, after the word "all," insert the word "general."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, would not the total have to be changed to take into account the $25,000?

Mr. ANDERSON. At the proper time I shall ask that all the totals be corrected to correspond with the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPLETION OF WOOL WORK.

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, $12,000, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.

DEMONSTRATIONS ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, $39,000.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 70, line 24, after the figures "39,000," insert as a new paragraph as follows:

"For printing, binding, and distribution through the folding room of the publications entitled 'Diseases of the Horse and Diseases of Cattle, $200,000.'"

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will reserve it.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy of the most rigid sort. I have voted to reduce practically every appropriation that has come to a vote. I have offered many amendments reducing appropriations. I have not offered any amendment increasing an appropriation. Hence I think I can in good faith speak to this amendment. The Government publishes a great many different pamphlets and quite a few

books and a great many documents. I believe, of all the publications that have been provided for, the ones which are mentioned in this amendment are the most useful. I believe practically every Member of the House will agree to that fact. Now, I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not make the point of order. I want to say in this connection that I mentioned this matter to some Members, and also to the Committee on Agriculture, of which I happen to be a member——

Mr. LOWREY. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. JONES of Texas. In just a minute. And every member of the Agricultural Committee, I believe, agrees that these books should be provided for. We have just had the discussion of the garden-seed distribution, an item of $360,000. It would take that much to provide garden seed. It takes more than that to provide some other documents and publications that are distributed.

This appropriation will provide 200,000 copies of each of the publications mentioned. I know that every member of the Committee on Agriculture who was present on the occasion in question thought the publications should be reprinted. I have spoken to numbers of men on both sides, and all agree that they are very valuable publications. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWREY. I just wanted to add to the statement that I think I get more letters asking for those publications and more expressions from the farmers as to the real value of them than anything else the Government sends out.

Mr. JONES of Texas. These cattle and horse books are valuable all over the United States in every man's district, and in communities where they have but one of them the neighbors call for it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Why does not the Committee on Agriculture bring in a bill authorizing the publication of those books?

Mr. JONES of Texas. They decided, in view of the shortness of the term, it would be impossible to get a resolution up before the House, and they decided it would be useless to bring it in this session for that reason, but the matter of their not being authorized was not brought up until recently. For that reason we decided it would be useless to report out a resolution and put it on the Calendar and not get it up in time to get the appropriation.

Mr. KNUTSON. Were there any hearings held on this proposition?

Mr. JONES of Texas. There was no hearing, but hearings were had when they were published before, I will state to the gentleman, and the House is familiar with the value of these books and the great demand for them among all the people wherever there are horses or cattle. If a man has only a few head there is great use for these books because they furnish valuable information as to handling and treatment.

Mr KNUTSON. How many does it provide?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Two hundred thousand copies of each of those volumes to be distributed through the folding room in the regular manner and method of allotment. I do not think there ought to be any objection, because I do not believe any man can present a substantial objection. If you will search through the items of the appropriation bill, I do not think there is anything so valuable as these books. I do not think there is any need for a hearing, because it is a reprint of a publication that has heretofore been published and the allotment was exhausted, and there has been a demand from practically every Member here for a reprint of those publications.

Mr. SNELL. How many books will that furnish?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Four hundred thousand copies, 200,000 copies of each publication.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Does the gentleman think it will be real economy to have the House sustain its action of yesterday in knocking out the seed proposition and utilizing that amount of money in the publication of these books?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I most certainly do. I think many fold more value will be obtained from this appropriation, which is only half as large as the one they came so near to adopting yesterday for garden seeds. The estimate of the department is in accordance with the figures I have given.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I would like to say that this is the one publication, above all others, that the farmers of my district seem to desire.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes. I think it is the universal experience among the Members. I do not think there are half a dozen Members in the House that will not have use for these publications. I do not think there is any considerable number of people in the country who will not be enthusiastically in favor of this provision.

We have gone to the expense, first, of gathering all this information, and then to the expense of putting it in shape, and then we have gone to the expense of having it published once, and now all that is involved is the republication.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DICKINSON. Why do you not include in your amendment the republication of the book called "Diseases of Sheep"? I do not know of such a publication in book form. I believe it is in pamphlet, anway.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I do not think there is such a widespread demand for that. These two publications that I have mentioned are called for all over the Nation, in every State of the Nation.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will permit, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that my colleague has sheep in his district, just as he has cattle and horses.

Mr. JONES of Texas. This is a matter about which I do not think there is any difference of opinion. What is the necessity of having hearings? Why not authorize a publication which everybody knows is needed?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I think these publications ought to be republished. But I do not feel, without any hearings or consideration of the matter at all, so far as it is in my power to control the situation, that I would be justified in taking the responsibility of allowing this item to go in. It is a matter that ought to go before the Committee on Agriculture or before the Committee on Printing. It would be promptly reported out, and I think it ought to be. But I make the point of order on its insertion here.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman think this is subject to a point of order? Does not the organic law authorize this?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not make the point of order, because the Committee on Agriculture has discussed this matter, and every member present at the time of the discussion expressed the hope that we would be able to get it into a legislative bill, but we came to the conclusion that we could not get a special resolution through the House because there was not sufficient time. But it was the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that these books should be republished.

Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes the point of order?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. The point of order should be overruled. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the decision which he rendered the other day based upon the organic act, which act reads as follows:

> The general design and duties * * * shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to secure the publication and distribute among the people, etc.

The gentleman from Minnesota meets himself coming around in a circle, because he himself cited this organic act the other day against just such a point of order, and the Chair held that the point of order was not good, as this organic act was sufficient authorization. If the Chair's decision the other day was right, clearly the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. JONES] is in order and not subject to the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield. But we are not here discussing the merits of the question. We are discussing merely the point of order.

Mr. SNELL. Surely. In the discussion the other day, did not that paragraph specifically direct some man to do something? Does the gentleman say that when you specifically direct a man in an executive department to do something that is not legislation? That is what this amendment directs.

Mr. BLANTON. The amendment as to garden seeds offered yesterday by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]

specifically directed the Department of Agriculture to spend $39,000 in collecting certain kinds of seeds and placing them in certain kinds of envelopes and placing on the envelopes a certain kind of printing, and the Chair held that it came within the provisions of the organic act and therefore was authorized.

Mr. SNELL. The Chair said he did not really think it came within the organic act, but ruled that way because he thought the House would put it in and overrule his decision as it did last year.

Mr. BLANTON. He followed the decision of the committee, and when he followed it his decision then became a precedent for him and the committee. It only forms a new precedent.

Mr. SNELL. If he follows the precedents of the House, he would be compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not direct the department to do anything. It simply provides an appropriation for this purpose. It contains no direction, no instruction. It is simply an appropriation for this particular purpose, and, as has been called to the attention of the Chair, the general authorizations with reference to publications in the general law are so universal in their provisions as to bring almost anything within the provisions of the organic law if you have an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported. Without objection, that will be done.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Chair will note that that does not contain a specific direction. It is simply an appropriation under the general provisions of the law which authorizes these different publications and the distribution of documents and printed matter and various publications of that kind. It simply authorizes an appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. SNELL. It specifically authorizes the distribution through the folding room.

Mr. JONES of Texas. That is one of the usual forms of distribution. Any Government publication that is printed may be distributed through the folding room. That is one of the usual methods, but that would not be a necessary part of the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It seems to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] has struck the crucial point of this matter. It might be held that the appropriation of $200,000 for a specific purpose would be in order. But the ordinary publications of the Agricultural Department are not distributed through the folding room. They are distributed by the Agricultural Department itself.

Mr. BLANTON. The Yearbooks are distributed through the folding room.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If they are so distributed there is a specific law for it; but the ordinary publications of the department are distributed by the department itself. Now, here is a specific direction that these books be distributed, not by the department but through congressional channels. I think that is plainly legislation.

Mr. JONES of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment so as to leave out the words "through the folding room."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. I regret to object; but if they are to be printed, they ought to be distributed by the Members of Congress, and I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. If the provision as to printing and binding on page 6 of this bill is a valid provision—and it seems to have been considered by everybody as unobjectionable and not subject to a point of order—I do not see how a point of order lies to the pending amendment. That provision appropriates for printing various reports, and then goes on to provide how they may be delivered and sent out, specifying that they may be distributed under the franks of Senators and Representatives, and that provision was justified on the general proposition that the organic act governing the Agricultural Department is much broader than any law that governs and controls any of the other departments of the Government. I think the Chair would be drawing a line that is not discernible at all between the paragraph on page 6 and this amendment if he should sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair realizes that this is a rather close question, but the Chair is of the opinion that the words "through the folding room" are a direction, and therefore legislation and repugnant to the rule. The Chair recognizes the broad principles of the organic law concerning the distribution of useful information and would hold the amendment in order if it were not for that provision of direction. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment without the words "through the folding room."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 70, line 24, after the figures "$39,000," insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"For printing, binding, and distribution of the publications entitled 'Diseases of the Horse' and 'Diseases of Cattle,' $200,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] desire to speak on his amendment?

Mr. JONES of Texas. No.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Before I vote on this proposition I wish to say that I realize the high character of these works. I have had many demands for them myself, and I should like to know something which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] perhaps can tell me, whether these works have been brought up to date. They have been out of print for many years.

Mr. KNUTSON. Since 1912.

Mr. JONES of Texas. The last printing was in 1916.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. These books treat of diseases which are common to cattle and horses, and of course medical science in these lines progresses just as it progresses in the treatment of human diseases. If these books are up to date I believe I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. They are the most valuable books published by the department.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If the books are out of date, that is another matter.

Mr. JONES of Texas. All the information covered by these books is kept down to date by the department, and the figures as to the cost of these publications were furnished by the department itself.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is there anything in these books about the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. JONES of Texas. I can not answer that question specifically.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That simply illustrates what I am saying. If these books need to be revised and rewritten, we do not want to appropriate $200,000 to have something printed that is of no value.

Mr. JONES of Texas. They are of great value. Even in the form in which they were last published these books are of a great deal more value than a lot of other things for the publication of which we have made large appropriations.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, unquestionably this book should be revised and brought down to date. Any medical book that is 10 or 12 years old is of little real value to-day.

Mr. JONES of Texas. It was last printed in 1916.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. All right; six years ago. There have been very decided advances in the treatment of certain diseases since that time.

Mr. KNUTSON. No doubt the war has led to new discoveries in veterinary treatment.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. New diseases are discovered and remedies are discovered. I am heartily in favor of the publication of these books, but I think they ought to be handled in such a way as to bring them down to date.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman has stated that the work has been kept up to date. Has he the assurance of the department that both these works have been kept up to date?

Mr. JONES of Texas. What I meant to say was that the work in connection with these subjects has been kept up to date.

Mr. KNUTSON. There are new methods of treating new diseases.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Yes; the department has all that information. I will say that there is nothing in this amendment that would keep them from modernizing the books. We will not make the subject any more modern by having a hearing on it. It will be in the discretion of the department to include such information as they desire to include.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, only a short time ago this same matter was before the House and an inquiry

at the Department of Agriculture brought the information to the effect that if an additional issue of the cattle book was authorized no change would be made, that the book could be published with the entire approval of the department just as it has been published heretofore.

The department stated that a slight modification or addition would be necessary in the horse book, to cover one disease. I do not know what the medical name of it is, but in common parlance it is called the big head. I do not know that that affects horses alone.

Mr. KNUTSON. Some Congressmen, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. With that change, which can easily be made, the horse book can be published just as it is published now.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That is the information I wanted.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment for two reasons: First, there has been no estimate asking for it from the Department of Agriculture; and second, I am opposed, as a general proposition, to the Government distributing so many books, pamphlets, and bulletins. As to many of them, we already have an oversupply. I am willing to grant that this particular publication called for in the amendment of my colleague [Mr. JONES] is probably one of the most useful that the Government prints, but how many will we get if this appropriation of $200,000 is made?

Mr. JONES of Texas. There will be 400,000 copies of each book.

Mr. BLACK. That will make probably three or four hundred copies of each for each Member to distribute in his district.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Four hundred thousand copies of the horse book and 400,000 copies of the cattle book.

Mr. BLACK. The Senate, of course, will be entitled to their quota, and I should say we would receive between three and four hundred copies of each of the books.

Now, I have 271,000 people in my district. I do not know how many are farmers, but if I am to intelligently distribute these books where they are to do the most good, how am I going to pick out of that number the 300 or 400 farmers to whom they should be sent? We all know there are entirely too many Government publications now to be sent out to those who have no special desire for them. Not long ago, walking through the corridors of the House Office Building, I saw a large pile of mail sacks in front of the door of a Member, whose name I will not mention, but I counted 47 sacks of different kinds of Government documents that were going out to his district for distribution.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

Mr. CARTER. That was probably some lame duck who was sending out the balance of his publications.

Mr. BLACK. No; he was not a lame duck. He was a good Member of Congress for whom I have a high regard. I presume these documents and publications had accumulated in his office and he felt it his duty to get them out to his constituents.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman wants to know how he is going to distribute these books. I will tell him my experience. After we had printed the books the last time notice was given of the publication in the newspapers that the books would be printed, and I had about twice as many requests as I could comply with. I sent all of my quota and begged all that I could, and still I did not have enough copies. The gentleman will not have any difficulty in getting the mailing list for these books.

Mr. BLACK. The statement of the gentleman just reinforces the very argument I make. If any one of the farmers in my district is entitled to receive the book at Government expense, then every farmer in my district ought to have a copy who wants one.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman might apply the same logic to Members of Congress. You would not send any man unless 300,000 in his district could go.

Mr. BLACK. Oh, no. I do not agree to my friend's illustration. I hold that every farmer in my district is a citizen of my district. In some one way or another he is a taxpayer, and if these publications are to be printed at the expense of the taxpayer, and are to be distributed, then, of course, it is unassailable from my point of view that there ought to be enough of them to supply every farmer who desires a free copy. Certainly the number which will be available by reason of this appropriation will not begin to go around if there is to be general distribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, the objection raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] against the appropriation for the printing of these books on the diseases of horses and cattle would also apply to the Agricultural Yearbook, of which we receive an allotment of about 700 copies.

The gentleman from Texas is concerned about the distribution of the book. I will say that the farmers, as a rule, have organizations in each community, and many of these organizations have libraries. These books can be placed in the libraries where they will be accessible to all.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is not, in my opinion, subject to a point of order, and if I have an opportunity I will vote for it because I think it is one of the most meritorious publications that the Government issues.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this much in addition to what has been already said. I think that of all the publications issued by the Agricultural Department this is one of the most useful. I have many requests for both of these books, and I send it to those who want it and have a use for it, and they can also be circulated through their libraries. The same objection urged by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] against these publications can be urged against the publications of the Bureau of Markets. It is only those who want the information, who write for it and who make the best use of them, that they will go to. I shall favor the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take issue with my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK], with whom I usually agree on these matters.

A few days ago you put through a bill that carried an additional hundred million dollars annually, and in my opinion a very small portion of it, if applied to this proposition, would do the country a great deal more good. Since I have been in the House I have never voted to waste $200,000 or $300,000 on garden seeds for political advertisement. Frankly, I believe it is a mistake, and I know the farmers of my district—and I represent a farming district—think it is a mistake. I also know that a great many farmers are calling for these books on diseases of horses and cows. Every week I get letters from farmers wanting these books; they want to read them and apply their teachings in their stock raising. My friend from Texas says you can not send one to every individual. I admit that. It is not necessary to send one to every individual. But if you are going to knock it out on that ground you might as well also strike out the appropriation for farmers' bulletins. You only have an allotment of 20,000 of them a year, and you can not send one to each individual, as there are more than 200,000 people in each congressional district.

Mr. BLACK. The way I distribute those is to send a list to every registered voter in my district and allow him to select the ones he wants. I have always had enough to supply every request.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to know if he is able to do that with reference to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. RANKIN. Why certainly not. These books on diseases of horses and cows should not be sent out broadcast, but should be supplied to those individuals who apply for them and who are really in need of the information they contain.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we do not intend to vote on this bill to-day. I want to make the point of order that it is time to do some Christmas shopping this afternoon, and I make the point that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-eight Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll, and the Sergeant at Arms will bring in the absentees.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Abernethy	Barbour	Brand	Burke
Ackerman	Beedy	Brennan	Burroughs
Almon	Bell	Briggs	Burtness
Ansorge	Bixler	Britten	Butler
Anthony	Blakeney	Brooks, Ill.	Byrns, Tenn.
Appleby	Bland, Ind.	Brooks, Pa.	Campbell, Kans.
Arentz	Boies	Brown, Tenn.	Cantrill
Bacharach	Bond	Bulwinkle	Carew
Bankhead	Bowers	Burdick	Chalmers

Chandler, Okla.	Griffin	McLaughlin, Pa.	Scott, Tenn.
Christopherson	Hadley	McSwain	Sears
Clark, Fla.	Hammer	MacGregor	Shaw
Classon	Hawes	Maloney	Shreve
Clouse	Hays	Mapes	Siegel
Cockran	Henry	Mead	Smith, Mich.
Codd	Herrick	Merritt	Snyder
Cole, Ohio	Hersey	Michaelson	Speaks
Collier	Hickey	Michener	Sproul
Collins	Hoch	Mills	Stafford
Connally, Tex.	Hogan	Montague	Steagall
Connolly, Pa.	Hooker	Moore, Ill.	Stedman
Cooper, Ohio	Huck	Moore, Ohio	Steenerson
Copley	Hudspeth	Morgan	Stevenson
Coughlin	Humphreys, Miss.	Morin	Stiness
Crisp	Husted	Mott	Stoll
Cullen	Hutchinson	Mudd	Strong, Pa.
Dallinger	Ireland	Nelson, Me.	Sullivan
Davis, Minn.	Jacoway	Norton	Sumners, Tex.
Deal	James	O'Brien	Tague
Dempsey	Jefferis, Nebr.	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Dominick	Johnson, Miss.	Ogden	Taylor, N. J.
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Olpp	Taylor, Tenn.
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Osborne	Temple
Drewry	Kahn	Overstreet	Ten Eyck
Dunbar	Kearns	Paige	Thompson
Dunn	Keller	Park, Ga.	Tillman
Dyer	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. Y.	Tilson
Echols	Kennedy	Patterson, Mo.	Tincher
Edmonds	Kiess	Patterson, N. J.	Tinkham
Elliott	Kindred	Paul	Tucker
Ellis	King	Perlman	Underhill
Evans	Kirkpatrick	Petersen	Upshaw
Fairchild	Kitchin	Porter	Vaile
Fields	Kleczka	Pou	Vare
Focht	Kline, N. Y.	Pringey	Vestal
Fordney	Kline, Pa.	Purnell	Voigt
Foster	Knight	Radcliffe	Volk
Free	Kreider	Rainey, Ala.	Walters
Freeman	Kuns	Rainey, Ill.	Ward, N. Y.
Frothingham	Larson, Minn.	Ramseyer	Ward, N. C.
Fulmer	Lawrence	Ransley	Wason
Funk	Layton	Reber	Watson
Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Reece	Weaver
Garrett, Tenn.	Lee, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Gensman	Lehlbach	Riddick	White, Me.
Gernerd	Lineberger	Riordan	Williams, Tex.
Gifford	Linthicum	Robertson	Williamson
Gilbert	Little	Rodenberg	Winslow
Glynn	Logan	Rose	Wise
Goldsborough	London	Rosenbloom	Wood, Ind.
Goodykoontz	Longworth	Rossdale	Woodruff
Gorman	Luce	Rucker	Woods, Va.
Gould	Luhring	Ryan	Woodyard
Graham, Pa.	Lyon	Sabath	Wyant
Green, Iowa	McDuffie	Sanders, Ind.	Yates
Greene, Mass.	McFadden	Sanders, N. Y.	
Griest	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Schall	

The committee rose; and Mr. MCARTHUR having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 13481, found itself without a quorum; that he directed the roll to be called, and that 158 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he handed in a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. When the point of order of no quorum was made three minutes' time remained, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we ought to get excited about this proposition. If we are to preserve the integrity of appropriation bills and the jurisdiction of the committee which deal with legislative propositions, this House can not afford to put on this bill an item of this sort for which there is no legislative authorization. There have been no hearings upon this item, there have been no general demands for it so far as I know. While I am in entire sympathy with these publications, in a regular and orderly way, after consideration by a committee, it does not seem to me that this is the proper place to consider a proposition of this kind. The rules of the House provide that no direction shall be made, and the law itself provides that no direction shall be made for the printing of publications without the submission of an estimate of the cost of that printing, and had I recalled that fact when the question about the point of order was under consideration I think the Chair would have recognized that this item is subject to the point of order. However, I assume that the Members of the House desire to comply with the law, and will recognize the salutary character of the provision which requires that matters of this sort shall be considered by a committee, and that there shall be an estimate by the Government Printer as to the cost.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. My understanding is that the Chair has held that this is in order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not arguing the point of order.

Mr. HAUGEN. I hardly see the justice of the criticism that the matter should be considered by another committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that any item that comes before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union ought to have the prior consideration of some committee of the House, which this has not had, and, in view of that fact, it seems to me that the House ought to reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON) there were—ayes 60, noes 41.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. JONES of Texas and Mr. ANDERSON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL FOREST LANDS.

For the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L., 961), as amended, $450,000.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The policy of the Federal Government in cooperating with the States in forestation and stream control is a wise policy. For that reason I shall not raise a point of order against this paragraph, but the section of the Weeks Act under which this appropriation is supposed to be in order was repealed by limitation on June 30, 1915. The rest of the Weeks Act is continued in force and effect. The preceding paragraph is in order because section 2 of that act is still the law. Section 3 was repealed by limitation on June 30, 1915. I call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the Agricultural appropriation bill to this fact, and also the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. If it is to be the policy of the Government to continue this appropriation, legislation should be had. Under the original act $1,000,000 was made available during the years 1910 and 1911, and not more than $2,000,000 for succeeding years, as appropriated by Congress, until June 30, 1915, at which time section 3 was definitely repealed by limitation explicitly provided in the act.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, $46,500.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 25, page 71, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Field station, Woodward, Okla: For the maintenance in connection with the Woodward, Okla., field station of a live-stock department through which experiments and demonstrations in live-stock breeding and growing and feeding, including both beef and dairy animals, may be had, $6,500."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this has been represented to me as a very important matter, and I only learned of its being left out of the bill through the good offices of my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a member of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, after the bill had already been brought into consideration by the House. On the next day I received a telegram from the Chamber of Commerce of Woodward, Okla., expressing great disappointment at the proposed suspension of this service, telling me of the good work being done and of the disadvantages that might result by abolishing this station. This live-stock branch of the station was only established in 1921, a little more than a year ago. Since that time the city of Woodward, Okla., has invested $15,000 in land for this enterprise, and now it is proposed here to abolish the matter and cut it off just as it is beginning to function to an advantage, thereby breaking faith with the city of Woodward and with the farmers in that section, who are interested in the tests and experiments being made.

I find by consulting the hearings that this is the only station in the United States carrying out a certain character of experiments in cattle feeding, and tests are being made both of dairy production and meat production by grazing cattle on winter

wheat. The importance of continuing this work must certainly be apparent to every Member of this body who knows anything about stock raising and farming, and will certainly be considered of great importance by those now engaged in that line of business.

The importance of the work was admitted in the hearings by those speaking for the bureau, and even our friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], while stating that he had been opposed to the establishment of the station, if I mistake not, admitted in the hearings that it might serve a useful purpose if continued; but for some reason the gentleman seems to have permitted a good intention to go awry. In fact, the only reason given for the suspension of this service was that of Mr. LARSEN of Georgia saying that it was in pursuance of the policy of rigid economy. Certainly if this were the absolute truth we might submit to having this item stricken out of the bill; but with it ought to go a great many other items of less value, such as the item discussed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEPHENS] yesterday for some investigation in distillation of wood, and other purposes which are of doubtful value to the farmers and producers of this country. Yet this item, carrying an appropriation of $350,000, was retained in the bill by a majority of this committee. From the best information I can obtain, I have no doubt in the world that this service renders a splendid and useful purpose, a great deal better than that served by a great many other items in the bill, and, I am sure, will be taken advantage of to a great deal larger extent by the farmers and stock raisers of the country. The item should be reinstated, and I hope the committee will take that view of the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENFORCEMENT OF PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the packers and stockyards act, approved August 15, 1921, $410,500: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $5,000 per annum except three persons at a rate not to exceed $6,500 each per annum.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, on this paragraph I move to strike out the last word in order to ask some questions. I would like to ask why it is necessary to pay three employees in this bureau as much as $6,500 a year salary?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman has reference to the item on page 79?

Mr. BLANTON. The top of page 79. It occurs to me that we are providing rather large salaries. Six thousand five hundred dollars salary per year is high for these three employees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, that is a very large job. The packers do not hesitate to pay $50,000 and $75,000 to their people.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and therefore, Q. E. D., every employee of the Government should receive as much as a private corporation pays their employees?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, I do not think so; but I think this is a very large job. I had a little to do with the drafting of the act, and I think we handed them a pretty hard job. I think we ought to have very efficient men to enforce that act.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman tell us what these particular three men do?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think they have but one $6,500 man now as far as my recollection goes.

Mr. BLANTON. But we are here providing for three to draw $6,500 each. Some of our expert scientists in this department are still drawing $4,000 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Some are drawing a good deal more than that.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of them are bureau chiefs at the head of bureaus and are yet drawing only $4,000.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman asks me, I think it is a shame they are.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I think our experts ought to be paid more, but some of these $6,500 and $7,500 fellows ought to be reduced because some of them are not valuable expert scientists.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman is asking about these $6,500 men. I think I have the information here. One assistant to the Secretary, who is in charge of the entire enforcement act, draws $6,500 now.

Mr. BLANTON. That is probably not too much, but how about the other two?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is only one other, and he is consulting specialist in marketing.

Mr. BLANTON. Why then provide another at $6,500?

Mr. ANDERSON. We always have to leave them a little leeway because, you know, unless there is some opportunity for advancement in Government service, as there is in private employment, it is difficult to get satisfactory men.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, in this instance I will not oppose the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. May I ask the gentleman in the time of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I ask for two minutes in order to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I simply want to ask whether practically all of these employees are selected under the civil-service system?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; practically all of them.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It is true also in regard to the next paragraph relating to the enforcement of the grain futures act?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So far as salaries are concerned I think they are very modest.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAXIMUM SALARIES.

During the fiscal year 1924 the maximum salary of any scientific investigator, or other employee engaged in scientific work and paid from the general appropriation of the Department of Agriculture, shall not exceed at the rate of $6,500 per annum: *Provided*, That for the fiscal year 1924 no salary shall be paid under this paragraph at a rate per annum in excess of $5,000 except the following: Not more than 12 in excess of $5,000 but not in excess of $5,500 each and not more than five in excess of $5,500 each.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and a change of existing law in that it increases the amount that may be paid for scientific salaries up to $6,500 a year.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order? I do not want to take up the time of the committee to plead with the gentleman if he is going to be adamant on this proposition.

Mr. BLANTON. I think it is too much as a general proposition. Whenever they have had a reason for it they come in and ask for it and the committee is liberal with them, but just to give them general authorization to increase and jump the salary up to $6,500 a year, why, there is no telling how much money it might require of the Appropriations Committee in the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; this does not do it. It limits the number that can be increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ANDERSON. I offer an amendment to the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON: Page 79, after line 18, insert: "The President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Farm Congress, to be held in the United States during the year 1923: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted or used for the expenses of delegates."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, this provision has been carried very frequently in an appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the usual provision authorizing the President to invite delegates representing the nations participating in the International Congress. Such an item has been carried almost every year in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and though it is probably outside of the rules of the House I think there will be no objection to it. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative construction of rural post roads: For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended, $29,300,000, to be available until expended, being part of the sum of $85,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, by paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, immediately upon the passage of this act, to apportion among the several States, as provided in section 21 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9,

1921, the sum of $65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, by said paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act approved June 19, 1922: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall act upon projects submitted to him under his apportionment of this authorization, and his approval of any such project within three years shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of its proportional contribution thereto.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CABLE. I would like to ask the chairman in charge of the bill about the appropriation of $50,000 that was carried in the law for 1922 for road purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. That authorization will be taken care of, I understand, in the deficiency bill.

Mr. CABLE. When will that bill be reported out of committee?

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand in a few days.

Mr. CABLE. That money will be available for contracts entered into between the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. ANDERSON. It will be available for contract obligations for the current fiscal year, $50,000,000.

Mr. CABLE. It will take care of all contracts for the current fiscal year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; so I understand.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I made a few remarks yesterday on the public-roads program. They did not get into the RECORD last night. I ask unanimous consent that they be put in the RECORD in the appropriate place on the roads item to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may print the statement which he made yesterday in regard to the public-roads program in its appropriate place in to-day's proceedings. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the remarks referred to:

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleagues on this side of the House that when we commenced the fight for the $50,000,000 appropriation for roads for the fiscal year ending June 30 next, there had not at that time been any provision whatever made to appropriate any of that money or to cover matured obligations. Since that time the deficiency subcommittee has had a hearing and they have come to a clear and complete understanding. The deficiency subcommittee will bring in a bill carrying $25,000,000 of that, and perpetuating the authorization for a period of three years, with legislation on it to which the Committee on Rules agrees. And secondly, it makes available $42,000,000 now lying idle in the Treasury, not contracted for by the States. That, with the money carried in this bill, will make $98,000,000 that will then be available to meet the obligations of the good-roads movement. They used $88,000,000 last year, and $78,000,000 the year before, and in my judgment $98,000,000 will be amply sufficient for the coming year. Many of these obligations under contracts let under the $50,000,000 appropriation of this year will mature by March, and if the deficiency bill carries an appropriation of $50,000,000 it will be then available. If the $50,000,000 is carried in this bill it will not be available until June 30, and therefore some of the States would have to wait until then before the money is available.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] reserved a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DOWELL. I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The Chair wants to remind the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] that in reading the bill we passed over without prejudice a paragraph on page 2, beginning with line 3, and ending with line 7 on page 3.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that we may return to this paragraph now and consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph indicated and consider it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request that was made.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the two paragraphs beginning on page 2, "Office of the Secretary," and ending on line 10 of page 3, be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the paragraphs beginning on page 2, "Office of the Secretary," and ending on line 10 of page 3, be agreed to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk have authority to change the totals in accordance with the action of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request of yesterday that I be permitted to insert in the RECORD an article from the latest edition of the Scientific American which, in my judgment, contains an unanswerable defense of the contention I have heretofore made, that we ought to continue the congressional free-seed distribution. When I made the request yesterday it was in the heat of debate, and the objection was interposed by gentlemen who disagree with me on this question but who are now convinced that I am at least entitled to this courtesy. The article will not occupy more than a couple of pages or a page and a half of the RECORD, and the discussion is so amplifying and so complete that even those who are opposed to what they term this "garden-seed graft" could not object to it. The objection that was interposed at the time, I have since been advised, was interposed under a misapprehension of the facts, and I am sure there will be no objection now to my renewed request. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks further in the RECORD by inserting the article from the Scientific American to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the article referred to from the Scientific American. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

[From the Scientific American, December, 1922.]

MILLIONS IN FOOD FROM FEDERAL FREE SEED—THE STORY OF 240,000 ACRES OF GARDENS AND $192,000,000 WORTH OF VEGETABLES.

(By George H. Dacy.)

Through his Congressmen, Uncle Sam annually gives away approximately 65,000,000 packages of vegetable and flower seed—the best seeds of their type and variety which are to be had in the world. All the Government free seed is tested for germination and trueness of type before it is disseminated among the amateur and professional gardeners, farmers, and suburbanites here, there, and everywhere throughout the United States. Ever since the inception of Uncle Sam's annual free-seed party commercial dealers and the general public have ridiculed the free Federal seed as cheap, impure, and generally "no account." Despite this, the demands for the free seed have increased. Our Representatives and Senators are swamped with applications for the large franked envelopes, each of which contain five packets of certain combinations of seed. The gardeners have tried out the seed and found it the best they ever used. They come back for more each season because they know that the only source from which they can obtain such superior seed is the Department of Agriculture.

The hives of the busiest bees look like centers of idleness as compared with the Government seed warehouse during the period from October to April each year, when the work of sampling, testing, packeting, enveloping, franking, and mailing the millions of congressional orders for seed is progressing at full speed. It is a well-planned orderly journey that the seed travels, from the gunny sack in which it came from the seed dealer to the franked package in which it is sent out by a Congressman to one of his rural constituents. There is no lost motion. The operations are all standardized and systematized. As far as possible mechanical appliances have been substituted for hand labor. One hundred and fifty girls and women are employed. They operate simple and efficient machines which expedite the rapid transfer of the tested seed from large sacks to small paper packets and finally to the mailing of five packets of the seed in one large franked envelope to the ultimate user.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has been opposed to the congressional seed project, as it is called. The Federal farming experts claim that the $360,000, which yearly is spent in buying seed and sending it to all sections of the country, could better be expended in securing from foreign countries new and rare seeds and cuttings of plants which appear to be adapted for cultivation under our climatic and soil conditions. But annually Congress overrides the recommendations of the department and adds the free-seed item to the agricultural budget in answer to the hundreds of thousands of letters which pour in from the highlands of Appalachia, the wildernesses of Maine, the deserts of Arizona, the cut-over lands of Wisconsin and Michigan, and where not in the United States. Our Federal lawmakers always reserve five-sixths of the seed for distribution among their constituencies. The remainder is allotted to the Department of Agriculture as an emergency seed supply which may be given to regions where weather conditions have been severe to the extent that their original quotas of free seed did not germinate.

As matters stand at present, each Congressman is entitled to 20,000 packets of vegetable seed and 2,000 packages of flower seed which he can distribute among the gardeners of his district. Needless to say, all the national lawmakers avail themselves to the full limit of their available quotas of seed. In fact, the Department of Agriculture has to keep a very accurate set of books on the seed debits and credits of each Representative or Senator. At the beginning of the annual seed distribution, each Congressman is credited with his just proportion of the Government seed on the books of the Department of Agriculture. Henceforward he is permitted to draw against this quota as if it were a bank account until his allotment of seed is exhausted. The persistence with which Congressmen try to overdraw their accounts indicates the great popularity of the officially inspected and guaranteed garden seed which Uncle Sam gives away.

Banks, merchants, and agricultural clubs the country over which have aided the respective Congressmen in the distribution of their seeds have kept tab on the resultant returns in the way of foodstuffs which emanate from this generosity of the Government. The average of innumerable reports shows that the representative acre of garden planted with Federal free seed yields at least $800 worth of food-

stuffs. A leading bank of Grand Rapids, Mich., reports acre yields of vegetables worth $1,200 from the free seed gardens under its patronage. Last year more than 240,000 acres were planted with Government seed, which demonstrates a food production worth $192,000,000. It's a pretty good investment that Uncle Sam makes in his farm and garden seed donations. He spends $360,000 in buying and distributing the seed and the gardeners grow $192,000,000 worth of vegetables and truck crops. If any other Government or private philanthropy in the country in a single year can yield a return five hundred and thirty-three and three-tenths times as great as the initial investment, the writer would like to know about it. Even under the worst possible conditions, where one-third of each packet of seed was wasted, damaged in transit or otherwise injured so as to prevent germination, a return of at least $10 per packet of seed in food products has resulted from the averages compiled from 20 years of accurate records kept by Uncle Sam.

Those who use the Federal seed from Maine to Florida and from California to Pennsylvania by the hundreds of thousands indorse it as much better seed than they are ever able to buy on the local markets. The Government seeds germinate well and grow and produce bumper yields of vegetable crops. "Government seeds are the only ones on which I can always rely," writes a gardener from Mississippi. A Representative from Texas, who last year personally made a garden and grew vegetables, reports that his Federal seed gave excellent results, germinating well, and being admirably adapted to the climate of the Lone Star State. A school girl from a corn-belt State last season raised $20 worth of fine vegetables from one of the small packets of Government seed. An amateur gardener in Providence, R. I., produced $50 worth of vegetable from his large envelope of Government seeds. He won a prize offered by the local merchants' association for the best home garden. A couple of old-timers in Hamilton, Ohio, won a $50 prize from their backyard garden, the superiority of which they attribute to Uncle Sam's faultless seed. Enthusiastic indorsements of the free seed has come in hundreds of letters from Detroit automobile mechanics and cotton-mill employees of the South, as much seed is annually distributed among the working forces of such establishments.

Approximately 30 different combinations of seed have been worked out which are adapted to production in different sections of the country. For example, some of the vegetables which will flourish in Florida will fail in Minnesota. The superintendent of seed distribution studies the orders of each Congressman and makes sure that combinations of seed are sent out which are propitiously adapted to cultivation in the section of the country where the seed are destined for distribution. Naturally, city residents can not plant vegetable seed unless they have back yards. However, most of them can put out window boxes seeded with flower seed. Hence there is a special proviso by which Congressmen can exchange a certain proportion of their vegetable seed for flower seed for distribution in congested city sections.

In addition to being tested for germination, all the Government seeds are tested for trueness of type and name by planting some of them in the gardens of Uncle Sam's big experimental crop farm at Arlington, Va. All seed that does not germinate up to Federal requirements is rejected, while if any dealers provide seed which is not true to name they are blacklisted and boycotted so far as potential national purchases are concerned. Just to illustrate that this factor is one of crucial importance, it is worthy of mention that there are more than 1,600 different types of lettuce, 2,000 different varieties of radishes, and 1,800 different kinds of beans grown and sold commercially throughout the United States. American seedsmen catalogue this number of varieties; and although Uncle Sam does not recognize all of them officially, he has to know them and their aliases in order to determine what sections of the country they are adapted to. It is especially notable that during the last score of years, during which Uncle Sam annually has distributed from 100,000 to 1,500,000 pounds of seeds, the official tests of the Federal free seed have averaged over 80 per cent—a record altogether remarkable. During the past 20 years between 30,000 and 50,000 pounds of Government flower seed have been circulated among the public each year. Opponents of the free-seed distribution measure yearly raised a great hullabaloo concerning the large post-office deficit that results from the fact that the free seed is sent out under congressional franks. These contentions are wholly unfounded. Records kept by the Department of Agriculture show that during the last 20 years the average cost of handling the Government seed if it were distributed by a retail seedsman would have ranged from $55,000 to $130,000 a year, with the average about $110,000. This includes the true cost of postage on the basis of the actual weights of the large and small packages of seed. This would at best be but a small item to the Post Office Department. Furthermore, the system of handling the seed has been so standardized that the labors of the Federal mail service are reduced to a minimum.

The seed packages have to be prepared and circulated on a rush-order, full-pressure schedule. By law it is required that no seed be put into the mails before December 1 and that the distribution of seed by Congressmen be completed by April 1. The Secretary of Agriculture is allowed the special privilege of sending out free seed up to April 15. During a short period of four months—on the basis of current activities—65,000,000 packets of seed placed in 13,000,000 of the large franked envelopes have to be put into the mails. The inception and perfection of mechanical hands to expedite this work have been of immeasurable importance.

The Post Office Department keeps from 5 to 12 clerks at the Government seed warehouse during the mailing season sorting and routing the Government franks—the substitute postage stamps—into the different towns and villages over the United States. This system eliminates much laborious work in handling the packages of seeds in the official post offices. For example, if Senator X, of Georgia, desires to send 1,000 large packages of seed to political supporters of his in the town of Stark the franks are prepared and visèed by the postal clerks at the seed warehouse. Then they are passed on to the large manila envelopes, which in turn are filled with the desired combination of seed. When the packages are finally counted and placed in the mail bags they are ready to go directly to the mail train which will convey them to their destination. The same number of postal clerks can handle twenty times as many packages in this way as they can of ordinary unassorted commercial packages. An ordinary mail pouch will hold 200 packages of Government seed. It takes 65,000 mail bags to carry the free-seed supply from Washington to the localities where the gardens will be planted.

Gravity is harnessed as much as possible in aiding the big job of packing the seeds in paper envelopes. On the fourth floor of the seed warehouse there are 22 galvanized iron hoppers, each holding about 4 bushels of seed. These feed seed to as many packets and sealing machines on the floor below. Mr. Frank Clarke, of Waco, Tex., the contractor in charge of the packing, sealing, and delivery of the seed packages during the current year, has invented a very ingenious sealing machine, which has vastly aided in speeding up the work. Formerly it used to take three girls who worked by hand all day to fill and seal up 16,000 of the small packets. Now two girls working with a machine can fill and seal an average of 30,000 to 35,000 packages in a similar period. The record day's work has been 48,200 packages by two girls who worked at top speed and filled and sealed at the rate of over 100 packages a minute. One of the girls sits in front of a delivery tube provided with a revolving adjustable cup that deposits exactly the same amount of seed into each package. The other girl feeds the packets of seed (ranging in size from 8 to 1,200 to the pound) into the gluing and sealing machine. This machine consists of an endless belt provided with a series of cleats spaced to fit the different sized packets. It is operated by electricity. In turn, the packets are slipped into the spaces on the moving belt and carried under an automatic device consisting of a brass wheel which applies glue to the flaps and then under another special contrivance which folds over these flaps and presses them tightly so that the glue adheres and seals the containers. As the belt reaches the end of the machine and begins its downward and backward journey, each packet in turn is delivered to a large basket. When the basket is full, an attendant replaces it with an empty receptacle and dumps the filled container through a chute in the floor to a bin. There are as many different chutes and bins as there are different kinds of seed.

Altogether there are 64 of these V-shaped seed bins, which are large enough to accommodate 50,000,000 packets of seed. The 14 vegetables include beans, corn, peas, watermelons, cucumbers, squash, parsley, lettuce, onions, radishes, turnips, tomatoes, carrots, and beets. About 30 different combinations of these seeds are sent out. There are 10 different kinds of flower seed, including nasturtiums, sweet peas, petunias, poppies, mignonette, asters, cosmos, and the like.

On the second floor of the seed warehouse there are five large endless belts, each of which is manned by a crew of nine girls. Chutes from the seed bins above distribute the different kinds of seed, respectively, before certain of these girls who feed the small packets of seed into the large envelopes which are carried along the belt. For example, the combination of seed may consist of beans, corn, peas, beets, and lettuce. The franked envelope starts from the tables where girls paste the franks onto the proper envelopes. There it passes on belts to the next post, where the girl puts in it a packet of corn. The next girl slips in a packet of peas, the next one beets, and so on, until all five of the required packets of seeds are placed in the envelope. Then it passes before another girl who inspects the package to see that it contains the right kind and number of seed packets. The final operator runs the machine that glues and folds the envelope flap. The large packages are delivered into baskets which are dumped onto tables before inspectors who count and check the packages and deposit them into the mail sacks, whence they go direct to the railroad.

The five conveyer belts handle 125,000 large packages or 625,000 small packets of seed daily. The day's record for any belt is 36,600 packages or 183,000 small packets of seed. The belt operates at a speed which carries 84 of the cleated spaces for the envelopes before each girl a minute. These large belts travel a combined distance of 2,555 miles in packeting and preparing the free seed for distribution. If placed end to end, the 65,000,000 packets of seed distributed during 1922 would cover a distance of 8,551 miles, or about one-seventh of the distance around the world.

And that is the story behind those large envelopes of seeds which come to us in response to our request.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. TOWNER as Speaker pro tempore having assumed the chair, Mr. HICKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 13481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that a vote was not to be taken on the passage of any bill until January 8.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has reported, and the Speaker pro tempore has announced the report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. The consideration of the bill in committee is concluded.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that the House do now adjourn.

EXERCISES IN MEMORY OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE KINKAID.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. I will withhold it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I understand that January 14 has been designated as the date for memorial exercises in honor of our late colleague, the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, of Illinois. I have conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], upon whose request this order was made, and I find it perfectly agreeable to him and to the Nebraska delegation that exercises in memory of the Hon. MOSES P. KINKAID, late a Representative from the State of Nebraska, be had on that day immediately after the memorial exercises in

honor of Mr. MANN have been concluded. I ask that an order to that effect be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30 REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,000 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept such devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3220. An act amending sections 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 29, and 30 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13571) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 13572) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office building to be erected at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13573) to determine proceedings in cases of contested elections of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13574) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., to commemorate the explorations and discoveries of the Verendrye brothers, and to expend not to exceed $25,000 therefor; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13575) to provide seed wheat for the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13576) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13577) granting a pension to Ella Kinser Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13578) granting a pension to George H. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13579) for the relief of Thomas F. Madden; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6678. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of K. Jacobs and 80 other residents of Pontiac, Mich., protesting against Turkish atrocities and requesting the Federal Government to initiate measures to restrain further violence in this respect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6679. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Bronx Board of Trade, in the city of New York, N. Y., urging a central post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6680. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of the State of California, favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6681. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Mr. Lyle L. Putney and 13 other residents of Arcadia, Mich., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *December 27, 1922.*

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast cared for us through the night season and hast granted us health and strength for the day and its duties. We look unto Thee this morning, asking that Thy guidance may be had and that every phase of life as presented to us may receive that kind consideration, that we may become more helpful in these days of need and of manifold problems, and finally receive Thine approbation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MEDILL MCCORMICK, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ARIZONA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which have just been received. I ask that they may be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, HENRY F. ASHURST was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at the city of Phoenix, the capital, this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

ERNEST R. HALL.

[SEAL.]

By the acting governor:

JOHN MCK. REDMOND,
Assistant Secretary of State.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], certified by the governor, and ask to have the same read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year 1922, ANDRIEUS A. JONES, Esq., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Merritt C. Mechem, and our seal hereto affixed, this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.] MERRITT C. MECHEM.

By the governor:

EDITH WILSMAN,
Assistant Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS presented resolutions adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Teton County, Mont., favoring the enactment of legislation for the taxation of unpatented lands on Government reclamation projects, which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bison and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., indorsing the rural credit bills pending in Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of J. D. Myers and 19 other citizens, of Raub, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of George Kugler and 30 other citizens, of Fairmount, N. Dak., praying for the passage of legislation repealing the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Edgar Wagar and 21 other citizens, of McHenry County, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23, 1922, they presented the following enrolled bills to the President of the United States:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4232) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Elephant Butte irrigation district, of New Mexico, and the El Paso County improvement district No. 1, of Texas, for the carrying out of the provisions of the convention between the United States and Mexico, proclaimed January 16, 1907, and providing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 4233) to provide for the appointment to higher grades of certain Army officers having conspicuously superior records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4234) granting a pension to Lillian H. Corcoran; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment providing for bringing 4,887 acres of Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the provisions and benefits of a drainage district, organized pursuant to the laws of said State, for the purpose of draining the lands within the Newlands irrigation project, and appropriating $2,500 for the purpose of paying the first installment assessable against said Indian lands, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment providing that the enlisted forces of the Navy shall not exceed 67,000 men, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation for pay of the Navy from $121,446,892 to $91,446,892, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. REED of Missouri submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Borah amendment proposed to be submitted to the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following:

"The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany."

PROPOSED SILVER COMMISSION.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it may be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) was read, as follows:

Whereas the production of silver in the United States is a large and important industry affecting the welfare of important communities and of a large number of citizens; and

Whereas the United States has throughout its history favored silver as an important element of its monetary system and now views with anxiety the recent tendency of many influential nations of the world to lessen the use of silver as money, in some cases by ceasing its coinage for subsidiary and fractional denominations, in other cases by diminishing the silver contents of coins of the same nominal value; and

Whereas such tendencies, if unchecked, will have a serious and far-reaching effect upon the monetary customs of the world and will directly and indirectly injure one of the world's greatest industries, that of mining; and

Whereas the subject is a complex one, requiring the investigation of many abstruse and difficult problems and their consideration by many nations: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States appoint a commission of nine, to be known as a "silver commission," of whom not more than three shall be Members of the United States Senate and not more than three shall be Members of the United States House of Representatives; that such commission be authorized to communicate with such nations as may be feasible, either individually or in a joint conference to be arranged for that purpose; that such commission shall use its influence toward the resumption of the use of silver in the various monetary systems of nations which have abandoned or lessened its use and shall also lend its influence toward the adoption of any step that may tend to stabilize the value of silver in the world's market; that the commission after such investigation and conferences as it may deem advisable shall report to the President its recommendations and findings; that no compensation shall be allowed to any member of such commission as such, but the actual necessary expenses of the commission shall be borne by the United States.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I move that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The motion was agreed to.

THE RULES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submitted on Friday Senate Resolution 385. It is on the table, I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that it may still lie on the table, going over for the day. There is other business to come up this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request will be granted.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on December 27, 1922, the President approved and signed the act (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. HARRISON subsequently said: Mr. President, while it is very true that we are on the naval appropriation bill we can not lose sight of the important fight that is to proceed at an early date, I presume, touching ship subsidy.

A few days ago, on Tuesday, December 19, appearing in the Washington Post and other papers throughout the country—I read from the Washington Post—there was a statement issued

by Mr. Lasker, chairman of the Shipping Board, in which he said—I read from the headlines of the Washington Post—

Lasker denounces CAPPER'S ship fight.
Statements published in Senator's paper declared biased and "at variance with facts."
Denies chief statements.
Says they were made on strength of minority report and are wholly erroneous.

The statement has been incorporated in the RECORD heretofore, but I desire to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD, so that those who are studying the ship subsidy bill may get some facts from it, this statement in the form of a letter from Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee, a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. I may say that Mr. DAVIS, in my opinion, is one of the best-versed men in the Congress touching this proposed ship subsidy legislation. He has given great thought to the question, and I am sure that he has sufficiently answered the chairman of the Shipping Board in this correspondence. I think it ought to be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1922.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I note that Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, has written you a letter, which he gave to the press, in which he takes you to task by reason of the fact that Capper's Weekly is conducting a poll on the ship subsidy bill and because the questionnaire accompanying the ballots contains a statement of the issue which does not wholly meet the approval of Mr. Lasker. In other words, Chairman Lasker takes exception to the fact that you have not swallowed without question all of the false propaganda which he has been busily engaged in preparing and disseminating, at least in part at Government expense, instead of attending to his official duties; the statute creating the Shipping Board provides that "each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office."

Mr. Lasker has the temerity to upbraid you because the questionnaire mentioned contained even a modicum of the argument and facts against the bill, although it contained a much fuller statement in favor of the bill, stated as strongly as any proponent of the bill has stated it, and occupying nearly three times as much space in the questionnaire as the only statement therein which can be construed as against the bill.

The fact of the business is that opponents of this bill have infinitely more cause for complaint against said questionnaire than has Chairman Lasker.

The statement in the questionnaire from Capper's Weekly for which Chairman Lasker upbraids you, and which he incorporates in his letter, is as follows:

"1. Do you favor a ship subsidy? In order to stop $50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed that the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately $200,000,000, lend one hundred and twenty-five million to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about $750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years. A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned. President Harding advocactes the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce."

Mr. Lasker further asserts in his letter:

"The statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts; your words are taken, practically syllable for syllable, from this partisan minority report."

I emphatically deny that the major portion of the statement in the questionnaire is taken from the House minority report or that it represents my views or that of any other Member who signed such report. On the other hand, the statement that "in order to stop $50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed," is not only not in accord with the House minority report but each and every one of those contentions is denied and disproved in the said minority report, as was also done in speeches delivered in the House by all of us who signed the minority report.

The questionnaire contains the following statement: "A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned." While this is one of the chief arguments of the proponents of the bill and stated in the manner in which it is usually stated, yet under provisions of the bill the only subsidies which would be so returned would be for the current year and not any subsidies which had been paid in previous years. Furthermore, it is insisted by those opposed to this bill that there would be no refunds under this provision, for the reason that any surplus would be taken up in salaries, through subsidiary companies, etc., in order to avoid a refund.

It will be noted that this questionnaire directs the readers' attention to the fact that "President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce." This is naturally calculated to largely influence the voter to whom the questionnaire is sent.

In fact, your questionnaire was more than fair to the bill and its advocates. As the readers of your papers are largely farmers, it would have been entirely proper for you to have called attention to the fact that this bill is not drafted or designed in the interest of cargo carriers, in which the farmers are interested, as has been conclusively and irrefutably shown. You could have well explained that this bill conferred more power on Chairman Lasker and his associates than good men ought to want or that bad men ought to be given.

The portion of said questionnaire which seems to have so riled Chairman Lasker is as follows:

"It is proposed: That the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately $200,000,000, lend $125,000,000 to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about $750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years."

Mr. Lasker states: "I challenge one to find where the Shipping Board has ever proposed that the war-built merchant fleet be sold for approximately $200,000,000." I accept that challenge.

The Shipping Board advertised the sale of the entire Government fleet last February. The New York Tribune of February 18, 1922, contained a front-page article which reads in part as follows:

"UNITED STATES TO SELL 1,470 SHIPS NEXT TUESDAY—ENTIRE MERCHANT FLEET, FROM "LEVIATHAN" TO TUGS, OFFERED—PROCEEDS FIGURED AT $200,000,000—SUCCESS DEPENDS ON SUBSIDY'S PASSAGE—READY MART AT TOP PRICES ASSURED IF CONGRESS ADOPTS HARDING'S PLAN.

"WASHINGTON, February 17.—The entire fleet of merchant ships owned by the United States Government will be offered for sale on February 21 it was announced to-day by Joseph W. Powell, president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The total of 1,470 vessels included is expected to net the Government close to $200,000,000, or an average of $20 a ton.

"All classes and types of vessels will be included in the sale, in the expectation that if the administration's proposed subsidy bill is passed by Congress the ships will find a ready market and assure a large, permanent American merchant marine."

The New York Tribune is a loyal supporter of the administration and of this ship subsidy bill. Articles similar to the above appeared in the press generally at the time.

I made a speech in the House of Representatives February 21, 1922, in which I read the Tribune article in full and commented thereon. Representative HARDY of Texas followed with a speech on the same subject, in which he, among other things, stated: "The proposition goes out that the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation propose to sell those ships at a round sum of $200,000,000." In fact, since said publications purporting to be an official announcement from the Shipping Board that it was expected that our fleet could be sold for approximately $200,000,000, in the event of the passage of this bill, it has been generally accepted as the expected sale price, and has been so mentioned by various speakers and writers, and, so far as I have seen or heard, Mr. Lasker's letter to you is the first instance in which he or any other member of the Shipping Board has questioned the correctness of such statements.

The statute required that those ships should be duly appraised before sale, and during the hearings on this bill the Shipping Board was requested to file such appraisal for the information of the committee and the Congress, but Chairman Lasker, through Commissioner Lissner, refused to file it, as appears on page 840 of the hearings, as follows:

"Mr. LISSNER. Reference was also made to the appraisals of these ships that were mentioned in the advertisement. The chairman has requested me to say to the committee that he regards it as against the interest of the public and as having a very detrimental effect if these figures should go into the record. They were simply informal appraisals that were made for the information of the board itself, and, in our opinion, they should not go into the record or be handed in here at all."

Although admittedly there was no sale for the ships at the time and the bids received therefor were described by Chairman Lasker as "facetious"—"a joke" (hearings, p. 47), Commissioner Lissner of the Shipping Board admitted at the hearings (pp. 989–990) that "one of the purposes of the advertisement was to put ourselves in the position where we could sell the ships, having said we had advertised them." In other words, the statute provides that the ships shall be sold "at public or private competitive sale after appraisement and due advertisement." The Shipping Board took the position that having advertised the entire fleet for sale on a certain day was such compliance with the requirement for "due advertisement," that they could for a reasonable time thereafter sell any of the ships at private sale without further advertisement.

As to another purpose of said advertised sale, I call attention to the following from page 990 of the hearings:

"Mr. DAVIS. I want to ask you if another purpose of this advertised sale was not that you would receive bids for certain vessels of different types, and that that could be taken as a proper criterion upon which you would be justified in selling other ships subsequently at private sale at the same price?

"Mr. LISSNER. It was the hope of the board that the bids that would come would be sufficiently illuminating and reliable so that we could make an estimate of the sales value of the ships; yes, sir.

"Mr. DAVIS. For future sales?

"Mr. LISSNER. Yes, sir."

It was the contention of Chairman Lasker and other representatives of the Shipping Board at the hearings that our ships should be sold at not exceeding world market prices for similar tonnage, and that such world market price for first-class cargo vessels is about $80 per ton or less. The large study prepared under the direction of the Shipping Board and widely distributed, states their position as follows:

"The Shipping Board should sell its remaining fleet as rapidly as possible at prices not to exceed the prevailing world market price for similar tonnage (p. 8).

"Moreover, it is clear that the sale of these ships to American owners on the proposed basis would merely tend to put those ships on a parity with similar foreign ships with respect to the first cost or book value and the fixed charges based thereon" (p. 83).

As evidence of the fact that this proposed sale only has reference to the half of our ships which Chairman Lasker estimated to be good ships, this same study declares:

"To achieve a balanced fleet then would involve the elimination of 3,000,000 gross tons (5,000,000 dead-weight tons) of cargo ships" (p. 40).

Upon the same subject, I call attention to the following extracts from the original statement of Chairman Lasker at the hearings (p. 7):

"Of our 6,000,000 tons of freighters, about half the steel tonnage is good tonnage—comparable to the best in the world. The other half ranges from fair to not usable for purposes and should be either sold abroad in such trades where we have every assurance it will not find itself in competition with our ships, or dismantled.

"Of the 6,000,000 tons of freighters the Government possesses it is the hope of the Shipping Board that ultimately a great measure of the 3,000,000 good tons will find itself in the hands of American owners, should the legislation here proposed be adopted. It is doubtful if, under the happiest conditions, the American flag will need the 3,000,000 good tons in its entirety, and ways and means must be found to dispose of such of the good tonnage as remains, so that American interests will not be hurt. Under no circumstances must the surplus good tonnage that America can not absorb be disposed of so as to bankrupt those who buy from the Government at current prices.

"Automatically the 3,000,000 poor tons must be done away with. Part of it can be used by selling to Americans the hulls at low figures for conversion to types of freighters of which we are not possessed. The balance may either be sold in small quantities in local trades abroad if any, where, because of shorter runs and cheaper labor, local operation may be possible, or it must largely be dismantled.

"It is the unneeded surplus, in ships as in all else, that determines the market, and the same circumstances that forced some farmers to burn their corn last winter demands that, at least so far as the uneconomical 3,000,000 tons of freighters go, we recognize that one of our problems is to force its disappearance from the market."

In further discussing the half of our tonnage which Chairman Lasker describes as from fair to useless, he says: "It is a very imprudent business man who fools himself on his assets. * * * Why should we swindle Americans by selling them ships that would only bankrupt them? It is unconscionable and the Government should not place itself in such a position" (p. 60).

Mr. Lasker correctly explains that 6,000,000 gross tons are equivalent to 10,000,000 dead-weight tons, and that ships are sold on a dead-weight ton basis. On cross-examination at the hearings he was questioned at length in regard to the value and anticipated sale price of our tonnage, and I quote from his testimony, as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. The world price on our good tonnage to-day is about $30.

"Mr. HARDY. You mean that there is 10,000,000 tons that is worth $30 a ton?

"Mr. LASKER. There is 5,000,000 dead weight that is worth $30 per ton if you can sell it. We have been willing to sell it at $30 per ton for some months now, and we have been able to sell exactly 100,000 tons at that price (p. 27).

"Mr. DAVIS. Now, Mr. Lasker, I assume that you and your associates have made some sort of estimate as to what you would hope to realize out of our fleet in the event this bill goes through?

"Mr. LASKER. I have answered that at such length to the judge and to Mr. BRIGGS that I can not think of a new way to answer it.

"Mr. DAVIS. It was stated in the press some time ago, purporting to come from members of the Shipping Board, that $200,000,000 was expected to be realized. Is that substantially correct?

"Mr. LASKER. I would not stand back of that figure. I do not know. It is in the womb of the future. If you do not give us this legislation, you will never get this $200,000,000; if you give us this legislation, you may get more. How much I don't know" (pp. 236–237).

"Mr. DAVIS. In other words, it would be 5,000,000 dead-weight tons, at $30?

"Mr. LASKER. Yes; that is it—well, wait; it would be 5,000,000, if $30 is what we get.

"Mr. DAVIS. Have you any real hope of realizing more than that on the average?

"Mr. LASKER. No; it is in the womb of the future. I don't want to be a prophet; I am no good at crystal gazing." (Hearings, 237.)

Neither Chairman Lasker nor any other representative of the Shipping Board could be persuaded to place any market value on the 5,000,000 dead-weight tons which they described as from fair to useless, nor would any of them make any estimate as to what they expected to realize upon this tonnage, even if the bill passed. However, in view of their pronounced policy of eliminating those ships by scrapping, dismantling, or otherwise disposing of them in such manner that they could not come in competition with the first-class tonnage and the other privately owned tonnage, it is quite evident that but a small amount could and would be realized upon same. It would certainly be a liberal estimate to say that same could thus be disposed of on an average of $10 per dead-weight ton, which would net $50,000,000. Assuming that the Shipping Board should be fortunate enough to sell this tonnage practically for junk at this price, and that they should sell all of the 5,000,000 dead-weight first-class tonnage at $30, they would only receive $200,000,000 for the total tonnage.

It appears clearly in the hearings that the hoped for price of $30 per ton is dependent upon the passage of this bill and also improved world conditions. Chairman Lasker and other proponents of the bill state repeatedly that there is practically no sale for our ships now at any price. On the same occasion in which Mr. Lasker testified as to the value and sale price of the tonnage, he declared that "at the present time there is, by and large, no market for our vast tonnage" (p. 13).

And he further stated "we can not sell ships to-day at all" (p. 230).

I also call attention to Mr. Lasker's testimony as to the intended sale of our ships appearing on pages 29 and 31 of the hearings.

W. J. Love, one of the $35,000 experts and a vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, stated at the hearings that he thought that our ships ought to be put on the market and sold for whatever they would bring regardless of price, even though our ships might thus fall into the hands of one large combination, after which he was questioned, and testified as follows:

"Mr. BRIGGS. I am speaking about the price the Government can get for its fleet. Suppose the bids came in—if this bill should pass—and the bids made were of about the same character as those recently made for the fleet, and it was thought then that Congress intended that the fleet should be sold and put into the hands of private operators at the best price the board could get. They would have to sell it?

"Mr. LOVE. Then you are going to end all the good that is done, because if you are going to hold it and sell it at the value established after the subsidy is made a law you are going to put into the hands of the private operators ships at a higher cost and put another burden on them.

"Mr. BRIGGS. You don't think that ought to be done?

"Mr. LOVE. Let them sell the ships at the best price they can get for them now and start over like everybody else starts.

"Mr. BRIGGS. Well, it is generally conceded that nobody now wants ships. That is true, isn't it?

"Mr. LOVE. That is true.

"Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Lasker has testified here that the bids they received were facetious. He regarded them as a joke.

"Mr. LOVE. That is true" (pp. 862–863).

H. H. Raymond, president of the American Steamship Owners' Association, after having stated that he did not think any ships could be sold now, was asked as to whether he would favor selling any of them until after the bill is passed, and he replied: "I would say emphatically that I would sell every darn ship that the Government has got as fast as I could and get the Government out of business" (pp. 987–988).

Similar views were expressed by other shipowners. As they have controlled the policies of the Shipping Board thus far, it may be reasonably presumed that they will do so in the future.

As a matter of fact, if this bill passes and the disposition of our fleet is left to the present Shipping Board I am convinced that it will not be sold for anything near as much as $200,000,000. In fact, the Shipping Board has sold several 4,100-dead-weight-ton steamers of best quality for $76,000 each, and have announced this as a fixed price for steamers of this type; that is, $18.53 per ton.

Mr. Lasker does not deny that it is proposed to lend $125,000,000 "to recondition the ships or build others." His comment on this is so utterly unfair and childish that it does not deserve notice.

As to the amount of the subsidies and aids provided in the bill, Chairman Lasker repeats the false statements, which he had iterated and reiterated, after having on cross-examination admitted the falsity of same; and he persists in resorting to the sophistry of discussing only the direct-voyage subsidies, as if that was all the burdens imposed by the bill. After considerable cross-examination, appearing on pages 239 to 242 and on pages 271 to 276 of the hearings, Mr. Lasker finally testified as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. Let me see, now, I think we can get a quick meeting of the minds.

"The total cost to the Treasury if the bill ever becomes highly successful in operating, so that we have an adequate merchant marine for peace and war, will be: Customs, $30,000,000; tonnage, $4,000,000; income tax, $10,000,000; construction, $5,000,000; and postage, $5,000,000.

"Mr. DAVIS. How much does that add up—$52,000,000?

"Mr. LASKER. That will add up $52,000,000."

This enumeration does not include certain indirect aids which Mr. Lasker was unable to estimate, although Mr. Lasker did say that the indirect aids were more valuable than the direct aids. Nor does it include the benefit to private shipowners by reason of elimination of the Army and Navy transport services, Mr. Lasker estimating that the net earnings to privately owned lines from this business in the Pacific alone would amount to approximately $5,000,000. Nor does it include benefits to the shipowners which do not involve a burden upon the Public Treasury, such as the provision requiring one-half of the emigrants to come in American-flag ships, which Mr. Rossbottom estimated would give the American shipowners net profits of $8,500,000 even under the present 3 per cent immigration law.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker was entirely too low in his estimates, and as the bill was indorsed by him and the President and as it passed the House it would involve a charge upon the Public Treasury of at least $75,000,000 per year, or $750,000,000 in 10 years, as has been fully shown in the minority report by Senator FLETCHER, by me, and others.

In keeping with his arrogant attitude, Chairman Lasker repeatedly refers to the fact that he and other representatives of the Shipping Board had testified at the hearings that the cost would be so-and-so, as if such assertions were conclusive and should not be questioned, when as a matter of fact such assertions were conclusively disproven upon the cross-examination of the same witnesses who asserted them, as well as by other facts.

Mr. Lasker begs the question by referring to amendments which were made in order to muster enough votes to jam the bill through the House or to report it out of the Commerce Committee. However, the amendment purporting to limit the voyage subsidies alone to $30,000,000 per annum is wholly ineffective, as it is based upon the proposition that the Shipping Board "is satisfied that the amount payable in any fiscal year" * * * "will not exceed the sum of $30,000,000." Besides, if it is not intended that the payment of voyage subsidies shall exceed $30,000,000 per annum, why is it so strenuously insisted that there shall annually be paid into this subsidy fund 10 per cent of customs duties, which it is estimated will amount to $45,000,000 under the present tariff law, and also tonnage taxes of over $4,000,000 per annum, aggregating $49,000,000, not to speak of the provision for refunds from subsidy recipients making over 10 per cent profits, upon which Mr. Lasker lays much stress, but which, I will frankly state, I consider of no consequence.

In his letter to you Chairman Lasker states that "the statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington-wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts." This characterization of the minority report is wholly and unqualifiedly false. Said report was originally filed June 28, 1922, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has answered or refuted a single statement contained therein. On June 13, last, I made a speech on this bill in the House in which I set forth the reasons for my opposition thereto, most of my speech being predicated upon testimony given by Chairman Lasker and other witnesses in behalf of the bill, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has as yet answered or refuted any portion of that speech.

I am opposed to this bill because I am opposed to subsidies in principle, but if I was in favor of subsidies I would be unalterably opposed to them being determined and dispensed by Albert D. Lasker; I would also be opposed to this bill because it is vicious and un-American in form, and because it involves an abdication by Congress and a usurpation of the rightful power of future Congresses. I am opposed to the bill because I am convinced that its passage and operation would be a hindrance, instead of a help, to a healthy, privately owned American merchant marine, although involving vast public expenditures. It is true that those of us who signed that minority report happen to be members of the minority party, members of the Democratic Party, which through its national platform has repeatedly declared against ship subsidies. However, the Republican Party in its national platform has never declared in favor of ship subsidies, even at times when efforts

were being made to put such bills through Congress. It is also true that 69 Republican Members of the House voted against this bill, and it is quite probable that at least that many more would have voted against the bill but for the pressure from the White House, or if the bill had been voted upon before the recent election.

Mr. Lasker purposely injected this charge of partisanship, because he knows that his infamous bill can not win upon its merits and that its only chance of passage through the Senate is as a partisan administration measure, as that was its only chance in the House.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker endeavored to work both sides of the street in a partisan way. While he was busily engaged in trying to line up Republican Members of Congress, he assigned to the members of the Shipping Board who had been appointed as Democrats the duty of lining up the Democratic Members, and said members of the Shipping Board, pursuant to such plans, addressed letters to the Democratic members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Representative HARDY of Texas and I in a reply to such letter (both letters appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1922), wrote in part:

"We readily concede that our merchant marine problem is of such transcendent importance that it should be solved upon merit and principle and not upon partisanship. However, with reference to the manner in which the matter has been handled, we wish to call your attention to certain facts of which you seem to be wholly oblivious. It is generally understood that Mr. Lasker was appointed chairman of the Shipping Board because of a very shrewd and valuable political service rendered during the last campaign; he certainly could not have been appointed because of any knowledge of shipping matters. His appointment, from a political standpoint, has been fully justified because he has demonstrated beyond question that he is a master politician. After months of laborious effort he has succeeded in committing the President to an elaborate and expensive ship subsidy program, a position never taken by a previous President. More than that, Mr. Lasker has enmeshed all the members of the Shipping Board in this program. This is especially significant in view of the fact that until now perhaps no high Government official in this country has openly and boldly advocated a ship subsidy since the emphatic rejection of such suggestions many years ago.

"Furthermore, Chairman Lasker, pursuant to the nonpartisan consideration for which you innocently vouch, invited the Republican members alone of the Merchant Marine Committee and the Commerce Committee to a dinner in his home, and after he had sumptuously fed them unfolded his ship subsidy program and undertook to commit them to it; and it has since been repeatedly announced in the press that Chairman Lasker has been in conference with the Republican members of said committees, that they had indorsed the ship-subsidy proposition in principle, and, later, that a bill had been agreed upon by Chairman Lasker, the President, and the Republican members of said committees. However, we predict that it will be demonstrated that Chairman Lasker misjudges some of the Republican members of said committees.

"Still further pursuing this nonpartisan course, a document of 268 pages, in which were assembled all the possible arguments in favor of ship-subsidy legislation, and particularly in favor of the bill which has since been introduced, was prepared and confidential copies thereof furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee and Commerce Committee. It purported to have been prepared by the Bureau of Research of the United States Shipping Board at the instance of the latter. The undersigned, Mr. DAVIS, addressed a letter to the Shipping Board, requesting a copy of that document as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, stating that as it had been prepared by Government officials at Government expense he presumed that he was entitled to a copy thereof. He received a reply from Chairman Lasker, in which he advised that those copies 'had been completely exhausted.' He further stated that it had been 'prepared at the request of the President and for him, and was furnished to him and to such persons as he directed.' This statement in spite of the fact that copies of said document had been furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, but to none of the Democratic members.

"Having, as he believes, successfully lined up the Republican members of said committees, Chairman Lasker has apparently assigned to you gentlemen the task of lining up the Democrats on said committees. However, you may tell Chairman Lasker that we are not as easily ensnared as some people he has come in contact with, and that we respectfully refuse to be 'bound and gagged' while he and the rest of you advocates of this iniquitous ship subsidy bill industriously disseminate your deceptive propaganda and lull the people and the Congress to sleep while you complete the job."

I take the liberty of addressing this letter to you in view of the fact that Chairman Lasker impersonated me in his letter to you, which he gave to the press and had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very sincerely,

EWIN L. DAVIS.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bursum	Dial	Glass
Ball	Cameron	Dillingham	Hale
Bayard	Capper	Elkins	Harris
Borah	Caraway	Fernald	Harrison
Brandegee	Culberson	Fletcher	Heflin
Brookhart	Cummins	France	Hitchcock
Broussard	Curtis	Gerry	Johnson
Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber	Oddie	Spencer
Jones, Wash.	McKellar	Page	Stanfield
Kellogg	McKinley	Pepper	Stanley
Kendrick	McNary	Phipps	Sterling
Keyes	Moses	Pittman	Sutherland
King	Myers	Poindexter	Townsend
Ladd	Nelson	Pomerene	Trammell
La Follette	New	Robinson	Warren
Lenroot	Nicholson	Sheppard	Watson
Lodge	Norbeck	Shortridge	Weller
McCormick	Norris	Smoot	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very loath to take any time or to delay in any way one of the major appropriation bills; but the House has adopted at the close of the pending bill a provision requesting the President "to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of subsurface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft." The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has proposed an amendment extending that request so as to cover land armament, and also inserting an entirely new subject, requesting and authorizing the President to call a conference for the purpose of considering economic problems.

The provision of the House bill and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho open questions of such grave importance that I do not feel willing to allow them to pass wholly without comment. They propose to request the President and to authorize him to take certain action in entering into negotiations with foreign powers. Under our Constitution and our system of government the conduct of our relations with other nations is under the control of the President of the United States. The President must conduct all such negotiations, and he carries the great responsibility of our foreign relations. It could not be otherwise, either constitutionally or practically; for a legislative body is, to all intents and purposes, incapable of conducting negotiations.

There are several instances in our history where the President has consulted the Senate in regard to negotiations or as to entering upon negotiations, and there are other instances on the other side where the Senate has expressed to the President its opinion as to entering upon negotiations or as to their purpose and conduct. There can be no doubt of the right of the President so to consult the Senate or of the Senate so to advise the President; but, of course, the final power in regard to negotiations rests and must rest with the President. The President is not bound by any action or any advice we may offer in regard to negotiations any more than is the Senate bound, when a treaty comes within its jurisdiction, to accept the advice of the President. At the same time, almost any President would give great weight to the advice of the Senate, which shares with him the treaty-making power, in regard to negotiations. Therefore the advice we offer should be most carefully considered.

To inaugurate such a conference as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho is not at all like summoning a conference to consider the question of coal or unemployment or railroads; those are matters of vast importance to the people of the United States, but they are wholly domestic and are within our own control. When, however, we undertake to advise the President as to his duties as the representative of the United States in charge of our foreign relations, the matter assumes a much graver complexion. That is especially true when we advise the President to invite a conference of the powers. When the United States invites other nations to meet here in a conference it assumes a serious responsibility. We have the same right that every other power represented has to put our veto on any proposition which may be made, but it is not a little difficult for us to do so when we are in the attitude of a host. Therefore it is of the utmost importance when we urge the President to invite other powers to a conference that we make very explicit exactly what that conference is expected to do.

The first proposition suggested by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho relates to disarmament; that is, to extending limitations to surface, subsurface, and auxiliary craft of navies generally. It seems to me that it is well very briefly to call the attention of the Senate to just what has been done. It is now barely a year since the President, with the approbation of Congress and the general approbation of the country, called a conference here for the purpose of considering the question of disarmament, or I should say, to be more exact, the limitation of armament. It was not confined to the limitation of naval armament alone; it covered also land

armament, as does the proposed amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Let me deal with the question of land armament first. It was the first subject dealt with by the conference. It was taken up at the third plenary session on the 21st of November, 1921; and, I think, we all must remember the speech then made by M. Briand, the prime minister of France at the time, on the question of the limitation of land armament. It was a speech of great force and great eloquence. He stated the position of France, and that they could not consent to any limitation of land armament in the present condition of affairs in Europe. That, of course, put an end to any further action by the conference on the question of land armament, for no action could be taken except by unanimous agreement. As a matter of fact, the United States had reduced its land armament to something less than a proper peace basis, and Great Britain had also reduced to a similar but sufficient basis her land armament; but the refusal of France, in which, as I recall, she had the sympathy of Japan, of course, put an end, as I have said, to any further consideration of the limitation of land armament.

France may have changed her attitude in that respect within the year, but if she has I have had no information to that effect. Of course, the Senator from Idaho may have information that France has altered her opinion; but, in any event, it would be useless to call a conference for the limitation of land armament without knowing as a preliminary step that France was ready to withdraw her objection and ready to consider with the other powers the limitation of her land forces. It would be futile to call a conference for the reduction of land armament unless it were known beforehand that those powers that were summoned were not going to object at the very beginning to any consideration of that point.

Now, as to surface and subsurface boats and the other auxiliary craft the limitation of which both the House and the Senator from Idaho desire to have a further conference to consider, when the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, opened the Washington conference, after stating in detail the proposition for the limitation of capital ships, he said:

> The plan includes provision for the limitation of auxiliary combatant craft. This term embraces three classes; that is: (1) auxiliary surface combatant craft, such as cruisers (exclusive of battle cruisers), flotilla leaders, destroyers, and various surface types; (2) submarines; and (3) airplane carriers.

In the appendix which is printed with his address the plan is given in detail, and will be found on page 60 of the report of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, under the head of "Auxiliary combatant craft," and it begins:

> In treating this subject auxiliary combatant craft have been divided into three classes:
> (a) Auxiliary surface combatant craft.
> (b) Submarines.
> (c) Airplane carriers and aircraft.

Then follow propositions of limitation of the tonnage of such craft by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan; limitation of new construction, and scrapping of old construction; the limitation of submarines, of new construction, and the scrapping of old construction; the limitation of airplane carriers and aircraft, with the limitation of new construction and scrapping of old construction. Then come replacements, aircraft, and clauses relating to the merchant marine. In other words, the American delegation, the representatives of the United States, presented through Mr. Hughes to the conference a complete plan for the limitation of all the various kinds of auxiliary craft which are covered by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

The matter was taken up in the committee of the conference charged with the question of naval disarmament, and was discussed at great length. I need not go into all the details of it. The French were opposed to the propositions as to capital ships, to which, however, they ultimately assented; but as to auxiliary craft, I read simply a passage from the telegraphic letter of M. Briand to Mr. Hughes on December 10, in which he says:

> But so far as the defensive ships are concerned—light cruisers, torpedo boats, and submarines—it would be impossible for the French Government, without putting itself in contradiction with the vote of the chambers, to accept reductions corresponding to those which we accept for capital ships under this formal reserve, which you will certainly understand.

I have marked here the different statements that were made in the course of the debate, which it is not necessary to take the time of the Senate to read; but I can state the matter very briefly.

To take submarines first, Great Britain proposed that the conference should agree to the complete suppression of submarines—to their abolition. To that, I think, all the members of the conference objected, and it proceeded no further. The United States then made a proposition for the limitation of submarines. We had at that time something over 80,000 tons, a larger submarine tonnage than any other power. We proposed to put on a limitation of 60,000 tons. France declined the limitation, and so, as I remember, did Japan, although after one declination no more was needed; but Holland, one of the smaller powers, also made strong objection to any limitation of submarine tonnage.

It is not necessary to go into the reasons of the different powers for this action; but the objection was an absolute one, and that made it impossible for the conference to effect any limitation of the submarines or the auxiliary craft except the general limitations put on as to the caliber of guns on vessels of less than 10,000 tons. That was a very important limitation, because it prevented competition in what is really the dominant element in a navy. Therefore no limitation was placed on auxiliary craft. The conference was unable to do it, owing to the refusal of France and other powers.

The naval treaty has been ratified by Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. It has not yet been ratified by France and Italy, the other two signers of the naval treaty. I hope and believe, and I have every reason to believe, that France will ratify the treaties of Washington within a very short time; but we have received no information, so far as I am aware, from France, from Holland, from Japan, or from Italy, that they are ready to meet us in conference and place limitations upon submarines and auxiliary craft. As in the case of land armament, it would be perfectly idle to take the great responsibility of calling a conference to consider limitations which were rejected only a year ago unless we had assurance from the powers invited that they were ready to consider the question of limitations for surface and subsurface and for auxiliary craft generally. It might not do any harm, except to put us in the rather absurd position of asking for a conference to consider limitations of armament which we knew beforehand would be refused, but it certainly could do no good. I have cordially supported, myself, the limitations which were made and we went as far as we could go, and I thought them a great step in advance; but it seems to me there is nothing to be gained until we are informed and until Congress is informed by those charged with our foreign relations that the time has come when we can have a conference which will be effective in further limitations applied to submarines and other auxiliary craft.

I know very well what the evidences of competition are to which the Senator from Idaho referred the other day. I know that the powers are building aircraft carriers and cruisers, as they have a right to do under the existing treaty of Washington. So far as the United States is concerned, we ought to build those light cruisers, and we ought above all to build the airplane carriers, whether a limitation is to be put upon them or not, because, though the Navy of the United States was very powerful in capital ships, in destroyers, in submarines, it was not well balanced. We had practically only one or two light cruisers. We had 10 authorized, vessels of 75,000 tons burden, and we need those light, unarmored cruisers very much. Some of them are under construction now. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] can tell the Senate just what their state of advancement is. They are absolutely needed. We ought to have them.

We have no airplane carriers. It is recognized, I think, by everyone, that the forces of the air will play a very great part in future naval warfare. Airplane carriers are necessary to accompany the fleet for the purpose, as their name implies, of carrying airplanes.

Without having looked into it with any minuteness, I think we are altogether too weak in regard to airplanes themselves; and although I most cordially supported the limitations of the treaties and believed, as I have said, that they constituted a very great step toward relieving the people from tax burdens and securing the peace of the world, I am not one of those who think that the time has come when we should have no navy or reduce it to a mere handful of ships.

It has been the characteristic of the American people, after they have had a war, to conclude that there never would be another. After the Civil War we proceeded practically to destroy our Navy, and in a comparatively few years we had no navy left. Then, at great expense, we went to work and slowly built it up. The performances of our new Navy in the Spanish War were such that the people generally were very ready to uphold it and we went on building a navy, with some stumblings and hesitations and not on a comprehensive plan; but still we went on building ships, and we all know what the history of our Navy was when the Great War broke upon us. I hope there never will be another war. I do not believe there is a man or a woman living who hates the thought of war more

keenly than I do; but the Navy and the Army are still necessary implements of national protection and defense.

No matter what treaties are made, we must have some means of protecting our commerce and our citizens abroad and our own territory and our citizens at home. I have had no sympathy with the extremes to which the House has gone, I was about to say not in the destruction of the Army but in reducing it to a point which is so low as to be positively perilous. It so happened that in 1919 the capital city of my State was for 24 hours left without a police force, which in its essence is a military force for the protection of a given locality. No one who is familiar with what then happened, I think, will ever recover from the lesson, which showed that it was not the body of men whom we see managing traffic, preserving order in the streets, arresting criminals, and so forth, but it was the fact of the existence of the force on which the safety of a great city depended. In those few unguarded hours there broke out from the darkness and from hidden places criminals and marauders. They suddenly appeared. Shops were broken into and sacked, lives were endangered and some lost, and the great city was at the mercy of those forces which are hidden from sight while we all live in the sunlight of well-protected streets and houses, and then in a flash people found the danger which was close to them. Among human beings there was an element which simply desired to rob, plunder, and destroy. Massachusetts was fortunate in her governor, who now presides over this Senate, and who, by his vigor, determination, and calmness, was able to face that crisis, and who happily was aided by a police commissioner who was a man of great courage, force, and readiness. The result of the governor's action was that the peril was over in 24 hours. The troops of the State were brought in, most of them men who had just come back from service in the Great War, and order reigned when those men appeared. But, Mr. President, those who saw and knew what happened in that one night realize the necessity of organized police or military protection if the fabric of society is to be at all maintained and anarchy and pillage are not to prevail.

What is true of the necessity of the manitenance of a police force in all our States and cities is equally true of this troubled world. No man can tell when some reckless, desperate power, perhaps a small one, may suddenly make an attack upon American citizens in foreign lands. In such emergencies it is necessary for every nation which undertakes to protect its citizens in every corner of the earth, as every great nation should, to have ships and troops, and not be obliged to wait for days and weeks, and perhaps months, before they can raise them. It is not a question of war making; it is a question of ordinary protection and safety, and under whatever arrangements we may make there is a limitation of reduction which ought always to be observed. It is not only not economy, it is the most reckless extravagance, to reduce the Army and the Navy of the United States to a point where we have no means of performing the duties which every great nation is obliged to perform.

I am not saying that, Mr. President, because I am opposed to a further limitation applied to auxiliary craft. I did my best personally only a year ago to secure those limitations. I should be glad to see them made now. But there is something that is not good like a limitation, something that is very dangerous, and that is when, without regard to national safety, we proceed in a false spirit of economy to enter on the road of abolishing or destroying our Army or our Navy.

I hope we can bring about a further limitation of auxiliary craft, just as I hope we shall keep our Navy, limited as it now is, at a point of high efficiency, and that we shall not allow it to go limping along without proper provisions for surface and subsurface craft and air defense. We have two great half-finished battleships, which were provided for in the treaty, which can be made into airplane carriers at once, and that ought to be done. We ought also to build up our airplane force.

Mr. President, I am aware I have strayed a little from the chief point I wanted to make, which is that desiring as I do to extend the limitations of a year ago, then confined to capital ships—I am putting aside for the moment the limitations which were put on gun calibers, which were equally important—I want to see those limitations extended to the auxiliary craft. I have told the Senate what the Senate and the House both should remember, that just about a year ago several of the powers assembled in Washington refused to agree to any limitations of the smaller craft, and until we can receive assurances that they are ready to proceed with those limitations and the limitation of land armaments, I confess I see nothing to be gained by our issuing an invitation which we know would either not be accepted or, if accepted, would be fruitless.

Mr. President, now I come to the very important proposition, not at all considered by the House, embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]; that is, a proposition for an economic conference. That, of course, is wholly new. In my judgment it is subject to the point of order; but I am not going to argue the point of order this morning. It no doubt will be made at the proper time. I am quite aware that the House in its clause put in general legislation in disregard of their rules, and when it came here it was in order because it came from the House, and I know very well the rulings made by Vice President Marshall in regard to the right which such action by the House conveyed to the Senate to amend general legislation and extend it if it was put in by the House. But this proposition for an economic conference is entirely new. It has no relation to the general legislation proposed by the House, and its importance is very great indeed.

Of course, we are all anxious to do everything we properly can do to restore business stability to Europe and to aid Europe in that direction in any reasonable way we can. Selfishness alone would be a sufficient reason for that, because the restoration of Europe to stability would tend to widen our markets and increase our commerce. Also, the American people feel a deep sympathy and also a very deep indignation agninst some of the cruel massacres perpetrated by the Turks which have disfigured Asia Minor and which have made the taking of Smyrna forever infamous. Everyone with any human sympathies at all must be anxious to have the United States do all it can to aid Europe in the situation which exists.

This amendment of the Senator from Idaho provides for "a conference which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions." That is very broadly drawn. It has no boundaries. It extends, or can be extended, from the heavens above to the earth beneath.

It seems to me, Mr. President, if we are to consider it at all with a view of action here—and it is very important action to express the opinion of the Senate on a matter involving our foreign relations—that we ought to know before we do it exactly what the powers of the conference are to be and just what the amendment means. As the amendment is worded, there is nothing to prevent such a conference, if called and assembled, from considering the question of the foreign debts due to the United States. It is true that consideration of those debts is now provided for by an act of Congress, but a treaty, if ratified, would override the act of Congress, just as an act of Congress could abrogate a clause in a treaty if made subsequently.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I asked a question?

Mr. LODGE. Not the slightest.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to say that if the treaty were agreed to, of course it would override the act of Congress.

Mr. LODGE. I meant ratified, of course.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator does not contend that the Congress itself may do anything toward canceling the debt until it is reported back to the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. The treaty would have to be ratified of course. But we summon the conference and we ought to tell the nations invited, if we do summon such a conference, exactly what we mean to object to and what we mean to consider. The fact of the invitation is a very serious matter. It is only just, when we are inviting a conference of this sort, that we should say just what we mean. I do not know what the feeling of Congress would be as to permitting a general economic conference to pass upon the foreign debts due to us, but it seems to me that is a question which should be excluded. I think the debts due to the United States should be considered and dealt with by the United States alone. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the people of the United States to deal with those debts otherwise than generously and fairly, but I do not think they would care to have the fate of those debts settled by other powers.

Under the conference of course we should be called upon to take part in the Reparation Commission. We are seeking no reparations, but we should be called upon to take part in it and enter to that extent at least into a revision, perhaps, of the treaty of Versailles. I think, whatever we feel about that, that we should determine and make clear in our legislation just what our opinion is and how far we should go. Such a conference, if it should ever come into existence, would undoubtedly have the power to consider advancing large sums of new money to help

Germany or to help France. I do not know how far the Senate thinks it should commit itself to the policy of advancing money from the Treasury of the United States for the reestablishment of the finances of Germany or France, but it seems to me that if we are to do it, if we are to enter into a conference where that question would surely arise, there ought to be some distinct statement as to our attitude in regard to it.

There are many other things involved. If we are to enter upon the business of restoring stability in Europe, of course we shall be called upon not only to help France, Italy, and Germany but the Austrian States of the former empire, the Balkans, Asia Minor, and, I suppose, Russia. I am not arguing now the merits of those varying propositions. I am merely suggesting that before we pass resolutions or adopt amendments favoring an economic conference we should know how far we are going and what we propose to do. It is easy enough to say "Let us have an economic conference," but when nations come together in an economic conference the case assumes immense importance and seriousness. There is one thing we should never permit, and that is to invite all the nations to meet us and have any misunderstanding about our attitude before we go into the conference. We must know exactly what we are ready to consider and what we will not consider.

Of course there are many other questions that might be brought up in the conference upon which I hope, before the debate ends and before final action is taken, the Senate will express its opinion. The question of immigration, for example, could not, in my opinion, be kept out of that conference under its very terms. I for one should not be willing to have that question go before the conference at all. I do not suppose that the conference would take up any purely political questions, but when anything is as large and broad as the conference proposed in this amendment no one can tell where it will end.

All I am asking to-day is that the Senate shall consider the matter with the utmost care before the amendment is agreed to. We are taking upon ourselves the duty of expressing the opinion of the United States Senate. We are undertaking to advise the President, who is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, to take a very grave step. We do not know what he has done in these various directions. We do know that he is as desirous as anybody possibly can be to improve economic conditions in Europe and to aid those countries toward greater business stability. But what steps he may have taken we do not know. It will be no one's wish, I am sure, to embarrass him in the conversations or negotiations or the efforts which he may now be making, and which he is now making as a matter of fact. For that reason, as well as for the others I have mentioned, we ought to set forth very carefully exactly what we mean in the amendment if we are to accept it at all.

My own belief is as a general proposition that the United States can be of greater service to humanity and to its fellow nations in Europe and elsewhere by holding itself free from obligations which would bind it to action which it might not be willing to take when the hour for action came. The United States without treaty obligations of any kind rendered a very great service to the world. We asked nothing; we received nothing. We took not one inch of land nor have we sought a dollar of reparation. I am very proud to think that that is the record of my country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that if the amendment were to be adopted we should set forth with particularity what was to be included within the jurisdiction of the conference.

Mr. LODGE. Or what was to be excluded.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator to particularize and state what he thinks could be considered with propriety and what could not be thus considered?

Mr. LODGE. I have confined myself to stating the things that I thought should be excluded or should be certainly defined. What precisely we can do in an economic conference in directions we should be willing to accept I am not yet able to say. I think we can be of service as we have been of service, but what we can do precisely at an economic conference, unless possibly as an arbitrator or mediator, I am not able to define.

In conclusion may I repeat that we have taken no foot of land and no dollar of reparations, and I am very proud to think that is our record. I have not a word of reflection upon the other countries who suffered and sacrificed so much in the war, but they have already received large and important advantages from the conclusion of the war. I do not grudge them anything they have received. I do not question the justice of it. But they have all received something of very great material value—immense territories in Africa, territories in Asia Minor, islands in the Pacific, and the rest. They have rid themselves for some years of the competition of the German merchant marine. Those things are all of great pecuniary value and, as I said, I do not grudge them anything. But we have asked nothing, we want nothing, we have taken nothing, and we do not propose to do so. I think that that fact alone should leave it to us to determine if we are to give, what we shall give, when we shall give, and where we shall give, and not permit it settled for us by other nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I share the pride which the Senator from Massachusetts takes in the fact that we have not demanded nor have we obtained one inch of territory or one dollar of reparation or of indemnity from Germany, but I wish it to be remembered that that fact, redounding much to our praise, was a fact which originated in the mind and was carried out in the conduct of Woodrow Wilson, then President of these United States; and that whatever cruelty may have been visited upon him while he came very near dying in the line of duty, that praise at least must be given him, that, sitting around the council table at Versailles, the very first thing that he announced to the world was that America wanted nothing out of the war except winning the war and making the world safe for democracy so far as the war had done it, overcoming autocracy and overwhelming German junkerism. That was Woodrow Wilson before the time when, falling like a soldier in the line of battle, he fell heavily wounded; and he is heavily wounded yet; and I hope that nobody will attempt to take from him the praise of the initiative and the inauguration of that purely unselfish American policy.

Mr. President, after the World War was over a few things occurred and a few things are now occurring that do not meet with my approbation, although my approbation or disapprobation amounts to very little, for I am just about ready to leave this august scene and to take my refuge with the birds and my books and my grandchildren. There are, however, some things that I do not like. I do not like to see America standing idle to-day while the Turks are deporting Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren, killing men of military age wherever they can reach them, and ravishing Armenian women all the time. I have been ever a peace lover and opposed to war, but there are some things that do arouse my warlike instinct. If I were of this administration, instead of being merely an outgoing Senator, if I stood in Harding's place to-morrow, I would send instructions to Child and the others representing us at Lausanne to give the "unspeakable Turk" an ultimatum that no more Christians must be deported, no more Christians murdered, no more Christian women ravished in Asia Minor; and that if it were not possible to find a home for them somewhere in Asia, where they could be protected, a home should be found for them in eastern Thrace; and that these United States—God bless them—would stand with all their power and their resources and their ideals and their traditions behind the idea that unspeakable outrages perpetrated by the present Turkish Government shall cease, or, if they shall not cease, that then these resources and these ideals and these traditions shall come into the combat upon the side of humanity and upon the side of Christianity.

I hesitate a little to say "Christianity," because I know that in the bottom of your hearts most of you do not believe in it at all except in a perfunctory church way; but there is a Christianity which proceeds from the philosophy of Jesus, and that Christianity consists in making of ourselves our brother's keeper. I have no patience at all with the utterance of Cain and the utterance of so-called modern American progressives after Cain, when they say, "We are not our brother's keeper."

Mr. President, we are our brother's keeper, and if we were as selfish as a dog who loves nothing except his master, as men and women we are still and must still be by the very necessity of the situation our brother's keeper. To undertake to isolate these United States—48 of them, each one of them an empire in itself almost—from the common life and community ideals and the rich traditions of civilization and of Christianity is the maddest and the most selfish thing that anybody ever attempted to do since this world began.

Mr. President, there lives on S Street in this city now a man who is a private citizen. For a time he cut a wide swath in the history of the world; for a time he was worshiped by nearly everybody outside of his own country; and "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." Crippled in the war struggle, no pity shown for him here, no sympathy ever uttered on the other side of the Chamber that I remember, not even one word from anybody, and yet the Senator from Massachusetts this morning can point with pride to only one thing—and that was not the policy of the Senator from Massachusetts nor

the policy of this Chamber, on either side, but it was Woodrow Wilson's policy—that was that America should be represented in a great congress of the great nations of the world, and very nearly all the nations of the world, and should say, through her Chief Executive's lips, "We want nothing, not one inch of land, not a dollar of reparation nor indemnity; we are satisfied, provided only we can put an end to war and put an end to the causes of war, so far as that is possible."

He came back from there and brought the Versailles treaty with him. There were many things in it which I did not like; there are many things that the people did not like; but it contained the great central idea that was uttered by a British battalion when they were charging successfully a nest of German guns: "Never again! Never again! Never again!" They destroyed the German nest; they won a glorious victory; but the victory was not in destroying the German nest; it was in the utterance that those atrocious, contemptible, inhuman, uncivilized conditions of actual warfare in the air and on the earth and in the waters beneath the earth should never be revisited upon this world again if they could prevent it; and they uttered to God the words that they were dying that day to prevent it if they could. So far as I know, that was the only battalion that ever uttered that slogan of warfare out loud, but they were not the only battalion that carried that slogan of warfare in their hearts across the trenches and into no man's land.

Let me speak an almost parting word to you, for it will not be long before I leave you, and God knows I never intend to bother you after I leave you or to be bothered by you. [Laughter.] That almost parting word is this: America is a part of this earth; her traditions, her ideals, her magnificent unselfishness are a part of the present status of this earth; and I do not care what you say nor what you do nor how you vote, you can not get rid of that fact. We are not only a part of it but a magna pars; we are a great part of it; I might go further and say that we are the greatest part of it. Is there a man here listening to me to-day who imagines that the condition at Lausanne and in Asia Minor could have taken place or would have taken place if America or rather these United States—for we are only a part of America—had been members of the League of Nations with the will and with the power to make the league count? And yet, gentlemen every day seem to take pride in the fact that the league has not counted for much. It has counted for more than they say, but it has not counted to the full. Why? Because you took off its right arm; you left it fightless; you left it almost ambitionless; but if you think that the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America have been stupefied and annihilated by what you did you are mistaken. Long after I have gone out of public life, perhaps after some of you have died an actual death, there will be the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America behind the idea of preserving and enforcing—mark you, enforcing—the peace of the world, and behind that, too, enforcing industrial peace and other forms of peace on this earth.

Christ was not born for nothing and did not live for nothing and did not die for nothing and did not preach for nothing. When He announced the doctrine of the common fatherhood of God and the common brotherhood of man He meant what He said, and that idea sank into our hearts. I do not care how weak we are nor how sinful we are—and God knows I am one of the weakest and one of the most sinful—the idea is there, and no politics, no finesse, no private meetings of Senators or of Representatives can ever overwhelm it.

It stands like the church of God, secure against the gates of hell. You can not help it. You may delay the coming of the time. You may think you are awfully smart when you advise the American people to take care of their own interests and to let their brethren in Europe go to hell. You may think all that; but you are not awfully smart when you say it, and you are not awfully good when you say it. You are just common, selfish, mean men, and sometime you will be swept away like playing cards upon the surface of a bowl of water which has overflowed; and the overflow will mean that America once more will step into her own on the surface of this earth, and that we will allow no more Armenian women to be ravished, no more Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren to be deported, and we will not allow the unspeakable Turk a place in Europe at all. If we had been members of the league, there would have been no question of it. No matter if Great Britain and France for selfish reasons, commercial or otherwise, had been willing to compromise, American idealism would not have been willing to compromise.

Why, Mr. President, I was reading in the last Literary Digest, which perhaps most of you have read, an account of what was happening to the Greeks and to the Armenians. Some of the things are unspeakable. Some of them are not to be mentioned before women, some of whom are in the gallery; and we—we, the people of the land of Washington and Jefferson and Henry Clay and Lincoln—are standing by, are holding our hands folded, and we are saying to the entire world, much to the encouragement of Germany and Russia and Turkey and Bulgaria, that we have nothing to do with it; that we are outside of the family; we rather doubt whether we are kin to the family or not. There may be a common fatherhood of God, but it does not cover them and us both. It covers them, maybe, or it covers us, maybe, but it can not cover us both. We can not live in the same tent; we do not intend to have anything to do with the same tent; and wise men in their imaginations, who think they are ultra progressive, tell us all that!

Do you know what real progressivism means? It means taking steps forward toward the concept of God and trying to idealize our ordinary relations toward a common goal, which is His will, and His will is for peace on earth amongst men. That is what real progressivism means; but I doubt not that to a lot of you it looks like conservatism and reaction of the most ultimate character—going back to God, which is rather, I imagine, a reactionary movement.

I indorse what the Senator from Massachusetts said in so far as I have dwelt upon what he said. It was a little peculiar, though, that he could say it, that even with his ingenuity he could say it, without mentioning the name of Woodrow Wilson, fallen soldier by the wayside. I got up merely to strain that point, and nothing else much.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I disagree with the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to the relationship which the Congress sustains to the President of the United States with reference to foreign affairs. I think the Congress may properly and constitutionally exercise much more power with reference to foreign affairs than it has assumed to exercise heretofore within the last few years. I understand, of course, that with the President lies, technically speaking, the act of negotiation; but we also have at all times not only the right but in my humble opinion the duty not only to consent but to advise. It certainly can not be out of place for the Congress—for the Senate particularly—to express itself with reference to a matter which not only appertains to foreign affairs, but which, by reason of its peculiar nature, essentially enters into our domestic affairs.

I do not think, however, that it is necessary to go into a technical discussion as to the powers of the President and the Senate, respectively, upon this subject, for it must be conceded that the amendment which I propose to offer is well within any number of precedents which might be cited.

The Senator calls attention to the fact that this amendment is very broad, and he is of the opinion that if we are going to pass a measure dealing with the subject we should be specific as to what we propose to do. If I may be permitted to say so, that would come closer to encroaching upon the power of the President as a negotiator than anything which has been suggested in the amendment. The amendment provides for the calling of an economic conference as well as a disarmament conference, and I think it will be conceded that until negotiations or satisfactory communications have been had with the foreign powers it would be very difficult to determine in detail the specific matters which would be dealt with under that kind of a call.

We passed a resolution with reference to a disarmament conference; and the President, as he had a perfect right to do, assumed to enlarge the program of the conference, and did so after communicating with the other nations. I take it that unless the President should advise us at this time as to the negotiations which are now going on and the extent to which they have progressed and the subject matters about which he is of the opinion that we may properly confer, it would be improper for us to undertake to designate specifically what particular subjects should be up for consideration at this conference.

I am perfectly willing—and I should suppose that the Senator from Massachusetts would be perfectly willing—to leave this matter where it properly belongs, and that is, with the Chief Executive, after he has communicated with the other powers as to the specific subjects which should be covered. The resolution was not drawn in this way inadvisedly or without due consideration. It was drawn for the very purpose of not embarrassing or curtailing, if he should see fit to observe our suggestion, the powers of the President to fix the program which he thought would be most effective in dealing with the subject. If, however, the Senator from Massachusetts or other Senators are sufficiently advised as to the Executive's views as to include those things which ought to be included, in their opinion, and to exclude those which ought to be excluded, I

should be pleased to consider the suggestions which they have to make.

This is not in all essentials a purely foreign question—that is to say, a question which relates alone to foreign affairs. It has progressed to the point where the subject matter of the conference affects our legislation here relative to domestic affairs, and it has progressed to the point where it concerns every business man and every farmer and every laboring man and practically every home in the United States. It is a matter about which we are compelled to think and with regard to which we must reflect in dealing with the multitude of things which we have to deal with and which are conceded to be peculiarly within the province of the Congress.

The Senator advises us that the President, as he knows, is now negotiating in regard to this matter. I am, of course, pleased to be advised of that in a way which would be considered as authoritative, but I had supposed that the President was thinking over the matter. I had no right to assume that he had yet taken up negotiations; but it is a matter which everyone must consider, and one with which we must all deal. It is interesting, however, to know that negotiations are now in progress dealing with the specific subject with which we are now concerned here as a Senate; and if we can be advised that the action of the United States Senate in approving of the dealing with these subjects will conflict with or embarrass the program which is now under way I shall be very glad indeed also to consider that in the disposition of the matter. I have a perfectly open mind as to how we shall deal with this subject matter. My mind is closed as to the proposition that we must deal with it. As to the method and the manner of treating the subject, it is one about which I should, of course, be glad to take suggestions in advance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Did the Senator understand the Senator from Massachusetts to state that the President had been negotiating with reference to further disarmament or only as to the economic situation?

Mr. BORAH. I understood he referred only to the economic situation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I supposed.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I had in mind, and it was to that I was addressing my attention at this time.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator hold that his amendment confers upon the President any power he does not now possess?

Mr. BORAH. I do not. The President has a perfect right to initiate these negotiations without this authority. It would be considered a part of his treaty-making power and also within his right as the Chief Executive. It has always been the contention of the executive department that the recent disarmament conference was initiated without any regard to the resolution which was passed by Congress. President Roosevelt initiated three separate movements for an international conference without any consideration previously by Congress. But there is very much to be gained, in my opinion, by a consideration of this matter at the hands of Congress and by the expression upon the part of Congress as to the necessity of the movement. The President could utterly disregard this amendment if he thought it was not wise to accept it, or he could, within the limits of the amendment, confine it to such subject matters as he thought were expedient to be dealt with. But if he is going forward, nothing could be more helpful than to be supported by the Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator remember the provision of the deficiency appropriation act of 1913 prohibiting the President from calling any conference, or issuing invitations to foreign powers to hold a conference, except with the approval of Congress?

Mr. BORAH. I do not recall its terms and it has been very greatly respected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] looked at that provision this morning and has it fresher in mind than I have, and if he has it before him I will ask him to read it, if the Senator from Idaho will allow it to be read.

Mr. BORAH. I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. LENROOT. This is a provision in the deficiency appropriation act of 1913, Sixty-second Congress. It reads as follows:

> Hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international conference or like event without first having specific authority of law to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had not lately looked up that proposition, and I am glad it has been called to my attention. It makes all the more essential the adoption of this amendment, if the President is to deal with this matter effectively, and by the way of a conference. I doubt very much if that provision of the law would stand the test; but, assuming that it would stand the test, it is all the more necessary that the Congress of the United States approve of the program before the President acts. This would be true, however, that notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United Sates were authorized by this, he would not be compelled to regard the amendment if he thought it was unwise.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Just there I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his amendment not only authorizes the President to do it but it requests him to do it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, so did the disarmament resolution authorize and request him to call a conference, but it has been stated time and time again authoritatively that he did not call the disarmament conference as a result of that resolution. It originated in another way, we are told, and it was not the disarmament conference for which the resolution provided. It included subject matters which the resolution did not cover. It included countries which the resolution did not cover, and it included subject matters which even disarmament did not cover. Therefore I take it that it will not be argued here as a technical proposition that because we adopt this amendment the President will be compelled to adhere to the suggestion.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think that if Congress shall adopt the amendment in the form in which he proposes it it will be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such an economic conference without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. It would be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such a conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. No; not necessarily without limitation, because the power rests with the President to fix the limits.

Mr. LENROOT. The power rests in him, but when we ask the President to call an economic conference for a certain purpose there is no limitation or condition implied, it seems to me.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I want the amendment to be so broad that the President of the United States will not be justified in saying, and could not sincerely say, that the amendment was such that he could not operate under it. If we undertook to say that it should be confined to reparations alone, the President would at once say, "In my opinion, it would be impossible to consider that subject without considering other matters in connection with it." If we confine it to this or that subject, and the negotiators, or those who are to be invited, suggest other subjects, the matter stops at once, so far as our negotiations are concerned, if we are confined to the amendment. If you give the President no breadth, no width, no discretion, you are in effect limiting his power to deal effectively with the subject.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator's view seems to be that the President should be left free to call up for consideration any question he sees fit to call up. Of course, any right the President can claim can be claimed by the representative of any foreign country the moment he takes his seat at this board. Is not that the Senator's view?

Mr. BORAH. That is correct.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So that when this conference is called, aided by the action of this body, we are calling a conference to consider any European question or Asiatic question or African question which may be brought before the conference.

Mr. BORAH. If the amendment is taken as it expresses itself, the conference would have to be confined to economic problems.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, yes; but the Senator agrees that they are not limited to that. The Senator is too fair and too broad a man to deny for a moment that it is easy enough to find that almost any conceivable question on earth is related in some way to the economic situation of the world and to the naval and military establishments of the world. So, if we call this conference, let us do it with our eyes open to the fact that there is no question on this earth which may not come up there for discussion, particularly unless we insist that the President in calling the conference shall expressly limit the

subject matter. Is not that about where we come out? I do not want to debate it; I want to get the Senator's view.

Mr. BORAH. I am very willing to debate it with the Senator or with anyone else, because if I am in error as to the terms of the amendment I shall be pleased to have suggestions in order that it may be made an effective amendment. You have either to take the amendment as a guide or you have to consider that the President is perfectly free to disregard it, of course. But you take it as a guide; then the conference must be confined in good faith to economic questions. I am perfectly aware of the proposition that they could consider anything which came before them for consideration. They could do it by disregarding the suggestions of the amendment; but nothing which they would consider could ultimately be binding until it was returned to the Congress of the United States for the action and approval of the Congress of the United States, or the Senate.

In that connection the Senator from Massachusetts referred to the question of our debts and said that the debts might come up for consideration before this body. Of course they might come up for consideration, but the negotiators could not cancel the debts or postpone the time in which they should be taken care of or change the interest or dispose of the subject until it came back to the Congress of the United States for its action. I take it there will be no conference called until negotiations have been had such as are supposed to be going on now as to the subject matters which will be dealt with, and if the President desires to confine the conference to economic questions, he will have it within his power to do so, and he will have the amendment backing him to that extent.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the argument that nothing can be done which would bind us until it is written into a treaty and is ratified by the Senate is of course good. That is true of any kind of a conference we might call. The Senator is well aware of the fact that when you call a conference you intend to do something, and we never should enter upon a plan or scheme unless we have in advance determined that the thing to be done is wise.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is no use debating that subject, because if it is unwise of course we do not want any action by Congress at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. But I have concluded long since that it is wise. Of course, as I have said, so far as I am concerned that is not open to debate, but the method of dealing with it is.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am glad to get the Senator's position on that. He has concluded it is wise, and therefore we ought to do it, in his judgment.

Mr. BORAH. In my judgment; but I am only one of 96.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody has more respect for the Senator's opinion than I have, but for those who may not have made up their minds that it is wise to go through with this program it is no answer to their objection to say that we may do something unwise but that we can afterwards refuse to ratify it. I have heard that argument advanced before, as has the Senator, "Let us go ahead; we do not have to ratify." But we all know the tremendous force of a tentative arrangement that is made between the representatives of governments, and we all know how embarrassing it would be to our own country to initiate this program and then at the end say, "Oh, well, you did something which did not suit us, and while our representatives agreed to it the Congress will disagree to it." We have heard that argument before.

Mr. BORAH. We had a very good illustration of it in connection with the Versailles treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; and I do not want to see it repeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Missouri, they are agreed upon the idea that if we enter into any conference at all with the other nations of the earth, we must enter into it with a fixed idea which we must not change while we carry on the conference.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take that position.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody else does.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Missouri to say that we could only enter into a conference to accomplish some purpose which we outlined, and I understood the Senator from Idaho partially to agree with that. I merely rose to say——

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand me. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, then.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senators have a misunderstanding between themselves, I would like to proceed until they come to an agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me further, I merely wanted to say that if we enter into a conference with other nations with fixed ideas, from which we must not vary, that is not a conference at all; it is a meeting called by us, with a chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer appointed beforehand and a plan outlined. Of course, if we enter into a conference with other nations we must confer with them as well as they with us, and we must reach some conclusion that was not the fixed purpose of every nation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it must be the finally compromised opinion of all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while I always hesitate to object to interruptions, I would like to proceed for a short time with the expression of my views in regard to the necessity of the amendment.

I look upon the question of dealing with these economic problems as distinctly at this time an American question, not exclusively so but inclusively so. It has reached the point where we are just as deeply concerned and ultimately to be quite as much affected by the situation as any European power. It can no longer be said that in dealing with these matters we are dealing with exclusively European questions. It is quite as much and in some respects quite as seriously an American question as the question of the war was in the spring of 1917. The conflict had proceeded in Europe for over two years and it was not regarded previous to that time as a question affecting American interests sufficiently to justify the United States taking part in the war. The invasion of Belgium had taken place. The outrage of Louvain and many of the things which were regarded as the most atrocious acts of the war happened between 1914 and 1917. But there came a time when the question reached the United States, when the subject had to be dealt with by the American people. If we are to believe the reports which come to us from every quarter not only in Europe but in the United States the economic problems have now reached the point where they are of practical concern to the people of the United States. It is now an American problem. We are suffering and suffering greatly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield for a question, and then I wish the Senator would permit me to proceed for a time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall permit the Senator to proceed now, if that is his wish.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is on his feet and I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall not interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. For illustration, we are now considering the naval appropriation bill. A little over a year ago we held a disarmament conference. The naval appropriation this year is $1,250,000 more than it was last year. We are advised by a report of the House committee that unless disarmament is extended to certain other subjects we shall again in a short time be in the midst of a naval race. In other words, we are now confronting a situation where we are to lose any possible advantage which was secured by reason of the disarmament conference a year ago, and in addition to that are undoubtedly to take upon ourselves a tremendous burden in the way of a renewed or a new naval constructive competitive program.

In addition to that, every spokesman of the administration, having regard now for the representatives in the Cabinet, is advising the American people that we must increase our Navy and enlarge our Army far beyond anything that we now have in mind. We are told by representatives of the Navy and by representatives of the Army that that condition is necessary by reason of conditions which obtain in Europe; that owing to the disturbances and discontent and unsettled conditions with reference to economic questions, and particularly reparations questions, the situation in Europe is so perilous that the United States can do no other than to prepare for another possible

conflict. It is not, therefore, purely a question for the Executive. It is not purely or solely a European question. It is also an American question and it is essentially and indispensably so.

I think it is pretty generally conceded that if another year shall transpire with reference to reparations such as the last year has been, and another year of conditions such as have prevailed in Europe shall be covered by the coming 12 months, war is imminent upon the continent of Europe, not between small nations or insignificant nations, but between the great powers of Europe.

I venture to say, after witnessing what happened in the campaign of 1916, and what happened immediately after the campaign of 1916, that if any conflict arises in Europe within the next year it will be practically impossible for us to remain out of the conflict. It is the height of prudence, therefore, and the first call of patriotism for the American people's authorized representatives to undertake to ameliorate the situation or to adjust the situation so as to eliminate the sources of discontent and the sources of turmoil in Europe.

The conditions which there confront us are peculiarly and particularly economic in their nature. The entire subject is organized around the question of reparations. To-day in every one of the leading countries whose budget I have been permitted to examine there is an increase in the military budget, and the justification of it is upon the ground of the unsettled conditions relative to reparations and the consequences which may follow.

So we are facing another continental disturbance. We are facing it by reason of the fact that there is a question of the settlement of the amount of reparations and a question of the adjustment of the controlling economic problems between Germany and France. If it were purely a European question or a European problem, if it had not reached us, if it were not here every day in our lives, affecting our standard of living and our taxes and affecting our appropriations and everything else with which we have to do, it might well be contended that it was premature to undertake to deal with it. But it is upon us. It enters into all our affairs. It influences our legislation. It has its effect upon our appropriations and it weighs with great heaviness upon all our people.

The conditions in Europe have been referred to of late by some whose position to judge is such that we are not permitted to disregard their suggestions. I read a statement from the American ambassador at St. James, a single line from an extended interview, in which he said:

> The meeting of allied premiers in London is the most important conference that has been held since 1918. If they are unable to find a solution, I do not know what is going to save the continent of Europe from utter wreckage.

Well, before the wreckage takes place in its ultimate effect there will be something more than an economic disturbance. Before the matter has reached the point where we may consider it as a financial or industrial breakdown there will be other conditions attach to it from which we will have difficulty in divorcing ourselves as they proceed.

I have also the statement of a leading French publicist, who supports in even a more pronounced way the view just read from the American ambassador, that without a settlement or an adjustment of these conditions Europe is facing another world conflict. I might spend the afternoon in reading that which is familiar to all Senators, that it is now recognized that we have reached a crisis in the economic affairs in Europe which extends to and includes the economic conditions and affairs also of the United States, and the question is whether or not we are going to undertake to deal with it now or whether we shall disregard it until such time as it forces us to take action probably in a different way.

This condition of affairs going on for the last two or three years has drawn us further and further into Europe. We are further into the affairs of Europe now than we were upon the 4th day of March, 1921. We are now concerning ourselves with more of the affairs of Europe, necessarily I shall assume, than we were a year and a half or two years ago. We are being drawn further and further into the affairs of Europe by reason of the economic problems with which Europe is now contending. We ratified what is known as the German treaty. Without debating now the wisdom or the unwisdom of doing it, the result of the ratification was to claim upon our part all the rights under the Versailles treaty which had been accredited or granted to the United States by its terms, and now, to all practical effects so far as our moral influence is concerned and, in my opinion, so far as the technical influence is concerned, we are assisting in the administering of the Versailles treaty.

We are sitting upon the reparations commission, not officially it is said, but in Europe they do not discern the difference so far as the results of the acts of the commission are concerned. Mr. Boyden, at the head of our commission there, takes part in the discussion of every question which comes up. He not only offers his views but he offers his argument and insists upon this or that being the correct course. Does anyone undertake to say that with a representative of the United States sitting upon the commission, with the moral backing and influence of the United States, urging a certain course or suggesting it, that it is without influence in affecting the course which the commission takes? It is in practical effect the administration of the Versailles treaty by this commission, in which we are not merely an observer looking on to report back to the President of the United States as to what takes place. We are far more than a reporter at that conference. We are a participant in the conference. It may be thought wise, especially for home effect, to avoid some technical proceedings but the ultimate results are the same.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, with regard to Mr. Boyden's part in the conference, I took occasion to ask the Secretary of State on yesterday, and he told me that Mr. Boyden never voted; that he took no part in the conference unless he was asked for his opinion; that he was acting entirely unofficially and that was perfectly understood by every power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it may be that technically Mr. Boyden does not vote, but the Secretary of State is misinformed if he thinks that Mr. Boyden waits for somebody to ask him for his opinion before he expresses it. I have talked with gentlemen who have sat upon subdivisions of the commission and they advise me to the contrary; that, so far as they were individually concerned, they took precisely the same part upon the subdivisions of the commission as did anybody else.

Mr. LODGE. I can only state the information which I have received from the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORAH. I think that technically, perhaps, Mr. Boyden does not vote, and not once in ten times do they ever come to a final conclusion by reason of a vote.

Mr. President, there is very little there for Mr. Boyden to observe if he is simply an observer; but there is a vast amount for him to do if he is there as a participant; and he is there all the time.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, of course if Mr. Boyden is doing what the Senator from Idaho suggests, he must be acting contrary to his instructions, which I think is very unlikely.

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to discuss that, but I have my opinion about it. I do not doubt the technical instructions but I have no doubt as to effect of what he is doing.

Mr. LODGE. Of course I have not been present at those meetings, but I implicitly believe what the Secretary of State says about his understanding of the matter.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning the veracity of the Secretary of State, but I know that Mr. Boyden is not sitting there merely as an observer and doing nothing but to take note of what happens and to report it back to the United States. He goes much further. I am advised that there is no more influential man in the body in bringing about results than is Mr. Boyden.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I do not know the sources of the information of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I think that it is inevitable. The Senator will remember that under the German treaty we reserved the right, in case we elected to do so, to have membership on the Reparation Commission, and I think we have elected to do so for all practical purposes; we are there.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the view of the Secretary of State; I can say that certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I defer to his view, for he is a great lawyer, and as a lone technical proposition he could sustain his position.

Mr. LODGE. I also know Mr. Boyden. He comes from Boston, and is a man of very high character and great ability. When the Secretary of State says Mr. Boyden holds no official position, that he is recognized as being unofficial, and that he speaks only when called upon, I rather think the Secretary of State so understands the situation, unless he is grossly misinformed.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning what the Secretary of State understands, but does the Senator from Massachusetts contend that in paying for the Reparation Commission the German Government does not pay our commissioner also?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know anything about the payments to commissioners.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Idaho stated that he thought we had elected to take our place upon the Reparation Commission. Is it not a fact that that election was reserved to Congress, and no power was reposed in the Executive to make such election?

Mr. LODGE. That is reserved in the treaty, of course. The President can not send a representative without our confirmation.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin turn to the German treaty?

Mr. LENROOT. I have it not before me, and I have made the statement merely from my recollection of the language. I will be glad to correct my statement if it is ascertained that I am wrong about it.

Mr. BORAH. I thought I had a copy of the treaty here, but I have not. It may be that that power was reserved to Congress. I know that at the time it was contended that only Congress should authorize such representation, but that was not the view of all the Senate. It may be that we put a reservation onto the treaty in reference to that matter; I think perhaps we did; but that does not change the situation a particle as to what is practically taking place with reference to the activities of the Reparation Commission.

However, Mr. President, suppose that we admit that technically Mr. Boyden is not an official member of the Reparation Commission, which I am perfectly willing to do; suppose we admit that technically he does not vote; no one who has been in attendance there pretends to say that he is not constantly engaged in the administration of the affairs which come up for the decision of the Reparation Commission. He is not there merely as an observer to report information, but he is participating and taking part in the discussions and proceedings.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Idaho, of course, does not contend that Mr. Boyden could make any sort of an agreement that would be binding upon the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, he could not make an agreement which would technically be binding upon the United States, but they are operating under a treaty and when a decision is made the function of the commission ends.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. BORAH. But we are now discussing what is actually taking place there so far as our activities in Europe are concerned with reference to existing conditions. Mr. Boyden is advising in regard to them just the same as a conference here would advise in regard to them.

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman from the United States sitting there unofficially has such weight that his advice is of controlling influence, then of necessity we would be more or less bound by what he says, would we not?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; we might be morally bound under certain conditions.

Mr. WATSON. By the same process of reasoning, if we call a conference and appoint a conferee to that conference and that conferee, for instance, agrees there that the foreign debt which is owing to us shall be forgiven, then would we not be morally bound by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so, because that is a mere matter of negotiation.

Mr. WATSON. Ah; but we call the conference. The work of the Reparation Commission is a matter of negotiation.

Mr. BORAH. No; the work of the Reparation Commission is not one of negotiation. It is in the nature of the administration of government.

Mr. WATSON. Largely it is a matter of negotiation as between the commissioners. They are there to negotiate.

Mr. BORAH. No; they are not negotiating. They are administering a form of government. The Reparation Commission is a form of government, in the heart of Europe, with governmental powers, and is exercising governmental powers, both legislative and quasi judicial.

Mr. WATSON. That is partially true; but, aside from that, coming back to the other question, let me ask my friend from Idaho if, under the sweeping terms of the Senator's amendment and without limitation, we appoint a member of the proposed conference to represent us at the conference and at that conference he should agree that the debts that are owed us by foreign countries should be forgiven, would we not then be morally bound to stand by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask the Senator this question, and then perhaps we can come to a conclusion: Suppose the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State and his foreign ambassadors, with the aid of the international bankers, should come to a conclusion that we should cancel the foreign debts and should agree to that, would we not be morally bound?

Mr. WATSON. I am inclined to think that we would be.

Mr. BORAH. Then, let us have it in the open.

Mr. WATSON. We are going to have it in the open. It can not be done secretly; but the Senator is not willing, I understand, to include that limitation in his amendment.

Mr. BORAH. I have not said that. There has been no amendment offered. Whenever it shall be offered I will be perfectly willing to consider it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, in view of the legislation passed creating the debt commission, does the Senator think that we would be morally bound if the President should make any arrangement for the cancellation of the debt?

Mr. BORAH. I think under certain conditions we might be morally bound.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not; but I wish to say to the Senator I have before me the reservation to which reference was made a few moments ago, and it expressly reserves the right of representation through the action of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Then if the President could not bind us in a moral way by reason of his negotiations, he being the Executive, I do not think that the conference would morally bind us either.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think the Senator believes that President Wilson morally bound the Congress when he negotiated the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, morally bound is one proposition and legally bound is another; but if the President through his agents were to agree upon a cancellation of the debt we would not be bound to any greater degree than where the President has negotiated a treaty and sent it up to us. We reject treaties regardless of the sense of moral obligation, if any there be.

Mr. BORAH. But there could not be any higher moral obligation come from the proposed conference than comes from the duly authorized power of the Government to negotiate a treaty.

Mr. WATSON. Which is my contention. I thought the Senator was contending otherwise, as he contended frequently in his arguments against the League of Nations, that whenever we appointed a representative to sit in the council or in the assembly, regardless of his power, and that representative entered into an agreement, we were morally bound, and from that moral obligation there would be no escape.

Mr. BORAH. We are digressing now from the matter which is of concern to me, and that is what we are actually doing in Europe at the present time. Whether technically, morally, legally, or accidentally, the question is we are drifting further and further into Europe.

Now, let me call attention to another proposition. We have an army on the Rhine in Europe. What is its business there? It is four years now since the war closed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How much of an army have we there?

Mr. BORAH. All they want. We have all that is deemed essential.

Mr. REED of Missouri. About 800 men; is not that the number?

Mr. WATSON. About 1,000 men.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I secured a statement from the Secretary of War just a day or two ago with reference to that question, and he stated that there are in Europe just a little over 1,000 men and, I think, 118 officers.

Mr. BORAH. What are 1,000 men doing there? Why is an American army there? Why is the American flag there? Why is the Government of the United States in the representation of its flag and its Army there? We must be there for some purpose; we must be there to effect a result, and it is supposed that 1,000 men are sufficient to effect that result. I assume if 10,000 were necessary to accomplish the same result they would be there. The fact is, Mr. President, by our presence there we are doing precisely what France asked us to do, or, rather, what was proposed in the treaty, namely, that we should guarantee the territorial integrity of France against the unprovoked aggression of Germany.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in a moment. So long as our soldiers are guarding the bridgeheads over the Rhine we are effecting the same result precisely that France anticipated would result from a signing of the treaty; we are giving notice to Germany and to the other nations of the world that our influence, our sympathy, our flag, and our Government are upon the side of France in the aggressions of Germany, and if the treaty between France and Great Britain and the United States

with reference to the boundary between Germany and France had been ratified it would not be anything different from what we are doing now. We are assisting in guarding and protecting the frontier of France. What other purpose would the treaty serve? If our soldiers must take the place of the treaty indefinitely, then I prefer the treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator think and has he not thought for a long time that the American troops in Germany ought to be brought home?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So do I.

Mr. BORAH. And one reason why we should want to settle the economic problems is to bring the troops home and to get out of Europe. I feel they will be there so long as this fearful condition continues.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would it not be easier to bring the troops home than it would be to have the proposed conference?

Mr. BORAH. You can not bring them home, nor can I.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We could make the President do it.

Mr. BORAH. We could not make the President do it. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and if in the discharge of his duty he wants to assign them there, I do not know of any power that we can exert to compel him to bring them home. We may refuse to create an Army, but when it is created he is the commander.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wish to change my statement. We can not make him bring them home, because none of us want to make the President do anything, but I think if there were a resolution passed asking the President to bring the troops home, where they belong, the President would recognize that request from Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, during the campaign of 1920 the President of the United States stated to the public that the troops had no business in Europe and that they would be brought home. This matter was debated in the Senate of the United States, and afterwards the Secretary of War stated that the troops were being brought home, and that they would all be home just as soon as we could get ships enough to carry them. The representative of France in this country—the French ambassador—made his protest to the Secretary of War, according to the press, and the President of the United States, and they kept them in Europe. Why were they kept there? We are just as much involved in that situation as if we had signed the treaty, and they are being kept there for the same identical purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, those troops, of course, as the Senator knows, are not there under the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I may concede they are not.

Mr. LODGE. They are there under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly aware that such is the contention. We did not ratify the Versailles treaty; but when we failed to ratify the treaty we apparently substituted the troops to keep the guard instead of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. We kept them under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. Let us admit it; but why are we keeping them there? What are they there for?

Mr. LODGE. That I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. No; and no living man can tell for the reasons would admit the whole contention.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, did not the armistice end when our separate treaty with Germany was ratified?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; precisely so. I thank the Senator.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that we are dealing with this situation in what I think is a roundabout way. Here is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is in as close touch with the Secretary of State as any other man in the Senate, and perhaps more so. We find our troops upon the Rhine, and he notifies us that he does not know why they are there. I know why they are there. They are there because it is not thought wise, it is not thought safe, to bring them out so long as Europe is in her present condition; and I venture to believe that if you will ask the Secretary of State why they are there, or the Secretary of War, and they feel free to speak fully, they will tell you that the French ambassador notified them that under present conditions in Europe, the question of the reparations and the unsettled conditions which prevailed, it was necessary to have the troops there as a part of the moral force to keep the peace. That will be the reason in substance and effect.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Let me ask another thing. Suppose that upon to-morrow morning the German troops should attack the forces on the Rhine. Suppose that M. Clemenceau's fears should prove to be well founded, and they have been manufacturing arms and munitions, and that they have hundreds of thousands of men ready at any time to take to arms. Suppose they should do so, and should undertake to take the Rhine. Our soldiers would be in the front of the fight and the United States would be in the midst of a European war.

I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I know this much about keeping the troops there: One reason, I know, is that they are there at the earnest request of Germany.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, you can find all the German authority you want that they would be delighted to have us send the troops home. There may be a division of opinion in Germany about that. There may be some who desire them there. If so, it is for the same reason that we are keeping them there, and that is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe. Certainly Germany would not want our troops there, costing her as they are, unless she thought that the unsettled and discontented conditions in Europe made it essential for them to be there.

Mr. LODGE. If our troops were moved from the bridgehead at Coblenz, the Senator knows perfectly well that their places would be taken by French troops.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I am talking about America being in Europe, not about France being in Europe. That is where France ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. I said nothing about France being in Europe. My information is not extensive, but I know that France is in Europe.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and there are some who think this country ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. And they will not get rid of troops at Coblenz by removing the American troops. I think they ought to be brought home, as a personal matter of opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. Well, everybody thinks they ought to be brought home, and nobody will vote to bring them home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me, in spite of his late refusal to be interrupted?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. When the question was raised a year ago about bringing home those troops it was opposed without much ceremony.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it seems that I must be courteous to all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He and the Senator from Massachusetts both seem to be agreed that our troops on the Rhine ought to be brought home; and the Senator has just said that everybody says that, but nobody wants to do it. I want to call his attention to the fact that I have never said it and I do not think they ought to be brought home. I think the American flag ought to be there; and when the Senator says that they are there for the purpose of making Germany observe the terms of the treaty of peace I admit that, and I think they ought to be there for that express purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and so do the people who are keeping them there think they ought to be there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because, outside of the treaty of peace, we were parties to the armistice. Whether we went into the treaty of peace or not, we were parties to the armistice; and a part of the armistice terms was that we were to occupy the gateways to the Rhine until Germany conformed to the treaty of peace which was to be afterwards entered into.

Mr. BORAH. It is now four years since we closed the war. The troops are still there. That is a physical fact. You can explain and excuse and refine upon the reasons, but there they are four years after the war, and two years after the promise was made to bring them home. It must be a powerful and controlling reason. I do not know what specific reason would be assigned if it were deemed necessary to assign a reason, but I venture the opinion that the real reason is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe, particularly over the question of reparations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. They would not be there unless they were taken for some such purpose as the Senator from Mississippi suggests; and they will not be brought home, in my humble opinion—that is to say, our presence on the Rhine will be maintained—until peace is restored, until the present conditions are settled, until the turmoil which is now seething shall have an end.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until Germany conforms to the terms of the armistice, which hitherto she has not done.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. Then, if that is to be the time, and the treaty is to remain unchanged, there is no child now living who will see the time when our troops will return.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, while this subject is up I should like to ask the Senator if he will accept the amendment which I am going to send to the desk?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I certainly do not want to yield here for the purpose of offering amendments and accepting amendments.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator will wait until I get through, I will discuss the amendment with him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator allow me to send it to the desk to be printed without being read?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and the Senator may have it read if he wishes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Let it be read, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following:

The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany.

Mr. BORAH. In so far as I am able to do so, I would favor the amendment. But I think it stands upon its own merits. That will accomplish one thing which I want to accomplish by adjusting the conditions in Europe. That is one step toward getting out of Europe.

Mr. President, we will not adopt that resolution and that amendment, in my opinion, but in all probability those troops will remain there indefinitely. There is no probability now of their being brought home, and it is by reason of the conditions which now prevail in Europe.

It may not be out of place here to call attention to the situation with reference to these troops, both of France and of the United States, upon the Rhine. I have a communication to the Baltimore Sun by Mr. Bouton, the European correspondent, in which it is said—he claims to speak, so far as he gives data or figures, from the record—

The debt owed to the Allies by Germany * * * is being increased daily by more than 4,000,000 gold marks of absolutely unproductive expenses. The further absolutely unproductive occupation of tillable land for military purposes is adding even more millions to this sum yearly.

* * * * * * *

But the unproductive wastage along the Rhine goes on unchecked. The average linotype probably does not contain enough ciphers to give in paper marks the amount required of Germany yearly to support the armies of occupation. But it can be given in another way. Let the reader set down 3,200 and then add nine ciphers to that sum. It is a good deal of money, even in paper marks. It would be a good deal in cowrie shells or wampum. And it amounts to almost eight times the total domestic budget of Germany. For unproductive purposes!

In other words, there is being maintained upon the Rhine at this time an army which in expense to Germany amounts to almost eight times her domestic budget; and the one great problem which is now tormenting the world is how Germany shall be able to meet the reparations judgment, whatever it may finally come to be. Under the present program and under the present policy which is being pursued the time will never come when Germany can meet this situation, and so it is postponed indefinitely; and unless there is some understanding or some conference or some arrangement or some agreement by which a changed condition can be brought about Germany will not be able to meet the demands which are now placed upon her and we will be drawn deeper and deeper and deeper into Europe from year to year, in my opinion. It is not, my friends, for the purpose of getting into Europe, it is for the purpose of getting out of Europe, that I believe it is absolutely necessary to exert whatever influence we can as an independent power to deal with the situation which is now keeping us there and drawing us deeper and deeper into her affairs each year.

Take the Lausanne conference: True, we were there unofficially! That is the saving grace; but, unofficially, what are we doing? In two particular instances we are informed by the Associated Press that our unofficial representative was the deciding factor in bringing about certain situations. Could he have accomplished any more had he been official? Would we have been bound by his acts as a Nation, morally speaking, in any different way, had he sat there officially? Even if he had sat there officially, he could not have bound us to any greater extent, in my judgment, unless he reported back a treaty which we ratified. So, as a practical proposition, there is no subject that comes up in Europe that we are not undertaking to deal with, and exerting our influence and exerting ineffectively and therefore unwisely. Whatever the conference may be, or whatever it may be called, we are there speaking for the United States in some form. Whether we cast a vote or not, we are exerting our influence to bring about a certain policy or a certain condition; and Europe looks upon it, and is coming to look upon it, as something more than mere observing and reporting back.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to some of the conditions in this country which result by reason of the unsettled affairs in Europe. I call attention to these conditions because they seem to me to justify our consideration of this subject matter even if there were no other reasons. I do not believe for a moment that the President of the United States can be unconcerned as to the conditions in this country or as to why those conditions exist. Therefore I do not believe that the President can be idle or inactive with reference to bringing about a change in the situation. We are informed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he is active in the matter.

As I said in the beginning, if this amendment will embarrass the President, if it will in any way disconcert the Chief Executive, if it will embarrass instead of help, that is the most conclusive argument which could be presented against it, in my judgment. If, on the other hand, it is looked upon as a problem which not only requires the technical skill and the negotiating power of the Secretary of State and of the President, but should have the moral support and the public opinion of the United States behind it, and the treaty-making power behind it, then there is every reason why this amendment should be adopted.

When I see Europe sinking lower into misery and suffering, and when I know that our own people are suffering by reason of that, and when I know that countless millions of Europe are this winter to suffer and thousands of them die, I am not willing to sit without at least expressing my conviction that something ought to be done, if it is possible to do it, and I can not conceive that it is embarrassing the President of the United States in the slightest for the whole world to know that the Senate of the United States would like to see him negotiate for an adjustment of these conditions.

Has the Senate of the United States become so inconsequential, has it become so utterly without power or respect among the nations of the earth and with our own people, that it should either be indifferent to such a situation or, if not indifferent, that it should keep its views to itself for fear of disturbing some fanciful situation not disclosed?

Let us look at the situation in this country for a moment. Our markets in Europe are indispensable to the prosperity of the American producer. We sell from 23 to 25 per cent of our wheat abroad. Unless that amount finds a market, it is impossible for the American farmer to realize a price which will justify his raising the wheat.

I read a statement prepared by a financier of the Middle West, which I have seen verified several times and which I have no doubt is correct. If it is incorrect, the able Senator from Utah can correct me, because I know he is informed about these things. This statement says:

The decreased purchasing power of Europe from 1919 to 1921, inclusive, has a very vital relationship to the present agricultural depression in America. For instance, in 1919 Europe purchased 332,000,000 pounds of beef from the United States, but only 21,000,000 in 1921.

In other words, there was sold to Europe in 1921 about one-fifteenth of what was sold to Europe in 1919.

Europe purchased 1,238,000,000 pounds of bacon in 1919 but only 489,000,000 in 1921. * * * What happened? The American live-stock industry became demoralized and the value of her live stock, approximately the same number of head, dropped from $8,800,000,000 in 1919 to $6,200,000,000 in 1921—a loss to the live-stock industry of America of about $75,000,000 for each month of the entire 36 months—a total loss of $2,600,000,000 to the live-stock industry in America.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. My friends, is not that a matter of supreme concern to the people of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, and to every business man in the United States? Could anything be more direct and essential for the consideration of this Government and its representatives than by some method to relieve that situation, whatever the method may be? You may pass tariff bills time out of mind, but unless the markets of Europe are restored upon these matters for which we must find a market in Europe, we will not enjoy the prosperity in this country which we have said to the American people they were to enjoy. It is indispensable; it is a part of our domestic policy; it is a matter which concerns us all. It is not the mere question of negotiating a treaty relating alone to foreign matters. It is dealing with a subject as wide and broad as the

conditions of the American people and the people of Europe combined can present.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator has anticipated me by making a very wholesome admission that tariff duties will not prevent a fall in the prices of articles when we cease to export them.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I am not going into a tariff debate. My vote upon the tariff question speaks for itself.

Mr. President, since my amendment was offered I do not know how many telegrams from farm organizations of the United States I have had, but a vast number. The members of those organizations are perfectly well aware of the situation. They know the condition which confronts us. They are not satisfied and will not be satisfied with having us pass a farm credit bill, which will only postpone the day of wrath in case this situation is not adjusted. They realize fully that they must have their foreign market. They are quite as keen in regard to this matter as those of us who have the honor to represent them here.

I have a communication from one farm organization in the Middle West, which says:

> Do you know that in the last five months we have exported 45,000,000 bushels less of wheat than we did a year ago for the same period?
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Do you know that when a Frenchman buys a bushel of wheat on account of the depreciation of francs that it costs him $4? Do you know that Italy is again eating black bread? Do you know that Germany is again rationing flour? Do you know that a boy came to a bank here the other day and for $5 bought 30,648 marks to be sent to his folks back home? * * *
>
> Do you know that our beef exports are only one-fifteenth of what they were in 1919, while Argentina's are greater every year? Do you know that Russia used to ship to western Europe 250,000,000 bushels of wheat every year? Do you know that there are 300,000,000 people of Europe who are being only partly fed but who if they were allowed to come anywhere near getting a square meal daily would more than consume all our surplus? Do you know that the world produced 1,000,000,000 bushels less of wheat in 1922 than it did in 1913? Do you know that Europe is desperately trying to buy our products, and paid us last year $667,000,000 in gold and has paid us this year over $400,000,000?

These are the conditions which lead me to believe that this is our question, this is our problem, from which we can not escape.

Another communication says:

> The Ford County Farm Bureau members assembled in annual meeting believe that everything necessary should be done to restore the farmer's market. For our surplus production, this market is overseas.
>
> We realize that the question of the German reparations * * * are inextricably interwoven.

Mr. President, there are not more goods in the world to-day than the world needs. There is not more food than the human family could properly use, and the peoples of the earth want to trade with one another. They want to deal with one another. They want to exchange the things which are rotting in their ground in some parts of the earth with those who are starving for them in other parts of the earth. They are not permitted to do so because of the political masters and political policies of Europe. They are kept from dealing with each other by reason of artificial conditions, and not by reason of reasonable or natural conditions.

We are just as much interested in that proposition as any nation in Europe or any people in Europe. It comes home to us in every vital way. It is menacing from an economic, and physical, and moral standpoint.

Mr. President, possibly I view the situation with too much concern. It may be that the impatience which I have no doubt we all feel at the slow recovery of economic health and at the tenacious hold which the spirit of turmoil and war maintain upon world affairs have clouded my view and distorted my outlook. But I do know that a deep and moving spirit of unrest, of discontent, has wrought upon our own people to their utter change in many ways. The fearful wave of lawlessness, the saturnalia of crime, which have swept over and engulfed this land for months, and which still linger, are not without a cause. The unusual apathy, the apparent indifference of entire communities, whole States, to these crimes are not natural to this people who have, through the century, built up a magnificent fabric of free government, the keystone of which, as they well know, is obedience to law. There is a cause for these things, an overwhelming cause. And I know of nothing which undermines the people's faith, which breaks down the nation's morale, like the fiscal policy which robs thrift of its savings, takes from frugality its reward, and plants the tax collector like a policeman upon his watch at the doorstep of every enterprising home. Why should men toil? Why save? Why plan for to-morrow? Rather, why not eat and drift and waste, for at the end of the year the result is the same. Not only that, but desperate times are the harvest times of the usurer and the profiteer. Taking advantage of the necessities of the unhoused and the needy, of the farmer or business man in distress, they ply their trade with unchallenged and unlimited success. They wriggle their slimy way through the wreck of vanishing hopes and baffled efforts, and like the ghoul on the field of Waterloo, of whom Hugo speaks, cutting the jewels from the fingers of the dead and snatching mementoes from the clutches of the dying, escape at last with their stained and sordid plunder. These things, all these things, make for discouragement, make for demoralization, make for despair, make for crime. We have reached a point where a fight for fiscal relief is a fight for the American home, for the unity and stability of the family, for American manhood and womanhood, a fight for that citizenship—free, intelligent, hopeful, confident—which made America and which alone can preserve America.

This is the situation as I see it in my own country. Will any deny the serious conditions upon every hand? Now, sir, what is the plan? What is proposed to be done? If this plan is not wise, what is your plan? Are we to sit idle and listless while conditions grow worse? I will gladly yield to a wiser, more effective plan, but so long as no other is proposed I deem it not only right but a solemn duty to urge this course.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator holds the political masters of Europe responsible for erecting barriers against natural trade and exchange. Should he not also hold the political masters of the United States responsible for some of those barriers erected against international commerce? Have we not only recently passed a tariff law which makes it almost impossible for European countries to pay us in their products for the products of ours which they purchase over here?

Let me ask the Senator another question: Is his amendment broad enough, in his opinion, to permit the European nations at such a conference as he proposes to suggest to us that if we would lower our tariffs against European goods they would be enabled to buy our farm products?

Mr. BORAH. I would not have any fear of the President of the United States paying any attention to the suggestion. They could suggest that we give them a voice in financial legislation. But such suggestions no one would consider.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would his amendment be broad enough?

Mr. BORAH. I think it might for the suggestion. I am not so sensitive about the tariff act as some others, and so I do not worry about such suggestion. I think on the tariff the President would be equal to the occasion.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I would like to suggest to the Senator that notwithstanding that last year was the shortest crop of cotton grown in the last 25 years—less than 8,000,000 bales—yet there were 2,800,000 bales carried over, and to-day the people in the South are selling their live stock by the hundreds because of the low prices prevailing, and laborers are leaving by the thousands.

Mr. BORAH. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] just informs me that there was more cotton exported this year than last year. I think possibly that is true. It was stated the other day in a press dispatch that Russia had purchased a very large amount of cotton from southern planters. In spite of every effort upon our part, Russia has gotten back where she has become a purchaser from the United States, but by no grace of ours.

Mr. President, there is another reason why we should deal with the existing situation. I am not going to refer to it at length at this time. I have already spoken too long. It may come up later in the debate. There are humanitarian reasons not only in Europe but in this country which ought to inspire us with an effort to help to bring about a different condition of affairs. If we couple all the subject matters together—our presence in Europe, our getting deeper and deeper into the affairs of Europe, also the economic questions and humanitarian questions—from whatever point we may view the subject matter, it is certainly incumbent on the United States to move. If there is, as I said, a plan in hand or a scheme in process of being formed—if the negotiations which are reported in the newspapers between Mr. Morgan and other parties are ripening into final results which will be beneficial to the people of the

United States—and that is thought to be the best way to deal with the subject matter, I am perfectly willing, when the facts are presented, to consider them.

But certainly the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of this body, will not take the position as a leader of the Senate and a leader of the Republican Party that we ought not to do anything. Certainly the Republican Party will not take the position that we ought not to have a program. Certainly we will not take the position that we ought not to proceed to exert whatever influence or power we have to bring about a satisfactory settlement of these conditions. We may fail. That is not impossible. We certainly will not accomplish it if we do not try. I know that there are many Members of this body who thought that the disarmament conference was a mere dream and that we should fail. But from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts to-day we know that we did not fail. We brought back a remarkable result.

A year has passed since that time, and that year, my friends, has been as a century at other times. The things which have happened in Europe during the last year would scarcely have been recorded in a half century in ordinary times. Every budget in Europe is being increased by reason of those conditions. Taxes are being constantly laid upon the people by reason of those conditions. They are borrowing money day by day. I have upon my desk the report of a distinguished publicist and economist of the United States who has been abroad for three months, and who made a report of conditions, a report which I would not dare to read without his most pronounced consent. But they are nearing the brink. Chaos is ahead. Conditions are insufferable. The greatest legislative body in the world can not disregard those conditions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, with very much of what was said by the able Senator from Idaho I agree. But I confess I have been astonished, as I am sure most of the Senators have been astonished who were present during the long, long fight upon the League of Nations and upon the four-power treaty and heard the Senator's eloquent speeches then insisting upon our remaining completely aloof from Europe and keeping out of European questions, with his position to-day, evidenced not only by his amendment, but by his speech, that he to-day is in favor of the United States thrusting itself into the very midst of the European problem. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the conversion of Saul of Tarsus was not more marked than the apparent conversion of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Wisconsin will remember that the conversion of the Saul of Tarsus saved his soul.

Mr. LENROOT. I would not for a moment intimate that that is the reason for the Senator's conversion.

Mr. GLASS. The conversion not only saved his life but some of us think it saved the life of the world.

Mr. LENROOT. I was only speaking of the facts and I do not in the least criticize the conversion, if such there be, because I find myself much more in accord with the Senator to-day than during the period to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I only desire to discuss very briefly one phase of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho. I assume that when the amendment is formally presented a point of order will be made against it and I think that the Chair upon the presentation of the matter will be convinced that the amendment is not in order and that such point of order must be sustained. But that discussion will more properly come when the matter is formally before the Senate. The part of the amendment which I desire to discuss is that part only authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference—

> Charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions.

I can not support the proposition in its present form because it is without condition or limitation and, if adopted, would, in my judgment, build up in Europe false hopes of American relief and American participation in European affairs that could not be realized, and thus postpone and delay the economic rehabilitation of the world instead of advancing it. I believe it would defeat the very purpose that the Senator from Idaho has in mind in proposing it. That such a conference may be held in the near future, under proper conditions and with advance understandings as to the extent of America's participation in it, in my judgment is most desirable; but without such conditions and understandings we shall be doing Europe positive injury as well as ourselves if the United States shall take the initiative in calling it. If the amendment be adopted, all of Europe will accept it as an indication that public opinion in America with reference to the cancellation of her debts to us has changed, that Clemenceau's mission has been completely successful, that any concession made between European nations will be compensated for by the United States, and that we will stand as a rich and generous uncle, showering our wealth upon them. From the language of the amendment they would have a right to draw such conclusions, because if, as the Senator from Idaho suggests, the President in calling the conference shall attempt to safeguard it by the addition of a limitation they will be able to point to the action of the Congress of the United States where they have requested that the conference be held without condition or limitation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator take the position that neither the Executive nor the Congress should take any step in regard to the matter?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator admit the proposition as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the President is now dealing with it?

Mr. LENROOT. I do accept it, and I hope it is true.

Mr. BORAH. Then that is liable to cause some false hopes in Europe also?

Mr. LENROOT. No——

Mr. BORAH. Possibly not.

Mr. LENROOT. The distinction is, as I think Senators must readily agree, that if the President, without any declaration either upon the part of Congress or upon his own part of being willing to enter into a conference without condition or limitation, makes the proposition that there must be some advance understanding as to the limitations and conditions under which he, as the President of the United States, will be favorable to such a conference, we are in a very different position than if Europe can point to action of the Congress requesting a conference without condition or limitation.

As further evidence of this—that is, the willingness of Congress to have a conference held without condition or limitation—as evidence of a change of opinion upon the part of the United States with reference to the cancellation of the foreign debt they can point to the fact that the proposal comes from the most distinguished isolationist in the United States, the most powerful and eloquent advocate of the complete aloofness of the United States in the political affairs of Europe, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. With all this, some delver into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find that although the distinguished Senator has at all times preached the doctrine of isolation he at the same time has said:

> It is our solemn duty to say to them [Europe], "You can have all that is within our power as a prudent people to give, for we recognize both our obligations to humanity and our material interest in the cause, but you must conform your treaties to the law of live and let live. You must subscribe to the principles of reconstruction and not destruction. You, too, must become advocates and apostles of rehabilitation.

Those are the words of the Senator from Idaho. With all due respect to him, I do not believe that either his policy of isolation or his unbounded generosity under certain conditions meets the approval of the American people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am very grateful to the Senator for finding that quotation, because I have been looking for it all morning.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall be glad to give the Senator a citation of where it can be found.

Mr. BORAH. It states exactly my position to-day. It states precisely my position. I have no desire to change a word or a punctuation.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not question that.

Mr. BORAH. It conforms exactly to what I am trying to do now.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Let us understand the purpose and object the Senator from Idaho himself has in the proposed amendment. It is that if Europe will conform to what he thinks Europe ought to do, there is no limit to what America will be willing to do for Europe, which includes, of course, the cancellation of her debt, and includes material help in every possible way. I for one am not willing, even if Europe does those things, to go as far as the Senator from Idaho expresses himself as willing to go.

Mr. BORAH. Would not the Senator be willing to go to the extent to which a prudent nation should go?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; to a certain degree.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I said.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; a prudent nation—give as much help as a prudent nation would be willing to give.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. LENROOT. That immediately carries the idea of what the resources of the United States are and what her resources will permit her to do. Of course, it would be at once said, and we would have to admit, that with the enormous wealth of the United States we should cancel every dollar of the $11,000,000,000 of indebtedness and we would no doubt prosper permanently in the years to come just the same.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have here a communication from the President written at the time the disarmament conference was sitting, in which he said:

> I have said to inquirers, as I am now pleased to say to you, that it is not of particular concern to the administration what form the expression that Congress shall take, though it is most agreeable that Congress shall express itself in favor of securing, if possible, an international agreement upon a program for the limitation of armament.

Again:

> It is wholly desirable to have the expression of a favorable opinion on the part of Congress relating to this world question, and it would seem to me ample if it should be expressed in the broadest and most general terms.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in agreement with that expression of the President upon the subject to which it refers, which was the limitation of armaments. I can not conceive of any general language upon that subject which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or operate in effect as a postponement of the result that was desired. Here, however, we have a very different situation, where general language will not only involve the United States in questions in which the American people, in my opinion, are not willing to be involved but, in addition, will operate to postpone the very object that is sought to be secured by the proposal.

I appreciate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Idaho differentiates between an international economic conference and one having to do with political relations; but the two can not be separated. What is the dominant motive and mainspring of every political movement in Europe to-day? It is economic advantage, economic domination. That is true whether we turn to Germany, to Russia, or to Turkey. Why did England finance Greece to fight Turkey, and France and Italy finance Turkey to fight Greece? Was there any reason other than rivalry for economic domination or advantage in the Near East? Will anyone upon this floor pretend otherwise? No man in the Senate has declared more forcefully than has the Senator from Idaho that political sovereignty of a country is an empty shell if there be economic control of that country by another power. Senators will remember the vigorous speeches which the Senator from Idaho has made upon that subject in discussing the relations between Japan and China. In one of them he was led to exclaim, "What does sovereignty amount to if economic control of the situation is in the hands of another power?" It will also be remembered that the Senator from Idaho objected to our being represented on the Reparation Commission under the Versailles treaty upon the ground that it would embroil us in all the political affairs of Europe. No, Mr. President, the attempt to limit the proposed conference to economic questions, if we should go into it without other limitation or restriction, would let us into every European question which the Senator from Idaho for long years has insisted the United States should keep out of.

I have thus referred to the able Senator from Idaho because of his great ability, which is recognized in Europe as well as in America. This proposal coming from him assumes greater importance and will receive a different interpretation than if it had come from almost any other Member of this body. This amendment, if adopted, will convince Europe and the international bankers in America as nothing else could that the $11,000,000,000 owing the United States by Europe will be forgiven and canceled. The Senator from Idaho has correctly described the insidious propaganda that has been going on in this country for the cancellation of the European debt to us; he has resisted it in the past most vigorously; and it is surprising that, unintentionally, no doubt, a proposal now comes from that Senator which will give that propaganda a new impetus and will certainly postpone the funding of that indebtedness by the debt commission which has been created by Congress.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to an economic conference, provided it be understood before we assume the responsibility for calling it that cancellation of the European debts to us shall not be one of the matters for discussion, and provided that the President of the United States will have some assurance from the leading powers of Europe that the matters for discussion shall be such as reach the heart of the European question, namely, the abandonment of present policies of economic exploitation and rivalry which are preventing the economic rehabilitation of Europe.

As to this matter, I am willing to trust President Harding and Secretary Hughes. Surely they are as much interested in the subject as is the Senate. They certainly have more information upon it than we have. They are in a position to secure conditions and limitations to such a conference as are utterly lacking in the proposal before us.

One word in conclusion with respect to the farm bloc and what the Senator from Idaho has stated as to the agricultural interests of the country. I am not a member of the farm bloc, but I understand that the proposal of the Senator from Idaho finds favor with many of them upon the theory that it will tend to increase the price of farm products. Let me warn them that, in my judgment, that will not be the case, for a postponement of the settlement of European affairs means continuous disadvantage to the farmers of America, and I believe if the Senate adopts this proposition it will mean postponement of the rehabilitation of Europe, for, as I stated in the beginning, it will raise false hopes in Europe which never can be realized.

May I refer for a moment to a little of the history in connection with the Limitation of Armament Conference? The proposal for that conference, like the proposal for this economic conference, came first, so far as the Senate is concerned, from the distinguished Senator from Idaho. The conference was called; it completed its work; and I believe in importance that conference was second to none in the history of international conferences; and yet I can not forget that the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who was the first proponent of that conference in the Senate, opposed with all his great power and ability the four-power treaty, which made the naval-limitation agreement possible. So, Mr. President, if the proposed conference be held without a limitation or condition, as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho, I am afraid that, if the conference should come to an agreement, some of the Senators who are now favoring the proposal would be the first, when a treaty came to the Senate to ratify the work of the economic conference, to oppose it and render for naught all the work which the economic conference had accomplished.

Mr. President, it should be understood once for all, and before any conference is called, that there will be no cancellation of the European debt to us; that that shall not be a subject for discussion in any economic conference. If France is right in her view that Germany alone, defeated and crushed, can pay reparations amounting to $30,000,000,000, then surely Europe can in time to come pay her indebtedness to us of one-third as much, $11,000,000,000. Let us leave the matter where it is now, with the President of the United States. We can trust him to act as soon as any good can be accomplished by action, and if at any time the President shall request the assent of Congress for such a conference, I am confident that Congress will speedily give its assent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has quite characteristically made a speech in a Shylock vein in favor of the utmost exaction of the pound of flesh. He has spoken of the European debt to America. There is not a European debt to America, and of course he knows that. There is a debt from Belgium, a debt from Serbia, a debt from Italy, a debt from France, a debt from Great Britain. They are individual national debts due to the United States. To try to cover them all under a general phrase of being the indebtedness of Europe to the United States is nonlogical to start with and stupid to end with. A man who might be very unwilling to cancel a debt that Italy, France, or Great Britain happened to owe the United States might be very willing to cancel a debt that Belgium, overridden without cause, never really a party to the war, or Serbia, dragooned and intimidated, happened to owe to the United States. The European debt to the United States reminds me of the common protective tariff nonsense about trade between Germany and the United States, or France and the United States, or between countries, when there is not any trade between countries at all, but the trade is between the individual citizens of one country with the individual citizens of the other.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned—and the Senator dared anybody to say anything in favor of the cancellation of any debt that anybody owed to the United States—I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Belgium owes us, and I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Serbia owes us. I do not think that a man would feel quite like a gentleman when he was presenting a bill to either one of them; but I want to collect all the balance, and the most part of it is upon the other side.

Mr. President, the quarrel between the Senator from Idaho on the one side and the Senator from Massachusetts, reinforced by the Senator from Indiana, upon the other side, as to whether our representative at Lausanne now is a participant or an observer, is really amusing to me, and I reckon it is

to you. It does not make any difference whether you call him a participant or whether you call him an observer; he is doing things, and he seems to be doing them on the pathway toward ultimate right. My only quarrel is that he is not doing enough things. He ought to read the riot act to the unspeakable Turk, and tell him that assassinations and rape have to stop, and stop right now, and that the United States says so. Call him an observer or call him a participant or call him whatever you please, as a Democrat I indorse President Harding's sending him there and having him do at least as much as he has done, and I hope he will have him do more.

Mr. President, it is a great thing to be a Democrat. It is one of the grandest privileges in the world just to be a Democrat, to believe in equal opportunities and to disbelieve in special privileges; but, Mr. President, there is something even greater than being a Democrat, and that is being an American—being a member of the English-speaking race which transplanted its institutions to America. I love the Senator from Idaho so much that nobody is more delighted than I am to find that he has finally discovered that these United States are a part of the earth, and that he has finally discovered today that these United States are a part of Europe.

Did you ever think of that? Every drop of blood in our veins, except the niggers and the Chinese and the Japanese in the United States, is European. Our ancestry is European. We are a part of Europe just as much as Magna Græcia was a part of Greece, just as much as the Sicilian colonies from Greece were a part of Greece. We are a part of Europe, and we can not help it. It is in our blood, it is in our bone, it is in our sinew. We are not niggers, and we are not Japanese, and we are not Chinese; we are Europeans, and I am delighted to notice that the Senator from Idaho has finally seemingly approximated that realization, merely approximated it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Senator's amendment. I have not consulted with anybody on this side nor with anybody on the other side, but I am in favor of it because it is "p'inted" the right way, as the darkies say; and I am opposed to any Lodge reservation, whether reinforced by the Senator from Indiana or by the Senator from Wisconsin, or not. God knows I have had enough of Lodge reservations to a generally idealistic purpose. I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, and I am opposed to any Lodge reservations. Lodge reservations can ruin anything that ever existed.

There is one thing, though, to which I wish to call attention before I sit down, because it was agreed to by both the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Wisconsin. They seem to think that the troubles of Europe now are economic. Well, of course, that is a part of the trouble, but the real trouble there, as during the entire history of the world it has been, is racial.

If you will let the energies of the people loose and quit confining them by governmental action, they will cure the economic troubles here and abroad; but nothing but the special grace of God can cure racial troubles between peoples. If we are to have another war soon in Europe, it will grow out of the Turk and the Balkans, and gradually Bulgaria and Greece and Serbia getting into it, and then finally the soviet in Russia backing the Turk out of hatred to civilization, not out of any natural affinity between Russians and Turks, and it will overflow the world. It is not economic at all. Of course, a part of the trouble with trade and exchange is economic, but there is no danger of war from economics at all. I have witnessed men here on this floor, at the beginning of the war between the Allies and Germany, and about the time we were participating in it, talking about it as if it were a contest of forces to outtrade one another. It had no more to do with that than it had with the wound on my off thumb, which was secured by slamming a door—nothing. The real trouble was growing out of a racial gospel that the Germans had preached for 40 years, recommending themselves to the other nations as being the chosen race of the world, and the balance of us as being degenerates. That was adopted by some college professors who were educated in Germany, and by three or four Senators upon this floor, strange as it may seem. They more or less admitted that the Germans were a superior race, most highly scientific, far ahead of us or anybody else; and it took us on the battle field, man to man, to prove to the German that he was not the special favorite of God at all. The trouble in Europe to-day is not chiefly economic at all, and when the Senator from Wisconsin says he is afraid that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho may go beyond that I hope he is right, because then maybe they can strike the center of the disease.

One more thing, Mr. President: The Senator from Idaho wanted to know why our few troops were still upon the Rhine. He pretended that he did not know why we were still upon the Rhine. We were parties to the armistice into which Germany entered. One of the terms of the armistice was that we were to occupy the gateways across the Rhine, the Allies and the associated nations, and we are occupying the gateway at Coblenz; and, unless we withdraw from our plighted word under the terms of the armistice, we must continue to keep the United States flag there. It does not take many troops. It does not take any war; but the Senator from Idaho said that what we meant by keeping the troops there, to try to quote him accurately—I believe I took it down—was giving notice to Germany that we were there. That is just what it means. We did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing.

I have nothing against the German people. I love them. I have a whole lot of friends among them. I was partially educated amongst them. But we did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing. We did not enter into the armistice for nothing. We gave Germany notice when we entered into the armistice that she had to observe the terms of it, and although we never became party to the Versailles treaty we are still parties to the armistice. The Senator from Idaho is right. We are staying there to give notice to Germany—notice by our mere flag and a thousand men, I believe it is about a thousand—that she must remember and she shall not forget why we are there.

Again I say, it is a proud thing to be a Democrat, but it is a better thing to be an American; and I indorse President Harding's course in keeping those troops there, and I for one, am not afraid to say so.

The Senator from Idaho read a whole lot of communications from what he calls foreign-born societies that he said were constituents of his. They are not constituents of mine. Whenever a man hyphenates himself he is, in my opinion, not an American, and nobody except Americans are constituents of mine. No Irish-American or German-American or Italian-American or Hungarian-American or any other sort of hyphenated cattle has ever been invited by me to vote for me, and never will be. The minute they make up their minds to be Americans and leave out the hyphen, and to quit bringing European special interests into American elections, then they can count themselves as constituents of mine, but until they do they can not. Perhaps it is not a very proud thing to be a constituent of mine, but in my private opinion it is a very important thing; and no man can be a constituent of mine who is not an American, and an American all over, and is not willing to leave out his hyphen.

The Senator from Idaho refers to how much it is costing Germany to keep our American troops there. Well, thus far it has not cost Germany anything, if I am correctly informed. Under the terms of the armistice she agreed to pay, but she has not paid. By the way, as far as I can find out, she has not paid anything much, either under the treaty or under the armistice; so the Senator need not distress himself to death and have the stomach ache because of what Germany is paying for the occupation of our troops upon the Rhine. I am not quite certain about my facts, but if I have my facts right she has not paid anything, except during the first year, toward our troops occupying the Rhine. America has been in that, as she has been in everything else, financially unselfish. Whatever else may be said about us—lying down on our arms after the war was over, instead of extending the great success and triumph into peace, as we ought to have done—whatever else may be said about us, we have not been stingy about money. Thank God for that! We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook. We have pulled out our money to feed and to clothe them, and we have left off all claims of ours against them for anything that ever happened. We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook, and so we have not forced Germany to observe her armistice terms in paying for our army of occupation on the Rhine. If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, she has not paid one-tenth of it. In fact I believe—perhaps the Senator from Utah may remember better than I—that she paid only the first year; it may have been the first two years. Does the Senator remember?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not remember just how much it was, but it was a very small amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, she has paid very little; so the Senator from Idaho need not go out stomach aching about our oppression of the Germans because of having a few of our men on the Rhine.

Mr. President, I remember that soon after the war was over there were men on this floor who rose time and again to vilify and vituperate Germany about everything in the world that they could think of, because that was temporarily popular then. I

remember that I had to check one or two of them; and now I find that the same men who were going too far in "cussing" Germany are going too far in consciously or unconsciously embracing German propaganda—I think mainly unconsciously. They do not know exactly what is being done, nor how it happens that they are doing it, but, anyhow, they are doing it.

Mr. President, I welcome every step, even though a short step, toward understandings between the nations and the peoples of the world. I was one of the very few men upon this side of the Chamber who voted for the four-power treaty. As I said to a distinguished Democrat who was on the other side of that question, I can not well see how I, who have advocated a league of peace between all the nations of the earth, could afford to oppose a league of peace between four nations of the earth. It is different in degree, but it is the same in kind.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho is going to do any particular good; I do not believe it is ever going to be allowed to come to a vote at this session, and I do not think it is going to be adopted. When I say it is not going to do any particular good, I mean unless the President is with it. Of course, if the President sends word to his men on the other side that he would like to have them vote for the Borah amendment it will be agreed to, and it will do some good; but if the President sends word to them that he does not want them to do it, it is not going to be agreed to, and it will not do any good, because it is never going to be enacted. But I am in favor of a dream, even if it is nothing but a dream, that looks toward peace on earth and good will among men.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. KING. I understood that the committee amendments were all disposed of.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At least one of them was passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Poindexter
Bayard	Harris	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Harrison	McCumber	Reed, Mo.
Brookhart	Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard
Cameron	Hitchcock	McKinley	Smoot
Capper	Johnson	McNary	Stanfield
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Oddie	Warren
Fernald	King	Page	Watson
Fletcher	Ladd	Pepper	Weller
France	La Follette	Phipps	Williams
Gerry	Lenroot	Pittman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The READING CLERK. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, where the committee proposes to strike out "$2,800,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "$3,800,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon that I would like to ask the Senator from Washington having the bill in charge what reasons prompted the committee to increase the appropriation carried in the bill as it passed the House. As the Senator knows, the House committee had very full hearings, and I am advised that some testimony was presented with reference to this particular subject. The Senate committee has seen fit to increase the appropriation approximately a million dollars. Will the Senator advise the Senate the reasons which induced the committee to make such a large increase?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the purpose of the increase reported by the committee was to provide retainer pay for the volunteer Naval Reserve upon the same basis as is provided for the Federalized National Guard among our land forces. To all intents and purposes, while it is called a naval reserve, it is a naval militia. In order to induce men to interest themselves in the necessary training and to hold themselves in readiness for service in case of an emergency, certain retainer pay, equivalent to two months' pay of their several grades, is provided by the law.

When they have complied with the requisite drills and subjected themselves to the required amount of training they are eligible to be enrolled. When they are enrolled they are entitled to retainer pay. Last year the bill carried about the amount the bill carried this year as it came from the House without the Senate amendment, and in order to get along at all the Naval Reserve was not enrolled during the first six months in the year; so the amount of money by which the appropriation was short was saved.

The first six months of the fiscal year was chosen by the department as the period in which the reserve would not be enrolled. They are expected to be enrolled on the 1st day of January and to be paid their retainer pay from that time until the 30th day of June. When that time arrives, unless the increased amount reported by the Senate committee is appropriated, they will have to be disenrolled again, and if that should occur, it is the opinion of those who are responsible and especially informed and especially active in the preservation of this civilian naval force, the Naval Reserve, that it would mean the destruction of the reserve; that if they are disenrolled again it would be impossible to retain such an interest in the reserve that they could ever again be enrolled.

They are expected to enroll on the 1st day of January, through the representations which have been made to them by their friends that they have reason to believe that provision would be made by Congress to keep them upon the enrolled list throughout the year after that time. These men are put upon Eagle boats and given two weeks' training at sea every year. In addition to that, they are required once a week to attend drills in armories, which are more or less makeshift affairs, no appropriation being made for the armories sufficient to procure the proper kind of armory. In their two weeks' training at sea 5 officers and 56 men are put upon a boat, and they are given very active boat drills; they are given instruction in engineering; they are given instruction in navigation, instruction in all duties of a seaman, and follow a very rigid regimen for the period of their active training. This amendment is offered to provide that retainer pay.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Washington, in charge of the bill, if he desires to proceed with the last clause of the bill to-night? There are several who want to speak upon this matter and are not ready to speak to-night.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has one or two matters he desires to present, one of them relating to the Marine Corps. That is the only remaining matter I know of to be presented, aside from the one of which the Senator from Idaho speaks. If anybody is prepared to speak this evening upon the question of the proposed conference, it seems to me it is a very appropriate time to proceed with that; but I will not ask that the matter be concluded this afternoon.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I have no objection to anyone speaking who wants to speak.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am perfectly willing, when we have proceeded as far as Senators are prepared to proceed, that we shall take a recess until to-morrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer two amendments, Mr. President. I will be glad to state at this time what the amendments refer to. I desire to have the number of the enlisted personnel of the Navy reduced. One amendment provides for a reduction of the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, that being the number suggested by the committee itself, as I understand its report. I suppose the amendment will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it very doubtful whether it will be reached this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can vote upon it at any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope to those having charge of the naval appropriation bill that they will press it as vigorously as possible, so as not to hold back the unfinished business too long.

Mr. KING. May I say in reply to the Senator from Washington that I do not think he should by his admonition criticize the Senate. Here is a bill carrying an appropriation of more than $325,000,000. Just one day has been spent in the consideration of the bill with that large appropriation. To-day has been consumed in the discussion of a very important question, and it is obvious that the bill will be passed by to-morrow. Certainly a bill which only takes three days to dispose of, though carrying these enormous appropriations, ought not to excite the ire of my friend from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I certainly did not manifest any indication of ire or anything of the sort, and it never entered my mind that I was criticizing the Senate or any Senator. I just thought that we should not adjourn at 4 or half past 4 o'clock without pressing the bill as much as possible and getting as much of it disposed of as possible. Of course, I did not make that suggestion with any idea of pressing Senators into debate when they had not had time to prepare. I merely wanted to express the hope that I did express, that the naval appropriation bill would be pressed as rapidly as it properly could be. But in

doing that I wish to say to the Senator that I never thought of criticizing any Senator or the Senate or expressing any impatience, because there has not been any unnecessary delay in connection with the bill.

Mr. KING. It occurs to me that if the Senate would give more consideration to these enormous appropriations, it would be for the best interests of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and is in charge of the pending appropriation bill. I should like to ask him to what extent the amount appropriated in the bill is lessened by the action of the disarmament conference which was held about a year ago. I recall that it was promised to us then that if that treaty were ratified, the expense of naval armament would be greatly reduced. That was one of the reasons, I think, why many Senators voted for the ratification of the conference action. If the Senator will give us the figures of the extent to which the cost of the Government has been relieved of the burden of naval taxation by reason of the accomplishments of the disarmament conference, I shall be glad to have them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The amount is something like $180,000,000 in this bill; that is, comparing the needs for the ensuing fiscal year, for which the bill will provide, and those of the fiscal year 1922–23, the current fiscal year, which were $180,000,000 less than the actual appropriations for the last year under the building program of 1916, which was modified by the naval limitation of armaments treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that we appropriated last year substantially the same amount of money that it is proposed to appropriate this year. Is not that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was just about the same approximately. The Senator will remember that last year's appropriation act was passed subsequent to the Armament Limitation Conference, and the reason why it was approximately the same as this year's bill was because of the suspension of the great naval program in which the United States was engaged prior to that conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Even now we are spending on our Navy about twice as much as we spent the last year before the war. Is not that true? We are spending more money by about 50 per cent than Germany ever spent on her navy in her palmiest days. Am I not correct in that? And still we are talking about peace and peace conferences. It looks to me like there is in the bill considerable preparation for war. Three hundred million dollars in round numbers are appropriated in the bill, and my recollection is that before the war we appropriated about $150,000,000 a year for our Navy, and built up a great Navy under those appropriations. Now, we are nearly doubling that amount under the pending bill, even after the peace conference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the fiscal year 1917, the appropriations made during 1916, which was before we were in the war, the bill carried $312,755,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will remember that was in preparation for the war. What was it the year before?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the year 1916 it was $147,533,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and for a number of years prior thereto, before we actually were preparing for the war, it did not exceed that amount. Of course, we were preparing for war in 1916, as we all know. In the appropriation act for 1917 we were doing likewise, but prior to that we built up our Navy under appropriations of approximately $150,000,000 a year, and for a number of years previously a much less sum each year.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We could go along this year on $147,000,000 if it were the desire to go back to the before-the-war establishment, but we would have the smallest and the most incomplete Navy of all the great powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought one of the purposes of the disarmament conference was that we should reduce the expense of naval armament; but, instead of reducing, the Senator admits that we are going beyond what we did before the war by about 100 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not responsible for the expectations which the Senator from Tennessee may have had as to what reductions would be brought about. I think it is very probable that many people imagined there would be a doing away with the naval expenditures in large measure as a result of the scrapping of the partly constructed increase of the Navy—the battleships and battle cruisers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think many people were deceived by it at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has not come up to their expectations as to doing away entirely with naval expenditures, but it has reduced the amount, as I have already pointed out to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. While I am on my feet I want to ask the Senator with reference to the enlisted men. I want to read from page 6 of the report of the committee which the Senator submitted on the pending bill. I read, for the purpose of asking him a question, as follows:

> The appropriations proposed in this bill are on the basis of continuing the enlisted strength at 86,000 men. The committee made a very exhaustive study of the enlisted personnel requirements when considering the estimates for the current fiscal year and reached the conclusion that 67,000 enlisted men would provide adequately for the maintenance of the so-called treaty Navy, but only last April the House itself, contrary to the committee's recommendation, decided that 86,000 men should be allowed and nothing has arisen during the few intervening months that would warrant the committee in proposing a smaller number than the House so recently expressed itself as favoring.

Now, as I understand the excerpt from the committee's report, the committee believes that under the treaty arrangement, the disarmament arrangement, 67,000 men would be sufficient for the Navy, but that because the House last year voted for 86,000 men, the committee are willing to forego their own views after an exhaustive study of the subject and report for 86,000. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the error into which the Senator from Tennessee has fallen is that he has the House committee report and the Senate committee report mixed up.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have here a report headed "Mr. Poindexter, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report," and included in that report is the report of the House committee from which I have just read. I supposed that when the Senator from Washington incorporated the House committee report into his report he recommended what the House committee report recommended.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no. We have shown that we did not do that by the amendments we have made to the House bill. We incorporated the House report——

Mr. McKELLAR. It was incorporated in the Senate committee report.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going to explain why we incorporated the House report in our report. It was to show what the House report was, not necessarily that we indorsed everything that was in the House report. It is a quite clear and able statement of the views of the House committee and in general of the contents of the bill, because there were very few changes made in it by the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I understand the Senator does not agree with the House committee report which was submitted with his committee report, that 67,000 men are sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree, when the Senator reads from a report that the committee was of the opinion that 67,000 men were enough, that that was the Senate committee, which I understood him to intimate. It was the House committee that said that and not the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the Senator's opinion that that number was not sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It certainly is. My opinion is that it was entirely inadequate and would put the Navy back somewhat on the basis existing before the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it would be very different.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It practically would deprive the Navy of its position as a sea power compared with the other sea powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now read further from the report which is submitted, together with the report of the Senator from Washington, as follows:

> It was the position of the committee at that time—

That is when it made this exhaustive investigation after the disarmament conference—

> that 50,000 men afloat would suffice for the 18-battleship fleet and all of the other types of vessels it was planned to keep in commission to round out that fleet and for special and detached service, and that 17,000 additional men would adequately take care of such shore assignments as it was usual and customary to fill with enlisted men, and allow a margin for men under training and in transit. Of course, the committee realized that the adoption of its proposal would have made it necessary, so far as the shore force was concerned, to exercise the closest supervision over the assignment and detail of men, and there would have been no reservoir from which enlisted men might be assigned to take the places of civilians forced out by reason of curtailed appropriations or to fill billets which properly should be filled by civilians.

Now, Mr. President, I find that the House committee, after an exhaustive examination of the subject, thought there was no need for more than 50,000 men. I will ask the Senator what

examination his committee made as to the number of men required?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know how much into detail the Senator desires us to go.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senate committee make any investigation at all?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It made a very exhaustive investigation, and that investigation was reported and printed in the hearings before the Senate committee of last year. The entire matter was fought out at the last session in a more or less sensational controversy on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It attracted the attention of the whole country, and any information which it was possible to obtain was used by one side or the other in the exhaustive debate on the floor of the other House. The same question, to a large extent, arose in the consideration of the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922. The Senate committee went into it in connection with that bill; they have repeatedly gone into an examination of the question as to the sufficiency of the personnel, and all of the testimony relative to that matter is contained in the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Washington will permit me to ask him another question in my own time I desire to inquire what is the average cost of the maintenance of an enlisted man in the Navy?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is approximately a thousand dollars a year, although I should have to examine the matter to give the Senator the exact amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's figures must be wrong. It costs nearly $1,800 a year for an enlisted man in the Army, and I imagine the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy would certainly be approximately the same, at any rate. The Senator's figures go back about 15 years, when the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy and the Army approximated $1,000 a year, but now it approximates something like from $1,500 to $1,800 a year. I thought perhaps the Senator from Washington had the figures before him, having had hearings in his committee about the matter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not the figures before me, but I will say there is a very great difference between the cost of the Army Establishment and the Navy Establishment. Quarters have to be provided for soldiers but they do not have to be provided, except to a very limited extent, for seamen.

Mr. McKELLAR. Except for those who were on shore duty; but the average would be considerably over $1,000 a year. I am quite sure it would be not less than $1,500 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this matter that having 86,000 men in our Navy at this time is practically without justification. My understanding is that England, with her navy, which is much larger than ours, has not that many men now; that she has reduced her naval force constantly since the World War. It is the part of wisdom to do that. The number of men now in our Navy is too large; their maintenance is very expensive. A reduction in the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, as proposed in the amendment which I have offered, would effect a saving to the Government of $30,000,000 a year, and I doubt if the retention of the additional 19,000 men would amount to a row of pins in the event we had trouble, for we should have to enlist a very much larger number of men immediately the war broke out. In my judgment, there is no reason in the world for putting this enormous cost for enlisted men upon the people of the United States at this time. We ought to follow the example of other nations. Whether we are going to live up to our treaty agreements or our professions when we participated in the disarmament conference or not, we certainly ought to act with prudence and caution, and not recklessly throw away the people's money, as we are evidently proposing to do in the pending bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee addressed to me a moment ago as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee a question relative to some of the provisions of the pending bill. I wish to state to him that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Naval Affairs Committee—at least most of them—have absolutely nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. Therefore any information which I may have as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee is that which I have obtained from a perusal of the bill and from the reading of the testimony which was given before the House committee and the very limited amount of testimony which was taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Utah should hardly have stated that the Committee on Naval Affairs has nothing to do with the framing of the naval bill.

Mr. KING. I had not quite completed my statement.

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Naval Affairs, under the rules of the Senate, choose three of their members to sit with the Appropriations Committee in considering the bill. No action is taken of any kind regarding the appropriations for the Navy by the Appropriations Committee without those members of the Naval Affairs Committee, both in the subcommittee and in the meeting of the general committee, being present; and they are always represented on the conference committee by one or two, and probably in the next conference they will be represented by three members. The Senator from Utah should keep that in mind.

Mr. KING. I had that in mind, and if the Senator from Wyoming had permitted me to complete the paragraph of my speech I should have explained the broad statement which I made was subject to the qualification which is contained in the rule to which I called attention, that a certain number of members of the Committee on Naval Affairs—and in this instance three—are selected to participate in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. However, I do not happen to be one of those three, so I may state broadly that only three members of the Naval Affairs Committee had anything to do with the preparation of the bill, and the remainder of us have only that information which we have acquired from an examination of the bill and the testimony before the House committee and the limited testimony which was taken before the Senate committee. So I can not give the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] the full information which he desired relative to the items to which he directed attention.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was called out of the Chamber for a moment and did not hear the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I have just been explaining that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the exception of three, have nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand about that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a moment ago we were discussing the item on page 13 of the pending naval appropriation bill relative to the Naval Reserve. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has given the reasons which actuated the Senate committee in increasing the appropriation above that carried in the House bill.

I have an open mind, let me say to the Senator, upon this subject. I profess to having but a limited amount of information respecting it. At first blush, it is a proposition that would address itself with a great deal of sympathy to my views. If we can have a naval reserve, although costing the people by taxation a comparatively large amount, which would be of value in the event of war, I can see that a measure that would execute that plan ought to commend itself to the country and to the Senate; but with the information which I have obtained I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that the plan thus far has not met with the success which many predicted and has many infirmities which are inherent and fundamental which prevent its being as successful as its proponents declared that it would be.

In the first place, our country is so large that any plan which might be successfully carried out in Great Britain, for instance, in the maintenance of a naval reserve could not as successfully be executed here. A number of persons who belong to the Naval Reserve, one officer and several enlisted men, have conferred with me in regard to the matter, and they declare that under the plan which has heretofore been adopted the results have not been commensurate with the expenditure. They state that only a few, perhaps 8,000 officers and men—and nearly one-half of them are officers—have maintained any connection whatever with the organization. They say that those who have associated themselves with the reserve have been persons residing in a few large cities or, at least, where the population is congested, so that we do not get a reserve which is based upon the population or which takes into account the wide extent of our great territorial domain. There are a considerable number of naval reservists in New York, in Boston, in Chicago, and a few other cities where the population is great, but in Iowa, Indiana, the great Mississippi Valley, and in the intermountain region, remote from the sea, there are but a very few members of the Naval Reserve, who have the advantage of the training, aside from the two weeks training which it is supposed will be given during the year. Of course, I can understand that a considerable number residing in the interior would join the reserve, if not for patriotic motives, for the opportunity of going to the seacoast for two weeks during the summer at the

pay which is allowed in the grade to which they belong, but if any benefit is to be derived from the training aside from the two weeks it will be confined largely and almost wholly to the few who belong to the reserve and who are found in the congested centers of population. That criticism was made. It was said that the talk about benefit being derived from the training is without any particular merit, and that but very few, if any, in the rural districts will obtain the benefit of the training. I am speaking now of the training aside from the two weeks at sea.

Another objection which was made by one of the young men who belonged to the Naval Reserve arose out of the fact, he said, that the boats upon which they were placed were not the ones which would be utilized in the event of war. The reserves are not placed upon battleships or battle cruisers or swift cruisers or torpedo boats or, at least, destroyers; but, as was indicated by the Senator from Washington, they are placed upon the little Eagle boats. It is quite likely that some benefit may be derived from training upon the Eagle boats, but, if I am to judge from the statement made to me by the gentleman to whom I refer, the benefit which is derived from the two weeks' cruise upon the Eagle boats is not very great and is not commensurate with the expenditure which is made. He ventured the assertion that it would be far better to enlarge the Navy, if that is what is desired, by a thousand seamen; and he said far better results would be attained with the augmentation of the Navy by 1,000 men than by the maintenance of the Naval Reserve system.

It does seem to me that if we are going to have the reserve the present plan should be greatly modified, simplified, and improved. There ought to be some plan by which the reservists will receive intensive training upon boats which will be used during war, not upon boats which are obsolete and which would give them no particular training that would be advantageous to them in the event of a naval conflict.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment which has been offered by the committee and support the provision as it came from the House. The House committee, as I have heretofore stated, gave a great deal of attention to this bill; that is, they gave it far more attention than did the Senate committee; and yet I am constrained to say that an examination of the testimony which was submitted before the House committee leaves very much to be said in favor of a fuller examination of witnesses. Much of the examination consists of the mere presentation by the naval officers of their demands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there was a much more complete showing made before the Senate Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the subject of a Naval Reserve. Captain Parker, of Boston, who is probably more familiar with the subject than is any other individual, appeared before the committee and also prepared a written statement, which is much more definite and much more instructive than are the hearings from which the Senator has read.

Mr. KING. I was not reading from the House hearings with respect to this particular item. I was speaking generally and stating that while the House hearings were much fuller, generally speaking, and comprised a volume of seven or eight hundred pages, there was much left unsaid that ought to have been said to enable persons who desired to ascertain the condition of the Navy and the need of these appropriations to form a matured judgment as to the justification for these enormous appropriations. I have read what was stated in the Senate hearings, but the Senator will bear me out when I state that the Senate hearings were very much abbreviated. Perhaps there is less than 100 pages in the aggregate in the Senate hearing and six or seven or eight hundred pages in the House hearings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, when Captain Parker came here and testified before the Senate committee on the subject of the Naval Reserve we did not have a stenographer, and we held up the proceedings for 15 or 20 minutes waiting to get one, but could not get one; so his testimony does not appear in the hearings. It was very illuminating testimony on this subject, and I am sorry the Senator could not have heard it.

Mr. KING. I say I have read all the hearings which have been published, both before the House committee and before the Senate committee; and I confess that with respect to the Naval Reserve the testimony is very unsatisfactory, as it is with respect to many other items that are found in this bill.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has spoken about the proportion of officers to men in the reserve. I take it that he gets this information from page 151 of the House hearings. I myself made the same mistake that the Senator made. As a matter of fact, when a large number of men in the Naval Reserve were disenrolled, a small number of them went into class 6, which gets no pay. This table represents substantially that number of men. Quite a large number of officers stayed in class 6, but the men mostly went out. Since that time they have been building up the organizations and getting the men to enlist.

On page 151 the statement is made that at Portland, Me.—my own home town—there were seven officers and four men. I took exception to this when the matter came up in the committee, and I recalled that we used to have a Naval Reserve company there of something over 100 men and a proper number of officers, and the city of Portland took a great pride in the company. That seemed to be very different from the conditions mentioned in this statement. I now find, on talking with Captain Parker, who has charge of the first district, that they already have 8 officers and 30 men enrolled.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator what is the total number of officers and men now in the Reserve Force?

Mr. HALE. Until the 1st of January these men do not go in under pay. They simply remain in class 6; and that list on page 151 represents those men who were in class 6. Under the new arrangement, instead of 4,000 officers there will be somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000. They will not all go into the new class under pay, and the number of men will be cut down from 8,000 to somewhere below 6,000.

Mr. KING. Then, if I understand the Senator, with the enlarged appropriation carried by the Senate bill there will be less than 1,500 officers and approximately 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. No; next year there will be more than 1,500. They hope to have 2,000 officers and substantially 6,000 men, whereas the appropriation for this year provided for 1,500 officers and 5,000 men, but applies for only six months of the year. If the Senator will read the hearings of last year he will see that the statement was made that they did not have retainer pay enough to take care of this full number of men, and therefore that they could only pay them for one-half the year. This year we hope to pay them for the full year.

Mr. KING. A reference to the House hearings, at pages 151 and 152, shows that the number of reservists attached to each station in each district, as shown upon those pages, is 4,440 officers and 8,751 men.

Mr. HALE. Those men do not go under pay, however.

Mr. KING. That is for 1924.

Mr. HALE. Those are the men who are enrolled in class 6 and who are not under pay. When they are taken in under the provisions of this bill they will be cut down in number and a certain number of them will go under pay.

Mr. KING. Then what becomes of the residue?

Mr. HALE. They keep on in class 6 without pay.

Mr. KING. What sort of an organization do they have and what drill?

Mr. HALE. They are honorary naval reserves, practically. They do not get any retainer pay.

Mr. KING. They do no drilling?

Mr. HALE. Not under pay.

Mr. KING. Neither on shore nor at sea?

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. KING. Then what advantage are they to the Navy?

Mr. HALE. They are interested in the reserve. They simply keep on and hold themselves in readiness in case of a war. They do not get any retainer pay at all.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator how the authorities would discriminate if all of them desired to join and get on the pay roll?

Mr. HALE. They would pick out the ones that were most suitable for the work.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that we ought to limit the number?

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. KING. At any rate, the proposition now is to expend approximately $4,000,000 for the Naval Reserve, and with that $4,000,000 to get enrolled approximately 1,500 to 2,000 officers and 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. Five to six thousand men, yes; and I think it would be very well worth while for the country if we could make the plan successful.

Mr. KING. The Senator has heard the criticism that I made in regard to the present system. The Senator, as a member of the committee, has gone into the matter more fully than I

have, and I should like to inquire of him whether he is satisfied with the present system.

Mr. HALE. The Senator means with this system?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. HALE. For the Naval Reserve?

Mr. KING. With the present law.

Mr. HALE. I think eventually we shall have to enact a fuller Naval Reserve law. I think we should take that up in the Naval Committee, of which the Senator is a member.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps I did not understand the Senator from Maine. Did I understand him to say that these officers and men in the Naval Reserve do not drill?

Mr. HALE. Not these men that are left in class 6. All of the men that come under the appropriation in the bill will drill.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of them will drill?

Mr. HALE. They will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am willing to take a vote. I think we should reject the Senate amendment and adhere to the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, on page 13, line 21, to change the total from "$2,994,000" to "$3,994,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee about a provision in the bill, on page 9, for the Office of Naval Intelligence. I see that there is $30,000 appropriated for that purpose. Can the Senator tell us anything about the advantage of an appropriation of that kind? I call his attention to the fact that some days ago there was printed in the papers a statement from New York showing that more than $1,000,000 worth of Navy material had been stolen and that the Office of Naval Intelligence knew nothing about it, and it was ascertained through arrests made at the instance of the Department of Justice. If such is the case, if the Office of Naval Intelligence does not function, if it does not prevent this kind of a theft, why should we appropriate the amount contained in this proviso for that purpose?

Mr. POINDEXTER. What proviso does the Senator refer to?

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 9, the Office of Naval Intelligence.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator any other criticism of the Office of Naval Intelligence except what he has just mentioned?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should say that this was enough. I read from the Evening Star of December 20 the headline:

Million-dollar theft from navy yard is charged to 23. Twenty-two are arrested in New York by Federal agents. Clothing and material is taken by truck load. Detectives pose as thieves, are accepted by men, and get evidence.

Without reading all the article, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put the whole article in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, December 20, 1922.]

$1,000,000 THEFT FROM NAVY YARD IS CHARGED TO 23—22 ARE ARRESTED IN NEW YORK BY FEDERAL AGENTS—CLOTHING AND MATERIAL ARE TAKEN BY TRUCK LOAD—DETECTIVES POSE AS THIEVES, ARE ACCEPTED BY MEN, AND GET EVIDENCE.

(By the Associated Press.)

NEW YORK, December 20.—Twenty-two civilian employees at the Brooklyn Navy Base were arrested to-day on indictments returned several months ago by a Federal grand jury charging that Government property to the value of more than $1,000,000 had been stolen since the war.

The arrests were made by agents of the Department of Justice.

The grand jurors indicted 23 men after its investigation of the alleged wholesale thefts, which the authorities said included clothing, oil, and various other materials used at the navy yard. The twenty-third man under indictment was not found to-day. The investigation has been under way for months.

YARD DETECTIVES FAIL.

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand; but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

William J. Burns, chief of the bureau of investigation of the Department of Justice, then was asked for help, and ordered Edward J. Brennan, head of the bureau's New York office, to assign operatives.

Brennan consulted Police Commissioner Enright and borrowed the services of Detective Francis Trainor.

Under the direction of Federal Agents Robert Walsh and Ralph Navarro and Detective Trainor, men were put into the warehouses as checkers, laborers, watchmen, and bookkeepers.

WERE WATCHED CLOSELY.

These detectives found themselves watched narrowly until they took advantage of opportunities obviously put in their way of stealing small articles, such as wrist watches and marine glasses. Not until they actually concealed these articles and pretended to steal them were they able to get any evidence against the men now in custody.

They then learned that Government property was being stolen by the truck load, including great boxes of clothing, paint by the barrel, crates of glass, and commercial alcohol by the gallon. Instances were found in which waste and salvage bought by contractors was substituted by new goods or by other merchandise than that mentioned in the contract; in other cases twice the quantity of actual salvaged stuff contracted for was delivered.

START OF WIDE CLEAN-UP.

It was indicated by prosecuting officials that to-day's arrests were but the start of a general clean-up involving Navy warehouse laborers, elevator operators, clerks, chauffeurs, watchmen, and packers, as well as fences, junkmen, and other accomplices on the outside.

Some of the missing material was said to have been located in warehouses in Brooklyn and Manhattan, and it was announced that the United States attorney would be asked to take steps for its recovery.

Government operators and detectives reported to Washington shortly after they began operations that heads of some of the departments in the buildings were the ring leaders in the conspiracy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call attention to this part of it, without reading it all:

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand, but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

Then it goes on to show how the Department of Justice had accomplished the discovery. It seems to me we probably had better leave these matters to the Department of Justice, and not appropriate money for the purpose of keeping up a department that seems absolutely unable to cope with the situation. If $30,000 is the amount provided for the Office of Naval Intelligence, I take it that it is wholly inadequate to effect the purpose, and it ought to be cut out of the bill entirely, in view of this report from New York. It seems to me we had better leave it to the agents of the Department of Justice and save that much money for the people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator has answered his own question. He just pointed out that $30,000 was not enough money to employ detectives to guard all of the property of our Navy, with stations on both coasts. The purpose of the Office of Naval Intelligence is primarily of an entirely different character. I do not understand that the Senator from Tennessee has any objection to the use of the secret service or of the agents of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to apprehend criminals who commit crimes against the United States. That is one of the purposes for which it is organized. In fact, that is one of the purposes for which the Department of Justice was established and is maintained. The Senator says that we had better make appropriations for the Department of Justice to do this work, and that is exactly what we do, and that is why the Department of Justice investigated the matter, and apparently investigated it successfully.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then that makes it all the more imperative that this provision of the bill should be stricken out, and I will offer an amendment to strike it out, for the reason that evidently this is just one of those things which have grown up in the department which ought to be corrected, a number of employees drawing from $1,800 to $2,000 a year who make a plaything of this naval intelligence, and while it is their duty to prevent the very kind of theft that is mentioned in this newspaper article they did not do it. I imagine that any kind of naval intelligence that could not keep up with a theft of that sort, done almost openly and in the manner pointed out in this article, surely ought to be abolished. Let us leave the investigation of that sort of thing to one department. Why have two departments doing it? The trouble is that in these various departments we have duplication of service, and what is everybody's business is nobody's business. We ought to strike this out entirely, and ought to put the duty upon the Department of Justice to prevent such thefts from the Navy Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is not necessary to go into a defense of the officers of the Naval Intelligence. I am acquainted with them. I do not know to what extent the Senator from Tennessee has personal knowledge of this office, in condemnation of which he has just spoken. My opinion is that instead of being useless men, as he describes them, men who are interested only in drawing their pay, there are no harder-working officers of the Government, no more competent or able officers, and none more successful in performing the services for which they are employed and for which their

office is established. They gather information from all parts of the world for the use of the Navy in the bearing it may have on naval activities. The Senator picks up an article in a newspaper and, without further information, apparently accepts as accurate its statements about the case to which he refers. As a lawyer, I do not think if he were put upon the responsibility of acting upon this matter he would act upon any such evidence as that, nor would he condemn an office of the Navy as he has condemned this, if he were speaking seriously and really undertaking to decide the matter, without making further investigation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am endeavoring to make that investigation in the very place where it should be made, and in the very manner, and the only manner, in which Senators can investigate such a subject. The Senator having the bill in charge has reported a bill making a certain appropriation, and I have produced this article, which very greatly reflects upon this service of the Navy. As I understand, the Senator does not know what the facts are. We have had no report about them. There has been no answer to this article, so far as I know, and I would really like to know, before this bill is passed, whether the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy has permitted these thefts by negligence, or in what way they have been permitted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator take the position that this little office, maintained on an appropriation of $30,000, ought to prevent all crimes in connection with the Navy?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Or ought to prevent the commission of any theft?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but this article said they were there, but that the thieves were too cunning for them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know that the article states the facts as they actually were?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is an Associated Press article, and by long experience we have found that the Associated Press is generally very accurate. The Associated Press would not dare to make charges against officers of the Navy which could not be substantiated, in my judgment. I believe that almost any lawyer, or any other man with good intelligence and a knowledge of the character of this institution, whether he was a lawyer or not, would say the same thing. The Associated Press is not going to print head lines like these, a significant article like this, a sensational article like this, and give it out unless there is something behind it; and it seems to me an explanation is due from the department about this enormous theft of naval material. We appropriate nearly $300,000,000 a year for this department for all sorts of purposes. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] reminds me it is over $300,000,000; and that is true, because there are a lot of unexpended balances reappropriated in this bill, bringing the total up to something like three and a quarter million dollars a year. Under these circumstances it does seem to me that when the Associated Press charges an office in the Government with having permitted thefts amounting to a million dollars or more, before we appropriate additional money to keep up that office there ought to be some explanation of the matter and some excuse at least given for these officers who apparently have neglected their duties.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will give the Senator an explanation. The explanation is that it is not the duty of the Office of Naval Intelligence to maintain guards at the warehouses where the property of the Navy is stored. There is no appropriation made for that purpose, and it would be utterly impossible for them to do it, even if they undertook it. Of course, the Associated Press is a great institution, and I join with the Senator in his eulogy, but even the Associated Press is very often misinformed and mistaken in what it has printed. The Senator's attention has been attracted by that, and he wants to be informed about it. It is not the business of the Office of Naval Intelligence to do what they have been charged with neglecting, but if the Senator is really looking for information, I have no doubt that the Office of Naval Intelligence or the Secretary of the Navy will be very glad indeed to give him a full report on that matter. No doubt he could have had a report on it if he had asked for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am a little surprised that the Associated Press would accuse these officers of doing something it was not their business under the law to do. The Senator from Washington says that it was not their business to look after this matter. The charge in the Associated Press dispatch is that they were actually looking after it, but were incompetent to do it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let me correct the Senator in his quotation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard what the Senator said. Of course, I am perfectly willing to have him correct it or change it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator heard what I said, but he did not hear correctly, or else misquoted me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not intend to do so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What I said was a comment on the remark of the Senator from Tennessee to the effect that these officers were charged with malfeasance or incompetence in permitting this crime to occur. I said that it was not their business to prevent the commissoin of crimes or to maintain guards over naval property.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what they were charged with:

> Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand.

Apparently this was their business and they were executing it, carrying out, or attempting to perform, the duties of their office. Then the article goes on to say:

> But the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

It does seem to me that this is a very grave charge against this office of the Navy, over a million dollars' worth of goods being stolen. Of course, in the Senate and in the House we appropriated money very freely, other people's money, and we forget that a million dollars amounts to anything. What is a million dollars—a little, trifling sum like a million dollars! No Senator ought to rise in his place and ask about the loss of a million dollars in a bureau of the Government! But it does seem to me that a million dollars is a considerable sum, and it is a sum about which we ought to make some inquiry. An officer of the Government is charged by the Associated Press in all the papers of the land with working on discrepancies, which afterwards turned out to be the stealing of a million dollars' worth of goods, and it does seem to me that the department should furnish a statement of the facts. If those officers have been guilty of such gross negligence, if it was their duty, as this article charges it was their duty, to prevent this very kind of theft, and they have failed in their duty, surely we should not undertake to appropriate money to keep those men in office. I hope the Senator will let this go over until to-morrow, so that we can find out something about this affair, who was to blame for it, and what steps have been taken to punish those who are responsible for it. There is no reason in the world why a million dollars' worth of goods of the Navy Department should be stolen, and where that has happened there has been wrongdoing somewhere, and it ought to be investigated by the department, and Congress ought not to appropriate additional money to keep that sort of men in office until there has been an investigation of it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have heard nothing in the account the Senator has read which would lead me to suppose that the Office of Naval Intelligence was charged with the responsibility of guarding those stores. Those stores were stolen, and afterwards the Office of Naval Intelligence was apparently set to work to find out who committed the theft. As yet they have apparently not been successful in locating the guilty parties. They may be able to do so before they get through. Similar things happen in cases coming before the civil authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why maintain that office, if the officers are utterly unable to even ascertain that $1,000,000 worth of goods are gone?

Mr. HALE. That happened very recently.

Mr. McKELLAR. An intelligence officer of that kind could not detect bear tracks in a snowstorm here on the Capitol Grounds. It would be impossible for him to detect anything if he could not detect the loss of $1,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Nobody could do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know; I think if I saw bear tracks in front of me in the snow I could tell what they were.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator might give the department a little time to work out the problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing that this should go over until to-morrow, and I hope it will. If the officers have not been derelict in their duty, of course the criticism that is here offered is not right; but the charge standing unexplained, we ought not to appropriate any more money for an office of that kind. I have offered the amendment to-night, and I hope the Senator will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the total for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, to strike out "$2,994,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,994,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that all the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the following amendment: On page 9, line 1, I move to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 9, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as follows:

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

For employees in the Office of Naval Intelligence, $30,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding $1,800 per annum except two persons at $2,000 each.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is now 5 o'clock and I think we had better have an executive session, as I understand it is desired to have one.

I opposed the plan of Republican leaders of keeping here during the Christmas holidays Senators who have been here all the year attending regularly the sessions of the Senate. I am not willing that some of us who have been here all day remain here any longer when others have gone home for the night. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum unless——

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will withhold that for a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thought the Senator suggested having an executive session?

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Washington is ready to go into executive session and end the legislative session now I shall withhold the point of no quorum. You forced us to remain here during Christmas and you have got to have a quorum to transact business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Thursday, December 28, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 27, 1922.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surgeon Julian M. Gillespie to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 30, 1921. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination required by law.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officers of the Department of Commerce to occupy the positions held by them under recess appointments:

Aaron George Katz, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Charles Mitchell Thomas, of Virginia, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

VETERINARY CORPS.

To be first lieutenant.

Second Lieut. Ralph Henry Lewis, from December 13, 1922.

CHAPLAINS.

To be chaplains with the rank of captain.

Chaplain Emil William Weber, from October 5, 1922.
Chaplain John Oscar Lindquist, from October 10, 1922.
Chaplain Alexander Wayman Thomas, from October 19, 1922.
Chaplain Frank Connors Rideout, from October 23, 1922.
Chaplain Alfred Cookman Oliver, jr., from October 24, 1922.
Chaplain Pierre Hector Levesque, from November 7, 1922.
Chaplain John Hall, from November 16, 1922.
Chaplain Edward Lewis Trett, from November 27, 1922.
Chaplain Charles Coburn Merrill, from November 28, 1922.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

MARINE CORPS.

Col. Rufus H. Lane, assistant adjutant and inspector, to be the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Luther A. Brown, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for a probationary period of two years, from the 20th day of December, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Carrie B. Yett to be postmaster at Safford, Ariz., in place of E. M. Dial. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

ARKANSAS.

Monroe J. Gogue to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of C. M. Cox, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Elizabeth Tyler to be postmaster at Randsburg, Calif., in place of Josephine Montgomery, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

William J. Reel to be postmaster at Canaan, Conn., in place of E. L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Carrie A. Bush to be postmaster at Watertown, Conn., in place of E. P. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

GEORGIA.

Andrew H. Stapler to be postmaster at Metter, Ga., in place of A. H. Staples, to correct name.

ILLINOIS.

Jesse E. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, Ill., in place of Bernard McManus, jr. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Walter H. Sass to be postmaster at Monee, Ill., in place of R. M. Freese. Office became third class April 1, 1922.

William W. Renton to be postmaster at Wheaton, Ill., in place of W. V. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

INDIANA.

Willard G. Minard to be postmaster at Bourbon, Ind., in place of J. N. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lester L. Wildman to be postmaster at Dupont, Ind., in place of G. A. Wilhelm, resigned.

Phineas O. Small to be postmaster at Laporte, Ind., in place of J. A. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Odin R. Smith to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ind., in place of Lewis Sartor. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

James S. Wright to be postmaster at Vevay, Ind., in place of E. F. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

IOWA.

William G. Wood to be postmaster at Alvia, Iowa, in place of J. M. Gass. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Elmer G. Warrington to be postmaster at Keota, Iowa, in place of G. H. Helscher. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Raymond S. Blair to be postmaster at Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of J. R. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Gabriel L. Archer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa, in place of H. R. Huribut. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John B. Rose to be postmaster at Chester, Mass., in place of J. J. Harrington. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

MINNESOTA.

Nellie M. Watkins to be postmaster at Clinton, Minn., in place of F. W. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Gunhild Soliom to be postmaster at Holt, Minn., in place of Racine Olson, declined.

Carl A. Ecklund to be postmaster at Marine on St. Croix, Minn., in place of C. A. Ecklund. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Norman Hanson to be postmaster at Renville, Minn., in place of W. L. Poseley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

NEW JERSEY.

George R. Truex to be postmaster at Red Bank, N. J., in place of Frank Pittenger. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

NEW YORK.

Wade E. Gayer to be postmaster at Fulton, N. Y., in place of P. T. Conley. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Samuel W. Berry to be postmaster at Maybrook, N. Y., in place of G. M. Pierson. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

Lewis E. Elston to be postmaster at Unionville, N. Y., in place of L. E. Elston. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. Kelly to be postmaster at Jonesboro, N. C., in place of B. R. Avent. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

OHIO.

Edward C. Anderson to be postmaster at Blanchester, Ohio, in place of M. A. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

George H. Lewis to be postmaster at Geneva, Ohio, in place of W. M. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

OKLAHOMA.

Robert B. Morford to be postmaster at Lawton, Okla., in place of Robert Landers. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank H. Keth to be postmaster at Summerville, Pa., in place of J. E. Guthrie, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Virginia M. Bodie to be postmaster at Wagener, S. C., in place of Virginia Gantt. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

TENNESSEE.

William M. Brewer to be postmaster at Collinwood, Tenn., in place of S. E. Byler, deceased.

Alvin M. Stout to be postmaster at Greenfield, Tenn., in place of P. D. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

TEXAS.

William M. Bowen to be postmaster at Beckville, Tex., in place of J. W. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Minnie L. Landon to be postmaster at Burnet, Tex., in place of L. S. Chamberlain, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Hugh W. Cunningham to be postmaster at Eliasville, Tex., in place of E. J. Smith, removed.

Lee Hood to be postmaster at Justin, Tex., in place of W. A. Leuty, removed.

Willie O. Brents to be postmaster at Whitewright, Tex., in place of H. L. Webster, removed.

UTAH.

Lydia R. Shaw to be postmaster at Huntington, Utah, in place of A. M. Truman. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Ruebush to be postmaster at Dayton, Va., in place of C. A. Funkhouser. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

S. Clyde Bliss to be postmaster at Farmville, Va., in place of J. L. Hart, deceased.

Thomas P. Farrar to be postmaster at Ivy Depot, Va., in place of H. G. White. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Emmett W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

WYOMING.

Percy G. Matthews to be postmaster at Evanston, Wyo., in place of J. H. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 27, 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Harry W. Haskell, Indio.
Lewis P. Hathaway, Ventura.

MINNESOTA.

Edwin Mattson, Breckenridge.
Carl G. Hertig, Buffalo Lake.
John S. Stensrud, Canby.
Herman C. Rustad, Kerkhoven.
Arthur C. Omholt, Sacred Heart.
Everett R. Vitalis, Shafer.
Einar S. Rydberg, Spooner.

NEBRASKA.

James J. McCarthy, Greeley.
Edward E. Ely, Milford.
Elmer G. Watkins, Orleans.
Chester C. Alden, Whitman.

OREGON.

Flora A. Fowler, Goble.
Lawrence S. McConnell, Sherwood.
Mart Griffin, Umatilla.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Frank D. Beste, Corsica.
Benny P. Humphreys, Reliance.
Jacob L. Bergstreser, Willow Lake.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *December 27, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of life and light, of time and eternity, the world is Thine and Thou art near. We have only to wait to hear Thy voice and to feel Thy presence. We thank Thee that we are not the victims of chance and fate, but we live in Thy life and move in Thy strength. With us may the happiness and comfort of all be the object of each. As Thou art above all and over all, so help us to think, to feel, and to speak with good will toward all and hate for none. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 23, 1922, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, in South Carolina, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider H. R. 13559, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to an hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour on each side, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about an hour on this side.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask for two hours of general debate, of which one-half is to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill; and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the old days at Rome every legislative proposal in the forum, every new religion brought in by strangers, every new idea of any kind, had to meet the test, "Cui bono," "What is the good of it?"

It seems to me that such a question should be put to congressional appropriations now as never before. The people of America are bending under the most grievous burden of taxation ever laid in any nation. Every dollar in taxes levied under such circumstances should mean as nearly as possible a hundred contribution to the general welfare.

This bill contains an appropriation of $13,312,805 for the maintenance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Very few persons, in or out of Congress, realize what a colossal sum that is, compared with the expenditures for other governmental activities.

The entire Department of State, with its bureaus, divisions, and world-wide activities, costs the taxpayers of America less than the Indian Bureau.

That is, we can pay for the Secretary of State, his assistants, and all the clerks needed for the conduct of this great executive department; we can pay the salaries of all our ambassadors and ministers, secretaries and clerks and interpreters at embassies and legations, United States consuls, vice consuls, and other helpers; we can pay for the transportation of all our Diplomatic and Consular officers, for the rent of all our embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds; we can pay the expenses of carrying out all our international obligations and commissions, such as the Pan American Union; we can pay all these expenses in connection with our official intercourse with all the world and still have $4,000,000 left, compared to the cost of maintaining the Indian Bureau and its activities which have grown like the fabulous bean stalk.

The entire judicial system of the United States, including the Supreme Court, circuit court of appeals, district courts, Hawaiian and Porto Rican courts, courts of customs appeals, courts of claims, Territorial courts, with all their United States marshals and deputies, their United States attorneys and assistants, their clerks and commissioners, and all other expenses, amount to $11,790,700. The Indian Bureau is to cost next year more than $13,000,000.

This Bureau of Indian Affairs, which 50 years ago was declared to be only a temporary activity, will next year spend about as much as the entire Customs Service, which brings $400,000,000 into the Treasury. It will cost the taxpayers about the same as the entire Coast Guard, about whose wonderful work we have heard so much recently. It will spend millions more than the entire Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which issues all the currency and securities of the United States. It will cost millions more than the entire Public Health Service, with all the far-flung activities dealing with the health of all Americans.

Think of the Department of Labor. It has a Bureau of Immigration which administers our laws relative to all immigrants. It has a Bureau of Naturalization which must look after the admission of all aliens into American citizenship. Under that department is the Children's Bureau, the Women's Bureau, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But for all these great activities, together with all salaries, rents, and all other expenses, the cost is but $6,618,556, while the Indian Bureau alone takes eleven millions out of the Treasury this year, besides the tribal funds of the Indians.

We finance the entire Department of Commerce, with the exception of the Bureau of Lighthouses, for less than the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have had many efforts to economize here and there in the Department of Commerce by cutting down appropriations a few thousands. Is it not time to realize that the millions of dollars involved in the handling of Indian affairs are worthy of our attention?

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask, "Cui bono"—what is the good of it?

First, what benefit comes to the American people from the expenditure of this thirteen millions?

It is spent to enable more than 5,000 Government employees to supervise and superintend less than 50,000 Indian families. It assigns a Government agent to every 10 families for 1923, as has been the case for many years. The public pays the bill.

Shall we say that the benefit comes to the American public in protection against the bloody menace of Indian wars? I will admit that thirteen millions is not too much to pay for a year's security against the scalping knife and tomahawk. If there were deadly danger that the Crows and the Blackfeet, who refused to shed the blood of the white men, even while they were being robbed of their hunting grounds, might descend upon Chicago and ravage the Windy City with knife and fire, the money would be well spent. If the Sioux and the Apaches, instead of being decimated by tuberculosis and trachoma, were threatening to go on the warpath against Omaha and St. Louis, the expenditure of thirteen millions would be amply justified.

But the difficulty is that no advocate of the costly system of Indian Bureau control will say that this great sum is necessary to protect the American people against the Indians. They admit that we must send the taxgatherers out to collect these millions from the earnings of the people and then pay it out largely to nonproducers and Government functionaries, but they do not argue that there is any benefit in return to the taxpayers, who produce it.

No, Mr. Chairman; they say that America must sacrifice many millions in tax money for the benefit of the Indians. These 50,000 families must be protected and guarded. One agent must be allotted to every 10 families, not to help the American taxpayers but to help the Indians.

That, then, is the crux of the matter. The whole case of the Indian Bureau is based on the assumption that it benefits the Indians to the extent of the $13,000,000 contributed by the American people.

If it be shown that no such benefit comes to the Indians through the bureau the case falls. But if it be shown that the expenditure of the millions taken out of the pockets of the American public in fact works an injury on the Indians themselves, then the appropriation of further funds is infamous.

Mr. Chairman, I deny that this $13,000,000 appropriation benefits the Indians. I propose to prove to the satisfaction of any person, save one who profits from the present bureau system, that it injures them. I believe that the Indian would be better off to-day if the Indian Bureau had been abolished 25 years ago.

Here are 300,000 human beings of a race which for 90 years has been under complete control of the Indian Bureau. During that time they have been forcibly driven off their home lands of the Eastern States and herded into reservations west of the Mississippi. These reservations, whose bounds were laid out in sacred treaties, have been cut in two oftentimes without a word to the Indians concerned. Not a treaty made by the United States Government with the Indians has been kept and these acts of faithlessness have either been initiated or approved by the Indian Bureau, this great protector of a helpless people.

But let us forget that black, hideous page of our history. These reservations, diminished even as they have been, have become very valuable. The building up of the West and the increase of population have added to the value of every acre. On some reservations great oil deposits have been discovered and minerals of various kinds have been found. There are valuable forests on others.

Not because of the Indian Bureau but because of the national growth of America and in spite of the Indian Bureau the lands still left to the Indians became valuable.

In all, the 50,000 families under the control of the Indian Bureau have lands and other property worth a billion dollars to-day.

That means for every Indian family wealth of $15,000 and more. It means an average income of $900 for every family, which is more than the average income for all the families of the United States.

These Indians are possessors of wealth, but they are starving for lack of the necessaries of life. Does it benefit the Indian to lock up his own possessions in order to keep him forever dangling to a pauperizing, degrading bureau system? Does it benefit the Indian to have bureau agents dissipate his property while they spend millions in tax funds as well?

Listen to James McLaughlin, for 50 years an American official dealing with the Indian problem. He has been superintendent of Indian agencies and Indian inspectors, and I have heard him given credit for knowing more about the Indians than any man in the United States. In his book, My Friend the Indian, he gives actual facts to prove that the expenditure of these millions does not benefit the Indian. He says:

> The fund belonging to the Indians held in the Treasury of the United States might be described as an endowment for the creation of paupers and the perpetuation of the present state of dependence among the people to whose credit it stands.

It appears to me that it is the duty of the Government to make some provision presently for the emancipation of these unhappy victims, to deliver them from the evils that guarantee a future of ungentle paupery, by giving to the Indian his portion and turning him adrift to work out his own salvation.

Mr. Chairman, Major McLaughlin made that declaration of policy in 1910. In the 12 years succeeding, instead of taking any steps to free the Indians, we have bound them in countless new schemes and toils, bringing them more surely under the system which he so deplored.

This enlightened man declares that the Indians to-day are not as desirable a class of people as they were 40 years ago.

Why is this true? Let Major McLaughlin answer:

The Indian was in turns browbeaten and cajoled, bribed and punished, threatened and rewarded, and all the worst elements in his character developed for want of firm, consistent, and honest treatment.

He describes in detail the condition of a South Dakota tribe of Indians which for many years lived on its own resources and which conquered its difficulties. Then came tribal funds through sales of lands and the consequent control of the Indian Bureau.

I have no hesitancy in saying that the conditions of these Indians to-day is not as hopeful as it was when they had no wealth in expectancy and no payments to depend upon—

Says Major McLaughlin.

Their advancement has been greatly retarded by the system under which they live. Fifteen years of annuity drawing has made of a people that was struggling to the surface by personal effort a set of paupers in chancery. They would be better off, as far as the future is concerned, if they stood as blanketed Indians on the virgin prairie.

Major McLaughlin draws a vivid picture of this particular tribe and then states:

I instance this band as a sample of what has been accomplished by governmental administration of Indian funds. They prove incontrovertably the demoralizing effect of the present system and they stand as a fair sample of people treated as they have been. The Indian who has nothing at all, either at present or in expectancy, is much better off and infinitely better material upon which to work.

Fifty years of study and observation and experience have brought Major McLaughlin to one conclusion:

Give the Indians the money they have coming. Give it to them as soon as possible. Do away with the leading strings and check rein by which the Indian is now so handicapped, and he will immediately feel the necessity for demonstrating his capacity to manage his own estate. By this means only can the Indian be saved from chronic indigence and ultimate and absolute paupery. I am sufficiently well acquainted with Indian nature to venture the prophesy that a large majority of those under 50 years of age will develop the capacity to hustle for themselves exactly in the proportion that their needs press them. Take away his annuity by letting him handle the principal, and the Indian will be given a start on the road to complete civilization and independence that will land him at the desired goal in nine cases out of ten.

That is advice this Congress would do well to follow. Every added dollar of appropriation works an injury to the Indians.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is loudly declared that these great appropriations must continue because it would be cruel and brutal to reverse our policy of 90 years. These self-styled friends of the Indians cry out that the Indians do not want freedom and its responsibilities. "Oh, no," they exclaim, "The Indians are begging to be allowed to remain under the sheltering wings of the Indian Bureau."

It has cost millions of American dollars to build up that falsehood and foist it upon the American people. The officials of the Indian Bureau know that statement is not true. They know the tricks and schemes and foxlike watchfulness necessary to give it even a semblance of reality. They fight to death any plan to settle the question by fair vote. They oppose any election which would show that the wings of the bureau give shelter to the Indians just as the hawk's wings shelter the partridge.

The best plan yet devised by the mind of man for ascertaining the will of a large body of men and women is through the direct election of representatives. Upon that principle is built our system of representative democracy.

The desires of the American Indians, wherever a free opportunity is given, have been shown to favor freedom and to oppose bureaucratic control. This fact is so well known to the Indian Bureau that it has for years arrogated to itself the right to supervise and control the election of council members and tribal delegates.

The superintendent of the reservation must put his seal of approval on the Indians who vote. He must approve the delegates elected. He assumes the right to fill all vacancies. As a final quencher of free representation, the Washington office exercises the right of recognizing only such delegates as it desires.

Is any man so foolish as to believe that an honest expression of opinion can be secured under such duress. Every Member of Congress has had experience enough in things political to know that if his political enemies had the right to scan the voting lists and select the voters he would have little chance of representing his constituency here or anywhere else.

If an Indian has shown any activity against the bureau system of control, he may have the support of a vast majority of the members of his tribe, but that means nothing if the superintendent says "Nay." It would take volumes to record the schemes which have been used to overthrow the will of the majority and substitute the will of a minority. Rump conventions, meetings of the few faithful, without notice to any others, refusal to authorize traveling expenses; they are many and devious, but are effective in smothering the desires of the Indians. It is brutal business, but necessary if the bureau is to endure.

The Flathead Indians had a council in 1921 which represented them. They selected Max J. Barnaby and Mary Lemery to come to Washington to correct certain abuses in administration.

The bureau could not deny the election, but nullified it by officially declaring that the business committee of the Flatheads was the real tribal council. Since the superintendent had named members of the business committee, he felt justified in making it the official body representing the Indians.

The two regularly elected delegates came to Washington with their credentials. They were not recognized by the bureau, and when Senator THOMAS J. WALSH took up the question of the payment of expenses from Indian funds he received this answer:

The council from which Miss Lemery and Mr. Barnaby claimed authority to come to Washington was not an official tribal council of the Flathead Tribe, and both are familiar with the order against coming to Washington at the expense of the tribe without procuring authority in advance.

It was not an official council because it was not completely under the control of the bureau officials. "Authority in advance" is only given those who represent the bureau rather than the Indians.

Mr. Chairman, if the Indian Bureau believed that the Indians are so devoted to their kindly control, would they stoop to such methods? The fact is that the bureau knows that a fair and free expression of the will of the Indians would show such an overwhelming majority in favor of freedom that it would end forever the expensive legend that these original Americans are hugging their fetters in ecstasy.

Oh, no, the bureau does not allow them to elect their delegates freely, nor can the Indians even select their own attorneys.

The Indians have interest which forever will conflict with the interest of the Indian Bureau. They might as well be unrepresented as to have an attorney whose only chance of employment lies in the approval of the bureau. It is a fraud and mockery to talk of representation under such circumstances.

These are not all the powers and the plots used to silence the Indians. Officials on the reservation and in Washington promise special favors for the silence of leaders who have voiced complaints. It is very easy to throw money and position in the way of the man who is a potential trouble maker for the bureau. Many have been tempted and some have fallen, but it is well to record for the sake of human nature that the great majority have spurned the bureau bribe and have refused to sell out their fellows for individual gain. "Divide and conquer" was the advice of the Hapsburgs to every holder of unjust power. It is the policy of the Indian Bureau.

The Flatheads are set against the Blackfeet, the Sioux against the Crows, and so forth. Although organization on nation-wide scale is the very key to modern development, it has never been permitted to get foothold among the Indians.

When the Pueblo delegation came to Washington and requested James J. Coffey, a Chippewa, to accompany them to the Indian Office for conference, they were soon given to understand the heinous crime they had committed. When Coffey tried to speak for them he was silenced. Assistant Commissioner Meritt said to the Pueblos:

We would be glad to consider anything you want done to help, but we want you to do it yourselves and not get anyone from any other reservation to help you.

Mr. Chairman, when any volunteer organization, like the Society of American Indians, undertakes to secure the cooperation of all the Indians in their common cause, it is made the target of unlimited abuse. Its members are denounced as agitators and the Star-Spangled Banner is called into use to drape over a most un-American institution. The Indians are forbidden by the bureau to form any kind of organization looking to their emancipation. They can not make a donation to Indians who have left the reservations and are eager to help their brothers escape.

This attempt to prostitute high American ideals into use against those who stand for American equality and square deal is disheartening evidence of the fact that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

Mr. Chairman, do you not understand how this system I have outlined tends to prevent expression on the part of the

Indians? Do you not see the net in which they are held? Do you not realize that the great cry of protest which is coming from these reservations is in itself proof of heroism and bravery worthy of noble men and women?

Let any white man go to one of these reservations and tell the Indians that all men are created equal and have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let him tell the Indians that they should be freed from bureaucratic control and compelled to obey laws of State and Nation as Americans.

That is high treason. Such heresies threaten the very ark of the covenant. There is an Indian Bureau official to stamp out these infamous doctrines. Back of that autocrat is a jail and police, and back of all stands the entire Government of the United States. Out goes this dangerous disturber of the peace—of the bureau.

If that be the fate of a white American citizen, what must be the abject helplessness of the uneducated, isolated Indian, and what must be his heroism when he dares fight on against such overwhelming odds?

It is an Indian saying that courage is the noblest quality of the heart. They lived by that motto when they faced overpowering foes unafraid. But no Indian attacked by savage beast or savage man ever exhibited greater bravery than those Indians who have dared to assail the Indian Bureau system of control.

Remember, he can be thrown into jail on the simple complaint of a bureau official. Remember, he can be tried and sentenced without jury or evidence. He can not have an attorney to defend him without the consent of those who are prosecuting him. His money, his property, and his means of livelihood are in the hands of the prosecutor.

Gentlemen of the committee, to fight in such an unequal battle as that requires a man. Fifty years of that oppression would crush the spirit out of any people that did not have inherent qualities of nobility and self-respect. Yet there are thousands of red men whose heads are bloody but unbowed. They have triumphed over the degeneracy and decay which accompany the segregated reservation system. The bureau has put them in prison but has not had power to chain their spirit. They have beaten down ignorance and idleness. They have retained not only their fleetness of foot and keenness of vision but also their qualities of endurance and high courage. They have the confidence of their people, who are eager to follow in their footsteps once the burdens are taken from their backs.

They are entitled to a fair chance, and I propose to do anything in my power to see that they get it. They have a right to have America know that the great sums spent by the Indian Office are not for the benefit of the Indian.

Mr. Chairman, the present system is wrong. In a day which has seen the crashing down of kaisers and czars, the Indian Bureau is a despot out of date. It is "fruit left too late, high on a blighted bough, ripe till it's rotten."

To live at the whim of bureau officials is the last and worst misery that human beings can feel. It is calculated to convert men into creatures without ambition, because without hope. I have heard an old Indian say, "Our grandfathers died in slavery; our fathers died in slavery; we may die in slavery, and our children may die in slavery, but something will come of it at last."

Something will come of it now if Congress has Americanism enough in its make-up. It is high time to reverse the maxim of bureaucracy, "The Indian is made for the bureau and not the bureau for the Indian."

Mr. Chairman, this is not the only bureau in American history which has undertaken to guide every detail of the lives of helpless human beings.

The Freedmen's Bureau was established in 1865 in order to do for the negroes exactly what the Indian Bureau is supposed to do for the Indians. Its record of maladministration has been outdone by the Indian Bureau and its abolition by Congress should be followed by similar action as to the Indian Bureau.

After Appomattox there were 4,880,000 negroes who were neither slaves nor citizens. They were dubbed "wards of the Nation," just as the American Indians are to-day.

The Freedmen's Bureau was given sovereign powers in dealing with these negroes. It undertook to regulate life, morals, and conduct. It had charge of every labor contract entered into by a negro. It had final authority over the sale, leasing, and cultivation of abandoned and confiscated lands in the South. It distributed rations, medicines, clothing, and other supplies. It looked after the transportation of all freedmen and bureau officials. It had power to provide for all educational facilities and to look after the savings of the freedmen.

In short, it had the same powers as the Indian Bureau to-day. It was a government within itself, legislative, judicial, and executive. It was independent of and superior to the civil governments in the various States. It established its own courts and supervised the action of the State courts.

The bureau was established as a temporary agency and was to go out of existence one year from the conclusion of the war. In 1866 it was extended for two years more, and later was extended to June 20, 1872, when it was finally abolished.

Its commissioner was Gen. O. O. Howard, one of the finest gentlemen and bravest soldiers in American history. In spite of that fact the Freedmen's Bureau made a record for corruption and debauchery which has shamed American annals.

It was organized to benefit the negroes. What was the result? History records that the ministrations of the bureau resulted in harsh treatment of the negroes, disease, pauperism, and death.

The freedmen were exploited by a horde of incompetent and unscrupulous officeholders. These deluded victims were told that they were to be given "40 acres and a mule" upon payment of a small sum. Agents sold the negroes red, white, and blue sticks and told them they could stake out their 40 acres wherever they desired.

In the public archives there is a deed for land which was handed over with these red, white, and blue sticks. It was headed "Office, Bureau of Freedmen," and was as follows:

> Know all men by these presents that a naught is a naught and a figure is a figure: all for the white man and none for the nigure. And whereas Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so also have I lifted this nigure out of four dollars and six bits. Amen, Selah, Nix Cum Rouse. (Seal.)

Then there was organized the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., whose founder was John W. Alvord, superintendent of the educational work of the Freedmen's Bureau. Although it was a private corporation chartered by Congress, the negroes were told that it was a Government institution. A picture of Abraham Lincoln adorned the cover of the bank books used, and there was also an official statement that it was an auxiliary to the Freedmen's Bureau.

The negroes were swindled by those who were appointed to guard and protect them. The bank failed in 1874, owing $3,299,201 to the deluded and helpless depositors, and although many bills have been introduced to reimburse them not a cent has ever been returned to the victims.

The bureau, like every bureaucracy dealing with helpless peoples, puts its hands into everything and corrupted everything. It started many schools and spent $5,262,511.26 for education, and yet never had one-tenth of the negro children in school. It issued more than 15,000,000 rations, at a cost of $8,000,000, which resulted, according to Walter H. Fleming, of the West Virginia University, in "the negroes crowding into the towns, where much suffering and disease resulted."

It established hospitals, camps, dispensaries, and communities at a cost of millions, and every one proved a failure. In all, the total expenditures in about seven years were reported as $13,359,065.58 out of the United States Treasury. Many more millions were contributed by charitable organizations and were spent by the bureau.

Such expenditures were regarded as ruinous, and finally the bureau was abolished, in spite of tremendous pressure from officeholders, who prophesied the destruction of the Republic if their bloodsucking institution should be touched with impious hands.

It was a wise act to stop its operations. If it had grown as has the Indian Bureau, dealing with millions of people instead of thousands, its expenditures to-day would require the total receipts of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau deals with some 300,000 persons. Yet in one year it spends more money than the Freedmen's Bureau in its entire history, dealing with fifteen times as many persons.

The negroes to-day, thrown upon their own resources and forced to sink or swim, have made giant strides toward self-reliance and self-support, compared to the Indians. The Indians have been herded into reservations, ground down by regulations issued by petty officeholders. Practically the Indians belong to the Indian Bureau, as Legree said of Uncle Tom, "body and soul."

"Poorer every year," sighs the Indian; and it is true, in spite of the fact that the wealth of Indian provinces has been spent by the bureau.

These appropriations benefit the Indians? You will never say so when you study the history of any of these tribes and know the audacious injustices perpetrated upon them down the years.

Let us take the Blackfeet Indians, for example. In 1855 the United States negotiated a treaty with the Blackfeet formally recognizing their ownership of a great tract of plains and mountains bounded on the north by the Canadian line, on the west by the summit of the Rockies, and on the south by the Musselshell River and the Missouri to the mouth of the Milk River, and on the east from the mouth of the Milk River north to the Canadian line.

That territory was to be the home and hunting grounds of these Indians. But in 1867 an Executive order fixed the southern boundary on the Missouri River. Other Executive orders took away half the land left. The Indians were never consulted about this diminishing of their reservations. In fact, the first they even knew about it was when United States soldiers rounded them up in their buffalo grounds and drove them north.

The Indian Bureau was to furnish them food supplies, but in the winter of 1883, 500 Blackfeet died of starvation because there was no provision made for them.

Then, in 1887, the United States besought the Indians to sell a great tract in the eastern part of the reservation. Finally they yielded, and for the sum of $1,500,000 they parted with their heritage. Once more, in 1896, representatives of the Government came to them and persuaded them to sell the western part of their reservation, the region which is now Glacier National Park, for another $1,500,000.

The money received was placed in the Treasury. All of it, and a great sum besides, has been spent by the Indian Bureau for the alleged benefit of these duped and deluded Americans.

The tribe has been decimated by disease and starvation, and for more than a generation they have suffered misery which could come only to serfs despised and neglected by their masters.

In 1915 United States Senator Harry Lane, of Oregon, made a personal inspection of the reservation and reported to the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs. Here is what he said:

> The condition of the full-blooded Indians in this district, many of whose homes I visited, was pitiable. I found families consisting of as many as six or eight persons living in single-room shacks, and in some instances the beds were made down with insufficient bedding; such bedding as they did have frequently consisted of old rags and sacks or scraps of coverlets. This condition is bad for them and will result eventually in their entire destruction, no doubt, for the reason that if one member of the family becomes infected with tuberculosis or trachoma or any other contagious disease, every condition is favorable for the disease to spread to all the members of the family and to other visiting Indians.
>
> There is no game in this country, or at least not enough to afford them subsistence. I was informed that to keep from starving they had killed and eaten all the prairie dogs and also had resorted to eating skunks.
>
> They are unable to protect themselves from acts of injustice done them, and are thus deprived of any remedy for their relief, and have been left to rot through the incompetence or willful neglect of those in charge of them and their affairs. Indeed, it has heretofore and is now said to be unsafe for anyone who can be "reached" to present their claims or complaints to Congress. It is "cords to the wrists and gyves to the heels" for anyone who undertakes the thankless task, and such persons are pursued and harassed, and the sole effort which is afterwards made seems to be to cover up the evidence and put upon trial the complaining witness in place of trying to remedy the evil or punish those guilty of wrongdoing.
>
> While upon the reservation I had experience with these tactics. I was informed by some of the Indians who had talked with me that the police of the agency had warned them against doing it, and had threatened to arrest some of them for attending illegal meetings. Right foxy and well able to take care of themselves are the gentry who are responsible for the gross mismanagement of the Blackfeet and other Indians.
>
> If the condition of the Blackfeet Indians at this time is to be taken as an index of the character of the trusteeship which the Government imposes upon other Indians, the work has been a failure. The spectacle is a depressing one and calls not only for immediate relief but for an entire and permanent change in the manner of handling their affairs.

Senator Lane made his investigation and his scathing criticisms more than seven years ago. Not one inch advance has been made in that time toward better conditions. Every year since the Indian Bureau, under color of devotion to the Indians' welfare, has fastened tighter its strangle hold upon the Indians for its own selfish and sinister purposes.

Under date of September 28, 1922, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in response to my request, gave me a statement as to the financial condition of the Blackfeet Indians.

He stated that there is $54,196.26 in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribe. The receipts from grazing leases were $32,586.20 in 1917, but they dropped to $1,503.54 in 1922.

In the meantime the appropriations from the Treasury for the support and civilization of these Indians increased from $24,681.94 in 1917 to $59,348.33 in 1922.

The commissioner reports that the bureau placed a tribal herd on the reservation on the reimbursable plan. The total cost of the herd was $367,053.46. Of this amount $61,957.84 was paid out for salaries and wages to bureau employees.

It is stated that the herd was sold at a net loss of $54,523, not counting equipment. The loss on this one venture is more than the entire amount to the credit of the tribe in the Treasury.

The whole scheme of tribal herds and communistic property is a bureau scheme to prevent the Indians becoming Americans. It is entirely wrong in principle, even though it should be successful as a dollar and cents proposition. But what shall we say when, after investing the money of the Indians without their knowledge or consent, the bureau loses the money invested and beggars the Indians?

Remember that the main argument of the bureau officials for the continuance of their bureaucracy is the business incapacity of their ward. How did they demonstate their efficiency?

There came a drought in the Blackfeet country and the grass failed. The supervisor in charge ordered the cattle turned into the allotments of Indians who had been endeavoring to make their own livelihoods on their lands. Even the little hay that they had toiled to secure was eaten by the tribal herds.

Then the supervisor became panic stricken and ordered that the cattle must be shipped out at once. They had to be dipped before they could be shipped and this was ordered done in severe winter weather. The cattlemen dipped their cattle in the summer time, but this tribal herd, the property of the Indians, was dipped when the thermometer was 30 degrees below zero. These cattle were crowded into a liquid bath which covered them completely and then came out of it to freeze to death.

Some of them died at once, others died on the railroad cars, but there was no recourse. The guardianship of the Indian Bureau had been exemplified once more. It was but one more illustration of the value of a system which puts the Indians, their lives and lands, their money and morals, in the hands of the Indian Bureau.

I have been told by members of the Blackfeet Tribe that the cattle of this tribal herd were branded with the same brand used by a Montana stockman. Little wonder that five or six hundred head of cattle disappeared from the reservation and that no effort was made to recover them. Fish Wolf Robe is a Blackfeet who had an allotment upon which he worked faithfully in an effort to put up enough hay to provide the necessaries of life. He had about 20 tons cured when the agency employees ran the tribal herd into his meadows. The cattle ate up his hay and left him destitute. When he complained he was threatened with jail. He was told that the official had leased his land for the use of the tribal herd.

He had never desired to lease his land and never received any money for a lease. But what mattered these little details when he was an Indian, who must be guarded and protected against himself?

Mr. Chairman, the whole system is intolerable enough to "stir a fever in the blood of age and make infant sinew strong as steel."

Do you realize that this losing venture of a tribal herd stands as a mortgage against the property of the Indians? Those cattle were bought with reimbursable funds. Even the Indians whose individual holdings were ravaged by the herd are held responsible for their due share of the losses. The Indians were not consulted, but they are expected to pay. They did not have a voice in the arrangement, but they must meet the bureau invoice of losses.

Still this tragedy of errors in regard to the tribal herd which dissipated every dollar of their tribal funds is not the greatest calamity endured by the Blackfeet.

The tribal herd has run its course over the reservation and has done its damage. The losses have been stopped.

A far greater liability is the irrigation system which has been fastened upon this reservation in violation of every vestige of common sense. The commissioner in his letter to me states that since 1910 $1,095,251.15 has been spent for irrigation on this reservation. In the last fiscal year the amount was $31,299.77. This great sum has been spent, not with the approval of the Indians whose property is mortgaged to pay for it, but over their protests.

Not even the bureau can defend the policy now. Assistant Commissioner Meritt testified before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the Interior Department bill of 1923. He said:

> This irrigation project has not proven successful in the past because of climatic conditions. They sometimes have frosts in May and snows in August.

Of course, the Indian Bureau only learned this habit of nature after a million dollars had been spent. For uncounted ages this territory in the Rockies, stretching to the Canadian border, has had killing frosts in the summer time. The Indians knew it, but, of course, they are incompetent, and must not be encouraged to offer advice to their masters.

There are 47,000 acres in that irrigation project already under irrigation. Only 2,005 acres have ever been cultivated by Indians. It cost for operation and maintenance last year $27,666 in order that a few incurably optimistic Indians might attempt to grow crops under such conditions—$14 an acre in costs—and the Indians secured only a small fraction of that in crops.

Could there be a more flagrant instance of the willful waste of money than that? Could the poor Indians, so incompetent in the eyes of a paternal bureau, have done worse?

I do not want to be unjust. Assistant Commissioner Meritt insisted before the committee that the irrigation project is an engineering success. Yes; the water runs in the canal, when it does not freeze. It is a success similar to that of the surgeon who performs a delicate operation most successfully, save that the patient dies.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that bureau officials who look down with scorn upon the Indians and claim a divine right to order their every action led them into a trap which has cost more than a million dollars; not only led them into it, but expects them to pay for the trap, for this is another reimbursable hoax and the Indians are helpless to prevent liens against their property to meet the costs of this infamous irrigation bubble.

Unless something is done the Blackfeet Indians are doomed. They are almost at the end of the trail. The divine-right theory has nearly reached its end—destruction. The President asked Congress to appropriate money for their relief last year and we passed a bill, but it was like putting a sticking plaster on a cancer.

James Willard Schultz, author of several books dealing with Indian life, has issued a piteous appeal to charitably inclined Americans to send money to the Blackfeet Indians relief fund, at Browning, Mont., so that rations may be issued to the starving.

Here is a paragraph from his appeal:

Owing to the starved condition of the Blackfeet, tuberculosis and infectious diseases of the eye are rapidly increasing among them. I saw one of the three physicians on the reservation who are in the Indian Service. I hear many complaints about him. It can be proven that he would not go 300 yards from his house to see a sick man who had become delirious; and that he would not come out of his house to see a woman who had an infected hand, because, as his wife said, "that was his vacation time of two weeks."

Mr. Chairman, the pathetic history of the Blackfeet is eloquent answer to the question as to whether this great annual contribution from the American taxpayers is of benefit to the Indians.

I maintain that practically every dollar of this appropriation works an injury to the Indians, in whose name it is taken from the Treasury.

Let any one who doubts that statement compare the Chippewa Indians of Michigan with the Chippewas of Minnesota.

The Michigan Indians are not under the bureau, while their brothers of Minnesota are held securely under bureau domination. That offers a fair test. Here are the same Indians, with the same ancestry and the same blood and breeding, but with different environment.

What has been the result? The Chippewas of Michigan became citizens through treaty and legislation in 1845. The last payments under the treaty were made in 1872, and they have been required to shift for themselves since that time.

They have established common schools and they are a part of the American communities where they live. They speak the English language. Though they do not have the majority of voters in the townships Indians have been elected to all the offices within the gift of the electorate. There have been Indian school directors, supervisors, and justices of the peace, while a number have held county offices. Two-thirds of them own their own homes, and there are no more paupers among them than among the white population. Out of their ranks have come ministers, lawyers, and teachers. Some of them are mechanics and others are farmers. Whether in industrial cities or on the farms they have made good in competition with all the world. They are real American citizens, of whom America may well be proud.

What of their brothers in Minnesota who have been guarded and sustained by the Indian Bureau? The current law provides $95,000 for the "civilization and support" of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota. It provides $51,000 for the support and education of Indian pupils in Indians schools. It provides $46,570 for the tuition of Indian pupils in other schools. It provides for superintendents and teachers and employees by the score to hold the reins tight over these Indians.

What has this money accomplished for the Indians? Listen to the letter sent out by the official council of the Chippewas of Minnesota, copy of which was addressed to every Member of Congress within the past six months:

As a tribe we have been dispossessed of our homes, our liberties, our lands, our wild-rice beds, our wild-berry fields, our timber, our sugar bushes, our hunting and trapping grounds. Our basket making, rug and blanket weaving, bead work, and canoe making are so imitated and cheaply manufactured by the white man that we can no longer compete. We are a people who under the present paternal system of Indian administration are deprived of every self-independent right, who are languishing in misery and dying of starvation.

You can call the roll of the Indian tribes of America and the response will be one great chorus of protest against the present system of control and the money distributed in a way to perpetuate the Indian Bureau.

However, Mr. Chairman, I know how quickly will come back the answer that these benighted Indians are not capable of knowing what is best for themselves. They are ignorant and are unworthy of attention.

In God's name, who is responsible for that situation? The Indian Bureau has had absolute power over the Indians for a long, long time. Its employees have trained these Indians under the reservation system in the way they said was best. Now they find fault with the Indian and his intelligence, but never with the system which blighted his intelligence and enforced his ignorance. Even a cat or dog or a bird can be trained if the method is right. But wrong methods through 50 years have left many Indians to-day who can not even speak the English language. If the Indians to-day are not able to speak intelligently concerning their own problems, the fault is the bureau's alone.

The Government is something separate and apart from these Indians. They have been made inferior through autocratic control, and then because they are inferior they are barred from exercising any rights or responsibilities. The Indian Bureau is exactly as logical as the brutal son who murdered his father and mother and then besought the judge for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan.

The only way to make any people responsible is to give them responsibilities. To forbid them any voice in their own affairs is to take away every inducement to allegiance and loyalty to the Government. It makes the victims incompetent, spiritless, and sullen.

The Indian Bureau has cunningly and with method reached out for new undertakings. It has bound them round with red tape and confusions, adding more complexities at every step. The result is useless agencies, silly duplication, and wicked waste of money.

The Indian Bureau is a despot which can do as it likes with the life, liberties, the possessions, and the occupation of every individual Indian on the rolls. Its only thought in meeting a problem is through tyrannical exercise of arbitrary power. Not by counsel but by coercion does it undertake its tasks. It relies on force, never on fellowship. Its policy is the exact opposite of the fundamental principles upon which the American Nation was founded. To its inspection and control and interference is subject everything that an Indian does or says or thinks or has. It is the most determined enemy of personal freedom and civil liberty that can be found anywhere on earth since the Czar of all the Russias lost his throne.

The Indian Bureau is not an agency of service; it is a great army of officeholders paid out of the Treasury and performing work which in large measure injures the Indians and the common welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I know many Indians do not have business ability to-day. How could they have when their training has come through a system in itself woefully unbusinesslike and inefficient?

H. N. Graves, accountant with the United States Bureau of Efficiency, testified before the Indian Affairs Committee of the House in the last Congress. Denouncing the bureau for lack of even the most ordinary care in its bookkeeping system, he said:

It is my opinion that the property accounting system up to July, 1917, was practically worthless, accomplished no purpose whatever. No such thing as an inventory was taken.

Mr. Graves undertook to put in an accounting system. He stated that his plan was designed so that data would be obtained as to the cost of operating each activity—such as dormitories, schools, farms, gardens, and so forth.

Our idea was—

Said Mr. Graves—

that if it happened that the farm was operated at a loss, our system would disclose the fact. This was not popular. Few people in the Indian Service are interested to know whether farms are being operated at a loss. Consequently the feature has been eliminated.

Of course, direct methods and businesslike plans were unpopular and were eliminated. The bureau system depends upon confusion, complexity, and circumlocution.

Out on the reservations nothing is permitted, everything is either ordered or forbidden. The veriest trifle must be referred to some official who starts in through a maze of red-tape procedure.

What can an Indian learn of forestry when he is compelled to deal with supervisors of forests, forest examiners, forest rangers, forest assistants, forest guards, each of whom may issue different orders and regulations to these helpless wards.

If an Indian needs seed for his garden, he may apply to the farmer of his district, who refers it to the clerk at the agency, who refers it to the superintendent, who refers it to the subsection head at Washington, who refers it to the section chief, who refers it to the field supervisor, who refers it to the field inspector, who refers it to the superintendent of the agency, who refers it to the clerk, who refers it to the farmer. The farmer makes a complete investigation and reports that the Indian might possibly use the seed to advantage if the cost is reimbursed out of his crop. That report goes up the spiral stairway and back again until it reaches the agency office.

The superintendent orders his clerk to get the seed to the Indian. The clerk orders an Indian messenger boy to deliver the package. The boy can pass it no further down the line. He kicks his dog and sullenly delivers the seed to the Indian, whose garden is buried beneath the snows of winter.

On page 196 of the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the year 1923, Assistant Commissioner Meritt explains that the bureau uses Indian labor and Indian boys in the construction and repair of agency buildings. He states that they make good carpenters, stonemasons, and painters when they have a leader. But here is the pencil of light pointing at the system. Mr. Meritt says:

> We put up a building at a cost to the Government of $5,000 ordinarily, that if constructed outside by a private individual would cost $20,000 or $25,000, because we are not required to pay for labor. It is a part of the training of the boys.

Great credit is taken for this cheap construction, but nothing could show more clearly the utter misconception of the true purpose of the bureau. The bureau does not secure its right to exist because it can erect reservation buildings cheaply through involuntary servitude. The bureau was really established to help the Indians become self-supporting, self-respecting citizens. Self-respect comes from an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. If these Indians make "good carpenters, stonemasons, and painters," they are entitled to the pay due for their labors.

Mr. Chairman, it would be far better to build self-respecting American manhood than to build reservation buildings without labor costs.

It would be far better to abolish the bureau than to abolish the opportunities for these human beings to get what they earn by faithful, constructive service.

W. H. Gibbs, formerly inspector in the Indian Service, who resigned because of this refusal on the part of the bureau to give the Indian a fair chance, said:

> Entering the Indian Service in the belief that the bureau was designed and conducted as a benefaction to the race, I am leaving it convinced that it is the Indian Old Man of the Sea, who will try to cling to his neck in a strangle hold forever.

Mr. Chairman, the money spent to keep these Indians under a guardhouse system works a deadly injury to the Indians themselves.

Would anyone advocate the reservation and agency system for the immigrants who come here from foreign lands? Would anyone propose to resurrect the freedman's bureau and put all negroes under a bureaucracy? Then, why continue to pay out millions in order that the Indians may be segregated, supervised, and schooled on reservations remote from contact with American life?

All we need is a very small fraction of the faith of William Penn, whose treaty with the Indians 240 years ago was kept inviolate. From the day that treaty was made to the death of William Penn not a white man in Penn's woodlands was killed by an Indian nor was an Indian killed by a white man. Voltaire says it was the only treaty never sworn to and never broken.

Why was it that when other colonies were suffering from Indian wars Pennsylvania was free from every menace? Why was it that for generations the Indian tribes revered and protected the followers of William Penn?

There was but one reason. William Penn treated the Indians as men entitled to every human right. Even when wilderness was king and the Indians were the product of savage environment this statesman did not fear to deal with them as equals.

To the Indians gathered under the great elm he said:

> The Great Spirit who rules the heavens and earth and who knows the inmost thoughts of man knows that we have a hearty desire to live in peace and friendship with you and to serve you to the utmost of our power.

That was a splendid sentiment, but, of course, it was utterly worthless unless translated into action. The Indian Bureau also prates about friendship for the Indian and desiring to serve him.

But William Penn was not trying to exploit the Indians. His treaty recited that the Indians were not to be molested in their lawful pursuits, even in the territory they had sold. They were to have the same liberty to do all things relating to the improvement of their lands and the support of their families that the English had.

That was the secret of the strength of William Penn's treaty. The Indian was treated as a man, not a serf.

> I will not compare our friendship to a chain—

Said William Penn—

> for the rain might rust it or a tree fall and break it, but I shall consider you as the same flesh and blood with us and the same as if one man's body were to be divided into two parts.

"Equal rights" was the motto of William Penn, and how successful it proved. "All paths shall be open and free to both Christian and Indian" ran the treaty. Is it any wonder that such a league of friendship was kept bright and clean without a spot and was held firm to the third and fourth generation of those who made it?

This great treaty was made with an Indian council. Penn was enthusiastic for such a plan of action. In a letter written in 1683 to friends in England he said:

> Every king has his council, and that consists of all the old and wise men of his nation. Nothing of moment is undertaken, be it war, peace, selling of land, or traffic, without advising with them, and, what is more, with the young men, too.

William Penn took steps to enforce his views. Not a settler could come to Pennsylvania unless he subscribed to the conditions.

> No man shall by any ways or means, in word or deed, wrong any Indian but shall incur the same penalty of the law as if he had committed it against his fellow planters.

If an Indian wronged a planter, the white man was not permitted to be his own judge upon the Indian, but must bring his case before the courts for determination. As long as any of these Indians lived in Pennsylvania they would assemble in some spot as nearly as possible like that where they met their friend. There they would lay the speeches of William Penn upon a blanket and with great satisfaction review the proceedings of the great treaty.

Even when exiled from the lands of their ancestors, these Indians taught their children the name of the friend, William Penn, who a century and a half before had treated them as human beings.

William Penn believed that in all ages—

> Every human heart is human;
> That in even savage bosoms
> There are longings, yearnings, strivings
> For the good they comprehend not;
> That the feeble hands and helpless,
> Groping blindly in the darkness,
> Touch God's right hand in that darkness
> And are lifted up and strengthened.

William Penn had the sense of the brotherhood of mankind. The Indian Bureau is built on the false assumption that the Indians are inferior beings, possessed of no rights which bureau employees should recognize. In my estimation that belief and policy degrades these self-styled superiors more than their despised fellow creatures.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian problem will disappear when the Indian is treated as a man. The great difficulty is that some 5,000 persons look upon the Indian question as their official pasture, where they graze at governmental expense.

They have "helped" the Indians until he is now helpless. It is time to give the Indian the property to which he is entitled and then let him shift for himself. Some of them will fail, but that is the fate of some white men, too, in the race of life. Better that than slavery.

But as a matter of fact, the vast majority of Indians, thrown on their own resources, will make good. They will find work and do it. Fewer employees will be on the bureau pay roll, but more Indians will be civilized.

Abraham Lincoln, in a message to Congress in 1864, said:

> I submit for your special consideration whether our Indian system shall not be remodeled. Many wise and good men have impressed me that this can be profitably done.

Sixty years have passed since that recommendation. The Indian Bureau, which then was beginning to show its possibilities for evil power, has become a Frankenstein creation. For every reason that Lincoln had for remodeling the system there are ten thousand now. In 60 years there has been a multiplication of taxes and expenditures. The solution is simply the old-time command, "Let this people go." All Indians born within the limits of the United States should be declared citi-

zens and entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens.

Every reservation should be allotted to the Indians so that each may have his individual homestead. The tribal property should be divided. Minors and incompetents should be treated exactly as are similar persons of the white race, their property administered in the courts of the States.

There should be arrangements for a final accounting by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at a certain fixed date. Each Indian tribe should be permitted to act through its freely elected council and a final settlement made, so that in all the future these original Americans shall be members of America.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau system is a wastrel, profligate beyond description. It wastes every year millions of dollars collected from American taxpayers and millions more abstracted from the possessions of the Indians themselves. It wastes still other millions which would accrue from this untaxed Indian wealth once it was Americanized. It wastes the self-respect of a race and the possibilities of a proud people. It wastes material resources by inefficiency and spiritual resources by dependency and pauperism. It wastes the confidence of the Indians by setting up decoys that lead them to their doom. It wastes their labor by setting them at futile tasks which have no value in American civilization. It wastes their youth in segregated schools which perpetuate tribalism. It wastes their maturity by keeping them in wigwam and tepee and making them aliens in the land of their fathers. It wastes money and manhood, character and citizenship, and conserves only idleness and ignorance and vice.

In this day of conservation, it is time to stop this waste. In this day when overburdened taxpayers are praying for economy it is time to save money whose expenditure works injury to the American Indian and the American public alike.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a very great deal of interest to the very earnest speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. I think perhaps it is well to have a speech of that sort made occasionally in regard to the Indian appropriations, or in regard to any other appropriations. I think a speech of that kind calling attention, with possibly a little exaggeration, to some of the evils that necessarily and unavoidably creep into Government operations is a good thing, and yet I think the gentleman himself, who knows a good deal about Indians and the Indian question, although he has not lived among the red men, I imagine, very much, would scarcely subscribe to some of the suggestions that were made by some of those he quoted.

The Indian problem is a very great one and has been from the beginning of white settlement in America. In so far as we have erred in the management, development, and settlement of that problem, I think we have erred in generosity, in doing too much rather than doing too little. I have very little patience with those who constantly and continuously wail about the alleged frauds against the Indians and constantly assert that we have not performed our duty toward them. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have overcoddled the Indians. We have unwisely undertaken some development of his land that should not have been undertaken. It has all been done out of a spirit of generosity and out of a desire to do our duty to those people who are the wards of the Government. But I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that we can scarcely turn the red man adrift. It is a long, long, weary, trying road from barbarism to civilization, and even those red men who were most advanced when our forefathers found them here had a long and weary road to travel to reach the goal of the white man's civilization. Many of them have not reached it yet. We are trying to civilize the Indian by moral suasion—that is, trying to give him our kind of civilization. That civilization is based on work, hard work, self-sacrifice. He is not given to exertion or self-sacrifice except in the chase and in war.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Right there will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment.

And it takes a long time for him to learn the lessons of self-sacrifice, of self-control, and of thought for the future, of work, of effort.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman states that civilization is based on hard work and effort?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is it not rather based on contact with civilization? And by keeping Indians on reservations we are keeping them from civilization?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is confusing a fact with a method. I agree with the gentleman that one of the best ways to civilize a man is to bring him in close contact with civilization. That is one reason why I have been in favor of allowing the Indian on the unopened reservation to sell his surplus land or to sell the lands of his deceased ancestors in order that white settlers may be brought onto the reservation, and in order that he may secure the benefit of contact with those white settlers. We should constantly reduce the number of Indians over whom we exercise supervision. But that separation of the Indian from Government supervision can not and must not be done hurriedly, without thought, care, and preparation. It is all very well to talk about putting these men not accustomed to the ways of civilization on their own feet and compelling them to make their way among white men. That all sounds very well, but our experience has been that in many cases where we have attempted to do that the Indian has become a pauper. His condition has grown infinitely worse instead of better. And yet we should just as rapidly as possible, and through the best methods that experience justifies, place the Indian in a position of self-support, of self-respect, and of independence. But it must be done with reason. It must be done with judgment. It must be done with intelligence. We have no greater problem before us than that. For quite a number of years and under several Commissioners of Indian Affairs we were gradually passing their lands to the Indians in individual ownership and control. We were reducing the reservations. We were reducing the number of Indians with whom we had official contact. That was the proper procedure. Then under commissioners in the last administration we reversed that policy, unwisely, in my opinion, and at least one commissioner seemed delighted to go afield and find men in Texas, in Georgia and in Florida, and possibly in Maine, who had some little Indian blood whom he could bring under the Government's tent. It was all wrong. It was all a mistake.

There are some items in this bill that are here by reason of that reversal of policy. We should return, we are returning, we have returned, under the present management of the Indian Office, as I understand it, to the policy of gradually putting the Indian on his feet and placing him in a position where he can care for himself. But it is still a tedious procedure, and it must be pursued with very great care and with full knowledge of the very great responsibility we have upon us.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Before I yield I want to pay a tribute to the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, well known to the membership of this House, a man who served here with very great credit for many years.

I believe he is the best Commissioner of Indian Affairs we have ever had, and I believe that under his management we will have the development of a policy which my friend from Pennsylvania would, I think, in the main approve; a policy under which we shall gradually and as rapidly as we may with safety, having due regard for the interest of the Indian, remove him from governmental restrictions and place him upon his own feet when we are sure that he will be able to stand and maintain himself.

Now I yield.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am disappointed, I will say to the gentleman, by the fact that there is over a million dollars' increase in this bill over last year.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the fact of an increased appropriation necessarily proves an extension of the bureau's activity. Such an increase may be necessary to the development of the policy of gradually making the Indian self-reliant and self-supporting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have one minute more?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. We might for a year, or even for a series of years, increase the appropriations and still be steadily following the policy of gradually reducing the number of Government wards and limiting the Federal control over them.

I do not know the character of the items by which the bill is increased. I do agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that a great mistake was made in attempting to irrigate on an extensive scale the lands of the Blackfeet Indians, for instance. I know that territory very well. I know that it was very unwise to attempt that irrigation on a large, ex-

pensive scale. And yet there were many people, locally and friends of the Indians generally, who were as insistent in regard to that expenditure as men ever were for any good cause in the world.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. As I recall, the Blackfeet appropriation is reimbursable from tribal funds.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; if there ever are any tribal funds. But even assuming that is so, we should lay no obligation on these Indians for ditches that may never be used for irrigation development that is not practicable, where the end does not justify the expenditure, because we assume that the lands over which these ditches are built are some time in the distant future to pay the obligation. They probably never will. We shall be very fortunate, indeed, if we can care for the Blackfeet Tribe as we should care for them with the resources that can be secured from their property without any very large lien upon it for irrigation purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a little while two matters relating to taxation. The first one has arisen within the last two or three days. Last June we passed through the House a bill increasing the right of States as to the taxation of national banks, authorizing them where they desired to be progressive and to impose income taxes instead of property taxes to tax the income of national banks instead of a property tax on the stock of national banks, provided they did not tax them at a higher rate than they taxed the income from other securities. In another body in the last day or two there has been considerable criticism by a distinguished citizen, acceded to by another distinguished citizen, of the fact that the House did not do anything for the people in that legislation. One citizen makes the statement that we now can only tax national-bank stock as we tax other ordinary citizens; that formerly we could tax stock the same as we could other competing capital, and not higher, but that now, under recent decisions, we can only tax it the same as we tax the property of ordinary individuals invested in choses in action and in other investments, and that it has caused great trouble in the State of New York. And he puts in an interview with Mayor Hylan, in which he threatens to go to jail because of the decision of the court of New York. Another gentleman arises in such other body and says that Massachusetts is in the same fix.

Now, what is the truth about it? The statement made in the other body that we are not now confined to taxing the national banks at the same rate as applied to competing capital refers to the decision of the New York Court of Appeals on the very question in which the full court says, "The taxing of national bank shares must not discriminate in favor of capital entering into competition with national banks." It says:

> The tax on national-bank shares must not discriminate in favor of moneyed capital entering into competition with the national banks. The court below has found that the competing capital in the hands of individuals, subject only to the personal property income tax, is very large.
>
> If the principle of substantial equality of taxation under State authority, as between capital so invested and other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens however invested, operates to disturb the peculiar policy of some of the States in respect of revenue derived from taxation, the remedy therefor is with another department of the Government and does not belong to this court.

The act which was passed by this House says that bank stock must not be taxed at a higher rate than other competing capital, and yet we have these distinguished men criticizing the House because it did not take care of them in that very way.

What was the situation in New York? The situation is found by the court in New York that the ordinary individuals—those put into a class by these distinguished gentlemen as ordinary individuals—with whom we had to equalize the national banks, operated with $200,000,000 capital in banking in the city of New York, and these are given as the names of ordinary individuals. They are J. P. Morgan & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; H. W. Seligman; Hallgarten & Co.; Lodenbury, Thalman & Co.; Goldman, Sacks & Co.; Blair & Co.; and others. These are the ordinary individuals, with $200,000,000 that come in competition with the banks. Under the law the national banks were taxed $1,000 on every hundred thousand dollars, while these ordinary individuals were taxed not exceeding $300—less than one-third. Yet complaint is made that we are destroying the rights of the States because we do not allow the States to enact legislation to kill national banks, which, by the way, was prepared, I am informed, by the tax association, at that time presided over by the distinguished Member of this House from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts in another body says that Massachusetts is in the same fix. Let us see about Massachusetts. Massachusetts's own member of the Banking and Currency Committee admitted that the national banks in Massachusetts in 1921 paid $2,999,000 in taxes, but if they had been taxed on the same basis that Lee Higinson & Co., Kidder, Peabody & Co., and other international bankers that occupied the same business relations in Boston that Morgan & Co. did in New York they would be taxed only $490,000.

And yet they say in criticism that the House of Representatives went ahead and refused to give authority to continue the tremendous preference to these people. We did refuse to help them perpetuate this outrageous discrimination against the banks that are the very foundation of our reserve banks.

That is all I have to say about that feature of taxation. The record of the House of Representatives is one of fairness. I was on the committee that prepared it, and there is no escape from the logical conclusion reached as to what legislation was needed.

Now, I want to discuss for a little while the proposed constitutional amendment as to the taxing of State securities. What is the proposition? What do we propose to do? In the first place we want to look for a minute at the terms of the proposed amendment. That is the first thing to consider. You will notice that it says:

> The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of any State but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

Notice it uses the same term—

> By or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

The contention was made here the other day that that applied also to the taxation of railroad bonds or any other kind of bonds that are issued by railroad companies organized under the authority of the State. I do not know where the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] got his authority, but that was his contention. You will notice that the same term is used. You are to tax the securities issued by or under the authority of the States. You must not, in doing so, discriminate against the securities issued by or under the authority of the United States or any other State. Therefore we must conclude that the term "by or under the authority" refers to the same securities in these instances, to use the identical term; and there being no reason why there should be conferred upon the United States the power to tax railroad securities, for instance, because they happen to be issued by a corporation organized by the State, there is absolutely no sense in putting it into the first, and therefore there can not be any use for concluding that the same term used in the second sentence means anything other than that which it means in the first. Therefore I conclude that the term means that the United States can tax it, but that it can not, in so taxing, discriminate in favor of the United States securities, which are not taxable now, and can not discriminate in favor of these securities which are not taxable now, and it has no reference in the world to any other class of securities, because they are all taxed at the present time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That matter was all gone over very carefully by the committee when this amendment was prepared. The United States, in addition to its own securities, has other securities issued under its authority—issued by or under the authority of the United States, which are not taxable.

Mr. STEVENSON. I submit that the gentleman should not take up my time in stating that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And that is contrary to what the gentleman said.

Mr. STEVENSON. Not at all.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Those securities stand in just exactly the same light as the corporation securities.

Mr. STEVENSON. What are the securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Bonds of the War Finance Corporation, bonds of the farm loan banks, and other bonds that perhaps I may not think of at this time.

Mr. STEVENSON. I was not differentiating as to those. I can not give my friend any more time. He can get time from his own side.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is not fair in so doing. I have not quite concluded.

Mr. STEVENSON. But I have not much time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This has all been gone over by the Treasury authorities. The legal authorities there believe that this applies to corporation securities.

Mr. STEVENSON. What corporation securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All corporation securities under the authority of the State and under the authority of the United States.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman contend that it applies to railroad corporations, where the railroad is incorporated by the State?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is not the slightest question about that.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is his position?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is my position and, so far as I know, the position of every other attorney.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I would like the gentleman from Iowa to get from the hearings or to get a letter from the legal department of the Treasury a statement that this is their interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have such a letter from the Treasury Department, addressed to me, and I shall put it into the RECORD at the proper time.

Mr. STEVENSON. If that is the intention, then the United States Government can only tax income from railroad securities as it taxes income from the securities of the city of Alexandria, under this proposition that is put there. I do not concede that that is the case, but let us suppose it is. Then there is another proposition which has come forward, and that is this, that the amendment will enable the United States Government for the next 20 years to tax State and farm-loan bonds, because we have it now admitted that that is intended—and I supposed it was—to tax them, and yet not let a State have a single dollar of tax out of a United States security. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] said the other day that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] said the United States would not owe any debts, and that that was a mistake, that the United States would always owe debts. The gentleman from Texas did not say that. The gentleman said that in all probability for 20 years the United States would not issue any new bonds. That being the case, there is nothing to prevent the United States from taxing the bonds of States at such a high rate as to absolutely put an incubus upon them; and that is the proposition the gentleman from Texas made, and which I reiterate—and I do reiterate—that the purpose of this is twofold.

It is, first, to burden the States and tax out of existence the power of the States in their operations. The President himself says tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation and are encouraging unproductive expenditures by the municipalities. He further says:

> There is more than the menace in mounting public debt, there is the dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. The proposed amendment will place the State and Federal Governments and all political subdivisions on an exact equality and will correct the growing menace of public borrowing, which if left unchecked may soon threaten the stability of our institutions.

The necessity for this amendment, if there were any, has certainly not been demonstrated by the facts which have been stated. Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, says that there is probably a billion dollars of additional indebtedness being issued every year. Let us see about that. The income of the United States is $50,000,000,000; in 1920, $23,700,000,000 was taxable income, as against $6,300,000,000 taxable in 1916, 300 per cent increase in four years. If the States and counties are issuing a billion dollars additional a year, what effect does it have? Two per cent only of the income of the United States will absorb the whole business, or 4 per cent of the taxable income. Does that make a great shelter for all of the great income-tax payers or show a drying up of the sources of supply—$17,400,000,000 increase in taxable incomes in four years? But I do not accept the proposition that there is a billion being issued every year. There has been no adequate evidence of it. There is less than $11,000,000,000 outstanding now, and the States and municipalities have been issuing bonds ever since long before the Civil War. But suppose you cut it off at the Civil War, and suppose there was a clean slate. For 55 years we have had issued only $11,000,000,000; in other words, $200,000,000 a year, and that is the average. I do not believe it has been accelerated five times within the last two or three years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall have to be excused.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has misstated what the Secretary said.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall get what the Secretary said.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He said it was increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year.

Mr. STEVENSON. The statement is made by Mr. Mellon and all of you, and that is what he says, that the tax-exempt securities are increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year; that many more are being issued every year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; that many more outstanding.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the same thing. If it is increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year, they have to be issued in order to be there, and if there is only a billion increase a year, there is only a billion dollars issued a year as a new debt, and that which retires old debts is no increase.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All right, if the gentleman wants to stand on that statement.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall stand on my own statement. What effect is it going to have? Take the record of the sale of bonds of the United States—and Mr. MILLS has put in here a table—that are taxable and those that are not. You will find that the Secretary of the Treasury's report contains that statement. But let us take United States bonds, nontaxable and taxable. Take for the last two or three weeks, and you will find that the average difference between the return on nontaxable and taxable bonds is from 96 cents to a dollar on every hundred dollars. In other words, people go out on the market to buy United States bonds. They buy a nontaxable bond, and they pay more for it, and get less return. It has been running $3.42 on a hundred dollars. If they buy a taxable bond, they require a higher return. In other words, they pay a lower price. They have been running at about $4.38 on a hundred dollars on taxable bonds. See the market statements every morning in New York and Washington papers where the return on each kind of United States bonds is given.

Well, what does that mean? It means an increase of 1 per cent that they are requiring on account of the taxable feature. All right. Put an increase of 1 per cent on the farm-loan bonds now issued, $300,000,000 a year, making the rate to farmers 7 per cent instead of 6. What will it amount to? Three million dollars the first year. If they go on and do not put out more than $300,000,000 a year, at the end of 10 years, as a burden to be laid on the farmers' backs, there will be $30,000,000 of an annual interest charge added by this taxation; and as the gentleman from Iowa said, that is one of the things that will go on.

Not only that, but you take the States and they will increase. Let me see; $11,000,000,000 are outstanding to-day. They say they are issuing a billion a year, or they are increasing a billion a year. That will be an average. The increased interest charge at 1 per cent will amount to $10,000,000 a year; that is, the increased interest that is put on of 1 per cent. But now you must remember, when you are dealing with the United States securities that are taxed only by the United States, the investor requires a difference of 1 per cent between the taxed and the untaxed bonds. Now, if you will allow the States to tax, where will you land? When the State puts its tax on, you will see they will require 2 per cent, or 1 per cent more, and if they issue one billion a year with 1 per cent additional interest it will be $20,000,000 in 10 years of increased taxation as long as you issue those bonds; and in 20 years, if you do not increase the tax and increase the difference, you would have $2,110,000,000 additional tax levied on the people of this country and collected to pay the interest on bonds because of this tax that you levy, and much of which you will not get because they will hide it out. If you put it at 2 per cent, 1 per cent to care for State tax, it will be $4,220,000,000 in 20 years.

Now, the whole thing about this is that it is boldly proclaimed, and you will see it in the speech of Mr. MACGREGOR, of New York, and in the speech of Mr. MILLS, of New York, and you will see it in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the idea is to stop or greatly decrease the issuance of State and municipal bonds, to tax them out of existence.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The President says it is a menace to the country.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. The President has made the same statement. You may say, "No; you will never tax anything out of existence." I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was here in 1865–66, but you will recall reading that they put on a 10 per cent tax on bank notes paid out by national banks. Over in Arkansas they made a

bank pay $160,000 in that way, and it was settled that the tax had to be paid. The United States Supreme Court said this tax is undoubtedly for the purpose of preventing that issue and preventing the States from issuing money, but it is within the power of Congress, and it is not for the court to say that Congress can not tax it out of existence.

Now, in every message and in every speech and document they proclaim that this is for the purpose of putting out of business the matter of issuing securities by and under the authority of the State. Yet they say there will be no danger of taxing them out of existence, when it is the evident purpose in every document that you have.

In the language of the Supreme Court, "Power of Congress to use a tax to destroy can not be questioned." (Bank v. Fenns, 8 Wall. 533.)

Also it says the power to issue free from taxation its securities either by State or Nation free from interference by the other "is an essential element of sovereignty of each." (Pollock v. Fownes L. & T. Co., 157 U. S. 586.)

Now, to come back to the question of the scope of this amendment. What is the object of the proposed legislation? Let us get at its genesis and see. The President in his address to the House on December 8, 1922, made the following statement:

> One year ago I suggested the submission of an amendment so that we may lawfully restrict the issues of tax-exempt securities, and I renew that recommendation now. Tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation and they are encouraging unproductive and extravagant expenditures by States and municipalities. There is more than the menace in mounting public debt; there is the dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. The proposed amendment will place the State and Federal Governments and all political subdivisions on an exact equality, and will correct the growing menace of public borrowing, which if left unchecked may soon threaten the stability of our institutions.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his report for 1922 made the following statement:

> A constitutional amendment, satisfactory to the Treasury and approved by the Attorney General, has already been proposed by joint resolution favorably reported to the last session of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means. This amendment would apply equally and without discrimination to the Federal Government on the one hand and the State and municipal governments on the other hand, and would, in effect, put an end to future issues of tax-exempt securities, making it possible for the Federal Government to tax income from future issues by or under authority of the several States if, as, and to the extent that it taxes future issues of Federal securities, and for the State governments to tax income from future issues of Federal securities if, as, and to the extent that they tax future issues of their own securities. The amendment, which appears in House Joint Resolution 314, reads as follows—

So the idea is that this merely provides for the taxation of incomes from securities heretofore tax free. Now corporate securities, such as railroad securities, are not in the tax-free list. Hence no power is given over them to either the Nation or State, for such power is already possessed. The bonds of the State and their governmental agencies, such as counties, cities, towns, and school districts, are the only bonds affected by the taxation to be imposed hereunder. Such being the case, the words in the first clause, "by or under the authority of any State," must refer to bonds heretofore tax free. Then the same clause in the latter part of the section, "by or under the authority of the United States or any other State," must refer to the same class of securities, to wit, issues of State or governmental agencies heretofore nontaxable.

When the same phrase is used twice in the same statute the same construction should be used in both. In the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in United States v. Central Pacific Railway Co. (118 U. S. p. 240), referring to a similar repetition of language in two statutes referring to the same thing, "we must give the same meaning to like expressions in both."

The Supreme Court of Ohio says that where the same words are used twice in the same section that it is a fundamental rule of construction that if in one case the meaning is clear and in the other obscure, the meaning where it is clear controls both.

Rhodes v. Weldy (46 Ohio St. 242):

> A word or phrase repeated in a statute will bear the same meaning throughout the statute unless a different intention appears.

Sutherland on statutory construction, section 399, cites many decisions. Certainly nothing appears to show a different meaning between the words "issued by or under authority of" in the two clauses of section 1. The first certainly refers to securities issued by States and their agencies not now subject to taxation, and the second must refer to securities of the United States and "other" States likewise now exempt. If not, and if it refers to railroad securities, why insert the word "other" before State at the end? It thus provides that in taxing State bonds the United States can not discriminate against bonds of other States which are rendered taxable by this amendment and can not refer to the mass of bonds of private corporations which were always taxable and are not affected by this amendment. These bonds are set off in a class to themselves in Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. (157 U. S. 583) to such an extent that the sixteenth amendment, giving authority to tax incomes "from whatever source derived," was held not to involve this class in the Gore case (Evans v. Gore, 253 U. S., p. 246). But Mr. GREEN, author of the amendment, says he and the committee agree that the words "issued by or under the authority of, and so forth," embrace all railroad bonds issued by virtue of authority conferred on a railroad corporation by a State or Nation. If that be so, then the United States can not tax income from railroad bonds or any other kind of bonds at a higher rate than it taxes State bond incomes. If that is the joker, it means a drive by the holders of millions of railroad bonds to get under cover with their income. Naturally a low rate will be contended for by everybody on incomes from State issues, and it must not discriminate against the income from railroad bonds issued by or under authority of "any State"; hence it makes a low rate for railroad bonds. Is this an explanation of the activity of some of the railroad magnates for this bill? Taking the words "under and by authority of" throughout the whole amendment to refer to corporate bonds of private as well as public corporations, it will prevent any higher rate being put on one class than the other.

The first paragraph allows the United States to tax State securities, which includes, according to Mr. GREEN of Iowa, railroad securities, and provides that they, the railroad securities, shall not be discriminated against in favor of United States securities or any other State securities. It simply brings railroad securities in under the protecting wing of United States securities and State securities.

I do not believe the court would construe it that way, but Mr. GREEN of Iowa does, and he says everybody connected with passing it does also, and, if so, then it is building a shelter for holders of railroad bonds. Every railroad mortgage in this country would be foreclosed and the new bonds issued after this amendment is adopted, and all of them come under its terms and stand on the same rate of income taxation as the State and Government bonds.

I warn the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that his construction of this amendment is not final. The sixteenth amendment was supposed to cover every kind of income, and so distinguished a man as Governor Hughes, of New York, so construed it in transmitting it to the legislature, but the Supreme Court in Evans against Gore made that theory look like "two bits."

Now, where do the States come in under the amendment? They can tax their own securities now. Why do not they? Because (a) it increases their interest charge, and (b) in most States they get no tax because all the bonds practically are owned in centers of capital and the State can only get tax on those held by residents. It pays the higher rate and gets nothing in return.

The following statement from Evans v. Gore (253 U. S. pp. 255–256) might well be pondered by the people before adopting this:

> When we consider what was done in those cases—

Referring to cases holding securities of States and their governmental agencies exempt—

> what is comprehended in the congressional power to tax, it becomes additionally manifest that the prohibition now under discussion was intended to embrace any diminution through the exertion of that power, for, as this court has repeatedly held, the power to tax carries with it the power to embarrass and destroy; may be applied to every object within its range in such measure as Congress may determine; enables that body to select one calling and omit another; to tax one class of property and forbear to tax another; and may be applied in different ways to different objects so long as there is geographical uniformity in the duties, excises, and imposts imposed.

I ask again if this is a device to make secure the place of railroad and other corporate bonds under provision that they can not be discriminated against in favor of income from the United States, and if it is the power to select one and leave another that this proposed amendment is intended to limit? If passed, could a tax be laid on the income of a railroad bond if none were imposed on United States bonds? Mr. GREEN'S construction would lead to the negative answer. The first section, as construed by him and written out, would read:

> The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from State, county, municipal, and school district, and railroad and other corporate bonds issued under authority of any State, but without discrimination against such State and railroad bonds, etc., and in favor of income on any like bonds issued by or under authority of the United States or any State.

Hence, if only normal tax is levied on United States bonds, only normal tax can be levied on railroad bonds, and so forth.

This will be a shelter for railroad and other corporate bonds if that view is sustained by the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay my respects to the able Secretary of the Interior and to the different heads of the bureaus under him and say that I believe that department of our Government is being administered with great efficiency and ability. I am sorry I shall not have time to discuss the work of the various branches of this department with something of thoroughness. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] a few minutes ago discussed at some length the Indian Bureau. During the consideration of the bill I shall refer to particular features of his criticism. At this time, however, I wish to refer to the general effect of his criticism of our Indian policy and what we hope to do. For the head of the important Bureau of Indian Affairs I have profound respect. I do not like to make comparisons, but I will say that in my judgment there never was a man who presided over that bureau who surpassed Commissioner Burke in any line, whether in understanding the problems of the bureau or in administration, whether from the standpoint of coming into contact with the wards of the Government on the one hand or presenting his problem to the Congress on the other.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to the Indian Bureau as one that ought to be wiped out. I think we are all in favor of that, but we are in favor of taking a little more time than he would take in accomplishing this result. The gentleman has referred to the negro problem and how the work of caring for the negroes in something of a similar paternal way following the Civil War was abandoned after a few years' trial. Well and good. It should have been abandoned. But in the Indian problem you have one that is entirely different from the problem that confronted the country at that time. True enough, millions of negroes were transformed from slaves into free men; they were ignorant, and they were without property. But the case of the negro is not the case of the Indian. First of all, the negroes could speak the language of the community where they had lived in a degree that would permit them to get along, earn a livelihood, and do the work they were accustomed to do.

Not so with the Indian. The negroes were accustomed to living in homes, modest it may be, most of them, but at any rate a home, and the system of the home, and the manner of their living, were factors that modified the problem of transition from a status of slavery to one of freemen. But what of the Indian? We are taking the Indians from the time when they were able to roam over a great continent, a population of possibly 400,000, a time when they earned their livelihood not in the field but by their prowess most of all as huntsmen, and we are asking them to compete in a highly organized age among people who themselves are industriously working to bring from the soil that which will support a large population. The negroes at the close of the Civil War were neighbors to the whites, and fairly evenly scattered amongst a large white population. The Indians never were so scattered. They have held together as tribes speaking their own language and following customs and habits different and apart from their white rivals.

I do not assume we have not made mistakes. We have made many blunders. But to suddenly wipe out the Indian Bureau and forget that we have an Indian problem would be the greatest blunder we could now commit. More, it would be a colossal crime.

What is our problem? When I was a boy and lived in what we call the Palouse country, a fine band of Indians called the Nez Perces had been placed upon their tribal lands. These lands were not allotted at that time but they belonged to the tribe. But the lands turned over to the Indians though now supporting thousands of people were not sufficient to support a comparatively small tribe of some 1,500 Indians in the way they had been accustomed to live.

At that time northern Idaho and eastern Washington were not very thickly populated, and while these Indians had their tribal bounds they roamed over areas of hundreds of thousands of acres beyond those tribal bounds for the purpose of hunting and fishing and gathering fruit for their livelihood and for the coming winter. As a boy I remember seeing them go by our home. In the woods I remember seeing bundles or rolls of mesh—sticks woven together by rawhide—upon which they would dry their fruit or their fish, and then roll the mesh into a bundle and put it into a place where it could be found the succeeding year—100 or 200 miles from where the Indians lived.

Then white people came in, the country settled up, and it was up to our Government to provide some way to help those Indians, to provide them some way to earn their livelihood. These Indians are not pauper Indians. They never have been. Most of them are not yet good farmers, but they are learning. They can not roam and hunt as they did 25 or 35 years ago; they must earn their support from the lands that were allotted to them when their reservation was opened to settlement nearly 30 years ago.

Another picture: A few years ago I fell into conversation on an eastbound train with one of the brightest Indians I ever met, who told me that he came from the Macaw Tribe of Indians over on Puget Sound. He told me some of the tribal history. He pointed back to about 130 years ago when his tribe had a population of 3,000. He related that through the barter of skins and other products to some Spanish traders for clothing the members of his tribe had become infected with smallpox, and that after the scourge had swept over that Indian tribe only one-tenth of the population remained.

He told me further that that was the first introduction of smallpox into the Northwest, and it reduced other tribes in enormous degree. The Indians in their native state had their medicine men and some helpful herbs, but they have not been able to cope with adjustments of what we call civilization.

If you will take up the reports of the Nez Perce Indians you will find that 50 years ago the medical officers of the Government reported that there was not a single case of tuberculosis among them. If you will take up the reports to-day you will find that notwithstanding as much of the outdoor life as they are able to lead the percentage of tuberculosis among the Indians is as great as it is among the white people, and that it is found in active or latent type among probably 90 per cent of the members of that tribe. We have, then, the problem of health to consider.

The problem of education is another one that we must consider. Twenty-five years ago, when I was a boy in that country, there came back to his home people the first Indian boy who had gone away to the Carlisle School, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] referred. He was regarded in the school as one of the brilliant students, one of the ablest men. Yet in less than six months he had gone back to the ways of the wikiup and was living the life of a blanket Indian, and why? Well, the greatest reason was because he did not have fellows to associate with who had had his experience, who had caught the inspiration of scholarship, and who by meeting and association could help, each the other, to maintain it. To-day, in increasing degree, the Indian students bring with them the ideals and benefits of the educational opportunities that they have had, and they are not so inclined to go back to the wikiup. And why? Companionship. The first boy who returned had not a single associate with whom he could talk over the experiences of his school days amid happy surroundings. He was alone. But when it came about that in another few years 10, 15, or 50 young men had the same experience, they were able to form something of a companionship and were able to maintain more of the standard of what we call civilization.

I raised this question in connection with the hearings on this bill, and I was told by the head of the educational service of the Indian Bureau that this phenomenon to-day is looming large. The report shows that to-day there is a larger school population in the Indian schools than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. May I have three or four minutes more?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FRENCH. Not only have we a larger school enrollment than ever before but the children of parents who were given the advantages of school 20 or 30 years ago, even though those parents did not avail themselves much of the ways of the white man's living, are to-day the children readiest in learning in the schools. They not only are the readiest during the first few years, in the beginning of their school work, but all through their school courses they are showing the effects of the training of the parents, although the parents themselves for practical purposes fell back to the life of the tribe.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. If I have the time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman realize that there are now some 20,000 Indian children of school age who are not in school at all?

Mr. FRENCH. In general figures there are 25,000 Indian children who are not in school, of whom 7,000 are physically unfit to be in school.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I mean outside of that number.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman wants the exact figures and I have them for the last fiscal year. There were 91,968 children of school age, of which number 64,943 were in school, 6,279 ineligible on account of illness or deformity, and 20,746 not in school at all.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. We have provided $200,000 additional for those children in this bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] refers to the total amount for the Indian Bureau he will find that nearly half of that, aggregating $5,100,000, is for educational work among the children of the Indians of our country. Surely this great work must not stop.

Nor can our Government immediately withdraw its supervision of Indian property. Indians to-day have property aggregating more than $727,000,000 in value. Many Indians would be as helpless as children in handling their personal estates if left to their own discretion. Some of these Indians want their property turned over to their own disposition as soon as possible. These Indians are spurred on by a horde of sharpers, who would make short shrift of the Indians' burdens. Then what? Well, the next thing many of these Indians would be paupers upon the counties where they live.

No. I am for winding up the affairs of the Indians with the Government as speedily as possible, but sound sense dictates that it will take years of time, patience, and care on our part and the gradual pushing off onto the backs of competent Indians responsibilities that more and more they shall be able to bear.

Another thing, we are paying some attention to irrigation. Gentlemen, we must, whether we like to or not. Water rights are passing away, and unless the Government acts now, Indians will awaken in another 25 years to find that they have land that is desert and no available water with which to irrigate. We must act now if we would protect the interests of our wards in a responsibility that we can not throw aside.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. CARTER. I yield that time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this appropriation bill provides the funds to carry on all the various activities of the Department of the Interior. That department is in many respects a department of public works, because Congress has placed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior a number of bureaus for whose efficient conduct the best engineering talent and a high degree of constructive ability are required. The United States Reclamation Service has built great reservoirs and canal systems. The Indian Service is likewise engaged in the reclamation of waste lands. The Alaskan Railroad is being constructed and operated under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Geological Survey is not only making a study of geological formations but also makes topographic maps of great value. The Bureau of Mines is performing a most beneficial work for the mining industry. All of this constructive effort is essential to the welfare of the Nation and Congress should not be niggardly in providing the necessary funds to enable it to be properly prosecuted in the interest of the entire country.

I want to comment briefly on the attitude of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having charge of this bill with respect to the appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Apparently the members of this subcommittee have been profoundly awed by the Director of the Budget. It seems that, in their opinion, the Budget Director is a grand llama whose edicts they must religiously follow. They have not dared, except in but a few minor instances, to suggest any kind of an increase over the amount allowed in the Budget for the maintenance of this great department.

The subcommittee having charge of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture recently reported a bill which shows that they had a much more independent attitude of mind. That subcommittee reported the Agricultural bill to the House, carrying over $68,000,000, and its action was approved by the House, with only 10 reductions in items authorized by the Budget. These reductions did not amount to anything, except in the appropriations for public roads, the remainder of which will be carried in the next deficiency bill, so that no Federal aid will be lost. But that subcommittee made 10 increases in the Agricultural bill which aggregated $574,700, of which $160,000 was for eradicating the cattle tick and $150,000 for the eradication of the barberry bush.

Now, let us compare this excellent record with that of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriations for the Interior Department. The bill before us contains 67 reductions under the amounts authorized by the Budget, totaling $1,092,000. This subcommittee has made but four increases, three of them out of the Treasury, aggregating $34,400, and one out of Indian tribal funds, amounting to $35,000. Balancing these total increases of but $69,400 against the $574,700 of increases made in the Agricultural bill, am I not justified in saying that this subcommittee did not have either the initiative or the independence which the agricultural subcommittee has conclusively shown that it possessed?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Arizona realize that what he is saying is a splendid tribute to this subcommittee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Upon the contrary, I am paying my tribute to the subcommittee which had in charge the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, which exercised its own independent judgment. Its members looked into the facts, ascertained what was necessary to be done, and did not hesitate to disagree with the Director of the Budget. They boldly increased essential appropriations, and the House approved of every one of their recommendations. This subcommittee has timidly refused to go beyond the sums stated in the Budget. They were no more responsive to appeals for additional funds than a blank wall. Regardless of the merits of any proposal, if it was not in the sacred Budget it was not to be even considered.

I hope that next year the members of this subcommittee will cultivate a more open mind. It may be that in the rush of a short session of Congress they have not had the time to make independent investigations of the needs of the public service. But I trust that next December they will go outside of the limited data contained in the Budget and see for themselves what is needed. Let the subcommittee exercise its own judgment, because I am sure that the House will have more confidence in any independent conclusions that its Members may reach than we have in the Director of the Budget.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has paid a tribute to the subcommittee by saying that he has more confidence in their opinion than that of the Budget. Of course, he will follow them without question in all the reductions which they have made.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may follow the subcommittee in a great many instances, but what I want the members of the subcommittee to do is to exercise their own mental faculties. I have confidence in them as men and Members of this House. We have reposed a trust in them and I desire that they shall fully exercise the power that has been granted and to do what in their best judgment ought to be done instead of arbitrarily limiting the scope of their authority by an unyielding determination not to go beyond that which has been authorized by the Budget.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INDIAN SERVICE.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] a few moments ago submitted some remarks on the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I should like to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that of the $11,000,000 carried in this bill for appropriations out of the Treasury for the Indian Service $5,200,000 is expended for the education of the Indians.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How does the gentleman know that the $1,977,000 for the general school fund is used for education?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because it is all devoted to that purpose.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is not some of it devoted to and used for stockmen and farmers? It has been used in part for that purpose.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no. The appropriation for the school is a specific appropriation to be used only for schools, and the stockmen and farmers come under another item in the bill—under the industrial appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. In addition to the $5,200,000 appropriated for education over $2,000,000 is devoted to Indian irrigation developments of one character or another. So that over $7,000,000 of the $11,000,000 contained in the gratuity appropriations for the Indian Bureau are for these two most useful and civilizing purposes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has given the House much alleged information about the Indian problem. I would be pleased to know how and where he acquired it, whether by reading what somebody else has written or by talking with somebody who has been on the Indian reservations, or whether he made any investigations for himself?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows where I got most of this information. I sat with him on the Indian Affairs Committee for two years and I have been on the reservations and visited the schools.

Mr. HAYDEN. How many reservations and schools?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. A number of them. I spent several weeks at the Carlisle School and I have been on some of the western reservations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which Indian reservations?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The Crow and the Blackfeet.

Mr. HAYDEN. Those are the only two? The gentleman has personally visited the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania and the Crow and Blackfeet Reservations in Montana?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. And for two years I made extensive study with the gentleman on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I served with the gentleman on that committee and listened to the testimony of many witnesses, but I want to say to the gentleman that one look is better than a thousand words. If one goes upon the reservations he can see and know the facts, but when some one else tells about the conditions there, without a background of experience, no man can form a mental picture of the situation or reach an accurate understanding of the facts.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield to me, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that the farmers are provided for under the industrial item on page 25.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I shall quote a statement by the assistant commissioner where he says that he took out of this education fund a sum for stockmen and farmers.

Mr. HAYDEN. The opinions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are not based on any intimate personal knowledge of actual conditions on the Indian reservations. He confesses that he has been to but one school and to but two reservations. Therefore the conclusions which the gentleman has submitted to this House must not be taken as seriously as though they were based upon information which he had acquired himself. His views are founded upon what somebody else told him. He brings practically nothing but secondhand information. It is hearsay evidence that he has presented to the House. Those of us who have personally visited many Indian reservations, who have seen the Indian school system in actual operation, who know of the good work done in reclamation of lands, and who have observed the conduct of the business of the Indian Service generally, will not confirm the very serious charges made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania against the Indian Bureau.

This bill very properly carries the sum that it does for education, which is almost half of the total of the appropriations for the Indian Bureau. The only way to qualify the rising generation of Indians for citizenship is to send them to Indian schools. The gentleman himself, if he were to visit the reservations in the Southwest, where there are many thousands of non-English-speaking Indians, would be the last one to urge that Congress dispense with the present school system. That would also be true if he actually saw the successful Indian irrigation projects there in operation. He happened to go upon two projects situated in the far north where even white men have not made a success of irrigation and therefore he condemns all irrigation projects in other places. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON].

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a strong point upon the number of employees that this department has. Has the gentleman any information as to the work that has been accomplished, for instance, under the appropriations for reclamation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to furnish the gentleman from Utah with any information of that kind that he may desire.

Mr. COLTON. Are there a larger number of employees than is required to do consistently what is being done under the department?

Mr. HAYDEN. My judgment is that if the scale of salaries were higher for positions in the Indian Service there would undoubtedly be more efficiency among the employees. The rates of pay are low and are fixed by a basis which was established a long time ago. So far as the building of irrigation systems or any other constructive work done on the reservations are concerned, I am sure that the Indian Service gets as good results for the money expended as does the Reclamation Service or any other branch of the Government engaged in like public works.

THE SALT RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT, ARIZONA.

There is a very remarkable statement in the hearings to which I want to direct the attention of the House, in order to correct a serious misapprehension of the facts. I refer to the hearings, where the chairman of this subcommittee questioned the Director of the United States Reclamation Service on the conduct of the affairs of that bureau.

Mr. SNELL. On what page?

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 619. These remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee refer to the Salt River reclamation project in Arizona:

> Mr. CRAMTON. So that, in this case, the Government took all of the chances, put in millions and millions of dollars, loaned the money without interest, gave them 20 years in which to repay it, and then postponed for 10 years the beginning of any payments, and with no interest running; constructed a power project; planned and financed it; made a success of it, and then turned the power project over to the water users in order that they might use the receipts from the power project to pay for the land made tremendously valuable by irrigation?

Then a little later in the hearings the gentleman from Michigan says that the water users under that project might be termed "profiteers."

Complaint is not only made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] but I have heard it made elsewhere, that the Salt River project should have been declared completed much sooner than it was, and reimbursement begun by the water users. That project, instead of being completed in 1910, as the gentleman from Michigan stated in the hearings, was never actually completed by the Reclamation Service. According to the tenth annual report of the Director of the Reclamation Service, the contractor finished work on the Roosevelt Dam on February 5, 1911. On March 10, 1911, the dam was dedicated by President Roosevelt, so that particular feature of the project was completed at that time. The project was officially declared completed, although, in fact, much construction remained to be done, and turned over to the water users on November 1, 1917. Between 1911 and 1917 there is a period of 6 years instead of 10 years, as the gentleman has asserted, wherein there was apparently no repayment to the United States.

But let us look a little further into the financial relations of the Salt River project to the Government. On the 30th of June, 1911, this report of the Director of the Reclamation Service shows that there had been expended on that project $9,878,521. Had the Salt River project been declared completed at that time, that is the sum of money that would have been required to be reimbursed to the United States. But it was by no means completed, and that is the very good reason why repayments were not commenced. It was not completed in any sense until 1917, and then, as I have said, the project was not finished. At that time the construction expenditures from the reclamation fund had risen to $12,744,222, which was an increase of $2,865,701 over the total construction charge in 1911. This conclusively proves that the gentleman from Michigan was mistaken, because if the Salt River project was completed in 1911, why was it necessary to expend nearly $3,000,000 additional on its construction?

Within that period of six years the Reclamation Service had been collecting rental charges for the use of water, and actually collecting more than it cost to operate and maintain the project. These reports of the Director of the Reclamation Service which I have before me show that between 1911 and 1917 over $1,600,000 was collected from the water users of the Salt River project in excess of what was actually necessary to pay for the cost of delivering water to their lands. So that, according to the records, there was a repayment to the reclamation fund within that six-year period of that sum of money.

If the Salt River project had been declared completed in 1911 and payments had begun under the terms of the reclamation act, 2 per cent for four years and 4 per cent for two years, instead of there being returned to the reclamation fund over $1,600,000, the net repayments would have been $1,580,563. Therefore by not opening the project by a public notice and by collecting excess money on rental contracts from the water users during that six-year period more money was actually re-

turned to the reclamation fund than there would have been if the Salt River project had been declared completed in 1911.

The gentleman from Michigan apparently was not aware of these facts. I am sure that he did not want to intentionally do any injustice to the water users of the Salt River project, but in making such statements he has done them a great wrong. The figures which I have presented clearly show that the water users during that six-year period were not "profiteers" but actually paid more money into the reclamation fund than the reimbursement would have been if the plan about which he now complains had not been adopted.

To read what the gentleman from Michigan has said anyone would conclude that the entire cost of all power developments on the Salt River project had been paid from the reclamation fund, but such is not the fact. The Reclamation Service expended on the hydroelectric plants a little over $2,843,000 prior to 1911. They were not completed and could not produce power in any substantiated amount. They were of practically no value. The project manager stated that no more money could be obtained from the reclamation fund for that purpose, so the water users on the project voluntarily assessed themselves $1,200,000 and completed the power development as planned. Being completed and in operation these power plants have produced a substantial revenue, the benefit of which the project has very properly enjoyed.

The Salt River project was turned over to the water users in November, 1917, but the price fixed in the contract was not the gross construction cost of $12,744,222. It was that sum less the total amount paid in by the water users toward construction, or a net construction charge of $10,548,119, repayable to the reclamation fund in 20 years. That is the amount charged against the project in 1917, but it was not a completed project. Since 1917 the water users have assessed themselves $2,146,000 for additional construction which has been determined to be absolutely necessary.

I am not referring to the operation and maintenance charges. I am not referring to the money that has been raised to pay the $600,000 which has been returned to the reclamation fund. I am referring to such burdens as the assessments levied to the extent of over $400,000 to install pumps and drain out water-logged land. It was necessary to expend $1,500,000 in additions to the power plants, and that was done. Drainage ditches and numerous other works were carried out on the project to complete it. So far as the farmers on the Salt River project are concerned, they have paid out more money from their own pockets than the farmers on any other reclamation project in the United States.

If the gentleman from Michigan will take into consideration the fact that the water users of the Salt River project have borne a great financial burden all the time during the past 10 years, if he will understand that the Government did not hand over to them a completed project, and that they were of necessity compelled to complete it with their own funds, he will not have the temerity to again assert, as he did during the hearings, that they have obtained vast benefits without effort or expense on their part.

I can understand how the gentleman and others who have made similar assertions have fallen into this error. They read the annual reports of the Director of the Reclamation Service and note that over $10,000,000 has been expended by the United States, of which only $600,000 has been repaid, and then jump to the conclusion that the water users of the Salt River project have not done their full duty toward the Government. But let us look at the situation of the individual water user on that project. What he is interested in is not so much how the money is divided after it is collected from him, but the total amount which he has to pay each year.

The last annual report of the United States Reclamation Service shows that during the past three years there has been collected from the water users of the Salt River project in assessments the total sum of $2,246,726, of which $610,717 was paid to the Government for the purpose of reimbursing the reclamation fund for the cost of the construction of the project. It is not a fair statement of the financial relationship between the water users and the Reclamation Service to mention nothing except this $610,000 and to utterly ignore the more than $2,000,000 which these same farmers have also contributed to the improvement of an uncompleted project.

The fact that the water users of the Salt River project have been able to pay these large assessments is conclusive proof that the Salt River project is a financial and economic success. The farmers on that project have suffered the same hardships as the producers of agricultural products elsewhere in the United States due to the great deflation in prices, but under ordinary conditions they can and will bring wealth from the soil sufficient to meet all of their future obligations to the Government.

The results that have thus far been obtained on the Salt River project completely justify a continuation of the reclamation of arid lands as a great national policy. The water users of the Salt River Valley are fully aware of the fact that all of the money which they repay to the reclamation fund is immediately used toward providing water for the irrigation of other lands in the West, where other American citizens are creating homes in what was once a desert. They are anxious to see this good work continue and can be counted upon to do their full share, as they have in the past, toward the accomplishment of this most beneficent purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not understand that the gentleman can reserve any time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I supposed that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who is not present at the moment, might want to use some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will ask the Chair to remind me when I have used 14 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the pending bill, which provides for carrying on all the activities of the Department of the Interior, appears for the second time in its present form, the second year in which the present policy has been followed. Naturally the bill carries many items of very great interest to the Members of the House and particularly to Members from the West, and it is easy to see that there can be a wide difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the amounts passed by the committee.

That has been illustrated this morning by the vigorous attack made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] upon the appropriations for the Indian Service, which he characterizes as entirely too large and as amounts which should be wiped out wholly, and, on the other hand, the protest of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that in many cases we have not gone beyond the figures presented by the Budget Bureau. I want to take a minute in which to say this: It has been the desire of the subcommittee who framed this bill to keep in mind always that there confronts the Treasury of the United States to-day, as much as at any time in the last three or four years and as much as at any time in the history of the Government, the need for absolute economy. It is necessary, as the President pointed out in his message accompanying the Budget, to keep even our expenditures below our receipts. We can not afford now to provide any new taxes, and the only alternative is to see that the appropriations made by this Congress are within the estimated revenues of the Government. And in order to accomplish that purpose of securing the greatest measure of economy with the proper conduct of the Government the Congress a year or two ago organized the Budget Bureau, not as a puppet to be knocked down but as the servant of Congress to aid in carrying into effect its policy of retrenchment.

Having been created for that purpose, and having secured the services of a gentleman as the head of the Budget Bureau, General Lord, who is performing his duty in an admirable and successful way, it is the duty of this subcommittee, and the duty of the House as well, to give their support and indorsement to his work. The aim of the subcommittee has been to supplement the economies that the Budget has recommended, rather than to do away with and defeat the economies that it has indorsed. Hence the occasions where the amounts recommended by the Budget have been increased by the committee have been very rare indeed.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a vigorous attack upon the expenditures for the Indians. The Indian problem has been one that has been with the Government for many generations. In fact, since Columbus first touched our shores the problem has been what should be done by the white race with the race that originally owned this continent. It is a problem in the working out of which there have been many mistakes, and it is not the province of the subcommittee to defend all those who have made mistakes. The Congress has created agencies and policies have been adopted, and I think it is safe to say that never in our history has there been any one at the head of the Indian Bureau who has been trying more conscientiously to economize with the money of the people of the

country and at the same time to do the utmost for the final working out of this problem than Mr. Burke, who is now Commissioner of Indian Affairs. [Applause.]

The appropriations at present for the Indian Bureau are only about $7,191,000—the gratuity items. Those are items that are not paid for by the Indians and are not reimbursable. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would make us understand that we are making these appropriations mount constantly to greater figures, but in 1920 they were $7,501,095 and in the bill before us they are only $7,191,375. The gratuity items and the reimbursable items total together about $10,000,000. For schools and education the appropriations are between $4,000,000 and $5,000,000.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania have the Government cease to educate the Indian, to make him capable of self-support? For irrigation $2,500,000 is appropriated. Would the gentleman have us try to turn the Indian adrift without industrial preparation? For administration, we appropriate $3,000,000 for caring for several hundred thousand Indians. Medical relief, $370,000. The gentleman's speech carried to its logical conclusion would mean the elimination of that item altogether.

What are we doing with the Indians now? Are we making any progress? Are we adopting any better methods? There are now 43,000 Indians cultivating 900,000 acres of land themselves as against only 20,000, 10 years ago cultivating 550,000 acres.

The number of full-blood Indians has increased from 160,000 in 1912 to 165,000 now. The total property of the Indians amounts to about $1,000,000,000.

The death rate in 1913 was 32 to the thousand and in 1920 only 22 to the thousand. The first hospital that we provided for the Indians was in 1882. Now there are 78 hospitals that treated 20,000 Indians last year.

In 1911, only about 10 years ago, $40,000 was the total appropriation for the health of the Indians. Now it amounts to $370,000.

There are 20,000 Indian children not in the schools. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] says we should wipe out all those schools and turn the Indian children adrift. Yet he complains that there are as many as 20,000 now adrift.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I regret that I can not. I gave the gentleman more time than I reserved for myself. This year there are 3,000 more Indian children in school than there were a year ago, and this bill to which the gentleman objects because it is increased in amount provides for taking care of more of those 20,000 children that are adrift than ever were provided for before. The gentleman protests against this bill as too large, and the only increases in it are for education, to provide more school facilities for the Indians, and for increased irrigation to provide for their industrial preparedness.

As to that irrigation, only those items have been considered that are already under construction and that need to be completed in order to make some use of money heretofore appropriated. Only those projects have been considered either by the Indian Office or by this subcommittee.

Let me say this one word as to the success in educating the Indians. Commissioner Burke says there can not be any question about the benefits of education among the Indians; that that policy is necessary to make them self-supporting. Read his statement in the hearings. Mr. Burke lived for years in the West. He was 10 years in this House, and was head of the Committee on Indian Affairs of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is now a member, and since he has been Indian Commissioner he has visited practically every school and reservation except those in Oklahoma. He knows what he is talking about. Read his indorsement of the success of education among the Indians. Then if you are not satisfied with that, take the indorsement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], himself of Indian blood. There is no man in the country better fitted to discuss that subject, and he gives unqualified indorsement to the program of Indian education. [Applause.]

In the few minutes I have I can only touch upon one or two other activities which are provided for in this bill, those which I think most interesting to the House.

The bill also carries the appropriation for pensions. You will be interested to know that 21 years ago our pension roll had the largest number of pensioners upon it of any time in the history of our pension legislation. In 1902 there were 999,446 persons on the pension roll. Still it was not until 1921 that the amount spent for pensions was the greatest, and that was $260,110,747.22. Even that was not the peak, because the Bursum bill that is just about to become a law will cause us to spend next year, in 1924, between $300,000,000 and $400,000,000 for pensions.

The pensioners of the Civil War are particularly close to the hearts of Members of Congress. In 1918 the number of them on the rolls was 591,793. Death has so rapidly cut their ranks that in 1922 they were reduced to 466,075, and they are going at the rate of more than 20,000 a month.

The Patent Office is another activity of the Interior Department. In 1919, three years ago, the total number of patent applications was 62,735. Last year that number was increased to 88,243, 40.6 per cent increase. Applications with reference to designs increased from 2,787 to 5,645, or a 102 per cent increase. Trade-mark applications increased from 8,561 to 17,029, an increase of 99 per cent. Still the showing made before this committee was that the Patent Office, with that tremendous increase in the number of applications and some increase in clerical force, is making gains upon its work of catching up, and the gains are even entirely beyond the increased personnel given to that office.

The Bureau of Education carries only $644,000 in the pending bill, an increase of only $23,000. That bureau touches all of the educational facilities of the country, the millions of school children, and your subcommittee are satisfied that the new Commissioner of Education is a man who has put great judgment and energy into the discharge of the duties of his office and that the money will be well expended.

The question of reclamation is one that is of great interest to the country, particularly to the West. The policy of this committee this year is the same as last year. Its policy was adopted this year by the Budget Office; that is, the policy of making appropriations in such an amount that the people of the West who are interested in these projects can feel sure that the work will be done for which appropriations are made. Before the appropriations were so large an amount the reclamation fund had insufficient money coming in, and hence there was often disappointment and complaint. We are satisfied there will be money enough in the fund for which we are appropriating and that the work here provided for will be carried on.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Very briefly.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. What is the total amount in the fund?

Mr. CRAMTON. The appropration is $12,250,000. In connection with this your committee are fully satisfied of the importance of the reclamation work and of its success; but I want to sound a word of warning to the West represented by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and others, that they who seek from Congress a great advance in reclamation, who seek money to be appropriated by Congress for this purpose, might better put their reclamation work on a business basis. [Applause.] Let the money that Congress appropriates bear interest if they want to borrow from the Government. Let them borrow the money of the Government at a lower rate of interest than they can get it anywhere else, but let it bear interest, and having borrowed that money let them pay it back at some time.

In connection with that I want to call your attention to one fact. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] spoke about the Salt River project and felt that we had not been entirely fair as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want only one minute for this. On page 61 of the hearings the Director of Reclamation says there was a dependable water supply available on the Salt River project in 1910, but the first public notice was not given until 1917, seven years thereafter, and no payments became due until such public notice.

And still this chart [pointing] shows that the Salt River project has produced in farm values more than any other reclamation project in the country, including the famous $1.25-a-pound cotton in war-time periods. Here is a representation of the construction cost that has been repaid, less than $1,000,000 on a cost of $10,000,000 to the Government. But the commodities produced run to $81,000,000. Why under heaven's name should not they be paying back to the Government the money to be used for other reclamation projects? The same and probably more could be said of the Uncompahgre project shown down here. There are farm products worth $16,000,000 on a $6,000,000 construction cost, and not one red cent has been paid back into the Treasury.

Now the Alaskan Railroad is included. We have provided for that and its completion of construction and for the deficit estimated in its operation. We feel that the railroad is making a favorable showing under the difficulties it faces, and I regret that the opportunity does not give me time to go into the details, but those will be reached later on in the bill.

The total of the bill provides an expenditure of $294,265,300—a reduction of $2,241,765 under the current year's expenditure and $1,092,000 below the estimate of the Budget. We are glad to have been able to supplement the work of the Budget to that extent and hope to have the indorsement of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

SALARIES.

Secretary of the Interior, $12,000; First Assistant Secretary, $5,000; Assistant Secretary, $4,500; chief clerk, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretaries, $3,500; assistant to the Secretary, $2,750; private secretary to the Secretary, $2,500; assistant attorney, $2,500; two special inspectors (whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the department), at $2,500 each; 6 inspectors, at $2,500 each; chief disbursing clerk, $2,500; chiefs of divisions—1 of supplies, $2,250, 1 of appointments, mails, and files, $2,250, and 1 of publications, $2,250; expert accountant, $2,000; clerks—4 at $2,000 each, 12 of class 4, 2 at $1,740 each, 14 of class 3, 20 of class 2, 1 $1,320, 20 of class 1, 1 $1,140, 3 at $1,000 each; returns office clerk, $1,600; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, $1,200; 8 copyists, at $900 each; multigraph operator, $900; assistant multigraph operator, $720; 2 telephone switchboard operators, at $720 each; automobile mechanic, $1,400; chauffeurs—1 $1,080, 8 at $720 each; 12 messengers, at $840 each; 6 assistant messengers, at $720 each; laborers—3 at $660 each, 1 $600; messenger boys—1 $540, 3 at $420 each; 5 packers, at $660 each; clerk to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, $1,200; in all, $221,520.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to inquire about the reduction in the salary of the chief clerk of the Interior Department. I understand there has been a cut of $500 in the pay of Mr. Harvey.

Mr. CRAMTON. The chief clerk has heretofore had $4,000, which included $500 as superintendent of buildings. Last year the custody of the four large buildings of that department was transferred from the Interior to the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Buildings, and that transfer is to be continued. These duties being no longer incumbent upon Mr. Harvey as superintendent, we felt that the $500 that went with it should be dropped out.

Mr. HAYDEN. How does this salary compare with the salaries of the chief clerks of other departments?

Mr. CRAMTON. The chief clerk of the State Department has $3,000. The chief clerk of the War Department has $4,000. The chief clerk of the Navy Department has $3,000. The chief clerk of the Treasury Department has $4,000. The chief clerk of the Post Office Department has $4,000. The chief clerk of the Department of Justice has $3,500, and the chief clerk of the Agricultural Department has $3,500. The chief clerk of the Department of Commerce has $3,000, and the chief clerk of the Department of Labor has $3,000. There are three departments where the chief clerk has a salary higher than $3,500.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not true that in the three departments where the salary is $4,000 the chief clerks have no more important duties or greater responsibilities than in this department? Does it not require the same degree of ability to be the chief clerk of the Interior Department as is required in the War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Post Office Department?

Mr. CRAMTON. The committee felt that $3,500 was in keeping with the ability of the gentleman and the responsibility that he has.

Mr. HAYDEN. The chief clerk of the Interior Department has as responsible a position as that of any other chief clerk. It seems to me to be exceedingly small to make a cut of $500 in a salary which has been paid for many years merely because a very minor duty has been done away with. If it was true that he had been relieved of a large part of his duties that might justify the reduction. But when he has practically the same work and the same responsibilities, I think he should retain the full salary. Where is the place in the bill that this salary is provided for? Apparently it is in line 8, page 2.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out on line 8, page 2, the figures $3,500 and inserting $4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out $3,500 and insert $4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR.

Salaries: Three members of a board of appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at $4,000 each; assistant attorneys—1 $3,000, 2 at $2,750 each, 4 at $2,500 each, 7 at $2,250 each, 11 at $2,000 each; medical expert, $2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 6 of class 3 (1 of whom shall act as stenographer and 1 of whom shall be a stenographer and typewriter), 3 of class 2, 1 of class 1; copyist, $900; messenger, $840; 3 assistant messengers, at $720 each; in all, $90,950.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that for this office of solicitor in the paragraph just read there is allowed the sum of $90,950. That is in keeping with the rule with regard to almost every department of the Government. They are gradually year after year building up a system of having an enormous force of legal advisers in every bureau of their own department irrespective of access to the legal advice in other departments of the Government and their access to the Department of Justice legal experts, an army of which we have provided. I want to call the chairman's attention to this provision where we provide three members of a board of appeals, at $4,000 each per year, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, which has been carried in the bill heretofore. Just what function does this board of appeals perform? I notice that you passed over this $90,500,000 in the hearings with just a casual observation.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that that has been in the bill for a great many years. These appeals are taken from various bureaus to the Secretary and are mostly Land Office matters, as I now recall.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that in the Land Office a proper appeal is there provided for and they have legal advisers in the Land Office.

Mr. CARTER. When they come here they have the right to appeal to the Secretary, and it goes to the board of appeals. I expect my friend from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] can give better information in relation to this subject than I can.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. For a great many years there has been something of a controversy in the West as to whether or not land disputes should be handled in separate land courts or handled by the registrars and receivers of land offices in the first instance, then with permission of appeal to the commissioner's office, and permission of appeal from there to the Secretary of the Interior. From the decision of the Secretary of the Interior appeal may be made to the Federal courts. There has been a very strong contention on the part of many that this matter of appeal from the registrars and receivers should go direct to some kind of land court, as has been suggested. However, the sentiment in favor of it has not been controlling, and the Congress has not provided the separate land court; but we do have in the Interior Department what might be called two courts. One of them is in connection with the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office——

Mr. BLANTON. That was the point that I called attention to, as I thought the one there sufficient.

Mr. FRENCH. And the other one under the Secretary of the Interior and to which reference is made here. This board is made up of men of very high class, who are thoroughly familiar with the public land laws, and I refer to the public land laws especially, because the bulk of the work that this board has to do arises from the public-land litigations throughout the United States. This board is made up of high-class men, and it helps the department to steer a consistent course touching the patenting of the public domain under the various land laws and the adjudication of rights that arise under the various laws of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. If I understand the gentleman, he admits that the controversies arise first in the registrar and receiver's office?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I would say——

Mr. BLANTON. And then they are passed on to the land commissioner's office. There he has a force of legal experts who pass on the controversy, and they decide the matter by affirming or setting aside the award. And they are provided with another appellate court, as it were, in this board of appeals in the Secretary's office?

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will permit, it is really the supreme court of the Interior Department.

Mr. BLANTON. We are having too many supreme courts in the various departments of the Government.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me make this suggestion, that while I said that the registrar and receiver are charged with the first responsibility for the most part, there is no controversy. For the most part the entries that are made pass on to final patent and consummation without any controversy.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; and the gentleman is sufficiently familiar with the business of the Public Land Office to know that most of the controversies are settled in the registrar and receivers' office in the first instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of these controversies are settled in the first instance in the office of the registrar and receiver, but the ones that fail of settlement there go on up through this system of appeals. There is too much duplication. I take it that we ought to have but one appellate tribunal in this department. The one in the Land Office ought to be sufficient. Then, if we are to permit the parties aggrieved to go to any other court, we ought to force them to carry their appeals to the courts of the land for final adjudication, as is now done in some States, like Texas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken; they have no rights to go into the courts at all. The disposition of public land is in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. He can let a man obtain a patent or not. The man can not go to the court and get a patent.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about getting a patent, but about getting a final judgment in a court.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not with respect to the disposition of public lands. That is an administrative function, and the duty devolves on the Secretary of the Interior, and this board of appeals provides the law for the Secretary.

Mr. BLANTON. And after all they have a final supreme arbiter in the gentleman's committee by coming to Congress, and the gentleman from Arizona takes care of them by bringing in special bills, most of which he gets through because he stands up here and fights for them until he does get them through.

The point that I am making is that we are having too many attorneys in every single department of this Government. Besides having numerous legal experts in the Land Office, I call attention to the fact that in the Secretary's office, under this heading of solicitor, we have three persons appointed by the Secretary of the Interior at $4,000 each; assistant attorneys—1 at $3,000, which is the salary of a circuit judge in many of the States, 2 lawyers at $2,750 each, 4 lawyers at $2,500 each, 7 lawyers at $2,250 each, and 11 lawyers at $2,000 each. They are supposed to be legal experts, and many additional ones are provided for other bureaus in this department; and I want to tell you the practice is growing in every single department and bureau of this Government, and if we do not watch out we never will be able to collect enough taxes to pay the expenses of the Government.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman would not have the Secretary of the Interior the final arbiter in the Land Office without giving him a legal department to settle the questions?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, certainly he has another legal department in the Land Office.

Mr. COLTON. That is under the supervision of the commissioner.

Mr. BLANTON. How many legal departments do we want? In the gentleman's State, if it is anything like my own, he has a court of appeals and a supreme court, and that is the end of it.

Mr. COLTON. That is it, exactly. The registrar and receivers, of course, may be compared to the justice of the peace court. Then you have your district court.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is in substance the trial court—the register and receivers' office—because all of the facts are developed in the proceedings held in that office. Then they go to the Land Office for review, and there it ought to end.

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman is not quite right. The registrar and receiver are not authorized to make final decisions. They make recommendations.

Mr. BLANTON. It is after all really the trial court, because the facts are developed there upon which the whole controversy is to be finally determined.

Mr. COLTON. But they simply act as referees and make recommendations to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, so that is really the first course.

Mr. BLANTON. I repeat what I said in the beginning. I believe we are having too many lawyers in most of these bureaus and departments of the Government, and I think the committees ought to watch each bureau every time they frame an appropriation bill. Now in the hearings this whole item of $90,950 was dismissed with just one little careless observation from one member of the committee. He asked one question about this great department of lawyers costing $90,950 of the people's money, and the matter was then dismissed, and the committee passed on to something else. Our committee, I think, ought to watch this legal expert part of all the bureaus in every single bill which they bring in here.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated the procedure followed in connection with land matters. I make this further observation, that the registers and receivers are not necessarily lawyers. Oftentimes they are not lawyers, and as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] said, they act rather in the capacity of referees in obtaining the information upon which the office of Commissioner of the General Land Office acts.

Again, the work of this board of appeals in the Secretary's office does not confine itself altogether to the work of the Land Office. While that is a large part of the work, yet there are many bureaus under the Department of the Interior, and from the best legal advice within these different bureaus appeals are sometimes made. The Patent Office, for instance, is an important one, and the Pension Office is an important one, and the Mining Bureau is an important one. It is true that the Commissioner of the General Land Office is given legal advice and a board to assist him in decisions, yet that board has to do with land matters alone, whereas this board of appeals has to do with appeals taken from the different bureaus on matters upon which the Secretary of the Interior himself must, under the law, pass, and he is charged with this great responsibility.

Let me make this further observation: The board of appeals has so much work to do that until the last few years one of the greatest complaints throughout the West was about the tardiness with which that board was able to pass upon decisions to be made by the office of the Secretary. The department was two or three years behind. The Land Office work was congested in the land offices and congested in the board that was responsible to the Secretary; and your committee is satisfied that just now, although the work is being brought more nearly current than it has been for many years past, it presents such a demand upon the Government in cases that ought to be heard expeditiously that we can not at this time reduce the item.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my attention was drawn to this item of $68,250 and the language of this paragraph, and it struck me that there is a great plethora of lawyers, composed of clerks and solicitors and assistant attorneys, of which there are 11 at $2,000 each. I have heard a great deal about the skill and the qualifications of lawyers, but I wonder how they are able to employ lawyers at $2,000 each whose advice and legal knowledge is worth anything. I would like if the chairman of the subcommittee would explain, so that we at least understand it better—myself and other members of the committee.

It was stated and admitted by the members of the committee that this department was handling appeals where the evidence was assembled in the Land Office. It looks to me as if it were a duplication of the provision on page 8, under the title of the General Land Office. You will find there an assistant commissioner at $3,500, a chief clerk at $3,000, a chief law clerk at $2,500, and two law clerks at $2,200. It seemed to me that there was a duplication of work, and it is stated there that there are three law examiners under the surveyors general and district land offices—the same identical functions that are said to be performed by the lawyers whose aggregate salaries amount to $68,250 on page 3 under the title of "Office of the solicitor." Is

that right? Can the gentleman from Idaho tell us? Is that a duplication?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the committee has tried to guard against duplication, and I am of opinion that there is no duplication of work along the line the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] has suggested. In the bill we carried several items under the heading of assistant attorneys—1 at $3,000, 2 at $2,750, 4 at $2,500, and 7 at $2,250.

The gentleman must know that the more numerous of these classes referred to are lawyers who are qualified largely as clerks, as well as attorneys, who at this time are giving their time essentially to assisting the more responsible attorneys in the department who pass upon the decisions, briefing the decisions, maybe, looking up citations, maybe, briefing citations, it may be, doing work that must fall upon as high a class of attorney clerk as can be employed by the bureau as assistants to the more responsible board of appeals or the more responsible attorneys connected with the office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there further?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I wanted to say also that these clerks and attorneys are engaged in answering correspondence from Congressmen and from people all over the country, and giving them legal opinions to help them in their private letters.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I think the gentleman is right, absolutely right, on account of some of the things I have had from this department. They must have been written by $2,000 men, or even $1,000 men, because it would seem to me you could not employ any lawyer who had any efficiency or competency who could be guilty of writing such letters. I do not see how you could get a competent lawyer for $2,000, unless he wanted to eke out a little money to assist him through a law school here—at the George Washington University, for example—which would be a commendable thing. But I find myself wondering and still wondering, although it is not strictly pertinent to this subject, how long it would take for one of these $2,000 men to graduate into a $30,000 man with the Shipping Board. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. About five minutes. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

For contingent expenses of the office of the Secretary and the bureaus, offices, and buildings of the department: furniture, carpets, ice, lumber, hardware, dry goods, advertising, telegraphing, street-car fares not exceeding $250, and expressage; for the purchase for the use of the Secretary of the Interior, at a cost not to exceed $5,000, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof; not exceeding $500 shall be available for the payment of damages caused to private property by department motor vehicles exclusive of those operated by the Government fuel yards; purchase and exchange of motor trucks, motor cycles, and bicycles, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motor trucks, motor cycles, and bicycles, to be used only for official purposes; diagrams, awnings, filing and labor-saving devices; constructing model and other cases and furniture; and other absolutely necessary expenses not hereinbefore provided for, including traveling expenses, fuel and lights, typewriting and labor-saving machines, $79,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 3, beginning with line 25, the following language:

For the purchase for the use of the Secretary of the Interior, at a cost not to exceed $5,000, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 25, after the semicolon strike out the remainder of line 25, and all of lines 1, 2, and 3, to and including the word "thereof" in line 4, on page 4.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, after the war ceased I was hopeful that we would stop the habit of granting $5,000 automobiles to various of our public officers. I think we ought to quit it. We pay our Cabinet officers $12,000 a year, or $4,500 more than a Representative or Senator gets. Then we grant them these $5,000 cars, and maintenance, and then they draft a civil employee, who draws another salary from the Government, to drive the car for them in many cases. This provision shows conclusively that the Secretary already has a car furnished by the Government. It has not been long since it was bought. If the committee will look it up they will see that it has been used by him only a comparatively short time. Yet this $5,000 is not to buy a new car, but it is just to pay the difference between his present car and a new one in exchange. I have a car, which I had to pay for myself, that I have been using a couple of years. It stands over at the House Office Building every day, out in the weather, and, of course, it was not looking very good. So I took it to the Studebaker Co. down here to see what they would allow me for it in exchange for a new one. They said they could allow me only $500 for it. That is all they would allow me, but I took it to an expert painter and paid him $50, and he painted it for me, and it now looks just as good as a new one and I am going to drive it two more years. I should think maybe the Secretary could have his car painted up, and it would not cost this Government $5,000 more in exchange. I am not picayunish. I believe in fellows spending their own money just as extravagantly as they want to, but I do not think we ought to spend this $5,000 of public money to enable our Secretary of the Interior to exchange his car, when the money comes out of the people's taxes. We ought to quit it. How long are we going to keep it up? It is just a continual increase of the number of officers for whom we allow these cars. I think the time has come when we ought to pin right down and cut them off. Let them furnish their own cars. Let them furnish everything else that other people furnish. Pay them their salaries, but when we pay them their salaries let us stop and not just keep adding these extras year after year. I think it ought to go out.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will only say that the only thing furnished to the Department of the Interior was an authorization for the department to secure one from the War Department. The statement set forth in the hearings is that when the Interior Department endeavored to obtain the new Cadillac, pursuant to the appropriation act, they were informed that there were no new cars on hand, but that a used limousine could be obtained at Camp Holabird or that a touring car could be had at Camp Jeffersonville, Ind. On delivery of the latter car it was found that it had been used very slightly, but that it is a very old model, paint badly worn, and aged, and that it is such an old type that the wheels, tires, and most of the principal parts are entirely different from the present Cadillac models. Your committee has simply desired to give this Cabinet officer the same courtesy that has been extended to other Cabinet officials.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The list price of a new Cadillac touring car, if I am not mistaken, is now $2,485, delivered. Yet we are proposing to allow the Secretary of the Interior $5,000 cash to use in exchanging his present car for a new one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 9, noes 11.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the chairman [Mr. CRAMTON] of the subcommittee in charge of this bill made reference in a disparaging manner to the Uncompahgre Valley reclamation project, one of the two Government irrigation projects in my congressional district in the State of Colorado. Referring first to the Salt River project in Arizona, he said:

Here is a representation of the construction cost that has been repaid, less than $1,000,000 on a cost of $10,000,000 to the Government. But the commodities produced run to $81,000,000. Why under heaven's name should not they be paying back to the Government the money to be used for other reclamation projects? The same and probably more could be said of the Uncompahgre project shown down here. There are farm products worth $16,000,000 on a $6,000,000 construction cost, and not one red cent has been paid back into the Treasury.

And at the hearing before this subcommittee some six pages (pages 612 to 618) are given to an examination of Director Davis and an arraignment of the settlers under these two projects for not repaying to the Government the cost of their construction.

I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I allowed those expressions to remain in the RECORD without a word of explanation. The history of the Uncompahgre Valley project would make several large volumes. Much of it would not be a happy record. I, of course, will not attempt to recite it but I want to mention just a few matters briefly to give some little idea of the viewpoint of the settlers under that project.

The Uncompahgre Valley project is in Montrose and Delta Counties. My home is in the adjoining county of Garfield. I have lived right beside and among those people for nearly 40 years, and I personally know the entire history of that project, and the long years and hard struggles, hardships, privations, and discouraging disappointments of the people under that project ever since it was started, some 15 years ago. I think that reclamation project was the first one started by the Government in the United States. Soon after the United States reclamation law was enacted on June 17, 1902, there

was an agitation commenced to induce the Government to create that reclamation project and construct a tunnel 6 miles long through a high mountain, to divert the water from the Gunnison River over into the Uncompahgre Valley. The Gunnison is a large river with an abundance of unappropriated water.

The Uncompahgre Valley at that time was fairly well settled, and the people were fairly prosperous. But there was not sufficient water in the Uncompahgre River to practically irrigate all of that valley, and the settlers desired to have the Government build that large Gunnison tunnel to a capacity of 1,200 cubic feet of water per second of time, and turn it from the Gunnison River into that valley to supplement the water rights which the settlers then had. In other words, give them more water and a better water right.

The Reclamation Service, through their engineers, made a thorough investigation of the project and decided that it was perfectly practical that the tunnel could be built and that vast amount of water furnished to the settlers at a charge or cost of $17 per acre, and promised a maximum cost of not to exceed $25 per acre. That was the original official estimate of the engineers and the official, publicly announced and widely advertised, inducement held out by the Government to the then settlers and also to all prospective settlers. That $25 per acre cost limit was put in the contract. The project was intended to cover about 140,000 acres of land, of which fully 100,000 acres was represented to be good land and practically irrigable under the project.

The Uncompahgre Valley is naturally one of the richest valleys in the world. The land is the finest kind of soil. The climate is as healthful and good as can be found anywhere under the shining sun. The altitude is about the same as Denver, and it is an ideal country for practically all kinds of fruit and agricultural products that can be raised anywhere throughout the Temperate Zone. There is everything there for a thoroughly practical reclamation project. In fact, it is a perfectly legitimate and splendid project. And the people were all delighted to have the Government accept the project and let the contract for the construction of that tunnel.

The first main contract was let to the celebrated contractors, Orman & Crook, who had a wide reputation as being one of the best engineering contracting firms in the country. The senior member, the Hon. James B. Orman, was the governor of our State.

Those contractors encountered all kinds of obstacles—hot water, bad air, more difficult rock formations, and other utterly unlooked for conditions that no one could foretell, and they practically lost the savings of a lifetime trying to build that tunnel, and went completely bankrupt and were compelled to give it up. Thereupon the Reclamation Service took the matter up and undertook to construct the tunnel themselves by employing day labor. That turned out to be a disastrously expensive experiment. In fact, this first project is now required to pay for many expensive governmental experiments that other projects are now getting the benefit of. However, the Government engineers finally, in the fall of 1909, declared the tunnel completed, and President Taft went out there to attend the opening and dedicate the tunnel. The President very kindly accorded me the honor and pleasure of riding with him across the State on his special train to attend that opening. There was a vast crowd of people and the President made one of his memorable, happy, and splendid speeches. And the people were all buoyant, optimistic, hopeful, and happy. But, alas, their illusions were soon dispelled. It first developed that instead of carrying 1,200 or more cubic feet of water per second, the tunnel did not then, and never has since, and will not now, carry 75 per cent of that expected amount of water. And regardless of what anybody may say or figure out theoretically, the actual irrigators under that project have always and do now insist that the tunnel does not carry sufficient water, and that they never have had during the dry seasons the sufficient quantity of water that was promised them.

But that was only the beginning of their disappointments and troubles. There had to be many adjustments made between both the old and the new settlers and the Reclamation Service. Some of the settlers had sufficient water, others had only partly sufficient, while others had none. Consequently there ensued years and years of jangling and bickering back and forth between the settlers and the Government officials as to a fair adjustment of their respective rights and obligations, and the charges that should be imposed and paid for, between the Reclamation Service and the people. There was great delay and trouble in bringing in the older canals and ditches in the valley and unifying the canal systems, and the Government finally decided to buy up most if not all of those old canals, ditches, and laterals.

Moreover, the mere running of the water through the tunnel and turning it from the Gunnison River over into the Uncompahgre Valley was not sufficient, and it became necessary to build two very large, long, and expensive canals and some smaller ones, and the Government undertook that additional construction. And that cost a vast amount more than was expected. The canals ran many miles through gypsum foothills. Gypsum will not hold water and the canals had to be concreted. The reclamation officials used, or permitted to be used, inferior cement that the alkali dissolved, and it all had to be largely rebuilt. That was another lesson to the Reclamation Service that was most awfully expensive and for which these people must now pay. About the 1st of April, 1917, about the time we declared war against Germany, the Reclamation Service announced that on June 1, 1917, they would open up the project and begin to collect construction cost. The settlers vigorously protested and sent a committee of prominent citizens down here to Washington, as is stated by Director Davis in the hearings before the subcommittee. At that time the Reclamation Service intended to open the project on a cost basis of $60 per acre.

That committee demonstrated conclusively to Secretary Lane of the Interior Department, and he very justly decided that the project was not completed or in proper condition to be opened and that the Government had not fulfilled its contract or proper obligations to the settlers, and that there was a large amount of work that the Government should perform before it would be in a position in good faith to require or expect the settlers to commence paying the cost of construction by the 20 annual payments. Secretary Lane conducted an extensive hearing and made a thorough investigation of all the facts and conditions and formally decided that it would not be acting in good faith or fairly, but it would be unconscionable and outrageous to declare that project open until such time as very much further adjustment, development, and construction was accomplished. Those water users under the project and, in fact, everybody else in western Colorado very naturally hoped and believed that that decision of Secretary Lane settled the matter. No one ever dreamed that those settlers would be criticized year in and year out thereafter and their motives impugned, and they bitterly resent these nagging, petty, and utterly unjust accusations and reinvestigations of that matter.

Moreover, the people were in no condition whatever financially to commence paying the construction charges in 1917. It was all they could do to pay—which they were doing and ever since have done—the annual cost of operation and maintenance. The Government has charged and collected from them $80 a year for every cubic foot of that water. Those people have been paying for all the water they have ever received during all of these years, which has been a heavy burden upon many of them most of the time at that rate.

The settlers insisted upon, and made such a complete showing that Secretary Lane decided that it would be at least five years under the then existing conditions, and in view of the difficulty of reclaiming the lands and settling the ditches and canals, before the Government would be warranted in declaring the project completed and open for the payment of construction charges. And, moreover, it would be that long in all probability before the settlers would be in financial position to commence paying the construction charges in addition to their annual operation and maintenance charges. That was the formal decision and official order of Secretary Lane rendered the latter part of May, 1917. No Secretary of the Interior in the history of this Government ever rendered a more honest, or meritorious, or justifiable, or humane, or even absolutely necessary judgment than that decision of Secretary Lane. If he had not so decided, further construction would have ceased. It would have meant confiscation of a very large part of the valley. Many of the settlers would have been compelled to move off the project. It would have been a monstrous wrong; and those two wonderfully rich counties, Delta and Montrose, would have relapsed practically back to where they were before the Reclamation Service was ever heard of. Fortunately Secretary Lane, who was one of the greatest men that this generation has produced in this or any other country, was big enough and broad enough to fully realize that impending disaster, and was honest and courageous enough to prevent it.

I have forgotten the exact amount that had been expended at the time of that extension; but my recollection is that it was something over $5,000,000.

That that extension of time was both necessary and just is proved by the subsequent facts that the Government has ex-

pended something over a million dollars on the project and toward completing it since that extension was made in May, 1917.

So at the present time it is correct, as reported in the hearings and by the department, that over $6,700,000 has been expended by the Government, and no part of it has been repaid to the Government. But no fair-minded person who knows the conditions can say that that extension was unjust or unnecessary, or that the Government has been imposed upon in the slightest degree, or that the Government has in reality lost a dollar by reason of that extension. The Government has a blanket lien on that whole valley and holds all that 100,000 acres of rich land as security.

Instead of the Government requiring those settlers to pay $25 an acre, as they originally were promised and agreed to, the charge is now $70 per acre, and Secretary of the Interior Fall has officially fixed that amount as the price that those settlers must pay the Government for whatever amount of water that tunnel will carry. In other words, the Government figures on 100,000 acres of land at $70 an acre, making a total of $7,000,000, and is demanding the first one of the 20-year annual payments. That payment of $1.40 per acre (besides the operation and maintenance charges) was due on the first day of this month. Those people are absolutely and utterly unable to make the first payment at this time and are now appealing for a further extension of time. On the 21st of last September I introduced a bill (H. R. 12780) providing for further extensions of five years more. The Interior Department was opposed to the bill, so I have now joined with the western Senators in support of the McNary bill (S. 4187), giving the Secretary discretionary authority to grant a further extension for two years.

In justice to the Director of the Reclamation Service, Mr. Davis, and the subcommittee that held those hearings, I should say that they all fully realized that the present year has been a most disastrous one to the settlers under that project—not through any fault whatever of the settlers, or lack of water, or through any fault of the Reclamation Service, or of the soil, or season, or the crops, but caused almost entirely by the deplorably inefficient service of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad. A branch or side line of that road is the only railroad there is in that country. They have no other means of shipping out their products, and that branch during the past 10 months has practically failed to function as a railroad. It has been more like the Toonerville Trolley, especially the narrow-gauge section throughout southwestern Colorado. The road has had the shopmen's strike to contend with, and its rolling stock has been very badly run down. But, personally, I feel that the management of the road is so thoroughly incompetent that it amounts to a colossal crime upon that entire valley. As the Governor of the State of Colorado recently wrote to Secretary of the Interior Fall:

> The condition of the people under the Uncompahgre reclamation project is pathetically appalling.

At page 615 of the hearings on this bill, on the 11th of this month, Diretcor Davis said:

> Mr. CRAMTON. But apart from the exceptional financial conditions of this time, is that project an unsuccessful project and one that should not have been developed?
>
> Mr. DAVIS. Not by any means. It is a project where not only is the production great and successful agriculturally, but I think it is above the average of projects that could be obtained. I was recently there at the request of the people and there is no question but what that project is to-day in one of the worst conditions of any project or any region that I know of in the country; not due to any lack or failure of crops or of the water supply or anything except two items, the lack of price for their products and the lack of transportation; by far the greatest difficulty is the lack of transportation. The reports that were made to me, that appear to me well substantiated, are that the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad has practically collapsed as a means of transportation.

The operation of that railroad this year has been a cold-blooded calamity; in fact, a tragedy. It has utterly failed to furnish cars at the necessary time for the shipment of the fruit and potato crops, and hundreds and hundreds of carloads of the finest peaches, pears, apples, and plums that are grown anywhere in the world were left to rot upon the trees or upon the ground. Fruit and early potatoes and early onions and other summer and early fall perishable produce must be shipped in refrigerator cars. And about half of what cars the road did furnish were box cars and cattle cars, and nearly everything shipped in them was rotted and lost, and the shippers had to pay the freight besides. That valley has a wonderful reputation for a specially fine variety of early potatoes, and they supply the early markets throughout the country before other potatoes come in when they can secure transportation, and 3,000 cars of the finest potatoes in the world are to-day rotting in the ground and not harvested. That has caused financial ruination to hundreds of families. Fully 20 per cent of all the renters abandoned their crops, and the owners of the land were left to harvest them if they cared to do so. The farmers on the project raised an enormous crop of those early potatoes, and the prices were high from August 1 to October 1 and fair up to October 15 this year. And while a few cars were furnished them, they were not furnished promptly or on time or at the proper time, but so irregularly and so uncertain that dealers could not rely upon them, and neither could the farmers, and therefore orders for over 400 carloads of fruit were compelled to be canceled and all that produce rotted. One of the main banks in Montrose suspended with 1,400 depositors. The banks, as everyone knows, very largely advance the money to the farmers to put in their crops, expecting to get their payments when the crops are harvested. And there have been, comparatively speaking, not sufficient crops harvested to anywhere near pay the cost of raising, and there is very little money and widespread loss and deplorable suffering.

A great many people are going to be bankrupt, and the valley has been dealt the most crushing blow in its entire history. And all of this, I repeat, is through no fault of the project or of the Reclamation Service, and certainly through no fault of the settlers. They have worked hard and have raised abundant crops, and have lost them. As everyone knows, this has been a bad year for farmers everywhere, and the prices are low, especially of potatoes; but if refrigerator cars had been furnished at the time the potatoes and fruit had to be shipped a very large part of that could have been sold and hundreds of people saved from ruinous loss. That railroad has for some 10 months been in the hands of a receiver under the control of the Federal court in Denver and the Interstate Commerce Commission here in Washington, and has in that way been practically operated under Government supervision, and that kind of operation, or lack of operation, has been the main outstanding cause of the financial assassination of that valley during the past summer and fall. Besides, there are other serious obstacles that must be considered, and from which the settlers are most justly entitled to and must have relief:

First. The freight rates on that travesty of a railroad are so excessively high that they are almost confiscatory and are prohibitive of practical farming in that valley at this time, and there is no earthly reason why they should not be reduced to such an amount that the farmers can pay. The freight is from 50 to 60 per cent of the selling price, but the farmers might possibly pay even that if they had any decent service and could market their crops.

Second. The high cost of farming in any irrigation district, especially under a Government reclamation project, where the cost per year per acre for water and excessive overhead charges is a very large and heavy burden.

Neither the Federal Farm Loan Board, the Federal reserve banks, nor any other Federal agency will loan these settlers under Government reclamation projects any money at a low rate or any rate of interest as other farmers throughout the United States can secure. The Government will not loan these settlers money upon any conditions whatever, so that they are deprived of all possibility of making necessary farm developments not only by the outrageous and infamous transportation situation but by the excessive high cost of the project and unreasonably high overhead cost, but are even denied the privilege of getting any Federal money to make developments. The Federal Farm Loan and War Finance Boards and all other Federal functions are an utter delusion, a mockery, and a sham, so far as these very needy people are concerned. In other words, the Government ties their hands with these insurmountable obstacles and then demands payments when there is no human possibility of making payments under the conditions that now prevail under that project.

The interest rate both on real estate and all other property is so exorbitantly high that it is almost prohibitive. Ninety per cent of all those farmers have chattel mortgages to almost the full extent of the value of their farming stock and machinery. The Government itself even charges these settlers 12 per cent per annum interest on all delinquent water payments, while at the same time we are loaning billions and billions of dollars to foreign governments at some 3 or 4 per cent interest, and the eastern bankers and big newspapers and international speculators and many prominent Federal officials are constantly urging its canceling all of those debts. It does seem to me that good will, charity, brotherly love, and especially humane treatment, fair dealing, and justice should begin at home.

Fifth. There must be some—either Federal or State or both—legislation providing cold-storage warehouses and bonded depositories for farm produce. And it seems to me the Federal Government might well undertake that service, especially upon these reclamation projects; and

Sixth. I think great improvement might be made in the system of cooperative marketing.

These are a few of the afflictions that are imposed upon these settlers and that must be corrected; otherwise not only most of the farmers but the merchants there and many other classes of people will be practically ruined. A majority of the farmers will not make enough this year to pay their taxes, while their crops would have been worth several millions of dollars if they could have been promptly and properly marketed. One or two years' extension of payment of construction charges are not at all sufficient. It is not a human possibility for these farmers to recover from the present calamity and be in position to commence paying for the project in less than five years.

This project is a worthy and good one. There is no complaint that it ought not to have been made a Government project, and there is no complaint as to its being impractical; but it is handicapped by a load of unnecessary or at least extravagant and unforeseen expenditures by the Government officials, outrageous and ruinous treatment by the railroad, and many other unforeseen obstacles for which the settlers are not to blame.

The project can be made a great success, and everyone hopes and believes that the present obstacles can be largely overcome and hardships much relieved, but it will be several years; and it will have to be under better and more competent and efficient management than now before that railroad will be in position to give those settlers the necessary transportation service. I think everybody in Colorado hopes that the Burlington or Rock Island or any efficient and capable railroad system may soon take over the Rio Grande and make a railroad of it and run it for the upbuilding of Colorado. It would be a marvelous godsend to about 30 counties of Colorado through which that railroad tracK runs if there could be a real up-to-date railroad operated on it. But under present conditions it is absolutely unreasonable, it is not even common sense to expect those settlers to commence repaying the Government that $70 an acre for their water.

There is no use of crimination or recrimination at this time. It is a heartbreaking condition that confronts us. It would not only be cruelly inhuman to force those settlers off of their lands and compel them to lose their homes and the meager savings of a lifetime of hard work for not paying money which they have not got and can not possibly get; it would be not only brutally outrageous but the height of stupidity and idiocy on the part of the Government to put those people off of the lands and put new people or settlers on them. I can not believe that anything of that kind is going to be undertaken or even seriously considered, because the Government holds the land, and it is ample security, and it would be sheer folly to take any course that would even discourage much less drive the farmers off their lands. Even if others could be induced to go on the lands under the existing conditions the new settlers could never make anywhere near as much of a success as the old ones have done. It has been a long, hard struggle. I could say a great deal more. Those settlers deserve much better treatment than being criticized by any Federal officials.

They are not seeking to repudiate one dollar of all that $7,000,000 expended on the project, although they were promised and had long hoped that it would only be about one-third of that amount. They are not complaining at being the pioneer project and paying dearly for it. They can and will ultimately pay that $70 an acre. But if Uncle Sam puts impossibly harsh conditions upon them he may discourage them into abandoning their homes. He may return portions of that project largely into a desert, but he can never by any possibility get money out of people who have not got it and can not get it. Their present condition is one in which pressure from the Government will not and can not accomplish any good purpose.

There is no community in the United States that rendered greater services in proportion to its numbers, or subscribed more to Liberty bonds and other relief activities, or did more in any other respect toward upholding the hands of the Government during the war to the utmost of its ability than the people of the Uncompahgre Valley. There is no better or more patriotic class of people in any two of the 3,078 counties of the United States than in Montrose and Delta Counties. And all they ask of our Government is that they be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to raise and market their crops sufficient to sustain themselves and their families and pay off this Government obligation of $7,000,000. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

PRINTING AND BINDING.

For printing and binding for the Department of the Interior, but not including printing and binding for the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, or the Patent Office, $145,000: *Provided*, That the annual reports of the department and of all its bureaus and establishments, including the Reclamation Service, shall not exceed a total of 1,250 pages.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, lines 21, 22, and 23, strike out the following: "But not including printing and binding for the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, or the Patent Office, $145,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Including all its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere except the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and Patent Office, $145,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered to make sure that the language in the paragraph is effective in carrying out the requirements of the provision in the legislative appropriation act for the assembling of all printing and binding items in one place in the bill.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What is the object of excluding the Patent Office? I notice nowhere in the bill is there an appropriation made for the Patent Office except for the Official Gazette. There are many other publications and pamphlets in the cellar of the Patent Office which are very valuable and are molding and crumbling away.

Mr. CRAMTON. The item we have for printing and binding of the Patent Office is on the next page of the bill.

Mr. WATSON. That is for the Gazette.

Mr. CRAMTON. Also there is an appropriation for the miscellaneous printing and binding, and that has some connection with the situation the gentleman is speaking of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Protection of game in Alaska: For carrying into effect the act entitled "An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1908, including salaries, traveling expenses of game wardens, and all other necessary expenses, $20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Governor of Alaska.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill how many game wardens there are in Alaska? Alaska is a large country. Also, if the gentleman has a record of the number of the arrests that the game wardens have made, I should be very glad to know it. It would be rather interesting to know. A few game wardens would be of very little use in such a vast territory.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the number is very limited, that is true.

Mr. WATSON. Has the gentleman a record of the number of game wardens?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; the number of wardens contemplated under the proposed language is nine, with a salary roll of $13,740. That is a reduction from the current year, and in addition to that there are items of travel expense and telegraph service provided also.

Mr. WATSON. There have been very few arrests; they have had to do very little service?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not immediately at hand the number of arrests. I might call attention to certain facts at this time, since the item has been mentioned. The people of Alaska through their Territorial legislature have put the license fees for citizens of the United States, nonresidents of Alaska, for hunting at figures that are unreasonably high, and there was an impulse on the part of some of the members of the committee to eliminate this item, feeling that having put the license fees so high as to invite poaching and unauthorized hunting they have put an added burden upon the Federal Treasury, which must be borne by those who are discriminated against. Of course, it immediately appealed to us that perhaps such a policy would be destructive of game in Alaska, so the committee has recommended $20,000 suggested by the Budget, in the hope that the Territorial Legislature of Alaska will renew the spirit of fairness toward those in the United States who are not residents of Alaska who have not large means who might want to hunt in Alaska.

Mr. WATSON. There is no attempt to place wardens in the northern part of Alaska?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not that information at hand. The fee amounts to $150 a year before anyone can do any hunting in Alaska who is a nonresident thereof.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think we should all bear in mind that the people of Alaska have absolutely no voice in the matter of regulating this matter. Congress placed an inhibition in our organic act which prevents us from having

any voice in the regulation of game. We maintain that inasmuch as Congress passes the laws that govern us, Congress ought to appropriate enough to protect the game to appoint enough game wardens. This year there is a reduction of $5,000 in the appropriation for game wardens, and there never has been a time in the history of the Territory when game wardens are required as much as they are to-day. We have a great many orientals who come to the Territory every year, going to the canneries, and during the summer season they kill duck and other game out of season, salt it and pack it away and carry it down to San Francisco in the fall. I do not think it is fair that this $5,000 reduction should be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

For appliances in connection with filing system, $3,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call attention to the fact that we are now just going to take up these offices of 12 surveyors general, provided for in the bill. I presume that if an inquiry were made of all of us from our constituents, all of us would admit that we are in favor of sane economy, sane retrenchment in governmental expenses. Yet what are we permitting here? I know the pressure that has been brought to bear upon this committee, as it has on other committees that have brought provisions of this kind in the bill. I call attention again to the fact, and remind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, every time one mentions retrenchment, comes on the floor, of the facts in connection with these offices. He is the one who, after all, holds the purse strings of the Treasury. Three years ago, after the armistice was signed and we were hoping to get back to normalcy, the Commissioner of the General Land Office appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and testified that, in his judgment, all of these offices of surveyors general ought to be abolished. At that time we had 13, and he testified that they were not needed; that the work could be better done here in Washington; that it was an unnecessary expense; that thousands of dollars could be saved annually, and he recommended to the committee that they abolish the 13 offices. The committee, acting upon his advice, left every one of them out of the bill and brought the bill in as clean as a hound's tooth, so far as these surveyors' offices is concerned. What happened?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman asks me, the House overruled the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just exactly what I want to call attention to. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] felt outraged when I intimated that by reason of being human beings the Committee on Appropriations could be influenced. I did not mean that they could be influenced in a bad way, but, being human beings, they are naturally subject to the same influence as other individuals.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course they are never influenced by votes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell him how he is influenced. He imagines right now that nothing on God's earth could influence him against his wish. When we spoke about continuing the civilian bonuses he said that he would not do it; he stood here on the floor and fought every time the matter was proposed, and he said that we had to stop it, that the war was over, that it was a war matter, and that they were going to stop it. Yet how many of these bonuses has he permitted to pass since that time? Six, one for $120 and five of $240 each. He has laid down on that proposition because they overreached him upon it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows that we tried to stop it.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but after all the stream kept wearing on the gentleman until not long ago he said he was not going to fight it any more, that he was going to give another one. Already we have given the civil employees who are entitled to it $1,320 bonus. I just mention that to show that even our great chairman can be influenced against his will. What happened?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. What happened when our distinguished committee voted to do away with these offices? I want to say that some of the best men in the House were on the committee when it had that matter in charge and when it was left out of the bill. They gave the matter close study; they went into the question. Look at the hearings three years ago, and you will see that they went into the matter to see what ought to be done. It was the consensus of opinion, based on the honest, sincere judgment in behalf of the people, that these 13 surveyors general offices should be left out. They did leave them out of the bill, and what happened? We found our friends from those States that had these offices coming in one by one. You could look around and call the roll of the 13 of them, and all of them were on the floor, led by the leader of the House, in whose State there was one. They said that we must put them back, right in the face of a claim of retrenchment, and they stood on the floor of this House in committee and put everyone of them back in the bill. Of course, the committee has refrained from leaving it out of the bill since then. I am glad to say in their behalf that they have done away with one of them. We formerly had 13 and they have brought in only 12. Thank God for that. Now I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the gentleman knows, it is pretty hard to do away with these things when they are once established.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it.

Mr. CRAMTON. But this committee tries to be practical, not to bring in things that the House is sure to overrule, but to bring in such economies as we can make stick; and so for the current year, in the last Interior Department bill, instead of attacking windmills, we took up the matter practically, and notwithstanding the fact that the House overruled us to a certain extent we saved $70,000 for the current year on the land offices.

Mr. BLANTON. I commend the gentleman for that.

Mr. CRAMTON. We try to do what can be done.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to commend the gentleman, but the gentleman's idea is for the Government to be practical in a way that will be approved by 13 men in the House, the men whose particular States enjoy the proceeds of the offices of 13 surveyors general. His idea is that it is going to be opposed and these 13 men are going to be strong enough to put it back; it is hopeless not to put it back. I say if it is right to stop it, stop it. If the commissioner testifies, as he did a few years ago, to the effect that it is useless and ought to stop, the committee ought to stand up here like the Rock of Gibraltar and say to these 13 men in these 13 States where the offices have been, "We are not going to put it back; we like you; we are your friends; we like you personally; but we are not going to do it at the expense of the taxpayers of this country."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Would the gentleman think it practical to put the surveyors' records 3,000 miles away from the land and from the people who are interested in the surveys? As a private individual, if the gentleman had millions and millions of acres of land thousands of miles away, would he do that thing?

Mr. BLANTON. I answer the gentleman with the testimony of the last commissioner.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; and by that you would build up a great big bureau here, a thing which the gentleman is always fighting.

Mr. BLANTON. In my State there are lands that belong to the State of Texas which are 600 or 700 miles from the land office at Austin.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am not talking about a thousand miles. I am talking about several thousand miles.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet the business is just as well attended to as if they were located right near Austin. The business of the public, as is said by the Commissioner of the General Land Office—and I did not say it—can be attended to just as well in Washington as out there on the ground. The commissioner says those officers out there are useless.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. We are talking about this matter to-day. Does the present Commissioner of the General Land Office take that attitude?

Mr. FRENCH. He does not.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. If the commissioner was given a fair opportunity to express himself I overlooked it.

Mr. FRENCH. On page 93 he expressed himself, and contrary to the advice of the commissioner three years ago.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the commissioner three years ago was a Democratic commissioner, and the one who is there now is a Republican, and that is just the difference between Democratic judgment and Republican judgment.

Mr. FRENCH. It is all in favor of the public.

Mr. BLANTON. It is all in favor of saving the people's money in the Treasury of the United States so that they will not have to pay it out in taxes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just a few words in regard to this matter. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would not favor the abolition of the offices of surveyors general and the handling of the work in Washington if it would mean adding to the expense rather than subtracting from the expense.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not.

Mr. FRENCH. It is therefore a question of judgment, and, so far as I am aware, the only responsible officer in the Interior Department during many years who has recommended the abolition of the offices of the surveyors general and the handling of the work in Washington was Commissioner Tallman a few years ago. The present commissioner takes another position, and Members of Congress who are closely familiar with this work believe that it would not only be a greater inconvenience to the people and work a more severe hardship, but that it would be less economical to handle the work of the surveys through Washington than through the different agencies throughout the country. The question was directed to the commissioner at the last hearing that we had, and the answer was made directly on this point by the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The question arose following the discussion of the abolition of one office in South Dakota. I read from the hearings:

Mr. BYRNES. Why did you abolish the South Dakota office?
Mr. SPRY. There was no further need of an office there.
Mr. BYRNES. Have you made a survey of the offices to determine whether or not it would be possible to abolish other offices?
Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir; and it is not possible.
Mr. BYRNES. Because of the amount of work being done and the acreage still left in the public-land States?
Mr. FRENCH. Would it be more economical to abolish any of the other offices and handle the work from Washington, or in any other manner than that in which you have handled it under the present system?
Mr. SPRY. I do not think we could duplicate the present system here. I do not think you could bring the work to Washington and handle it as successfully as we are handling it in the various States.

Altogether, then, the testimony, in my judgment, is one-sided on the matter of the convenience of the people and the expedition of the work. There is a debatable question touching the expenditure, and I believe it would probably be equally expensive, if not more expensive, to have all that work done from Washington than to handle it from the different agencies. But I say I do believe in pinching off these different surveyors general's offices just as rapidly as the work can be brought to the point where it can be done.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman any idea whether the action of the House in overriding the judgment and recommendation made by Commissioner Tallman has anything to do with the state of mind of the present commissioner?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I do not know. I suppose he is meeting the question as a man charged with responsibility would naturally do.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman does know that these little influences do creep in; when the commissioner finds out that the House is in what the late distinguished Speaker Champ Clark used to say "a certain mood," it is absolutely impossible to go up against that mood, and it does influence the state of mind to a certain extent.

Mr. FRENCH. I do not think the present commissioner would be controlled by that fact. I think he was giving us an answer that was direct and sincere and earnest in advising upon a question that might come before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, $550; in all, $14,650.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In order to strike out these various 12 offices of surveyors general would require under our rules a motion after each office was read, or, in fact, after each line was read, as each line contains an item, and each office embraces from three to four lines. I realize, of course, that it would be a waste of time to hope for success in having them stricken out. Therefore, I do not make the motion, but if I thought there was any possibility whatever of the committee sustaining such a motion I would make it.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is very much the position of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BLANTON. I was sure of it. The only reason I have taken the time to call it to the attention of the committee is in the hope that sooner or later, first in the Committee on Appropriations, or then in this Committee of the Whole, or then in the House, we will some day stand up here and strike them out, no mattter where the chips fall.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail temporarily clerks from the office of one surveyor general to another as the necessities of the service may require and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands. A detailed statement of traveling expenses incurred hereunder shall be made to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the committee in charge of this bill if they have any figures showing the amount that has been expended for traveling expenses, per diem, and so on, in going back and forth from these different surveyors general's offices and doing the work in the States where there are no surveyors general?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a very small amount for such States as the gentleman speaks about. Of course, I suppose the gentleman has in mind his own State, where the office was abolished this past year. We have not any apportionment of the expense to cover that particular office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Registers and receivers: For salaries and commissions of registers of district land offices and receivers of public moneys at district land offices, at not exceeding $3,000 per annum each, $370,000: *Provided*, That the offices of registers and receivers at the following land offices are hereby consolidated, and the applicable provisions of the act approved October 28, 1921, shall be followed in effecting such consolidations: Leadville, Colo.; Gainesville, Fla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Lakeview, Oreg.; and Waterville, Wash.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee or the gentleman in charge of this item the reasons for the consolidation of the Lakeview office. What is the justification for that?

Mr. FRENCH. In reply I will say that the gentleman will recall that last year the committee found a very undesirable situation confronting the organization of land offices throughout the country. In spite of the law which provides that land offices shall be abolished when the area of public domain within the district that the land office serves shall be not to exceed 100,000 acres, there were numerous land offices where the area was less than a township, others where it was less than half a township.

Again, there is another law which provides that whenever the expenses of a land office exceed 33⅓ per cent of the income of the office the land office may be abolished. We found a condition existing that had accrued through quite a number of years and several administrations, where land offices were being continued where there was no justification for them. We brought in a rather severe provision last year, as a result of which we wiped out nine land offices entirely and consolidated the offices of register and receiver in something like 26 other land offices; and in spite of the fact that some land offices were restored, we succeeded in effecting a saving of approximately $71,000 in the handling of this work. The only disastrous result that has occurred of which I am aware was reported to me by one Member from a district that lost one or two land offices. He said that while he was elected to this Congress, he thought he lost 150 or 200 votes on account of our action.

Now, as to the particular land office of Lakeview, let me say that the expenses have increased until they are 40 per cent of the revenues of the office and in excess of the amount suggested in the law as justifying the continuance of the office at all. On the other hand, there is an immense amount of work yet to be done in that district. Your committee thought it was an appropriate time, not to abolish the office but to continue it on a basis that would come within the law and bring its expense down to 33⅓ per cent or less of its receipts. Therefore we have provided for the consolidation of the offices of register and receiver into one office, and of course have made such allowance as will permit such clerical assistance to be employed as may be necessary. At present there is one clerk employed at that office.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of land offices: For clerk hire, rent, and other incidental expenses of the district land offices, including the expenses of depositing public money; per diem, in lieu of subsistence, of clerks detailed to examine the books and management of district land offices and to assist in the operation of said offices, and in the opening of new land offices and reservations, when allowed pursuant to section 13

of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said clerks: *Provided*, That no expenses chargeable to the Government shall be incurred by registers and receivers in the conduct of local land officecs except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, $370,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 14, line 2, strike out "$370,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$360,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. In connection with that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain that when the officers of the General Land Office were before the committee we noted an estimate of $36,000 included in this sum for rental of these various land offices, which seemed to be a little increase over the current year. We asked for information to be furnished and a detailed statement of rentals, and when that statement was furnished it developed that the rentals for the current year are $30,000 instead of $36,000 as the estimates propose. We thought, therefore, this item could very well be reduced $6,000 below what had been recommended. But, in addition, the statement of rentals which appears in the hearings shows that in a number of offices the annual rental exceeds $1,000 per year for each office, and that, too, in small towns or cities and often in offices where there is not much work to do. For instance, at Baton Rouge, La., with a total of 8,816 acres in the State, there is a rental of $1,440. In Lamar, Colo., the annual rental is $1,050, with an acreage of 4,824 acres. Of course, we are aware that at such offices as Lamar there are other elements entering into the question, but it impressed the committee that, generally speaking, this rent roll should be pruned somewhat, and so we are suggesting a further cut of $4,000 in that connection, making a total cut of $10,000, which we anticipate will come from the rental portion of the estimates.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call attention to the language in lines 22 and 23 on page 13—

and for actual necessary traveling expenses of such clerks.

I want to call attention to the fact that the committee have failed to insert the usual restriction of a maximum of $4 a day for subsistence. In other words, it leaves the actual traveling expenses open to whatever they expend.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; and let me say that this statement will also in part answer the question of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON]. The total expenditure estimated for traveling expenses is $1,000, and the item before us carries this language:

When allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914.

And that contains the $4 limit.

Mr. BLANTON. That act limits it to $4?

Mr. CRAMTON. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Depredations on public timber, protecting public lands, and settlement of claims for swamp land and swamp-land indemnity: For protecting timber on the public lands, and for the more efficient execution of the law and rules relating to the cutting thereof; of protecting public lands from illegal and fraudulent entry or appropriation, and of adjusting claims for swamp lands, and indemnity for swamp lands, including not exceeding $15,000 for clerical services in bringing up and making current the work of the General Land Office, $485,000, including not exceeding $35,000 for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of agents and others employed in the field service and for operation, maintenance, and exchange of same and for operation and maintenance of a motor boat: *Provided*, That the compensation of the chief of field service employed hereunder, including his services in the District of Columbia, shall not exceed $3,500 per annum and the compensation of all others employed hereunder shall not exceed $2,700 per annum each, except in Alaska, where a compensation not to exceed $3,000 per annum may be allowed: *Provided further*, That agents and others employed under this appropriation may be allowed per diem in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and actual necessary expenses for transportation, except when agents are employed in Alaska they may be allowed not exceeding $5 per day each in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 12, strike out the amount "$35,000" and insert "$40,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the appropriation beyond the $485,000 as carried in the bill, but it makes a larger apportionment available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for field service. There is interesting matter in connection with this, which gentlemen will find on page 118 of the hearings, showing the real economy in the operation of Government-owned cars as against rented cars.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska whether or not the expense of subsistence—I am not speaking of traveling expenses, but the expense of subsistence—is 20 per cent greater in Alaska than anywhere else in the West?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; I think so. I think that we are absolutely safe in saying it is 20 per cent higher.

Mr. BLANTON. In the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and various other places in the West we allow $4 per day for subsistence, but in Alaska we increase it to $5 a day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In the gentleman's State you have competition in the sale of merchandise. You have competition in transportation; but in Alaska we have not any competition; we are in the grip of a monopoly, and the charges are two or three times as much to carry merchandise from Seattle to Alaska as they are from New York to Seattle. All these things we have to contend with. The gentleman must recollect also that we are shut off from transportation through Canada, while all the States have that privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the completion of the Government-owned railway, upon which we are expending a great deal of money, give any relief of that situation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To the interior of Alaska; it will not on the coast. That takes care of the coast to the interior, but on the coast we are in the hands of the monopoly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surveying public lands: For surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, making fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $650,000: *Provided*, That the sum of not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated may be expended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purchase of metal or other equally durable monuments to be used for public land survey corners wherever practicable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of employees of the field surveying service temporarily detailed to the General Land Office: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of this appropriation may be used for the survey, classification, and sale of the lands and timber of the so-called Oregon & California Railroad lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 8, strike out the amount of "$53,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, that is simply a reduction in the authorization for survey of the Oregon & California Railroad land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

SALARIES.

Commissioner, $5,000; assistant commissioner, $3,500; chief clerk, $2,750; financial clerk, $2,250; chiefs of divisions—1 $2,250, 1 $2,000; law clerk, $2,000; assistant chief of division, $2,000; private secretary, $1,800; examiner of irrigation accounts, $1,800; draftsmen—1 $1,400, 1 $1,200; clerks—20 of class 4, 31 of class 3, 2 at $1,500 each, 36 of class 2, 64 of class 1 (including 1 stenographer), 30 at $1,000 each (including 1 stenographer), 30 at $900 each, 1 $720; messenger, $840; 8 assistant messengers, at $720 each; 4 messenger boys, at $420 each; in all, $306,150.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 17, line 20, after the figures "$306,150," add the following: "*Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be expended for the preparation of estimates for future appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs which shall not give itemized statement as to the total sum of money requested for expenditure in each reservation, school, or other activity, whether gratuities from the Treasury, withdrawals from Indian funds, treaty items, or otherwise, together with a detailed statement of the total expenditures from all sources and funds for such reservation, school, or other activity during the previous fiscal year."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it includes not only a limitation

but it directs an executive officer of the Government. In fact, there are a number of directions in it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order, the amendment I have offered is a limitation on the appropriation of $306,150.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered I believe should be accepted by the subcommittee and also by the Committee of the Whole House without objection because it simply aims to get a businesslike statement of the appropriations carried for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Why are these appropriations carried in a lump sum? Here is an appropriation for irrigation on the reservations of $197,450. It should be possible to itemize the amount and show on which reservation it is to be spent so that the committee may have the information. There is an appropriation for the support of the Indian schools, $1,799,500. That is a lump-sum appropriation, almost $2,000,000, and may be used for many purposes. I believe it is common sense to require information as to which schools and for what ends it is proposed to spend it.

For industrial work, $375,000 in a lump sum. It is impossible to tell where it is going to be spent, and yet it should be itemized and the reservations should be shown. There has been one difficulty, I will say, in regard to this bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and that is that the accounting method does not show in a businesslike way where the money goes. In 1912 a New York accounting firm was put to work and they came back and said that there was no real system in keeping the records in the bureau, and it gave an opportunity for fraud in the handling of these great sums.

In 1919 Mr. Graves, of the Efficiency Bureau of the Government, appeared before the committee and testified that he had tried to install an accounting system in the bureau, but he found a great deal of opposition. He said that there was no one in the Indian Bureau who was interested in whether or not any money was made in any particular activity, or whether there was a loss. Therefore, that part of his proposal had to be eliminated. Here is a chance to put a proviso upon this bill, not cutting down a dollar of appropriation, although it should be cut in two if this proviso is not put in here, because there are too many clerks there, unless they are doing some of the accounting work that this proviso will compel. I believe there should be no objection to this amendment. It is in the interest of efficiency and economy and will mean a great deal eventually for the taxpayers and the Indians.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment would protect the next appropriation for the fiscal year 1925.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But for the $13,000,000 that we are providing in this bill for this bureau we have no accounting whatever.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No business accounting, and I will offer some amendments later to the bill to deal with certain particular items. This amendment will mean that the commissioner when he goes before the committee will have to detail the reservation, the school, and show all of the money appropriated for each particular activity at each location.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman what he means by saying that there is no accounting in respect to the $13,000,000?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I was quoting from Mr. Graves, who said that there was practically no accounting system.

Mr. CRAMTON. That was in 1912?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In 1919 his testimony was given before our committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman made any inquiry as to the present situation to find out whether those conditions continued?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, we did before Mr. Graves——

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, has the gentleman this year made any inquiry as to what the condition is under Commissioner Burke?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; it is not necessary, for these immense general items show that the same system continues.

Mr. CRAMTON. Neither is it necessary to make a charge of this kind.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Here is one appropriation of $1,799,500 without itemizing, and that is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that it is not necessary before he gets up on the floor and makes some very serious charges against an official of the Government to find out first whether his charges are true or not. He is giving the House as the only support for his charges a statement by some official at some time in the dim past when the bureau was under a different management, but as to what the situation is under this administration at this time he has no information to give. I hold in my hand a volume containing an itemized statement of the estimates of the Indian Bureau placed in the hands of our committee, and I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that there is no bureau of the Government that voluntarily comes to the Appropriation Committee and submits its estimates in the detail and in the good order and gives the information that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does. Still the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have this House understand that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has a great lump sum of $11,000,000 to disburse for which it makes no accounting whatever——

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield to the gentleman—as to which it gives no information. But the gentleman brings in some amendment here of his own concoction, without any previous notice to the committee in charge of the bill, with no opportunity to examine the provisions of the amendment that he has offered to determine whether or not it is wise, with nothing except that we know that they come from the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and I submit that this committee can not afford to impose unknown burdens, possibly making necessary hordes of clerks to seek out information which the House does not know whether it wants or not.

The gentleman speaks about the item for irrigation on page 59, a preliminary paragraph. Then they go down district by district, and every single dollar is itemized, we are told how it will be spent, and when we come to the schools the gentleman will find in the printed hearings, what was in all of these estimates, that the individual salary of every individual employee connected with every school, in so far as the whole five or six million dollars is concerned, is set forth in black and white. I guarantee the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not yet read a quarter of the information that is now available for him, and he would not read what is called for in his amendment if it was compiled for him at great expense to the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has committed a hanging offense. It is true that he is not now a member of this subcommittee of five members, and they may have had information probably before them that he has not had; and if they have had the information before them that he seeks to bring before the next committee, still his amendment is not such a terrible crime. After all, his purposes are good, and I am with him. He has been on this Indian Committee. He has served faithfully. No one will contend that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not work as hard as any other member of the committee when he was a member of it. He knows something about the Indian business.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. He does not know as much as our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. No one could do that, because Mr. CARTER knows all about the business, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania probably knows as much as any other Member of the House, I take it, about the subject of Indian affairs. If his amendment will absolutely insure for the committee in the next fiscal year the getting of information which the chairman says that he has already gotten, then his amendment has not gone far wrong. It is a good amendment, after all. It could only be called surplusage. I do not see any occasion for this cyclone that has been raised, which is about to sweep the whole House of Representatives off its feet and annihilate all action except that which comes from the committee itself. It is true that out of 435 Members only a few of us have come here to-day to attend to the Nation's business, and we ought to be permitted to attend to it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is only seeking to attend to the people's business, and I commend him for it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Would it not be a good plan to have under the reservation head all the expenses from all these lump sums?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. And in view of the fact that the committee is furnished with a detailed report, the only additional expenditure would be the printing of the report, would it not?

Mr. BLANTON. That is true; but this is not going to require any additional expense. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, and no one has denied it, that the expert accountants from New York that came down here in 1912 said the business of that department was in a terrible shape; that there was no system whatever of proper accounting there. He said to us frankly that that condition existed in 1917, when the Bureau of Efficiency here saw fit to investigate the facts and make its recommendation. He brought it in, not in a partisan way. He referred to it under a Republican administration first and then under a Democratic administration and now again under a Republican administration. It was the same under both administrations. It was not partisan. He was merely seeking to rectify the situation; and we are not sure, without the gentleman's amendment——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is aware, I assume, that the Budget Bureau is outlining methods of bookkeeping and accounting to govern all the agencies of the Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am with the Bureau of the Budget. I am backing them up here every day when I vote, and I vote to hold their maximum as our outside limit, and I also vote to hold the committee's maximum as our outside limit. But because we have a Budget, and because we have our distinguished friends on this committee, there is no reason why the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as a Member of this House, should not get up here and make a proper suggestion. I am going to vote for his amendment, because it is a good one.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I remember when the criticism was made by the accountant who was working here establishing new systems in all the Government departments. He did criticize the accounting system in the Department of the Interior, just as he criticized the accounting systems in other departments of the Government. He did not charge that large sums were spent without being accounted for; he simply criticized the manner in which the accounting was done. Since then the system that he suggested has been adopted and is being carried out.

I find here, in the first item that I opened up, an analysis of an expenditure by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which is typical of every item appropriated for in this bill and every item that has been appropriated for in years that have passed and that will be carried in the future, I have no doubt. I happened to open up at the item, "Suppressing the liquor traffic among Indians." For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the amount appropriated was $30,000; fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, amounted appropriated, $35,000; amount expended, $27,384.03; unexpended balance, $7,615.97. Under "Analysis of expenditure": Salaries, wages, and so forth, $11,905.80; traveling expenses, $14,041.32; transportation of supplies, $8,068; stationery and printing, $155.17; equipment and miscellaneous material, $1,008.11; miscellaneous, $180.

Then follow several pages of detailed itemizations of these expenditures, showing how it was done.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Itemized on reservations and the other expenditures, so that we can get at each expenditure at each reservation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is a total for each reservation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes. He will find a minute analysis of all these expenditures if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will go into the record to ascertain what the facts are.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have read that; but there is nothing there to show where the money is expended. There should be no objection to my amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman's proposition would merely add vastly to the expense of conducting the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How could it do that when it asks that an itemized statement be presented to the committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Such statements are presented.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Then why should the gentleman object to my amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They are here.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is no objection, then, on the part of the gentleman to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see the interest taken in these matters by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] and by my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I do not quite agree with them, but I am glad to find such men giving attention to these important matters, and out of such discussions as these perhaps will come some good, wholesome legislation eventually.

I had the good fortune to serve on the committee with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for several years, and I found him to be a very active, energetic, and efficient member of the committee, taking an interest at all times for the Government and for the Indians. The gentleman now proposes an amendment, however, that in my judgment ought not to be adopted. It ought not to be adopted because it will preclude the use of any of these funds for the beneficial purposes set out until estimates are made at the next session of Congress for the appropriations. The estimates can not be made before next autumn. It means a suspension of Indian schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. In a moment. It means a suspension of all irrigation development. It means a suspension of all agency activities and the protection of the Indians generally. I do not think the gentleman realizes the far-reaching effect of the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This amendment refers only to the Secretary's office.

Mr. CARTER. Well, none of the agencies can function without the head of the bureau functioning. It will be necessary to have a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, an Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and a superintendent of education, and all the other bureaus functioning. Otherwise there would be no head to direct the subordinates.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a minute?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Let me put in the RECORD a letter I wrote last year, 1921, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for a very brief and simple statement of the amounts of money appropriated for the last 20 years from tribal funds and for gratuities. I remember I got back a statement that they did not have that information.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman certainly would not call a statement regarding all those activities for 20 years a simple statement. It would certainly be a very complicated statement, involving a large amount of work, digging through old documents and papers not now in use, and requiring, perhaps, a search of half a day sometimes to dig out one amount that the gentleman requested.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, as to the item just read, for four messenger boys, the gentleman wants a statement of what part of the compensation of those four messenger boys down there in the office is to be charged for the Seminole Indians in Florida, and what part for the Quillehute Indians in Washington, and the Ontonagon Indians in Michigan. Eventually, after the figures are made out, they would not be worth anything, anyhow.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is facetious in his statement as to the effect of my amendment. My amendment refers specifically to the money spent on the reservation.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was unfortunate in his request calling for definite estimates when he referred to the irrigation item.

Every one of them is set out separately in this bill just preceding the amount the gentleman referred to, the amount of $197,450. For instance, after the first part of the clause we have—

Irrigation district 1: Round Valley Reservation, Calif., $1,000; Hoopa Valley, Calif., $1,500; Colville Reservation, Wash., $6,000; total, $8,500.

Irrigation district 2: Walker River Reservation, Nev., $5,000; Western Shoshone Reservation, Idaho and Nevada, $2,000; Shivwits, Utah, $500; total, $7,500.

Irrigation district 3: Tongue River, Mont., $1,500.

Irrigation district 4: Ak Chin Reservation, Ariz., $3,400; Chiu Chiu pumping plants, Arizona, $12,600; Coachella Valley pumping plants, California, $8,000; Morongo Reservation, Calif., $7,000; Pala Reservation and Rincon Reservation, Calif., $4,500; Owens Valley, Calif., $2,000; Tuolumne Reservation, Calif., $2,700; miscellaneous projects, $10,000; total, $46,200.

Irrigation district 5: New Mexico Pueblos, $15,000; Zuni Reservation, N. Mex., $7,500; Navajo and Hopi, miscellaneous projects, Arizona, including Tes-nos-pos, Moencopi Wash, Kin-le-chee, Wide Ruins, Red Lake, Corn Creek, Wepo Wash, Oraibi Wash, and Polacca Wash, $20,000; Southern Ute Reservation, Colo., $20,000; total, $62,500.

And so on, until each item is set out in detail, and the bill states specifically just where the money is to be used and how much is to be used on each reservation. So there is not an irri-

gation appropriation in any bill that is set out more definitely than this general irrigation proposition in this Indian bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. As the gentleman will remember, some five or six years ago, at the earnest solicitation of the committee, the House rearranged this item so that every amount is specifically itemized. They are carried so plainly that he who runs may read. It would not be possible for any irrigation item to be stated more in detail than this particular one; and if the same plan were followed as to schools and all other items, instead of this bill being slightly more than 100 pages in length it would be 600 or 700 pages, and might take half the session of Congress to pass it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems that the committee is just one jump ahead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. In their endeavor to get a comprehensive report of the Indian Commissioner's affairs, at the request of some one on this committee the Bureau of Indian Affairs has prepared a most elaborate explanation of the expenditure of every dollar expended for the Indian, by the Indian, or by his friends, and that statement has been presented to this committee for their guidance in the framing of this measure. With the little experience I have had, I could not help commending the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for furnishing this complete statement which he has furnished. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] if he has seen this book setting out all these expenditures?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In reply I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not in that Book of Estimates there is a complete statement of every dollar appropriated for the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana?

Mr. MURPHY. I think so.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. For schools, irrigation, and other expenses? If so, I would like to see it.

Mr. MURPHY. Every dollar asked for by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is itemized, dollar for dollar, and there is a statement of the project where it is to be expended, why it is to be expended, and all about it.

I dare say that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had had access to this information he would not have presented this matter at this time, because there is no question that the Committee on Appropriations is doing the very best that can be done for the protection of every dollar raised by taxation and every dollar to be expended from the Indian fund; and of all those who came before this subcommittee presenting their various projects the bureau having charge of Indian affairs presented the most comprehensive explanation of everything they asked for of everyone who appeared before the committee. I think the gentleman's amendment is unnecessary, because it will involve additional expense; for, as I have said, we are just one jump ahead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because we already have what he is asking for.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is a vital difference between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] says it would involve great additional expense. The gentleman from Ohio says it is already being done. Therefore there is a difference of opinion even among the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman's question in regard to the Blackfeet Reservation will illustrate the difference. The gentleman wants forthwith and immediately to know just how much is expended this year for the Blackfeet. Now, through the bill there are several items that make appropriations definitely, clearly, and particularly for the Blackfeet Reservation. There may be something for irrigation, something for support and civilization, there is something more in the hospital item, and the committee can not assemble all these items in a moment and turn over the total to the gentleman, but the hearings will disclose all these different items.

In addition, there is something that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] has in mind and that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] has in mind when they talk about additional expense. The hearings disclose that information, which is essential, necessary, and practical, so the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] states. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] urges that the amendment proposed would go further and include the unnecessary and impracticable. For instance, here is a little item that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] spoke about—$15,000 for the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians. Some of that $15,000 may be spent, perhaps, among the Blackfeet and some of it elsewhere. There are a number of tribes scattered all over the United States, and we appropriate a little item of $15,000 to carry out one purpose, and we trust the discretion of the bureau to spend that $15,000 to the best advantage. Now, if you require them in advance to say that they are going to spend $40 among the Seminoles of Florida, and $100 among the Blackfeet, and $200 among the Chickasaws, and then an emergency develops in the course of the year, and later when the money is to be spent it develops that there is need for $100 in Florida and $50 among the Blackfeet, the gentleman has required them to sew themselves up in advance, and in order to do that useless thing we will have to spend a lot of money unnecessarily.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I trust the gentleman will understand that I simply want the total on the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for irrigation on Indian reservations, $197,450, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. at L. p. 582): *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which public funds are or may be otherwise available: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the necessary expenditures for damages by floods and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided, however*, That the amount so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 20, line 24, after the word "reservation," strike out the figures "$197,450" and all of line 25 and line 1 on page 21 to the semicolon, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$135,000."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the general items carrying $197,450 for which there is a justification in the regular form that has been used for many years on behalf of the Indian Bureau. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, there was appropriated $174,500, but of that appropriation only $132,220 was spent. I provide for an appropriation of $135,000, which is a sum in excess of the amount expended for 1922. The analysis of the expenditure shows the salaries and wage account was $85,297 and the traveling expenses $10,000, making $95,000 for expenses of that kind. The equipment and miscellaneous and material items ought to give some indication of the material cost, which is $15,550, and shows a great disproportion compared to salaries. Now, as to this reimbursable proposition, it is one which should be discontinued entirely or put on a sound basis. Some years ago we started in on the reimbursable plan for the first time. We advanced the money for irrigation purposes, putting liens on the land of the Indians. We have appropriated $28,283,495 of the American taxpayers' money and very few millions have come back, either for industrial purposes or irrigation. The additional amount needed to complete all items would be $32,350,700, so that we are involved in the tremendous proposition with $32,000,000 yet to go.

The act of 1914 provided that first liens should be laid on the lands to pay for the cost, but it stated that it should not be enforced as long as the land was occupied by the original possessor of the lands or his heirs. What is the effect of that? That means the perpetuation of tribalism. You are going to bind the Indian to the reservation so that he can not get away. His land is mortgaged, and if he disposes of it this lien by the Government is enforced. I believe that the time has come when we should have a constructive plan for reimbursement if we are to continue it at all. The time will come when we will have to cancel fifteen or twenty million dollars. We will have to wipe that off altogether. Why should we not start now and lay down an efficient business system? My amendment provides $135,000—more than was used during 1922. Then we should put the reimbursable proposition on a sound basis through the action of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUPPORT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, and other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, $1,799,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind or mentally deficient Indian children: *Provided*, That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools, with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924: *Provided*, That this limitation as to attendance shall not apply to the Hope Indian School for Girls at Springfield, S. Dak., which school is hereby continued. The pupils in schools so discontinued shall be transferred first, if possible, to Indian day schools or State public schools; second, to adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools, to the limit of the capacity of said schools: *Provided further*, That all day schools with an average attendance of less than eight shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924: *And provided further*, That all moneys appropriated for any school discontinued pursuant to this act or for other cause shall be returned immediately to the Treasury of the United States: *Provided further*, That not more than $250,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support of Indian day and industrial schools where specific appropriation is made: *Provided, however*, That the deficiency appropriation of $290,000 made by the act approved March 1, 1921, for the support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools is hereby declared to be available for expenditure for the benefit of all such Indian schools whether supported by specific appropriations or otherwise.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that part of the paragraph beginning on line 25, page 22, to the end of the paragraph. I make the point of order that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. RAKER. I think there is too much new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. To what part of the paragraph does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. RAKER. Commencing in line 25, the word "provided," on page 22, and running down to and including line 5, on page 24. I want to include all the provisos.

The CHAIRMAN. Down to the Indian schools and the agency, on the next page.

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Michigan say to the point of order made by the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAMTON. If I understand, the gentleman's point of order begins at the bottom of page 23, the last line, and ends at the end of the paragraph on page 24. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. RAKER. No; I make the point of order against all the provisos, beginning on page 22, line 25, down to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. But they are all sustained and within the authority of the committee to report. The first one is that $40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of the deaf, dumb, and blind or mentally deficient children of the Indians. This authority is given by the Snyder Act for the general support and civilization, including education. The Snyder Act reads as follows:

That the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate, for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes:

General support and civilization, including education.
For relief of distress and conservation of health.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What I am trying to get at is this: The whole amount, $1,799,500, may be used by the department as it thinks best and should not be controlled by legislation of the committee. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand now, Mr. Chairman, the point of order made by the gentleman from California—and if I do not state it accurately I will be glad to have him correct me—is that the whole amount, $1,799,500, is in order for the general purpose stated, but that it is legislation for the committee to put in a limitation as to the amount to be expended for any one purpose within the general purpose which, of course, I think requires no argument. It is not legislation.

I think I have stated the gentleman's position correctly. As to the first item, for instance, we could have appropriated $5,000,000 for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind Indian children, but we have simply put in a limitation that not over $40,000 of that shall be used for that purpose. That is not legislation. I understand that is typical of the point which the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] makes.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Michigan could defend his position against the point of order on the second proviso, that that is a saving to the Treasury of the United States and in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a saving.

Mr. CARTER. It is not a change of existing law. The Secretary has the right to discontinue schools whenever in his discretion it should be done.

Mr. HICKS. It is a saving, and is in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. CARTER. It would be; certainly, but the Secretary has that right. This is simply a requirement made on the Secretary under existing law.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggested that it would be a saving. You can make that general statement without any real facts on which to base it. The gentleman says that they will discontinue the schools unless they have a certain number of pupils. At the bottom of the same proviso provision is made to transfer these pupils to other schools, and the gentleman will know, if he has investigated that, that it is costing the Government more money to make these transfers where they discontinue the schools when you take care of the same number of pupils.

Mr. CARTER. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the proviso referred to by the gentleman from California pertains to boarding schools, and here the proviso pertains to the public schools. Certainly it will be cheaper to educate the children in the public schools than in a boarding school.

Mr. RAKER. The suggestion I made is that where they discontinued the nonreservation or reservation schools they must and do transfer them to some other nonreservation or boarding school. Sometimes they send them as high as a thousand or two thousand miles away from where the children have their homes, at a large expense, and in the ultimate, the Government is paying out more money to educate these Indian pupils by scattering them broadcast, and that is within my own personal knowledge and observation, through visiting the schools and observing what is being done with these Indians in California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman's statement regarding the matter in so far as nearly all of these different provisos is concerned, is, the Chair thinks, correct, but the Chair would call attention to the second proviso, and the third and the fourth, which seem to be connected together and to be of similar nature. For instance, taking the first proviso—

That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools, with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924.

What does the gentleman say as to whether that is legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Snyder Act of November 2, 1921, carried the blanket authority in the form of legislation to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to direct, supervise and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States "for the following purposes":

For general support and civilization of the Indian, and for education.

So that that money that Congress does appropriate for education of Indians may be administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations is to report to this House sums of money to be appropriated for the specific purposes within the general purpose of education. Having done so, that committee has the authority to say that we appropriate for 1 school or 10 schools or 100 schools, and in the course of such an appropriation may define the use of the appropriation. That is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The legislative authority has already been given in the Snyder Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the fundamental law, the law under which this appropriation is made, would it not be interpreted that the Secretary is given discretion as to whether or not he will discontinue the schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. Discretion no doubt except for such a paragraph as is before us.

The CHAIRMAN. If that be true, if this proviso takes away from the Secretary any discretion, would it be a change of existing law?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the Snyder Act does not explicitly give any authority to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to do anything except to use such money as Congress may from time to time appropriate. It does not give the bureau authority to continue those schools in existence at the time the Snyder Act became law. It gives the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, authority to administer the money that Congress gives in its appropriations, but when Congress makes an appropriation for a specific purpose the Bureau

of Indian Affairs can only use it for the purpose for which it is appropriated, and hence this committee may at any time report to Congress an appropriation of $100,000 for a school that has not been heretofore in existence, or we may cut out, with no appropriation, the school, say, at Albuquerque, and hence the bureau can not spend the money for that school since none has been appropriated; and, having that authority, your committee in this general paragraph may restrict the use for the money thereby given, directing to him where to use the money that is given.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if I may add a word in support of the proposition offered by the committee and against the point of order made by the gentleman from California, I would respectfully call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the reduction in schools must be a saving of public funds.

Mr. CARTER. And it is a limitation.

Mr. HICKS. Yes; and the gentleman speaks of the matter of transportation. It seems to me it would be cheaper to educate the children in one general school than in a thousand schools scattered all over the country. For that reason it seems to me that this is a saving of public money, and it comes under the provisions of the Holman rule.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. That would be true if the language here would carry out what the gentleman has suggested, but this language directs what the Secretary shall do. It is legislation.

Mr. HICKS. But for the purpose of saving money.

Mr. DOWELL. It is not only limitation but it is a direction that he shall do certain things.

Mr. HICKS. It would save the public funds.

Mr. DOWELL. It has no relation whatever to this appropriation. It may not save money and it may. That is purely a speculation, but the question arises that this is permanent. If you direct him to do certain things, that is permanent law and it has nothing to do with a limitation on this appropriation.

Mr. HICKS. I can not concede that at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman speaks of its being legislation. The gentleman does not question that this committee could have brought in an appropriation bill specifying how much money, item by item, should be expended as to all of these schools, does he?

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman can do this: He can limit this appropriation to any amount that he sees fit.

Mr. CRAMTON. And can itemize——

Mr. DOWELL. And can take all of it away, which will close the schools——

Mr. CRAMTON. And itemize by schools where it can be used, and the next year provide an entirely different itemization?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; but you can not direct the Secretary as to a matter of legislation which does not affect this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. If that is true, then no limitation would be in order upon an appropriation bill, because every limitation would prevent somebody from using certain funds. What does it say? It says that none of these reservation schools having less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be operated during that fiscal year, to wit, none of these funds shall be used for that purpose during that fiscal year, the fiscal year of 1924, the very year that this bill deals with.

Now, what does that language mean? It means that no money shall be spent for these schools during the year 1924. You could not make it any plainer even by adding "*Provided*, That no funds shall be used for these schools for the year 1924." It is certainly a limitation which the House has the right to put upon the Secretary if it thinks necessary. Otherwise we shall never be able to effect any economy by our legislation here.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman does not need to appropriate from this committee. This is not an appropriation. This is a direction.

Mr. CARTER. The appropriation here in the first part of the item is $1,799,500, to be used how? To be used according to specifications to be laid out in the bill later, and one of which is that none of these reservation schools having less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be operated during that fiscal year, to wit, that none of these funds shall be used for that purpose during that fiscal year. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, about the Secretary having the right to suspend any school he wants to at any time.

Mr. DOWELL. Then why does the gentleman direct him to do a thing that you say he has authority to do without the direction?

Mr. CARTER. Just for the reason that if we were to find that he was spending money wrongfully, say, in pensions or in irrigation or in anything; if we thought an irrigation project, for instance, should be stopped, we could say, "*Provided*, That no money shall be expended on that particular project for the year 1924." That is what we do in this item respecting schools.

Mr. DOWELL. You say he has already authority to do this, and if that is so, it is not necessary.

Mr. CARTER. We are limiting it to the extent that we keep the appropriation out entirely and do not allow him to use any funds for it.

Mr. DOWELL. No; you are not cutting out the appropriation; you are directing him to do certain things that have no relation with this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. We say just as plainly as we can that these schools shall be suspended. There can not be an appropriation for them if they are suspended. That is as clearly a limitation as the English language could make it.

Mr. HICKS. In other words, if that proviso were not in there, there would have to be some money in there?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; to take care of those schools. I remember the distinguished former Speaker of this House, Champ Clark, in deciding a point of order, said if you wanted to you could provide that a certain amount of money shall not be paid to a red-headed school-teacher.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no question about that proposition, but that is not the proposition we have here.

Mr. CARTER. That is the fact. The gentleman has not analyzed the entire item. If he would analyze the entire item he would see that this does only one thing, to wit, it does not permit any expenditure for these schools during the year 1924.

Mr. DOWELL. No; the gentleman is not limiting this appropriation. If he were doing that only, that would be in order without a direction. But you are directing the Secretary to do certain things which have nothing to do with this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. What are we trying to do? To suspend certain schools. If you suspend certain schools, it means there will be no money used on those schools, and there is no appropriation for them.

Mr. HICKS. And we are saving money?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question raised by this point of order is not altogether clear. The language of the act of Congress approved November 2, 1921, was very broad and general in its character. The act provides:

> That the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and subsistence of the Indians throughout the United States, for the following purposes: General support and civilization, including education.

Now, then, an appropriation is here provided of a certain amount of money, the language being "for support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for," and the language which follows is very general, as the committee will see: "Other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith." In other words, the language of the provision of this appropriation bill is intended to be, and is, in accordance with the general law.

Now, various provisions are inserted following that general appropriation and following that general statement of the purpose, among others the following:

> That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1925.

It might appear very well, if we do not go rather deeply into the proposition, that that would constitute a change in the existing law, because of the fact that whereas the general law gave to the Secretary the discretion with regard to disbursements of funds in this way, this provision might seem to limit that general discretion. However, I am inclined to think that it would be not within the stated purpose of the general law to give that sort of an interpretation to this provision and the others which follow; and I do that upon this broad and general ground: The statement here is that "the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes: General support, including education." Now, here we have a proviso which says that this appropriation shall not be used for a particular class of schools during the year for which this appropriation is to be used. The Chair thinks that would clearly, generally speaking, be within the power of the Congress, and certainly within the scope of the provision of the

general act which is made for this particular purpose. That being the case, the Chair feels that he is justified in overruling the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: On page 22, line 25, after the figures "$1,799,500," add the following:

"*Provided further*, That no part of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended for any purpose not directly connected with the education of Indian children."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent first to modify the amendment by striking out the word "further," which is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the proposed amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Chairman, this brings up the question which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and I had up a few minutes ago regarding the possibility of expending money out of this "Support of Indian schools" item for other purposes than those directly connected with Indian schools.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman said "farmers," did he not?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I said "farmers."

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman consider that the farmers and stockmen who teach the Indians to farm and raise stock are not directly connected with their education?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made a different statement——

Mr. CARTER. I am not making any statement. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Oklahoma is right, then, of course, there should be no hesitation about the adoption of this amendment, which provides that no part of this appropriation shall be spent for any purpose other than that directly connected with the schools. I say it is possible under this appropriation to pay out the money for farmers, stockmen, matrons, relieving distress, and other purposes which are already provided for in special items.

Now, let me prove exactly what I am saying by quoting from pages 350 and 351 of the special investigation of the Indian Bureau held by the Indian Affairs Committee of the Sixty-sixth Congress. I was a member of the committee then and had a somewhat active part in that inquiry.

Here is the statement of Mr. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

Mr. MERITT. From an administrative standpoint we think that there are too many items in the Indian bill. Practically every administrative official that I have met in Washington believes that appropriations for his bureau or department should be in as near lump-sum form as possible, so that he can administer those funds to meet the needs as they may arise. We realize that Congress has an objection to that form of making appropriations. The Indian bill is a matter of growth covering a long period of years, and we are required under the law to follow the form of the bill of the previous year. I think it could be very materially improved upon, and at the same time Congress could keep track of the moneys appropriated. The bill is somewhat misleading to a Member who has not had long experience on the Indian Committee. For example, we will have an appropriation for the support and civilization of the Klamath Reservation in Oregon, including pay of employees, $6,000. That would imply to an uninformed Member of Congress that that was all the money that we used for administrative purposes on that reservation, when in fact we use a very much larger amount than is stated in the bill. We not only use that fund but we take money out of the general funds in the bill for various activities.

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, let me ask you, can you use funds from a general fund for a purpose for which a specific appropriation is made under the law?

Mr. MERITT. Where there is a specific appropriation for a specific purpose we are not permitted to supplement that appropriation by any other fund. For example, where we have an appropriation for a nonreservation school we would not be permitted to use any of the general appropriation for school support to supplement the specific appropriation for a nonreservation school. * * *

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, what do you use that $6,000 for; for the Klamaths?

Mr. MERITT. We use it for administrative purposes on the Klamath Reservation.

Mr. CARTER. Can you take here from the general administrative appropriation any funds to use for administrative purposes there?

Mr. MERITT. We could take from the Indian school support.

Mr. CARTER. But that is not answering the question. My question was: Could you take it from the general administration item in the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. That support of the Indian schools is a general administrative item.

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress, for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. That is exactly what I wanted to find out. By reason of the elasticity of some of these general appropriations would you say that the bureau has authority to institute new activities and create new functions and corresponding new positions without authorization of Congress?

Mr. MERITT. We can create new positions on Indian reservations without authority from Congress, but we must keep within the appropriations authorized by Congress in the total expenditure of funds.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). Isn't that one of the invisible reasons for this 6,000 employees here who have gradually grown on the roll without Congress being advised that they were being worked into the service?

Mr. MERITT. The growth of the service has been gradual and the appropriations for the service have gradually increased, and as the activities of the service in the field increase the bureau would come to Congress and ask for increased appropriations. For example, in the Sioux country, before the allotments were made, there was not very much activity on those reservations, but since the allotments have been made and the property prorated among the Indians there has been necessarily a very greatly increased amount of work, and we have accordingly been required to ask for a larger appropriation.

I made the statement, Mr. Chairman, that it was possible to take out of this lump sum for the support of schools money for other purposes, and Mr. Meritt, who is in charge of the bill before the committee on behalf of the bureau, corroborates my statement.

Mr. CARTER. From what report is the gentleman reading?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The Indian investigation of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the committee reviewed the appropriation bill for 1920, page 351.

Mr. CARTER. The report or the hearings?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The hearings before the committee.

Mr. CARTER. I still maintain, Mr. Chairman, that if Mr. Meritt made any such statement as that he was mistaken, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will yield, yes; although the gentleman would not yield to me a moment ago.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman started the precedent, and I will not take the gentleman's time now if he objects.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to ask the gentleman if he has before him the language of the appropriation bill to which that statement of Mr. Meritt purports to refer.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; it was section 20 of the bill for 1920, for the support and civilization of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., including pay for employees, $6,000. On that item the whole question came up, and Mr. Meritt said that, instead of being used for schools, the money could be used for these other purposes. Now, we desire to have this money spent for schools—and I do desire it, for I believe the right kind of school is the civilizing agency for the Indian. I should like to see this money, which is $124,000 more than we appropriated last year, spent for the Indian children, to give them an education, so that they may become a part of the American community and not have the bureau take out of this lump-sum appropriation money to be used for the relief of distress when they have a large appropriation for the relief of distress. I do not want to see the money used for the payment of stockmen and farmers when there is already a large appropriation for the payment of stockmen and farmers.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman let me see that hearing?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have it copied here. I will get the printed copy of the hearing.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I should like two minutes more.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quite well aware that every item appropriated for in this bill has been calculated, and the number of students attending each school is itemized, and every dollar has been accounted for as the representatives of the Indian Bureau came before this committee and asked for it. Every item in this particular part of this bill is protected by that sort of information which is in this book that we referred to. Every item has been specified and every expenditure has been itemized as it came before the committee, and it has been pared down. Where there was a possibility of fluctuation in the numbers of those attending the schools from day to day we took the benefit of the doubt, and

we cut them down. So I do not believe the gentleman could find the possibility of diverting these funds into some other channel.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman has the Book of Estimates, which is the all-powerful word in this matter, let me ask him to tell me what has been done with the money appropriated last year under Indian school support?

Mr. MURPHY. I was not on the committee last year. I am a new man on the committee, but my observation so far is that this Indian Bureau have brought the figures in and put their cards on the table face up. I want to say to gentlemen on the floor that if every department of the Government was as honestly administered as is the Indian Bureau we would see the Government's tax money well expended.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am making no objection to the honesty of the bureau for years. I am calling attention to the inaccuracies and inefficiency of the bureau. Commissioner Burke is a splendid commissioner, but he is not as big as the system which is 91 years old. It is bigger than Commissioner Sells or Commissioner Burke or any man put in that position. I say the money should be spent for schools, and my proviso is that it shall be expended for no purpose except that connected with the Indian children.

Mr. MURPHY. Again I want to say to my dear friend from Pennsylvania that we are just one jump ahead of him. The Indian Bureau appropriation for schools is based on the per capita attendance at each and every one of these schools, and the salaries of each and every teacher is enumerated, and every dollar of the Indian money has been protected as far as honest and intelligent effort could protect it. I think the gentleman's motion at this time is unnecessary.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If I may have a moment more, I would like to say that in this bill there are appropriated over $5,000,000, and I am in favor of the money being expended for the education of the children, and I am interested in the way the money was spent last year. If the Book of Estimates shows how the money was spent and the schools upon which it was spent, then it will be shown if any money was expended for the relief of other purposes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Was Mr. Meritt's contention before the committee that the money could be spent for other than school purposes under the language used in this particular paragraph?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Absolutely; and I presume because of industrial purposes.

Mr. CARTER. It does not say industrial purposes; it says industrial schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is broad language.

Mr. BURTNESS. It is not as broad as the language in the bill of 1920.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is a case where the language is made very broad.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has read from some hearing in 1920, prior to the adoption of the Snyder Act in 1921. He quotes Mr. Meritt as stating under the language of the appropriation bill of that year that the money could be taken out of the support of schools and used for some other purpose not connected with the schools. Now, I asked the gentleman as to whether he had before him the language in the appropriation act of that year showing the language in the item under which Mr. Meritt said that could be done.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not understand my question and quoted another provision of the bill. I challenge the gentleman to produce the language of the bill corresponding to the item before us. I am safe in saying that under the language now in the bill, and put into this bill to conform to the Snyder Act, no money can be used for industrial purposes except in connection with the Indian aid to industrial schools. Now, I do not care what language he proposes to put in, he can only lumber up the paragraph; he can not make it any more clear than it now reads. What the paragraph was three or four years ago I do not know; the gentleman has not read it to the House. The money will not be used for industrial purposes except in connection with the schools, and we want them to teach the Indians how to care for stock and other industrial pursuits.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows there is a provision covering the industrial work in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Apart from the schools, yes; but the money appropriated in this paragraph could not be used except in connection with the schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is what I am trying to do by this amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to read the language that was used as a basis for appropriation before the committee two or three years ago and upon which the interpretation was made by Mr. Meritt. The language now which the gentleman from Pennsylvania hands me as having been the language referred to reads as follows:

For support and civilization of Indians of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., including pay of employees—

And so forth.

If the gentlemen of the House will turn to page 58 of the present bill they will find precisely the same language:

For support and civilization of Indians of the Klamath Agency, including pay of employees—

And so forth.

The statement of Commissioner Meritt as to that language was absolutely right. That would be right under the language in this bill on page 58, but it would be absolutely wrong as applying to the language we are now considering on page 22. This language on page 22 provides that the appropriation may be made for support of Indians and industrial schools not otherwise provided for.

In this paragraph we have provided for schools not specifically referred to in the bill. There are many of them, many of 1 teacher and 20 to 30 pupils. In the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will be found eight pages reciting the names and location of these schools and the number of children in attendance. Under the general law and through the provisions added to the paragraph we think we have thrown safeguards around the administration of the amount carried in the bill. Here we could not go into great detail with any particular profit. But when it came to other of the larger schools we called for comprehensive statements.

If the gentlemen of the House will be interested in turning to the hearings, not necessarily this big volume of estimates furnished to us by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs but the hearings themselves, they will find that following every particular item there will be a very closely itemized detailed statement of where these moneys were expended during the present fiscal year. For instance, on page 395, there is an Indian school in North Dakota—Wahpeton. There we have an appropriation of $46,800 for the present fiscal year. We have here in the hearings 2 pages indicating in detail the various items included in the general total of figures that I have given, indicating salaries, wages, traveling expenses, transportation of supplies, and so forth, salary of the superintendent, financial clerk, teachers, principal, children enrolled, average attendance, and so on in as full detail as it would seem anyone could possibly desire.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In a case of this kind where a department of the Government has submitted estimates to the committee showing how it proposes to expend this money, the department would not necessarily be bound by those figures, would it?

Mr. FRENCH. Those are estimates used as the basis for requests for appropriations. This is the policy that is followed by our committee: If a department shows that it has abused the trust of the Congress in failing to expend the moneys appropriated for the purposes indicated, the appropriations may not be made at all, and are not apt to be made for a succeeding year without a thorough understanding, and maybe not without a recital in the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the department found it necessary and useful to shift those appropriations from one institution to another, and it is of the same general object, I presume the committee would not complain?

Mr. FRENCH. We would complain, and, in fact, that would be impossible under the form in which this bill is written, because we make appropriations direct for the several Indian schools other than the small amounts that are carried generally in the bill for such purposes, as the chairman of the committee indicated awhile ago.

Mr. MADDEN. And it would be considered a breach of confidence on the part of the department to deviate from the understanding it had with the committee, and there would be retribution as the result of that breach.

Mr. FRENCH. There is no question about that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. FRENCH. And let me say this, that the language proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], if it were to be construed in connection with the language used in the discussion, might hamper the department where it ought not to be hampered. For instance, in several of these schools there are gardens where a great amount of produce is raised annually for the support of the children within those schools. This goes to the cutting down of the expense of maintaining the schools. Unquestionably, in my judgment, the moneys could be used and properly used for the purpose of handling that work, which is ancillary to the conduct of the school itself, the schooling of the children in agriculture on the one hand and helping to cut down expense of maintenance on the other. I think the language goes too far, and while I do not think in general that the language perhaps vitiates the spirit in which this bill is written, and which will be followed in administration by the department, I do think it might lead to trouble in the expenditures of money provided for.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section, and offer that as a pro forma amendment.

This bill carries for this item of support of Indian schools, $1,799,500, which is $124,500 more than the item was in the bill for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and $227,757 more than it was in the bill for the preceding fiscal year ending in 1922. The amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] sought a few moments ago to have adopted would require next year in the estimates a detailed statement by the Commissioner of the Indian Bureau of how he was going to expend this vast sum of money. In defeating the gentleman's amendment, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] produced this volume of estimates which I have in my hand, and because of its great size they thought that it would overwhelm the gentleman from Pennsylvania as evidence of the fact that there has been a detailed statement. Let us look at the book and see what the book contains as to a detailed statement of this expense of $1,799,500. Here is what it says:

Indian school, support: Analysis of expenditure.

Here is one of the detailed statements that the commissioner gives to Congress for us to pass on:

Miscellaneous, $11,071.

Can the gentleman from Ohio tell us what the $11,000 is spent for under the head of miscellaneous? What does "Miscellaneous" embrace? Then there is "Outstanding liabilities, $107,219." What are these outstanding liabilities? Is the gentleman from Ohio prepared to answer? Is there a detailed statement for it? The gentleman from Pennsylvania was right when he sought to have a detailed statement put into this record. Then they have this:

Fuel and lubricants, etc., $100,000.

That is a pretty high amount to be specified under those few words.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is there not light and power as well?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; fuel, lubricants, power, and light service. Then there is the item of dry goods, $118,000, and there is transportation of supplies, $60,000, which are rather indefinite.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. That is pretty general, is it not?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that they do not specify how much they are going to spend for calico and how much for gingham and how much for linen?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that is facetious. It does not state in this great big volume how many teachers they have. That is what we want to know. It does not state how much salary they draw. That is what we want to know. We want to know how many teachers they have or how much they are paid, what is the maximum and what is the minimum, and we want to know what this "miscellaneous" is and the other very indefinite large items unitemized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us turn to the last item we passed on a few minutes ago, relieving distress, prevention of disease, and so forth. Let us see how they itemize that. "Miscellaneous, $3,172.51." What is this miscellaneous? Then they have "Outstanding liabilities, $32,600." What are the outstanding liabilities? In what way and for what did they incur these debts that they want money now to pay?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is there anything in that book to show where the money was spent?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I challenge the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] now to show us in this book how many teachers they have for which they are expending in part $1,799,500, or what salaries are shown in this book as paid to teachers? You can not show it at all. The committee has failed after all to have detailed estimates. The committee is not one jump in front of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. The committee is just about 20 jumps behind him, if the truth were known; and because he is not a member of the committee, these five stalwart Members of the House who constitute the subcommittee ought to be willing to take a suggestion when it is sane from the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has studied this question, and not defeat his amendment by mere force, because they have the strength to do it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do so only long enough to say, because this record must be correct, that the $1,750,000 to which the speaker referred several times is not $1,750,000, but is in fact $1,799,500 in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, when the time comes I want to say a few words on the provisos found on page 23, lines 3 to 13. This amendment but indicates the situation. It is unfortunate that some of the schools are not visited by the officials of the department or even by the committee. They do not see them all by any means.

Here is a provision that I want to call your attention to: A school with 79 pupils. Under this law it will have to be abandoned, with an expenditure of $50,000 on behalf of the Government. Another one, a reservation school of 40 pupils, will have to be abandoned under this bill, with an expenditure already of possibly $60,000 or $70,000.

These are things that we know to exist. I have seen them. And yet they talk about that being economy.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield, of course.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the proviso he speaks of has been carried in the bill for several years, and the schools have already been closed, except there might be an occasional one that would come within the limit which has not yet been closed.

Mr. RAKER. There is one that I speak of, and as to that, of course, I speak advisedly; I am personally familiar with it. We talk about being humane. We talk about legislating in such a humane way for these Indians. Here a school is closed where there are 79 pupils, with an expenditure already on behalf of the Government of, say, $50,000. These Indian pupils must be sent away, not in the discretion of the department, but the Secretary must transfer them to certain other schools, as the provision provides. The pupils in schools so discontinued shall be transferred.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has in mind the closing of the school at Greenville, in the gentleman's district?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman understands that that school has never been appropriated for under this item?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I know. That is the reason why I am taking a little opportune time on the question of education. I saw a school in Nevada where they sent some of these pupils from California. They sent some of these pupils up into a reservation in Oregon. They sent some of them into northern California. They sent some of them down to southern California, at the Riverside Institute. The Government pays for this expense.

Mr. CARTER. These children are taken from near their homes. Does the gentleman from California say these pupils were sent a thousand miles?

Mr. RAKER. That was a hypothetical question. But I think you can figure that the distance from Greenville Institute down to the Sherman Institute is, as I guess, about 700 miles by travel. I have traveled from northern California to San Diego—and that is by the only way we could travel—and it was eleven hundred and odd miles.

Mr. CARTER. It is not the language of the law that the gentleman ought to complain about, but it is the noncompliance with the language. The language is as plain as it can be.

Mr. RAKER. They shall be sent, first, to an Indian day school. You shut up one of those schools and then send them

to a State public school. The gentleman and myself knows that the people are not in a position to bear this burden, although they are struggling to give to the Indians all the assistance that they can, but they do not believe the Indians should be sent to the same school with the white children. It is not right and proper. You compel the Secretary of the Interior to do this.

Next to the adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools, to the limit of the capacity of said school; and when you get to the limit, then poor little Mr. Indian does not get any consideration. You can figure on all the good things and you can say all the nice things you want, but I have been there and I have seen them, and I know what I am talking about. I have seen the Indian schools in Oregon and in Nevada and in California. I do not care to have you tell me what is done in these Indian schools and these day schools. I have seen them in the last 30 years, and I know their conditions of my personal knowledge.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What becomes of the pupils where the schools are discontinued?

Mr. RAKER. There is a nonreservation school at Greenville, Calif. There are 28 public buildings there, property that has probably cost $100,000 to the Government. You have an attendant there looking after it. They had a public building there for general school purposes. That was burned down by accident. Would the Congress or the Government pay out the money necessary to rebuild that school which was burned down by fire caused by an act of God? No; but they sent those pupils to Oregon and Nevada and scattered them over California. That is the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to object—the gentleman knows we are proceeding by courtesy of the House.

Mr. RAKER. I do. That is true, but I have taken only a little time, and if I can have five minutes now, I will not take so much time when we get to the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Am I correct in understanding that where there are less than 8 children to attend a day school on a reservation, then the children are sent to a distance to be educated?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; they are scattered broadcast like a bunch of quail, depending a good deal on the feeling of the local superintendent. Some of them will be picked up and sent to Oregon.

Mr. WATSON. If there are more than 8 children they are taught on the home reservation, and if there are less than 8 then they are sent away.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. For instance let us go back to the Greenville Indian School, located in a delightful part of the State of California, in the home of the Indians, who have been there since before the first white men came there, some of the older people and their descendants. They held lands there which, of course, have been taken from them. They are trying to become civilized, and are doing the best they can.

These Indian pupils come from within a short distance of this school. The school was built there by the Government at the request of the Indians and of the other people. Unfortunately the main building burned down in December, 1921. There are 28 public buildings remaining there to-day going to waste and destruction. Those Indian children were sent, some of them to Oregon, some to northern California, some to southern California, some to Nevada; and I think, although I will not make the statement positively, that some of them were sent to Arizona—two or three of them. Now, that is not a question of economy.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman contend that the reservation and nonreservation boarding schools are better than the Indian day schools?

Mr. RAKER. They are all pretty good if they are properly taken care of.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The boarding schools take them away from actual home surroundings and really Americanize them?

Mr. RAKER. They are both good, but I am very much in favor of the day schools. I am in favor of the boarding schools also, because they are both doing good work, but the nearer you can keep these children among their home people, where they do not have to go too far to get an education and to know how to do things in a civilized way when they go back and live with their parents, and then come to school every day; that is what you want, because I want to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that you can not take one of these Indian pupils away from his relatives and his tribe for five years and then send him back home expecting to get anything out of him. Any man who knows anything about human nature knows that, and when they write that they are going to civilize the Indians by taking them away for four or five years, that is all nonsense, unless you give him some care and attention after they leave school. You can not turn them loose like so many birds. The thing to do is to give them a chance to do the matters they will come in contact with in after life, and they should know something about this while they are getting a book education.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Let me read from page 137 of the hearings on this bill a statement of Commissioner Burke, in which he says that children in the reservation schools do not acquire the English language as they do if they go away from the reservation.

He says:

> If you go to a reservation school and you hear them recite or you listen to a little program, you can tell right away that they have not been to school anywhere except in that one place. They do not broaden. They do not acquire the English as they acquire it if they get away from the reservation. Another thing which you can readily see: If a child goes to a school, we will say a day school or a public school, he goes at 9 o'clock in the morning and leaves for home at 4. He goes into an Indian home, and only Indian is spoken in the home, and necessarily he does not acquire English as rapidly as he would if he did not hear Indian or could not speak Indian when he was out of school.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I want to answer the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. About what age are these children?

Mr. RAKER. They run from 7 to 15 years of age. Now, anyone knows that an Indian, unless he is living with some of his people——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for one minute.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has called my attention to a statement where I used as an illustration the Wahpeton School as being suggestive of the items in this paragraph which we are discussing. If it had that implication at all, it should not have had, because we will come to that item in a later paragraph. I would say that in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs there are eight pages that give, name by name, the schools all of which are included in this particular item that we have under consideration, not only showing the names but showing the number of pupils in each particular school.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I ask that the gentleman have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho may proceed for another minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to get the record absolutely straight, because I believe the gentleman made a statement which was inaccurate. He made the statement that in this Book of Estimates there is a complete itemization of all the moneys in this general fund. He now states that it is given in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs does not give $1 of the expenditure on these reservations. It shows the number of pupils attending, the number eligible, and the capacity of the school, but it does not show the amount of money spent, and that is what I was trying to get.

Mr. FRENCH. It gives the statement in a general way, touching the schools in this list, so far as this amount is concerned.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But not on the reservations?

Mr. FRENCH. No. Not as to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. I offer an amendment on page 23, in line 3, to strike out all after the word "children," commencing with the word "provided," down to and including the word "schools" in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 33, line 3, after the word "children," strike out all down to and including the word "schools" in line 13, page 23.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that the word "schools" appears twice in line 13, on page 23.

Mr. RAKER. I refer to the last word "schools" in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 23, line 11, after the word "to," strike out the words "Indian day schools or."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the proviso here provides that where these schools are discontinued, the pupils shall be transferred, first, if possible, to Indian day schools, or to public schools, and then to adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools. As far as the other proviso is concerned, about the discontinuance of these day schools, it is rather farcical, when we remember that exactly the same provision was carried in the bill last year. That was for the fiscal year 1923. Now, exactly the same provision is carried for the fiscal year 1924. There is only one reason to-day for that in my estimation, and that is that once these Indian bills are framed they keep going year after year without subtraction, but always with additions. There are no schools having such a small attendance, so that that proviso is entirely unnecessary. But the question as to whether or not these children should be put in the day school is important. Commissioner Burke made a fine statement before the committee, in which he went further than I have. He said that this thought had been impressed on him within the last few years, that he had come in contact with many graduates of the old Carlisle schools; and wherever they might be, or whatever happened, there was one thing they did possess, and that was a complete mastery of the English language. They spoke that as well as we speak it.

Now, that is essential in connection with the civilization of the Indians. The Indian day school is exactly the opposite. I have seen a letter from a teacher of a day school in Arizona in which it is reported that the conditions were shocking; that the children came to school covered with lice, and it was necessary for the teacher to disinfect them; and then they would go back to the sheep blanket and come back in the same condition.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman makes a distinction between the Indian day school on the reservation and the Indian day school off the reservation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Well, the day school on the reservation is the one to which I refer. Mr. Burke has protested against it, and I think anyone familiar with it would rather see the children taken to the nonreservation boarding school than the day school on the reservation. My amendment changes the preference and makes the public schools the first preference if there are pupils transferred on account of the discontinuance of schools.

I submit that if the Indians could be put in the public schools—all of them—they would get the genius of our institutions and know the meaning of American ideals better than through tribal segregated schools. There are no graduates from the reservation day schools that can interpret for an American to an Indian or from Indian to American. Why? Because they do not have the American language, and without the American language they can not become real Americans.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes a great deal for granted when he says that the committtee left language in the bill for no purpose. It shows that the gentleman has not studied the question that he discusses.

This item was in the bill last year. For what purpose? For the purpose of discontinuing all schools where the attendance fell below the point of 45 or 80 during the current fiscal year. It is in the bill this year for the same reason; that is, to force the discontinuance of schools falling below 45 or 80 during the next fiscal year. If the attendance falls below 45 or 80 they ought to be discontinued. My friend from California [Mr. RAKER], who is trying to interrupt me, seems to have a grouch about the Greenville school. I want to call attention to the fact that the Greenville school was the most expensive experiment the United States ever undertook with education of Indian children, and the gentleman from California knows it, because the sum per capita for the time it ran cost more than any other school we ever had. Now, there is a purpose for having all these things in the bill. No nonreservation boarding school ought to be conducted with less than 80 pupils and no reservation boarding school should continue with attendance less than 45. It has been found that schools with such a small attendance are more expensive. They entail a much greater per capita cost. We have to keep the overhead expense going just the same as for a larger school. Therefore these things have not been left in the bill by any haphazard methods. They are there for a purpose, and that purpose is economy and efficiency.

I am surprised that my friend from California says that children have been carried—I think he said 2,000 miles at first, but amended that statement later by cutting it down to 800 miles—I think the gentleman must be mistaken about that, because the bill is perfectly plain in its direction. It says that pupils shall be transferred first to the Indian day school and then the day public schools, and second to the adjacent reservation or non-reservation schools. If they have been carrying children across one reservation to another, if they have been carrying them from one school to another farther on, then the law has been violated and the gentleman's complaint is not against the committee, not against the law, but against the administration of the law.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will yield, I never made any complaint against the committee. I am trying to get results, and I hope when I try to present a matter here the committee will not think that I am against the committee. I am not against the committee or any individual. I love you all.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the gentleman wanted to ask a question. I have no time for the gentleman's felicitations. I took no offense at anything he said. My hide, like his, is thicker than an alligator's skin. I am trying to present this matter with what little emphasis there may be at my command to show to the members of the committee that these things were put in here with a purpose and what that purpose is.

Now, my friend from Pennsylvania has had some derogatory remarks to make about the day schools. While much can be said for the boarding school, the day schools also serve their purpose, and the value of that purpose can not be denied. The child leaves his house and comes to the day school about 8.30 to 9 o'clock in the morning. It returns to the little Indian home about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. When he returns to the cabin or tepee he carries with him some of the education, some of the civilization he has absorbed during the day. His mother, father, and other members of the family have an opportunity to observe and absorb a part of that; so the day school carries its civilizing influence beyond that which the pupil itself attains on to all other members of the family and to the tribe.

Just as strong a defense of the day school can be made on the grounds of economy. It costs a little above $2 per month to keep the average Indian child in the day school, while it costs about $25 at the boarding school. At this rate 10 may be educated in day schools for the cost of 1 in a boarding school. Then, again, the child in the day school is not wholly dependent on the Government for everything. He returns home for his meals, his parents furnish his clothes, he is in a more independent environment, and his parents are not completely relieved of all responsibility for his conduct, demeanor, and subsistence.

The public school is, of course, the ultimate goal where the Indian youth may be educated alongside his white brother. But until the Indian child is properly equipped, until public schools are available, the Indian schools must be continued; and the day school and the boarding school both have their place in the general scheme. Neither interferes with the other. It would be more proper to say one is the natural complement of the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN SCHOOL AND AGENCY BUILDINGS.

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of con-

struction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the proviso.

Mr. CRAMTON. Against all three of the provisos?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. On what grounds?

Mr. RAKER. Legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. We will consider the point of order as pending. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13559 and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 4172. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, in South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3295. An act to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolutions:

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary;

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askell;

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921; and

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 28, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

853. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend section 3 of the act approved September 14, 1922 (Public Law No. 299, 67th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

854. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report showing what officers of the Government were delinquent for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, in rendering or transmitting their accounts, together with a list of such officers as were found upon final settlement of their accounts to be indebted to the Goverament and who at the date of making this report have not paid such indebtedness into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

855. A letter from the national commander of the American Legion, transmitting report of proceedings of the American Legion for the year 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 13580) to authorize the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children to sell and convey certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13581) to provide hospital and dispensary treatment for all disabled veterans by the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13582) granting a pension to Elida G. Cusick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13583) granting a pension to Harlin Scaggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13584) granting a pension to Margaret Wellman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13585) granting a pension to William Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 13586) for the relief of Glenn D. Good; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 13587) granting a pension to Kate Bantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13588) granting a pension to Leo Forst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 13589) for the relief of Alice Sarrazin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSENBLOOM: A bill (H. R. 13590) granting a pension to Mary C. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13591) granting a pension to Sophronia Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13592) granting an increase of pension to John S. Furling; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6682. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 86 residents of Vallejo, Calif., protesting against excise tax on small ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6683. Also, petition of 42 citizens of Vallejo against section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill, being the tax on firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6684. Also, petition of 22 citizens of Richmond and Oakland, Calif., against section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill, being the tax on firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6685. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, Tri Council, No. 166, of Rock Island, Ill.; Southern Supply & Machinery Dealers' Association, of Richmond, Va., and Mobile, Ala.; and Haddorff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6686. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of J. W. Paxton and 10 other cotton growers of Dunklin County, Mo., urging legal protection of quail as destroyer of the boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6687. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of United Veterans' Council of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, urging the repeal of section 4 of the act of Congress approved August 23, 1912 (37 Stat. 413), relative to retired enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6688. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of the Drug and Chemical Section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, protesting against the enactment of the Ernst-Wood bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6689. By Mr. SWING: Petition of Pioneer Citizens of the Imperial Valley, State of California, favoring the passage of House bill 11449; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *December 28, 1922.*

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 27, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gerry	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Glass	McCumber	Sheppard
Brandegee	Hale	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Harris	McKinley	Smoot
Cameron	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Capper	Heflin	Moses	Stanfield
Caraway	Hitchcock	Myers	Sterling
Colt	Johnson	Nelson	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Keyes	Norris	Warren
Dillingham	King	Oddie	Watson
Ernst	Ladd	Page	Weller
Fernald	La Follette	Pepper	Williams
Fletcher	Lenroot	Phipps	
France	Lodge	Poindexter	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily detained on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter which I have received from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 27, 1922.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Replying to your inquiry relative to the proposed amendment to the pending naval bill authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference to deal with conditions in the war-torn nations of Europe I write to say that I know of no prohibition against such an expression on the part of the Congress, but I do frankly question the desirability of such an expression. I think it is undesirable because of the false impressions which may be conveyed thereby to Europe, and even more undesirable because of the wrong impression it conveys to our own people.

On the face of things it is equivalent to saying that the executive branch of the Government, which is charged with the conduct of foreign relations, is not fully alive to a world situation which is of deep concern to the United States. As a matter of fact, the European economic situation has been given most thorough and thoughtful consideration for many months. Without questioning the good faith of the proposal I am very sure it would have been more seemly, and the action of the Congress could be taken much more intelligently, if proper inquiry had been made of the State Department relative to the situation in which we are trying to be helpful.

Of necessity the communications of the State Department relative to delicate matters among nations can not be bulletined from day to day, but the situation is never withheld from Members of Congress who choose to inquire for confidential information in a spirit of cooperation. Such inquiry would have revealed the futility of any conference call until it is understood that such a conference would be welcomed by the nations concerned within the limits of discussion which the expressed will of Congress compels this Government to impose.

In ratifying the treaty of peace with Germany the Senate made a reservation that the United States should not be represented on the Reparations Commission without consent of Congress, and no such consent has been given. Moreover, in creating the World-War Debt Funding Commission that body was restricted to explicit terms for rates of interest and ultimate time of payment. If Congress really means to facilitate the task of the Government in dealing with the European situation, the first practical step would be to free the hands of the commission so that helpful negotiations may be undertaken.

It is quite generally accepted that the adjustment of the question of reparations must underlie any economic rehabilitation of Europe, and reparations can not be settled without the consent of governments concerned. The United States can not assume to say to one nation what it shall pay in reparations nor to another nation what it shall accept.

In discussions with foreign governments the previous administration and the present administration have insisted that the question of European debts to the United States is distinct and apart from the question of reparations, but European nations hold a contrary view, and it is wholly inconsistent to invite a conference for the consideration of questions in dealing with which the Government is denied all authority by act of Congress.

So far as the limitation of land armaments is concerned, there seems to be at this time no more promising prospect of accomplishment than when the conference was held in Washington a year ago. Here, again I venture to warn the Senate against the suggestion to our own people or a gesture of promise to the world which can not be fulfilled until the nations directly concerned express their readiness to cooperate to such an end.

With respect to a limitation of auxiliary types of naval craft, which are not limited by the present naval treaty, it is to be said that such an agreement is much to be desired, whenever practicable, but we may reasonably postpone our further endeavors along that line until the agreements made at the Washington conference secure the final sanction of all governments concerned.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

PETITIONS.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a resolution unanimously adopted at the member's council meeting of the Denver Civic and Commercial Association, favoring the enactment of legislation extending liberal and adequate credit facilities to farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HALE presented a resolution adopted by the New York State Conference, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the maintenance of a strong Navy adequate to the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pontiac, Mich., praying that the United States protect the Armenians from persecution and massacre, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4235) granting consent of Congress to the Charlie Bridge Co. for constructon of a bridge across Red River between Clay County, Tex., and Cotton County, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4236) granting a pension to Abner C. Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4237) to control the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, to provide for indemnity bonds or insurance policies, to fix penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4239) authorizing officers who were retired for incapacity resulting from an incident of the service before July 1, 1922, to be given the same pay, according to longevity, as if retired after June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4240) granting a pension to John R. Scott; and

A bill (S. 4241) granting a pension to Fred D. Carlos; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4242) for the relief of Major V. Hampton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FRANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Borah amendment proposed to be submitted to House bill 13974, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

In lines 2 and 3 strike out the words "such Governments as he may deem necessary or expedient," and substitute therefor the following:

"The States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors and other States since recognized."

WOODROW WILSON'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, from all over the world, from the high and the low, from the rich and the poor, to-day are coming letters and cables congratulating our former President, Woodrow Wilson, on his birthday and rapid recovery of health. When every Member of this body has been forgotten, Woodrow Wilson's name will go down in history as the greatest man of this century. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution which I send to the desk may be given immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 386) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Senate has heard with great pleasure the announcement of the rapid recovery to good health of former President Hon. Woodrow Wilson: Be it

Resolved, That the Vice President be requested to express to Hon. Woodrow Wilson the pleasure and joy of the Senate of the United States because of his rapid recovery to good health.

REPORT ON TUBERCULOSIS AMONG NORTH AMERICAN INDIANS.

Mr. SPENCER. On Friday last I presented a report on the condition of tuberculosis among the North American Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Printing. After consultation with the chairman of that committee I ask that the report be returned from that committee and be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN RELIEF IN RUSSIA (S. DOC. NO. 277).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report by the Surgeon General of the Army showing the medicines, medical, surgical, and hospital supplies transferred to American relief organizations under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to transfer certain medical supplies for the relief of the distressed and famine-stricken people of Russia," approved January 20, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 28, 1922.*

ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Mr. CAMERON. I present an address delivered by the Attorney General at Canton, Ohio, October 21, 1922, which I think deserves to be incorporated in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD in 8-point type, as follows:

[Address by the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Harry M. Daugherty, at Canton, Ohio, October 21, 1922.]

"When law and order no longer remain as the guiding principles of all peoples and all institutions, then civilization is doomed to atavistic revolt."

—

"The freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution is not that freedom of speech which incites mob violence, destruction of life and property, and attacks on Government."

—

"LET US ALL SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT THAT IS ALIKE TO ALL OF US"—JUSTICE AND EQUITY MUST BE DENIED NO CITIZEN OF THIS GREAT REPUBLIC.

(Hon. Harry M. Daugherty.)

Those charged with responsibility in the conduct of government, even though temporarily in office, should periodically be called upon and be willing to give an account of their stewardship. No politics can be practiced in the discharge of the duties of the Attorney General of the United States without interfering with the proper business of the Government and without discriminating between citizens and classes. This should never be, and it is not done in the present administration.

The people of the whole country are entitled to know accurately and honestly just what is being done in the interest of orderly government and better society. It is impossible, of course, for public officials to disclose all the intricate moves required in the proper management of a department. As in the case of the Department of Justice, for instance, it would be disastrous to make public indiscriminately what is being done in specific instances and cases, or what is in contemplation.

IMPORTANT MATTERS INVOLVED.

I do desire to present in a limited way—limited only because of limited time—several of the most important matters which are now engaging the attention of the Department of Justice and of your Government. All of us understand that a great Government, such as ours, can have no malice; it must be just, and it must be honest to all alike.

STEPS TO INVESTIGATE.

I want you to keep in mind that the war ended on November 11, 1918, and from that day until the 4th of March, 1921, responsibility of conducting the vitally important legal business of the Government rested upon the previous administration. The war being over, those in positions of responsibility should immediately have begun the work of settling the affairs of the Government in order that we might forget the horrors of the conflict, ascertain who had been helpful and who had been hurtful, square the accounts, and close the books. Nothing of this character was undertaken. No suits were brought to correct mistakes and enforce adjustments.

Until this administration was installed no attempt was made to dig out the acts of dishonesty that on every hand were charged not by those in politics but by well-meaning persons, regardless of politics, who were compelled to foot the bills. Stagnation prevailed, and multitudinous claims and unadjusted accounts of every caliber and description were piled high in one conglomerate mass when the present administration came in. Barbed-wire entanglements of modern warfare were simple as compared with the artfully contrived barricades thrown up in concrete form about the countless cases of national and international importance. But no word of criticism is heard of inactivity in this respect, because such conduct suited those who have been the most critical of the Department of Justice since much has been started and much has been done.

DUTY OF THE DEPARTMENT.

A great majority of the individuals and a great majority of the industrial concerns transacting business with the Government during the war period were honest in their representations and activities. Others, unfortunately, were not, and it was the duty of the Department of Justice as quickly as it could be done, as quietly and in as dignified a manner as it could be accomplished without sensationalism, to ascertain what transactions were honest and what dishonest; what persons grafted, if any, and who were to be placed on the golden roll of honor and beyond suspicion.

The Department of Justice, therefore, immediately began and is continuing to exercise in the interest of the Government and its people all of its great powers to see that justice may be kept alive. The war-fraud cases, under investigation by a corps of experts, representing the best legal minds obtainable within the limitations, and even far beyond the limitations because of their personal sacrifice, fixed in the appropriation for the payment of compensation, will be cleared up as rapidly as human energy can accomplish the stupendous task made so difficult through the complicated and inexcusable confusion attending all such war-time transactions.

VOICE OF CALUMNY RAISED.

Some disloyal and incompetent employees had to be ferreted out and kicked out. The records of the war transactions had to be built up from scraps of paper and the faulty memory of witnesses in many cases scattered over the world. Those who were under suspicion and with guilty conscience had been at work for months and years to prevent the day of reckoning.

Every known method of interference and intrigue had been adopted. There was no limit to their resources. Money improperly and criminaly secured in war transactions was more in amount for defense than the Government had for investigation and prosecution by civil and criminal proceedings. The scoundrels struck from behind. They hid behind willing or innocent tools, who were induced to make attacks on faithful agents and officers of the Government for the promised consideration of notoriety and spectacular and sensational temporary prominence. They had no regard for the Government; they had no regard for conscience; they had no regard for the character of any man in position, high or low, who in a painstaking way was trying to get at the truth, to protect the good name of the innocent on the one hand, and on the other trying to get dependable testimony to prove the fraud, if any, and

to find who were actually the criminals. No name was sacred, and in fact no life was safe if it stood in the way of their escape.

CONGRESS AID INVOKED.

As soon as we could become acquainted with the persons with whom we were to be associated, the work was begun by the regular force. Others were added as the funds at the command of the department permitted. Without sensational announcement, published notice, or vainglorious promise, the work was thus started. Up to this moment, as the directing head of the Department of Justice, I have never, in public speech or in public print, mentioned the name of a man or a concern under investigation until court proceeding was properly instituted and the records of the proceeding had served as an announcement to the entire world. It is the duty of the Department of Justice to protect as well as prosecute. The department continued to do this important work quietly as long as it was permitted to do so.

As soon as it became known how effectively the work was going on, the storm broke. When all available funds of the department had been exhausted, Congress was asked for financial assistance. It was necessary to pass laws to make it possible to bring certain suits; extra grand juries had to be provided for so that the investigations might proceed; extra judges had to be authorized in order that the courts might get at the cases expeditiously.

Legislation for this purpose was compelled to take its course, but was hurried as rapidly as possible, and the last bill necessary for the prosecution of the department's fraud work has only recently become a law. The request for the appropriation of half a million dollars for use in this particular work was made of Congress at the very time when accusation and calumny, like poison gas, were being used to prejudice, to interfere with, and to defeat the purpose of the work. Yet at the time the storm broke and reached its greatest fury sufficient facts had been quietly presented to the committees of Congress to justify the appropriation asked for, and Congress made the appropriation without a single dissenting vote in either branch, thus giving the full initial amount requested for the purpose of paying the expenses of conducting the work.

ENEMIES BEHIND SMOKE SCREEN.

The opposition of the crooks was conducted behind a smoke screen of calumny created for their own escape, and the real reason for the attack was in every instance withheld. The very men against whom both civil and criminal proceedings have been brought were using the ignorant and the notoriety seeker to make charges in the open that nothing was being done by the Department of Justice. The real reason for their activity was the fact that things were being done. What did any man's reputation, his character, his life even, amount to if it stood in the way of their corrupt defense? But we have gone through it all, and still we are not afraid, and we will go on.

A congressional investigation was demanded. Why? Because they could then, as they thought, disorganize us and compel us to produce the evidence prematurely, and thus dissipate the Government's efforts to bring and try the cases in a dignified, orderly way before the courts of justice of the country. They have tried for months to force an investigation and trial of these cases before congressional committees that have no judicial authority and in the daily press. This we have not done. This we will never do, no matter what the temptation and no matter what the provocation, unless under the direction of Congress as expressed by duly authorized legislation we are compelled to scatter to the four winds the facts and evidence of the Government which would enable the guilty to escape civil and criminal liability.

NO TURNING BACKWARD.

We are going back to the day, thank God, when there is some hope and expectation that the world and the country will be in order, and precedent well and long established will be followed for the adjudication of differences between citizen and Government. It will take time, and it will take patience. The work will be done, and it will be done as thoroughly as human agency can do it.

The Government will never answer any attack made upon the responsible heads of its departments except in the orderly process of our dependable courts. The Government will not play into the hands of those who hope to be the undeserved beneficiaries of a premature showing of the hand of the Government in transactions which it is the Government's business to investigate and rectify.

More than 400 separate and distinct cases of tremendous magnitude, representing billions of dollars, now are undergoing a process of what might be termed liquidation. Recoveries will be made; many settlements will be made and have been made; and many transactions will be terminated successfully. I will not make promises that I do not think can be kept, and I want to say to the American people that the great unjustifiable financial loss, even considering the ravages of war, which the Government was compelled to sustain, can never be recovered, because, when the story of these contracts and transactions are truthfully written in the records of the Government, as they will be, it will be found that the greatest loss resulted from improperly made contracts wherein the interests of the Government were not properly protected, and improvident settlements too speedily made, and made without judgment, and made carelessly, recklessly, and possibly preferentially, but where actionable fraud, dishonesty, and conspiracy can not be specifically proven—all of which is necessary for conviction, and in most civil cases necessary for recovery.

MILLIONS SQUANDERED.

We are not picking at small things. We will only complain where complaint is justified. Many facts and disclosures attending this investigation indicate that hundreds of important contracts were entered into by the Government with great corporations and manufacturers without proper examination of conditions or requirements; without exercise of sound judgment; with carelessness and laxity that reflect no credit upon those agents of Government intrusted with authority to negotiate such contracts. Billions of dollars were squandered through this class of contracts—billions which never can be recovered.

United States attorneys throughout the country now have before them approximately 150 cases dealing with fraud in wartime transactions, and they are progressing with court action as rapidly as conditions permit. In Washington indictments already have been returned against 13 men who have been charged with complicity in attempts to defraud the Government at a time when all of our resources were so urgently needed for the prosecution of a war in which our sons by the millions were braving death in all its horror on the battle fields of Europe. Other indictments will follow in due course. It takes work and time, and several cases require more than a year and a half for preparation and investigation.

CAUTION IN ALL DETAILS.

I should like for the American people to know how painstakingly careful this investigation is being conducted. Attorneys who neither know, nor have now, or ever have had, any connection with those involved in the cases under investigation are endeavoring with all their skill to reach just, impartial, and scrupulously honest decisions in each individual case. When these separate cases are completed they are referred to what might be termed an advisory council, or court, which is composed of three of the most eminent legal scholars in America, who, after they have passed judgment, present their findings to the Attorney General.

Despite the infinitely careful research and analysis, the balancing of every element entering into the transactions, the sifting and sorting of facts and allegations and superficialities by trained and competent agents of Government who have spent months on their task—despite all this the Attorney General and his advisory board again go over in detail the merits of the cases before final decision is reached as to how they shall be disposed of and to see that justice is done the Government and no injustice done anybody.

In the shortest space of time in which it can be accomplished every case will be closed. Reports will be written covering every detail, omitting nothing which in the name of justice should be contained therein, and then when the Government has done its duty, whether by court proceeding or by civil settlement processes, these books and records will be sealed, this horror and scar upon our national life will be erased for all time, and it is my ambition to see terminated this tremendous task in such manner that there may be inscribed upon the back of each volume of the record and upon the title-page of each volume the words "truth and justice."

ORIGIN OF CRITICISM.

There has been criticism, naturally, of the Department of Justice and those who faithfully have sought to serve the Government with all the honesty of their being. I refer not only to the Attorney General himself but to those loyal and devoted officers of Government who have in silence suffered bitter and infamous charges, but whose armor, when all has been said and done, will have stood the test of faith and confidence of the people of this country.

How futile it would be for public officers to respond to every demand of the curious, to reply to subtle innuendos and criticism, to attempt to appease the curiosity of those who would

seek to learn if they or those with whom they are allied are under investigation or likely to be investigated. It is this class which indulges in criticism and attempts to throw up about every department of Government and every official in responsible position a cloud of distrust and suspicion.

We would have heard little criticism of the Department of Justice had it not been discovered that a case like the Chemical Foundation, for instance (in which valuable patents were assigned by public officials to companies which they themselves had organized), was under investigation, and the part played by those involved also was being scrutinized carefully by Government agents.

INSIDIOUS PROPAGANDA.

And let me here, without giving any intimation as to who the men were—let me suggest that I have had the unique experience of sitting in the Department of Justice and listening to the story of a man formerly connected with the Government and hearing patiently his pleas for certain fairly legitimate concessions, when at the same time in the city of New York another former official, one of his associates, was busily engaged in getting contributions and making connections in order that the attacks upon the Department of Justice and the Government might be increased, reinforced, and successfully continued.

I can give the names of these parties if ever they lift their voices to dispute this statement, but unless I am authorized by them so to do I should like to go through this entire investigation without prematurely mentioning names except in the orderly process of court proceedings. Their names, however, will be found in connection with certain litigation wherein some of the most important questions and some of the most questionable transactions and some of the most valuable properties in the world are in dispute, and the right and wrong of the transactions connected with the transfer of certain property must be determined in a court of justice.

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT.

Now that you know the obstacles ever in the path of those officers of the Government who would do their duty honestly and faithfully, is it surprising to you that public servants so often are vilified with the most bitter and contumelious language? But as long as government lives, as long as chosen leaders of peoples perform the tasks set out for them fearlessly and with all the honesty of their being there still will be some few who would attempt to breathe scandal where no scandal lurks, to find fault where no fault exists. To attempt to combat this sort of thing would be as futile as the heroic exploits of Cyrus, who employed a whole army to revenge himself on the river Gyndas for the fright it had put him to in passing over it.

I could not in volumes give a full account of the accomplishments of the Department of Justice during this administration, but if I may, I want to give a glimpse of a few of the problems disposed of or under consideration at the present time.

During the past year civil suits to which the United States was a party were instituted to the number of 9,646; more than 8,000 were terminated. There are now pending in the courts something like 12,000 cases.

More than 60,000 criminal prosecutions were begun. During the year 53,000 were terminated. There are now pending more than 64,000 cases.

From these prosecutions and adjudication of cases brought under the present administration, nearly four and a half million dollars were realized by the Government from the civil suits alone, while fines and penalties to the amount of three and a half million dollars were realized, making a total of nearly eight million dollars.

COSTS OF ADMINISTRATION.

The total appropriation allotted for the conduct of the Department of Justice for 1922 was $19,000,000. How trivial this sum would seem when it is remembered that in 1913, for instance, the enormous sum of $11,000,000 was appropriated for the department when the problems were infinitesimal as compared with the issues of towering magnitude to-day. It must be understood that the Department of Justice is now cleaning up the war débris and the department has at least ten times as much work and business as it ever had before.

Another administration accomplishment, one which is most gratifying, was the enactment of legislation which made possible additional judgeships. Our courts are clogged, but now, with 24 additional trial judges, the Nation may look forward to the expediting of cases which long since should have been disposed of. On June 30 of this year there were in excess of 172,000 civil and criminal cases pending in the Federal courts of the United States.

The American people must be protected by its courts. One particular issue which it shall be my privilege to force will be the disposal of approximately 480 cases developed through postal frauds and which are now pending. These cases, now in the hands of United States attorneys for institution of criminal proceedings, represent the filching from the public—widows, old men, and even children—of the enormous sum of $140,000,000. These scheming and vulturous users of the United States mails shall be brought to trial, and the humble citizens victimized shall have the satisfaction of knowing that the Government is determined to see that their cases get as much attention as the cases in which the great and mighty are involved. Equity and justice must be denied no citizen of this country, now or hereafter, if our courts and our public officers are to enjoy the continued confidence of the people.

NO APOLOGIES TO OFFER.

From the birth of this Republic to the present day the American Government has never shirked its duty to nor felt constrained to apologize for any action or step taken in the interest of its nationals and its industries. Nor shall the Attorney General of the United States now or hereafter apologize for any act of his which provides protection and establishes more firmly those bulwarks of human liberty and justice to which the American people are so bountifully entitled.

No more sacred trust is placed upon Government or man than that which looks to the preservation of the traditions and ideals of enlightened civilization. And when basic fundamentals of our national welfare are threatened, when conniving and vicious elements seek through menacing doctrines and destructive acts to undermine the faith of the people in their Government and those officials who have been chosen by mandate to guide and guard with all the honesty and fearlessness of human courage the laws of God and man, then I say that the time has come when eternal vigilance not only becomes a precaution but a duty on the part of mankind.

If American institutions are to endure they must be surrounded and buttressed by all the protective forces known to the ingenuity of man.

LABOR AND THE GOVERNMENT.

I am not now, nor have I ever been, an opponent of honestly conceived labor organizations and trade-unionism. If I were a skilled worker in mill, factory, or mine I would join a union, but I would never affiliate with a union that sets its laws and its constitution above the laws and Constitution of my country. In a great industrial nation, such as ours, labor organizations are necessary, but they must be the right kind of unions under the right kind of leadership.

Labor must be constructive and not destructive. There must be loyalty to employer, to the Nation. The radical and unscrupulous leader and those elements which make up the agitator type must be eliminated from our national life. They menace the whole system of trade-unionism, and for its own protection organized labor must banish them from its ranks. The advocate of violence in our national and industrial life must go, and the word of labor everywhere must be as good as its bond.

If those who come to this country and become naturalized citizens, that they may enjoy the benefits the country affords to all alike, are not satisfied with our laws and our form of government, then they should as rapidly as possible denaturalize themselves and return to the country under whose laws they did not care to live but whose theories they would attempt to exploit upon us.

THE CHICAGO INJUNCTION.

I am not altogether sure but that we have reached the point where for the safety of the country every foreigner coming to our shores should be met at the dock and impressed with the fact that he must, before naturalization, in some effective manner prove his worthiness to citizenship in this great Republic. As it is too many of those entering our gates are met at the port by the professional parasite and advised that the only prerequisite to American citizenship is membership in this or that organization—organizations which are dedicated to the destruction of the very freedom which the immigrant hopes to enjoy.

One of the most important steps taken by the Department of Justice in the interest of the American people was that in connection with the injunction proceedings at Chicago that reestablished justice and individual rights in America. The railroads of the country are compelled by law to furnish interstate commerce for the country. It is the duty of Government to see that this obligation is performed according to the letter of the law. The roads were attempting to keep interstate com-

merce alive, but conditions had reached a point where this was made impossible, through lack of skilled workers, deterioration of equipment, and other conditions brought about by the strike of 400,000 members of the Federated Shop Crafts Unions.

The Government acted. It was a duty, not to labor, not to the railroads, but to the American people and to the Government itself. More than 17,000 affidavits from every section of the United States concerning anarchy bordering on civil war furnished convincing proof that the people needed the protection of their Government as never before.

Bear in mind that I did not undertake this proceeding as a partisan or as the advocate of the railroads. As between the railroads and those with whom they were in conflict, considering the matters in dispute, I was neutral, and I took no action on behalf of the Government until it became apparent to the entire country that interstate commerce and the carrying of the mails were being interfered with to the extent that our people and our industries were being materially affected. In fact, more than 1,000 mail trains had been withdrawn from service.

ECONOMY IN EXPENDITURES.

Was the Government interested? The Department of Justice alone spent probably a million and a half dollars in seven weeks, as economically as it could be used, to keep down strife and preserve order in its neutral capacity between the contesting parties.

In the last half of August it was evident to all that the situation was growing worse, and it was solely in the interest of the entire people, the maintenance of commerce, and the carrying of the mails, furnishing food and fuel, that the Government performed its duty when it brought action to restrain those who were interfering with transportation and threatening the life of the Government. It may truly be said that the transportation crisis through which we passed came dangerously near imposing a veto upon the economic readjustment of our national life.

When the heads of the Federated Shop Crafts unions called their strike the men who walked out were in revolt against a 12 per cent reduction in wages authorized by the Railroad Labor Board, the quasi judicial body charged by Federal law with the duty of fixing railway wages. This move was a complete renunciation of the Esch-Cummins law, which afforded them special protection as to wage status by providing that all disputes concerning basic wage conditions and working rules should be referred to a Federal tribunal representing the roads, workers, and the public.

FAIR WAGE FOR LABOR.

Thus, with one bold challenge to constitutional government, the strike leaders to all apparent purposes renounced the protection of governmental authority when they mutinied against a decision which they construed to be unfavorable to their cause.

In practically every other industry in this country and throughout the world war wage scales had been abandoned, but union leaders demanded continuation of wage inflation at the war peak.

The Government and those chosen to safeguard its integrity and constitutional rights believe that labor deserves and should enjoy an equitable wage scale. On this issue there is no quarrel between labor and government.

More than 40,000,000 wage earners in this country depend upon organized government for livelihood, and protection of their interest ever constitutes a source of deep concern to government. In the industries alone some 30,000,000 toil in mill, factory, on public carriers, and in the mines. Of this number organized labor claims a representation of five or six million.

When certain rail workers were instructed by their leaders to lay down their tools, 400,000 of the 1,600,000 men employed by the carriers walked out in defiance of the law. A certain conspicuous union leader immediately suggested that a sympathetic or progressive strike was being considered, which would involve other crafts which had remained loyal to the carriers themselves and to their country. Attempts were made by strike leaders at this juncture to justify their stand by subtle intimation to workers that further wage reductions were contemplated by the Railroad Labor Board. But fundamentally the revolt was against the 12 per cent wage reduction.

Neither Punic cunning nor the vociferous canting of those who had determined to crush any conciliatory spirit that might exist among the army of wage earners thus arbitrarily ordered into idleness could disguise the facts behind this revolt against government.

RULINGS OF THE LABOR BOARD.

Not a year back this same governmental board whose ruling now was branded as an "infamous injustice to American workmen" had, in its decision No. 2, directed a substantial increase in the wages of rail employees. The carriers submitted, though they complained that labor costs had increased 115 per cent in comparison with 54 per cent increase in revenues made possible through higher rates granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

From a period of distressing inflation and soaring prices the country had passed into a period of severe liquidation; and the Labor Board, in effect, through its ruling No. 1036, of June 5 this year, had decreed that, in view of reduced wages in other industries, railway wages must of necessity be made to approximate them if readjustment of our economic and industrial life was to be accomplished.

But the die was cast, and labor's legions marched in solid phalanx from beneath the protecting bulwarks of constitutional law at the command of their leaders.

Industrial paralysis, human suffering, and irretrievable losses confronted the Nation as train after train was laid off. Cessation of traffic was destroying the arteries of trade and commerce. Government, industry, society, and labor itself realized that the helpless millions jammed into the great centers of population were dependent upon transportation for food—for life itself. But the upheaval went on. Sporadically tales came out of the West, the Southwest, and the South and from our northern border States of derailments, maiming, sabotage, and even murder.

FACED BY AN ECONOMIC CRISIS.

Just a year back more than five million men and women were walking the streets of our cities, jobless, hungry, and despondent; but now they were at work, through the sound operation of constructive government. The coal strike, which had spread over five months, was nearing final settlement, and 600,000 miners and their families were about to return to work contented. But anew there blazed upon the horizon of a prosperous Government and a happy people a crisis which stunned the Nation—a crisis which threatened not only economic and industrial depression, not only a recurrence of idleness among our wage earners, but the country's transportation systems, upon which all elements alike must depend for orderly government and those things which must hold together the human fabric.

Out of Philadelphia came the mandate of one of the heads of the shop crafts in that district, and which appeared to reflect the attitude of other leaders, that—

> We will tie up every train, both freight and passenger; every ferryboat and every railway shop, and not a wheel will turn anywhere.

Government was being mocked and pilloried in scorn. Appeals were being made to Washington by countless thousands of American citizens. Scarcely a community in any part of this broad, free land was being spared the iron heel of terrorism. Depredation of property was in full swing and human life was anything but sacred. All the great transcontinental systems were jeopardized, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, after infinitely painstaking surveys, had found that the rolling stock and equipment of the afflicted roads were so seriously impaired that 50 per cent of the locomotives in use were unfit for service and many were out of commission entirely.

The Nation was in the grip of civil war. We had reached a point where loyal, intelligent Americans wondered if organized government actually existed in this free land of ours—or a land presumed to be free and consecrated to observance of law. Criminals of the vilest types, apostles of the ultra-red variety, and crafty, power-lusting missionaries of discord mingled in the attack upon life, property, law, and government.

FIRM STEP NECESSARY.

Then, when all conciliatory efforts on the part of trusted Government emissaries had failed, when court proceedings in practically every district in the United States had been instituted by the railroads to safeguard their property and prevent willful and malicious interference with the orderly operation of their lines, when men were willing and anxious to work if permitted to do so, when the heads of the strikers had called upon the men who had deserted their tools and shops at their dictation to do "their damnedest and then some," when human suffering and hardships were beginning to leave their impress upon the innocent and helpless public, when transportation was impaired 50 per cent or more, and the country was stung to a fury, the time had arrived when national security no longer made it possible for government to stay its hand. A decisive and firm step was essential to the preservation of American institutions, its people, and the basic principles of government itself.

MORAL SUASION INEFFECTIVE.

Moral suasion up to this point had fallen upon deaf ears. Finally both railroad executives and shopcraft heads appealed to President Harding to use his good offices in an effort to adjudicate the differences between the two elements. In the most patient and painstaking way the President's great genius as a human harmonizer was put forth, but by the latter part of August his efforts had failed to receive the consideration to which they so rightfully were entitled. The President appealed to the striking workers, without denying their right to strike, though I may say on my own behalf, considering the fact they had submitted their dispute to the Railroad Labor Board, they had no moral right, at least, to repudiate that arm of the Government by refusing to abide by its decision. Appeal to the railroad executives received no remedial response. Reconciliation appeared to be impossible between the conflicting hosts, though the Government and its highest officers had expended every ounce of energy and brain force to persuade opposing leaders to compose their differences.

Railroad tracks and terminal shops of the country were in control of men who were undertaking to prevent other workers performing duties necessary to the free flow of interstate commerce. Demagogic and violently bitter disciples of force and anarchy worked in open sympathy with those who would paralyze transportation and stultify government, for no industrial dispute of mammoth scale in this country can survive without the contribution of this criminal class which revels in vandalism and thrives off the bounty of strike managers, who, perhaps oftentimes innocently, are inveigled into accepting their support.

IMMEDIATE ACTION DEMANDED.

Could government therefore be expected to remain supinely indifferent when its authority was challenged and threatened by chaos as deadly as armed strife itself? I say no, and every thinking man with love for his country and his fellow man will say no as vehemently as I do.

When government falters, when its chosen leaders neither know nor respect their duty, when law and order no longer remain as the guiding principles of all peoples and all institutions, then civilization is doomed to atavistic revolt. Thus fell Rome and Athens, and thus passed the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, but America was neither to succumb nor surrender to those elements which sought to destroy the traditions and ideals upon which her forefathers had builded a Nation of justice to all mankind.

What was the Government to do? The only logical answer and the only effective measure possible was an appeal to the courts for a restraining order—restraining those responsible for this condition of affairs from further interference with interstate commerce.

Before discussing the features of and the intent of an injunction let me say that the injunction proceedings at Chicago were instituted under the provisions of the Sherman law, the same law which 28 years ago was invoked by President Cleveland in the so-called Debs strike, when Federal troops were marched into Chicago by the thousands, and the same law employed by my predecessor during President Wilson's administration in a controversy wherein coal miners and operators were involved at Indianapolis. Cleveland, it will be remembered, was denounced as a despot and tyrant by sniping demagogues who scorned our Constitution and laws. But this was Cleveland's greatest public service.

THE SHERMAN ACT.

Section 1 of the Sherman Act declares that—

"Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

Section 4 declares:

"The several circuit courts of the United States are hereby invested with jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this act; and it shall be the duty of the several district attorneys of the United States in their respective districts, under the direction of the Attorney General, to institute proceedings in equity to prevent and restrain such violations. Such proceedings may be by way of petition setting forth the case and praying that such violations shall be enjoined or otherwise prohibited. When the parties complained of shall have been duly notified of such petition the court shall proceed, as soon as may be, to the hearing and determination of the case; and pending such petition and before final decree the court may at any time make such temporary restraining order or prohibition as shall be deemed just in the premises."

COMPARED WITH CLAYTON ACT.

The Clayton Act contains a similar provision, but the Clayton Act does not modify the Sherman Act in a situation of this character where the Government itself is a complainant and where interstate commerce is involved.

A temporary restraining order or injunction, such as was properly and legally granted in the recent case, probably would not be authorized in a similar contest between employer and employee or in strikes in industrial enterprises upon which the Government does not depend to aid it in maintaining interstate commerce and the transportation of the mails.

What is an injunction? Radicals and other obsequious sycophants, supported by that infinitely small portion of the press which depends for its circulation upon sensation and socialism, would have us believe that it is a modern device, a recent discovery. The injunction is the most humane, the most charitable, and the most prompt and effective civil proceeding known to law. Violation of an injunction may be punished by the court issuing the injunction, but the violator has a right to stand before the court, assert his right, defend his act, and be judged guilty or guiltless, as the court may determine. When a set of men are unwilling to abide by the decision of the court, they should be forced to do so, and when they no longer can be forced to stand before the bar of justice, then government ceases to exist.

INJUNCTION AS A REMEDY.

Further, an injunction is the laying of the hand of the Government in an admonishing and restraining way upon the shoulder of a man who is about to commit a crime, warning him and ordering him to stay his hand and hold his wrath and desist from committing a crime and becoming a criminal. If he stops, no crime is committed. If there is a dispute as to his right, he is given a speedy hearing before the court, which answers finally the question of right and wrong, justice and injustice.

The injunction is a remedy that has in one form or another existed throughout the entire period of civilization. It is as old as the common law itself, and held an important place in the protection of legal rights under the Roman law. Self-help, or the impulse to take the law into one's own hands, which the history of civilization shows to degenerate into mob violence if left unrestrained, is the alternate course of conduct which all through history has run parallel to the efforts of organized society to protect rights and redress wrongs by a government of law and order.

Even under governments firmly established the primal impulse asserts itself at times to take the law into one's own hands. Hence the functions of courts have been not only to redress wrongs already committed but to protect rights, and by writs of injunction forbid a threatened course of conduct in advance of the actual invasion of the right. The injunction is fundamental in every system of jurisprudence worthy of the name that has been devised for the protection of human rights. A fundamental principle of English law is that "Where there is a right, there is a remedy." Running along with the legal maxim is another old adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure," and the comon-law system found the writ of injunction effective for accomplishing its purpose.

PROTECTION FROM CRIME.

The injunction further saves a man from becoming a criminal. It protects the rights, not only of government itself but of all the people pending final judicial adjudication. It was the mildest form of procedure that could have been adopted in this case.

If the injunction were not resorted to, what was the next thing the Government could do after all efforts at voluntary and peaceful persuasion had failed? Step aside and let violence continue; let the mob grow in fury and in numbers; let the leaders with torch and bomb and dagger continue destruction of life and property? Could the Government permit itself to be weakened to a point where, after commission of hideous crimes by unrestrained hordes of violators of all we hold sacred, it would find itself impotent to adopt the policy it did?

Is it not better to prevent a man from committing a crime than to encourage him to become a criminal? Is it not better to restrain him by the gentle hand of the law in a kindly but impressive way than to let him go along to his own destruction? Is it not better to have men again at work, as they now are, than confined in jails, as many of them would be had this injunction not been issued?

Another step the Government could have taken was to have called out Federal troops. That would have been a sorry day, but it would have been done had necessity compelled. Appeal after appeal had come to Washington for troops, but armed troops were withheld. Who will say that it is not better to lay the hand of Government, with its restraint, its admonition, and protection, on the shoulder of the citizen than to call out troops to shoot him down, and, as is always the case, mingle his blood with the blood of innocent bystanders and bruise the hearts of his loved ones?

RIGHTS OF THE MINORITY.

In such a situation, if none of the steps referred to were taken, then Government would cease to exist in name as well as in fact; the people would become the prey of human vultures, anarchy would permeate the land, and mob rule would become the law.

We hear quite a little about the rights of the minority. A minority in this country has greater rights and is protected to a greater extent than in any other country in the world. But a minority has no right to deny to the majority the right it claims for itself. The minority has no right to promote civil war, impoverish a nation, deprive a people of those things to which they are entitled under the law, or to ignore and seek to withhold from the majority rights as equal as those enjoyed by the minority.

I hear no great cry on the part of the Nation's "mentors" as to the rights of the majority. It would seem from observation that there is a broad impression on the part of the doctrinaire and their ill-advised and sycophantic followers that the majority is subservient to the will of the minority, and the minority is subservient to the will of the radical, and that the radical may be led by any person who comes to our shores and undertakes to lead the American people into a pathway of fire and flame and chaos, intimidation, coercion, and disloyalty.

NO VOICE AGAINST CRIMES.

When the Chicago injunction was granted there was a hue and cry on the part of this radical element that the freedom of speech was being interfered with. It has been my privilege to read and hear, since the granting of the restraining order, great volumes of criticism, unfounded, of course, which in itself would seem to indicate sufficient proof that the freedom of speech neither has been interfered with nor abridged in any respect.

It must be remembered that the freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution is not that freedom of speech which incites mob violence, destruction of life and property, and attacks on Government. That is not what our forefathers intended by vouchsafing freedom of speech and liberty of press.

May I call the attention of the law-respecting citizens of this country to the fact that no frenzied voice was lifted by these same pedagogic pawns of profligacy when law-abiding American citizens by the hundreds, all over the land, were dragged into the mire of the woods, stripped of their clothing, and there left; when almost as many, according to prearranged schedule, well carried out, it seems, by somebody, were tarred and feathered, when others were thrown into streams and their clothing destroyed.

Where, it might be asked, were those frenzied voices now crying out for freedom of speech and liberty of press, when the loyal engineer and his crew, in the dead of night, faithful to their service and their country, pulled 12 Pullman cars across the continent only to be suddenly switched into eternity without a moment's notice by the vandal and murderer who pulled the spikes and threw the switches that murder might contribute to the cause of anarchy, and anarchy might destroy government?

FACED CRITICAL PERIOD.

Where were these frenzied voices when train after train, loaded with men, women, and children, were ruthlessly and criminally abandoned by those in charge as a part of a conspiracy, and left in the hot sands of the Santa Fe, with food and water scarce, comforts few, fright surrounding, even birth taking place—left to the tender mercies of Providence and the Government of the United States, if those responsible for the conspiracy were not successful in destroying it?

Where were these frenzied voices when $100,000,000 worth of produce raised in the State of California alone was left to rot because the railroads were not permitted to transport it to the consumer because of a quarrel between a small percentage of the citizenship of the United States?

Where were these frenzied voices when that horrible thing occurred at Herron, Ill., that will forever be a blot upon the community and the Nation?

We had reached the time when, if necessary, people of this country, in order to protect their homes, perpetuate their liberty, and be guaranteed the right to work and earn and save, were about to be called upon to write in human blood a new Declaration of Independence and a new declaration of human rights and liberty.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE.

Men have the right to strike; surely this proceeding does not destroy that. Men have the right to work; surely this proceeding insures that. There is no involuntary servitude in this country, but slavery consists as much in depriving a man of the right to work as in compelling him to work against his will.

The fact of the matter is that, under the circumstances and evidence existing and proved in the case at Chicago, had the Attorney General not complied with the provisions of the law by taking the action he did, he could have been impeached, and any Attorney General failing or refusing under similar circumstances to do precisely what was done should be impeached.

There will be no backward step in the policy of the Government as at present organized. I know that unless legislation prevents, if established policies prevail, if the courts are not destroyed, if duty is performed by those in positions of authority, all will be treated fairly in this country—labor and capital alike. I think we have reached the day when it may truthfully be said that we have seen in the United States the last extensive strike involving the tying up of transportation.

In conclusion I want to say another word here to labor. As truthful a statement as any I have made in this address I now make: I am your sincere friend and will not deceive you, but you make a mistake when you set up rules in conflict with the rules, laws, and Constitution of our common country, which rules and laws and Constitution are applicable to every other man in every other employment, and must, for your own security and safety, be applicable to you.

SECURITY IN THE CONSTITUTION.

Your principal trouble lies, and your greatest danger is, in the radicalism and character of some of your most prominent leaders. Your security lies in the Constitution of the United States and in the laws of the United States and in the good opinion, by you deserved, of all the American people. There should be no quarrel between labor and the Government.

A few irreconcilable railroad executives, who insist upon calling themselves "hard boiled," might also, with considerable benefit to the country, be dispensed with. The fault is not all on one side, but at a time when strife that was almost civil war raged in this country the Government, having the right to do so, insisted upon the railroads performing their necessary functions to serve the people. Those in conflict with the railroads interfered with the performance of this service, and it was to protect the rights of all the people, strikers and employers, and every man, woman, and child in the country, that the Government in its rightful capacity took a hand.

FULL RESPONSIBILITY ACCEPTED.

I accept my full responsibility for the step taken, and though it temporarily shocked because of the sudden halt of civil war, I would under the same circumstances do the same thing again or feel incapable to speak for an important branch of the Government and unworthy of the confidence and trust imposed in me by the President of the United States.

Let us all love and support the Government that is alike to all of us. The picture is not all dark. The country is secure, the Government is dependable, the rights of the people are safe. The best proof of that fact was when a dignified court, exercising jurisdiction with courage and fairness, issued a restraining order to prevent the destruction of government, the taking of life, and the sacrifice of property. All turned to the warning, and peace and quiet and thought and judgment again reigned, and when I saw that and when you saw that, well might we say, in the words of another great Ohio President, "God reigns and the Government at Washington still lives."

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire briefly to discuss the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to the bill which is now before the Senate. In view of the brevity of the remarks which I shall make, I hope that no Member of the Senate will ask me to yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. President, the man in the street would say, if two or more were in disagreement, the chances are that a mutual understanding would be reached if the discordant persons placed their feet under the same table and discussed the various factors that brought about such disagreement.

By applying the same formula, discord subsisting among the nations would likely disappear by assembling an economic conference where world-wide welfare could be discussed and the nations participating made to understand their mutual dependency and that national prosperity is founded upon mutual sympathy and helpfulness.

In my humble opinion, the amendment offered by the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is limited to operate only in the field of international economics and can not be construed to imply any obligation calculated to involve any aggressive or defensive military action, or to entangle this Nation in any political maelstrom. The only charge laid upon the conference is the duty of considering the economic problems now confronting the world, followed by the expression of a hope that some understanding or arrangement may be reached providing for the restoration of trade and the establishment of the finances of the world on a solid foundation.

I know of no provision of the Constitution that would permit the delegates at a conference of this character to obligate our country in respect to a reduction or cancellation of the allied debt, or to consider any other subject concerning our relations with foreign powers that are properly the subject of negotiations by the President and ratification or rejection by the Senate. Mr. President, I am not disturbed nor made to tremble by the rumblings of the isolationists that at an economic conference the traditional policies of our country would be overthrown or disregarded; nor am I persuaded by the argument that the best policy for this country to pursue is to leave the nations of Europe alone until they solve their own problems which so greatly concern us. That effort has been going on in Europe for more than two years, while this country has sat supinely by and conditions have grown steadily worse, until at this time it appears as though the whole economic edifice of Europe is tottering to its fall. The nations engaged in the last war have drifted widely and strangely apart until they are now on the brink of chaos, and unless heroic measures are undertaken by them, with the powerful assistance of this country, financial collapse to many will follow, and to others instability and internal turmoil will be gathered as the harvest of dissension.

Mr. President, I can see no analogy between the commitments contained in the covenant of the League of Nations and the mere effort to discover the proper economic action the various nations should take in the present world crisis under the suggestion of the Borah amendment. The plan proposed does not anticipate the employment of a soulless economic boycott or retaliation as a means of its enforcement, nor does it suggest in the mildest way the use of armed force in any form. It is fashioned to fit the present unstable conditions running riot throughout the world and to clear the economic current of the world from the débris of hate and discord which are keeping open the wounds of war. This Nation, powerful and rich, should take as much interest and display as much concern to bring about mutual accord among its debtor nations as does the private banker manifest in the welfare of those patrons who have created pecuniary obligations in the institution of which he is the directing head. Aloofness should be our national policy when powerful foreign forces operate to involve us to our peril or national disadvantage, but such a situation can not grow out of a mere economic conference unless it is the desire of the people of this great Republic, expressed through their Representatives in the Congress. Therefore I cherish no fear that my country will shift from its assured foundation on account of any economic discussion in which it may choose to participate.

Mr. President, in a large way the cruel and unfortunate plight of the farmer is due to the fact that he is smothering in a surplus of agricultural products. A strong, brisk, foreign market, such as he is entitled to enjoy, would lift the farmer from impending ruin to a position where he could meet his obligations and leave him a fair profit for his laborious work and his investment. To this reward he is abundantly entitled. After a study of the problems of rural credits by the Members of the Congress representing agricultural States, legislation designed to provide farm credits so that the farmers may obtain better prices through the orderly marketing of their products will soon be brought before either branch of Congress for consideration. This legislation has been long delayed, but is now upon us and should be speedily enacted into law. But what is most needed by our farming population are markets, and these can be found and will be supplied if Europe is at rest, stabilized, and its economic structure made safe and sound. It will be said that rural products have moved to various nations in considerable abundance. This statement I shall accept as a verity. Owing to improved methods of farming and labor-saving machinery, farm production is greater than formerly, and in consequence thereof a greater quantity is available for exportation and must be exported to permit the residue to demand and receive a fair and profitable price. The surplus would be absorbed by other countries if proper credits—national, corporate, or otherwise—could be arranged. I do not advocate loaning more money to our creditor nations, but I do stoutly believe that if the reparations which Germany owes were reduced to a point where she can pay, thereby restoring the morale of her people, private capital would flow to Europe in such a volume as speedily to bring about a correction of the present unfortunate economic conditions existing in Germany and in other European nations. I am not predicting that any outstanding achievements would follow as a result of the proposed conference, but, in any event, its efforts would discover the true situation, which in itself might be of great value in future treatment of conditions in Europe.

In an ably edited paper, the Oregonian, there appeared an editorial about a week ago from which I quote the following:

> So grave is the plight of Great Britain, France, and Germany that a positive move by one of them that was deemed harmful to it by either or both of the others might light a flame of war that would soon become a conflagration enveloping the Old World. If a French army should advance into Germany, not only might it meet armed resistance but it might easily start a war that would spread eastward. Allied with Germany is Russia, and allied with Russia is Turkey. These three are the making of a new triple alliance, hungry, destitute of all but arms and fighting capacity, but in the mood to defy a world that is utterly weary of war. If Britain and Italy should stand aside, these desperadoes might defy France and might strike to regain all that they have lost and to take much more. Such a war would sweep over Poland, the Danubian States, and the Balkans, and could not fail to involve Britain and Italy.
>
> It is doubtful whether the United States could keep out. If we should, it would be at the sacrifice of civilisation in Europe. Though that might not move our isolationists, the loss of the market for three-fourths of our exports would. At the best, Germany would sullenly submit to armed occupation, and France would probably collect from a nation that having lost hope had abandoned itself to bankruptcy, no more than would pay the cost of the army, while all Europe would continue to slide down the slope of moral and material decay, more slowly though no less surely than if hastened by war.

Mr. President, I make no claim to knowledge of international affairs. My activities while a member of this body have been confined to domestic issues, particularly with reference to agricultural undertakings; but I have held to the belief that after the termination of the world-wide war our policy of isolation has been too severe for the good of ourselves and the welfare of the world. I know full well that this belief will arouse the opposition of the international statesmen's bloc, found among the intellectuals of the United States Senate. I have no doubt that the great majority of the farmers and laborers and business men of the country will look with favor upon any plan constructed to bring about the economic rehabilitation of world affairs.

Mr. President, I shall never know whether it was the stubbornness of our distinguished President, Woodrow Wilson, the perversity of the able senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], or the eloquence of the irreconcilable Senators that prevented the ratification of the Versailles treaty, yet I shall always think that much of the unrest and hatred existing among the nations at this time would not have occurred if that treaty containing the covenant of the League of Nations, with the Lodge reservations, had been ratified.

Having that view, I can not persuade myself to oppose any conference which I believe would work for a better understanding among the nations of the world, even though such a conference calls upon this Government to play an important rôle. The result of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, held in this city 13 months ago, aroused the antagonism of many learned and patriotic statesmen in this country, still I venture the prophecy that the labors of this conference will prove beneficial beyond the expectations of its most ardent advocates; and so I express the confident belief that an economic conference held in Washington, attended by representatives of various war-shocked nations, would result in the world stabilisation of currency, exchange, and flow of commerce equal to the calculations of those devoted to the restoration of agricultural and other industries to a profitable basis.

America is not going back to Europe, for Europe will come to America for the healing of her wounds, to compose her differences, and to direct her to a haven of peace and economic achievement. Sincerely believing in the wisdom of the policy and having faith in its possible benefit to mankind, I shall actively support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to the pending naval appropriation bill.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, there are many of us who followed yesterday's debate and the argument of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] this morning with unflagging attention, in the hope, in the expectation, that we might find weighty argument upon the necessity of adopting the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I say "weighty argument upon the necessity of adopting the amendment," for I assume that Senators do not seek to impose upon the President a moral obligation to summon a conference under the broad terms of the amendment unless they believe either that he is uninformed as to the condition of Europe or, if he be informed, that he is incapable of acting or is unwilling to act upon that information.

It is not difficult for Senators to enjoin a President to convoke a conference upon an international question like that of the economic distress of Europe. It is a very different matter to conduct the delicate negotiations both precedent to a conference and necessary to its successful conclusion. Certainly there arise from time to time international difficulties which can be surmounted only by international conference. There befall a suffering world ills so general that only international action will cure them. Such was the case when the continued burden of armament and the threatened competition in the building of battle fleets led to the summoning of the Washington conference.

The conference—as the Senator from Idaho, I think, indicated yesterday—was not called as the result of any action of Congress upon the question. Even before the President had been inaugurated, within 60 days of the election of 1920, informal communications passed between the President elect and European statesmen then charged with the responsibility for government looking to the limitation of armament and the resolution of the then existing differences between the naval powers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. McCORMICK. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I am quite willing to concede the construction put upon history by the Senator from Illinois as to the fact that the President had months before conceived of this movement, but under that condition of affairs what becomes of the construction which was placed upon the statute yesterday that the President can not call a conference without the authority of Congress?

Mr. McCORMICK. If I remember, in the debate yesterday the Senator from Idaho said that the statute would not stand.

Mr. BORAH. I said I doubted that it would stand the test; but does the Senator understand that the President did disregard that statute wholly when he called the conference?

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, Mr. President, since the Congress had acted prior to the calling of the conference, patently he did not disregard the statute.

Mr. BORAH. That is the answer which the Senator desires to make?

Mr. McCORMICK. It seems to me a perfectly obvious statement of the sequence of events. The negotiations—I said the negotiations—were precedent to any action by Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Then, as a matter of fact, unless the resolution had been passed, the President could not have called the conference without violating the statute?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if the negotiations had reached a successful conclusion, and if it were necessary to secure legislative action, the President could have sought it.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; but that is not the question which I submit. Unless the resolution had been passed, the President could not have called the conference without violating the statute?

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator will permit me, I think that is beside the mark.

Mr. BORAH. It seems so.

Mr. McCORMICK. It was made to appear at one time in the naval debate two years ago that action by Congress was necessary to initiate the calling of the conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. May I ask the Senator from Idaho whether a statute could not be valid limiting the power of the President to call certain kinds of conferences without its applying to conferences which are clearly within the Presidential power?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the statute unfortunately makes no distinction as to the kind of conference.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, in this connection let me add that I am not sure, as I look back upon the sequence of events, that the initial action by Congress did not handicap the American negotiators at the Washington conference. The efforts in yonder Chamber and here drastically to curtail the power of the American Navy, and eagerly to press upon the Executive the obligation to negotiate with governments financially weaker than our own, gave evidence to foreign statesmen that there were certain molders of opinion in this country, as eloquent as they were influential, who were not unready to disarm America even though the world remained armed. I have thought that the congressional agitation at that time weakened our position and made necessary the negotiation of the four-power treaty, for which some Senators would not vote, and for which others like myself could not have voted but for the Brandegee reservation.

The history of the ratification of those treaties has been interesting.

The powers which were financially able to support the burden of naval armament were the first to ratify. The other signatories of the five-power treaty, with vast and constantly growing debts, with recurring and disastrous deficits, have not yet ratified the naval treaty. In my humble opinion, France would not have made ready to ratify after the new year but for the foresight, the prudence, and the influence of Charles de Chambrun, who has returned to Paris after his service as minister ad interim in Washington. The French Government first, and the Italian Government later, doubtless will ratify the restricted treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, while all the while France has refused to consider the limitation of aircraft, subsurface craft, or light cruisers and destroyers. She would not thus limit her sea power and would not limit her land forces at all, although to deny that Germany is utterly disarmed is so wide of the facts as to be ludicrous.

The powers of continental Europe have done what their past bade them do, not what the present demanded of them. They have sought to subordinate economic actualities to political considerations. It was in the dim light of the past that Europe wrote the four obscurantist treaties—one of which the Turks have rewritten in the blood of dying Christians and another of which the victorious allies have revised in the tears of the starving Austrians.

The present state of Europe, so depressed as to touch our prosperity, after all is due to no single cause, economic or political. Plainly it is attributable in great part to the waste of war, which can be made good only by years of toil and frugal living on the part of millions; it is attributable in part to the ruin of Russia, where more millions have died since the Imperial and Bolshevik peace of Brest-Litovsk than ever were killed while Russia fought Germany; it is attributable in part to the Balkanization of Europe by the peace treaties, which some would have had ratified by the Senate which added new boundaries, new governments, new armies, new customs, borders, new traffic tariffs to the many which threatened peace and thwarted trade in Europe before the war; it is attributable in part to the ambitious and aborted policies of short-lived cabinets throughout Europe; to the planless purposes of inexperienced parliaments seeking to govern talented and dauntless peoples long denied self-government.

There is no convention of the powers under the covenant of the league proposed to the Senate by Woodrow Wilson, or under the general conference proposed to the Senate by the Senator from Idaho, which can recreate in a year that which was destroyed by the war through the long years which, by recognition of the soviet, by loans, or gifts to the soviet, can rebuild the vastest ruin in history which the soviets have wrought. Neither President Wilson's league, which lives and languishes, nor the Senator's conference, which is not yet born, can break down the new political and economic barriers set up by the treaties of peace and guaranteed by the league; neither of them can endow newly freed peoples with an age-old experience in self-government, in political self-denial, in political prudence and political self-restraint, in political administrative efficiency. How long did the newly freed American Colonies suffer under the Articles of Confederation before they devised and accepted the Constitution of the United States?

The world seeks a remedy for its ills. Remedy by the league? Remedy by conference?

The members of the league have met in conference in Geneva. The governments of Europe met in conference at Genoa. The prime ministers have met in conference, political and economic, at San Remo, Cannes, Paris, Spa, Brussels, London, and Boulogne. Sometimes they have accomplished nothing; sometimes they have accomplished a little. They have not been willing to seek the realizable. They seek the impossible. As I heard a prime minister remark the other day, "One of the great powers for three years has assiduously fished behind the net." Time and again they have

been willing to do "to-day" that which "to-day" was no longer realizable, although it could have been done six months before.

The prime ministers meet in Paris Tuesday next in economic conference with some prospect of agreement at last, because stubborn prejudgment must give way to actualities, because the governments of Italy and France face bankruptcy, as well as those of Austria and Germany. I say the governments face bankruptcy; I do not speak of the peoples. If I have alluded to the several causes to which Europe's condition is attributable, let me pause again to emphasize the truth that her plight has been aggravated because her governors, matured in the political philosophy of the nineteenth century, have insisted upon subordinating economic to political considerations. The congregated statesmen have hastened the day when John Maynard Keynes's first volume would be justified by established facts; they have made manifest the monstrosity of the treaties, and have made clear to impartial observers that as they choked the vanquished people of Central Europe so they throttled the victorious peoples of western Europe in their struggle for economic recovery.

Mr. President, if I may be pardoned a personal allusion. I told the representatives of the press before I sailed for Europe, nearly two months ago, that I hoped we might find a basis for economic collaboration with the European States. But I fear that if a general conference be summoned at a time when the immediate need is for prompt consideration and prompt action, for urgent and limited action and relief, I fear that a general conference—no matter what the agenda on paper may be—will precipitate a general discussion, inclusive of the cancellation of the debts due America, no less than American political and military guaranties of European frontiers.

If we had not heard read to-day the letter of the President, and Senators required assurance that negotiations are under way, as the President pointed out in his letter, the Secretary of State and the President were in the city of Washington, accessible to all. But was it necessary to confirm the known evidence? The prime ministers met in London a fortnight ago. Three American ambassadors met in London at the same time. Immediately thereafter the American ambassador to Great Britain was summoned to Washington for conference and is now on the high seas. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer is on the high seas following him. The prime ministers are to meet for conference in Paris on Tuesday, January 2, and the British Chancellor of the Exchequer is to meet the American Debt Commission in Washington on Wednesday, January 3.

I alluded a moment ago to the facility with which Senators might communicate with the Chief Executive or the Secretary of State. It is no less easy to communicate with Senators. Frankly, I am amazed that the State Department has been at no pains to keep the members of the Foreign Relations Committee current as to the outline of negotiations now under way. Or rather, I would be amazed if the department had not made the same mistake during the negotiation of the four-power treaty. In this instance I am less concerned about what is due the committee of the Senate or what consideration is due the State Department than I am in the success of the delicate negotiation now under way, and known to be under way.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator know what the purport of these negotiations is, what they include?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator does not, but if the Senator had been here a few days longer he could have learned, no doubt, by going to the State Department to ask.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator would take occasion to visit the State Department any time soon, I would be greatly pleased to have him advise his colleagues what the negotiations include.

Mr. McCORMICK. Manifestly, if the amendment pending be necessary, it is because we believe the President and the Secretary of State to be ignorant of the condition of Europe and of the United States, which is known to us; or because we believe them, knowing these conditions, to be indifferent to them and to the suffering of the people; or because we believe them to be neither ignorant nor indifferent, but incompetent to deal with them. That is to say, if we vote for the amendment we do so because we feel that an administration either ignorant, indifferent, or incompetent, or all three, must be prodded to hasten and conclude a negotiation known to be under way. Not only that, but by the broad terms of the amendment, by the very plain implication in it, we would say that we would have this Government invoke a conference which would include everything from American garrisons and guaranties in Europe to European cancellation of debts owed in America.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Would it interrupt the Senator if I said, in regard to the question asked by the Senator from Idaho about what these negotiations include, that I am not in a position to state precisely what they include, although I think it is very obvious to everyone what their limitations might be; but I can say what they do not include. They do not include the cancellation of the debt. I asked that question of the President, and he said:

> This administration has been steadily against the cancellation of the debt, and is now.

I also asked in that connection about his reference to the greater latitude to be given to the commission, and he said that referred to the question of time for the amortization of the debt or to the question of the rates of interest.

Mr. McCORMICK. Precisely——

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. McCORMICK. If the Senator will permit me to conclude my sentence.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

Mr. McCORMICK. The negotiations by the State Department, I assume, like those between the European governments, have sought to find a basis for agreement upon which the tentative Brussels conference could be held, because, as published in the press, none of the governments believed it would be profitable to meet in economic conference at Brussels if that conference were foredoomed to failure by reason of the unwillingness of governments to establish a basis upon which they could negotiate.

Mr. BORAH. The President says in his letter that while the State Department has contended that the question of the debts should be considered separate and apart from the question of reparations, the foreign governments contend otherwise, and that the two propositions apparently are interwoven and must be considered together. Then he suggests that if the Congress desires to be helpful, it will give the debt commission greater authority to deal with this question of the international debt. Does the Senator understand that by that reference the President means that he wants the Congress to change the statute so that the debt commission may have full latitude to deal with the method and manner of disposing of the debt and the consideration of the reparations question?

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from Massachusetts, I hope, may answer that question, and he has conferred with the Secretary of State.

Mr. LODGE. I asked the President that question. The latitude mentioned in his letter, to which I have already alluded, refers to a greater latitude in regard to the rate of interest and the term of the bond, but it does not in any sense include the question of the cancellation of the debt; and I am authorized to say, as I have said here, that that is not within the consideration of the administration at all and that they are opposed to the cancellation of the debt, as they always have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts mean that the administration is opposed to the cancellation of any debt of any European power to the United States, even of Belgium or Serbia?

Mr. LODGE. I did not ask the details. I was speaking of the general cancellation of the debt. If one is canceled, I suppose all will be canceled.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not one debt; it is half a dozen different debts.

Mr. LODGE. I know that.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the President says in his letter:

> If Congress really means to facilitate the task of the Government in dealing with the European situation, the first practical step would be to free the hands of the commission so that helpful negotiations may be undertaken.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> In discussions with foreign governments the previous administration and the present administration have insisted that the question of European debts to the United States is distinct and apart from the question of reparations, but European nations hold a contrary view, and it is wholly inconsistent to invite a conference for the consideration of questions in dealing with which the Government is denied all authority by act of Congress.

The President does seem to desire some authority from Congress to enable him to do what he is now doing, or seeking to do. Do I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Illinois are in favor of modifying or changing the statute creating the debt commission and giving the President greater latitude?

Mr. LODGE. I understand that the view of the President is that there might be greater latitude in regard to the rates

of interest and the time of amortization of the debt, and many people hold that opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from Massachusetts hold that opinion?

Mr. LODGE. I am inclined to think there might be greater latitude given on those points with wisdom; yes. I am not in favor of the cancellation of the debt or of any part of it, because I suppose it all goes together; nor is the administration.

Mr. BORAH. The time is now 25 years?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. About how much time does the Senator suppose it would be necessary to extend it?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am not on the commission and I have made no estimate as to the time whatever, but it is a subject which I think may fairly be opened to discussion, and I think also the rates may be opened to discussion. We have discussed the rates here; we have lowered the rates from what they were.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, in this connection it is just as well to recall that the British Chancellor of the Exchequer is on his way to Washington. It is conceivable, certainly, that in proportion as we evince an eagerness to join in a general economic conference, he might prudently evince a disposition to prolong his negotiations, to the end that in the general conference the British debt, with the refunding of which he is charged, might be considered in conjunction with the other debts.

It has taken a long time to convince his Government that we were not disposed to cancel. Patently the signing of an instrument for the funding of the debt of the British Government to the Government of the United States is an important step to a consideration and solution of the economic problems of Europe and to the establishment of terms for the funding of the debts of governments less able to pay than the British Government.

There are Senators who have announced their support of the pending amendment who last summer were demanding payment under the terms of the act of Congress. They have not said to us what they thought might be done in the proposed conference, whether in their judgment additional funds should be advanced to governments which can not pay what they now owe, or to peoples or groups of peoples living under governments which are now unable to pay.

Since the signing of the armistice the Government of the United States has advanced to European governments $1,500,000,000. It is generally estimated that private advances to Europe since that time have aggregated $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000. During the year and a half immediately after the signing of the armistice those advances were great and purchases by Europe in America were correspondingly great. If we would seek just comparisons of exports to-day with those of prior years, they must be made not only with the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities but with the years immediately preceding the outbreak of hostilities.

Mr. President, because some of us shrink from a general conference which we believe will delay the immediate and restricted action which we know to be urgent, it does not follow that we would not find a basis for economic collaboration with Europe. It does not follow, because we are unwilling to propose a conference, the scope of which seems to us almost unlimited, that we do not recognize an economic community between Europe and America.

The great Senator who has proposed the amendment in so doing has bewildered many of us, although he has not diminished our affection or admiration for him. He seeks what we seek, the further diminution of our now attenuated political responsibilities in Europe and the discovery of means for economic collaboration between Europe and America. But I submit that in the all-comprehensive conference he proposes he breaks from the course which he has followed and along which, together with millions of others, we have followed him. Thus to-day we behold Woodrow Wilson, Thomas Lamont, Otto Kahn, and the great Senator from Idaho proceeding along once widely separated but now converging paths to the common goal where they must find Asia, Europe, and America bound together in a death struggle like that of Laocoon and his sons.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is in the company of Woodrow Wilson, he could not find himself in better company than in the company of the greatest peace advocate since Christ was upon the earth. The Senator from Idaho has realized that the plans and policies of the Republican Party up to this time have failed utterly to restore peace in Europe and bring about stability in the business world, including his own country. The Senator from Idaho wants to see peace established in the world. He is not content to remain silent while the world is in such a disturbed and chaotic condition as it is to-day. The Senator from Idaho is a brave and fearless statesman. I do not believe that he is willing to sit down and fold his arms and seal his lips and permit things to drift and drift from bad to worse. If the Senator from Idaho believes that a step should be taken to improve our own condition and the conditions of the world, I believe that he has the courage to take that step.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] has said that the Senator from Idaho greatly surprised the leaders on the Republican side of the Chamber by this course. We on this side of the aisle are not surprised at that course. The leaders on the other side in the main are content to let things drift. Things are drifting, as certain international bankers would have them drift, in a way that will permit them to get a strangle hold upon the finances and the business of the world. There are those of us who will not be content to permit that condition to obtain.

Mr. President, it is high time that this Congress was waking up. I wonder what it will take to arouse it? Has not the recent election had sufficient effect to bring it to its senses, to a realization of the responsibility that is upon it, to some measure of compliance with the demand for peace and economic adjustment in the world? Why should the Senate remain silent and sit supinely down with folded arms and wait for a partisan debt commission to work out some secret arrangement behind closed doors, away from the gaze of the American public? What is there back of the screen that certain Republican Senators want to hide from the people whose Government this is?

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said this morning that he is opposed to canceling the debt due us by foreign countries, and that the administration is opposed to canceling the debt. I remember when I and others over here discussed in the long session the matter of collecting this debt, that we could not get any very positive expression against canceling that debt from the other side of the Chamber. Where was the Senator from Massachusetts then with his assurance that they intended to collect the debt? They were very quiet about it then, Mr. President. There is no use to hide any of these things. Let us talk about them in the open. My opinion is that the Secretary of the Treasury intended to cancel the debt, and that the administration was favorable to it; and if they have gone from that position it is because they have been driven from it by the Democrats in this body and by American public opinion.

Mr. President, the Republican Party in power can never get away from the blunder it made, from the political crime that it committed, when it solemnly arranged for five Republicans to handle this $12,000,000,000 foreign debt. When the bugle call of war was sounded our boys from East and West and North and South met on the fields of France. They were Republicans and Democrats side by side, American patriots supporting the flag, fighting for the ideals and institutions of the greatest Government in the world. No partisan consideration entered into the conflict over there. When the men and women of America were digging up their treasure, stinting themselves, many of them buying Liberty bonds, and that money was going abroad to help carry on the war, those men and women did not contribute as partisan Democrats or Republicans. They contributed as American patriots and contributed to the best of their ability. They supported the war in every way possible. No partisan spirit was anywhere manifest among them.

But when the war is over and when the Shylocks of the United States like vampires decide to suck the financial lifeblood of the people, then it is that partisan considerations enter in; then it is that the Democratic Party is ignored—a party as old as the Government, a party that never had a scandal connected with its conduct of the fiscal affairs of the Nation, no land frauds ever charged to it, no misconduct in the affairs of the Government that touch the integrity of that party. And yet when the Debt Commission was to be appointed, when we naturally thought there would be Democrats and Republicans alike upon the commission to represent the two great parties which are supposed to speak for the whole people of the country, what did we find? We found the leaders of this branch and the leaders of the other branch of the Congress and the President himself all scheming and conniving together to appoint five commissioners, and every one of them a partisan Republican. Mr. President, that was unfair and unjust. I have never quite understood that very strange conduct. I have my opinion about it. I have expressed it before and I am going to express it again.

There is something that the commission was intended to do that they did not want the public to know. We may just as well talk plainly and call a spade a spade. That was the purpose, I take it, of leaving the Democrats off. It was because they knew when negotiations were inaugurated looking toward a cancellation of the debt that the Democratic members would cry out and would apprise the people of that fact. The failure to appoint any Democrat on that Debt Commission has created suspicion in the minds of the American people. Mr. President, the Democrats are entitled to have representation on that commission. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] has a resolution now pending to appoint three more members of that commssion who are to be Democrats, which will make its membership eight. There are now five members on that commission who are partisan Republicans, and three more Democrats would make the commission consist of five Republicans and three Democrats, all of them, of course, to be appointed by the President. Is not that fair? What is there unfair or unjust about it?

Are Senators surprised that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has the courage to come out and say that he is not satisfied with the way these matters are being handled? One of the Republican leaders in the other House stated that it was presumptuous in the Senator from Idaho to make such a suggestion as he has made. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Idaho will be severely criticized behind closed doors in high administration circles. He has probably committed the unpardonable sin against the administration for daring to offer an amendment to the pending naval appropriation bill without first consulting the high muck-a-mucks of the Republican Party. [Laughter.] Is Senator BORAH to be condemned because he wants to save money to the American people rather than tax them to put money into a great naval outlay? Should Senator BORAH be scolded for seeking universal peace rather than to encourage the upbuilding of a big army and a big navy and keeping the world in a state of ferment and war? Yes; Senator BORAH has offended certain interests by offering an amendment that, if adopted, would disturb the program of certain international financiers who have sucked the lifeblood of our country for the past two and a half years. They have fed upon the substance of the American people.

We now have domestic unrest and distress amongst eighty-odd millions of our people. Some of the highbrows who write reports from Wall Street, where stocks have gone up and bonds have advanced in price, immediately get out on the housetop and shout that prosperity has been restored. There is no real prosperity in America now except in the case of a favored few. While Senators on the other side of the Chamber were bragging here on yesterday about prosperity having returned, and some of the paid experts of the big financiers were telling us how rapidly prosperity is coming back, I received a clipping from one of the New York newspapers. There is an organization in New York City which has arranged to have referred to it all letters written to Santa Claus by the children of the country in the fall time prior to Christmas asking for gifts, and they undertake to send gifts to such children.

The writer of this newspaper article states that heretofore such requests had come for toys, for little trinkets, for playthings for the Christmas time. But what do we find this year, Mr. President? One million of the letters which came this year asked for bread and butter. These little waifs, poor little children, made in God's image, are living in sweatshops and tenement houses, eking out a miserable existence, and yet Senators are standing up and proclaiming and newspapers are stating that there is prosperity in the land.

While this condition exists and those children are suffering and starving the farmers of the South and West have products in abundance to feed the hungry and starving people here and some of those in other lands, and yet those products are selling below the cost of production. The Senator from Idaho said truly yesterday that we have an abundance of products in this country which are wasting and rotting while the people are starving for them in other places. There ought to be some way to get the products from those who produce them here over to those who can consume them and who would be happy to have them. Certain countries are in a distracted condition.

America's part in world affairs recently is not a very creditable one. Mr. President, we may just as well be plain; we ought not to undertake to deceive one another.

The Senator from Idaho suggests that an economic conference of the nations be summoned. What harm can come from that? The Bible says, "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety"; but the Senator from Idaho has grievously offended because he has displayed some wisdom in seeking a "multitude of counsellors," because he is seeking to bring about something that will be for his country's good and the good of the world.

Mr. President, do you know many of those interested in naval matters are opposing the amendment of the Senator from Idaho? The reason is that they make money out of the building of battleships. Could there be a more timely thing than the introduction of the amendment of the Senator from Idaho? The naval appropriation bill now pending carries a larger appropriation than the one enacted just before the disarmament conference met in Washington. What do Senators think of that? We were told that as a result of the disarmament conference we were going to have peace; that we were going to cut down appropriations for war purposes; that we were going to save expenses; that we would appropriate less money; that we would leave money now expended for war purposes in the pockets of the taxpayers of our country. Let us see whether or not we have done that. I asked the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], in charge of the naval appropriation bill, what amount the bill carried. He gave the figures. I then asked him, "Is that larger or smaller than the amount carried by the naval appropriation bill enacted just prior to the Conference on the Limitation of Armament?" He replied, "Larger." Mr. President, is not that sufficient to warrant the Senator from Idaho in trying another experiment? "If at first you do not succeed, try, try again." We have heard that old saying all of our lives, and it is good advice to this day. But Senator BORAH, a Republican, is being condemned because he has dared to throw a brick into the do-nothing show window of the Republican leaders; he is about to break up their secretly arranged diplomatic playhouse, and that is why they are so offended and hurt with him.

Mr. President, the mismanagement, the incompetency displayed by the present administration is simply appalling. It used to boast about what it would do when it obtained power and it went into power, following the administration of that great leader of the American people, Woodrow Wilson, in many respects the greatest intellect that ever sat in the White House. He is 66 years old to-day; God bless him and give him health and spare him to the American people and to the world for many years to come!

Mr. President, he had high ideals; he was willing to fight for them; to suffer for them; yes, and he was willing to die for them, and he almost lost his life fighting for those noble principles and ideals. I sat with him in the White House one day while the death struggle over the League of Nations was going on in this Chamber. He told me of conditions as he had found them abroad; he told me of the hard faces that he had seen, of the dull eyes, the emaciated forms. He told me of the lame, the halt, and the blind; and of the distress and suffering that he had seen in the war-cursed countries of the Old World and of the fields billowed with the graves of millions of dead, and I saw the tears running down his face as he said, "I can not understand why they want to defeat the League of Nations after all that has happened and in the face of conditions that now exist."

Now Senators are saying that he was responsible for the failure to ratify the treaty of Versailles with the League of Nations covenant. It ought to have been ratified with reservations, if you please; but the failure to ratify it by the Republican Senate lost to our country hundreds of millions of dollars in foreign trade and threw away America's opportunity to establish peace in the world. We drew ourselves away and apart under the leadership of the Republican Party and sacrificed our leadership in the establishment of world peace on a permanent basis.

We look over there now, and what do we see? We see Russia in a state of unrest and revolution, the Bolshevists holding sway in that great and rich country. And what are we going to see? We are probably going to see Germany, once put down as the greatest autocratic power and military despotism in the world, acquire control of Russia with her 180,000,000 population, with her great wheat fields and rich treasure of many kinds. America, under the mismanagement and incompetency of the leadership of the Republican Party, has permitted this thing to go on, and Russia, our ally in the World War—and probably we could not have won but for Russia—has been turned loose to drift and drift until Germany binds poor, distracted Russia to her side with hooks of steel. Then, with the military genius of Germany and with the old desire for vengeance and all of that man power and wealth at her command, we do not know what sort of a problem will be presented to us; but these are some of the results which have been achieved under the Republican administration. If Woodrow Wilson had

retained his health, I believe the league covenant would have been ratified, even with reservations; and if it had been, there would not be heard a gunshot in the Old World today. The world would have been moving steadily toward disarmament in the light and in the bonds of a mutual respect and desire for universal peace. The forces of civilization would have been working in concert to prevent future wars.

But crafty, avaricious interests in league with Republican leaders conspired to defeat that great international institution created to prevent war. And now certain financial interests do not want BORAH's resolution passed. They do not want any economic arrangements made, except in the way that they are trying to make them, and that is for them to continue to get the cream of the earth and give to the masses the skim milk that is left. That is what they are undertaking to do, and we do not intend that that shall be done.

What else has grown out of this mismanagement and incompetency and aloofness that we have witnessed? The Turk—the beastly, unspeakable Turk—is threatening all Europe, and Russia and Germany are waiting, we are told, and may join with Turkey in the conflict after a while. Oh, Mr. President, how pitiful it all is when we think of what might have been—of what might have been if patriotism and statesmanship had triumphed.

What is going on over there? The blood of the Christian runs red on the sod, and the Turk makes his way toward the temple of God; and what are we doing? We are receiving a message from the President to wait and let things drift. Why should not we have an economic conference between the distressed nations of the earth and America, the incarnated spirit of liberty?

Why, Mr. President, they are murdering Armenians by the thousands. They are slaughtering little children. They are ravishing the women of the white race. Misery and ruin are all around. The trade conditions of the world are disturbed. Economic conditions are bad, chaotic in many places. Let us try, at least, Mr. President, to establish better trade relations with the countries beyond the sea and see if we can be of mutual help and benefit; but the President writes a note in the Christmas time, in the birth time of Him who said:

> Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

A message comes at the Christmas time protesting against an effort to bring about a better understanding and peace in the world. God speed the passage of the Borah resolution! The Bible tells us:

> Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

So if the Senator from Idaho offends a few Republican leaders in the House, or if he treads upon the sensitive toes of the leaders on his own side of this Chamber, if he can by so doing become one of the children of God, I would seize with joy that opportunity any day rather than be called a leader of what is left of the old standpat Republican Party. [Laughter.]

Oh, Mr. President, the old standpat crowd over there do not want anything done except in a certain cut-and-dried fashion. They want it to be O. K'd by these big financiers. They want them all to bow and smile and approve it, and then they will come right up and support it; but if somebody suggests a way of doing it that will really bless and benefit the mass of the people, for whom governments are really instituted, they are ready to oppose it. I wonder how many Republican Senators are going to vote against the Borah resolution. I wonder where the progressives will be when the roll call is had. I wonder who will come out on the side of a better economic world arrangement, universal peace, disarmament, and the preventing of our boys from going abroad to battle in useless wars in the future?

Mr. President, what do they tell us now when we say we ought to disarm as rapidly as sound sense and conditions in the world will warrant? What are we told by the big Navy people, by the big Army people? We are told to wait. "Look over yonder. You do not know what is going to happen over there. War may break out at any time. Therefore put these millions more in this appropriation bill for war purposes." And those who build the battleships will put it in their pockets, and they will laugh and be joyous as they take money out of the Treasury under those conditions. "You do not know what minute war is going to break out," they tell us.

And they insist that we keep on building up for the time being, because they say that we do not know what is going to happen.

What is the Senator from Idaho undertaking to do? He is undertaking to keep anything serious from happening. He is undertaking to remove the cause, the necessity, for piling these appropriations on the backs of the already overburdened taxpayers of America. He is trying to do that which is best for the American people.

What did we tell them in the campaign just closed? Why, the Republicans told them, "We had a peace conference. We are going to disarm. We are going to save tens of millions in appropriations. We are cutting down the size of our Navy, and everything is going well," and it is not so. Now, then, when we come in and the bill is put in print and is brought here for passage and we ask, as I did, "Does it carry a larger appropriation than before we agreed to disarm?" and they say, "Yes," then somebody has been deceived. Deception has been practiced on somebody, and we ought to talk it out in the open Senate and let the people know just what is going on here.

The President suggests that the hands of this commission ought to be free. Well, I wish I could see their hands. They may be free for some purposes, but they are behind closed doors, where the public can not see. There is not a Democrat in the Nation who knows what they are doing, and therefore none of the rank and file of the people know what they are doing, and I submit that that is a crime against the American people. I do not care whether the man in the White House be a Democrat or a Republican; a Democrat who would provide for five Democrats on a commission like that to handle an indebtedness to the American people of billions of dollars, putting only Democrats in charge of it, leaving out all Republican representation, ought to be severely criticized by the American people.

I am not saying this because the man in the White House at this time is a Republican President, or because the Republicans are in power temporarily. I simply insist that in a matter of that character and magnitude there ought to be both Democrats and Republicans on the commission, so that the American people would know what was going on with this $12,000,000,000 of indebtedness. Here are twelve thousand million dollars due the American people, and a partisan commission, five Republican politicians, have got hold of it and are manipulating it and handling it and conniving with it behind closed doors, in what way God only knows. They are not going to hear the last of that soon.

There is but one way, Mr. President, to drive from power a party that is misusing the power intrusted to it, and that is through publicity—publicity in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD day by day, week by week, and month by month. The people get the facts into their heads, and they let you hear from them at the polls. That is what we have to do. If Woodrow Wilson had been President and he had appointed five Democrats to handle this foreign indebtedness, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, would have been in his place day after day, and how pious and injured he would have looked when he pronounced that act of Wilson's a great crime against the American people! I can hear him now, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], crying out against that partisan action. "Five Democrats," they would have said, "to handle an indebtedness due the whole American people; five Democrats, with no Republican on the commission to know what they are doing!" I can just see them now, Mr. President, with my mind's eye, and I am going to let them see themselves with their mind's eye quite a number of times before they go out entirely on the 4th of March, 1925.

"Free the hands of the commission!" Well, Mr. President, there ought to be some way by which we can compel that commission to report to the Senate what it is doing. "Oh, that would not do," they say; "you are trying to tie its hands." Well, I would rather tie the hands of that commission than for that commission secretly to tie the hands of the American people. I do not know what they are doing. I do not know what sort of arrangements they are trying to negotiate. I know they have not succeeded in collecting any money, except a little from Great Britain, I believe, who paid some of the interest on the debt due us. We want something done for the people. We want the American people to be represented in a conference. We want to discuss all of the things that will look to better understanding and better trade relations. We threw away our chance at world trade. The Republican Party did that. Now we want to try to build it up or get it back. Are we to be condemned for making an effort along that line? Is the Senator from Idaho to be criticized because he suggests that we try to improve world conditions? Why, if leaders on the other side have been asleep and have not looked into these matters as they should, and the Senator from Idaho has seen a light, I suggest to them that they had better hunt the same light before it is everlastingly too late.

Mr. President, if we can have this conference, and discuss the things that are causing unrest in the world, and do something that will help to settle international affairs justly and fairly the world over, it seems to me we ought to be commended for it. If we could do that we might prevent another war. If Germany is trying to get hold of Russia, and then if Germany, with Russia, is contemplating an alliance with Turkey, as has been suggested, if we could aid in some way in preventing that, would we not be doing a great service not only to our own country but to the world?

Mr. President, there are people all over the world who need our products and we must provide a way for getting our products to them. In 1920, when the Federal Reserve Board advised that the War Finance Corporation be put out of business, they used the argument that American funds ought to cease going to aid our export trade, and by that act they helped to strike down our export trade.

If we can find that a country really needs our products, and by a little help could get on its feet, why not make some trade arrangement with that country? That is what the resolution of the Senator from Idaho may accomplish in the economic readjustment of the world, and through improved conditions and better trade relations we hope to benefit the downtrodden farmers of America. Are we to be discouraged in an effort of that kind?

Mr. President, I think that Senators on the other side should be anxious to vote for a measure like that. They have favored a policy that has brought ruin to agriculture in the United States. Why not do something now to restore conditions which are tolerable to the farmers? I charged before that Senators on the other side permitted Wall Street interests to collect from Great Britain and France $1,700,000,000 on a private debt, and never collected one dollar interest on the debt due us by Great Britain and France during that period. I charged, and I repeat the charge, that they permitted private interests in Wall Street to hold up the collection of the foreign debt to our country while they collected a private debt. They can not deny that; that was done. I said that if Great Britain and France could pay a private debt to Wall Street, why can they not pay this public debt to the United States? We are tax burdened. Our people are ground to the earth now with taxes.

Mr. President, many a man in the Nation who was fairly well to do in 1918, 1919, and 1920 is now borrowing money to pay his taxes. There is many a merchant who was fairly well to do in that period who has gone to the wall with the sign of bankruptcy written above his door. There is many a country bank which was in good condition in those years now closed and gone out of business. This army of distressed farmers, merchants, and country bankers is hoping that something will take place; that good conditions may return; and here is an opportunity to bring it about by the adoption of an amendment on the naval appropriation bill asking the President to call this economic conference, to invite these people to come here to the United States and sit down and discuss our affairs, their affairs, world affairs in a friendly way. The world is one great community now, with the present means of communication and travel—one great community—and we ought to bring those people here and talk about things that vitally affect us and the whole human race.

Senators on the other side who have always been very silent heretofore about the foreign debt—many who I think were in favor of canceling it and who I still fear intend to cancel it—may have changed their minds. They heard from the American people very strongly in that connection in the last election. But those Senators who now oppose this amendment of the Senator from Idaho are suggesting that its passage might hold out false hopes to somebody about debt cancellation. We can arrange that at the start. We can simply say that this economic conference is called to discuss matters pertaining to their business and things looking toward bringing about more peaceful relations between the various countries and us, but that the debt due to the United States is a part of the obligation growing out of the last war, and that debt must be paid.

There are so many other things of an international character to be discussed. If we could get those people here and talk to them; go over again the ruin wrought by the war; remind each other of the 10,000,000 boys from 18 to 25 years old who went down to death in that terrible struggle; discuss the suffering caused in the world, and how all the nations should work together to prevent a recurrence of another such war, Mr. President, good would come out of it; good is bound to come out of it.

Why is it, then, that we can not adopt a simple amendment like this? It would cost but very little. It would not cost this Government as much money as the increase in the naval appropriation over the last appropriation as it appears in the bill now pending. That money would be spent in the interest of universal peace, in the interest of better economic arrangements and understanding amongst the nations, and I submit that we are warranted in taking such a step at this time.

I simply rose at this time to express a word of approval of the position taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I am a Democrat and the Senator from Idaho is a Republican, but I, as a Democrat, am in favor of his amendment. I think the other Republicans ought to support his amendment, as I believe a majority of the Democrats on this side, and practically all of the progressives in this Chamber, will do so. I hope to see it passed.

Through that amendment I want the Congress to serve notice upon the Shylocks who made their millions and billions out of the last war, who held their Government up in the hour of its peril and fleeced it of millions and billions of dollars—I want to serve notice on them through this resolution that we care more for the boys of America, the girls of America, the fathers and mothers of America, and the peace of the world than we do for them and all the millions and billions they have obtained through questionable methods.

Let us go upon record as favoring this movement for a better international understanding, for better economic conditions in the world, and for better trade relations between our country and the nations of the earth. Let us continue to advocate the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. In God's name, let America wake up and take her place in the great household of the world, and lead in the name of Him whose birth time this is, for peace on earth and good will to men.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	France	Lenroot	Reed, Mo.
Bayard	Gerry	Lodge	Sheppard
Borah	Glass	McCormick	Shortridge
Brookhart	Hale	McLean	Smoot
Broussard	Harris	McNary	Stanfield
Bursum	Harrison	Moses	Sterling
Cameron	Heflin	Myers	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Nelson	Townsend
Caraway	Johnson	New	Trammell
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Nicholson	Underwood
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	Kellogg	Oddie	Warren
Dial	Kendrick	Page	Watson
Dillingham	Keyes	Pepper	Weller
Ernst	King	Phipps	
Fernald	Ladd	Poindexter	
Fletcher	La Follette	Pomerene	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The pending question is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive, on page 9.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if there is to be further discussion of the so-called Borah amendment, I should be very glad if that could be proceeded with, for the reason that the Senator from Tennessee, who offered the amendment just referred to, was compelled to go to one of the departments on official business, and he will not be able to return until a quarter past 3. In his interest, if there is any other matter to be taken up, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What was the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KING. The Senator from Tennessee was compelled to go to one of the departments on official business and stated that he would be unable to be back until 3 or 3.15, and I asked that his amendment be passed over until his return.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the bill and to pass over the amendment temporarily. The bill is open to amendment as in Committee of the Whole, I understand.

Mr. KING. If there is to be any further discussion on the Borah amendment, I should be glad if it might be proceeded with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be passed over temporarily. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Has everything been disposed of now except the last paragraph, with the proposed amendment to it, I inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill?

Mr. POINDEXTER. All the amendments proposed by the committee have been disposed of. The bill, of course, is subject to amendments which may be offered by any Senator.

Mr. BORAH. If the debate has closed upon my amendment so far as the multitude opposing it are concerned, I desire to say a few words in regard to it. I understand, however, that there are other Senators who wish to speak on it. In order that we may come to an understanding about the matter, I ask that we agree to take a vote upon the proposed amendment, which I shall offer later, at 3 o'clock to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] desires to speak upon the amendment. I am sure, however, he will not be prepared to speak to-day, but will be prepared to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I certainly do not desire to cut off any Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber.

Mr. BORAH. I will say to the Senator from California that a vote is about to be taken upon the amendment which I propose to offer, and I understood that the Senator desires to speak upon the matter to-morrow. If the Senator desires to request that the matter go over until to-morrow, I shall be very glad to approve of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do I understand that the Senate is ready for a vote, with the exception of a possible speech from me?

Mr. BORAH. I have a few remarks to make with respect to one matter and then I shall be ready for a vote myself; but I do not want to bring it to a vote until the Senator is ready to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would not permit for an instant any desire on my part or any speech of mine to interfere with the vote. If the Senate is ready for a vote, I would not ask that the matter go over. I do know, however, that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] desires to be heard upon the subject, and I have been told that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] wants to speak upon it. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], I understood, too, was going to offer a "few feeble remarks," and I have no doubt there are other Senators in a like situation. However, so far as I am personally concerned, I would not ask for a continuance of the subject until to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. I do not desire to cut off debate upon either side of the question. I simply want to get the matter in such a condition that Senators can protect themselves for the discussion; that is all. I am perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, that it shall go over until to-morrow. I would be very glad to have it go over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In view of the statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I see no reason why we should not proceed with the consideration of the bill. Of course, it is open for discussion and subject to amendment. It has now been under consideration for a number of days, and the question that is raised by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho, which has been printed but has not yet been offered, has already been discussed at great length. I ask that we proceed in the regular order with the consideration of the measure before the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to say to the Senator in charge of the bill that so far as I am concerned I shall be very glad to vote now or to vote at any time this afternoon, but there are a good many Senators who want to be here when the vote is taken. If we could fix an hour this afternoon or an hour to-morrow to vote on the particular amendment which is to be offered, which is the point of interest in the bill, so far as the vote is concerned, I think it would help the convenience of the Senate and expedite its business.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion. In fact, I think the Senator from Idaho did propose a unanimous-consent agreement to vote this afternoon at 3 o'clock. That hour or any other hour that may be agreeable to the Senate is satisfactory to me.

Mr. BORAH. I proposed 3 o'clock because I understood the debate had closed, but I understand now it is not closed, and I do not want to cut off debate by any proposal of mine. I want those who desire to discuss it to have ample opportunity to discuss it on either side of the controversy.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask, has a point of order been raised against the proposed amendment?

Mr. BORAH. The amendment has not yet been offered.

Mr. HARRISON. Where does the Senator propose to offer it? Does he intend to offer it as a substitute for the last paragraph on page 56 of the bill?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. If there is going to be a point of order raised on the amendment, why could we not argue the point of order if there is no one ready to proceed at this time on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to offer the amendment until the debate is closed, because I know what is going to happen to it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Senator mean so far as the vote is concerned?

Mr. BORAH. So far as the point of order is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON. I know what I hope will happen to it.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator's hopes are going to be realized.

Mr. JOHNSON. I trust they will be; they are the same hopes the Senator from Idaho has entertained in the past.

Mr. BORAH. They are by no means the same, nor anything like it.

Mr. HARRISON. I submit the Senate never does a revolutionary thing, and if we will follow the precedents the amendment is in order. I do not think the matter should be prejudged until it has been presented. The Presiding Officer is a very fair man, and I am sure——

Mr. BORAH. It was not a criticism, either express or implied, upon the Presiding Officer, but there seems to be no doubt about the proposition that the precedents are supposed to be in support of it. Whether they are or not, I have not examined.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Senators have gone so far as to say what will happen to it. I give notice now that there will be an appeal from the decision of the Chair if he does hold that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator from California desire the matter to go over until to-morrow?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not ask it, because I think I ought not to do so. I do not think I am justified in asking the Senate to delay its action to listen to remarks of mine. I can not conceive that they are of sufficient importance to delay the action of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. I do not agree with that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is very kind, but, so far as I am concerned, whatever the Senate sees fit to do will be perfectly satisfactory to me in that regard.

Mr. HARRISON. In view of the fact that the Senator believes the decision will be to sustain the point of order and notice has been served that an appeal to the Senate will be taken if the point of order is sustained, and which would be debatable, does not the Senator think we should not enter into an agreement to vote at a certain time?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator addressed that remark to me, I made no request to vote at a certain time. I am willing to agree or not to agree, just as seems agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. If there is no one else going to request that it go over, I shall not do so, but I would be very glad to have it go over if anybody else wants to have that course taken. However, I shall not ask that it go over.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me for a brief announcement?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

DEATH OF DR. WILBUR F. CRAFTS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the International Reform Bureau wishes me to announce that the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, superintendent of the International Reform Bureau since 1895, died in this city on yesterday, December 27, 1922, and that his funeral will be held at 4 p. m. to-day at the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, at the corner of Fourth and B Streets SE.

Mr. President, Doctor Crafts throughout his life exerted a great and wonderful influence for good and that influence will permanently survive him. Among the things in which he was interested and which he helped to promote were the spread of religion, law enforcement, moral education on a Bible basis in school and out, the creation of a public sentiment for a higher moral environment and a better world here and now, the suppression of intoxicants, gambling and other commercialized vices, substitution of recreation for dissipation, protection of the young against narcotics, one day's rest in seven, encouragement of reading with a view to inspiration to usefulness, arbitration and conciliation instead of industrial and international war.

Doctor Crafts was devoted to the best interests of humanity, as all Senators will testify, and his loss will be deeply mourned.

NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I ask to be indulged by the Senate a few moments while I express a hope that the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] may be favorably acted upon by the Senate. I do not think that this is any time for political or partisan play. It makes no difference to me now, so far as this amendment is concerned, whether the Senator who offers it agreed with me or not when the Versailles treaty was submitted to the Senate for ratification. It makes no difference to me now, Mr. President, whether the past performances of the present administration have been such that it should be commended or criticized. There are times and there are occasions and there are measures that should rise above partisan consideration. The question of whether the world shall go on down to destruction or shall find some basis upon which its differences may be accommodated and peace and prosperity again shall be established on the earth is one so vital that, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to forget all other questions and look to that alone.

If one wished to be captious and critical he could express some amazement at the suggestion of the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who was unwilling that a conference should be called unless the administration should be so hedged about by reservations and amendments that nothing could be done except the thing pointed out in the resolution. It evidences an amazing lack of confidence either in the intelligence or the patriotism of the President of these United States to suggest that if he were authorized to call a conference it would be unsafe to let him do so unless the Senate should so hedge about the questions that should be considered, under his call, that the President could not do a foolish thing. I am willing to trust the President to set out in his call those matters that are vital and which should be considered.

I have more confidence in the President of these United States, even though I have been accused of being overly critical of him, than has the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who expressed the same grave fear that the President might err if he were clothed with power to act, unless his powers were circumscribed by amendments and reservations. I am willing that the President shall be trusted. I say that, although I know that the President does not wish to call the proposed conference. We knew that before his letter was read to-day. We know equally well that he was opposed to the Limitation of Armament Conference which was held here a little more than a year ago. He wrote a letter then asking that it be defeated. He held conferences with Senators and asked that the armament conference resolution be not passed. One of the Senators, who was in charge of the bill when the amendment proposing the Limitation of Armament Conference was offered—I refer to the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]—said:

> I will say that I went to see the President with the Senator from Washington—
>
> Referring to the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]—
>
> and we talked over the question of disarmament, and I gathered from what was said there that the President thought it was not necessary for Congress to go ahead in this way with a resolution asking for disarmament.

The President afterwards wrote a letter opposing the resolution. That letter did not find its way into the RECORD, but the Senate for some reason saw fit to disregard the opinion of the President then and the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference was convened and a limitation of armament was agreed upon. A treaty with reference to the Pacific islands was also negotiated and ratified by the Senate. I know, Mr. President, that recently the Washington Limitation of Armament Conference was pointed to as one of the great achievements of the present administration.

The conference was held, as I have said—and I refer to it not in a spirit of criticism but merely to show that the President was opposed to that conference—and the very same Senators who now offer objection to the conference proposed by the Senator from Idaho were opposed to the Washington conference. The Senator from Massachusetts was opposed to it; he was honestly and sincerely opposed to it. I am not criticizing him for that. There comes a time, Mr. President, in some men's lives when they are afraid of the future; when they want to take no step forward. They are not to be criticized; it is their viewpoint that they want always to look backward, as if they thought there was nothing but an open grave ahead.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. From the Senator's statement in regard to what I said on the floor of the Senate last year, I gather that he implies that I meant that the President was opposed to the holding of a limitation of armament conference?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course. I thought the Senator meant what he said.

Mr. HALE. Such a construction is entirely foreign to my meaning, and I have never before heard of such a contention being made.

Mr. CARAWAY. Is it the Senator's intention now to say that the President was in favor of the adoption of the Borah resolution?

Mr. HALE. I do not think he was.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course not; and that is what I said.

Mr. HALE. I think that the President felt that it was unnecessary.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HALE. And that is the impression I tried to convey in the Senate at that time.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly the impression the Senator from Maine did convey—that the President wanted the Borah resolution killed.

Mr. HALE. I think the President thought it was unnecessary for the Senate to take any action.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly what the President says about the conference now proposed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. But the Senator from Arkansas is conveying the idea, if not stating it in express words, that the President was opposed to a conference——

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. STERLING. And not that he was merely opposed to the resolution?

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not care how the Senator from South Dakota wishes to split hairs now——

Mr. STERLING. I am not splitting hairs, Mr. President. It is the Senator from Arkansas who is evading the real question.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not evading anything. I say that there would have been no Limitation of Armament Conference if it had not been for the adoption of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho; and there would not have been a Limitation of Armament Conference if either the Senator from Maine or the Senator from South Dakota could have prevented it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota would not have lifted his hand toward preventing such a conference.

Mr. CARAWAY. And he would not have lifted his hand to have brought it about, either.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from South Dakota has understood all the time that the President was in favor of the conference but not in favor of the resolution which was passed by the Senate.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where did the Senator from South Dakota get that information?

Mr. STERLING. I can not give the source of my information now exactly in regard to that, but it has been my understanding all along that the President was in no sense opposed to a conference.

Mr. HALE. I object strongly to having the Senator say that I was opposed to the holding of a conference, but I was opposed to the resolution of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course.

Mr. HALE. I was in no way opposed to the conference.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator was opposed to it, and then voted for the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I do not recall how I voted.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes; the Senator did vote for it. The Senator got his orders and voted for it. I am not criticizing Senators who wish to follow the administration.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is the habit of sheep.

Mr. CARAWAY. As the Senator from Missouri suggests, it is a matter of habit.

Mr. President, I did not intend to impugn anyone's motives. I do know, or else I have been very much misinformed, that a year ago a Senator now sitting on the floor received a letter from the President asking him to kill the Borah resolution. The President also wants to kill the amendment of the Senator from Idaho now pending.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator specify to what Senator he is referring?

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator from Washington knows to whom I refer.

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I do not know.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did not the Senator from Washington receive a letter from the President asking him to kill the Borah resolution?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then, some one else is very, very much misinformed, because my information is that the Senator from Washington received such a letter. I will ask the Senator if the President did not express the hope that the Borah resolution would be killed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Not to my knowledge. He never expressed any such hope to me.

Mr. CARAWAY. He did not ask the Senator to have it killed?

Mr. POINDEXTER. He did not.

Mr. CARAWAY. Was the Senator present when the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] talked with the President?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I may have been present on one occasion when the Senator from Maine talked to the President.

Mr. CARAWAY. Here is what the Senator from Maine said in the Senate on the 13th day of May, 1921:

I will say that I went to see the President with the Senator from Washington—

That is the Senator with whom I have just been having a colloquy, is it not?—

and we talked over the question of disarmament, and I gathered from what was said there that the President thought it was not necessary for Congress to go ahead in this way with a resolution asking for disarmament.

Did the Senator from Washington get that same impression?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, perhaps I ought not to get into this controversy; but, in view of the labored effort of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. MCCORMICK] to change the actual facts, if the Senator will look at the Associated Press dispatches upon the day on which the able Senator from Maine and the able Senator from Washington left the White House, he will find an Associated Press dispatch to the effect that the President did not desire the resolution to be adopted and that, in their opinion, Congress would stand by the wishes of the President.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not happen to have the dispatch to which the Senator refers, but I know that was the general impression. I will inquire of the Senator what was the date?

Mr. BORAH. I do not remember the date, but it was the day the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Washington conferred with the President in regard to this matter.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, there might be an easy way to settle the controversy. Senators did confer with the President in regard to this matter; that is admitted. Suppose they tell us what the President said. We should like to know.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course they are not going to do that. I would have asked them to do so, but I knew they would not do it, because they have declined once before. I heard the Senator from Washington decline to do so. I know, however, that the Senators referred to came back from the conference and both of them announced that they were against the resolution. No one ever knew either one of them to fail to hear the voice of the administration, and therefore I know what the administration said to both of them.

Mr. President, that was entirely foreign to what I intended to say. I am not falling out with anyone for following the administration. I am not intending and had not intended to criticize anyone. I had hoped that the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho might be adopted. I was merely showing that the President's attitude toward the Borah resolution a year or so ago was the same as his attitude toward the pending amendment; but even he afterwards and all of his adherents talked of the great benefit that grew out of the Washington conference, to which the President was, I am sure, thought to be opposed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I will read from the New York Times Index for April–June, 1921, an article which is reprinted in the New York Evening Post of December 26, 1922, under the heading "The Story of Five Weeks." The article is as follows:

THE STORY OF FIVE WEEKS.

[From the New York Times Index for April–June, 1921.]

"House debate; row over disarmament, April 27, 19:1; Editorial, Disarmament Logic in House, April 27, 16:3; bill adopted by House without important changes; Representatives fail to force amendment which would force Harding to call disarmament conference, April 29, 17:8; President Harding, conferring with Senators POINDEXTER and HALE, warns them that he does not want 'hand forced' on disarmament question, May 4, 1:5; Harding opposes insertion of BORAH'S proposal into bill, May 4, 2:5; Senate committee agrees on bill adding $100,500,000 to that passed by House; Senate committee rejects BORAH'S proposal for conference between United States, Britain, and Japan, and House committee decides informally to drop disarmament agitation following Harding's talk with Senators; BORAH offers new amendment; POMERENE offers proposal calling for delay of six months in beginning building program provided for in bill to enable Harding to call conferences, May 5, 1:1; Representative STEVENSON asks House to reject Senate increases, May 6, 4:3; BORAH in statement says he will push disarmament plan, May 10, 1:2; Senate considers bill, May 13, 19:5; Senate debate; BORAH, in tilt with CURTIS, says Congress is raising, not cutting, costs; Kenyon and NORRIS assail measure and call for halt in building program, May 14, 1:6; deadlock in Senate; Senator POMERENE supports disarmament proposal; Senator KING wants naval holiday called and completion of ships less than 10 per cent completed stopped during holiday, May 17, 19:3; Harding is believed to have withdrawn opposition to BORAH'S disarmament amendment; Republican Senators allowed to vote as they wish; POINDEXTER tells of having sent letter to Harding, May 18, 1:6; economy advocates make $1,000,000 cut in bill; other changes, May 19, 17:8; Central Trades and Labor Council adopts resolution asking Senate to pass Borah resolution, May 20, 17:2; line-up on vote for amendment; pay increases also fought, May 24, 10:2; Senate rejects House proposal to cut down personnel; line-up of votes; LENROOT says Harding was misquoted to make him appear advocate of big navy; other amendments add largely to appropriations, May 25, 1:3; Senate adopts BORAH'S disarmament amendment; text of amendment, May 26, 1:5; Editorial, 'Mr. BORAH'S Triumph,' May 27, 16:1." BORAH'S amendment to the naval appropriation bill calling for a conference on world economic conditions and reparations is being frowned upon by administration leaders.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, Mr. President, everybody understood the situation. It is strange how quickly some people forget. I am not criticizing, nor did I intend to criticize, the President for being against the Borah resolution then or now. I was expressing the hope that, in view of the great ends to be accomplished, Senators might find it within their power to think of what might be the benefits and cast aside any political bias that they may have because the President happens to oppose it.

I do not know whether I am as good an American—and I want to speak with all kindness—as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday afternoon asserted he is. He served notice that nobody could be a constituent of his who was not an American. He did not want any Irish-Americans, or German-Americans, or Italian-Americans to be considered as constituents of his. I do not know that I can go that far. I never found it in my heart to hate people. I do not hate any race of people. I never found it in my heart during the war to rejoice when the newspapers told about the hunger that stalked in Germany and how children starved, tugging at their mothers' withered breasts. I did not hate the German women and children then. I do not hate them now. I do not hate any class of people that were engaged with us in the war. The war is over. I do not seek any political advantage that might come from the adoption of this resolution. I do not want to say, as some have said, that it would be a vindication of the position of the past administration and a condemnation of this. I want to say that the man who represents his people, and does it wisely, must be controlled by conditions as they now exist, not by what was true last year. It is the present condition that we must meet; and the Senator who can not forget the past, and, because he hated some people last year, must hate them this year, will never, I fear, support any progressive measure. I do not know whether the present condition of Europe impress people as it does me. I shall, however, say this, and you will pardon the personal note.

I had an opportunity this year to observe the condition in seven or eight of the European countries, among them France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries of middle and eastern Europe. The impression I got then, which stays with me, is that unless some relief or solution for its economic ills is found all of central and eastern Europe must sink in ruin. Whether we can see two hundred and fifty millions of people go down to destruction and not be destroyed with them, I do not know. I do not believe we can. I do not believe anyone who has not obtained first-hand information can understand the economic distress, the actual want, the lack of power to help themselves that confront these people of Europe. I know that I got no pleasure out of viewing it. I get none out of its remembrance. It may be that others can, that they feel they should hate all who are not American. I can not.

I know that in all the great cities of Europe, in those countries in which I was, when you saw a crowd of women standing in front of a shop window, packed in so that it was almost impossible to obtain a view of the window, when you got through that crowd of women and children to learn what attracted them you would not find it a display of dress or jewelry, but one containing a piece of meat or

a loaf of bread. I saw men—men of character and standing—come into hotels or the restaurants with a piece of bread wrapped up in paper under their arms, buy a cup of coffee, and sit down to a meal of nothing else, and then get up and go out. I know that the professors of the best known medical school in the world were starving until an American made it possible for them to eat one meal a day that cost between 4 and 5 cents each.

I know that the consul of this country in one of the greatest industrial cities in Germany told me last summer that the charwoman who cleaned their floors on the Fourth of July was given a present of a hen; that when she received it the tears trickled down her old withered face, and she said: "This will be the first bite of meat I have tasted in eight years." I know that you can go through countries like Austria or Germany and Hungary and see the conditions that confront those people and know that unless some kind of an arrangement can be made whereby they can reestablish themselves, anarchy must follow. Take Austria, with 6,000,000 of people, 2,000,000 of whom live in Vienna, with the entire agricultural products of that country not sufficient to feed the population two months, without any raw materials, surrounded by hostile people who have been taught to hate by hundreds of years of conflict, and you must know that Austria can not survive under the present conditions.

I do not know what this country can do. I do not know what an economic conference can accomplish. I do know, however, to refuse to do anything will bring no relief. I do know that action might be helpful, and inaction can not accomplish anything. I know that thousands and thousands of men, women, and children—but especially women and children—will go down to their graves this winter, victims of starvation, if these Senators shall have their way who say: "Let Europe solve its own problems and save itself."

You can not escape the responsibility. You may say: "I shall not assume it," but you can not escape it. You can not refuse responsibility for what happens in the other parts of the world however you may say that you will not assume responsibility for it, because the power lies within your grasp to take some action. You are not responsible if you act upon your best judgment and your action proves futile. You can not guarantee that the step you shall take will bring the relief for which you pray; but you will at least have maintained your self-respect and rendered unto the world all the aid you could, because you took whatever action seemed to you wise; but you can not escape responsibility if you simply say: "I will not act at all."

I do not know how much of hatred lives in the hearts of the people of America. I do not know. I do not know how many people would rejoice to think that starvation will stalk the streets of Berlin and Vienna this winter. I for one shall find no pleasure in it. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] in his speech before the Senate a few days ago said that the mistake which we made—I want to quote him accurately if I can find the RECORD; it was last Friday—that the thing we ought to have done was to have marched into Berlin and collected reparations then, when England and France and Italy and America had an army of millions of men in Europe. In other words, the Senator from Washington believed that you could have settled all the problems with the bayonet; that murder and destruction of property would have brought prosperity. Well, it never did in the history of the world; it never will, the Senator from Washington to the contrary notwithstanding; and the Senator expressed regret also that we did not send our armies into Russia to overthrow the government there established and set up another government, whether it pleased the people in Russia or not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall read the Senators' remarks if he has any doubt about that being his position last Friday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I did say what the Senator has just quoted. I am very deeply convinced that if we had carried on the war until it had come to a conclusion and to such a point that there could not have been any controversy about whether or not the German army had been defeated—and it is now claimed by Germans that it was not defeated—and such reparations as were collectible had been collected at the time, and Germany then freed from any further military control and allowed to proceed to reestablish herself we would then have avoided this world menace which is now proclaimed and which undoubtedly exists, arising from the effort, after four years of controversy and of world disturbance, to collect reparations from Germany, because after all that is the question which is at the bottom of the economic problem of Europe.

So far as Russia is concerned, what I said was that while we were in the war, and while the Allies had armies of trained men and veterans, if they had supported the party which existed in Russia and which was led by men of great ability, in my opinion, called the Constitutional Democratic Party, I think, that was in favor of a constitutional democracy, the world would have been relieved also of the still greater menace which now exists and which is undoubtedly carrying on propaganda in the United States, of revolutionary Bolshevism. I may be mistaken, of course, about that view, but I am very firmly convinced of it, and the Senator has accurately quoted me.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. He thinks it was a mistake not to have gone with our armies into Germany, to Berlin, in 1918? Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes. The Senator is just repeating what I have already said.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, wait; I want to ask the Senator another question. Is he now in favor of organizing an army to go to Berlin?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I certainly am not, Mr. President. The very fact that I am not in favor of it now, and that it can not be done now and that it ought not to be done now, is the reason why I believe it ought to have been done while the war was on.

Mr. CARAWAY. Let me ask the Senator another question. I hope he will not quit this discussion quite so abruptly. Why could we not get the same effects by invading Germany now that we could by invading it in 1918? It is the same German people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Of course, the Senator is too able a Senator, and too intelligent, to fail to see the difference between starting another war four years after the war closed and carrying it on to a successful conclusion while we were engaged in it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I can conceive that the Senator thinks the war was a failure as it ended, but that if it had gone on it would have been a success. I should like to ask him what reparation we could have collected from Germany with an army of invasion in 1918?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not like to undertake to make an inventory of what we might have collected. If we could not have collected anything at all, we would have discovered that fact. I think there were stores of government property and of government wealth, which we are now seeking futilely to get, which could have been taken then if it had been the will of the Allies to take them; and the threat of the world now, of which the Senator speaks, and advisedly and truthfully speaks, is the threat of taking reparations from Germany. Of course, if we could not have gotten them then, what hope is there of getting them now?

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator is the one who was advocating taking them by force of arms, and I thought he had some particular property in view which he thought the armies might have seized. No one would advocate the prolongation of war and the killing of men unless there were some object which could be reached. I had thought myself that when an army laid down its arms was not the time to invade the homes and murder the women and children. It may be that the Senator from Washington has so much better ideas of how to carry on a war than I have that he can see some advantage.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think either one of us could set himself up as an expert on how to carry on a war. I imagine that my views about that are just about as good as those of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. I want to ask the Senator another question, if he disclaims he is a great soldier. He wanted us to invade Russia, which was our ally, in 1918. Does he still hold to the idea that we ought to reassemble our armies and invade Russia and overturn the government? It is the same government that it was then.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator asks a great many questions, and bases many of them upon false premises.

Mr. CARAWAY. Where is the falsity in that premise? Let the Senator answer that, and then give me an answer to my question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will be glad to do that, because I am prepared to answer the question. The false premise the Senator laid down—and I only state my impression——

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure the Senator is right about it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is that the Bolshevist Government of Russia was our ally. I deny that, and my opinion is that it was our enemy and the enemy of the world. It is carrying on hostile propaganda in the United States to-day. It was bought and paid for by Germany and is sending money into the United

States to-day with the avowed purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States. I deny it is our ally, or ever was our ally or our friend.

Mr. CARAWAY. Nearly 9,000,000 Russians laid down their lives fighting for the same cause for which we fought. The Senator says they were our enemies. They were dying with us and dying for us, but praying against us. Of course, I realize the falsity of a premise of that sort, but which one of us assumed it I shall leave unanswered. I want to ask the Senator another question; he is interesting. The Senator makes the statement that Russia is sending money into the United States now to carry on a propaganda. From what source does the Senator get the information that that is true?

Mr. POINDEXTER. From various sources. I have reports from investigations which have been made, and also from open statements which have been made by the agents of the Bolshevist Government of Russia, among others Mr. W. Z. Foster, recently arrested by officers of the Government of the United States for revolutionary activities in the United States, who boasted of the large amount of money he had brought back from Russia for the purpose of carrying on revolutionary propaganda in this country.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not know he had ever been in Russia. That is the first information I have had that he had been in Russia. I knew Mr. Haywood went over there; but he is still there.

Mr. POINDEXTER. And he is begging to get back.

Mr. CARAWAY. Haywood?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. There are some people here who would be delighted to see him.

Mr. POINDEXTER. He went over there with the idea that it was a sort of an economic paradise.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; he went over there because he was under sentence to the penitentiary, and some people were foolish enough to go on his bond, and he jumped his bond and went away.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The people who went with him have been starving and freezing, and I took occasion not long ago to read a report giving the names of certain American travelers who had passed through Russia and seen some of those people, and who repeated their conversations with them, a very good side light on economic conditions in Russia which have been established by these "friends" of the United States, as the Senator calls them.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have never said that Bolshevism was a friend of the United States. It was not to fight Trotski and Lenin that the Senator wanted to send armies into Russia in 1917, if he wanted to support the Kerensky government, because neither Trotski nor Lenin was there at that time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Arkansas is mistaken about that.

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I am not.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. Lenin had then been in Russia for some time. Mr. Trotski went there a short time before. He was arrested en route by the Canadian authorities at Halifax and held in custody. The British Government filed a protest against allowing him to proceed to Russia.

The activities of Mr. Lenin in Russia at that time were well known; but they were not interfered with by the weak government which existed in Russia at that time or by the Government—I will not characterize it in its relation to Mr. Trotski—which existed in the United States at that time; but I will say that through its influence Mr. Trotski was released and allowed to proceed to Russia. Then they carried on their activities and established a hostile and alien government in that country. However, the period about which I was talking a moment ago and to which the Senator referred when he spoke about marching an army into Berlin was not in 1917 but it was in the autumn of 1918.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I may be permitted to say it, then the Senator is somewhat mixed in his history, because there were no leaders in Russia in 1918 for us to support.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Had they all been killed? What had become of them?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am not such a great authority on what became of them as is the Senator from Washington. I know that the Lenin government was in full control of Russia in 1918, except for an army that was backed by France and then deserted. However, I am not falling out with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, just in the interest of historical accuracy may I suggest that the Bolshevik revolution occurred November 8, 1917, I think, and since November 8, 1917, Lenin and Trotski have been continuously in control of Russia.

Mr. CARAWAY. Does the Senator understand that Kerensky was a Bolshevist?

Mr. JOHNSON. Oh, no, no; I was just fixing the date when Lenin and Trotski came into control.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator is entirely in error as to when Kerensky came into power.

Mr. JOHNSON. It was before that. The revolution occurred November 8, 1917.

Mr. CARAWAY. When was it that Senator Root went to Russia?

Mr. JOHNSON. Prior to that.

Mr. CARAWAY. What month?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think it was in the spring.

Mr. KING. It was in June, 1917.

Mr. CARAWAY. Possibly I am in error as to my date. I am willing to accept the statement of the Senator from California, who seems to have accurate knowledge. Anyway, Kerensky's government was not in existence when the Senator from Washington says he would have had an army invade Russia and uphold our friends, because Kerensky had left Russia long before that time.

However, Mr. President, controversy leads nowhere. I had gotten up to express the hope that for once at least the Senate might forget its war with itself, or its abject truckling to the powers that be, or its hatred of the powers that be. There ought to come a time when we are willing to let measures be decided upon their merits.

Referring to what the Senator from Idaho said yesterday, I know that an invisible tax collector stood by the side of every farmer in America last year, the year before that, and this year. Whether the farmer was husking his corn or threshing his wheat in the Northwest or picking his cotton in my Southland, that invisible tax collector stood by his side and took one-half of everything he produced. That invisible tax collector is called "Isolation." That is the price we pay in order to have nothing to do with Europe. That is the price we are paying now. The farmers of America are paying this year, in the loss of markets, as much as half the debt Europe owes us, of which we are speaking. They lost that much last year. They are paying more, in order that we shall have nothing to do with Europe, than the entire expenses of conducting this Government for a whole year. That is the price you are levying upon the producers of America. If it is worth it, if you get enough satisfaction out of seeing women and children starve in Europe to warrant you in levying that burden upon the producers of America, you must be your own judges in that matter. But whatever the condition is, and whatever the remedy may be, I take it that in the last analysis you will have to answer for yourselves and your party for your action here to-day.

I do not say that any Senator who opposed the reconciliation of Europe, by the methods which I believed, ought to be criticized. I do not say that he was wrong, although I think he was. But whether he was right or wrong, I do know—and this is all I intend to say—that if you shall vote that this amendment shall not be adopted, that there shall be no economic conference, you will be condemning thousands and thousands of women and children to their deaths, and you can not escape that responsibility. You can say that no good can come of adopting this resolution, but you can not prove it. You know that unless some action is taken death must stalk through all the countries of central Europe this winter, and if you are unwilling to make one effort to save them you must carry your responsibility.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has made a very impressive speech. I am very sorry that I missed a part of the colloquy. I wondered if he had referred to the power of hunger as propaganda of revolution.

Mr. CARAWAY. I did not.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to submit a few observations upon the pending amendment and to offer an amendment to the amendment, which I will send to the desk in order that it may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment to the amendment.

The READING CLERK. In lines 2 and 3 strike out the words "such governments as he may deem necessary or expedient" and substitute therefor:

The States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors and other States since recognized.

So as to read:

That the President is authorized and requested to invite the States signatory, etc.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is to make it certain that if this conference is called the participants at the conference will be all of the principal nations of the world. While I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, I feel that it is very important that we do not again call a conference consisting merely of the three empires of the world and this one Republic. I hope that at the conference which may be called the influence of the three great empires of the world, with their imperial policies, may be counterbalanced by the influence of this Republic, supplemented by that of the other Republics of the world.

Mr. President, the opposition to the proposal for a general international conference is not sudden. It is a settled, stubborn opposition. It is the organized opposition of the great interests of the world which have brought the world to all but utter ruin. The proposal for a general international economic conference is not new. On the 14th day of January, 1919, I offered a resolution providing for a general economic conference. In February, 1920, I again offered a resolution providing for a general economic conference. When the last Borah amendment for calling the disarmament conference was pending I was about to offer my resolution providing for a general international conference as a substitute for the Borah amendment when I was assured that if I did not do so, if I would let the matter as it then stood come to a vote, my resolution providing for a general economic-conference would be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee. It was not so considered, nor have the other resolutions which I offered bearing upon the European situation been considered.

After my journey to Russia in 1921 I offered a resolution based upon a knowledge of Russian conditions, the only accurate knowledge then available for this Government, the knowledge which I had obtained there. I offered a resolution, based upon first-hand information, which provided for the sending of an economic commission to Russia and the inviting of a Russian commission here. Neither the resolution providing for an economic conference nor the resolution providing for dealing with the Russian question was even considered by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

That reveals a deep disease from which we are suffering here, the disease which caused the Senate to so largely abdicate its powers during the Great War in favor of the executive department, a most dangerous proceeding. The executive department can not know, no matter how competent it is, all of the problems of the country and all of the problems of the world. Its wisdom must be supplemented by the wisdom of men elected fresh from the people, and by the knowledge obtained by legislators who take the trouble to investigate or even to go to foreign lands to find out the true situation.

Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss the European situation at this time, but I can not let the occasion pass without saying something as to conditions there.

Hardly had the armistice been signed, hardly had the joyous voices, the tumultuous shouting and the vibrant tones of the victorious bells announcing the end of war died away upon the chill November air before some of the Senators who, in spite of being in public life, are yet interested in public questions and not solely in political questions—and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is one of these—began to realize that the acid difficulties of the reconstruction period would test the resources of the world's statesmanship even as they had not been tested by the problems of the war.

Senators can scarcely realize the situation which confronts the world to-day. In the Senate Chamber, surrounded by all the comforts which we have here, it is difficult for the imagination to run out over Europe and over the far reaches of Germany, Austria, the Near East, Russia, and Siberia, where the real problems for statesmanship lie. If the newspapers should suddenly announce to-morrow morning that during this very winter there would come a war to Europe which would mean the sacrifice of 15,000,000 lives it would be a startling piece of news. I want to say that I believe—and I can support my belief by figures—that more than 15,000,000 people may meet death in Europe this coming winter from starvation because of the refusal of the parliaments and the leaders of the world to fully comprehend the situation which confronts us. It is a situation which imperils the very foundations of our civilization.

Talk about propaganda! Talk about governments being overthrown by insidious propaganda! Why, Mr. President, I am surprised that a Senator of the United States should give voice to such an utter fallacy. Is there a boy reading the history of the world in his elementary school who does not know that revolutions are never caused by agitation, by propaganda, by discussions?

Revolutions are caused by conditions; and when we create the conditions which bring about revolutions they will come. Until those conditions exist they will not come. Hunger is the most potent cause of revolution. Even our Bolshevist friends know that. Even those Bolshevists whose policies have been so greatly criticized by men who knew nothing about them admit the fact that until conditions are ripe for revolutions propaganda and agitation will not bring them about.

But I want to say that the conditions this winter in Europe, if we do not act, will be ripe for revolution, and the red tide of anarchy may sweep the continent of Europe, may even reach England, and possibly cross the Atlantic to this most fortunate land; although I believe that here, in spite of many evidences to the contrary, we will be able to withstand even the most adverse conditions.

In passing, it might not be inappropriate for me to refer to the fact, only mentioned by the distinguished statesman from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]—for he is a statesman, even if he is a Senator—to the effect that already there were signs of deep unrest in the United States. The violation of certain of our Federal statutes has reached such a point that it may be called anarchy. Following the violation of the prohibition statutes, which we were quite sure would be violated if enacted—and for that reason I opposed them—there is now reported a wholesale violation of the statute against counterfeiting our currency. The Senators from the Northwest can tell us that while the patient farmers there are peacefully waiting for some solution of their problem, government has ceased to function, and governmental functions and activities are practically dead in portions of the Northwest because the funds ordinarily secured from the farmers through taxes are not available because the funds are not there.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I will yield in a moment. Recently I had gone to Chicago, at great inconvenience to myself, hoping that I might be able to arouse some of the business men of that great metropolis to the seriousness of the situation confronting this country and the world. Coming back from Chicago I met a delegation of farmers from the Northwest who told me of conditions there which were far worse than anything I had dreamed of. I saw a county paper from a South Dakota town in which there were perhaps 1,000 farms advertised for sale because the farmers could not meet their taxes.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I hope the Senator will not be quite so general in his statement with reference to conditions in the Northwest. I have the honor to represent in part a Northwestern State. There is nothing of the kind with reference to the government ceasing to function in the State of Wisconsin nor any other State in the Northwest that I know of so far as the functioning of the government is concerned.

Mr. FRANCE. I meant to say to the Senator that the funds which are necessary for the maintenance of some county governments in the State of Wisconsin are not available because the farmers in the State of Wisconsin can not generally meet their taxes. That information I received from a resident in the Senator's own State, and there were several other residents of his State in the delegation.

Mr. LENROOT. There are many farmers in the State of Wisconsin who are in dire distress, but there is no government or agency of government in Wisconsin down to the smallest township that is not functioning to the fullest extent.

Mr. FRANCE. I thought I had made myself clear in stating that when a government can not through taxation secure the funds which it requires for the conduct of its business then it must sooner or later cease to function. It is certainly the case in many of the Northwestern States that the farmers have not the money with which to pay their taxes, and that is the only way of raising money for governmental use.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator tell us of a single Northwestern State or a State anywhere that is not able to keep its courts or its county offices open? I would like to have the name of such a State.

Mr. FRANCE. I think I have covered that question quite fully. I was alluding to three specific examples of what I wished to allude to, merely in passing, of an indication that all of our governmental functions in the country were not going on in the usual healthy manner.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator made a statement which, if it is incorrect, is very unfortunate and very damaging.

Mr. FRANCE. I think the record will show what my statement was. My statement was that in a single county—and it

can be duplicated by many other counties—substantially all the taxpayers who are farmers are unable to pay their taxes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The fact that the farmers are unable to pay their taxes is quite a different thing from the fact that the government has ceased to function. On the other hand, instead of this country being in a condition where it is unable to keep its courts open and carry on the civil business of the country, there is more money being expended in public improvements in the United States to-day than at any period of its history, and these improvements have been voted by the people and are being paid for out of the revenues collected from the people.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Missouri cite me any State, county, or municipality in the United States which pays for its public improvements out of revenue? The distinguished Senator from Idaho a few days ago called attention to the danger of our mounting public debt, and I myself have some figures upon that very point. That is not a sound condition.

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is true, of course, that a great majority of the public improvements are being made out of the proceeds of the sale of bonds; but it is also true that the best financiers in the world take those bonds without question and at low rates of interest. They would not do that if government had broken down. Moreover, in all of the States about which I know anything provision has been made for the payment of interest and a sinking fund and the taxes are being regularly paid. I know of no greater injury that can be done to the economic situation of a country than by the proclamation of a bankruptcy that does not exist. This country is not bankrupt; our States are not bankrupt; and if they were, so much the more reason why we should not undertake to carry the load of Europe.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President——

Mr. REED of Missouri. One moment. We are told that we are as rich as Crœsus. That is, when it is desired that we shall go over to Europe and spend our money there. The next moment we are told that we are going to pieces because we have no money and that we are on the verge of starvation. Which end of this proposition do gentlemen intend to take?

Mr. FRANCE. That is a very simple question for me to answer, for I never take but one end of any proposition where our international relations are concerned, and that is the American end. I wish to say in that connection that I have heard a considerable amount of internationalism talked in this Chamber by Members on both sides. I am no internationalist. I would not sacrifice one dollar of American interests or make America sacrifice one single iota of her privileges to save Europe from ruin. I have but one care, and that is the care for my own country. That care for my own country is based upon the belief, which is a part of my being, that the only idea adequate to heal the agony of this disordered world is the American idea. I would not jeopardize this American idea by sacrificing a single American interest to save the millions of Europe from starvation. It is only because I believe that the conditions in Europe are such that our own institutions are being menaced that I think the time has come for us to act and for us to attempt to assert the leadership of the American ideal in the affairs of the world.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I hope the Senator from Maryland did not understand me, although a part of his remarks leads me to think he may have so understood me, to intimate that he was preferring the world over the United States. I cast no such aspersion on the Senator. I know he is just as much of an American as am I. I want him to understand that. I wish, however, to say that the point that I make is that in one breath we are being told that the people of the United States are impoverished to the point where they are likely to become Bolshevists, and the next moment we are told that we are so rich and so prosperous that we can carry the burdens of the world. Both of those propositions can not be true; and it is time in this debate to get down to a few plain facts.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Missouri for his contribution to the debate. He knows in what high esteem I hold him, considering him one of the great statesmen of this body. I was merely saying, in passing, that the conditions in this country are most unsatisfactory.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

Mr. FRANCE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The voice of the Senator from Maryland reaches very far. I do not like to sit here in silence, especially in view of the suggestions that have been developed in the colloquy, representing in part one of the Northwestern States, and allow to go unchallenged the statement of the Senator that government in those States has broken down.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I merely wish to say a word. I am familiar with the conditions in a number of the Northwestern States. I am familiar with the conditions in the State of Washington, which I in part represent; I am familiar with the conditions in the States adjoining that State, and in a number of other States in that section of the country. I think I am as familiar with those conditions as is the distinguished Senator from Maryland, and I can state not only that I do not know of any breaking down of government, but I can say affirmatively and positively that government has not ceased to function, but that it is functioning; that the State authorities are exercising their jurisdiction under their respective constitutions; that the courts are open; that the county governments are carrying on the work of the people; that all of the municipalities are actively engaged in the administration of the laws of an orderly, well-conducted, and free people.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I take no exception to the misinterpretation or the misquotation of my words. I am accustomed to that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not misquote the Senator.

Mr. FRANCE. I merely mentioned in passing the situation of the Northwest. It is as I have told the Senator. Thousands of farms are for sale in the Northwest because the farmers can not pay their taxes. I am a countryman; I come from a county which is supported by its farmers, and I know that if the farmers generally of my county can not pay the taxes it will interfere with the normal operation of governmental processes in that county. That is my proposition, and I maintain it now. I expect to see, of course, the Tory press to-morrow come out with the statement that "Senator FRANCE has stated that all governmental functions in the United States have suspended"; and if Senators who are listening to me can not understand my words any better than to put that interpretation upon them, how can I expect the newspapers, with their own games to play, with their own purposes to serve, with their own masters to obey, to put any better interpretation upon my words?

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is not much opportunity to misinterpret the statement that government has ceased to function.

Mr. FRANCE. If I said that government has ceased to function, I think what I said in the paragraph made my meaning perfectly clear; but if it is not clear, I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I have never said that government had totally ceased to function in any part of the United States. I was not laboring under that impression; I have not that impression, and I did not intend to convey that impression. I intended to say just exactly what I have stated to the Senator; and I think that the Senator would do well to inquire into agricultural conditions particularly in Oregon, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana if he has not done so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I only intended to submit a few observations, but at the present rate I am afraid that my observations will consume the whole of the afternoon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was merely going to ask the Senator a question. I should like to ask him if he has made any calculation of the amount of taxes, a share of which the farmers of whom he speaks have to pay, that have been imposed upon the people of the United States by the loans of money and the gifts of money which we have already made to Europe? I might suggest in supplementing my question that we loaned Europe a principal of something like $10,000,000,000, on which there is now said to be an accumulated interest of something like $1,000,000,000, making a total of $11,000,000,000 in round numbers, and probably considerably more than that. I remember it is not long since we made a direct appropriation of $20,000,000 out of the Treasury to buy food for Russia; that not long before that we appropriated $100,000,000 to form a revolving fund for the purchase of food for various countries of Europe; and in addition to those amounts still further amounts have been appropriated out of the Treasury, and there have been literally hundreds of millions of dollars donated by private subscription out of the wealth of the United States, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States for the relief of various portions of Europe and Asia.

What I should like to ask the Senator is how he expects, in view of the picture which he is drawing of the distress of the farmers of the United States, calling attention particularly to the farmers of the northwestern section of the United States, to relieve that distress by going still deeper into their pockets to pay out money to foreign countries?

Mr. FRANCE. I am very glad the Senator has asked that question, because it is a question which it is the purpose of

my remarks to answer. The Senator's mind evidently has been anticipating what I intend to say. I might preface what I have to say by stating that my proposition is not to take one dollar away from America for any purpose. I would have this country in the position of a creditor who is seeking so to rehabilitate his debtor that he can recover some of his loss.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that all of the speeches which have been made thus far have been general in character. I hope the Senator in his remarks will tell the Senate and the country what he thinks America ought to do to meet the situation. Let us do away with generalities; let us get down now to exactly what we can do, and what the American people ought to do to meet the situation. The passing of resolutions will not do it. In what way does the Senator want the relief for Europe to come from America, and how can it be extended?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, there is no man in the Senate to whom I would rather present my plan than the Senator from Utah, for he is a wise Senator and a very sound business man. It is true that the passing of resolutions will not solve the difficulty, nor will the refusal to pass them solve the difficulty. I have already presented my plan several times to the Senate. I have not been able to secure any considerable amount of attention to my plan, chiefly, I will say, because of the vicious practice which has grown up in the Senate of passing every problem up to the Executive for solution. If it had been considered by the Senate to be its duty to wrestle with our problems due to European conditions, the Senate would have considered the plan which I have presented, which in my judgment is a sound plan for the liquidation of the international debt. Some may not agree with me; some may say that my solution is not a sound solution; but it is a solution, and it is like a banker's solution, and it is a businesslike solution, and unless that solution is accepted I ask the opponents of it to propose something else. We must find a solution for the difficulties which confront the world or we will allow Europe to plunge to utter ruin.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that the Secretary of the Treasury a year ago asked Congress for certain powers in order to meet the situation existing at that time; and it is no better to-day than it was, but is growing even worse. He asked that Congress give the commission to be appointed through an act of Congress the power to refund the obligations. He asked that they be given the power to extend the payment for 40 years, and he asked that the rate of interest be not named in the act itself, but be left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury or the administration, so as to deal with every country according to the situation of that country and the conditions existing at the time the settlement was made. He asked also the power to treat the interest upon those obligations in a way that would take care of them at some time in the future, by the payment of monthly payments or yearly payments, or whatever plan might be adopted.

The Senator knows that Congress held that act down to the granting of only two powers. One was that the extension of time should not exceed 25 years. The other power granted was to reduce the rate of interest upon the obligations as it exists to-day—namely, 5 per cent—to not less than 4½ per cent, and to add the accumulated interest to the principal of those debts. That is all the power that was granted the commission, and I do not believe Congress knew at the time that every country in the world that was owing the Government of the United States, except possibly England, could not meet those conditions. I will say to the Senator now that what has happened since—and the information that has been brought to the commission is such that it is impossible for me at this time to go into detail, and it would not be wise for me to do it anyway as a member of the commission—has demonstrated beyond a question of doubt that those debts can not be paid by foreign countries, as was contemplated in the passage of that legislation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is very apparent from the letter which came in from the President to-day, and from the argument of the Senator from Utah, and from the other propaganda which is going on in the country, that while we are talking about not canceling the debt, it is proposed to put the matter in such a condition that for all practical purposes it will be a cancellation.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want the Senator to intimate that I have such an idea. On the contrary, I have stated my position openly and publicly so many times that I did not think anybody even thought for a moment that I had such an idea.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the American people are not interested in this debt as a mere memento, to lie down here in the archives of the Treasury for an indefinite length of time, until the seventh and eighth generations shall have passed over. But it is the plan, and has been the plan for weeks, to extend these debts so indefinitely that instead of an actual cancellation it will be a practical cancellation..

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that not a scintilla of evidence has been submitted that I know of that would justify such a charge against the Foreign Loan Debt Commission.

Mr. BORAH. I am not talking about the commission. I do not know that the commission has any idea of such a thing, but that view is being advanced by powerful interests.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator now that I have not a doubt but that every member of that commission would be opposed to any cancellation of the debt.

Mr. BORAH. Why, of course they are opposed to the cancellation of the debt. I am not speaking about the wishes or desires of the commission as an individual entity or the actual open cancellation. I am speaking now of the plan which is being put forward, and which we are advised to-day we must go to the State Department to get our information concerning in a confidential way, to take the limitation off the commission. I do not have to go to the State Department to know that that scheme has long since been on.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that what I stated was in answer to a statement that was made by the Senator from Maryland, brought out by a question that I had asked the Senator from Maryland—that before he concluded his remarks I should like to have him submit some proposition, or his ideas, at least, as to how these debts from the foreign countries can be met and what he recommended for immediate action in order to relieve the situation in Europe.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I shall be very glad, if time permits, to refer to that subject, to which I have already referred on a previous occasion.

Referring to the statement by the Senator from Idaho as to the scheme for settlement of the foreign debt, I would say that is very simple. I do not know whether the Senator from Utah is familiar with it or not, but I am. The scheme is very simple, and I for one am very glad that the Senate took such action as to make that scheme unworkable by specifying a near date for the maturity of the bonds and by regulating the interest charges.

There are two classes of debts owing to the United States by the European countries. The one class is composed of the debts with interest owed by government to government, amounting to some $11,000,000,000. That debt is not giving the international bankers of New York any great concern; but there is another debt owing by Europe to this country which is giving them concern, and that is the debt owing to them—a debt represented by open accounts and bills payable in the banks; a debt amounting perhaps to a sum between four and six billions. Two years ago, according to a careful estimate by one of our leading banks, it was approximately $4,000,000,000, and since that time it has been added to. In other words, there are two classes of debts, the debts owed by governments abroad to our Government and those owed by Europe to our private bankers and investors. Included in that debt, which is made up of open accounts, is, of course, the debt represented by the old Anglo-French bonds which are now in the boxes of these bankers and of their customers. The proposition of the international bankers is to have this Government indefinitely postpone the debts owing to this Government in order to render the investments of the bankers more secure, and the Senate by wise legislative action headed off that proposition. In other words, the international bankers who themselves have European paper in their banks and the bonds of European countries in their boxes want to take care of their interests first by deferring for a long time the payments due from their debtors to our Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that that situation does not relieve anyone in Europe. It does not get them back to work. If all that the Senator has said were true——

Mr. FRANCE. It is true.

Mr. SMOOT. If the international bankers held the obligations of these countries for even the amount that the Senator states, the question before the Congress and the country and America, as all the speeches have led us to believe, is that there must be immediate relief in some way. What I want the Senator to tell the Senate and the country is, How are we going to give that relief? Where is it coming from? From what source? Does the Senator believe the time has arrived when the Government ought to extend further credits to these countries without the payment of the interest that is now due upon the obligations that those countries owe America? Does he think for a

moment that the international bankers in this country and in foreign countries are going to advance further loans to these countries under the conditions described by him as existing in those countries?

We have to look at the thing in a business way. No human being living would like to relieve the suffering of Europe any more than I; but the question is, How are we going to do it? From what source is the relief to come? If it is to come from international bankers, as the Senator intimated that they are holding obligations of four or six billion dollars, they are not going to advance any more money unless they know that they are going to have some chance of that money being returned. That is just as natural as life itself. Now, the question is, Does the Senator think that we ought to advance them more money? If so, to what countries, and upon what conditions?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, it is a very simple proposition. The Senator criticized the Senate for not acquiescing in the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; the Senator misunderstood me. I simply stated the situation, and the Senator knows that what I stated is absolutely true.

Mr. FRANCE. Perhaps I should not have used the word "criticized," Mr. President; but the Senator certainly suggested that the Senate did not acquiesce in the plan of the Secretary of the Treasury for dealing with these debts. Certainly the Senate did not, because the plan was not adequate. It merely provided for a deferment of payment. Now, any banker knows that you can not generally relieve a debtor merely by deferment of his payments.

There are three things for a banker to do if he has an insolvent debtor. First, he must defer payment. That is inevitable. He has no choice in that.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that that is exactly what we have in Europe in a great many of the countries.

Mr. FRANCE. I say, that is inevitable. If the debtor is insolvent, the deferment of payment is automatic.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not saying that England is insolvent. I am not saying that any of the other countries are insolvent. I am not going to particularize; but the Senator knows that many of the countries that owe the United States are insolvent, and those are the very countries where the suffering is taking place. Now, how are we going to relieve that situation?

Mr. FRANCE. If the Senator will permit me, I will give him what would be a banker's answer. The answer would be this: Deferment of payment is the first step. The finding of assets which might be utilized in the settlement of the account is the second step. The rehabilitation of the debtor is the third step. Those are the three steps—first, to defer payment; second, to find assets which might be used in liquidation; third, to rehabilitate the debtor.

The Secretary of the Treasury, a great financier and a preeminently distinguished banker, only suggested deferment of payment. He did not suggest examination of the assets, nor did he suggest any plan for the rehabilitation of the debtor. All three of those things are indispensable.

Mr. SMOOT. I agree with the Senator as to that. But let us consider the case and see where we land. I suppose nobody will deny the fact that in order to relieve the situation Germany has to be relieved in some way.

Mr. FRANCE. That is true.

Mr. SMOOT. She must receive assistance from some source. If Germany should apply for a loan from the international bankers of any country, those bankers would say, "What security have you to offer? How are we to feel secure for the repayment of the money we lend you?" The Senator knows that the reparations imposed upon Germany are such that she can not meet them. Her man power and productivity of the soil are not sufficient to meet the reparations that have been demanded of her. Is there any property in Germany, as long as those reparations stand as a first lien against Germany, that she could give for any further advance of money to relieve her of the stress she is in?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I appreciate the intelligent comment of the Senator from Utah, and we might discuss this matter at some length. I understand, however, that it is desired that a vote be had; and I do not wish to delay the vote, though I would prefer to proceed with my argument. But I wish to say, in passing, that I am not so unsophisticated as to be advocating a loan to Germany with an indeterminate liability in the shape of impossible reparations standing against her. Very shortly after the Versailles treaty was presented I began to contend—and for many, many months I have been contending—that the German reparations should be reduced and that we, as a creditor of Germany's creditors, should see that something be done to relieve Germany from paying these impossible reparations.

I have heard some talk to-day about the wonderful Versailles treaty and what it might have accomplished. A number of Senators on this side of the Chamber, some of whom are business men, voted for the Versailles treaty with reservations. Yet when the treaty of Versailles first came to the Senate the late distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Knox, a great statesman, a student of international affairs, and a student of finance, rose in his place and said in effect that the worst part of the Versailles treaty was not the League of Nations part, but the reparations part, and that if we attempted to place those reparations upon Germany we would hold back the reconstruction of the world for many years. Some of the viper press of the United States, the disloyal tory press of the United States, dared call the great distinguished Senator, Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania, of late lamented memory, a pro-German because he suggested the inevitable reduction of the German reparations, the attempt to pay which is keeping Europe to-day in distress, as we all now begin to recognize.

It was estimated by an eminent economist a year ago that at the rate at which the mark was then selling the total income of all the German banks, of all the German public utilities, of all the German industries at the then value of the mark was equal to $4,000,000,000 each year. That is an estimate by a distinguished banker of Boston, W. Irving Bullard. The reparations fixed against Germany, he estimated, amounted to $5,000,000,000 annually. Yet the total income from all of the German banks, industries, and public utilities was only equal to $4,000,000,000, one billion of which had to go to meet fixed charges and one billion of which had to go to meet depreciation, leaving a balance of a possible two billions for the reparations payment, when five billions had been fixed. Of course, it is well known that the reparations payments demanded of Germany are helping to create the situation in Europe to which I am about to refer.

I have long since advocated a reduction of the German reparations, and there is, I will say in passing, somewhere on the dusty files of the Foreign Relations Committee a resolution which probably has never been read by any considerable part of that committee, certainly has never been considered, providing for two things: First, for the liquidation of the debts owed us by certain governments by transfer to us from them of certain assets which they have and which can be transferred, and for a reduction of the total German indemnity to $15,000,000,000, which is the maximum amount which any economist thinks Germany can possibly pay.

Mr. SMOOT. What character of assets had the Senator in mind when he drew the resolution?

Mr. FRANCE. The former German African colonies and cables, transferred by Germany to the allied and associated powers, of which we were one. That may seem to be an unreasonable solution, but it is a solution. It would result in the liquidation of the debt, it would result in the restoration of the exchange rates, and it is a sound business solution. I mean to say it is a solution which a banker would consider, for I have said there are three things which a banker must do with an insolvent creditor—defer payment of interest and principal, seek assets which can be used for the liquidation of the obligations in order that the debtor may begin to buy again, and find means for the rehabilitation of the debtor.

The situation of our debtor, taking Europe as a whole, is this, that Europe can not buy the things necessary for her rehabilitation because she already owes us so much that the exchange situation prevents further adequate buying. The liquidation of what she owes us and the rehabilitation of her productive power must go hand in hand. That is true with reference to the restoring of any insolvent debtor to solvency. You must liquidate what he owes in order that he may buy more, in order that he may restore his productive capacity.

Mr. SMOOT. If that were all, and we were simply relying on the fact that there must be goods sold to Europe, I could answer that by saying that in this year, 1922, we exported more goods than we did in 1921. We exported 60 per cent more goods in 1922 than we exported the year before the war. So it is not the power of Europe to purchase our goods that is producing the unbalanced conditions in the world. It is far deeper than that. I grant that that would have a bearing upon the exchange values of money between countries. There is no doubt of that at all. But I was surprised to learn that the exports of even the products of the farm, of which we speak, have greatly increased, and in some respects they are greater this year than they have been at any time, with the solitary exception of 1918 and 1919, during the period of the war, when everything was bought at enormous figures.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the very dominating Senator from Utah wants me to make my remarks in the order which he chooses rather than the order in which I had chosen to

make them. I would say that I feel very happy that I am able for once to put the Senator in the wrong on figures. His figures of the exports this year, which show that our exports are greater than those last year, are certainly in error. I had intended to refer very shortly to the very subject to which the Senator has alluded in his remarks, and if the Senator will allow me to proceed until I finish——

Mr. SMOOT. I will; but I simply want to say to the Senator that my figures are from the Department of Commerce, and I have a letter of transmittal here, and can tell the Senator in detail what the articles were and the amounts. They will go into the RECORD before we get through with this discussion.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I might accuse the Department of Commerce of almost everything except putting out two sets of figures for the same transactions. I also have figures from the Department of Commerce, which are quite the contrary to those of the Senator from Utah. In fact, my figures from the Department of Commerce show that in the 11 months of 1922 we exported $3,490,345,750 worth of goods, as compared with $4,188,832,983 last year, showing a falling off in exports this year, in the 11 months, over last year of $698,487,233.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has not the figures for the full year?

Mr. FRANCE. This is for 11 months.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington.

Total values of imports and exports of the United States.
(Preliminary figures for 1922, corrected to December 16, 1922.)

MERCHANDISE.

	November—		11 months ending November—		Increase (+) decrease (−).
	1922	1921	1922	1921	
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
Exports	388,000,000	293,092,219	3,490,345,750	4,188,832,983	−698,487,233

EXPORTS OF MERCHANDISE, BY MONTHS.

Exports.	1922	1921	1920	1919	1913
	Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
January	278,848,469	654,271,423	722,063,700	622,096,726	227,092,930
February	250,619,841	486,454,000	645,145,225	585,097,012	193,998,942
March	329,979,817	386,080,346	819,556,037	603,141,648	187,426,711
April	318,469,578	340,464,105	684,319,392	714,800,137	199,813,438
May	307,568,828	329,760,579	745,522,223	608,987,025	194,607,422
June	335,116,750	336,898,606	629,376,757	928,379,203	163,404,916
July	301,157,325	325,181,138	651,136,478	508,987,515	160,990,778
August	301,771,602	366,987,538	578,182,601	646,054,425	187,909,020
September	313,093,286	324,993,123	604,686,259	595,214,300	218,240,001
October	370,720,154	343,330,815	751,211,370	631,618,449	271,661,464
November	388,000,000	294,092,219	676,528,311	740,013,585	245,539,042
December	.....	296,196,373	720,295,774	681,415,999	233,195,628
11 months ending November	3,490,345,750	4,188,832,983	7,507,729,533	7,239,009,991	2,250,832,664
12 months ending December	.....	4,485,031,356	8,228,016,307	7,920,425,990	2,484,028,292

Mr. SMOOT. I have an estimate of the exports for 1922, and I will put all the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. FRANCE. They are the estimated exports?

Mr. SMOOT. We have to estimate them for the last few days.

Mr. FRANCE. I am very skeptical about such an estimate. I am dealing with the 11 months of 1922, as compared with the 11 months of 1921, and I know that there has been a falling off of about $690,000,000 in the 11 months.

I had not intended to detain the Senate so long, but here is our situation: The world is short of goods, and distressingly short of food. For more than four years millions of men in Europe were engaged in destruction, withdrawn from the peaceful and plentiful production of food and commodities and placed in the work of destroying life and destroying goods. It is perfectly apparent to all students of European conditions that the productive capacity of Europe since the war has not been restored, and therefore Europe is alarmingly short of all sorts of goods—cotton, wool, manufactured articles, and food products.

At the same time, with Europe to-day needing for her rehabilitation all kinds of commodities as desperately as she needed other commodities for the purposes of the war, our exports have alarmingly fallen off. Because of her failure to reconstruct her productive industries, Europe is in a desperate financial situation. As the Senator has already said, the budgets of Europe do not balance. I shall not discuss the British budget or the budget of any particular country, but a fair striking of any balance sheet in any country of Europe would show that the budgets do not and can not balance.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator does not mean to imply that because we have not contributed to the reconstruction of European industry the budgets do not balance? He does not allege that undue expenditure, unrestrained expenditure, which we would regard as amazing in this country, is not responsible for those deficits?

Mr. FRANCE. We could not be amazed by any expenditure for naval or military preparation. That is inconceivable. We are too accustomed to spending money for those purposes to be amazed. But if the Senator will allow me to proceed, I think I shall be able to develop my argument a little more clearly than if interrupted, and I have been asked to conclude as soon as possible—at which I am not at all surprised—in order that we might have a vote.

Here is the situation in general: In 1913 the aggregate debts of all the countries were $43,000,000,000. In 1918 they were $205,000,000,000. In 1919 they were $295,000,000,000, and in 1922 the total aggregate debts of the countries reached $400,000,000,000.

Of course, that does not mean the European countries alone. In addition to that there is an increased fixed charge for interest on this additional debt of approximately $15,000,000,000.

In addition to the increase of $15,000,000,000 annually in fixed charges there has been one absolute loss in income due to the killing and serious maiming of approximately 10,000,000 men. Those 10,000,000 men, on an average, might be considered to be capable of earning about $500 each, making a deficit in the loss of their earning power and in the loss of their productive capacity of approximately $5,000,000,000. This would make a total loss from the increase in fixed charges due to interest and the decrease in productive capacity due to loss of man power of $20,000,000,000 each year.

In addition to that apparent deficit there is the other deficit to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] has referred—the deficit which is represented by increased expenditures for naval and military appropriations as compared with the same expenditures before the war. Then, of course, there is the increased expenditure owing to the fact that those who are maimed and disabled must be cared for by government pension. So there is an apparent deficit, taking all of those items into consideration, of possibly between twenty-two and twenty-four billion dollars annually in Europe.

Now, what is the proposition? It is a business proposition. The world as a whole is not earning its fixed charges, because its charges have been increased, its productive capacity has been decreased, and its productive power is decreasing because the means are not at hand for the rehabilitation of the productive power. With the increase in the fixed charges and decrease in earning in the world, there are only two alternatives. One is insolvency—and the insolvency of any of the great European countries, even Germany, would certainly produce an all but disastrous effect here, and the insolvency of all would be sure to produce it. We dare not consider insolvency. Then we must turn to the other horn of the dilemma and consider whether it is possible for us to increase the productive capacity of Europe and the world sufficiently to meet the increase in fixed charges. The logic is inevitable. We must either choose an insolvency because of the increased fixed charges, which amount to from twenty-two to twenty-four billion dollars annually, or we must find some way to increase the income of the world by increasing the productive capacity of the world.

There is the problem. What can be done about it? Something must be done, and we can not do it by sitting here wishing somebody would find a way. The only way it can be done is to call into a conference all of the great nations to see how in each nation the productive capacity of that nation may be not only restored, for that is not enough to prevent insolvency, but increased as well.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But, Mr. President, if we were to increase the production of goods in Europe, what would we do for a market?

Mr. FRANCE. That is not a hard question to answer at all. I say that the world is short of goods, short of all kinds of manufactured commodities; and if that be the case, we need not worry about the market. A market can be found. I have already had some observations to submit on that question.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Did not the Senator vote practically to exclude suffering Europe from the American market?

Mr. FRANCE. I hope not, I will say to the Senator. Of course, it is very difficult to discuss any question here without

discussing the tariff question. The tariff law which we enacted, whatever any other Senator or Member of Congress might call it, to me was an emergency tariff law—nothing more, nothing less. It was an antidumping law. We did not call it an emergency tariff law, but that is what it was, comparable in every respect to the safety of the realm act which was passed by Great Britain and which carried tariffs quite comparable to the tariffs carried in our law, and which also carried a provision for a sliding scale adjustment there by a committee which was formed under the English law for that purpose, the functions of that committee being comparable to the functions the President will perform here under the sliding scale process, so that the tariffs might not be inequitable and such as to absolutely prevent imports.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator said they are starving over there, so we passed an emergency law to keep them from bringing their goods over here and selling them quickly. Three or four years from now we will have a sliding scale that will let their goods in; but by that time they will all be dead, according to the Senator's theory.

Mr. FRANCE. No, Mr. President. I perhaps did not clearly state what I intended to state, and that is that the safety of the realm act of England and our tariff act, which I call an emergency act, both had for their purpose the making up by a tariff of the difference in the cost of production abroad and the cost of production at home. It was not intended to be a tariff wall; and I am quite sure that if it shall appear that all exports are being stopped by the tariff in any particular schedule, the tariff will be adjusted. That was my theory of the law, and on that theory I voted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that the figures will not justify the statement made by the Senator from Missouri. The tariff law was enacted September 22 of this year. October was the first full month during which the law was in effect. In October, 1921, we imported, of all goods, $343,330,815. In October, 1922, we imported $370,720,154. We imported more goods after the passage of the tariff law than we did before its enactment.

Mr. FRANCE. I thank the Senator for the contribution.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator want to let that stay just that way?

Mr. SMOOT. How does the Senator want me to let it stay?

Mr. REED of Missouri. How much wool came in—6,000,000 pounds?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no!

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does not the Senator know that a large part of that was made up because we had passed the so-called emergency tariff law that was very high in its rates, and when we enacted the new law lower rates than the emergency tariff rates existed, and thus let the goods come in which had been banked up waiting for the enactment of the new tariff law? The rates contained in the new tariff law were lower than those of the so-called emergency act, and that accounts in part for the importation. Is not that the fact?

Mr. SMOOT. There were 107,000,000 pounds of wool held in bond waiting for the passage of the tariff law. Of that 107,000,000 pounds of wool that was in bond, there have been about 80,000,000 pounds withdrawn and a rate of duty of 31 cents a pound on the scoured basis has been paid. If 100,000,000 pounds of wool had been brought in and paid for after taken out of bond, that would only have been $31,000,000 on all of the wool. So that it does not account for the increase in the imports of goods since the enactment of the law. It accounts for $31,000,000, and that is the whole of the amount of duty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Well, Mr. President, if that is the case——

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I must decline to yield further, as I must conclude my remarks. I hope Senators will allow me to conclude. I do not wish to delay a vote upon the Borah amendment and I do feel that the observations which——

Mr. REED of Missouri. We are not going to have any vote to-night, I think, on any amendment.

Mr. FRANCE. I think it is the desire to have a vote.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. FRANCE. I am sorry that I can not yield further to the Senator from Missouri. I would do as much for him as for any Senator, but I feel that I must conclude. I feel that before a vote is taken upon the amendment the Senate should be advised of certain of the facts which I desire to present as briefly as possible.

Before I take up the figures which I had intended to present I want to say that to my mind immediately after the armistice there seemed to be three problems: First, to restore Germany as a productive nation; second, to restore Russia as a productive nation; third, to find some way for the liquidation of the debts owing us by certain of the countries of Europe in order that the European countries generally might find the exchange market so rehabilitated that they would be able to purchase raw materials and to generally bring about a restoration of their productive industry.

I was so persuaded in the first place of the necessity of the restoration of the productive power of Russia that I took my political life in my hands—and I lost it and I have no regrets—by openly advocating some action which would restore Russia as a productive nation. The restoration of Russia is a part of the general problem of European rehabilitation, and it has a direct bearing upon the amendment which I have offered; for any conference which might be called must, of course, include Germany and Russia; otherwise it would be worse than useless. It would fail as the Paris conference failed; it would fail as the Washington conference, in my judgment, failed; it would fail of removing the great economic difficulties which seem to be forcing the world inevitably to the brink of war.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator from Maryland offered an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. FRANCE. I have offered an amendment to the Borah amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to how I happened to become interested in the Russian question. I was not interested in the Russian question because I was particularly interested in Russia; I knew nothing about Russia, except in a most cursory way, and I had very little particular interest in the Russian people; but I was considering how we might so restore Europe that Europe would be able to meet her obligations to us and how we might be able to keep open the markets of Europe for American goods. As I began to study that question I began to realize that Russia was the key to the whole European situation and that if we allowed Russia to continue prostrate we would invite in Europe inevitable disaster.

Consider the fact that prior to the World War Russia, on an average, exported to the industrial countries of Europe 460,000,000 bushels of grain. Russia is the trunk of the tree of Europe. Even before the World War the peoples of the industrial countries of Europe generally were not overfed. Yet, I repeat, prior to the World War Russia poured into the arteries of international commerce 460,000,000 bushels of grain every year, enough to support life in the bodies of about 60,000,000 people in the industrial countries. It soon became evident to me as I studied the European question that if Russia did not export a sufficient quantity of grain to support life in those 60,000,000 people they would inevitably be brought to the verge of starvation. Certainly it seemed inevitable to me that they would become so undernourished that they would become dissatisfied with the conditions in their respective countries and revolution would be invited.

To-day Russia is not exporting and can not export to the industrial countries of Europe her normal amount of 460,000,000 bushels of grain. Not only can she not export 460,000,000 bushels of grain but she herself needs for immediate import 100,000,000 bushels of grain, making an apparent deficit in Europe of 560,000,000 bushels of grain. We know what the situation was in Europe last winter. Hundreds of thousands of people starved in Russia, and hundreds of thousands of people in Germany were undernourished and yet at that time there were, perhaps, some carry-over supplies. This winter, however, the situation will be even worse, because not only is there that apparent deficit of 560,000,000 bushels of grain but there is a deficit because of the falling off of production in the other countries outside of Russia of 275,000,000 bushels of rye and wheat, making a total deficit, apparently, of grain in Europe of more than 800,000,000 bushels, an amount equal to the total of our last wheat crop. Senators can imagine what our situation here would be if we had not raised a grain of wheat last year with all our surplus of corn and potatoes and other edibles, which in many years we do not even use.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator a question at that point?

Mr. FRANCE. I will yield to the Senator from Florida if he only wishes to ask me a question, for I am very anxious to conclude my remarks.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to ask a question. How many bushels of grain did the United States send to Russia with, I think, it was the $10,000,000 which we appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. FRANCE. We appropriated $20,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. How many bushels of grain would that purchase?

Mr. FRANCE. I think a considerable amount was expended for corn, but I have not at hand the exact figures as to the number of bushels of wheat which we exported to Russia.

Unfortunately, however—for it was really a tragic misfortune—we did not get that wheat to Russia in time for the last spring sowing, so the Russian crops this year have not been benefited by the shipment of the wheat into Russia last spring.

I repeat there is an apparent shortage in Europe of 800,000,000 bushels of grain. That, of course, is more than enough grain to supply 100,000,000 people with breadstuffs. The only redeeming feature of the terrible situation in Europe is the fact that they have produced in Europe this year an extraordinary potato crop—a billion bushels more than last year—so that they will have approximately 200,000,000 bushels of potato starch to in part make up the loss of the 800,000,000 bushels of grain so far as the starch foods are concerned; but that a destructive famine seems inevitable in Europe during the present winter can not be denied.

It is probably quite true that unless drastic steps are taken so that we can export all of our surplus foodstuffs to Europe several million—probably, putting it conservatively, 15,000,000—people will perish in Europe this winter from starvation. It is quite true, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has stated, that we have exported this year more than the usual amount of foods to Europe; I do not deny that, but the purchasing power of Europe has been so weak that even the physical demand has not created what might be called an economic demand for our grain and the price has not risen.

Not only that, but, to counterbalance the export of food, there has been a falling off of the consumption of foodstuffs in the United States due to our own industrial depression here. The mere fact that under these conditions we have exported to Europe more grain than we normally export is in itself an alarming one, for the reason that were it not for the desperate situation in Europe the Europeans would not be buying our grain in such unprecedented quantities. However, while our farmers in the West are unable to sell their grain at a price comparable to what the price should be, while they are compelled to sell their grain at far below the cost of production, indeed, while exports to Europe are not proceeding as they should, millions of people in Europe are in desperate need of all that we could supply in the way of foodstuffs.

I have been unable to get the newspapers to give any notice to this alarming situation in Europe. If I were a speculator, which I am not, I would be purchasing wheat to-day; and I am quite convinced that some of the wise ones who must know the conditions in Europe are quietly accumulating wheat at this very time, buying from the farmer at less than the cost of production and holding it in order that they may sell to Europe next spring when the price should certainly be much higher than it is now. I am in favor of a free market, of course, for grain. I do not believe that we can by law control the price of anything, but I say that if it is true that the newspapers are concealing European food conditions from the people in the interest of those who are quietly accumulating the grain, it is a crime which should not be lightly passed over if there is any way of dealing with it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what information he has that certain interests are hoarding grain?

Mr. FRANCE. I will say that the information which I have—and I have collected it simply because of my interest in this public question—certainly should be available to many of the big operators in grain, and it seems to me that if they have the information they might well be quietly accumulating grain before the price enhances. I have no criticism to make of their doing so; I am merely pointing out that it is very unfortunate that these facts should be kept from the farmers in order that this quiet accumulation of grain may go on. I will say further to the Senator from Michigan that I am not one of the Senators who believe in regulating from Washington every grain exchange, every newspaper, and every business transaction. I think that is one of the false theories of government with which some were indoctrinated during the war, much to the detriment of the country, and I am very free from that theory; but the situation seems to be as I have described it, and that the need in Europe for grain is desperate. There is an apparent deficit of 800,000,000 bushels of grain, and yet our farmers can not sell their wheat and corn for what it costs to produce them.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very much interested in the view expressed by the Senator to the effect that we may expect a very material rise in the price of grain during the spring months. That will be gratifying information to the destitute people of the Northwest. However, I tried to follow the Senator to learn upon what basis he ventures that opinion. The people of Europe will not within that period of time improve in their financial and economic condition, I am sure, so as to hold out the hope that they will eat more. Russia will produce no more. Is there any other element than the apparent shortage in the production throughout Europe affording hope along that line?

Mr. FRANCE. I value the Senator's opinion very highly; and I will say that I am merely expressing an opinion, and an opinion upon such a question is not, of course, compelling upon anyone.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to try to find out from the Senator upon what he bases his opinion, because I value his opinion.

Mr. FRANCE. I am rather persuaded that before the situation becomes too desperate in Europe the statesmen of the world will be so aroused that some means will be found to facilitate the purchase of grain. At any rate, however, it is undeniable that, in order to preserve their very lives, those Governments over there must strain their resources to the uttermost to purchase, if necessary, as they did during the war, enough grain to keep their people sufficiently nourished so that they can be held in stable government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is to say, the Senator thinks the situation is so desperate that relief must come.

Mr. FRANCE. It must come, in my judgment; and yet I say that it may possibly not come. I am not at all persuaded that we can cure the serious situation in which we find ourselves; there may be some ground for the pessimism which some express when they say that the situation can not be cured, but I think we should try to cure it.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Did I understand the Senator from Maryland to say that there was a shortage of 800,000,000 bushels of grain in Europe?

Mr. FRANCE. Apparently so.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator be so kind as to refer to his sources of information in regard to that?

Mr. FRANCE. I will say to the Senator that these calculations unfortunately must be worked out by a process of reasoning. We have not any adequate crop reports for Europe; we have no crop reports at all from Russia. I will refer the Senator to the manner in which I compiled my figures. I said that prior to the war Russia exported to the industrial countries of Europe on an average 460,000,000 bushels of grain. That quantity of grain is not now available for those industrial countries. Russia now must import 100,000,000 bushels of grain in order during the winter to sustain the lives of her people who are short of grain. There is a deficit of 560,000,000 bushels. The fairly accurate crop reports of the countries outside of Russia indicate that there is a shortage of wheat and rye of 275,000,000 bushels. Adding that to 560,000,000 makes a deficit of grains of approximately 835,000,000 bushels. Now, even if you cut that in half the situation is desperate, because 800,000,000 bushels of grain is an ample quantity of grain to support the lives of 100,000,000 people, and I have only been predicting that approximately 15,000,000 would face actual starvation in Europe the coming winter, which, I will say to the Senator, is very conservative.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator's statement that there is a shortage of 800,000,000 bushels is a startling one to me.

Mr. FRANCE. It is, I will say to the Senator; it is a very startling one.

Mr. STERLING. I would rather have a different statement than that given by the Senator, namely, that we must reach this by a process of reasoning. It seems to me that crop estimates might be furnished that would be quite reliable. I am reminded, if the Senator will permit me, of what we were urged to do during the war by the present Secretary, Mr. Hoover, the then Fuel Administrator, and of his statement as to what the shortage was or would be in Europe with the man power of Europe so engaged in the prosecution of the war; but the Senator's figures are surely away beyond anything that was given us at that time.

Mr. FRANCE. I will say to the Senator that I presume he does not question that prior to the war Russia produced 2,600,000,000 bushels of the grains, about 1,600,000,000 bushels more of these grains than the United States produced. I presume he would not question that.

Mr. STERLING. As the Senator from Indiana suggests to my mind, what kind of grain? Was it wheat?

Mr. FRANCE. No; certainly not wheat; but I would recall to the distinguished Senator's mind that there are no wheat eaters in the world except in the United States and possibly in England. I mean to say, wheat eaters in the sense that they

support life by the use of wheat. No; I am referring, of course, to wheat, rye, barley, and oats, the staple food grains; and in such a situation as this we must, of course, take into consideration all of the food grains. Let me say to the Senator that the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I think, yesterday—perhaps it was another—presented figures showing that the world was short a billion bushels of bread grains. I am very glad that the Senator is becoming alarmed, because it is time that we became alarmed over the real food situation and less alarmed over the propaganda situation, because the worst propagandist in the world for revolution is hunger gnawing at a man's stomach.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand my friend to say that there is a shortage of 830,000,000 bushels of wheat in Europe, or of all grains combined?

Mr. FRANCE. No; of all of the grains. The shortage of 275,000,000 bushels is the shortage of wheat and rye. That is the shortage in the countries outside of Russia. The total shortage which I said was the shortage represented by what Russia formerly exported is a shortage of wheat, rye, barley, oats, and corn.

Mr. WATSON. How much of wheat?

Mr. FRANCE. This is what Russia formerly exported—161,000,000 bushels of wheat, 34,000,000 bushels of rye, 168,000,000 bushels of barley, 65,000,000 bushels of oats, and 30,000,000 bushels of corn. I will put these figures in the RECORD. They have been put in the RECORD once before.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Russians are not wheat eaters?

Mr. FRANCE. Not as we are.

Mr. WATSON. Do they export all they raise?

Mr. FRANCE. Oh, no—no, indeed. I do not think it is necessary for me to put in all of the figures of the production. The total production of those grains in Russia was 2,600,000,000 bushels, as compared with our total production of the same grains of about 1,000,000,000 bushels.

Now, I appeal to the Senators. There can be no question as to the significance in my figures. I say that the alarming fact, which no other Senator here has seemed fully to realize, is that Russia—the great granary of Europe, producing normally 2,600,000,000 bushels of grain—has been practically prostrate for four years; and the inevitable result of that will be malnutrition, a great amount of starvation, and profound unrest in the industrial countries of Europe. As a matter of fact, the situation in Germany to-day, which is one bordering on revolution, has been brought about owing to the shortage of food, and I want to say that the same situation exists to a lesser degree in England itself, for many people in England are on short rations to-day because of the failure of the agricultural productive power of Russia; and I say to you, Senators, that if you really face this great Russian question you will find that there can be no rehabilitation of Europe until the agricultural productive power of Russia is rehabilitated. Russia, of course, always paid the interest on her external obligations and for her imports of manufactured goods with her exports of grains. That 460,000,000 bushels of grains exported every year by Russia went, of course, for the payment of the interest on the debt she owed the other countries, and for the payment for what she bought in the way of manufactured articles. The reason why the French are making such demands upon the Germans is that the French are deprived of income which they might be receiving from Russia, owing to the fact that Russia is not in a position to make any payments, in view of the fact that she can not export.

Mr. President, I have already referred to how this situation affects the United States. We found in 1921 that we were in a very serious condition, due to unemployment. We had between four and five millions of men unemployed, and we did not know why it was. It was very apparent that the slowing down of our industries, causing that unemployment, was due to a falling off in our export trade; and I will put into the RECORD the figures showing the falling off of our export trade in 1921 as compared with 1920. Our export trade fell off $3,700,000,000.

That is quite a tidy sum if you stop to figure it up. That is a sum sufficient to pay 4,000,000 men $70 a month for a year, and yet we wondered why you had unemployment and why our farmers could not sell their grains at a living price. It was due to the sudden curtailment of our export trade, and this year it is worse; and I will say, as meeting the food-export figures of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], that during that period of 1921, owing to industrial depression, our domestic consumption of wheat, according to estimates, fell off 250,000,000 bushels compared with 1920.

Mr. President, it is a source of regret to me that so few Senators seem to understand the real causes which bring about war. We hear so much talk about disarmament, and I really believe that there are Senators here who think that if we did not have navies and armies we would not have any war. That is the most absurd proposition that ever could be conceived of. We could disband every army, scrap every navy, destroy every rifle, abolish gunpowder, and still, if the economic conditions were such as to bring about war, war would come. We had wars before these great agencies of destruction were ever dreamed of, and we will have them, perhaps, if civilization shall go down into darkness, after they have been forgotten.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the truth of what the Senator has just said is proved by all history. Applying it to naval disarmament, the greatest naval battles in the history of the world, which have had more effect upon the destinies of mankind than any others, were fought long before we had any modern navies at all.

Mr. FRANCE. That is true. My fear with reference to the disarmament conference was that if Great Britain, Japan, and France—the three great remaining empires of the world—met with the United States to formulate any sort of a policy, we would naturally drive into another camp the great, the mighty nations, the mightiest nations in all the world so far as man power and natural resources are concerned—Russia, Germany, China, and the Mohammedans—creating a countercoalition. A very few weeks after I expressed that fear Russia and Germany had already struck hands in a notable treaty. The situation in Europe is such, the economic distress in Russia and Germany is such, the situation in the Near East is such, that Russia, Germany, and the Mohammedans are naturally being consolidated together under the hammers of repression and oppression into a mighty counteralliance which threatens war.

If the British deliver an ultimatum to the Turks, what will happen? Why, I heard a Senator declare here that it was safe to go into the four-power pact because Russia would not revive within the 10 years of the treaty's life. I asked him where his information on that score came from. I knew that he had no information.

I knew that the great arms conference was sitting with its eyes blinded as to what was going on in Russia, and I knew that it was making a terrible mistake; for all the Russians need to-day is artillery, and they have an army which they can put in the field that could march to Paris and could hardly be stopped. We have read in the papers within a few days that the great Krupp industry has received a concession of several hundreds of thousands of acres of land in Russia—and for what purpose? It seems to me that it is quite possible that it is in payment for artillery; and certainly the closest sort of relationships exist between Germany and Russia. It is a situation which certainly needs most careful study.

Mr. President, I have concluded what I have had in mind to say. I say that we face the most critical situation which the world has ever faced, and it is time for us to lay aside our prejudices, to discard all policies of vengeance and violence, and to seek to apply policies which will mean the reconciliation of all peoples and the rehabilitation of the productive power of the world. If we are to do that, we must have an international conference where these great questions can be discussed. What is Russia to do with reference to her former external obligations, her former debt? What is to be done about the German reparations? What is to be done about the obligations owing by the various countries to the United States? Those are the great questions which must be settled if we are to prevent a most serious situation overtaking the world.

Mr. President, I had anticipated discussing the European situation from a slightly different angle within the next few days. I am in doubt as to whether it would be helpful or harmful for me to state what I believe to be the real reason for our Russian policy. Certain it is that the whole weight of the international bankers and of the leaders of Great Britain, France, and Japan is thrown on the side of not allowing us to deal directly with Germany and Russia. The Empires have their own imperial purposes to serve, and it seems to me that we should be very careful not to be guided or influenced by their advice on these great international questions. We should formulate our own German policy and our own Russian policy. I think if the real situation behind the politics of Europe were thoroughly understood, it would mean that we would soon most radically change our general European policy, and particularly our Russian policy.

I felt that it was my duty to put some of these figures in the RECORD with reference to the European situation. Of course, if Senators feel, in view of certain unreasoning opposition here and there, that they wish to defeat this amendment, it is for them to decide. Personally, I want to see my party deal with this situation in a masterful way. I want to see a policy adopted by our party for this Republic which will mean the assertion in the world's counsels of American leadership and the application of the great principles of exalted benevolence enjoined upon us by Washington, who in his farewell address said:

> Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.

Mr. FRANCE subsequently said: Mr. President, during the course of my remarks yesterday I had intended to ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks certain letters and resolutions substantiating what I had said. In the haste of closing the debate I neglected to do so. Therefore I now ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks of yesterday letters from the Department of Agriculture and certain resolutions which bear out the statements which I made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Figures from tables of Mr. O. B. Austin, statistician of the National City Bank of New York, showing the increase in the national debts of the world.

1793, total of national debts	$2,483,250,000
1820, total of national debts	7,299,750,000
1850, total of national debts	9,000,000,000
1874, total of national debts	22,500,000,000
1900, total of national debts	31,201,759,000
1913, total of national debts	43,302,300,000
1918, total of national debts	205,396,000,000
1919, total of national debts	295,070,000,000
1921, total of national debts	400,000,000,000

National debt of United States now 10 per cent of pre-war wealth.
National debt of Great Britain now 50 per cent of pre-war wealth.
National debt of France now 73 per cent of pre-war wealth.
Austria-Hungary and Germany each now has a national debt in excess of the national wealth.
The increase in the fixed charges of the nations as the result of the increased interest payments on approximately three hundred and sixty billions of increased national debt must be in 1921 about fifteen billions of dollars, as compared with 1913.

Table showing mobilized strength and casualty losses of the belligerents.

UNITED STATES AND ASSOCIATED NATIONS.

Nation.	Mobilized.	Dead.	Wounded.	Prisoners or missing.	Total casualties.
United States	4,272,521	67,813	192,483	14,363	274,699
British Empire	7,500,000	692,005	2,037,325	360,367	3,089,757
France	7,500,000	1,385,300	2,675,000	446,300	4,506,600
Italy	5,500,000	460,000	947,000	1,393,000	2,800,000
Belgium	267,000	20,000	60,000	10,000	90,000
Russia	12,000,000	1,700,000	4,950,000	2,500,000	9,150,000
Japan	800,000	300	907	3	1,210
Rumania	750,000	200,000	120,000	80,000	400,000
Serbia	707,343	322,000	28,000	100,000	450,000
Montenegro	50,000	3,000	10,000	7,000	20,000
Greece	230,000	15,000	40,000	45,000	100,000
Portugal	100,000	4,000	15,000	200	10,000
Total	39,676,864	4,869,478	11,075,715	4,956,233	20,902,226

CENTRAL POWERS.

Germany	11,000,000	1,611,104	3,683,143	772,522	6,066,769
Austria-Hungary	6,500,000	800,000	3,200,000	1,211,000	5,211,000
Bulgaria	400,000	201,224	152,399	10,825	265,448
Turkey	1,600,000	300,000	570,000	130,000	1,000,000
Total	19,500,000	2,912,328	7,605,542	2,124,347	12,542,217
Grand total	59,176,864	7,781,806	18,681,257	7,080,580	33,434,443

Source: The New International Yearbook, 1918, page 761.

Mr. FRANCE. It has been claimed that the earning power of the world has been reduced by the absolute loss of 10,000,000 of men, at their most productive ages, due to deaths and serious and total disabilities. Estimating the productive power of each of these men as worth $500 per annum there would appear to be an annual deficit of $5,000,000,000 due to loss in man power. Adding to the $15,000,000,000 representing the increased interest charges the $5,000,000,000 of decreased income through loss of man power gives us a deficit of $20,000,000,000 annually. To this must be added increased charges for the care of the disabled and for pensions for widows and orphans.

Tables showing pre-war foreign crops of principal grains as compared with crops of the United States.

WHEAT.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Russia	600,933,000
France	317,254,000
Germany	152,119,000
Italy	185,260,000
Hungary	156,523,000
Rumania	86,679,000
Austria	61,075,000
Bulgaria	43,725,000
Poland	23,343,000
Serbia	14,775,000
Belgium	14,583,000
Grand total production of wheat in foreign countries	2,779,593,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909–1913, 686,691,000 bushels.

OATS.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Russia	874,945,000
Germany	591,996,000
France	310,020,000
Austria	143,392,000
Hungary	85,840,000
Poland	76,590,000
Belgium	40,905,000
Italy	36,945,000
Rumania	27,545,000
Bulgaria	9,880,000
Serbia	5,443,000
Grand total production of foreign countries of oats	2,955,768,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909–1913, 131,175,000 bushels.

RYE.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Russia	815,996,000
Germany	445,222,000
Austria	112,752,000
Poland	90,494,000
Hungary	48,716,000
France	48,647,000
Belgium	22,675,000
Bulgaria	8,553,000
Italy	5,328,000
Rumania	4,652,000
Grand total, production of foreign countries of rye	1,656,627,000

United States production, yearly average 1909–1913, 34,916,000 bushels.

BARLEY.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Russia	384,027,000
Germany	153,529,000
Austria	71,988,000
Hungary	69,812,000
France	46,489,000
Poland	27,150,000
Rumania	24,821,000
Bulgaria	12,425,000
Italy	10,104,000
Serbia	5,072,000
Belgium	4,247,000
Grand total, production of foreign countries of barley	1,198,608,000

United States production, yearly average 1909–1913, 181,881,000 bushels.

POTATOES.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Germany	1,681,959,000
Russia	869,798,000
France	489,377,000
Austria	456,485,000
Poland	373,917,000
Hungary	180,103,000
Belgium	107,021,000
Italy	60,813,000
Rumania	3,634,000
Bulgaria	454,000
Grand total production, of foreign countries, potatoes	4,797,098,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909–1913, 356,627,000 bushels.

CORN.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Hungary	168,081,000
Rumania	100,620,000
Italy	100,349,000
Russia	56,571,000
Bulgaria	28,219,000
Serbia	28,128,000
France	22,229,000
Austria	14,536,000
Grand total production, of foreign countries, of corn	903,822,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909–1913, 2,708,334,000 bushels.

BEANS.

Production, yearly average, 1909–1913:	Bushels.
Italy	21,038,000
Austria	9,666,000
France	9,518,000
Hungary	7,516,000
Russia	6,027,000
Rumania	5,615,000
Bulgaria	1,895,000
Serbia	1,676,000
Poland	505,000
Grand total production, of foreign countries, of beans	267,295,000

United States production, yearly average, 1909–1913, 11,156,000 bushels.

Table showing the pre-war average crops of wheat, oats, rye, and barley of Russia and the United States, in bushels.

(Production, yearly average, 1909–1913.)

	Russia.	United States.
Wheat	600,933,000	686,691,000
Oats	874,945,000	131,175,000
Rye	815,996,000	34,916,000
Barley	384,027,000	181,881,000
Total	2,681,901,000	1,034,663,000

Table showing the pre-war yearly average (1909–1913) export from Russia of the following cereals in bushels:

Pre-war yearly average (1909–1913) exports of cereals in bushels:	
Wheat	161,766,000
Rye	34,921,000
Barley	168,461,000
Oats	65,279,000
Corn	30,034,000
Total	460,461,000

Russia can not now export these grains to the industrial countries, but requires, it is estimated, to import 100,000,000 bushels of wheat for seed and food. Adding the loss of the grains which she formerly exported to what she requires for import would give us an apparent shortage of 560,000,000 bushels of these principal grains. In addition to this apparent shortage must be added the decrease in the production of rye and wheat in the European countries outside of Russia, as follows:

Table showing the loss of production of rye and wheat in the principal European countries in 1922 as compared with 1921, without including Russia, and the increase in the potato crop.

	1921	1922	Decrease.
Rye	726,812,000	670,715,000	56,097,000
Wheat	1,208,535,000	988,719,000	219,816,000
Total loss			275,913,000

I offer the following paragraphs from those memoranda giving the figures showing the loss in grains and the increase in the production of potatoes in Europe in 1922 as compared with 1921:

[Extracts from statement of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture from memoranda submitted by Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.]

The present estimate of the rye production of Europe for all countries reporting amounts to 670,715,000 bushels as compared with 726,812,000 bushels last year, or a decrease of 56,097,000 bushels. These estimates include figures for 18 countries, and all of the principal rye producing countries have reported except Russia.

According to our last published statement the European production for 1922 was 985,650,000 bushels compared with 1,215,084,000 bushels for 1921, or a decrease of 229,434,000 bushels. This statement was published in Foreign Crops and Markets October 11, 1922, page 215, and in Weather Crops and Markets for November 18, page 449.

Since that statement was prepared revised estimates have come in from some countries for both 1922 and 1921, so the total European production for 1922 is now estimated at 988,719,000 bushels as compared with 1,208,535,000 bushels in 1921, or a decrease of 219,816,000 bushels.

The European potato production this year is estimated to be 8,260,184,000 bushels as compared with 2,192,640,000 bushels in 1921, or an increase of 1,067,544,000 bushels. These estimates do not represent the total European production since they include only 12 countries. Among the countries for which figures are not available are France, Russia, Ireland, Spain, Sweden, and Italy, which together produced an average of 1,702,205,000 bushels during the period 1909–1913. Reports on the condition of the potato crop indicate that it is good in Europe generally this year.

From what I have said it is apparent that considering the world as a whole, as made up of the great civilized nations, we may say that it is short of food and goods, disordered in its productive power, and practically insolvent. The remedies are: The immediate calling of a general economic conference; a world-wide plan for food and seed conservation and for increased acreages next year; financial machinery so that our farmers can export at profitable prices to meet Europe's famine need; the restoration of Russia's agricultural productive power; increase of total world productivity by development of her human and natural resources; reduction of German indemnity; liquidation of the international debts, especially those owed to us by Europe; establishment of cooperation or a concert between the nations in plans for reconstruction, reconciliation, the spread of civilization, the application of equity and justice in international affairs, and permanent peace.

I ask to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks the following bills and resolutions, presenting in concrete form my solution for these various problems created by the World War.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY MR. FRANCE JANUARY 14, 1919, PROVIDING FOR AN IMMEDIATE PEACE, THE RETURN OF OUR TROOPS FROM EUROPE, AND THE CALLING OF A GENERAL INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO DEAL WITH THE POLITICAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND FINANCIAL INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS GROWING OUT OF THE WAR.

[Sixty-fifth Congress, third session.]

Senate Resolution 412.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 14, 1919.

Mr. FRANCE submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the Central Powers, against which this Nation had been at war, the President at that time declaring "The war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it has not as yet come to the knowledge of the Senate of the United States that peace negotiations have been entered into with the enemy; and

Whereas the keeping for any length of time of an American Army upon European soil is undesirable and a cause of vast expense and of deep anxiety to the American people; and

Whereas profound unrest among the people of many nations and violent revolutions in several countries, which spirit of unrest and revolution are augmented by the hardships resulting from the maintenance of armies of occupation, and by that underproduction, throughout the world, of the necessities and commodities of life which has resulted from the long withholding of many millions of men from productive industry, must be a cause for deep concern on the part of the several governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, First. That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the very earliest possible moment negotiations be entered into with the enemy looking to the establishment of a just peace, and that all subsidiary questions which might delay the establishment of such a just peace between the nations, without which peace national stability is everywhere endangered, may be postponed for a later discussion at an international conference.

Second. That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the safety of this Nation American troops be returned from Europe; and, further, that after the establishment of peace the President call upon the Governments of North and South America to appoint two delegates each to an international conference, to be held at some suitable time and place, to consider plans for the closer cooperation of these Governments in promoting justice, progress, and friendship among and within the said countries of the Western Continent; and further, That the President also, at some time subsequent to this conference of the American Republics, call upon all the nations to appoint delegates to another international conference to be held at some suitable time and place to discuss and consider plans for the promotion of justice, progress, and friendship among and within the nations of the world, such conference to particularly discuss and consider plans for the removal so far as may be of the economic and social causes of war, and to this end particularly give attention to—

First. The congestion of population of some nations.

Second. The underpopulation of other nations.

Third. The unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the raw products and trade of the less populous and agricultural ones.

Fourth. The exploitation of the weaker and the less advanced by the stronger and more highly organized nations.

Fifth. A larger self-determination of peoples and nations.

Sixth. The possibility of the cooperation of the more advanced nations for the improvement of the conditions of the backward countries, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for education, and for the spread of civilization in the interest of those countries and of the world.

Seventh. The best means for the wider and more rapid extension of education and civilization throughout the world, looking to the ultimate elimination of national, racial, and religious antagonisms.

Eighth. The establishment of constitutional republics or of governments of such uniformity throughout the world as would make for that national stability upon which could be based a permanent international order.

Ninth. The elimination of all causes of national enmities and the establishment of friendship and justice between the nations, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a league of nations or world federation of republics for the purpose of promoting the cause of progress and of peace throughout the earth.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE FEBRUARY 26, 1920, PROVIDING FOR THE REESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE AND THE CALLING OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO FORMULATE PLANS FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION; TO CONSIDER THE COMMON AND MUTUAL INTERESTS AND THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF THE STATES AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD; TO RECOMMEND PROJECTS OF UNIFORMITY, RECIPROCITY, OR COOPERATION IN THE ACTION OF THE STATES, RESPECTIVELY; TO FORMULATE A BODY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW BASED ON THE SECURITY OF THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AS THE PRIME FUNCTION OF ALL GOVERNMENTS, AND FOR APPLYING AS BETWEEN STATES THE ANALOGIES OF THE LAWS OF PARTNERSHIP AND COTENANCY, AND AS BETWEEN STATES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, AND DEPENDENCIES THE ANALOGIES OF THE LAWS OF CONSERVATORSHIP, GUARDIANSHIP, AND TRUSTEESHIP; TO DEVISE METHODS FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE PEOPLES OF COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, OR DEPENDENCIES FROM THE STATUS OF DEPENDENCIES TO THAT OF INDEPENDENCE AND TO FULL PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES; TO PROMOTE COOPERATION AMONG THE MORE ADVANCED NATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND ADVANCEMENT OF THE BACKWARD COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES; TO CONSIDER THE PROBLEMS OF THE CONGESTION OF SOME AND THE UNDERPOPULATION OF OTHER NATIONS AND THE UNREGULATED COMPETITION BETWEEN THE MORE POPULOUS AND INDUSTRIAL COUNTRIES FOR THE TRADE AND RAW PRODUCTS OF THE LESS POPULOUS AGRICULTURAL ONES; TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, CREDITS, AND EXCHANGE, WITH A VIEW TO THE PROMPT SHIPMENT ON SUITABLE CREDITS, PARTICULARLY INTO RUSSIA, GERMANY, AUSTRIA, CHINA, AFRICA, AND ANY OTHER AGRICULTURALLY OR INDUSTRIALLY UNDEVELOPED OR PROSTRATED COUNTRIES, OF TOOLS, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, SEEDS, AND OTHER MATERIALS NECESSARY TO PRODUCTION, AS WELL AS FOODSTUFFS, NECESSITIES, AND COMMODITIES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENCOURAGING A RESUMPTION OF PRODUCTION WHICH WILL BE FAVORABLE TO THE REHABILITATION OF THE WORLD; TO LOCALIZE HOSTILITIES BETWEEN STATES; TO MAKE FURTHER PROVISION FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES; TO ENCOURAGE THE ESTABLISHMENT, WHERE STABLE GOVERNMENTS DO NOT EXIST, OF CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLICS OR GOVERNMENTS OF SUCH CHARACTER AS WOULD MAKE FOR THAT NATIONAL STABILITY UPON WHICH COULD BE BASED A PERMANENTLY PEACEFUL INTERNATIONAL ORDER; TO PROMOTE AMITY AND MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE ORIENTAL AND OCCIDENTAL PEOPLES; TO CONSIDER THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS OF THE STATES AND PEOPLES OF THE WORLD AS NATURALLY AND NECESSARILY UNITED FOR MUTUAL AID AND BENEFIT; AND TO CONCERT MEASURES ACCORDINGLY.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 163.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 26, 1920.

MR. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) providing for the reestablishment of peace and the calling of an international conference to institute a concert of nations to advise concerning international cooperation as a substitute for the League of Nations and for a national referendum.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, the President at that time declaring "the war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it is most desirable that there shall be a prompt termination of the status of war by the formal legal reestablishment of peace between the United States and Germany; and

Whereas the peace treaty has failed to receive the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate, one of the reasons for the negative action being that more than one-third of the Senate hold that the covenant of the League of Nations incorporated in said treaty if adopted by the United States would contravene its fundamental principles as declared in the Declaration of Independence by subjecting the external relations of the United States to the control of a foreign body not recognizing these principles, would violate the Constitution by attempting to change the form of government of the United States without a constitutional amendment, and would ignore and tend to destroy the right of States under the law of nations to defend themselves and to extend civilization in behalf of all civilized nations by means of war when other means are impossible; and

Whereas there is a profound unrest throughout the world, due in large part to the failure of the Paris peace conference to formulate such plans for peace and for international cooperation for the advancement of justice, liberty, and the general welfare as would commend itself to the great liberal spirit of the age and the new enlightened conscience of mankind; and

Whereas the long-continued underproduction and rapid destruction during the war of the necessities and commodities of life, particularly of food, have resulted in a serious shortage, which makes imperatively necessary an immediate reorganization of all agricultural, industrial, financial, and commercial activities for the maximum production in all countries and for the distribution among the nations by the normal methods of trade and commerce of such food, necessities, and commodities; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all of the nations of the world, the industrial and financial prostration and paralysis of Germany, Austria, Russia, and other recently belligerent countries of Europe, with the necessarily ensuing unemployment, impoverishment, and starvation of their citizens, with the threatened unrest and revolution in certain of these countries, are impeding the rehabilitation and are menacing the peace of the world and the stability of all government; and

Whereas, therefore, it is desirable to bring about immediately a situation of general peace and to take measures for establishing at the earliest practicable moment a form of international organization, approved by the public sentiment of the people of the United States, to deal with the social and economic problems growing out of the present war, and to bring about as nearly peaceful relations as possible between States by judicious and carefully wrought out measures of international cooperation; and

Whereas those opposing the plan of international organization contained in the covenant of the League of Nations recognize that it has now become necessary for the United States to cooperate methodically and permanently with the States and countries of the world and to take the lead in establishing a concert of nations to direct such cooperation by considered advice, but have heretofore been confined to an indirect and imperfect expression of their views by means of reservations to the said covenant proposed in the Senate; and

Whereas the question of the participation of the United States in an international organization is an issue in the approaching presidential election, and it is desirable that the plan of international organization approved by those opposing the League of Nations should be formulated so that the voters, by supporting a candidate for the office of President pledged to one or the other of the two plans, may express the public sentiment concerning the policy to be pursued by the United States respecting international organization: Now, therefore, in order to promote a general pacification, to declare the plan of international organization approved by those opposed to the plan of the League of Nations, and to make provision so that at the next national election a referendum vote may be had determining the public sentiment of the United States concerning the form of international organization which the people approve, be it

Resolved, etc., That the status of war with Germany, declared by the Congress by Senate Joint Resolution 1, on the 5th day of April, 1917, be, and it is hereby, declared to be terminated and the full status of peace be, and it is hereby, declared to be reestablished.

2. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and advised to make treaties of peace without annexations or indemnities and of trade and intercourse with the Republic of Germany, all matters of dispute between the two countries to be submitted for arbitration to The Hague tribunal.

3. That, in pursuance of this resolution declaring the reestablishment of peace, all American troops now upon foreign soil shall be immediately returned to the United States.

4. That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of May, 1921, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of the invitations, to send three delegates each, and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or dependencies, to assemble at Washington, on a date in September, 1921, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert and union, the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquility, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity.

5. That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brasil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjaz, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Yugoslavia, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

6. That the invitations shall expressly state that the motive of the United States in issuing them is to initiate and bring about a concert of nations as a substitute for the League of Nations, and shall be expressly with the understandings as herein set forth, namely: There shall be an international conference of the States, composed of three delegates from each of the States, and an assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, composed of two delegates from each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies to sit separately but at the same time. The assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall deliberate exclusively concerning social and economic measures and shall report to the international conference. The international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be the first of a series of periodical conferences and assemblies of similar character, meeting at periods of three years at places determined by the international conferences. The general object of the conferences and assemblies shall be to constitute a concert of the States and countries of the world on the general lines of the International Conference of American States and the Inter-American High Commission, by means of central and national institutions and processes adapted to carry on orderly discussion, deliberation, and judgment concerning matters of common interest with a view to inducing such peaceful and voluntary action of the States in the common interest as may be needful to bring about international cooperation. All resolutions agreed upon either in the international conference or in the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be of an advisory character, and any international or pannational organs or processes initiated or instituted shall be of a voluntary nature and shall have only advisory powers. The international conferences shall establish and maintain a system of advisory correspondence, with continuation committees sitting in the intervals between the conferences to prepare for the international conferences and the assemblies of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies and to carry on the system of correspondence. The more specific objects of the international conference, of the assembly of colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, and of the continuation committees, and the purpose of the correspondence between the States participating shall be—

(a) To consider the common and mutual interests and the social and economic relations of the States and peoples of the world as naturally and necessarily united for mutual aid and benefit and to recommend such projects of uniformity or reciprocity in the action of the States, respectively, as will enable them to cooperate for the general welfare.

(b) To formulate a body of international law based on the security of the fundamental rights of the individual as the prime function of all governments and for applying as between States the analogies of the laws of partnership and cotenancy, and as between States and their respective colonies, protectorates, and dependencies the analogies of the laws of conservatorship, guardianship, and trusteeship.

(c) To devise methods for the advancement of the peoples of colonies, protectorates, or dependencies from the status of dependencies to that of independence and to full participation in the international conferences.

(d) To decide concerning the admission into the international conferences of any communities claiming to be States formed by the division of existing States or by the junction of States or parts of States.

(e) To promote cooperation among the more advanced nations for the improvement and advancement of the backward countries and territories, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste land, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for the promotion of education and the spread of civilization throughout the world.

(f) To consider the problems of the congestion of some and the underpopulation of other nations and the unregulated competition be-

tween the more populous and industrial countries for the trade and raw products of the less populous agricultural ones.

(g) To study the problem of international finance, credits, and exchange, with a view to the prompt shipment on suitable credits, particularly into Russia, Germany, Austria, China, Africa, and any other agriculturally or industrially undeveloped or prostrated countries, of tools, agricultural implements, seeds, and other materials necessary to production, as well as foodstuffs, necessities, and commodities, for the purpose of encouraging a resumption of production which will be favorable to the rehabilitation of the world.

(h) To localize hostilities between States by cooperative policing of the high seas or otherwise and to take such action in case of such hostilities that the result of any armed conflict between States may be to increase the area within which the rights of the individual are effectively secured and to render more perfect the union of all the States for mutual aid and benefit.

(i) To make further provision for the pacific settlement of international disputes and for the settlement of such disputes according to accepted principles of law and by due process of law; and for this purpose to establish an international supreme court of justice and a system of inferior international courts having jurisdiction of controversies between States in which the parties in interest are citizens of different States, and also of such controversies between States in their own right, as may be susceptible of decision by application of accepted principles of public or private law.

(j) To encourage the establishment, where stable governments do not exist, of constitutional republics or governments of such character as would make for that national stability upon which would be based a permanently peaceful international order, and to promote the institution in each nation of appropriate national agencies of international correspondence and concert and the control by national legislatures of the appointment and instruction of national delegates to the international conferences.

(k) To promote amity and mutual understanding between the oriental and occidental peoples and to proceed with all possible means and speed to conciliate the people of Russia, China, India, Afghanistan, the Central Powers, and Turkey, in order that these nations or countries may not form against the western powers a hostile coalition which might menace the peace of the world.

7. That the functions of the United States as the initiator and host of the international conference and the assembly of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies shall be in the charge of a committee which shall come into existence in the month of April, 1921, and shall consist of the then Secretary of State as chairman, the then Secretary of the Treasury, the then Secretary of Commerce, two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The delegation of the United States to the international conference and to the assembly shall be nominated to the President by said organization committee and said nominees when approved by the President shall be appointed by him by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The said organization committee shall also suggest to the first international conference and to the first assembly a plan for their organization, a program of matters to be considered, a project for regulating the action of the continuation committees and a plan for organizing and regulating the central and national agencies of correspondence and concert; but nothing in the plans, project, or program so suggested shall be inconsistent with the provisions of this resolution.

8. That the general expenses of the international conference and of the assembly shall be borne by the United States, each participating State, however, paying the salaries and expenses of its own delegates and of the delegates in behalf of its colonies, protectorates, and dependencies.

9. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the carrying out of the provisions of this resolution the sum of $500,000.

10. That in case a candidate for the office of President, who shall have publicly announced his adherence to the plan of the League of Nations with or without reservations shall be elected at the national election in November, 1920, this act shall expire on March 4, 1921, at noon, and shall thereafter have no force or effect.

11. That the provisions of this resolution shall take effect immediately after its passage and its approval by the President.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE FEBRUARY 27, 1920, PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MORE FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA, FOR THE LIFTING OF THE EMBARGO AGAINST SHIPMENTS TO THAT COUNTRY, FOR THE EXTENSION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE WITH THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE, FOR THE ARRANGEMENT OF CREDITS, FOR THE WITHDRAWAL OF ALL TROOPS OF THIS COUNTRY WHICH MAY STILL BE ON RUSSIAN SOIL, FOR ANY NEEDED EXPLANATIONS AND REPARATIONS WHICH MAY BE DUE FROM THIS COUNTRY FOR OUR INVASION OF RUSSIAN TERRITORY, FOR THE EXPRESSION OF OUR GRATITUDE TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE FOR THEIR HEROIC PART IN THE DEFENSE OF CIVILIZATION, OUR FELICITATIONS TO THEM FOR HAVING OVERTHROWN A DESPOTIC GOVERNMENT, AND ASSURANCES OF THE DESIRE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO COOPERATE WITH THEM AND TO ASSIST THEM IN EVERY PROPER AND POSSIBLE WAY IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH INSTITUTIONS WHICH WILL INSURE TO THEM AN ORDERED LIBERTY.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 164.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
February 27, 1920.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) providing for the establishment of more friendly relations with Russia, for the lifting of the embargo against shipments to that country, for the extension of trade and commerce with the Russian people, for the arrangement of credits, for the withdrawal of all troops of this country which may still be on Russian soil, for any needed explanations and reparations which may be due from this country for our invasion of Russian territory, for the expression of our gratitude to the Russian people for their heroic part in the defense of civilization, our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government, and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

Whereas from time immemorial there have existed, with few misunderstandings, most cordial relationships between the Governments of the United States and Russia; and

Whereas because of the devotion of the American people to free institutions, the citizens of the United States had long looked forward to the time when the people of Russia would see fit to establish such free institutions for themselves; and

Whereas during the European war the noble Russian people made heroic sacrifices, cooperating with the allied nations in the war against Germany, without which cooperation Germany might have been victorious; and

Whereas it was not because of any lack of devotion to freedom and to the cause of the Allies, but rather on account of the incompetence and corruption of their autocratic government, which failed to supply the munitions of war, that the Russian people made a separate peace with Germany; and

Whereas no unfriendly act against the United States has been committed by the Russian people but, on the contrary, the Russian people have borne with patience our unlawful invasion of their territory and intermeddling with their internal affairs; and

Whereas the people of the United States desire the continuance of friendly relations and the reestablishment of trade and commerce with the Russian people and wish, by every proper means, to assist in the rehabilitation of the industrial and agricultural activities and agencies of Russia for the sake of the Russian people, as well as for the general welfare of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, advised to communicate at once, through the Department of State, with the Government of Russia, assuring the people of Russia of our friendship, sympathy, and desire to cooperate with them and to reestablish with them full and cordial relationships of friendly intercourse, trade, and commerce; and, further, that the President be, and he is hereby, advised—

(1) To instruct the Department of State to raise the embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia;

(2) To consider and advise as to the best method of arranging credits which will make possible the shipment of such American goods as may be needed and desired by the people of Russia for the rehabilitation of their country;

(3) To immediately withdraw from Russia any and all American troops which may still be on Russian soil;

(4) To enter upon negotiations, through the Department of State, concerning any explanations or reparations which may be due from this country because of our invasion of Russian territory;

(5) To convey to the people of Russia expressions of our appreciation and gratitude for their heroic part in the war and our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government, and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE APRIL 12, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO UNDERTAKE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE TERRITORIES IN EAST, SOUTHWEST, AND WEST AFRICA, AND IN OCEANIA, OVER WHICH GERMANY EXERCISED SOVEREIGNTY PRIOR TO THE WAR; TO UNDERTAKE NEGOTIATIONS WITH A VIEW TO ACQUIRING BY PURCHASE OR OTHERWISE THE CABLES SURRENDERED UNDER ARTICLE 244, ANNEX VII, OF THE TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY; TO ENTER UPON THE NEGOTIATION OF A TREATY OF INTERNATIONAL COMITY, COMMERCE, AND COOPERATION WITH THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS LOOKING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HUMAN AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF AFRICA; TO URGE THE FIXING BY THE ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS OF A JUST AND REASONABLE INDEMNITY TO BE PAID BY GERMANY TO SAID POWERS; AND TO NEGOTIATE FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL SUMS AND INTEREST THAT REPRESENT THE DEBTS NOW OWING BY THE SAID ALLIED AND ASSOCIATED POWERS TO THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, first session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 11.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
April 12, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11) authorizing the President of the United States to undertake negotiations for the purchase of the territories in east, southwest, and west Africa, and in Oceania, over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war; to undertake negotiations with a view to acquiring by purchase or otherwise the cables surrendered under article 244, Annex VII, of the treaty of peace with Germany; to enter upon the negotiation of a treaty of international comity, commerce, and cooperation with the allied and associated powers looking to the development of the human and natural resources of Africa; to urge the fixing by the allied and associated powers of a just and reasonable indemnity to be paid by Germany to said powers; and to negotiate for the settlement of the principal sums and interest that represent the debts now owing by the said allied and associated powers to the United States, and for other purposes.

Whereas since the 11th day of November, 1918, when the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the powers with which the United States had been at war, little progress has been made toward the rehabilitation of the European nations, and there are widespread financial and industrial depression, unemployment, misery, and social unrest; and

Whereas the dismemberment and bankruptcy of Austria, the disorganization and insolvency of Germany, the unfavorable conditions in Italy, the isolation of Russia from the world's trade, and the diminished purchasing power of the European countries because of the enormous debts owed by certain of the European nations to the United States have created conditions which tend to prevent the sale and shipment from the United States of the raw products and food supplies so desperately needed in Europe for the rehabilitation of industry and the feeding of starving peoples; and

Whereas a satisfactory settlement or liquidation of the huge debts and obligations growing out of the war, owed by certain countries to other countries in Europe and to the United States now seems to be necessary, if there is to be a speedy rehabilitation of industry in Europe and in the United States; and

Whereas cordial and constructive cooperation between the advanced nations for the solving of these serious financial, industrial, and international problems and for the advancement of the backward peoples and the development of the undeveloped, natural resources of the world has become a necessity; and

Whereas the submarine telegraphic cables to which Germany under the peace treaty renounced all rights, titles, and privileges in favor of the principal allied and associated powers, have become the subject of

a controversy in which the interests of the United States are vitally involved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be authorized to call and enter an international conference of the principal allied and associated powers—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—for the formulation of plans for the adjustment or settlement of the international debts and obligations growing out of the war, particularly the debts owed by certain of the principal allied and associated powers to the United States; that the President be further authorized to urge international policies and actions for the relief of the overburdened and bankrupt peoples by the extension of credits; that the President be authorized to promote the export trade of the United States with Europe, with Asia, and with Africa by the removal of financial and artificial barriers and restrictions; to negotiate the acquisition for the United States of the territories in east, southwest, and west Africa, and in Oceania over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war; to undertake negotiations with a view to acquiring, by purchase or otherwise, from the principal allied and associated powers, the cables surrendered under article 244, Annex VII, of the treaty of peace with Germany; to enter upon negotiations looking to a treaty providing for international comity, commerce, and cooperation between the United States and the principal allied and associated powers for the purpose of the upbuilding and development of the peoples and of the natural resources of Africa, Oceania, and of the backward portions of the world; and to urge the fixing by the principal allied and associated powers of a just and reasonable indemnity to be paid by Germany to said powers.

SEC. 2. That the President, in order to enable to arrive at a just and equitable determination and settlement of all debts growing out of the war, particularly those owed by the principal allied and associated powers, or any of them, each to the other or to the United States, be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter upon conversations and negotiations with the said principal allied and associated powers, namely, with Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan:

(a) For the determination of the extent of the debts and obligations owed by Germany to the principal allied and associated powers, the debts and obligations owed by any one of the principal allied and associated powers to any other power and those owed by the principal allied and associated powers to the United States; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized—

(b) To urge upon the principal allied and associated powers the immediate necessity for fixing the indemnity sum to be paid to the principal allied and associated powers at such an amount as can be met by Germany without an undue strain and disturbance of international financial and trade arrangements, and to recommend to and urge upon the principal allied and associated powers that such indemnity sum should be, in addition to the sums already paid by Germany in money or in kind, approximately, and not to exceed that named by the principal allied and associated powers, Great Britain and France, at the Hythe conference, tentatively, namely, the principal sum not to exceed $15,000,000,000, or not more than $1,000,000,000 in gold a year for 28 years, and further to urge, upon this sum, a credit to Germany of approximately $5,000,000,000 be allowed for full, final, and unconditional cession to the said principal allied and associated powers and to the United States of the territories in Africa and Oceania which were, prior to the war, under German sovereignty, namely, Togoland, Kamerun, German East Africa, German Southwest Africa, German Samoan Islands, German Pacific Islands.

(c) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with Great Britain, France, and Italy looking to the purchase by the United States from the said powers of the colonial territories in Africa over which, prior to the war, Germany exercised sovereignty, territories with an area approximately of 1,032,280 square miles.

(d) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with the said principal allied and associated powers, including Japan, looking to the purchase by the United States of the Samoan Islands and of the islands in the Pacific over which Germany exercised sovereignty prior to the war.

(e) To enter upon conversations and negotiations with Germany and Japan for a full and unconditional release by them, or either of them, of all rights, titles, or privileges of whatever nature which they, or either of them, might claim or have in said territories or islands in the Pacific.

(f) To enter upon conversations and negotiations for the acquisition by the United States from the principal allied and associated powers, or from any of them, and from Germany any residual right which she may claim, indeed, all rights, titles, or privileges of whatever nature which they or any of them may claim or have in the submarine cables to which Germany, under article 244, Annex VII, renounced all rights, titles, or privileges to the said principal allied and associated powers.

SEC. 3. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to enter upon such conversations and negotiations looking to the purchase by the United States from the principal allied and associated powers of the said territories and of the said submarine cables, with a view to relieving the said principal allied and associated powers—Great Britain, France, and Italy—by a credit to them on the debts which they owe the United States of the amount of the purchase price which the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay by such a credit on said debts for the said territories and submarine cables, namely, a sum approximately $5,000,000,000 and not to exceed $6,000,000,000.

SEC. 4. That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, in the event of a successful termination of the negotiations for the purchase by the United States of the said territories and submarine cables, to enter upon further negotiations looking to treaty agreements between the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and Germany for cordial international cooperation in solving the problems of Africa and for the development of the undeveloped natural resources of Africa by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands, for the utilization of the natural resources, including water power, for wise colonization, particularly by the citizens of the overcrowded countries, and for the promotion of education and civilization throughout Africa in the interests of the people of Africa and of all the nations of the world.

SEC. 5. That in the event of the failure of such conversations and negotiations to result in the acquisition by the United States, in the manner and for the sums above recited, of the territories and cables herein described, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to negotiate for the prompt settlement, principal and interest, of the debts owed by the said principal allied and associated powers to the United States, and, pending such settlement, to request collateral satisfactory and sufficient as security for said debts.

SEC. 6. That it is the sense of the Congress that such an agreement upon and discharge of the debts of the nations, and, in particular, the satisfaction of the claims of the United States in the manner herein proposed, would be highly promotive of the good will and economic well-being of the peoples and governments of the principal allied and associated powers and those of the other European countries, and that the United States in entering upon the conversations and negotiations, through the President, with the several governments herein named, is moved by a desire to have such adjustments made, in order that there may result an associated effort by the enlightened nations in behalf of the backward peoples of the territories affected, to the ends of human welfare and the promotion of the ideals of civilization.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE DECEMBER 15, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEND A COMMISSION TO RUSSIA AND TO INVITE A RUSSIAN COMMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES TO HOLD INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DE FACTO GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARRIVING AT A BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 145.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

December 15, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) to authorize the President of the United States to send a commission to Russia and to invite a Russian commission to the United States, to hold informal conversations with the de facto Government of Russia for the purpose of arriving at a basis of understanding between the United States and Russia, to discuss and to negotiate all problems and differences which must be adjusted, looking to the formal recognition by the United States of the de facto Government of Russia and to the restoration of friendly international and commercial relationships between the United States and Russia.

Whereas there has been carried on in this country an insidious and misleading propaganda against the people of Russia, designed to disturb the friendly relations, which had for many years existed between the United States and Russia, and to alienate the people of these two countries from each other; and

Whereas the alienation of the people of the United States from the people of Russia and the deprivation of our farmers, cotton planters, woolgrowers, manufacturers, and exporters of the great Russian markets for raw products and manufactured goods are working great hardship to them and are redounding to the great advantage of the producers, manufacturers, and exporters of other countries; and

Whereas our farmers and planters are suffering an acute distress while millions in Russia must starve, and we have millions of workers unemployed because of the industrial depression while Russia requires shoes, clothing, machinery, agricultural implements, tractors, railway supplies and equipment, and all kinds of manufactured goods and articles in unprecedented quantities; and

Whereas from motives of self-interest, as well as for the sake of humanity, we must desire to enjoy the advantages of the Russian markets, to share in the rehabilitation and development of Russia, to secure mutual understanding and friendly cooperation between the United States and Russia; and

Whereas several of the nations of Europe, including Great Britain, have already invited to their countries commissions from Russia and have sent to and now have in Russia trade delegations, while the United States has, to the disadvantage of the people of the United States, refused to hold negotiations with the Russians, maintaining the indefensible policy adopted at Paris and practically abandoned by all other nations, of isolating Russia for the purposes of punishment and coercion from commerce and intercourse with the world; and

Whereas there is a widespread demand throughout the United States for such a change in our governmental policy toward Russia as will enable the people of the United States to obtain correct information as to conditions in Russia, to participate in the great advantages of the Russian markets, and to enjoy the benefits of cordial international and commercial relationships with the people of Russia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to select, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, seven prominent citizens of the United States, one of whom shall be experienced in international relationships and diplomacy, one to be a farmer representing our agricultural interests, one to be a member of and representing organized labor, one to be a manufacturer and representing industry, one to be a banker, financier, or political economist, and two to be representatives of the general interests of the United States at large, all of whom shall constitute a commission to visit Russia for the purpose of investigating and making report upon the problem of the restoration of normal and peaceful relationships between the United States and Russia; and

That this commission of seven members may be authorized by the President, in his discretion, to employ clerical assistants, expert accountants, political economists, interpreters, legal counsel, and such other assistants for the purpose of carrying on its work as the commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That no member of this commission shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $6,000 a year and actual traveling expenses while in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses while absent on official business from the United States, and that no employee of this commission shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of $5,000 a year, together with actual traveling expenses in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses outside of the United States when on the official business of the commission.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to send this commission at the earliest opportunity to Russia, if this shall be agreeable to the de facto Government of Russia, for the purpose of holding conversations and carrying on negotiations in Russia with the de facto Government of Russia for the purpose of establishing a basis of mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries, for the purpose of settlement of all differences which may exist between them, and the adjustment of all claims which either of these Governments or its citizens may assert or have against the other, and for the bringing

about of conditions which will make possible the resumption of cordial international and commercial relationships between the two countries.

That the President be authorized to particularly direct the commission, if the de facto Government of Russia shall so desire, to extend to the Russian Government such advice and assistance in the formulation of such plans for the stabilizing of the Russian currency, for the economic restoration of Russia, and for the solution of the problems growing out of the revolution as would tend to restore mutual confidence and understanding between the two countries.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss with the de facto Government of Russia and to carry on negotiations concerning the recognition and refunding by the present de facto Government of Russia of Russia's proper share of the debts and obligations of Russia outstanding, particularly the obligations of the old Imperial Government, and concerning the proper proportion of such old imperial debt outstanding which should be borne by the present Government of Russia and the proportion to be borne by the countries constituting the territories disannexed from Russia by the powers in the peace settlement.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss all other matters which must be considered and adjusted looking to the bringing about of friendly relationships, and to charge it with the general duty of securing the most complete information possible, to be reported to the President and to the Congress and to the people of the United States concerning the attitude, the conditions, and the circumstances of the Russian people, and the purposes toward the United States of the de facto Government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to submit to the Congress from time to time, as he may obtain it, information from this commission as to conditions in Russia, with a view to the earliest possible recognition by our Government of the de facto Government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the de facto Government of Russia to send a commission of seven members here to discuss with our producers and exporters the question of trade with Russia, and to negotiate with our Government all those questions which our commission to Russia shall be authorized to discuss with the de facto Government of Russia, and such other matters as the President may deem best to discuss with such commission.

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses and salaries of the commission and of its employees and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

—

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE DECEMBER 22, 1921, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO CALL AN INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE FOR THE DISCUSSION OF THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, PARTICULARLY THE PROBLEM CREATED BY THE OUTSTANDING OBLIGATIONS BETWEEN CERTAIN OF THE NATIONS, AS THE RESULT OF THE WORLD WAR.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 150.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
December 22, 1921.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) authorizing the President to call an international economic conference for the discussion of the economic problems and questions of international finance, particularly the problem created by the outstanding obligations between certain of the nations as the result of the World War.

Whereas there are grave economic and financial problems which have grown out of the war, and which must be solved before there can be a return to normal international, financial, and commercial relationships, and a reasonable basis for a permanent peace; and

Whereas serious disturbances of the exchange markets presenting insuperable barriers to the normal process of trade are due to the huge debts owing by certain of the nations of Europe to the other nations, and the question of the terms upon which there may be a liquidation of these debts is an international question involving the interests of all nations; and

Whereas because of the close community of financial, industrial, and commercial interests of all the nations of the world there can not be secured any cooperation for the solution of these common economic problems without an international economic conference: Therefore be it hereby

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized and directed, by invitations to be sent out by him during the month of January, 1922, to invite the States signatory of or adherent to the convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes of July 24, 1899, and their successors, and all other States since recognized, or which may be recognized prior to the sending out of invitations, to send three delegates each, and also two delegates in behalf of each of the colonies, protectorates, and dependencies, respectively, of the various States having colonies, protectorates, or independencies, to assemble at Washington, on a date in March, 1922, to be fixed in the invitation, to consult concerning the formation of a more perfect general concert for the establishment of general justice, the assurance of the general tranquillity, the promotion of the general welfare, and the securing generally of the blessings of liberty to the peoples now living and to their posterity and the solution of the grave economic and financial problems growing out of the war.

That the list of said States to be invited shall include the following: Argentine Republic, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hedjas, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Persia, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Salvador, Serbia, Siam, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

That the invitations shall expressly state that the motive of the United States in issuing them is to initiate and bring about a concert of action between the nations for the common solution for the general welfare of the grave financial, economic, industrial, and commercial international problems growing out of the war.

That there shall be appropriated, out of any sums in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of $100,000 for the carrying out of the provisions of this act.

JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE MARCH 9, 1922, AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEND A COMMISSION TO RUSSIA AND TO INVITE A RUSSIAN COMMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES TO HOLD INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS WITH THE DE FACTO GOVERNMENT OF RUSSIA FOR THE PURPOSE OF ARRIVING AT A BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA.

[Sixty-seventh Congress, second session.]

Senate Joint Resolution 177.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
March 9 (calendar day, March 14), 1922.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 177) to authorize the President of the United States to send a commission to Russia and to invite a Russian commission to the United States to hold informal conversations with the de facto government of Russia for the purpose of arriving at a basis of understanding between the United States and Russia.

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to select, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, seven prominent citizens of the United States, who shall constitute a commission to visit Russia for the purpose of investigating and making report upon the problem of the restoration of normal and peaceful relationships between the United States and Russia; and

That this commission of seven members may be authorized by the President, in his discretion, to employ clerical assistants, expert accountants, political economists, interpreters, legal counsel, and such other assistants for the purpose of carrying on its work as the commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That no member of this commission shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $6,000 a year and actual traveling expenses while in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses while absent on official business from the United States, and that no employee of this commission shall receive compensation at a rate in excess of $5,000 a year, together with actual traveling expenses in the United States and actual traveling and living expenses outside of the United States, when on the official business of the commission.

That the President be authorized to direct the commission to discuss all other matters which must be considered and adjusted, looking to the bringing about of friendly relationships, and to charge it with the general duty of securing the most complete information possible, to be reported to the President and to the Congress and to the people of the United States concerning the attitude, the conditions, and the circumstances of the Russian people, and the purposes toward the United States of the de facto government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to submit to the Congress from time to time, as he may obtain it, information from this commission as to conditions in Russia, with a view to the earliest possible recognition by our Government of the de facto government of Russia.

That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to invite the de facto government of Russia to send a commission of seven members here to discuss with our producers and exporters the question of trade with Russia, and to negotiate with our Government all those questions which our commission to Russia shall be authorized to discuss with the de facto government of Russia, and such other matters as the President may deem best to discuss with such commission.

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not heretofore appropriated, the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the expenses and salaries of the commission and of its employees and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution.

—

A BILL INTRODUCED BY MR. FRANCE MAY 6, 1920, AMENDING THE WAR FINANCE CORPORATION ACT IN ORDER THAT THERE MIGHT BE A SECURED CREDIT TO GERMANY OF $250,000,000 IN ORDER THAT GERMANY MIGHT PURCHASE FOODSTUFFS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

[Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

(S. 4341.)

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 6, 1920.

Mr. FRANCE introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Finance:

A bill (S. 4341) to amend the War Finance Corporation act.

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Finance Corporation act is hereby amended by adding to Title I thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 22. (a) That the corporation shall be empowered and authorized to pay to any person, firm, corporation, or association engaged in business in the United States the contract price of supplies of food and raw materials hereafter purchased, or agreed to be purchased, by the German Government from any such person, firm, corporation, or association, and to accept, in full payment of the moneys so advanced, the bonds, obligations, or other evidence of indebtedness to be issued by Germany for the payment of the moneys so advanced, to bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from the date of such advance: *Provided*, That the said contract shall be approved by the corporation as to price, quantity, and subject matter; that the said contract shall be for such supplies of food and raw materials as may be judged by the Governments of the principal allied and associated powers, parties to the treaty of peace between the said powers and Germany, to be essential to enable Germany to meet her obligation for reparation under the said treaty; and that the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings by Germany shall be a first charge on all the assets and revenues of the German Empire and its constituent States, and shall be paid in priority to all other bonds, obligations, and undertakings of Germany except such as may be issued for the payment of the costs and expenses of the armies of occupation subsequent to the armistice of November 11, 1918.

"(b) The total advances to be made by the corporation shall not exceed $250,000,000.

"(c) The terms of payment of the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings, the conditions of priority, and the assets and revenues of Germany, against which the said bonds, obligations, or undertakings shall be a charge, shall be fixed and established by the Reparation Commission appointed under and pursuant to the said treaty, subject to the approval of the corporation.

"(d) Any such bond, obligation, or undertaking shall provide that the payment thereof shall be a lien and charge against the property of Germany or of any of her nationals in the custody of the Alien Property

Custodian after the payment of debts due to the nationals of the United States.

"(e) There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $250,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of making payments by the said corporation as and when required under the provisions of this section."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Is the Senator from Utah ready to go ahead now?

Mr. KING. No; but I think after a conference with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] we will be able to expedite the consideration of several amendments we have to offer.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand the consideration of the bill will go over until to-morrow?

Mr. POINDEXTER. As to the matter the Senator from Tennessee spoke to me about, that was my understanding, but I thought perhaps if the Senator from Utah has some other matter to present he might be ready to go ahead with it this afternoon.

Mr. KING. I have one or two amendments I have not put in shape yet, but I assure the Senator that in the presentation of all the amendments I shall occupy not to exceed half an hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In view of that I shall move an executive session.

Mr. KING. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, December 29, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 28 (legislative day of December 27), 1922.

PRESIDING JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS APPEALS.

George Ewing Martin, of Ohio, to be presiding judge of the United States Court of Customs Appeals, vice Marion De Vries, resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES.

Marcus B. Campbell, of New York, to be United States district judge, eastern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

Henry W. Goddard, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

Francis A. Winslow, of New York, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York (an additional position created by the act approved September 14, 1922).

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Harry C. Whitehill, of Waterbury, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., in place of Herbert C. Comings, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 28 (legislative day of December 27), 1922.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Harry J. Glover, Albion.
Thomas Turigliatto, Benld.
Pearl W. Norman, Galatia.
Lyman S. Graves, Wyoming.

INDIANA.

Wade Denney, Farmersburg.
Reuben Hess, Kentland.
Edna M. McDermott, New Point.
John S. Lightcap, North Judson.
Rex Hannum, Worthington.

IOWA.

Dennis L. McDonnell, Bernard.
Bertha Zadow, Blencoe.
John F. Schoof, Denver.
William W. Andrew, Dexter.
Ben W. Stearns, Logan.

KANSAS.

Horace A. Fink, Russell.
Dell D. Jackson, Winona.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

George L. Crockett, Whitefield.

NEW JERSEY.

Dorothy H. Miller, Essex Fells.
Thomas F. Zettlemoyer, Sewaren.
George W. Earl, Tabor.

NEW YORK.

Jennie E. Carroll, Cuylerville.
Henry C. Almy, Friendship.
William D. Carpenter, Hagaman.
George W. Van Hyning, Hoosick Falls.
Thomas W. Hamer, Lacona.
Rhoda E. Jackson, Wantagh.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John T. Ritter, Carnegie.
Daniel A. Strayer, Coalport.
Isaac W. Edgar, Glenshaw.
Carey W. Huff, James City.
Clarence F. Ellis, Jamestown.
William N. Jones, Johnsonburg.
William J. Winner, Sandy Lake.
Joseph L. Roberts, Sharon.
Franklin Clary, Sharpsville.
Joseph C. Scowden, Tionesta.
John M. Graham, Volant.
Sara B. Coulter, Wampum.
Harry V. Gibson, West Middlesex.
William A. McMahan, West Pittsburg.

VERMONT.

John H. Dimond, Manchester Center.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *December 28, 1922.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art still going on with life. Unto us may it mean something intensely. Help us to meet the claims that conform to Thy holy will and to ever feel the constraints that are upon us. Giver of life, take our lives, so often misused and contradictory, and restore, renew, and simplify them and give us strength to use them better. Continue to work through us Thy great purposes which Thou hast for the good of our country. Teach us that our love and faith are tested by what we are willing to suffer and sacrifice and that these are the graces that bring us to the Father of us all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SLEMP, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a bill (H. R. 13593) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, which, with the report thereon (Rept. 1318), was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I reserve all points of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado reserves all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the judicial review of legislative procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the judicial review of legislative procedure. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks referred to is here printed in full as follows:

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed by constitutional amendment to take from the Supreme Court the power of judicial review of legislative enactment.

It is further proposed that congressional enactments may be reviewed by the court, but if declared a violation of the Constitution by the court, then Congress may by subsequent enactment replace the law upon the statute books and further court review be restrained.

Which means that if the court in review holds the law to be good and not a violation of the Constitution it becomes a law.

If the court holds the law is bad because it violates the Constitution, then Congress can make it good by the simple process of reenactment.

If Congress passes a good law once, it is to remain, but in order to make a bad or unconstitutional law constitutional it will be required to do the bad thing twice, and by this repetition bad law becomes as good as good law.

If Congress strikes the Constitution only one blow with one fist, it will be called a draw; but if Congress comes back and hits the Constitution a second blow with the other fist, Congress wins.

DISCUSSION NECESSARY.

The destruction of $300,000,000,000 in property and 30,000,000 in lives has shaken the whole world to its very foundation, and a certain unsettling influence in our country has produced an unusual increase in crime, accompanied by assaults upon our form of government and its Constitution.

These assaults upon our Government can only be stopped by a statement of its fundamental objects and a repeated and reiterated defense of its form, by an explanation of its machinery.

This was not necessary 20 years ago but is necessary to-day, for the study of the Constitution is now neglected and our Bill of Rights is assailed in official life and by secret organizations of a political character.

The official violation of the express prohibitions contained in our Bill of Rights will find its gradual correction by the courts.

The lawless methods of the secret organization will, because of its lawlessness, be destroyed by enlightened public sentiment and criminal prosecution.

The propaganda designed to destroy our system of government must be met by discussion and answer.

The effective way to counteract these assaults is by a simple statement of our system of government and explanation of how it functions.

To restore mental poise, at least political optimism, the advantages of our form of government should be stated.

And while discussing its wisdom, its series of checks and balances, point the way to change by the orderly and intelligent use of the ballot.

Only an imperfect understanding exists of the division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial.

We understand how to apply the ballot to change an offensive Executive, and that a legislator may be removed and another more acceptable be selected.

JUDICIAL POWER NOT UNDERSTOOD.

But the place of judicial power in our National Government is not understood; there seems some mystery about it; and when it is assailed, some may carelessly and without examination agree with its critics.

There have been revolts against the Executive, and we are accustomed to a discussion of this office at all times, and every four years in national elections the personality of the President, in the press and on the rostrum, is subjected to the severest test of public acclaim or disapproval.

Every two years we have a political campaign in which candidates of the various State legislatures, Congress, and the United States Senate are analyzed, respective political platforms discussed, and the issues are understood by the voter who gives thought to the subject.

But with the third great power, which comes by appointment of the Executive—the President—with the consent and approval of the legislative—the Senate—he is not familiar and leaves its discussion to the lawyer or trained educator.

First. We must understand that the judicial power of the Government is created by the joint act of both the executive and legislative branches, and then upon its creation it becomes a check upon both of the branches which created it.

Second. That while Supreme Judges are appointed for life, the legislative branch—the House and Senate—may remove by impeachment.

Third. That the Executive—the President—may be punished for an unwise selection by a subsequent defeat administered by the electorate.

Fourth. That during the nearly century and a half of our national history no scandal and but little criticism has been honestly directed against either the integrity or ability of the members of our Supreme Court.

Not since the early years of our national life, when all its machinery was rough and its detailed powers uncertain, has there been open or organized effort made to take from the judicial power the right of review of legislative enactment.

There have been criticisms of decision, and naturally in each trial there have been two sides to each controversy presented for determination, and no single judgment could be entirely satisfactory to both, and there has followed dissent and disappointment.

But in all these years until now there has been no political movement to destroy the power itself.

ITS REMOVAL WOULD DESTROY.

To destroy, by constitutional amendment, one of the three coordinate and foundation branches of our Government means the destruction of the present American form of government and the setting up of an entirely new and different system.

It would remove the balance of power between the executive and the legislative.

It would destroy the judicial check upon both.

It would either increase the power of the executive and lead the way to monarchy or increase power of the legislative and destroy the force of the executive.

It would take from the American plan of government its marked difference from that of any other nation which preceded its formation.

It would destroy all those interpretations of our laws which have developed with our progress and civilization and have become in effect new laws.

It would involve the rewriting of thousands of laws by both State and National Governments.

It would destroy the arbiter which decides disputes between States and citizens of States.

It would leave our Bill of Rights, so essential to personal liberty, without special official defender.

It would destroy the heart of the Constitution because it would kill the defender of the Constitution and leave 110,000,000 people subject to the intemperate, hasty, or arbitrary act of the two remaining branches of our Government.

It would remove all protection for the right of the minority.

It would place unlicensed and unlimited power in the hands of a majority.

It would destroy the written defense of individual liberty, because there would be no power to defend our written guaranties.

It would take away the balance wheel which causes the affairs of government to run smoothly and methodically.

It would destroy our dual form of sovereignty.

It would be a crowning victory for the advocates of government by mobs.

It would take from the Government its fine conscience to judicially determine right from wrong by a solemn tribunal which, unswayed by partisan heat or temporary excitement, punishes or rewards without impulse created by passion or prejudice.

It would destroy our sane plan of checks and balances.

It would disturb, unsettle, and make uncertain all the relations between men as individuals; it would make uncertain the relations between States; it would endanger the sanctity of contract; it would create for a period distrust and disputes which would destroy our national equilibrium and cause agricultural, labor, commercial, and industrial chaos.

Various persons in official life and at least two national conventions called to form new political parties advocate the destruction of the court by abolishing the power of judicial review.

This would take from the Supreme Court the power to uphold the Constitution and, by decision, to prevents its violation.

This would create, as a natural consequence, a change not only of the Constitution of the United States but of the constitutions of each of the 48 States comprising our national Union.

It would mean the rewriting of all the laws of the Nation and all the laws of each State in the Nation.

It would strike at the very vitals of our Government and, upon its ruins, would substitute anarchy for order, passion for moderation, and mob rule for judicial decree.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The Congress and the legislatures of the various States are at least partly to blame for this new movement.

Each Member of Congress and each member of the State legislature takes oath and with uplifted right hand solemnly swears before God to uphold and defend the Constitution.

And frequently within a week's time he votes for a bill which he knows at the time, or upon investigation could ascertain, is in violation of the Constitution and which the Supreme Court, acting under their oaths of office to "uphold and defend the Constitution," must in turn declare to be void.

The Member knew the bill was unconstitutional, but he calmly removes all blame from himself, places the full failure upon the court, smiles upon his constituent, secures his support, and awaits with calm indifference the howl of rage and disappointment which follow the court's unpopular decision.

In former years the question of a measure's constitutionality was given consideration and Members listened with attention to a discussion of its legality.

To-day time for such discussion is limited by the Rules Committee of the House, and, in the brief allotment accorded Members, it is almost impossible to discuss the subject.

An adverse court decision on a measure of great public interest is followed by denunciation of the ruling by the thoughtless, and finally, in organized form, comes a demand that Congress may pass any law without review or check by an impartial tribunal.

There are, naturally, some close questions upon which even the court divides, and many important decisions are by a mere majority of the court.

Time given to the discussion of the constitutionality of a law would benefit the public and afford at least a measure of protection for one of the three coordinate branches of our Government which can not publicly defend itself.

JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Briefly, without legal precision and omitting all reference to other powers of the Supreme Court, it will be found its power of review rests upon common sense.

In unanswerable logic, one of the framers of the Constitution said:

> There is no position which depends on clearer principles than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid. * * *
>
> The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar provision of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law.
>
> It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning, as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body.
>
> If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation and validity ought, of course, to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of its agents.

Our Constitution, it must be remembered, not only grants authority to govern but just as expressly limits such authority.

John Marshall could not stop criticism, but he confounded objection in two sentences:

> To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limitation committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained.
>
> If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts on the part of the people to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

While the lesser power, a Congress—with but two years' life—can not override a greater power, the Constitution, with its history of nearly a century and a half, the Supreme Court always gives the benefit of doubt to Congress in declaring its acts constitutional and must be clearly convinced of an act's unconstitutionality before it will so decide, and this is the rule of State supreme courts.

It may be said courts lean toward legislative enactment rather than away from it.

THINGS CONGRESS CAN NOT DO.

There are certain individual rights the Constitution demands that Congress must not destroy.

If court review is abolished, then Congress can in any one session take away these rights:

(1) Religious liberty; (2) freedom of speech; (3) freedom of the press; (4) the right of peaceful assembly; (5) the right of petition for redress of grievances.

(6) The right of State militia to bear arms.

(7) No soldier shall be quartered in time of peace in a house without consent of the owner.

(8) Unreasonable search and seizure.

(9) No arrest except upon probable cause (10) supported by oath or affirmation (11) describing the place (12) and the persons or things to be seized.

(13) Capital offenses must be found by a grand jury indictment.

(14) No person shall for the same offense be twice put in jeopardy, (15) compelled to testify against himself, (16) nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; (17) no private property taken for public use without just compensation.

(18) In criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy a speedy (19) and public trial (20) by an impartial jury (21) in the district wherein the crime is committed; (22) to be informed of the nature of the accusation; (23) to be confronted by witnesses; (24) to have compulsory service for obtaining witnesses (25) and the assistance of counsel for his defense; (26) the right of trial by jury where the sum exceeds $20.

(27) Excessive bail shall not be required (28) nor excessive fines imposed (29) nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

These rights are now all guarded by the Supreme Court, and its decrees have so far been enforced by mere announcement and notice given by its marshal.

But back of its decree and marshal is the respect of the Nation, which means the whole power of Army and Navy should necessity require.

The average man and woman finds in these provisions their greatest protection against abuse and tyranny; they are now written so all may understand and not subject to change by the whim or caprice of a passing Congress.

CHANGES.

The Constitution is a very simple human document, written in plain language, that contains only 4,000 words of 89 sentences, and can be read aloud in 23 minutes.

We should amend our statute law to meet the requirements of a changing and complex civilization, but in making changes the fundamentals of government and the balance of powers should be preserved.

In interpreting our statutes and in passing upon their constitutionality an immense amount of law has been written, now consisting of over 250 volumes. The abolishment of judicial review would destroy this immense storehouse of legal interpretation and place upon an unskilled Congress a work of staggering magnitude.

History has the habit of repeating itself, but it is doubtful if we could to-day produce men capable of satisfactorily changing our form of government.

The old framers had just been purified in a long, bloody struggle for human liberty. They had all the necessary guideposts of history for review. They were singularly free from sordid motive. Their work has brought approval from the great thinkers of all nations, and it should not be changed in form without weighty reasons, and then at a period better suited for constructive reflection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] will please resume the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

> A bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose yesterday there was pending a point of order made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] against the provisos in the pending paragraph for Indian school and agency buildings, on page 24, the first proviso beginning on line 11. I would like, if agreeable to the gentleman from California, for the convenience of the Chair as well as my own, to have the gentleman designate the particular portion of the language to which he takes exception rather than require the committee to justify all three provisos.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, maybe the gentleman might expedite the matter by explaining the particular part of the first proviso as to bridges and roads. It might relate to re-

serves. Bridges might be indefinite as to amount and location. Clearly there would be no right and authority to construct bridges outside of the reservations. As to the second proviso, I will not make any question on that. I believe it ought not to be there in that shape, but I believe the committee has power on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman does not object to the second proviso?

Mr. RAKER. No; I do not.

Mr. CRAMTON. He objects to the first proviso on the ground that the money might be used outside the reservation?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. To the second he does not object?

Mr. RAKER. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. Now, as to the third proviso——

Mr. RAKER. I believe the gentleman will concede that that changes existing law.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will not concede that. He will concede that it is legislation, but it is already permanent law and is unnecessary, and I am willing to have that taken out.

Mr. RAKER. All right.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will agree with the gentleman to offer an amendment striking out the third proviso.

That leaves only the question of the first proviso, and as to that the gentleman waives any objection to it so far as it relates to work upon reservations. The language of the item, Mr. Chairman, is "construction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings"; "including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith." The proviso in question is that this appropriation for the purposes stated "shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service."

It is my understanding that this item has to do only with such construction or repair work on roads and bridges as is upon the reservations and in connection with the institutions. For that, of course, there is ample authority, and to that the gentleman has no objection. Apart from the point of order, if the language is uncertain as to that, if it does leave it open for construction of roads not upon reservations, I think the committee would not object to an amendment that would make it clear.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CARTER. It does not seem, Mr. Chairman, that there is any ambiguity about that language. It provides for repair work on roads and bridges. That is certainly within existing law. Those contemplated must be on the reservation. I agree with the gentleman in charge of the bill that if there is any doubt about it, I myself would like to see it fixed so that the money must be spent within the limits of the reservation. But I do not believe it is necessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, to obviate delay in a discussion that is not necessary, I will also agree to offer an amendment to insert after the word "bridges," in line 14, the words "on Indian reservations." The only question in my mind as to that is whether the word "reservations" is broad enough to include lands that might be used in connection with schools, and so forth.

Mr. RAKER. The language is peculiar—"roads and bridges, schools and agency buildings." But on the gentleman's statement as to that proviso and the last one I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. CRAMTON. We will get to it. The point of order being withdrawn, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the last proviso, beginning on line 21, be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 24, line 21, strike out the colon and insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. HAYDEN. How will it read then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CRAMTON. I propose only to strike out the last proviso. I will say to the gentleman I am advised it is already permanent law and unnecessary to be carried any longer.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the gentleman expect to add the words "on the Indian reservations"?

Mr. CRAMTON. I expect to do that later. This is on striking out the third proviso. The further pending amendment is to strike out the third proviso. I will offer the other later.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment at the end of line 14. After the word "bridges" insert "on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service." I think that will meet the wishes of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 24, line 14, after the word "bridges" insert the words "on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service."

So that as amended the proviso will read:

Provided, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of construction or repair work of roads and bridges on Indian reservations and other lands devoted to the Indian Service and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, while I do not now think of any contingency which may arise, yet it is entirely possible that where there is a nonreservation Indian school located away from the Indian country it might be necessary to build a bridge to get to it.

Mr. CARTER. This would cover that, "other lands devoted to the Indian Service."

Mr. HAYDEN. But suppose a bridge had to be built off from the school ground in order to get to the school?

Mr. CARTER. This would not cover that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not understand that the appropriation is now used for any such purpose. I think wherever that happens there is specific language in the bill authorizing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDIAN SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION.

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, $90,000: *Provided*, That not exceeding $5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment: *Provided further*, That where practicable the transportation and expenses of pupils shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that this is another general appropriation of $90,000, a $5,000 increase over last year, providing for the collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and so forth.

Yesterday I tried to make clear the proposition that it would be a businesslike policy if these different amounts were so itemized that we could show the exact amount spent for each reservation and each school. My friend from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and myself had some controversy over that, he taking the position that the school appropriation could not be spent for any other purpose. I quoted a statement in the hearings before the investigation commission, printed this morning on page 976 of the RECORD, in which Mr. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, stated to the committee that the money could be used for relieving distress, and so forth.

Mr. CARTER. What money?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The support of schools money.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is mistaken about that, according to his own quotation from the testimony.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to call attention to the statement made by Mr. Meritt in which he said:

We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress, for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Now, I want to go just a little further and quote from page 856, volume 1, of the hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Sixty-sixth Congress on the condition of various tribes of Indians. The gentleman will remember that Congress appropriated $15,000 and directed that committee to investigate the Indian Bureau. They spent the $15,000, and I am afraid very little beneficial results have come from that

investigation, although we sat day after day for two years in an effort to get to the bottom of this very involved and complicated system. But here is a question I asked Mr. Meritt at that time, on page 356 of the hearings:

Mr. KELLY. I was just trying to bring out the principle when I used that illustration. There are other instances through the bill that I have noticed, and I want to get information as to why the system grows up by which there are large lump-sum appropriations in the same bill that apparently is carrying specific appropriations for everything, and, to my mind, should be carried in specific appropriations right down the line. Why are those two opposing principles in the same bill every year?

Mr. MERITT. That is a matter of growth, covering a long period of years.

Mr. KELLY. What is your judgment on that, Mr. Meritt?

Mr. MERITT. As to the wisdom of it?

Mr. KELLY. As to the wisdom of the policy.

His answer is the crux of the whole matter:

Mr. MERITT. If I were a Member of Congress and a member of the committee, I think I should advocate the appropriation bill being made up so that when we make an appropriation for a reservation or a school that would be the entire appropriation for that reservation or that school, so far as it would be possible to do it.

Remember, Mr. Meritt is Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs in charge of these bills, and is one of the ablest men I ever saw before a committee, adroit, resourceful, and able. I am only sorry that he is not using his splendid ability for another purpose than attempting to add to the activities of this bureaucracy. But that is what he said, and that is exactly what I attempted to do yesterday when I tried to get an amendment adopted to itemize these expenditures under reservations and under schools, so that there would not be a dollar carried in this bill that it could not be explained what it was spent for, and the activity for which it was spent. We might then know exactly what each reservation and what each school was costing.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one important distinction between what Mr. Meritt said he would do as a Member of Congress and what the gentleman from Pennsylvania yesterday tried to do. Mr. Meritt said "so far as it was possible," or words to that effect. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania paid no attention to that, whether possible or impossible. His amendment provided that every cent spent on a reservation must be foretold in advance.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman quibbles about that, because here is an item of $90,000 for the transportation of school children. In my State of Pennsylvania they also pay out money for the transportation of pupils, and I can find at Harrisburg an account of every dollar that has been spent by the township. I can show you where that money goes, and at very little clerical expense, but the $90,000 carried here is a lump appropriation expended here and there without any statement as to the reservation it is spent on, so that we can not tell the total expenditure for any reservation. If estimates can not be made in advance, the Budget policy is a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have no doubt that the gentleman can ascertain from the Indian Service what has been spent, but no one can definitely foretell just how many dollars of this will be spent next year on each reservation, and that is what the gentleman called for in his amendment.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I called also for a statement of expenditures made. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CRAMTON] will do this when the bill comes before the committee next year. He says it can easily be done for the last year; that is, that he can get the total expenditure for each reservation and for each school, from all these items, so that it can be laid before the committee. If he will do that, then we will know exactly where this money has been spent. I shall be glad to see that done when next year's bill is presented to this House.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania makes appropriations itemizing the amount to be paid to every township.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I do not ask for that. I want the bureau to bring the estimates and show where the money was spent. We do that in the Legislature of Pennsylvania and we know how much was spent in each township.

Mr. HAYDEN. Do you make a lump-sum appropriation?

Mr. HICKS. What the gentleman wants is for them to make a post-mortem examination.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; but I want the amount laid out and to show how the money was spent last year. That was the point that I wanted to bring out in the discussion we had yesterday, and I hope that Mr. Meritt's suggestion as to what he would do if he was a Member of Congress will be carried out next year.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the controversy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself on yesterday was clean-cut and there should be no confusion about it.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated was that a part of the school appropriation could be used for farmers out on the reservation and away from the schools. He read from what he said was a record of old hearings. As I understood his reading them, he made Mr. Meritt say the same thing, to wit, that a part of a school appropriation could be used for paying farmers out on the reservation away from the school. I wondered at the time that the assistant commissioner, familiar with conditions from his long service in the bureau, could have knowingly made any such erroneous assertion. Since the alleged statement has been published in yesterday's RECORD I find that Mr. Meritt made no such statement and in fact no statement that could be distorted into any such misleading construction. Let us see what Mr. Meritt did say. I read from the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, credited to Mr. Meritt:

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, let me ask you, can you use funds from a general fund for a purpose for which a specific appropriation is made under the law?

Mr. MERITT. Where there is a specific appropriation for a specific purpose we are not permitted to supplement that appropriation by any other fund. For example, where we have an appropriation for a nonreservation school we would not be permitted to use any of the general appropriation for school support to supplement the specific appropriation for a nonreservation school. * * *

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, what do you use that $6,000 for; for the Klamaths?

Mr. MERITT. We use it for administrative purposes on the Klamath Reservation.

Mr. CARTER. Can you take here from the general administrative appropriation any funds to use for administrative purposes there?

Mr. MERITT. We could take from the Indian school support.

Mr. CARTER. But that is not answering the question. My question was: Could you take it from the general administration item in the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. That support of the Indian schools is a general administrative item.

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

Thus it will be seen that the controversy between Mr. Meritt and myself was not whether in expending these funds he could cross the line of school appropriations and go over to industrial appropriations. The controversy was strictly whether he could apply funds from a general item to supplement funds appropriated for a specific purpose. Specifically, could he use a specific item for administrative purposes on a certain reservation and then draw from a general administration item for expenditures on that same reservation. Never was the question discussed as to diverting funds appropriated for schools to the use of farmers; and this statement, placed in the RECORD by the gentleman himself, does not warrant the assertion that anyone connected with the Indian Bureau ever made any such foolish asservation.

Let me call attention to that portion of the commissioner's alleged statement pertinent to this controversy, in order that this membership may judge for itself if there is indeed any further proof necessary. Mr. Meritt said:

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

That is the language of Mr. Meritt, as quoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and it is as unmistakable and plain as the English tongue could make it.

Does Mr. Meritt say that moneys appropriated for schools may be used for farmers? No; not even by the remotest implication. He simply says in plain, blunt English words, "We

could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation," and later on, "We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers," meaning the lump sum, "in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation." Nothing could be plainer, nothing could be less ambiguous, nothing could be more distinct and intelligible, and in no place, in no particular does this statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself even remotely intimate any such foolish assertion by the assistant commissioner as that he was authorized to use funds appropriated for schools in the employment of Indian farmers out on the reservation.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Turning from the controversy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Oklahoma as to what is the point of controversy between them, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee just how this money is used for placing the school pupils under the control of white families. Do these Indian children who are placed in the homes of white families remain there permanently? Do they become members of the family with the white people, so that they are subject to the regulations of the home and likely to be called upon to work as the other children would be in the household? What is the general plan in the expenditure of this appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure that I can answer all of the gentleman's inquiries, but approximately $5,000 of this appropriation is expended in obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths, and for the payment of transportation to the places of employment. The other portion of it is transportation, sending pupils from their homes to the nonreservation boarding schools. Of course, that involves some transportation, but the portion the gentleman refers to is the expenditure of the $5,000, which is to secure employment in white homes and otherwise for Indian youths, the intention being, I assume, to place the Indian in the surroundings of modern American homes where he will acquire a full knowledge of the English language, of American customs, and at the same time be in employment where he will be self-supporting and perhaps earning something in addition thereto.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Of course, the $5,000 is set aside for obtaining employment, but then there is the item of collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian public schools; but the item to which I am directing particular attention is for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training. Do these white families take these Indian children into their homes?

Mr. CRAMTON. In some instances.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And give them training, send them to schools, and are paid for that purpose?

Mr. CRAMTON. Let me read from what Mr. Meritt said:

> Mr. MERITT. You will also notice that a part of that money is used for the purpose of procuring employment for our Indian youths. We have a large number of children, for example, at the Riverside School in California, who go out for employment. At Mr. Peairs's school, Haskell Institute, they have a number who go out for employment when the school is not in session.
>
> Mr. PEAIRS. Yes; we have quite a large number every summer, during the vacation months, that we send out in the neighborhood of 50, 60, or 75 miles of the school into homes and on farms.
>
> Mr. MERITT. We feel that this is good education for them, to get out in the white homes, during the summer vacations, and learn how the white people live, as well as earn their money, and cultivate the habit of industry.

I think the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is familiar with the subject and could give it more in detail to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then I shall ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether this is the placing of school pupils in the homes of white families only during vacation periods.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I expect I can better inform the gentleman by giving him a general statement about it. This money is used for the transportation of pupils to and from their homes. It is also used for securing employment for the pupil both before and after leaving the school—before he leaves the school in the vacation period and after he leaves the school, of course, in permanent employment. Then there is the third, and a very beneficial purpose, which is set forth by the language which the gentleman from Michigan has just quoted, and that is what is known as the outing system. In many of the Indian schools the term lasts only about eight school months. It begins in September and runs for eight months, giving the child in some of those Indian schools about four or five months' vacation. During that vacation the child is sent out into white families, the girl usually to learn cooking and sewing and housekeeping with some good white woman who must furnish proper testimonials as to character and other things, and then the boys are sent out to families to do farm and dairy and other work of that kind.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. But only during the time of the vacation period?

Mr. CARTER. Only then.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So that these white families do not have control of the general education of the child?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no; the child goes back to the school when it begins again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The policy proposed yesterday by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is not a complex one. It is not ridiculous. There is nothing about it that calls for any action that is unreasonable. He merely proposed that the Indian commissioner should submit to the Committee on Appropriations a detailed estimate of the amount of money that he would need for each separate project. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] immediately interposed that it is a post-mortem proposition. It is not. He is asking for these estimates before we appropriate the money. That is not post-mortem. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] in trying to crush the proposition said that it is perfectly reasonable to ask him to tell how he spent the money after he spends it, but that it is impossible for him to tell us what his estimates are of the amount of money that he is going to need for the coming fiscal year. That is the way he disposes of it.

There is nothing unreasonable about the proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think it is a wise policy and one that ought to be adopted. Take that Book of Estimates and go through it, and there is not a subject in there, not a single analysis that is given, that does not embrace the item of "miscellaneous" involving thousands of dollars; that does not embrace "outstanding indebtedness" that involves several hundred thousand dollars, the itemization of which is not shown at all. I think the committee ought to be reasonable. I think that when a sane proposition like that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is proposed, where it has merit, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS], who comes from the leading business State of this Nation, ought to appreciate the business horse sense that is involved in the policy, and he ought to get behind it.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. My thought when I made the remark about its being post-mortem was that in many of these items you can not tell in advance what money is going to be refunded until it is refunded.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I am not talking about refunding, I am talking about spending. I am talking about what the gentleman from Pennsylvania was talking about when he said we must demand estimates of the amount of money proposed to be expended in the next fiscal year. That is what his amendment had to deal with. If, as was stated by the gentleman from Michigan, it is impossible to give estimates, then our whole Budget system is a farce. Our whole Budget system is founded on the policy of giving reliable information in advance of the expenditure. It is impossible to go into detail before the Budget Committee. All the Budget Committee demands is general estimates. Then it becomes the province of the Committee on Appropriations, after the Budget Committee gets its general estimates, to get the estimates in specific detail.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman should admit that anything that the chairman of the subcommittee has done has been with an effort to differentiate between the cases where an itemization was possible and desirable, and other cases where itemization to the degree demanded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not only impossible, without tremendous expense, and probably impossible even then to foretell, but also unnecessary and quite undesirable.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to submit to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan this proposition: If he will take that so-called Book of Estimates and go to his office and spend a month on it, he can not tell within a million dollars of where the money is going specifically. It is just one conglomeration of generalities. Go through it, look at the analyses of estimates given there, and then the explanation that is attempted in the succeeding pages, and you will find that it is one generality after another. You can not tell within a million dollars of where the money is really going.

I think in view of the fact that the House has given these 35 men this tremendous power and responsibility, when a Member from Pennsylvania like our distinguished friend [Mr. KELLY] offers a wise policy, I think it ought to be treated seriously and given due consideration by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIAL WORK AND CARE OF TIMBER.

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters of them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, $375,000, of which sum not less than $50,000 shall be used for the employment of field matrons and nurses: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not, as to timber, apply to the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $20,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grain, vegetables, and fruits: *And provided further*, That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, nurses, and other hospital employees, and stockmen provided for in this act shall not be included within the limitations on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, merely for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. HICKS. I have not had the opportunity of going through these hearings, and so this may be a foolish or academic question. But why is the proviso in there excluding the Menominee Indian Reservation from the operation of this act?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Menominee Indian Reservation lumbering, as I understand, is a separate proposition, which at one time was a matter of considerable controversy in Congress before my time. There are extensive lumbering operations now going on there. It is cared for by separate legislation, and it is my impression that the exclusion clause here is to avoid having this act taken as in any way amending or interfering with the other act.

I will say to the gentleman further that this is an appropriation to aid in carrying on industrial and other work. The Menominee operations are self-supporting, and it is not necessary to use any of this money for that purpose. Further, there are in the hearings statements from the Indian Service as to the progress of these Menominee operations, showing the profits obtained, and so forth.

Mr. HICKS. Has this proviso been carried in other bills for many years?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; and there is no necessity for any appropriation for the Menominee operations, and that would be a sufficient reason for its exclusion here.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES OF INDIAN SERVICE.

For pay of special agents, at $2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping car fare and a per diem of not to exceed $3.50 in lieu of subsistence, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, $109,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 of this appropriation may be used for continuing the work of the Competency Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma: *Provided*, That not to exceed $15,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended out of applicable funds in the work of determining the competency of Indians on Indian reservations outside of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 28, line 6, after the semicolon, by striking out the words "For pay of employees not otherwise provided for."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 28, line 6, after the word "duty," strike out the words "For pay of employees not otherwise provided for."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph carries an appropriation which is indeed general. It is styled "General expenses of Indian Service, $109,500." It is in addition to the items carrying practically every class of employees known to the Government, and the justification on page 209 of the hearings had before the subcommittee gives this statement:

The purpose of the fund, "General expenses, Indian Service," is adequately set forth in the title. It is used exclusively for general and not specific purposes. There are about 150 different agencies and schools throughout the country, nearly every State west of the Mississippi River having one or more agencies or schools within its territory. To carry on the work of these various schools and agencies it is necessary to employ over 5,000 persons in order that the work may be efficiently and expeditiously carried on. A force of special agents and supervisors is maintained for the purpose of making regular and periodic inspections of the various agencies and schools to see that all work is properly and carefully carried on.

Now in the analysis the salaries and wages and traveling expenses of these employees carried in this item amounts to $84,000; $84,000 out of some $109,000. I submit that here is a case where we should at least stop putting a general provision in for the pay of employees not otherwise provided for. There are teachers, agents, inspectors, farmers, stockmen, and supervisors to infinity carried in this bill specifically, and an item of this kind adding still others under a general clause seems to me unjustifiable.

Mr. BLANTON. And it involves $109,500.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; and it can be eliminated without doing any injury, and making a saving of that much to the taxpayers. I believe that at least, after making a general appropriation of $109,500, we should take out the blanket authority of putting in other employees without specifically stating where they shall be sent or for what purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Do the hearings disclose where this money is likely to be spent and upon whom?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. They do not. There is no showing for reservation or school, although we heard yesterday about this wonderful Book of Estimates which, it was contended, itemized everything. I believe that an expenditure like that should be segregated according to the reservation and school. We should not attempt to deceive ourselves in a matter of this kind. This is a wasteful policy and my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the item involved here for the main part is analyzed in detail by the department to the committee. It does include the language to which reference has been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. The item is one that would need to be taken care of either in this general way or else it would need to be taken care of by an allocation of the amount of money involved to the various agencies having to do with the Indian work.

For instance, we have seven supervisors at definite salaries; we have three special agents; we have four traveling auditors; we have one supervisor, five superintendents, one chief clerk, eight clerks and financial clerks, and other definite employees who are engaged in some definite class of work. Then in addition to that we have occasion to use miscellaneous and temporary employees for a particular short period of time in bringing up work at one agency or another, and it is more economical to handle this work by having a lump sum, not too large, from which these expenses may be borne. It will be no economy to strike this item from the bill here, because you will need to provide definite items for the different agencies throughout the country, and the items would need to be large enough in each case to take care of the maximum expenditure required in each particular instance. In this case we can keep the item fairly small, because then it is elastic, and it can be used to meet an emergency whenever it may arise. The item should remain in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Could the gentleman tell us out of the five thousand and odd employees in the Indian Service how many are Indians? Have you any record of it?

Mr. FRENCH. About 2,000 employees.

Mr. RAKER. Can the gentleman advise the committee whether or not it is the policy of the service to give competent Indians, both men and women—young men and young women as well—employment wherever opportunity presents itself?

Mr. FRENCH. It is the general policy, and my impression is not only that it is the general policy but that in many instances it is required. Officers coming before the committee have testified of their great desire to have Indians employed in various capacities for the effect in encouraging other Indians and for the training it gives the Indians who are employed.

Mr. CARTER. The general rule is to give the Indians preference. That has been carried to the extent of establishing an Indian employment division within the Indian Bureau, headed by Charley Dagenette, a Peoria Indian, as I recall. It is a part of his business to look after the employment of Indians in the service, and look after their welfare and see that they do not get the worst of it in promotions and otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Is it the policy to give them employment wherever they can under these circumstances?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly, and that is done.

Mr. FRENCH. The last two items that we passed over I think are entirely for Indian employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, on line 13, page 28, to strike out after the word "appropriated" the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 28, line 13, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is not a good way of getting at what I desire, but I can see no other way of stating it than to provide that $15,000 shall be expended for determining the competency of Indians on Indian reservations. I realize that the word "may" there gives a leeway which might be justifiable if a real effort were being made to determine the competency of these Indians; but the difficulty has been that a policy has gone on for years under which only a very few Indians a year are declared competent. Where there should be thousands, there are only tens. It seems to me that 91 years of hothousing these Indians and supporting and civilizing them at a cost of many millions we ought to be able to produce some competent Indians. There never was a normal Indian who, with 21 years' training under American conditions, could not become a competent citizen. I do not believe there are any more Indians than white men who would be naturally incompetent if they were given the same opportunities and the same environment. But the Indian Bureau can not exist without the Indians, and that is the philosophy that runs through these bills. I believe that we should do the best we can here to declare the policy that there shall be real efforts made on the part of the Indian Bureau officials to declare these Indians competent, to cut them loose and let them sink or swim. That is the only way that manhood ever develops, by letting men out to face the difficulties of life and to win or to fail. Some white men fail and so some Indians will fail, but the majority of them will get to their feet and will come to a point where they will win a place as members in the American community. I hope that something can be done which will indicate that Congress is determined to see that the Indians who are really competent are declared competent, their lands given them, their division of the tribal funds made, and then take them for all time from the clutches of the Indian Bureau, whose existence is the reason for the expenditure of these vast funds.

Mr. STEPHENS. Following the gentleman's line of argument, does he not think it would be a good idea to abolish all of our civil service laws in order to turn out those who are dependent upon them?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is this difference: The personnel in any other bureau of the Government is not the same kind of a bureaucracy as in a bureau where you are dealing with helpless wards. These Indians are wards. They can not vote——

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. There is not an Indian in Oklahoma who has not full rights, and every member of the Five Civilized Tribes is like all the other citizens of the United States.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, that only applies to one State. I do not mean to say that all of the Indians can not vote. But if all could vote to-day, there would be a different Indian policy.

Mr. CARTER. This only applies to the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I am amending the other item, outside of the Five Civilized Tribes. The gentleman does not understand what he is talking about. If he will follow my amendment he will see that I leave out the Five Civilized Tribes and that I have offered to amend the next item, leaving it so that he can take care of his own Five Civilized Tribes if he so desires.

Mr. CARTER. Let me find out what the gentleman's amendment really is.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. These Indians in the majority of cases have no votes. They are the ones on the reservations. They have very little influence; but here is a bureau that has considerable influence, because it has the power to give certain things to its friends. I believe if there is a choice between standing for the Indians and standing for the Indian Bureau, Congress should stand for the Indians, and that means that you will have to declare these Indians competent when they are competent. I have known of cases where Indians had great ability but could not get allotments, could not get themselves declared competent, although they were competent in fact; could not be turned loose, no matter how earnestly they requested it.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand the gentleman has moved to strike out the word "may," in line 13, on page 28, and to substitute the word "shall."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. That proviso, as I understand, refers entirely to the Five Civilized Tribes?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Not at all. This refers to those who are outside of the Five Civilized Tribes.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman repeat his amendment? Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. My amendment is on page 28, line 13.

Mr. CARTER. What does the gentleman propose?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I propose to strike out the word "may" and to insert the word "shall," so that this bureau shall get our idea that we want Indians who are really competent declared competent and turned loose. This does not touch the Five Civilized Tribes. Perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma says they do not need any competency commission.

Mr. CARTER. I never made any such statement, and I have a commission provided in here for that.

Mr. BUTLER. I asked my question because of the statement made by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is just the opposite of what the gentleman from Oklahoma stated. I leave out the Five Civilized Tribes and am trying to get a competency commission on the other reservations. It simply provides for $15,000 for determining the competency of Indians who are entitled to it and declaring them competent with such benefits as accrue from such action.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania undertakes to put strange words in my mouth and assign positions to me that I never occupied when he says that I have taken the position that the Five Civilized Tribes did not need any competency commission. If the gentleman will look at the bottom of page 29 he will find there an item for a competency commission for the Five Civilized Tribes. That item was placed in the bill several years ago by an amendment proposed by me and has been carried along ever since. For several years we used the mandatory term there, but we found that we were getting no further by using the word "shall" than by using the word "may." The language provided that "not less than $15,000 shall be used for a competency commission for the Five Civilized Tribes," and so forth, yet in the analysis of expenditures subsequently submitted to our committee we found that only $5,000 had been expended. We had no desire to force the expenditure of money on the bureau that could not and will not be used in relieving the Indians from the bureau supervision. Our friend from Pennsylvania seems to labor under the delusion that no progress has been made with reference to the releasing of the Indian.

Let me call his attention to a few outstanding facts. There are a few more than 101,000 enrolled members of the Five Civilized Tribes. As late as 1908—14 years ago—all of them were restricted Indians and not a single one could sell his property nor execute any valid contract with reference to it without permission of the great White Father at Washington. Within the duration of these 14 years restrictions as to alienation and contract have been removed from nearly 70,000, leaving only a bit more than 30,000, or about one-third, still re-

maining under Government supervision. Every member of less than one-half Indian blood has all restrictions removed and every Indian of less than three-quarters has every inhibition removed except homestead restrictions, and practically all educated full bloods and those of more than half blood have been released from all restrictions.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Why should these Indians be continually carried on the bureau rolls and held under supervision as tribal Indians are held?

Mr. CARTER. I think I have just shown that about two-thirds of them are not held under supervision at all, and I know of no reason why their names should be dropped from their rolls simply because they have been declared competent. Moreover, it is necessary to carry the names on the rolls of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes, for they still have a residue of tribal property undisposed of. The tribal affairs of the Cherokees, numbering about 41,000 members, have been completely disposed of, and the tribal government abolished. The tribal affairs of the Creeks and Seminoles, some 17,000, as I now recall, have all been settled with the exception of three boarding schools. All the tribal property of the Choctaws and Chickasaws has been sold and that estate wound up with the exception of their segregated mineral lands. Most of the surface of the mineral land has been sold, all the asphalt deposits have been sold, and about 20 to 25 per cent of the coal deposits are sold, as I now recall. The department claims to have been unable to sell the remaining coal deposits on account of the general depression affecting the price. When the balance of these coal deposits are sold another per capita payment to Choctaws and Chickasaws will be in order under the law, and certainly that could not be made unless the names of all the beneficiaries were carried on some kind of authentic document, whether you call it a bureau roll, a roster, a list, or whatnot.

More than $25,000,000 of their funds have been distributed among the enrolled members of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes during the past six years, making a per capita distribution of about $1,000 to every man, woman, and child enrolled with the two tribes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. My amendment does not touch the Five Civilized Tribes. It applies to the others; and does not the gentleman, who has had a great deal of experience and who knows as much about Indian affairs as the committee—and I sat with him pleasantly on the committee that investigated the Indian Bureau and I know that he has tried to solve these great problems—I want to ask him if $15,000 is too much to spend for the purpose of getting competent Indians out from under the bureau and giving them a chance to be American citizens in American communities.

Mr. CARTER. I was not inveighing against the gentleman's amendment, either with reference to the Five Civilized Tribes or other Indians. I have no objection to it; the only thing I was undertaking to do was to keep the gentleman from Pennsylvania from putting me in a false position; putting words into my mouth which I never uttered. Notwithstanding the great progress made in releasing the Indians and admitting of them into full-fledged citizenship, if I had thought they needed no other release from restrictions I would not have agreed to the appropriation of $15,000 for the competency commission. I was on the subcommittee that reported it and insisted that it stay in the bill.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman did agree to have the word "may" substituted for the word "shall."

Mr. CARTER. Yes; and for a good reason. We had found that in the bill of the last fiscal year it was provided that the bureau "shall" use $15,000.

The officials of the bureau said that they were unable to use more than $5,000. Therefore, what is the use of camouflaging and demagoguing, pretending to do something for little political gain in Oklahoma, that does not serve any beneficial purpose in the way of legislation? I want to get results; I do not want to make any grand-stand play. I want to get my people down there graduated into full-fledged citizenship, so that they will be able to take care of themselves at the earliest possible moment. Every step I take is in that direction, and there is no use of trying to do something which we have found impossible. That is why I agreed that the word "shall" should go out.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not opposed to this amendment?

Mr. CARTER. No; it is a matter of no consequence, one way or the other. The bureau officials will use it if they deem it necessary and they will not use it if they think it unnecessary, regardless of the language you put in the bill, and our most recent experience has proven that to be a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRY AMONG INDIANS.

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, $80,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, which sum may be used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided*, That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1930: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians, and that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the purchase of tribal herds.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information. This item proposes an expenditure of $80,000 for the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians, to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops. On page 26 of the bill there is a section dealing with industrial work and the care of timber. A reading of that section discloses the fact that it is proposed by that appropriation to encourage and aid the Indians in the cultivation of grain, vegetables, fruit, and so forth. Will the gentleman in charge of the bill explain why it is necessary to split those items? How is the work related? It seems to cover the same service. The item last referred to on page 26 of the bill is for the cultivation of vegetables, cotton, and fruit. This item just read has to do with the cultivation of fruit, grains, and other crops.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, the item at the bottom of page 25 running onto page 26 is for the purpose of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations, and so forth, and the conduct of experiments on agency farms, and the teaching of domestic science and farming and stock raising, and so forth. The item before us is to accomplish the same general purpose, but through a somewhat different method, for encouraging industry by the purchase of seeds, animals, and so forth. In that connection the department says that under this plan no money is loaned to the Indians directly, but the appropriation is used for the purchase of seeds, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary, to enable the Indians to become self-supporting.

The department further says:

The Indians generally appreciate the benefits of this appropriation and make every effort to pay the amounts due under their agreements. They are allowed six years to pay for live stock and four years to pay for other articles. This appropriation has been one of the largest factors in the industrial progress of the Indians and has enabled many Indians to become self-supporting who would otherwise still be dependent upon the Government. The appropriation has been used on about 80 different reservations located in practically all the Western States, and nearly 40,000 Indians have received direct benefits therefrom.

From the total appropriations of about $4,000,000 that have been made, $2,400,000 has been repaid. The general purpose is the same, but the one is through methods of instruction and the other through giving them equipment with which to carry on the industry.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is this activity—that is, the one with reference to the purchase of seeds, animals, tools, and so forth—closely related to the work of experimentation, and so forth, covered by the paragraph on page 25?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a relation that is necessary, and they are both parts of a plan to bring about eventually the self-support of the Indians, but it is necessary that the two activities be carried on side by side.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I suggest to the gentleman, though I would not undertake to put my opinion against his knowledge, he having studied the matter, that the purchase of seeds, tools, and general application of that which is ascertained by experimentation ought to be very closely related to the experimentation. In other words, the people who make the experiments determine that a given grain or cotton, or whatever

agricultural commodity they have, is well suited to a given locality, and ought to have to do with the purchase of the seeds.

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that is the case. I call the gentleman's attention, however, to the items themselves. This is a reimbursable item; the money is to come back to the Government, and, as a matter of fact, it is coming back. Out of $4,000,000 heretofore appropriated, $2,400,000 has been repaid. The other is a gratuity that does not come back; it is for instruction.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Is there any additional personnel employed, the salary of which is a burden on this activity, by reason of the item on page 29?

Mr. CARTER. No. The principal difference between the two items is that one is reimbursable and the other is a gratuity. That is the only difference. One is used in connection with the other.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has overlooked the fact that there is a little item of $4,800 for salaries out of the $80,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How much money has been expended through this paragraph?

Mr. CRAMTON. Four million dollars, beginning with 1912. In one year as much as $600,000 was appropriated.

Mr. BUTLER. How much has been recovered?

Mr. CRAMTON. Two million four hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. About $1,600,000 remaining unpaid?

Mr. CRAMTON. Of course, the time has not expired.

Mr. BUTLER. We are bound to lose something, of course. I know that, and I am not making any criticism of anyone. I think this is one of the useful things in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. We should emphasize the fact that $2,400,000 has come back. The percentage has been much better than has been our experience with the white farmers of the West where seeds were furnished them.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARIZONA.

For support and civilization of Indians in Arizona, including pay of employees, $185,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 31, line 20, after the figures "$185,000," add the following: "*Provided*, That in this item and in all others in this act making appropriations for the support and civilization of Indians not more than 25 per cent of the amount here appropriated shall be expended for salaries, wages, and expenses of employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the first specific item for the support and civilization of Indians. It carries $185,000 for the Indians of Arizona. This bill carries these items for support and civilization in a total of $3,219,700. That is in addition to the appropriation of $370,000 for the relief of distress and in addition to the appropriation of $150,000 for vehicles used in the service, and in addition to the payment for Indian schools and others. This is an item used in a certain way called "for support and civilization."

Now I make the requirement in my amendment that for these special appropriations at least 75 cents out of a dollar shall go to the benefit of the Indians themselves, and that only 25 per cent of it be spent for salaries and expenses of employees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. How does the gentleman expect the Indian to get this other 75 per cent? How is he going to have the money delivered to him?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I would get that 75 cents delivered to him at an expense of 25 cents. I will show what has been done on a few items in this bill. Colorado receives an appropriation for support and civilization of Indians of $3,788, and under that the salaries and wages were $2,605. That was for salaries and wages alone and did not include traveling expenses, supplies, and so forth. For the Florida Indians last year the appropriation for support and civilization was $6,535, while salaries and wages alone consumed $4,187. In Idaho, on the Fort Hall Indians there was expended $24,361; for salaries and wages, $14,391. In Kansas, on the Pottawatomies there was expended $3,230, and out of that $2,154 went for salaries and wages. In Minnesota, for the Chippewas there was spent $43,200, and for salaries $30,319. In Montana, at the Fort Peck Agency there was expended $28,081, and for salaries and wages, $19,171.

I believe if you go through this bill you will find that more than 50 per cent of these appropriations for support and civilization of Indians went to salaries and wages alone, not counting their expenses. That is not support and civilization of the Indians. That is the support of the Indian Bureau and the pauperization of the Indians. If Congress takes money out of the Treasury for the support and civilization of the Indians, its benefits ought to go to them, not in cash alone, but the things purchased should be for the benefit of the Indians themselves.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman think that too much of the money goes to the civilizer here?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I surely do. I think the support is for the employees of the Indian Bureau instead of for the Indians.

This is a reasonable proposition, Mr. Chairman. I realize we have not a quorum here and it is impossible to secure the passage of amendments with the few Members here present. But this is a reasonable proposition, that 25 per cent is enough out of each dollar for the support and civilization of the Indians to be spent on the employees of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman please explain to the committee how it will civilize the Indian to pay him money out of the Treasury?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows I am not talking about that. I am anxious that the benefits shall go to the Indians.

Mr. HAYDEN. You want to take three-quarters of this money, as I understand it, and give it to the Indians in cash?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. The support and civilization is not given in cash. We have rations and relief of distress provided in other items.

Mr. HAYDEN. You want to give them rations and relief?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I want this padded salary list cut in two or more. I believe this amendment of mine would save $800,000 to the Treasury and that the help that the Indians get would be exactly what it is now.

Mr. LAYTON. If that is the case, is it not worth while having a quorum to settle the question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. If we had a quorum we would have some constructive amendments put into this bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not civilization largely a matter of education, and is not education largely a matter of salaries?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, I am talkng about the large proportion of these funds beng spent in salaries and wages under the title of support and civilization.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman's amendment provide that 25 per cent of the appropriation shall be applied to the Indians in the field?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No. I am willing that these items for schools and relief of distress, and so on, should be given largely in salaries to teachers and physicians, but when we come in and appropriate $3,000,000 and more for support and civilization of the Indians I want that money to be spent for the Indians.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is the gentleman's definition of civilization if it is not education? Education, of course, must necessarily go through the salary pay roll.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not know that this bill carries $5,000,000 a year for education alone, and that this item we are discussing is an entirely different matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that is similar to a great many that appear throughout the bill, and hence I think that the situation should be clearly put before the committee. The item is for the support and civilization of Indians in Arizona, $185,000. That money could be used in different ways. We could ship out to an Army post $185,000 worth of bacon, cloth, and so forth, and tell the Indians "Come on, boys, and we will support you as long as that $185,000 lasts," and there would be no expenditure for salaries. One hundred per cent of the appropriation would go to the Indians. In that way it would go further than the gentleman is suggesting; but whether it would really be for the benefit of the Indians is a question on which most authorities disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Most of the authorities will agree that the proper policy is not to give the Indian corn, but to help him to learn how to raise corn and handle his land so as to produce corn for his own support. Most authorities will agree that that is the most beneficial and in the long run the most economical to the Government.

Now, as to this item, the department said:

The Indians to be benefited under this appropriation number approximately 43,300, of which 42,992 are full bloods.

Only $5 per Indian approximately is expended. If you buy bacon, corn, and so forth, $5 would not last long.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Of course, the gentleman understands that other items are being used along with this $185,000 for support and civilization.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am now talking about this item. I read further:

These Indians are scattered over a territory composed of 18,653,014 acres. As most of the land in this State is not adapted to agriculture, many of the Indians are engaged in stock raising, and every effort is being made to advance them along this and similar lines.

In other words, it is a matter of education, as the gentleman from Illinois has emphasized. The greater part of this appropriation is to be expended in the payment of salaries of employees of the several agencies. The gentleman wanted information, and it is here in the hearings.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I read it in the hearings, and that is the reason I introduced the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. All right. We have nothing to conceal. The sum of $96,660.27 is for salaries of employees at the several agencies, of which there are 13, in the performance of their official duties in instructing the Indians; not in handing out rations to them, but in instructing the Indians in the method of stock raising.

The remainder of the appropriation is to be expended for the purchase of subsistence supplies and other miscellaneous expenses in connection with the supervision of these Indians. The entire amount requested will be required for the support and civilization of the Indians in Arizona during the fiscal year 1924.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a speech yesterday. He says there is not a quorum here. There was not a quorum here yesterday. I am sorry his speech does not appear in the RECORD this morning so that those who did not hear it yesterday could have read it to-day. Those who are here to-day who were not here yesterday have not the advantage of the information the gentleman gave us yesterday. If they had heard the speech, they would know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to wipe out the Indian Service, and this amendment is just one of the amendments by which he wants to accomplish the purpose of destroying the Indian Service. I hope the committee will not support his amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. This appropriation is $485,000, and it carries only $12,960.28 for subsistence. I do not know whether that is for subsistence of Indians or of employees of the bureau, or what not; but if every cent of it is used for subsistence of Indians, it is the best argument that can be offered on the floor of this House to show the advancement of the Indians. They have advanced to the point where for this great number, some 43,000 Indians——

Mr. CRAMTON. More than 42,000 full bloods.

Mr. CARTER. Forty-two thousand nine hundred full bloods, or a little less than 43,000, only $12,000 is required for subsistence, less than 30 cents per capita, whereas I dare say 40 years ago it would have taken one-third this entire appropriation for subsistence for the same number of Indians. So I say this item is the best argument for the progress that the Indian is making and a real argument in defense of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This money for subsistence supplies is not used for subsistence of the Indians entirely. It is used in great part for subsistence of employees.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman had only listened to what I said, he would not be wasting our time by repeating my statements. The amount expended for subsistence—$12,000—is such a small portion of the entire amount that any controversy as to whether it be for Indians or employees would be immaterial, irrelevant, and incompetent and might well be stricken out of the record.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman would be happy if not a cent of it went to the Indians?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman is talking about rationing the Indians, I say yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am not talking about that.

Mr. CARTER. I think the quicker you get away from the rationing system and put the Indian on his own feet, as the gentleman has been talking about, the quicker you make a self-sustaining citizen of him, and everyone should certainly know that to be the paramount purpose of the Indian Bureau. I would rather spend money in this bill for educating the Indians and making good self-sustaining citizens of them than to dole it out $5 or $10 at a time for rations or anything else.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is a typical illustration of a radical change sought to be accomplished by one who has no knowledge of the actual facts and conditions on the Indian reservations. The gentleman has obtained the alleged information, which is the basis for his amendment, by hearing somebody tell about the Indians or by reading what somebody else has written about them, but never having visited these Indian reservations and having no personal information as to the facts of course the gentleman does not really know what should be done.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made that statement yesterday, and I admitted that I did not have any reservation in my district, and that therefore I can probably give a little attention to the Indians as well as to the Indian Bureau. I have not an Indian in my district as far as I know.

Mr. HAYDEN. I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no Indians residing in his district, because if he had, and had visited them on their reservations, he would know something about the conditions which exist there. Not having been upon these reservations, the gentleman has acquired from somebody else a mass of misinformation which he is now inflicting upon the House. The fact is that nine-tenths of this appropriation is spent for salaries of Indian agents, stockmen, farmers, and other employees on these reservations. If I understand the gentleman, his desire and purpose in offering his amendment is to cut down the salaries of these employees by three-fourths and expect them to live on the remaining one-fourth, and to dole out to the Indians, either in cash or in goods, the remainder of this appropriation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No, no.

Mr. HAYDEN. That would be the worst calamity that could ever happen to the Indians of Arizona. Fortunately they have never been pauperized. The Navajos, Pimas, Papagoes, and practically all of the Indians in Arizona are self-supporting. They are not ration Indians. The Apaches are the only Indians who ever received rations, and that was at a time when they were prisoners of war. They are the only Indians in Arizona who know anything about the ration system. So long as I remain a Member of this House I shall exercise every effort to prevent any Indian in Arizona from receiving anything in the way of a direct gratuity from the Government of the United States except in the case of the old and infirm. I want every able-bodied Indian to earn his own living and to make his own way, to realize the value of a dollar because he has worked for it. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted, and I presume that he offers it in all seriousness, if it accomplishes that which he seeks to have done, it would result in having three-fourths of this money appropriated out of the Treasury and either paid to the Indians in cash or in goods. This would be a pure gratuity for which they did no work and which they did not honestly earn. This would immediately instill in the minds of the Indians the idea that Uncle Sam, the great father at Washington, owes them a living and that they do not have to work to support themselves and their families.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not concerned about rations, and he should not be, in view of a ration which has been shown to me and for which I will give the authority, Joseph K. Dixon, of Philadelphia. This is the ration for a northern Cheyenne Indian for one month. Here are the rations for one month: Three pounds of meat, one-fourth pound of sugar, one-fourth pound of coffee, two small scoops of flour, little baking powder, salt, and soap. That is the monthly ration for an Indian who is destitute.

Mr. HAYDEN. If that Northern Cheyenne was an able-bodied Indian he ought not to receive any rations from the Government.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. He was destitute, sick, and in a cellar with a dirt floor, with a temperature 40 degrees below zero.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then he should have been sent to one of the Indian Service hospitals.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is just one month's rations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment means nothing more or less than taking money out of the Treasury of the United States and paying it over to able-bodied Indians in the State of Arizona who are now making their own way, who are entirely self-supporting, and who stand before the world as capable of earning their own living. His offering it at this time proves the truth of the old saying that "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing."

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman from Arizona allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. BUTLER. We owe a great duty to the Indians, we all admit that. But this item seems that it is costing us more to feed them than it is to attempt to educate them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly it would cost the Government a large sum of money to feed all of the Indians. I am certain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not want to thus pauperize them.

Mr. BUTLER. Not for a minute, but it seems to me that it may be necessary to expend this large sum of money for agents, inspectors, and so forth. I do not know, for I have never studied the subject as has the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are 13 reservations in Arizona and 43,300 Indians reside thereon. Does the gentleman think that $185,000 is too much overhead to pay for the supervising of all of the affairs of the Arizona Indians, whose property includes over 18,650,000 acres of land?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I was asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. HAYDEN. In further reply to the first remark made by my friend let me say that there was a commission appointed by President Grant to study the Indian problem. That commission reported that it then cost a million dollars to kill an Indian. That figure was derived by dividing the expense of keeping soldiers in the Indian country by the number of Indians that had been killed in warfare. Therefore, the commission concluded that it would be much cheaper to feed them than to kill them, and that was the beginning of the ration system. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 250 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Fort Mojave, Ariz., and for pay of superintendent, $50,000; for general repairs and improvements, and enlarging dining hall, $12,000; for equipment for irrigation plant, $8,000; in all, $70,000.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there is any limitation on the age of a pupil going to a day school or any of the Indian schools.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think there is no limitation of age, although, as a matter of fact, I think almost without exception they are minors.

Mr. WATSON. Is there a limitation of age at the day schools on the reservation?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as I know—and I am a long way from being an authority—there is no limitation of age at any of the Indian schools. Almost every school, excepting those relating to some industrial activity, are attended by minors.

Mr. WATSON. Can men or women regardless of age take advantage of this appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. So far as I know there is nothing to prevent it, but I think that almost without exception the pupils are minors, and it is an exception that one of them is an adult.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Government require compulsory education?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; though the Government in many cases is active in securing the attendance of Indian pupils. I think the gentleman would be interested in reading in the hearings the statement in reference to education by Commissioner Burke, Mr. Meritt, and Mr. McDowell, secretary of the board of Indian commissioners, on the subject of education. All their statements are in the direction that there is a very encouraging movement on the part of the Indians to desire their children to be in school and the desire of the Indian children to go to school. Voluntary applications are greater than the facilities of the schools to accommodate them.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 800 Indian pupils at the Sherman Institute, Riverside, Calif., and for pay of superintendent, including not to exceed $1,000 for printing and issuing school paper, $160,000; for general repairs and improvements, including construction of additional sleeping porches, $15,000; in all, $175,000.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 25, after the word "porches" strike out the rest of the sentence and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$40,000; in all, $200,000."

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, last year when the Interior Department appropriation bill was before the House I offered a group of three amendments. One increased the number of students from 750 to 800. The second increased the allowance for their support from $150,000 to $160,000. The third, $25,000 to provide increased capacity to take care of the additional 50 students.

The committee has adopted now the first two of my amendments offered last year and has provided for the increased attendance at this school by 50 additional pupils. They have made proper provision for their support, but the committee failed to provide funds for increasing the housing facilities. I say that because the item in this bill, "General repairs and improvements, including construction and additional sleeping porches, $15,000," is only the same amount which has been appropriated for a number of years for general repairs and improvements at this school. It has been $15,000 a year right along, except last year, when, there having been a small surplus left over from the year before, this item was cut down to $14,000. It has now been put back to the sum heretofore carried for this purpose. The introduction of the additional language into this bill, to wit, "including construction for additional sleeping porches," without the appropriation of additional money means nothing. It confesses the need for additional sleeping porches but withholds the means for securing them. It is, of course, economy in one sense of the word, for we can refuse to provide any houses for them or any place for them to sleep—they can sleep on the ground—but the purpose of maintaining these schools is to teach, among other things, civilized ways of living. If we want them to retain the habits which they have on the tribal reservations, that is one thing; but when we start out with the idea that the purpose of maintaining these schools is to teach them the ways of civilized people, to teach them trades and occupations, and, for instance, to teach the girls housekeeping, then it seems to me that we ought to at least provide proper housing facilities for them.

Last year I stated that there was a waiting list of 100 Indian children who want an education but could not be admitted to this school for lack of capacity. Then the Greenville Indian School in northern California burned down and many of their students were brought down to Sherman Institute and are being taken care of there as an emergency proposition. They had to be taken care of because there was no place else for them to go. They are crammed in there to-day like sardines. It is a deplorable condition and is to be tolerated only as a temporary situation.

Mr. Meritt, the Assistant Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, has been praised very highly by the members of this committee, who say that he conducts the Indian business economically and efficiently and has never asked for a dollar that he did not need. He asked for this very item, the very amount that I am asking for, for repairs and improvements, $15,000, which has always been allowed, and $25,000 in addition to that for the purpose of providing these much-needed sleeping porches. For the committee to say that changing the amount of the general-repairs item for $14,000 last year to $15,000 this year, when it has been $15,000 for many years, and that that $1,000 increase is to provide sleeping porches is a joke. No man here but knows that you can not put a porch on the front of a private dwelling house for $1,000. But they say they will do it some way. It is like making bricks without straw. It can only be done, if at all, by neglecting some vital and necessary repairs. It may be possible to build the porches and let the roofs leak, but that is mighty poor business and mighty poor economy.

I want now to read the statement of one who knows very well the situation at this school with respect to the amount of money needed for general repairs:

Last year, instead of receiving an additional appropriation it was reduced to $14,000, which has made it difficult to provide needed improvements and repairs. Next year one and probably two new boilers will be an absolute necessity, this requiring an expenditure of approximately $5,000. Extensive repairs to our steam-heating system are also necessary, as well as extensive repairs to the roofs and floors of many buildings, requiring more than ordinary expenditure of funds. A new pump will be needed at the school farm. We can not make these unusual as well as absolutely necessary repairs from the repair fund heretofore allowed from year to year. It is false economy to neglect necessary repairs and improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWING. It seems to me that the committee has overlooked a vital part of this item and has failed to provide any money with which to build the sleeping porches, although it declares that the schools should be equipped with sleeping porches.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How many pupils were there at the time this amount was admitted—750?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. And they propose to admit 50 more and make the same allowance?

Mr. SWING. Yes; but in the meantime they have taken in an additional number. There are in the school now 791, but they are in a deplorable condition—three and four of them jammed into one small room, a thing which would not be permitted under ordinary health and sanitary rules and regulations of any modern city. It is a temporary condition, however, which should be promptly remedied.

I feel there has been an unwarranted discrimination against this school, because the committee in the case of every other school of this class, where they have added 50 pupils they have also added a substantial sum to the usual amount of the repair fund for the purpose of building additional sleeping porches, and only in the instance of the Sherman Institute have they failed to provide any appropriation over and above the amount usually appropriated for ordinary repairs.

This school, in my opinion, is one of the best schools in the United States. It gives the most for the money. Last year the committee brought out the information that out of 26 schools in the United States 65 per cent exceeded the lawful maximum rate per capita, which is $250 where there are less than 200 pupils and $225 where there are more than 200 pupils. This school in Riverside made the remarkable record last year of $168 per capita. There are only two other schools in the United States that beat it. One is at Cherokee, in North Carolina, which is an unfair comparison, because there a number of the pupils are day students only, and the Government is not paying for their food and clothing. The other is the Chilocco school in Oklahoma, which is partially endowed, because it owns 8,000 acres of land, 6,000 of which are under cultivation. Taking school for school, of those which are in the same class as this, you will find that this school is the most economically and efficiently operated Indian school in the United States. With this fine record we ought not to hesitate to provide facilities for taking care of those Indian children who desire to attend this school. I agree with the committee and compliment it upon the idea that they are carrying out of enlarging these schools, because they have found it to be true that where they increased the number of students at a school they decreased the per capita cost, because the overhead is about the same in any event.

Mr. HAYDEN. Where do the pupils come from that principally attend the Sherman Institute?

Mr. SWING. I have 12 reservations in my district; some of them come from along the Colorado River.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the gentleman sure that none of them come from outside of the State of California?

Mr. SWING. Oh, yes; they come from all the Southwest, because the school has an excellent standing and a fine reputation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not a fact that much more than half the students at that school are from States outside of California?

Mr. SWING. I do not think as many as that. There was last year a waiting list of 100. I tried to get 2 pupils in myself, but was unable to get them in.

Mr. HAYDEN. And those were California Indians that the gentleman tried to get in?

Mr. SWING. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly they ought to take care of the California students rather than send outside of the State and pay transportation charges for bringing them in.

Mr. SWING. Oh, they do not send outside of the State to get them. They come there of their own accord, many paying their own traveling expenses in order to get there.

Mr. Meritt said in testifying before the committee:

> This is one of our best schools, and we feel that the Indian children are fortunate to have a school like this in which to get an education.

And the Indian children do feel just that way, and that is why there is a waiting list all the time. With this magnificent plant, with a wonderful record for efficiency and economy, we ought to be glad to avail ourselves of its usefulness by increasing its capacity without at all increasing its overhead expenses. I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in opposition to the amendment. I am very frank to admit it is difficult to oppose such an amendment, both because of the sincere zeal of the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING], who has urged the amendment not only on the floor but in personal conversation with the chairman of the subcommittee on several occasions, and in addition to that there is the recognition on the part of the subcommittee that this is one of the very good schools and that it is doing very good work. Of this school it was said a year ago by Mr. Meritt that if they had the money for repairs and improvements and additional construction, they could take care of 1,000 at a small additional cost. The attendance at that time at the school was 732. That was within the appropriation made at that time. The average attendance of the current year is 791, and the administration of the school should be given credit that with an appropriation for 750 pupils they have actually taken care of 791, and that at a per capita cost, as the gentleman says, below that authorized by law. The average cost is only $168. They make a splendid showing. The present bill proposes an appropriation for 800, which is 50 more than the appropriation for the current year. It is only nine above the average attendance at the present time.

Mr. SWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. SWING. That is an increase from 732 last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, yes; I get all of that.

Mr. SWING. And 791 this year, with no additional appropriation for the increase.

Mr. CRAMTON. I admit all of that. The present attendance is 791, and we are appropriating for 800, and we anticipate that they will have room for more than 800.

Now, it is true that if we give them $40,000, as the gentleman proposes, they would pretty well fill up the school next year; if we gave them more they would fill it up, because we are not alone taking care of California there but we are taking care of the Navajos and other tribes as well. The gentleman has made comparison with other schools and talked about endowments and farms, and so forth. This school received from agricultural products raised on 146 acres $21,812, and all of it goes to any purpose they want for the maintenance of that institution. In the Cherokee School, over in North Carolina, where they have a most remarkable per capita cost—and the gentleman referred to that school as having such a large income—the total value of the agricultural products raised there was $5,314; the value of other products was $1,905; and the amount received for labor was $273.73.

Mr. SWING. What conclusion does the gentleman draw from the comparison of the two schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am simply emphasizing the fact that while a splendid showing has been made by the Sherman Institute a similar splendid showing has also been made by the Cherokee School and by other schools.

Now, the difficulty that confronted the Budget officers passing on this matter, and the difficulty that confronts the committee facing the problems of these schools, is that they all make appeals which we would like to grant, but there must be a sum total after all and there must be an apportionment between the schools, and we must face the fire of such gentlemen as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], who charges that the bill already is too large.

We must not unduly increase the amounts. They have 791 pupils now. We appropriate for 800. That is an increase really of 9, although I am frank to say that if we give them that they will have over 800 pupils in the school. I dare say that they have them packed pretty closely now. But, on the other hand, gentlemen are complaining that we are giving too much luxury to the Indians.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Having great confidence in the gentleman's good judgment, I would like to know whether he thinks those children are overcrowded? I am particular about that. I hope they are not overcrowded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am sure that the management are packing them as closely as is conducive to good health. They are trying to take care of as many as they can. There is no evidence about their being packed in to an extent that is injurious to their health. The management are trying to get the most out of the money which the Government gives them.

Mr. SWING. Sixty were moved down from our end of the State, and the institution had no choice, but had to receive them.

Mr. CRAMTON. And the appropriation carried an extra amount to take care of them. I admit that they are crowded in as close as they ought to be, but not closer than is consistent with good health. There is no evidence to the contrary.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Are they crowded in as closely as they are in the public schools in Washington?

Mr. CRAMTON. That depends upon whose judgment you follow.

Mr. WINGO. It is not a question of judgment. It is a question of mathematics.

Mr. CRAMTON. It depends on whose mathematics. But let us take up the District bill when we come to it.

Mr. WINGO. It is a matter of comparison.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say that white children sometimes are pretty well crowded.

Mr. WINGO. If the children are crowded in these Indian schools as badly as the children are crowded in the city of Washington, I think we are treating them shamefully.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman does not mind, I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. Meritt states in the hearings that the $15,000 covers also the construction of additional sleeping porches for the accommodation of the added number of pupils. The cost of the sleeping porches is $5,000; and to be sure of what his understanding is, I talked with him this morning, and I am advised that if this $15,000 is given they will find, in that $15,000, $5,000 for the construction of additional sleeping porches, and therefore the increase as anticipated will be taken care of, although not as fully as the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] or I myself would like.

Mr. CARTER. You will notice that the statement is that the approximate cost of the sleeping porches is $5,000, which is to be taken from the $15,000 appropriation?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. That is about the same proportion of increase for improvement that they allowed to the Phoenix school in the same climate where they have different conditions and where it is better for the children to sleep in sleeping porches than inside?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words for the purpose of asking a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BUTLER. What does the superintendent say about the crowded condition there? Does he make a request for this additional money?

Mr. CRAMTON. The superintendent asked for repairs and improvements, $30,000; for new buildings, $75,000; for equipment, gymnasium, and hospital, and so forth, $15,000; purchase of additional land, $75,000. That is the superintendent's idea. He evidently supports the $15,000 anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. Does he speak especially of the crowded condition there?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have nothing on that, but I will state that it is admitted that the institution is filled up now, but they have a wonderful climate in California, and they will stand crowding.

Mr. BUTLER. There is none better.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition for the purpose of asking the chairman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. KETCHAM. Just a moment ago the chairman made reference to the total value of agricultural products at this Riverside school. We have been making some comparisons, based on the value of these agricultural productions per acre at each Indian school, and I find that this school at Riverside, Calif., their production is $149.39 per acre, rather an unusual production. In contrast with that of the Cherokee Indian school in North Carolina they have $106.06 per acre. How does the committee arrive at that? That is an unusual production.

Mr. CARTER. I suppose it is arrived at by setting down just exactly what was produced. But you can not always tell by the area how much the products will amount to.

Mr. KETCHAM. It is the quality of the area?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes. The land may be better in one place than in another.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I can explain that in a nutshell. One is irrigated land, the other is not. Therefore one is more intensely cultivated, with a much better production than the other.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman is not exactly clear about that, is he? Does he say the lands at Cherokee are irrigated?

Mr. CARTER. No; the lands at Riverside are irrigated.

Mr. KETCHAM. The production at Cherokee is larger than at Riverside.

Mr. CARTER. I thought the gentleman made the other statement.

Mr. KETCHAM. No. One is $106.06 and the other $149.39.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SWING) there were—ayes 9, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, Calif., including pay of superintendent, $22,500; for general repairs and improvements, $6,000; in all, $28,500.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 36, line 3, strike out the figures "$22,500," in line 3, page 36, and insert "$24,000," and in line 4, page 36, strike out the figures "$28,500" and insert the figures "$30,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, this change of $1,500 looks almost infinitesimal. It ought to be at least $10,000 instead of that amount, at a very low estimate. There will be an increasing number of pupils at this school the coming year. The department in its estimate and in its statement before the committee urges that the amount of $30,000 be allowed, $24,000 for superintendent and maintenance and $6,000 for repairs.

I want to say now in response to what was said yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I think the gentleman did not really mean what he said when he said that this is a very expensive school. The misfortune is that several of these schools are not like some of the larger ones, for which a great amount of money has been poured out. In this school, as in others that I know of, the superintendent gives at least half of his time, if not more, and the employees give about half of their time as agents outside of the schools, traveling over the district and the State, and at this particular school traveling over three States looking after the Indians' lands and the Indians' interests. So that ought not to be charged to the per capita of the school, although it is unjustly so charged. This school ought to have this amount, and I trust the committee will not oppose this slight increase.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. When we had the last amendment up I suggested to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], in charge of the bill, that if these Indian schools were as crowded as the schools in the city of Washington they ought to have some relief. My friend suggested that that depended on whose judgment was taken. I am not taking the judgment of anybody on the question of the schools of the District of Columbia. I am basing my conclusions upon a personal knowledge, mathematical and mechanical, as well as a general survey of the schools of the District of Columbia. Of course, we are what might be called a city council for the District of Columbia. Nobody can ever accuse me of partiality for the District of Columbia, but candor compels me to admit that every time I look into the school situation in the District of Columbia I blush with shame.

The schools in this District are not taken care of as they should be. I think I know some of the reasons why they are not. It is a reflection upon Congress that we permit the condition to exist that does exist here. The facilities are inadequate and the schools in every way might be improved by a proper recognition of the problems and by proper appropriations, and by a businesslike constructive program extending over a term of years. I say that not only from the standpoint of business judgment but as one who has given a good deal of study to education. I have taken a great deal of interest in it. I have taught school myself and I am always interested in the public-

school system anywhere. I state, as my judgment based upon a personal study of the school system in the city of Washington, that it is a shame and a disgrace that Congress does not treat the schools of this District better than it does.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, speaking in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], the maximum per capita cost for pupils at these Indian schools is $250 for schools of the size of the institution in question and $225 for the larger schools. The Indian Service, however, has been able to administer these schools so economically that they are being maintained upon a per capita cost of $200 for schools of the larger size and $225 for schools of this size, and this bill is framed upon that basis, except in the case of two or three schools in the extreme north where, naturally, the cost of fuel and so forth is greater during the winter. Schools in North Dakota and Montana, I think, are the only exceptions. The schools in California are based on a per capita cost of $225 for the smaller ones, and the committee has therefore cut the budget estimate as to this school, where there are only 100 pupils appropriated for, to conform to that general policy. The sum of $22,500 allows them the same amount proportionately as is carried for other small boarding schools through the country. In addition to that, this school, which is a small one, has $6,000 coming in from the operation of its farm, and that is also used for the support and maintenance of the school.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Did the gentleman have anything before the committee to show the amount of work performed by the superintendent and officers of this school in the handling of Indian property and disposing of materials of the Indians outside of the school?

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it the purpose to give this $1,500 increase to the superintendent?

Mr. RAKER. No; it is for the general business of the school.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I think that matter is quite immaterial. I have no information on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 36, between lines 4 and 5, add as a new paragraph the following:

"For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Greenville School, California, including pay for superintendent, $24,000; for general repairs and improvements, $4,000; for repair of school building on account of and by reason of the fire of December 17, 1921, to be immediately available, $60,000; in all, $88,000."

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. SWING] has presented a good statement in regard to the Riverside School. A part of the pupils from the Greenville School went there and are there at present. They are not appropriated for. I have looked over the provision for the school at Carson and there is no provision for them there. I visited that school, went over there to look at it, and spent some little time there. No provision is made for them at the schools in Oregon and none in the other schools in California.

It was stated positively, and the RECORD will show it was stated, that they were going to transfer these pupils to the Bidwell Indian School and improve the Bidwell School and give additional buildings and equipment so as to provide for them there. They have not done so. They have made no provision for these Indian children. When the deficiency bill was up June 23, 1922, I presented an amendment which was ruled out on a point of order. At that time I showed that there are 28 public buildings—I want to call this particularly to the attention of the subcommittee and the committee—28 public buildings unused, standing idle. The valuation of this property was $250,000. There are 320 acres of Government land not estimated in value but probably worth $15,000, a good farm and good equipment. We have had already in the bill provision for sleeping porches, $10,000 or $20,000, and gymnasiums. Here is a school, and I care not who makes the report, I know that nobody has been there except perhaps some subagent. They may write to the committee and make statements, but I know that nobody has been there with authority, except, perhaps, Mr. Pierce may have been there, but nobody else. None of the committee is personally familiar with it. Everybody in the community is desirous of having the building destroyed by fire on December 21 rebuilt.

The people in the community that have the lumber are willing to turn it over at cost to the Government so that the building can be built without delay. Now, these Indians live within a small radius of this school building. I have been familiar with that for many years. Years ago I worked in the Indian valley in haying and the harvest fields. I am familiar with the Indians who live there, their condition. I know you can paint a beautiful picture of the school at Carlisle. I have been there. You can describe the surroundings of the school at Riverside, and there is no better place on earth. I have helped take Indians there when I was on the bench to give the girls a better consideration rather than turning them out loose. I have seen the schools in Oregon and Nevada.

This is a school where there are 70 to 100 pupils. The climatic conditions are the best, there are fine surroundings, where the children can go home and visit their parents and come back again. Thirty years ago they had no houses there but only wikiups.

To-day some have very good homes and outbuildings. They have automobiles and are trying to become civilized, working up. Now, because you will not give $25,000 or $30,000 for a new building you are to abandon the property you have. You take these little Indian boys and girls from their parents and send them—the nearest location 700 miles away—to schools scattered over four different States. I appeal to this committee: Is it right, is it proper, is it just? It may be that some special reason is being exerted to prevent this building from being erected. I can not believe it. Both Senators from California are desirous of securing this building. Every member of the congressional delegation from California and the people of the community, public officials, superintendent of schools of the State of California, the board of charity and corrections, that have visited the place, all unite in a desire for this building.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I know of no more worthy cause, no more worthy purpose. I know of no place where this amount of money could be so well expended with as much advantage as it can be to build this building that can be put up in two months and give these Indians an opportunity for a better education. Education as I speak of it now in this school and all these schools is not simply book learning but an education so that the Indian can go out and make a living when he gets through his school.

Gentlemen, this school at Bidwell and Greenville, if I had the time to go into it minutely, to show you the benefits to the Indians, the advantages they derive from these schools, I know you would grant the request of these people.

Go out there and visit them now and you will see Indians grown up from little boys and girls dressed as they ought to be. They keep their persons in proper shape. Their health has increased 90 per cent, and it is by virtue of the instruction that they have received. It is by virtue of the surroundings of the schools, and in addition to that they have assisted people in the community, so that the young Indians are healthy and clean and do not have contagious and infectious diseases. These pupils go home and assist the men and women and other young Indians that are not going to school to get better results. These Indians are law-abiding, they are sober now—they never violated the law except when the white man interfered—and the community has been benefited by these schools. I trust that the committee will see its way clear at this time to provide for the destroyed buildings, which the Indians were not responsible for, but one of pure accident.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has offered an amendment for the repair of the buildings. The amendment is a subterfuge. What is sought is to put up a building to replace one destroyed by fire. It is in this language because otherwise it would be subject to a point of order which would have been made. The gentleman spoke about the value of the institution having been placed at $230,000 or more. The report made to Congress last year, which is shown on page 289 of the hearings, gives the value of the plant at $71,708, and subsequent to that time the principal building of the plant was destroyed.

The building housed the dormitory, the dining room, the kitchen, the clothing and school rooms. That is the building destroyed by fire, and it does not say partially destroyed. That housed those principal activities of the school. It is safe to

say that most of the $71,000 of valuation was destroyed by the fire. That having occurred, the committee was impressed a year ago, and the Indian Service took the same position, that it was the proper occasion for the consolidation of the school activities in the larger schools in that part of the country, the cost per capita being less, and, on the other hand, there are the benefits which the child receives because of the larger schools, there is a better morale, and the results are better generally. The committee did not last year provide for the rebuilding of the school, and I trust the House will not do so now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAKER) there were—ayes 12, noes 11.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan demands tellers. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Eighteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 350 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich., and for pay of superintendent, $79,000; for general repairs and improvements, $12,000; in all, $91,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling to the attention of the committee some facts which I have worked out in connection with one item that appears in the report of the committee in respect to every one of these schools mentioned in the report, namely, the production per acre of agricultural products. I think a comparative table of these figures will be of interest. I give them for the various schools noted in the report.

Beginning with Arizona, at the Fort Mojave School, it amounted to $58.33; at the Phoenix School it amounted to $99.97; at the Truxton Canyon School, $103.86. In California, at the Riverside School it amounted to $149.39; at the Fort Bidwell School, $47.51. In Kansas, at the Haskell Institute it amounted to $60.31. In Michigan, at the Mount Pleasant School it amounted to $96.85. In Minnesota, at the Pipestone School it amounted to $32.26. In Nebraska, at the Genoa School it amounted to $48.89; and in Nevada, at the Carson City School it amounted to $17.05. In New Mexico, at the Albuquerque School, $195.86; and at the Santa Fe School, $137.46. In North Carolina, at the Cherokee School, $166.06; and in North Dakota, at the Bismarck School, $39.50; at the Fort Totten School, $30.21; at the Wahpeton School, $23.61. In Oklahoma, at the Chilocco School it amounted to $6.15, and at the Cherokee Orphan School, $26.31. In Oregon, at the Salem School it amounted to $32.72; and in South Dakota, at the Flandreau School, $71.48; at the Pierre School, $31.26; at the Rapid City School, $11.41. In Wisconsin, at the Hayward School it amounted to $30.16, and at the Tomah School, $41.61. In Wyoming, at the Shoshone School it amounted to $4.83.

The extremes will prove interesting. The lowest production per acre was in Wyoming, at the Shoshone School, where it was $4.83; and the highest in New Mexico, at the Albuquerque School, $195.86. Striking an average of them all, it appears to me that the showing from the standpoint of agriculture is a very satisfactory one and indicates that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is giving attention to a very vital and important proposition in teaching these Indians how to conduct their agricultural enterprises successfully.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Can the gentleman give me the figures upon the Sac and Fox School in Iowa, which is in my district?

Mr. KETCHAM. I regret that I am unable to do so, because the figures for that school are not given in the report, and that was the source of my information. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MADDEN having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was presented by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On December 20, 1922:

H. R. 11040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the sale of the marine hospital reservation in Cleveland, Ohio," approved July 26, 1916.

On December 27, 1922:

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary; and

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921.

On December 28, 1922:

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askell;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case; and

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For promoting civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, $110,000, to be paid from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of said Indians, arising under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889, to be used exclusively for the purposes following: Not exceeding $35,000 of this amount may be expended for general agency purposes; not exceeding $15,000 may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in aiding in the construction, equipment, and maintenance of additional public schools in connection with, and under the control of, the public-school system of the State of Minnesota, said additional school buildings to be located at places contiguous to Indian children who are now without proper public-school facilities, said amount to be immediately available; not exceeding $15,000 may be expended in aiding indigent Chippewa Indians upon the condition that any funds used in support of a member of the tribe shall be reimbursed out of and become a lien against any individual property of which such member may now or hereafter become seized or possessed, and the Secretary of the Interior shall annually transmit to Congress at the commencement of each regular session a complete and detailed statement of such expenditures, the two preceding requirements not to apply to any old, infirm, or indigent Indian, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior; not exceeding $45,000 may be expended for the support of the Indian hospitals.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I do that for the purpose of calling attention to the situation arising from this provision which I believe will result in the Government being required to pay back some millions of dollars which have been taken from the tribal funds in violation of law. The provision here is for promoting civilization and self-support among the Chippewa Indians, $110,000, to be paid from the principal sum on deposit to the credit of said Indians arising under section 7 of the act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889. The Committee on Indian Affairs some time ago held extended hearings on the Chippewa Indian matters and found a most complicated and involved condition due to bureau control. One or two things stood out clear and distinct, however. One is that the act of 1889 prohibits Congress from appropriating money from the tribal funds of this tribe for the purpose of maintaining officials of the Indian Bureau and for administrative expenses on the reservation. Section 7 of that act reads as follows:

That all money accruing from the disposal of said lands in conformity with the provisions of this act shall, after deducting all the expenses of making the census, of obtaining the cession and relinquishment, of making the removal and allotments, and of completing the surveys and appraisals, in this act provided, be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of all the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota as a permanent fund, which shall draw interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, payable annually for the period of 50 years, after the allotments provided for in this act have been made, and which interest and permanent fund shall be expended for the benefit of said Indians in manner following: One-half of said interest shall during the said period of 50 years, except in the cases hereinafter otherwise provided, be annually paid in cash in equal shares to the heads of families and guardians of orphan minors for their use; and one-fourth of said interest shall during the same period and with the like exception be annually paid in cash in equal shares per capita to all other classes of said Indians; and the remaining one-fourth of said interest shall during the said period of 50 years, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be devoted exclusively to the establishment and maintenance of a system of free schools among said Indians in their midst and for their benefit, and at the expiration of the said 50 years the said permanent fund shall be divided and paid to all of said Chippewa Indians and their issue then living in cash in equal shares: *Provided*, That Congress may in its discretion from time to time during the said period of 50 years appropriate for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the said Indians a portion of said principal sum not exceeding 5 per cent thereof.

We have had for some years past a provision in the bill taking out of the tribal funds large sums, running up to as high as $180,000, for the support and civilization of the Indians and the maintenance of the employees and administrative expenses. It has always been held by the Indians involved that this was not a rightful charge against the tribal funds. Millions have been taken from the tribal funds, which have been

cut in two, and certainly some day a claim will lie. A provision in this item I seek to strike out provides a sum of money for schools. There is some $50,000 now being spent out of this interest on these Chippewa funds. There is provision here that $35,000 shall be spent for agency expenses, every dollar of it unwarranted, and I believe in violation of the act of 1889, and the claim will lie against the Government for every dollar of this expenditure, extending over the years since 1911. The intent of the act was that at the end of 50 years the principal should be divided among the then living members of the tribe. If the present policy is continued they will be turned loose as paupers, with only a memory of past riches.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course, this is an appropriation bill; but after a provision upon it is passed by the Congress authorizing certain tribal funds to be expended, is not that authority of law for that expenditure; and where it is so authorized now in the years to come could they come back and say that there was no authority of law for the expenditure?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is surely no authority to carry items on appropriation bills which violate a law on the statute books.

Mr. BLANTON. To that extent would it not be a repeal of that law?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That question has not been decided judicially, to my knowledge. The Supreme Court did have a phase of this question before it some years ago. In 1915, on the 4th of March, a resolution was passed through this House carrying on the appropriations for the year previous by general resolution. One of the Chippewa Indians took the matter to court, and that court held that Congress by a general resolution could not detail this appropriation in the bill, but it was appealed to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court decided that by general resolution this appropriation could be continued, but the question of the power of Congress to appropriate from these tribal funds for administrative purposes was not decided.

The question as to whether Congress had the power to take the tribal funds in violation of a specific statute was not at issue, although it has been stated before the Committee on Indian Affairs that it was in question. I maintain that this appropriation of $110,000 is unnecessary, in view of the fact that some $250,000 is available from interest on the tribal funds, and the act itself provides how this sum can be expended. By striking it out you will do no injury to the Indians, and at the same time we make sure that there shall not be any claims on the part of these Indians against the Government for this sum in addition to the amount already involved in these appropriations. The Chippewas have the right to have the act of 1889 carried out as written and as it was explained to them by the commissioners. The commissioners agreed that it would not be so used, and it should not be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEENERSON: Page 40, at the end of line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "at the Red Lake, Croquet, and White Earth."

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain the reason for this amendment. Up to last year the agency for the Chippewas of Minnesota was at White Earth, and there were erected there numerous buildings, including a very fine and practically new hospital, with full equipment and furniture and everything to accommodate those people. The agency being moved to Leech Lake, quite a long distance away, about 100 miles away, these buildings have been abandoned.

Now, there are on White Earth Reservation something like 7,000 or 8,000 Indians, and many of them are very poor. Many of them, of course, are well to do. But owing to the peculiar theories of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] having been carried out one year, by which the appropriations were taken away from the agency at White Earth, they received no medical attention, and the condition is very bad among the poor Indians.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that as to the $25,000 which has been carried for the three hospitals there, two of them have been discontinued and the money spent for one?

Mr. STEENERSON. I went to the White Earth Reservation last October. I met a great many people there. I saw this hospital, which is in splendid condition, even to the beds and bedclothes and furniture and everything, although it has been closed for a year. They were complaining that there were scores of sick people that needed hospitalization a few miles away. I at once sent a telegram to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs requesting that this hospital be opened. I sent a similar telegram to the President of the United States and explained that there was real urgency, according to the evidence of scores of people that I met there at the White Earth Reservation, so called. The answer came in this way; here is the telegram:

Replying to your telegram of October 24, White Earth boarding school hospital closed as the result of reduced appropriation brought about by the activities of the Chippewa General Council and Attorney Ballinger.

That is the result of carrying out the theory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think the bill already accomplishes what the gentleman wants.

Mr. STEENERSON. It may, but I want to make it sure. If I may be permitted, I want to explain this. I think I am entitled to the opportunity to do it. I read further:

We are asking in our estimate for increased Chippewa appropriations so that White Earth, Fond du Lac, and Red Lake hospitals may be operated for the benefit of the Indians. If these appropriations are made immediately available White Earth hospital can be opened as soon as Congress passes the Interior Department appropriation bill. We will appreciate your cooperation in procuring the necessary appropriation.

The whole telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October 24, 1922.*

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,
Detroit, Minn.:

Your telegram October 24. White Earth boarding school and hospital closed as result of reduced appropriations brought about by activities of Chippewa General Council and Attorney Ballinger. No appropriations now available for operating White Earth hospital. We are asking in our estimates for increased Chippewa appropriations so that White Earth, Fond du Lac, and Red Lake hospitals may be operated for benefit of Indians. If these appropriations are made immediately available White Earth hospital can be opened as soon as Congress passes Interior Department appropriation bill. Will appreciate your cooperation in procuring necessary appropriations.

E. B. MERITT,
Acting Commissioner.

Now, then, I got a letter to the same effect—that the appropriations were not sufficient. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] has got the estimates there, and I think they show that the appropriation for 1922 was $20,000. They only used a little over $9,000, so they had over $10,000 unexpended balance of that item for that year. If they spend the same amount for the current year they will have enough to run both hospitals the balance of this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. It shows an appropriation of $20,000, and they spent $9,000. That is for the current year—1923. If the expenditures for this year are the same as those of the year before, then there would be the difference between $17,500 and $9,000 available for the opening of the White Earth hospital. But although there was an absolute emergency there to my certain knowledge—being right on the spot when I telegraphed to the department—they answered that the appropriations were not sufficient. They have had $17,500, yet the record here before the committee shows that they used only $9,000 for the hospital, and you have the difference between $9,000 and $17,000, or $8,000, to run the hospital at White Earth for a few months the rest of this fiscal year.

Now, the money provided in this bill will not be available for opening the White Earth hospital until the 1st of July next. I intend to offer another amendment to make the money immediately available. I am specifying three places where Mr. Meritt, in his statement before the committee, says he intends to use this money. He says it is for the Cloquet, Red Lake, and White Earth hospitals. I presume he intends to do that. But for the satisfaction of the people there, where there are many Indians suffering for lack of hospital treatment, it

should be specifically stated, because in the current year and the year before there was a lump-sum appropriation for these hospitals and they used the money for only one.

There could be no objection to specifying here that this $45,000 provided in this bill shall be for maintenance of the hospital at Red Lake, where they have one, and at Cloquet, where the commissioner says he is going to maintain one, and where there is a hospital that is vacant and that could be continued in operation, and at White Earth, where the hospital is fully equipped to take care of the people by just putting in the help.

Mr. BURTNESS. I saw the hospital and the Government buildings there on the Indian reservation a few months ago, and I was just wondering if the gentleman could give us any information with reference to the closing of the school on that reservation. They have splendid school buildings, and, if I were correctly informed, the school has been closed for a year or two.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; that is true, and the only reason why we have not made any effort in this Congress to change that situation is that they are negotiating with the State authorities for the disposal of that school. There is a school there that cost probably $50,000, and there are some 600 acres of land connected with it. If the legislation already enacted is not sufficient, I should like to have a provision inserted in this bill authorizing the sale. However, the bill of a year ago, I think, carried sufficient authority for the sale, but the State authorities have not carried out that proposition, because they claimed that the legislature of Minnesota must first take action, which, it is expected, they will take next month when they meet in biennial session. That is the reason why that school still stands vacant.

Mr. BURTNESS. Is it the intention to convert it into a State school and sell it to the State?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. The appropriation bill a year ago, I think, carried authority for the United States to transfer this school property and the land connected with it to the State of Minnesota for school purposes and other public purposes, and the State of Minnesota is now going to enact a law that will enable them to do so.

I hope that the amendment will be carried so that it will relieve these people from the anxiety which they now suffer.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is entirely unnecessary. The language of the current law, as the gentleman stated, was broad enough to have permitted a portion of the $17,500 to be spent at any of the three hospitals named. It is being spent only at the Red Lake hospital, because a year ago, when they asked for the $17,500, it was expressly stated that it was for the hospital at Red Lake and not for the other two; and so good faith required the Indian Bureau to spend it for the one where they stated it would be spent.

Mr. STEENERSON. Why did they represent to me that they had not any appropriation when they had $17,500, which is nearly twice as much as they spent for that one hospital last year?

Mr. CRAMTON. Because in good faith they could not spend it anywhere except at Red Lake, where they said they were going to spend it.

Mr. STEENERSON. There was no such provision in the act. It was for the support of Indian hospitals in Minnesota generally.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; but there was an understanding with Congress, and good faith required them to keep that understanding.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then people must die for want of care because of a secret understanding with the committee?

Mr. CRAMTON. As a matter of fact the whole trouble has been that they have been hollering around that they did not want the money spent for this purpose, and because of that attitude on their part we shut up two of the hospitals, and they have been hollering ever since to get them opened again; and it has taken some time to do it. Now, this year the Indian Bureau have evidenced their good faith by asking for an increased appropriation for this purpose.

Their statement is that the item of $45,000 for Indian hospitals is $25,500 more than that authorized therefor for the current fiscal year ($17,500). This appropriation was for only one hospital, viz, that at Red Lake, the hospitals formerly operated at Cloquet and White Earth having been discontinued. However, the Indians themselves have asked that these two hospitals be reopened and that the expense thereof be paid from their tribal funds, in view of the lack of other adequate facilities of this nature. Under the circumstances it is desired to reestablish the hospitals at Cloquet and White Earth, which explains the increase in the amount requested for such purposes. So that if the bill passes as now written, without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the two hospitals in which he is interested will be reopened and cared for out of the $45,000, and the gentleman's amendment will be mere surplusage.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then we are reduced to this situation: We have got to depend upon a private agreement between the committee and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs instead of depending upon what is written in the law.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; there was an express agreement between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Congress of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is a most honored Member.

Mr. STEENERSON. Therefore the gentleman thinks we ought to leave this matter in doubt. Why should we have to depend upon such an agreement with the committee? Let us put it right in the law saying that these three hospitals which they say they are going to reestablish shall be provided for so as to relieve the anxiety of the people on White Earth Reservation and the other reservation. It can not hurt anything to put it into the law, instead of having a private agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee which the Indians up there do not know anything about.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the chairman in charge of the bill [Mr. CRAMTON] if this bill passes, the appropriations, of course, will not be available until the 1st of next July? Where is there any provision here making the appropriation mentioned by the gentleman immediately available?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is no such provision, and there is none in the pending amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, that being the case, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who has been sitting here patiently all day long waiting for this item to come up, so that he could have this hospital provided for, is right about it.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the gentleman proposes to offer such an amendment, but has not offered it yet.

Mr. STEENERSON. I said I was going to offer it.

Mr. CRAMTON. What I have been saying is in relation to the pending amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. And when the gentleman from Minnesota offers the other amendment, then the gentleman from Michigan is going to crucify that also, is he?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not know. We have not reached that yet.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman would not object to that, then?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am discussing the amendment which is before the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. The point is simply this: The gentleman from Minnesota says these hospitals are closed up, that they are needed, and he wants them reopened now, and he says that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has promised him that if he would help make the money available in this bill he would reopen them. The gentleman from Minnesota is seeking to do that very thing. If he fails in doing it, the hospitals are going to remain closed. So I think there is a good deal of merit in what the gentleman from Minnesota is saying, and I think there ought to have been a provision inserted in this bill making this money immediately available, so that they can be opened up now, and not wait until next July.

Mr. BURTNESS. Possibly there is some arrangement between the subcommittee and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs so that they may be opened up.

Mr. BLANTON. I will admit that the subcommittee is practically all powerful, that it has unlimited power, but it can not by private agreement with anyone make this money available unless it is so stated in this bill. It has to be specified in the bill; they can not have a secret understanding that money appropriated shall become available before next July. It has to be written into the bill, and the gentleman from Minnesota has been here long enough to know it, and that is why he is now fighting for this proposition. I think the money ought to be made available, and I trust that his amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify my amendment by adding "which sum is to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that he may modify his amendment as reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment by Mr. STEENERSON: Page 40, at the end of line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following words: At Red Lake, Cloquet, and White Earth, which sum is to be immediately available.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment in its original form was not objectionable, but it was unnecessary. In its present form it makes available for use this year $45,000 that was estimated as necessary for three hospitals next year. I hope in that form it will not be adopted.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will modify it so as to provide that $15,000 be made immediately available for the White Earth hospital.

Mr. CRAMTON. That would leave only $30,000 for the three hospitals next year. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. STEENERSON. They are dying there for the want of this hospital service.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh no; they wanted the hospital closed at one time, and it was closed in response to their clamor.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEENERSON) there were 9 ayes and 13 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw from the Treasury of the United States, in his discretion, the sum of $35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the principal sum on deposit to the credit of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota arising under section 7 of the act of January 14, 1889, and to expend the same for payment of tuition for Chippewa Indian children enrolled in the public schools of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There has been a good deal said here about the policy in regard to Indian affairs, and I think that the situation in Minnesota is a pretty good object lesson on that subject. A great many in Minnesota shared the view of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that the way to civilize the Indians was to release them from all Government restrictions in the control and management of their property. That was done in the case of mixed-blood Indians on the reservation in 1910 or 1911. The amendment was put on in the Senate as a rider on the Indian appropriation bill and agreed to in conference, so there was no opportunity to vote upon it in the House. So it became the law, and it released the mixed-blood Indians from the restrictions as to the alienation of land. They had before that been allotted valuable land in 80-acre tracts, some worth $15,000 and some running down to $1,000. There was a lumber company there that had employed the leaders to help acquire the land that had been allotted. The speculators went in there and took advantage of these mixed-blood Indians, many of whom were entirely incompetent. The greatest Indian fraud and scandal ever known in the Northwest resulted.

Some time thereafter when the department woke up to the situation there were 1,100 or 1,200 lawsuits started to set aside the title to land which had been acquired for little or nothing through fraud and deceit from these people. Many Indians claimed to be mixed blood that were not in order to sell their allotments for what they could get. Many were swindled out of all they had and are now poor and in distress. It was the theory advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that they ought to be let loose from Government control that was their undoing. On the other hand, the Red Lake Indians, who were by far the least advanced, have never been relieved of restrictions, still own their land, and are now better off than the others.

They have their own property, they are advanced greatly in agriculture and industry, and they are doing well. There is little disease among them, whereas among the others the reverse is true. The Minnesota board of health investigated the situation for fear it would have to be taken care of by the State. Here you have an object lesson of the working of the theory advanced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He wants to remove restrictions on all. The test of the thing is and ought to be, are they competent? No one knowing the Indians, the half-blood or the mixed blood, would claim that they should be relieved from Government restrictions unless they are reasonably able to take care of their own affairs. The clamor here was that when a man was mixed blood, when he was a half-blood, he ought to be turned loose, and he was turned loose. But he was not competent. Some of them got a fair price for their land and some of them just about gave it away. Some fooled it away in a few days. Some gambled it away. One Indian, who had received a large sum, wanted to ride in state, so he went to town and bought a hearse and sat down in it and rode through the town showing that he was as big as any white man. [Laughter.] That shows that he was not competent to take care of his own affairs.

These gentlemen who are philosophizing so much about the Indians ought to go and get acquainted with them before they lay down general rules on that subject. There is no question but that there are many, probably two-thirds of the White Earth Indians, counting full bloods and mixed bloods all together, that are now competent to take care of their property as well as the average white man, and they should be released from Government restrictions. But Indians who have large tribal property interests should be given control only gradually as they demonstrate their competency.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota is familiar with some things in the Chippewa case, but if he had gone further and made a study of the White Earth investigation he would find there reasons for the scandals that arose in the action of the employees of the bureau in administering the law.

Here is what the House Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department during the Sixty-second Congress had to say about the situation to which the gentleman has referred. They made a most thorough investigation and published the results in two large volumes, known as House Report No. 1336. I commend it to the consideration of the gentleman:

These White Earth Indians, the remnant of the once powerful Chippewa Nation, are rapidly succumbing to the effects of extreme poverty and the white man's diseases and, betrayed by their lawful guardian and their mixed-blood relatives, are now despoiled of their heritage.

It is indeed a sad commentary upon the administration of the Interior Department, and more particularly upon the Indian Bureau, that notwithstanding the fact that they have about $4,000,000 in the United States Treasury and that millions of their own have already been spent ostensibly for their relief and civilization, the condition of a very large part of the tribe is far worse than when the first treaty was concluded with them at Fort McIntosh in 1785.

The Chippewa Indians of Minnesota are not released. I pointed out yesterday the difference between the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota and the Chippewa Indians of Michigan, who are released. The Chippewa Indians of Michigan have not had a dollar out of the Government Treasury since 1872. They are Americans owning their own property, unfettered, and free. Two-thirds of them own their own homes. They have township supervisors. They have county officials. They are not under the bureau; but here is a tribe, the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, who now have in the Treasury of the United States some four or five million dollars, and they are being pauperized and kept in leading strings on these reservations, although it was the intention of the Congress to turn them loose.

The gentleman is mistaken in his idea that they are released from control. If you were to take the Indians in this country and divide up the property which they own as a race, every Indian family would have $15,000. Suppose some of them, after being released, should stumble and fall on the upward climb; that is not an indication that all of them should be kept serfs under a debasing system of dependency.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is one dollar appropriated in this bill out of the Treasury of the United States for the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This item is out of the tribal funds, and is in violation of law.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is their own money.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. They are still under the Indian Bureau. The result is that you have a people up there who are living in uncertainty. If they had been turned loose they would be to-day in the position of the Chippewas of Michigan, absolutely free, American citizens.

Mr. STEENERSON. This bill contains an appropriation of $500 for the Indians of Michigan out of their trust funds, and further along another provision out of the trust funds. Giving the man his own money is not pauperizing him.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; that is exactly what I contend. Give his own to him and let him go. There is a gratuity in this bill of $62,000 for the Indians of Minnesota. There is a treaty item running up to almost $200,000 more. My argument is that they are not out from under the jurisdiction of this system. If they had been, they would have been in the situation of the Chippewas of Michigan, who are brothers in blood, but who are free, and who are self-supporting and self-respecting American citizens. I would like to see the experiment tried on the White Earth and the Red Lake Reservations in Minnesota. In 1889 the Congress ordered that the Red Lake Reservation should be allotted, but no allotment has been made. The reservation is still a center of tribalism, although a generation ago Congress ordered it divided into homesteads for the individuals.

Mr. BURTNESS. By what reasoning does the gentleman arrive at the conclusion that the Indians on the White Earth Reservation would be better able to handle their own funds if they were distributed to them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am sorry that I have not time to answer the question of the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 200 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., including pay of superintendent, $45,000; for general repairs and improvements, $7,000; in all, $52,000.

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLAGUE: Page 41, lines 11 and 12, strike out all of line 11 after the word "superintendent" and all of line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$47,000; for general repairs and improvements, $8,000; in all, $55,000."

Mr. CLAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this school at Pipestone is one of the main schools in the State for taking care of Indian children. As stated here, the school at White Earth has been discontinued. There are applications now at Pipestone from more than 300 children to attend the school. In my own county there are at least 20 Indian children who can not attend this school because there is not room for them. At the present time there are attending the Pipestone School 230 children. There are applications to make the attendance 300. Personally, I know this school and its surroundings. They have buildings there worth nearly $200,000. With an appropriation of $8,000 for repairs and improvements there could be additional room made to take care of at least 250 pupils, to take care of a number of pupils that should attend the school that are not attending a school anywhere. It is stated in the report of the committee that they educate children up to the eighth grade. That is not the fact. They are carried only through the sixth grade, and those of the sixth grade go to Flandreau and to other schools. There have been two additional teachers added to this school within the last year, but there is no room for them to carry on the school work. I visited this school during the last six months twice. It is located in my district, and I know it is in need of the money to carry on the school work. It will be an actual loss not to appropriate more for general repairs. More room is needed to take care of the Indian children that do not have a chance to go to school anywhere.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the allowance granted—$45,000—is above the allowance granted through the bill for schools of 200 and more in attendance. Some allowance is due to the need for more fuel, and so forth, than in the southern schools, but having given the $25 per capita above what is given schools generally of that same size, the committee does not feel that we should go any further in the direction the gentleman suggests, and we hope the item will not be further increased.

Mr. CLAGUE. Does not the gentleman think there should be room made for children that ought to go to that school who are in that vicinity who have no school facilities anywhere?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLAGUE) there were—ayes 7, noes 10.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the necessary surveys and enrolling and allotting the homeless nonremoval Mille Lac Indians in Minnesota, to whom allotments have not heretofore been made, on lands purchased for that purpose in accordance with authority granted in paragraph 8, section 8, of the Indian appropriation act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat., pp. 582–591), $10,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 5, after the word "paragraph," strike out the figure "3" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "4."

Mr. CRAMTON. This is simply to correct a clerical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSISSIPPI.

For the relief of distress among the full-blood Choctaw Indians of Mississippi, including the pay of one special agent, who shall be a physician, one farmer, and one field matron, and other necessary administration expenses, $10,000; for their education by establishing, equipping, and maintaining day schools, including the purchase of land and the construction of necessary buildings and their equipment, $21,500; for the purchase of lands, including improvements thereon, not exceeding 80 acres for any one family, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, to be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States under such rules and regulations as he may direct, $4,000; for the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among said Indians and to aid them in building homes, in the culture of fruits, grain, cotton, and other crops, $8,000; which sum may be used for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable said Indians to become self-supporting, to be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1930; in all, $43,500.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," add the following: "under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under the control of the public-school system of the State of Mississippi."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make the point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; I desire to make the point of order on the ground that the gentleman proposes to expend money for the operation of schools under the public-school system of his State, not under Government control. There is no law authorizing such an expenditure.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I followed the wording exactly, I think, of the provision which was passed in regard to Minnesota on page 40.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the difference between the items as having any effect on the parliamentary situation is this: The Minnesota item is for the payment of tuition to public schools, and, of course, those public schools are a part of the public-school system of the State. The gentleman in his amendment proposes here that the Federal Government school shall become a part of the school system of the State of Mississippi.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, all the items appropriating money for the Minnesota Chippewas are authorized by a special treaty, which has reference only to those tribes and none other.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would like to be heard, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me clearly in order, because Congress has authorized an appropriation for the education of Indians. Under the Snyder Act of 1921 the appropriations are authorized for general support, including education. The broad term "education" covers a public-school system, a private-school system, or any kind of school system that the Congress may make appropriations for in behalf of the Indians. Clearly to my mind under existing law, as carried out in the Snyder Act, this amendment is in order.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I call attention again to the fact that the language of the amendment is identical with the language just passed in the item in regard to Minnesota.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will permit, the item to which he refers is an item the authorization of which is provided by a special treaty with these particular Indians, and it applies only to the Chippewa Indians. Practically all the items in Minnesota are of that character. They are all in compliance with the treaties. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] will agree to that.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. As a matter of fact, all the appropriations for Minnesota are made out of tribal funds, and not a dollar comes out of the Treasury.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. The appropriations in Minnesota are made out of the tribal funds and in pursuance of a special treaty with those tribes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can put any Indian he desires in the public schools. He can put these Indians in Mississippi in the public schools without any authorization of law. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] simply says he must work in connection with the public-school system in Mississippi. It seems to me in any case it is clearly in order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman undertakes to go a little further than that, if the gentleman will permit. He undertakes to place the jurisdiction of the expenditure of this Federal money under State authority.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But the Secretary of the Interior must also act in connection with the Mississippi system.

Mr. CARTER. I do not think the amendment quite states that. I think it places the expenditure of the funds and the jurisdiction of the children completely under State authority, without any joint control on the part of the Secretary. I would not be sure about that.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It says "in connection with the Secretary."

Mr. LOWREY. If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to put that under joint control. I would like to have an opportunity to discuss the merits of this particular situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan reserve his point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman desires, I will reserve it for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves his point of order. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] for five minutes.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, the situation with reference to the Indians of Mississippi is just this: There are only about 1,100 of them, and I suppose it would involve only 400 or 500 educable children. For years, I might say for generations, they have lived right there with the white folks and the negroes. There are three races there. They are all mixed, and they are not segregated in any sense, and as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] knows, the Indians lost their opportunity for tribal lands in Oklahoma, and they are just there as Mississippians. I think they ought to be citizens of Mississippi, and ought to be taxpayers, and ought to be educated and dealt with just like the other two races in the State, and I would like to see them come to that condition. I would not favor making any appropriation to them if circumstances did not warrant it, but I think they should be educated just to be a part of "the folks." Their schools should be just like the other schools and under the same management.

Further, I know the superintendent of education in Mississippi and his assistants and his coworkers, and I consider that system one of the most efficient aggregations that I know of. They are interested in this proposition, and they can handle this situation better than anybody else.

Further, I do not want to enter into minute details, but there have arisen lately some complications, some prejudices with reference to the Government's handling of things there that are hurting the situation and will hurt it further the longer this thing stays in the hands of a Government bureau. The sooner those schools are put along with the other schools and under the same management and under the same board the better for those 1,100 Indians. Now, if this money could be expended for building under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, as stated, then wherever the schools could be run with the State schools the other system could be discontinued. I believe next year it could be abandoned entirely. I think those Indians should become citizens and part of the State.

But I think this move is heading that way, and I insist again that I have adopted the very wording used in another State. While one is a gratuity and the other out of tribal funds, it is all money for Indian education, and I see no reason why the distinction should apply in one case and not in the other. I shall be glad, if I may, to put in the words "under joint control." I want to bring these schools into the State educational system and to do it as soon as possible. I am sure it will be the very best thing for all concerned.

I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by inserting the words "under joint control."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. I reserve a point of order upon the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment" add the following: "Under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under the joint control of the public-school system of the State of Mississippi."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan make a point of order?

Mr. CRAMTON. I desire to reserve it for a moment to make this one observation: There may be much merit in what is proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi. It may be a matter that should be worked out in concert with the officials having the responsibility and who are fully familiar with the facts. I do not think, however, that it is a good plan to go into something when we do not know just exactly what we are doing. Hence I feel obliged to oppose the amendment.

As to the parliamentary phase of the amendment, I make the point of order that the language, as it stands, providing for joint control of Federal funds, is not permissible under existing law and is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, let me call the gentleman's attention to this: I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] has taken a step in the right direction; but as the gentleman from Michigan suggests, we do not want to take any step here that will do any violent damage to the thing that is at present being done for these people. I would suggest that what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] desires to accomplish may be accomplished by inserting after the word "equipment" in line 16 the words—

or for paying the tuition of full-blood Mississippi Choctaw Indians in the public schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Here is an appropriation which compels the erection of buildings for these schools. It provides that the money shall be spent for the erection of new buildings and the purchase of equipment that will not be necessary if the children are put in the public schools.

Mr. CARTER. It does not compel the building. It simply authorizes it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows that will be done.

Mr. CARTER. I think they have built all the schools they will build. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] will agree with me on that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma withhold his argument for a moment until we can have a ruling on the point of order?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, since the amendment has been modified by providing for joint control, it may be subject to a point of order, but the way the gentleman from Mississippi originally offered it I do not think it is subject to a point of order, for this reason: In practically all of the legislation up to the present time we have made provision for sending these Indians to day schools and public schools. That is positive legislation providing that they may be sent to the public schools. The gentleman made the argument awhile ago that we were doing that under the Snyder law. Now, when you direct the Secretary to send them to the public schools, do you not do just exactly what the gentleman is proposing to do here by his amendment?

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman from California admits that the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. RAKER. I think the amendment with the words "under joint control" is subject to the point of order. Yes, sir. But as the amendment was originally presented I have grave doubts of a point of order being successfully lodged against it. I just wanted to call the distinction to the Chair. I am afraid the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOWREY] has lost just what he is after by the amendment to the amendment which has been offered by him without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi reads:

Under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and in connection with and under joint control of the public schools of the State of Mississippi.

The point of order is made that this is legislation not authorized by existing law. The provision of the law under which it is claimed that this amendment may be authorized is the act of November 2, 1921. The provision of that law is that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct and supervise the expenditure of such money as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit and care of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes: "* * * General civilization, including education."

The members of the committee will understand that all of these general provisions must be placed under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, under this law. There is no provision made for a division of control. It would be perfectly within the power of the Secretary of the Interior to direct that these children might be educated in the public schools. There would be no objection whatever to a provision in this law that if they were educated in the public schools it might be paid for out of the general fund or out of tribal funds. There would be no objection in either case. Still the disposition and control of the funds would be under the Secretary of the Interior. But this proposes to place the control partially at least

under the school authorities of the State of Mississippi. That is not authorized by existing law. For that reason the point of order is sustained.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," insert "or for the tuition of full-blood Choctaw Indian children enrolled in the public schools."

Mr. CRAMTON. That amendment is satisfactory and the committee will accept it.

Mr. CARTER. I suggest that the word "Mississippi" be inserted before the word "Choctaw."

Mr. LOWREY. I ask unanimous consent that the word "Mississippi" be inserted according to the suggestion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOWREY. You have got all the land belonging to these Indians. You ought not to get all the school money, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOWREY: Page 42, line 16, after the word "equipment," insert "or for the tuition of full-blood Mississippi Choctaw Indian children enrolled in the public schools."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all purposes necessary for the proper drainage of the lands of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico in the Rio Grande Valley, including the Pueblos of Cochiti, Santo Domingo, Santa Ana, Ranchitos purchase, Sandia, and Isleta, including cooperation with drainage districts formed or to be formed by others or draining the land by the Government direct, $20,000, reimbursable in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand this paragraph, it is proposed to spend $20,000 for the drainage of the lands of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico in the Rio Grande Valley. Would it be advisable to spend that money there if the Bursum bill is passed and becomes a law?

Mr. CRAMTON. My information is that the Bursum bill has been interned in the committee from which it came, and that there will be no probability of its passage.

Mr. BUTLER. I hope the gentleman's information is correct, but the gentleman would not think it advisable to extend it if the bill was passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

For improvement, operation, and maintenance of the Hogback irrigation project on that part of the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico under the jurisdiction of the San Juan Indian School, $7,500, reimbursable under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman give us the information so that the country may know as to these reimbursable amounts to the reclamation funds? How do they get the consent of the Indians to do this work? I see that most of the items are reimbursable for irrigation work on Indian lands and take it out of the Indian fund.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is asking me for information which perhaps is far less valuable than his own. My understanding is that legally the consent of the Indian is not necessary. The authority to supervise their affairs by the Government makes it legally unnecessary to obtain their consent. I assume, however, as a practical question, that very generally the matter is worked out in cooperation with the views of the Indians who are interested. At any rate, there should be some sort of cooperation in order that money shall not be expended the benefits of which will not be realized by the Indians.

Mr. RAKER. I am asking in the best of good faith. These matters are so varied and so large that we can not get too much information about them. The point is that the Indian is getting the benefit by virtue of irrigation and will receive a splendid return for the money expended in his behalf?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say to the gentleman that in this particular project before us the figures show that the activity is in accordance with the wishes of the Indians. The Indians do not always avail themselves of the land after it is irrigated, but in this case the amount that is actually irrigated on this project is 1,550 acres. Of that, 1,540 acres are cultivated by the Indians and only 10 acres by whites, which demonstrates that this particular project is in accordance with the desire of the Indians.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a further answer to the gentleman's question, with all due regard to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I think it was a proper question to have been raised by the gentleman from California, and I think my answer will give him some information.

I remember in 1920 or 1921 I was a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. I was asked by the chairman of the committee to make some investigation into the reimbursable appropriations for the use of irrigation projects. Now, while what the distinguished chairman said is true in regard to the law, the practice is that they do not consult the Indians. I know as a matter of fact and I know of many cases where the Indians, well-informed Indians, came before the subcommittee and complained that under the operation of the law permitting the use of tribal funds for irrigation purposes, under this so-called method of reimbursable legislation, that in many cases valuable allotments of 40, 80, 120, and 160 acres of land have been encumbered by more money than the land would sell for, because of the department spending large sums of money on these irrigation projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more in order that I may yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I now yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RHODES. It is my opinion, and I think my distinguished friend [Mr. CARTER], who was present during a great many hearings, as was also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], will agree that it is not the practice to consult the Indians, and it is a matter of general complaint by many well-informed Indians.

Mr. RAKER. From the gentleman's observation, what was the conclusion that the committee came to as to whether or not the money expended was justified by reason of the value of the land and the location?

Mr. RHODES. I think in most cases it was not justified, but the committee was somewhat divided in opinion as to what the future policy should be. That situation was true, because the testimony that came before the committee from the Indian side of the case was not entirely in accord with the testimony that came before the committee from the officials representing the Indian Bureau. My personal opinion is that there had been an abuse of authority in this regard by the bureau, and my opinion further is, and I think it is borne out by the statement of the officials of the bureau, that it is very doubtful whether or not many of these great irrigation projects are practicable. The Government of the United States by law has undertaken to convert into agricultural land that by nature is not fit for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more, and then I will not trouble the committee further.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri this question: What is his opinion as a member of that committee, with his long experience as an attorney, as to whether or not, if the Indians should venture to raise the question on the facts stated, their land would be responsible and could it be taken to pay the expenses of the reclamation?

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very doubtful in many cases whether or not the land of the Indian can be held liable for the amount expended. I was reading the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year just closed, and I think there are some cases pending in the district courts of the United States now which involve this very question.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. If I have the floor; yes.

Mr. CARTER. As to the lands that had been allotted prior to the passage of the act, there might be some question; but as to lands that had not been allotted prior to the passage of the irrigation proposition the matter was clearly settled in two decisions, one the Lone Wolf decision, in southwest Oklahoma, and the other the Gritts case, in northeast Oklahoma, in which it was held that the Federal Government had plenary power to do as it saw fit in the capacity of guardian to ward in con-

nection with any properties retained in tribal ownership. I assume one of the reservations is with reference to the Blackfeet?

Mr. RHODES. Yes; and on the Flathead, too.

Mr. CARTER. I hold no brief for the Indian Bureau, but the Blackfeet irrigation project, as I recall, was put over by Congress without the consent of the Indian Bureau.

Mr. RHODES. Most of these propositions have been put over without the consent of the Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I think I should make this statement for the benefit of the committee generally as to these irrigation projects for the Indians: It is the position of the Indian Service now—of the commissioner and the assistant commissioner—that there have been errors made in the taking up of some of these irrigation projects for the Indians, but what has been done can not now be undone. At the present time the Indian Service is not encouraging any new irrigation projects. It is simply continuing those that have heretofore been commenced and which must be completed in order not to have a complete loss.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and education of 220 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Wahpeton, N. Dak., and pay of superintendent, $49,500; for general repairs and improvements, including well and water system, $9,000; in all, $58,500.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTNESS: Page 51, line 8, after the word "system," strike out the figures "$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and for the purchase of additional land, $41,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment, that it is legislation not authorized by existing law.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, the Snyder Act has already been referred to several times. It was approved November 2, 1921. The amendment proposed comes clearly within the authorization of several provisions of that act. I think it would come within the first provision authorizing appropriations for the general support and civilization, including the education of the Indians. I think it would come within the provisions of the third subdivision, possibly, for industrial assistance and advancement, but if it should be held that it does not come within either the first or the third subdivisions, it is very plain that it comes within the provisions of the fifth, which reads as follows:

For the enlargement, extension, improvement, and repair of the buildings and grounds of existing plants and projects.

The only purpose of the new language in this amendment is to enlarge and extend the existing plant.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has knowledge of the situation. The amendment which he offers does not show whether the land he proposes to acquire is contiguous to the existing plant. Will the gentleman state whether it is?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes; it is. I would be very glad to insert in my proposed amendment the word "contiguous."

Mr. CRAMTON. Under those conditions it would not be subject to the point of order, and if the gentleman states that is the condition, then I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, so that there may be no question about it, to modify my amendment by inserting the word "contiguous" before the word "additional."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota to so modify the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTNESS: Page 51, line 8, after the word "system," strike out the figures "$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and for the purchase of contiguous additional land, $41,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTNESS. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. At what page are the hearings on this particular matter?

Mr. BURTNESS. At page 395.

Mr. RAKER. And where does the statement of the gentleman appear in regard to this?

Mr. BURTNESS. I did not make a statement before the subcommittee. I did introduce a separate bill, H. R. 13190, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, covering the individual matter of buying additional land, but in asking for a hearing I was informed by the subcommittee that it would not hear anyone except such people as were interested in items that had come through the Budget estimates.

Inasmuch as this item had not been included in the estimates of the Budget, I did not appear before the committee. I was told it would be useless, regardless of the merits of the case, and that it would be a waste of the time of the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. And of the gentleman.

Mr. BURTNESS. The question raised by this amendment is simply whether or not it is advisable to purchase additional land for this school. This is a nonreservation school. The appropriations last year were authorized upon the basis of 200 pupils. The hearings show that there was an average enrollment of 222 pupils. There are several hundred applications in from pupils who can not be taken care of at the school. The school does not provide facilities for pupils in my district, because there happen to be no Indians in that district, although the school is in the corner of my district. It provides facilities for children that come from South Dakota, Minnesota, and a number from North Dakota.

Mr. MURPHY. How much ground is there at the school?

Mr. BURTNESS. The school now has approximately 150 acres of ground, or a little less, possibly, that can be used for cultivation purposes. It is in the valley of the Red River of the North, and there is no better land to be found anywhere. The superintendent of the school, not only the present one but a former one, has been anxious for a considerable time to get additional land. To show that additional land is required for the school, I need only point to the fact that they have during the past several years been renting some land, but even with that they have not sufficient to take care of the needs of the school. The school to-day has to buy hay and feed. Under the items proposed in the present bill they are increasing the appropriation so as to take care of 220 pupils, and upon the same basis of last year I presume the enrollment will actually be increased to 240 or 250.

The per capita cost of taking care of the school even in that cold climate is only $188 each. If a reasonable amount of additional land can be provided, it is the contention of the people at the school that they can provide, among other things, plenty of wheat to take care of the flour needs of the pupils. To-day, as I have already suggested, they are trying to build up a herd of dairy cattle; they are trying to establish a herd there sufficient to meet the needs of the school, retaining the females and selling the males. There is no chance of keeping more females there without additional land for pasture as well as for raising forage for the winter.

As you all know, most of the pupils who come there naturally come from agricultural communities, and, in my judgment at least, it is fully as important, if not more important, to teach these Indian boys and girls something about farming out in that country, so that they can go back to their communities and know something about farming, as to acquire book learning.

If a reasonable-sized farm can be maintained in connection with the school it will be very beneficial for all concerned, both for the Government and for the pupils.

At Fort Totten, in the second district of my State, they have a large and substantial farm in connection with the Indian school there, and a great deal is accomplished in the way of enabling the students to develop along agricultural lines and be able to conduct their farming operations when they get back home. The land at the Wahpeton School at the present time can be bought——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTNESS. I might suggest that just now it is only reasonable to suppose that the additional land which is required could be bought very reasonably, due to the general agricultural depression. It would be a very good investment on the part of the Government to make the purchase now, rather than at a later date.

This present bill proposes an increase of 20 pupils, I believe, at the school. The fact is that in the immediate future there is expected to be a further increase. Some years ago there was appropriated $20,000 for an additional school building and

$10,000 for an assembly hall at the school, but owing to the war conditions the amount appropriated has not been sufficient, so that it has been deemed advisable not to let contracts up to this time for these buildings. I am informed by Mr. Meritt, Assistant Indian Commissioner, to-day that the bureau is now proceeding to advertise for bids for those contracts, and if contracts for such buildings are let, the school will be able to accommodate many more pupils. I hope the bids will be such that they can erect the required buildings within the appropriations available, and if that is done they expect to take care of nearly 300 pupils instead of 220.

This probable growth emphasizes that much more the need for additional land in the immediate future, so that this school would have in a general way somewhere nearly the same amount of land that like schools have up in that northwestern territory. This happens to be a place where perhaps the same objection can not be given against providing for the needs which we think are urgent as was made to the gentleman who presented the amendment for one of the California schools. The suggestion by the committee there was that the climate in California was so excellent that they might not need the additional appropriation to take care of the children. Our climate, while it is healthful and vigorous, and all that, is such that we do not always allow our children to sleep out of doors in the wintertime. We need this money not only to take care of some of these children who are clamoring to get into the school, but particularly to teach these young Indians something more about agriculture than they now know, and also to assist the Government in providing for the needs of the school, for the proceeds from the additional land, if bought, would amount to a splendid interest on the investment in the way of additional crops and produce. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the item that the gentleman asks, $75,000, is a larger amount than is proposed for the extension of any other Indian school in the bill.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. The item suggested in the amendment is not $75,000; it is $32,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, $32,000. Then I say that the amount that the gentleman suggests is still larger than any amount proposed for the extension of any other Indian school in the country, notwithstanding it has an attendance of only about 213, while there are others of 700 or 800, and with waiting lists.

Now, as to the particular needs of even that particular school, the committee feels that we must keep pretty well within the Budget and within the estimates that come from the bureaus, because they are carefully weighed and the relative consideration due to each institution is given to it.

The gentleman speaks of the importance of the land and the results obtained at Fort Totten School in the same State. There they have 1,500 acres and they are cultivating only 420 acres. I do not know how much they would cultivate of this proposed extension at Wahpeton if it were given to them.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman realize the difference in the value and quality of land near Wahpeton, N. Dak., and that at Fort Totten?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. They all look alike to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTNESS. I am sure the gentleman does not, because if he had understood anything about it he would not have made the comparison.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman referred to Fort Totten as illustrating what could be done. I admit that the land near Wahpeton may be more desirable than that in the neighborhood of Fort Totten.

Mr. BURTNESS. Much of it there is brush and hills.

Mr. CRAMTON. About one-third is used. Now, as to the estimates of this particular school, I want to suggest that in the judgment of the management of that institution, and they are about as near to its needs as the estimates of anyone, if they are to have $32,000, they have several places where they would like to put it before they want to buy any land. I read in the hearings a little while ago where a superintendent wanted $200,000, where it was not approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

This superintendent sent in his estimates, the same as all the rest of them. He had the opportunity to ask for what he thought was needed. What did he ask for? He asked for support $49,500, which is carried in the bill. He asked for repairs and improvements $10,500, which the Budget and the committee reduced by $1,500, allowing $9,000. Then he asked for new buildings, assembly hall, $45,000. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment about that. He wanted for the purchase of laundry, machine shop, kitchen and dining-room equipment, $5,000. There is nothing in the gentleman's amendment about those things. On the other hand, there is not a word in the estimate of the superintendent as to any need of any more land.

In the absence of a more clear showing as to the needs, I hope we will not appropriate $32,000 as requested, more than we are giving to any other Indian school in the country for extension.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Does the gentleman recall that the Senate regarded this as of sufficient importance to attach the item to an emergency deficiency bill a year ago?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not recall that, but I know that another body has attached to appropriation bills many things that are of very questionable value.

Mr. BURTNESS. I take it the gentleman does not contend that this additional land is not desired by the superintendent.

Mr, CRAMTON. There is no evidence except the gentleman's statement, which I accept.

Mr. BURTNESS. I have several letters here which I should be glad to have the gentleman read.

Mr. CRAMTON. I accept the gentleman's statement, but in the superintendent's own report it is not asked for.

Mr. BURTNESS. The $45,000 asked for building is plainly a duplicate of the $30,000 which is already available, which doubtless the superintendent did not understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURTNESS].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTNESS) there were—ayes 5, noes 9.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that in line 19, on page 50, there is a typographical error in the spelling of the word "Fort."

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask unanimous consent that that typographical error be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to page 50, line 19, to correct a typographical error in the spelling of the word "Fort." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The sum of $325,000 is hereby appropriated out of the principal funds to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, the sum of $75,000 of said amount for the benefit of the Ute Mountain (formerly Navajo Springs) Band of said Indians in Colorado, and the sum of $175,000 of said amount for the Uintah, White River, and Uncompahgre Bands of Ute Indians in Utah, and the sum of $75,000 of said amount for the Southern Ute Indians in Colorado, which sums shall be charged to said bands, and the Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to withdraw from the Treasury the accrued interest to and including June 30, 1923, on the funds of the said Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated under the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., p. 934), and to expend or distribute the same for the purpose of promoting civilization and self-support among the said Indians, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall report to Congress, on the first Monday in December, 1924, a detailed statement as to all moneys expended as provided for herein.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLTON: Page 63, line 8, after the word "herein," strike out the period and insert: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds in this paragraph shall be expended on road construction unless wherever practicable preference shall be given to Indians in the employment of labor on all roads constructed from the sums herein appropriated from the funds of the Confederated Bands of Utes."

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Gladly.

Mr. CRAMTON. The language of this amendment has been discussed with the subcommittee by the gentleman from Utah. The subcommittee see no objection to it and have no opposition to it. We had not supposed the language to be necessary, but had supposed that to be the policy, as it generally is the policy. The gentleman from Utah states that he has evidence that that policy has not been followed, and so he thinks the language is necessary, and the committee have no objection.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, just a word in reply. Complaint has been made to me that on this reservation the Indians are not given the preference. In a letter which I have received from an Indian it is stated that—

But little of the road money is paid to the Indians. Yesterday I visited the road camp and found 26 teams with drivers and 9 single hands. Of this number only one team was owned by an Indian, and

he is not a member of the tribe; and among the single hands only one was an Indian. I know of many Indians who have applied for work and have been refused. We are willing and anxious to work, and we need the money. A number of our tribe are badly in need.

From the information contained in this letter I infer that preference is not given to the Indians. Hence I have offered this amendment. I do not know how accurate the information is, but the amendment is in harmony with numerous other provisions in the bill and can do no harm.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the construction of lateral distributing systems to irrigate the allotted lands of the Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes in Utah, and to maintain existing irrigation systems authorized under the act of June 21, 1906, $100,000, to be paid from the principal funds held by the United States in trust for the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There have been a great many complaints made to me that the expenses of maintaining this particular system are excessive. I have tried all day to get certain information but have not succeeded, and am asking now if the chairman of the subcommittee can give it. I notice in the hearings, as recorded on page 460, that among the items of expenditures of a similar amount last year is one of salaries and wages in the sum of $57,742. In fact, over half of the money appropriated was paid out in salaries and wages, and the complaint to me is that this work is costing too much and that it can be done much more cheaply. It may be interesting to the committee to know that a great many white settlers irrigate lands adjoining the Indian lands and use jointly the same canals. In some of these canals the rights of the Indians have been entirely extinguished, yet the Government continues to operate and maintain these canals at the expense of the white settlers.

Those using the canals have no voice whatever in their maintenance or, at least, in the expenditure of the money. They pay what they consider large assessments and have no voice at all in the expenditure of the money thus paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was trying to get information as to the rates of wages and salaries paid under this item?

Mr. COLTON. I am trying to get whatever information I can as to how this money is expended.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will state that the information before the committee is that there is a proposed salary roll of $31,360, the same as for the current year. That carries an engineer at $2,000, a junior engineer at from $1,800 to $2,040, an instrument man at from $1,200 to $1,500, a hydrographer at $1,500, a chief clerk at from $1,200 to $1,380, a foreman at $1,500, supervisors of ditches at $1,600 to $1,800 and ditch riders at $1,380, there being one of each of those positions except the last, and there being 14 of the ditch riders.

In addition to that there is proposed $40,000 in wages, which is miscellaneous and temporary labor at from $3 to $6 per day.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what the gentleman has said, let me state that a committee of white settlers representing those who use these canals jointly with the Indians have made representations to me and to the department that this work can be done very much cheaper than it is now being done. They say that there is a large item of expense connected with the use and operation of automobiles which is unnecessary and that the work of maintaining the canals can be done much more economically. The white settlers are asking that they be given some voice in the expenditure of the money to operate the canal. It is hoped that some system can be worked out whereby they can have some voice in the operation. I simply arose to make this statement and to ask information of the committee, which the chairman has kindly supplied. I appreciate it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes, including pay of employees, $900.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that we have appropriated here for the support of the Qui-nai-elts and the Quil-leh-utes, including the pay of employees in the State of Washington, the sum of $900. I would like to make the observation that the Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes are not being very well supported and not becoming any too well civilized, with a few exceptions. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what employee receives the $900?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is one-half of the time of one clerk at a salary of $1,200 a year, being $600 for half his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am not surprised that the Qui-nai-elts and Quil-leh-utes are not getting along any better. They are dying off and a few have allotments, but a number of them never received an allotment and never will. It will be some time before the proceeds for sales of timber from that part of their forest which belongs to the tribe will be paid into a tribal fund. There seems now to be little or nothing in that fund, therefore some of these Indians must be supported by the Government in spite of their potential wealth. Old and dependent folks are thrown in on those who are still older to be fed, and they have to beg and borrow, in spite of resources of great value. They live on in the hope that some day they will come into possession of the fifteen or twenty million dollars, the value of the timber reservation.

The sale of timber on allotted lands has begun and will help the situation a great deal, and a happy lot might as well abandon the hope.

The Clerk read as follows:

For support and civilization of Indians at Colville, Taholah, Puyallup, and Spokane Agencies, including pay of employees, and for purchase of agricultural implements and support and civilization of Joseph's Band of Nez Perce Indians in Washington, $11,000.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Washington says that he is powerless to get any benefit for this tribe of Indians in his State. I want to put in the RECORD two episodes in regard to making a change in this system which might seem to enforce his hopeless attitude but which does not, for no question is ever settled until it is settled right.

The first statement is by the soldier who founded the Carlisle School and was its superintendent for 25 years, Gen. R. H. Pratt, a faithful friend of the Indian. In 1904 he made a speech before the Baptist Church of New York City, in which he said:

I believe that nothing better could have happened to the Indians than the complete destruction of the bureau which keeps them so carefully laid away in the dark of its numerous drawers, together with all its varied influences, which only serve to bolster and maintain tribal conditions.

The early death of the "Freedmen's Bureau" was an infinite blessing to the Negro himself and to the country as well. If you say the turning loose of this large number of ignorant and unprepared people would threaten the peace of our communities, I say that not a year within the last 30 but we have imported from foreign countries and turned loose in the United States a much greater number of no less unprepared and ignorant people. One thing is certain, this bureau will never lift its finger to end its own life, and we can rely on it that its emotions are most pleasurable when Congress adds to it increased responsibilities in the distribution of money, etc. It is a barnacle to be knocked off some time.

Better, far better for the Indians had there never been a bureau. Then self-preservation would have led the individual Indian to find his true place, and his real emancipation would have been speedily consummated.

He made that speech while superintendent of the Carlisle School. He was discharged from his position. He had committed lese majeste. He was a dangerous agitator in the eyes of the bureau. He made this statement later:

If my speech before the Baptist ministers was untrue in any particular it ought to be easy to indicate wherein and to hold me responsible. No part of it is contested except it is alleged I said, "Indian Bureau officials are barnacles." What I said was that "the Indian Bureau is a barnacle to be knocked off some time."

It takes far-fetched construction to contort this into personal affront. I now repeat, that after 37 years of experience in Indian affairs, 25 years of it directly under the bureau, the bureau is a barnacle, because it is an unnatural, unphilosophical attachment to the ship of state whose perpetuity depends solely upon its being able to prevent the one race in America always here from getting aboard and becoming a real part of the American crew and family. It therefore clogs progress, and that is what a barnacle does. * * *

In 1917 Mr. W. H. Gibbs, inspector in the Indian Service, resigned his position and, in a signed article published in the State, at Columbia, S. C., on January 14, 1917, he made this statement:

From association and contact with the Indian I have become convinced that his treatment by the Government is one of continued error heaped upon initial mistake. Originally segregated upon reservations in order to insure the safety of the whites who were thinly settled in outlying territory, the continuation of such a policy after the full attainment of its purposes has operated to delay the development, the amalgamation, and the civilization of the Indians in the fulfillment of their manifest destiny. This proposition is proved by the undeniable fact that those Indians who have cut loose from the Government have progressed far ahead of those who are still in serfdom as its wards.

This serfdom is a greater reproach to this Nation than was the slavery of the Negro. The tenure of the title to his lands and the holding of his funds by the Government are sometimes used to coerce him into compliance with Government requirements, thus sapping independence and undermining his character. Therefore, if there is decadence in the manhood of the old Indians thus treated the Government owes support to these Indians it has ruined, and education to their children to keep them from being ruined also. Its activities should stop there.

Everywhere there are capable and competent Indians who ought to be free and independent citizens to-day, but usually the office keeps them chained to their stationary cotribal members.

The proud, sensitive, high-strung Indian often feels that hope for him and his lies not on this side of the grave.

The young and middle-aged adult Indians should be given their land and money and made citizens of America, and citizenship should be conferred on the minors as fast as they reach maturity.

If any squander their heritage it will be no more than our white citizens do, and usually the school of adversity alone confers a valuable civic education.

Turn such Indians loose now under some well-considered plan and they, humanity, and civilization will soon be the gainers.

The emancipated Cherokees of North Carolina and Oneidas of Wisconsin have done more for themselves than the Government has done for any Indians still enslaved under its wardship.

My severance from the service is voluntary on my part, partly from a feeling of hopelessness in going after real progressive reform through the heavy machinery of the Indian Office. If field workers could talk for publication as I know they feel, in the main my points would be overwhelmingly sustained. As a rule they are faithful workers and distressingly underpaid.

The reason for my conclusions may be found in the facts and details in my official reports, which should be open to the public, which are susceptible of proof and have never been excepted to by office, though often of grave importance.

Entering the Indian Service in the belief that the Indian Office was designed and conducted as a benefaction to the race, I am leaving it convinced that it is the Indian's "Old Man of the Sea," who will try to cling around his neck in a strangle hold forever.

Mr. Chairman, here are two men of wide experience in the Indian Service under different conditions, one the superintendent of the best school the Indian Bureau ever had, which was abolished because it was making real Americans out of these original Americans, and the other a man who endeavored to lift the Indians out of tribalism and degradation, and gave it up in the face of the opposition of the bureau system.

It does seem a hopeless task, when years after their valiant efforts in official position were made, we find the system as strongly intrenched as ever and all efforts to change it ridden down.

But I am not afraid of the final outcome. Whenever the American people come to know the facts of this most un-American system they will command and secure a new policy.

History teaches but one lesson, and that is that for injustice and oppression and subjection doomsday comes at last. Freedom is stronger than serfdom. I am firm in the faith that there will be sunrise for the American Indians, when out of the night of bureaucratic control and injustice and misery they shall step forth as Americans into the dawn of a new day of freedom and development as full-fledged members of the Republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me say to the gentleman that that start is being made, because they have cut down the Qui-nai-elts from $1,000 to $900. The paragraph just read is for the support and civilization of the Indians at Colville, Taholah, Puyallup, and the Spokane agencies, and the amount is $11,000. How is that amount divided up? I would like particularly to know the amount that goes to the Puyallup agency, and where that agency is at this time.

Mr. CRAMTON. I fully understand, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Washington is asking questions about matters that he understands much better than I do myself.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no. Before the gentleman undertakes to answer——

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman understands that he understands better than the chairman does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Then, if that is so, these Indians are surely in a bad way. I am serious about that. If I remember correctly, it is only two or three years ago that Congress abolished the Puyallup School. Out of the clear sky they abolished that school, regardless of the treaties with the Indians. When they abolished that school that left about a dozen tribes of Indians in the western part of Washington with no headquarters. Thereupon, after the department down here discovered that, they hitched one-half of these tribes to the agency in the district of my colleague [Mr. HADLEY] and the other half of them to the agency at Taholah, which is the county seat, you might say, of the Qui-nai-elts, and after doing that they discovered that it was too much to have these Indians come from clear up near the Cushman School down to this place on the ocean beach, so they moved the headquarters of the Qui-nai-elts and allied tribes away from there, and I do not know where they have moved the Puyallup agency and I am asking for that information.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman discussed this matter at one time with the chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the subcommittee took him into a conference with the Assistant Indian Commissioner, and the gentleman came out of that conference with a smile on his face.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and that is all I got.

Mr. CRAMTON. I supposed that he obtained all that he wanted to know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no.

Mr. CARTER. As I recall the information the gentleman speaks of, it is that these agencies have all been consolidated with the general agency at Nes Palem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And so when we say for the Indians at the Puyallup agency, we mean ex-agency?

Mr. CARTER. I think the Nes Palem is an agency for all of those tribes, although I would not be positive about that. That is my recollection when I was at Nes Palem several years ago. At that time it was being contemplated to remove a number of the agencies to Nes Palem and operate all of them from that place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think the gentleman must be mistaken in part.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] read a letter a moment ago comparing the Indian Bureau to a certain extent to the Freedman's Bureau, and in his speech yesterday morning he also made some comparison of that kind and spoke of the promise of 40 acres of land and a mule that was made by the Freedman's Bureau. The Freedman's Bureau was a thing which operated down in my country, and I do not think it is proper to begin to compare the Indian Bureau with that. I can give the gentleman an instance of that which will show, I think, that he is mistaken in making that comparison. One of these fellows appeared in my own county and claimed to be a representative of the Freedman's Bureau, having come there to set off the 40 acres and allot the mule. He went up to old Mr. Evans's plantation, who had been a large slave holder before the war. He had a splendid plantation. All of the slaves had left the place where they lived to show that they were free. The old colored foreman was there, however. This agent or representative of the Freedman's Bureau said to the old man: "I have come here to lay off your 40 acres of land, and you can get the mule out of old man Evans after you get the land." This man picked out a piece of land, the 40 acres, and it had a good cabin on it, and he moved in. The old man Evans went out and discovered him the next day, and said: "What are you doing here?" He replied that this was his land; that the man from the Freedman's Bureau had been down there and laid off his land. He had laid it off; had set a little peg with a red ball on top of it at each corner. Mr. Evans then asked him whether he got a paper for it, and he said yes, he did, that he got a deed. He went to the house and got his deed and brought it out. The fellow had charged him $5, incidentally. I think I may have that deed yet in my office to-day, and the man had written on it the following:

Even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness so have I lifted this nigger out of $5.

That is about the way the Freedman's Bureau operated, and I hope the gentleman will not compare the Indian Bureau to that.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I had yesterday a copy of that same deed, and I shall be glad to put it into the RECORD word for word. There have been instances where the Indian Bureau has given a man 40 acres, and he has made it his home, raised hay there and used it for 17 years, when a tribal herd was allowed to run over it and utterly destroy it, and he did not have his 40 acres at all.

Mr. STEVENSON. All he could do was to raise cain?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

For operation and maintenance, including repairs, of the Toppenish-Simcoe irrigation system, on the Yakima Reservation, Wash., reimbursable as provided by the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. L. p. 28), $5,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 66, line 13, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 66, line 13, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. CHINDBLOM. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The effect will be to comply with this situation: At the Toppenish-Simcoe irrigation unit, on the Yakima Reservation, there was first authorized to be expended $150,000. Later the authorization was increased to $200,000. However, only $150,000 has been expended. Expecting the faithful performance on the part of the Indian Bureau and the Congress, the local people there have cleared up the sagebrush and prepared the land for immediate irrigation and for cultivation. They have waited year after year for an expenditure of the additional $50,000 which was authorized to be expended on that unit. They feel greatly disappointed and

aggrieved that their Government has not carried out the evident intent of Congress.

In fact one of those Indians was in my office just a few days ago and related this story: One of their Indians died and went up to the pearly gates seeking entrance to the happy hunting grounds and was there asked by St. Peter for his record. The Indian replied, "The Indian Bureau has my record." St. Peter turned to an assistant and said, "Step inside and find some one from the Indian Bureau and bring this Indian's record." The assistant was gone for three hours and returned, saying, "Nobody from the Indian Bureau here." [Laughter.]

That is the feeling of the Indians in that particular section. They do not believe they are receiving fair and just treatment from the bureau.

Mr. RAKER. Which section did he come from?

A MEMBER. California.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Washington. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. We believe that in good faith we ought to do for the Indians of that part of the reservation what we do for Indians on either side, on the Wapato side and the Satus side, which lands lie adjacent to the lands contemplated to be irrigated by this amendment. This is not a new project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows that the inclusion of one of the new extension items carried in this bill, the one item that has perhaps more to do than any other item in the bill in raising the irrigation costs above the current year, was the inclusion of the item at the gentleman's initiative, I assume, for the Satus unit. Has the gentleman any idea that while other projects all over the country are being neglected and requests are being denied, the Government is going to open up the Treasury doors wide to the people of his district?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Not at all, I will say to the chairman of the subcommittee. But this $50,000 was authorized some three years ago, and it was fully expected that it would be provided in order that a certain amount of work might be done at this time, and it is in order to take care of that situation that I have offered this amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman think that the need for that $50,000 is greater than the need for the $150,000 for the Satus unit? If the gentleman feels that way, I think the matter may be corrected.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am informed the land at the one place can be irrigated for less, perhaps, than that at the other. However, each unit stands on its own merits, and I am contending for fair and equal treatment for all parts of the Yakima Indian Reservation. Our obligation under the treaty of 1855 is the same to all of these Indians. Our present plan makes some of them wealthy while others eke out a bare existence. During the past four years I have repeatedly presented the merits of the Wapato, the Toppenish-Simcoe, and the Satus units and have introduced bills and offered amendments seeking funds with which to carry forward the work on these various units.

I am gratified that at last we are securing $125,000 for the Satus unit; at the same time I earnestly urge favorable action on my amendment for $50,000 for the Toppenish-Simcoe unit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask the Chairman how long he intends to keep us here?

Mr. CRAMTON. We expect to run until 5.30. That will pass us through, as I understand, matters that are not controverted respecting the Pension Office and the Patent Office.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the gentleman ought to turn us loose now.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think our speeches are all made now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For completion of the road on the Quinault Reservation, Wash., $7,500, reimbursable from the tribal funds of said Indians as provided in the act of May 25, 1918. (40 Stat. L. p. 588.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WATSON. I notice two or three items in this bill of appropriations for road construction. Are these roads permanently constructed for automobile purposes? Or are they open trails, or are they simply dirt roads? I find the appropriations are very small.

Mr. CRAMTON. I think they are permanent roads. The character of the road, I suppose, varies with the circumstances.

Mr. WATSON. Seven thousand five hundred dollars would not go very far in building permanent roads in Pennsylvania. They cost us about $90,000 a mile.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are not of that kind.

Mr. WATSON. I presume these are trails.

Mr. CRAMTON. They are more than trails. They may be dirt roads or gravel roads in some cases.

Mr. WATSON. I was wondering whether it was the intention of the Government to build permanent roads through the reservations.

Mr. CRAMTON. In some cases they are paved roads and in other cases they are dirt roads.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, including the Big Wind River and Dry Creek Canals, and including the maintenance and operation of completed canals, $200,000, reimbursable as provided by existing law.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. RHODES. I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Michigan a question. I see that $200,000, reimbursable, is provided for in line 17 on page 69. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee if any part of the $200,000 is to be expended for doing new construction work on this irrigation project or is it all to be expended for maintenance and operation?

I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1919 the Committee on Indian Affairs made a very thorough investigation into this whole matter of reimbursable legislation for irrigation purposes, and as a result of this investigation it was ascertained that much of the work on the various irrigation projects of the Northwest has been carried far beyond the point of necessity; that is to say, on many of these projects there are thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land under irrigation where there is nobody, neither Indian nor white man, to make beneficial use of the water. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that there should be no further sums expended on new projects until use is made of all available water, and that the only justification for the expenditure of any of the Indians' money or for the expenditure of any of the Government's money on these projects is for maintenance and for the operation of the units that are completed.

Mr. CRAMTON. Replying to the gentleman's question, I now have the information at hand, and it is stated that the funds available for work on the Wind River project for the past two years have been so limited that very little has been done in the way of betterment and construction work, with the result that a large amount of work of that class must be done at the earliest practicable date or considerable portions of several of the units will be unfit for further service. Several of the units contain laterals having from 5 to 15 drops constructed of timber of from 4 to 9 feet, many of which have been in use since 1906 and 1907 and are now so badly decayed that it is practically impossible to make repairs that are effective. For the past four years considerable portions of available funds have been required to make temporary repairs to these hundreds of old structures, and it is a serious economic waste to continue to spend money on temporary repairs to structures in such condition. As a matter of fact, unless many of these structures are immediately replaced there is grave danger of the system's failing at a critical time, which will result in great damage to crops.

In addition to this, each year some new tracts are being broken and put into cultivation, which require the construction of new laterals and structures to enable delivery of water to the tracts. The needed demands for irrigation purposes especially during years of insufficient precipitation, necessitate

better diversion facilities and in some cases storage. The construction of the Ray Lake storage reservoir is now considered urgent. This reservoir will store water from the Little Wind River during flood season, which will greatly facilitate the delivery of water during low-water season, as the low-water flow of this river has always been found inadequate to supply the lands now under cultivation. When the Ray Lake storage reservoir is available for use it will also greatly relieve the low-water diversion requirements of the Ray and Coolidge ditches and permit a large quantity of water to flow to the subagency unit and to numerous private Indian ditches on the Little Wind River. The cost of operating and maintaining the system must also be taken care of, and in addition thereto it is necessary to make irrigable area surveys at the earliest practicable date, so as to be in position to make proper proof of beneficial use of water. So there is some construction proposed, but apparently it is only that which is necessary to protect the investment already made.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask this further question: Has the committee considered the question of fixing a permanent policy in carrying forward these irrigation projects in making up the estimates for these reimbursable appropriations?

Mr. CRAMTON. I assume that the general policy will be a continuance of the reimbursable feature, so that at any rate when the lands come into white ownership they will be subject to the repayment of these costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RHODES. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RHODES: Page 69, line 17, strike out "$200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. RHODES. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman stated a little while ago that as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs he had given considerable time and attention to the question of the reimbursable feature of these funds expended for reclamation. Did the gentleman or his committee make a report on that subject?

Mr. RHODES. The committee held hearings and reached a conclusion that Congress should not make further appropriations for new construction work on these irrigation projects until beneficial use had been made of all the water provided for, and I do not believe you will find in the appropriation acts of 1920 and 1921 there is authorization for new construction work on these projects.

Mr. RAKER. It seems to me that there is nothing more beneficial to the Indians than the development of these irrigation projects. And the reason I am so particular in asking these questions is that the Government will be protected and will be able to have refunded to it the money expended on these projects. I think we ought to be fair with ourselves in considering these matters.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a technical legal question. Of course, my opinion should not be controlling either as to the position of this committee or as to what conclusion the gentlemen may arrive at, but I do say that in these cases large sums of money have been expended on irrigation projects for which there seems to be little justification; and with due regard to those who have brought about these projects, I am prepared to say that the testimony before our subcommittee was that in most cases they were the white man's projects. The Indian was not consulted in the first instance, and he was not consulted as to the expenditure of money in the development of these projects, and in many cases he has found his property encumbered for more money than it is worth for construction charges. In truth and in fact the policy of ambitious white men and the policy of the Interior Department has been to try to convert large areas of land into farming lands which by nature are unfitted for that purpose. The severe climate, the short season, the lack of rainfall, and everything that make successful agriculture possible are wanting. Congress authorized a committee to go into the Indian reservations, and that committee went over the reservations and found that in the opinion of both Indians and many white men large sums of money had been expended on projects which were not justified, and for that reason this committee decided that no further money should be appropriated for new work until all the land now under water has been used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RHODES. I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman is saying is very interesting, but it does not apply to the particular case that he is discussing. If he will give me an opportunity to enlighten him as to that particular case I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to complete my statement. Then the gentleman will be able to make his statement and I shall be very delighted to hear it. Like a great many of our distinguished friends from the extreme Northwest the gentleman from Wyoming is very zealous in the cause of irrigation. What I was about to say was that as a result of a well-directed effort a well-meaning committee was sent by the Congress into the Northwest and made an investigation, and it was the opinion of that committee that Congress is not justified in appropriating these large sums of money against the Indians' will on these new projects. This sum of $200,000, appearing on page 69, in line 17, seems to be a large sum of money for a small project. I was only wanting to know if it is the policy of the present committee to change the plan that was adopted by your committee in the Sixty-sixth Congress, which I thought was well understood and accepted by Congress?

My question to the chairman of the committee is this: What is the policy of the present committee? Now, if $100,000 is not a reasonable sum for carrying forward the improvements that are necessary, then, of course, I shall not be grieved if this committee votes down my amendment. But I do think in a majority of these cases it is largely problematical as to what the result will be, and not justified.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman could hardly expect to cut out of this bill any portion of this particular $200,000, could he?

Mr. RHODES. I offer the amendment in good faith.

Mr. RAKER. Why does the gentleman ask that question?

Mr. BLANTON. I think it would take great effort to do it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I asked the gentleman from Missouri to yield to me, and he refused.

Mr. RHODES. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The gentleman need not do that, but I would like to hear some word about this particular item. Does the gentleman know that this particular item is extravagant? So far I submit that there has been no discussion of this item.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think that my services here or my action in regard to appropriations justify anyone in suggesting that the appropriations that relate to my section or my State do not have the same scrutiny that other appropriations do. The increase in the item referred to is not only justified but the item could have been increased still more and still be justified.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RHODES] clearly has in mind, in the statement he made, certain projects in the Northwest for the irrigation of lands partly held by Indians but proposed to be reclaimed largely for the benefit of white men. Some of these projects have merit and some have not much merit. We discussed one yesterday which I do not think has much merit, but it carried a small appropriation in this bill. But this is an Indian irrigation project. It is on an Indian reservation. The lands are all owned by Indians except where the land of a deceased Indian has been sold to a white man, the white man paying the full value, including construction cost, under regulations carefully prepared by the department. In that way there are white settlers scattered throughout the reservation, occupying perhaps 20 or 25 per cent of the irrigable land. There is no fairer area of irrigable land anywhere of the same latitude and altitude than this area.

It is a good fruit country; it is a part of my State where we grow the best apples. It is a wonderful alfalfa section. It is a good grain section. It is an ideal farming country, largely owned by the Indians, operated by the Indians, farmed by the Indians—one of the projects in the United States where the Indian is really making splendid progress in the cultivation of the land.

I went through the reservation this last summer and fall several times, over different roads, and I saw fine hay and straw stacks, and threshing machines at work, and I took pains to inquire whether the farms and the stacks and the machines were those of white men or Indians. I found that in a majority of cases the stacks of wheat and alfalfa and the machines were those of Indians, operated for and by the Indians.

During the war the development of this project, which has been going on for a number of years for the benefit of the Indians with their complete approval under treaty provisions to that effect, the appropriation was reduced to $75,000 a year. With that sum it has not been possible to keep the ditches already built in a good state of preservation and it has been utterly impossible to extend the system or even the laterals to the additional lands which the Indians themselves were desirous of cultivating.

The Indians not only made the treaty under which we are doing this work, they are not only taking advantage of the work being done and farming their land, but these Indians have abundant sources from which the money will be repaid. They own over a million acres of land on the north side of the Big Wind River which they have ceded to the United States but which has not yet been sold. A large portion of it is under lease for grazing purposes, bringing a steady revenue for the benefit of the Indians. On that land there are several oil fields.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. These oil wells are a long way from the railroad. They are just beginning to get in operation, but from these oil fields alone these Indians will be able to repay not only all the costs of reclamation but have a fine sum remaining. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the criticism aimed by him at certain enterprises on so-called Indian lands for the benefit of white men have a reasonable basis, but what he has said in no way applies to this particular Indian project, where the land is rich, where the climate is good, where the project is being carried on economically, and where the Indians are utilizing it, and where they have abundant resources for payment.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman has stated a number of conditions which are certainly ideal, and I think I am justified in pressing this further question. If it is answered to my satisfaction, of course I shall not be disappointed if my amendment fails. The gentleman has indicated that it is necessary from the Indian standpoint, and that is the thing about which I am particularly concerned. Does the gentleman say that the Indians are requesting the appropriation of $200,000 for the continuation of this project?

Mr. MONDELL. I visited this project recently. I found everyone interested anxious for a larger appropriation, particularly the Indian farmers. My attention was called to the fact that the money which has been appropriated during the past four years—the war period—was wholly insufficient for the maintenance of the system in good condition and for the necessary extension of the canals and laterals to the land. I discovered on inquiry that there had been a request submitted for an increase in the appropriation. This is an Indian project, and a good one.

Mr. RHODES. It is very refreshing to know that there is at least one Indian project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing roads and bridges within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, $20,000, said sum to be reimbursed from any funds which are now or may hereafter be placed in the Treasury to the credit of said Indians, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said Indians until paid.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, before that motion is put I have an amendment I desire to offer, and so has my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman will have any rights to-morrow that he has now.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman from Oklahoma has an amendment which could be disposed of at once.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will there be any debate upon it?

Mr. McCLINTIC. No.

Mr. CRAMTON. If there is no debate, I will withhold my motion.

Mr. CARTER. Then I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 21, line 12.

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, I prefer to have a little consideration of that. The gentleman will have his opportunity to-morrow. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13559 and had come to no resolution thereon.

RUSSIAN RELIEF.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report by the Surgeon General of the Army showing the medicines, medical, surgical, and hospital supplies transferred to American relief organizations under the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the President to transfer certain medical supplies for the relief of the distressed and famine-stricken people of Russia," approved January 20, 1922.

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 28, 1922.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McFADDEN, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 29, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13359) granting a pension to Mary Burdick, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 13593) making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. FROTHINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 13594) to amend section 14 of the military services act approved June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 13595) authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a drawbridge across the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal in Williamsport, Washington County, Md.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 13596) providing for the erection of a post-office and public building at Belding, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COLTON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 77) authorizing the President to appoint a "silver commission" to endeavor to bring about a larger use of silver and stabilize its value; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: Resolution (H. Res. 475) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives certain facts in his possession concerning the United States Sugar Equalization Board; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 13597) granting a pension to James A. Franklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13598) to provide an examination and survey of the Columbia River at Kalama, Wash.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 13599) granting a pension to Midian Mercer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13600) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shinall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13601) providing for the retirement of Richard F. Pellett; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 13602) granting a pension to Margaret Devlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6690. By Mr. CRAMTON: Memorial of the Minerva Club, of Croswell, Mich., protesting against the "all-year park measure" and the water-power amendment to the Barbour bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

6691. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of San Francisco Post, Society of American Military Engineers, urging adequate military preparedness in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

6692. By Mr. LAYTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Del., favoring the abolishment of the tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6693. By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: Petition of sundry citizens, favoring the abolishment of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6694. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of Valley Forge Chapter, No. 330, Order of Eastern Star, and citizens of Pennsylvania asking for the passage of the Towner-Sterling bill for the creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

6695. By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Kiwanis Club of Fargo, N. Dak., upon the subject of location, etc., of Government building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.